

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

REGULAR MEETING

The regular meeting of the South Bristol Town Board as called to order August 8, 2016 at 7:00pm at the South Bristol Town Hall, 6500 W Gannett Hill Road, Naples, NY 14512.

PRESENT

Daniel Marshall, Supervisor
Scott Wohlschlegel, Councilman
Donna Goodwin, Councilwoman
Stephen Cowley, Councilman
Jim Strickland, Councilman

RECORDING SECRETARY

Judy Voss, Town Clerk

OTHERS

Jim Wight, Brooks Lyon, Kevin Murphy, Dahl Schultz, Alan Braun,
Ralph Endres, Ceceilia Danahar, Wade & Jocelyn Sarkis, Brian & Delores Perkins, Bub
Seymour, Shelley & Peter Rees, Ann Jacobs, Ann Hanley, Ted Russell, Brett Detingo, Charles
Blake, Joe Kohler, et al

I. Supr. Marshall opened the meeting with roll call and the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion made by Councilman Wohlschlegel and seconded by Councilman Cowley the July 11, 2016 Regular Town Board meeting minutes were ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

Supr. Marshall noted that next Monday night (6pm – 8pm) there will be a meeting held by the Canandaigua Watershed Council to discuss and get public input regarding the proposed on-site wastewater treatment law which would have effect on properties with a wastewater system within 100 feet of the lake. The public is encouraged to attend.

Supr. Marshall announced that South Bristol's own Meghan Musnicki won their first heat today by 2-boat lengths and will be in the finals of the Rio Olympics.

Supr. Marshall mentioned that the Town of South Bristol is very dependent on the sales tax revenue for the town budget and we are very fortunate to receive approximately \$1.2 million each year in sales tax for a \$2 million budget is significant. That is one of the reasons we can do so well with our tax rate. The sales tax is received quarterly and this last quarter the check received was down from the 2015 2nd quarter check of \$317,564.00 to receiving just over \$312,000.00. This is what we depend on and the majority of the sales tax certainly comes from Eastview Mall.

V. OLD BUSINESS
SUPPLEMENTAL EIS DISCUSSION
EVERWILDE PROJECT – MARY JO KORONA & KATHY SPENCER

Supr. Marshall noted that Privilege of the Floor and the Committee reports will follow Old Business.

Supr. Marshall said that the discussion of the viability of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. There is currently, in the process, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and because of some things that have occurred and changed since the DEIS was started there has been some argument for and against the need for a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. The Town of South Bristol is the lead agency for this issue, it is up to the Town Board to decide whether this needs to be done. It is quite an extensive process to go through and to understand what our legal obligations are and interpretations, Supr. Marshall said to assist the Town Board tonight, Supr. Marshall asked the Town Attorney, Mary Jo Korona, from LeClair, Korona, and also Kathy Spencer from LaBella Assoc. LaBella has been the South Bristol consultants since the beginning of the project. Supr. Marshall introduced Mary Jo Korona.

Ms. Korona thanked Supr. Marshall, the Board and residents' attending tonight's meeting. Ms. Korona said it is important tonight and the Board will engage in dialogue about whether or not the facts and the law support or do not support a decision for requiring a project developer to prepare and submit a SEIS. Ms. Korona said that the Board has been provided with a packet of information which includes letter of support for not requiring the SEIS authored by Ashley Champion, Esq. dated May 10, 2016 who is here tonight with her colleague, Rob Renner, Esq., and also accompanied by the author of the FES letter, Frank Sciramammano. The Board also has a letter from Wade Sarkis to the Town Board members, the Cecelia Danahar letter, and 2 letters from Karl Essler, Esq., dated February 25, 2016 and follow up letter dated May 31, 2016 in support of the opposing residents. The May 31, 2016 letter from Mr. Essler is a reply to Ms. Champion's letter. The Board also has been provided with a copy of NYS Environmental regulation Section 617.9 and that's the regulation that covers and governs decision making about whether or not you should require the supplemental. The packet for the Board also includes the SEQR handbook explanation that deals with the SEIS and also the explanation of Alternative Sites. Ms. Korona also noted that Ms. Spencer is also here as a resource. 9.55

Supr. Marshall said the packet referred to by Ms. Korona has been in the hands of the Town Board for more than a week for review.

Ms. Korona gave a background summary, you are here tonight presented with the opportunity to consider whether a supplemental option should be required and summarized the context of the decision making tonight in terms of the varied positions that you've got in front of you. You have the Project Developers position that No SEIS should be required because onsite utilities were considered in Section 4.4 in the DEIS. That position sort of focuses on the proposed hook-up to quasi-public facilities which are the facilities offered the Bristol Sewerage Disposal Corp. and the BWWC. The opposing residents' view which is that a new DEIS should be required and then we have a position that has been articulated by Mr. Sarkis that the scope of the changes would warrant opportunity for further investigation.

Ms. Korona directed the Board to Section 617.9 of the NYS Environmental regulations

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

which is *Preparation and Content of Environmental Impact Statements* and (a) paragraph 7 called *Supplemental EIS*. This is the law that we are looking at in context to the decision that you have been asked to make whether or not to require the *Supplemental EIS*. Ms. Korona read from the text:

(i) *The lead agency (which is the Town Board) may require a Supplemental EIS limited to the specific significant adverse environmental impacts not addressed or inadequately addressed in the EIS that arise from:*

(a) *changes proposed for the project;*

(b) *newly discovered information; or*

(c) *a change in circumstances related to the project.*

(ii) *The decision to require preparation of a supplemental EIS, in the case of newly discovered information, must be based upon the following criteria:*

(a) *the importance and relevance of the information; and*

(b) *the present state of the information in the EIS.*

(iii) *If a supplement is required, it will be subject to the full procedures of this Part.*

Ms. Korona asked Ms. Spencer about the significance of statement (iii).

Ms. Spencer said that the Supplemental EIS would be limited to a narrow set of issues that you thought were not addressed or might bring us significant adverse impacts that have not been addressed adequately in the DEIS. Once those issues of concern are identified, the project sponsor or applicant would write a supplement to the EIS which would be a very narrow document. This would then be subject to the full procedures means it would then have to be accepted by the Town Board as complete, would have to make a decision if a public hearing is required and if there is the comments would be limited to the those issues in the supplemental, not the whole range of the project. Those comments would be added to the comments all ready to be address to the final and proceed forward with the final impact statement.

Supr. Marshall asked about a timeline. Ms. Spencer said once that was submitted and acceptable fairly soon after that, might take one month. We are adding about 3 month to where we are now.

Ms. Korona discussed the (a), (b) and (c) of the guidelines: *Changes to the project (b) newly discovered information*. Ms. Korona said the answer to this is no. Changes to the project that give rise to specific significant adverse environmental impacts not addressed or inadequately addressed in the EIS. What is out there that has been identified as a proposed change? If you look at the Champion letter and Mr. Sciramammano's letter, we are talking about the proposed change that relates to the decision to have the utilities provided by Bristol Sewerage Disposal and the Water Company versus developing on-site septic. You must focus on and decide the importance and relevance of that information and do that in the context of what the present state of the DEIS is. (a) *change in circumstances related to the project*. Ms. Korona continued, has been described in the case law as a "catch all" provision and described that way by the 4th Department which South Bristol is within that jurisdiction. Ms. Korona read from the decision: *A leading commentator has described the change of circumstance as a catch-all provision intended to encompass situations not directly related to project changes or to the discovery of new information*. Ms. Korona said it is one of the helpful areas where you can focus in and decide, has this changed the circumstances? Newly discovered information is the disclosure

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

about the change in the project, an affiliate of the project developer has acquired the resort property and also a fact to consider the DEIS does not include the analysis of alternative sites. The change in circumstance is the affiliate of the developer has acquired the resort property; the resort property is all ready zoned for the use that is proposed by the spa and inn, whereas the present site would have to be rezoned, a very important factor to be considered in the analysis.

Ms. Spencer continued with (c): As you may recall the current DEIS at this time does not include a discussion of alternative sites; however that is consistent with the situation at the time it was written. In the case of a private developer, SEQR says that they do not have to consider any alternate sites except those owned by them or under their control in some way. At the time when the inn and spa was proposed there was no alternative site owned by the developer in the Town and we had no discussion of alternative sites in the DEIS. From the SEQR handbook which is one of the guidance documents we use, there is an analysis of when alternatives sites are reasonable to be included in the EIS: *Any case where the suitability of the site for the type of action proposed is a critical issue in which case a conceptual discussion of siteing should be required. Is the suitability of this site for this type of action a critical factor?* Ms. Spencer said it is her opinion that it probably is. 25.47

Supr. Marshall asked about the current proposed site, not the viable alternative site?

Ms. Spencer said we don't know if there is a viable alternative site; we don't know if it is actually a viable site because there hasn't been anything written about alternative sites. One of the standards in SEQR about alternative sites is that the project sponsors goals and objectives have to be met by that site. It is possible that the project sponsor would argue that the ownership of Bristol Harbor Resort and that land does not offer a site that meets their goals and objectives. There is competing guidance in SEQR; one is saying the suitability of the site is a critical factor and you should talk about alternative sites and then it says earlier that if the project sponsor doesn't own or control a site they don't have to. There is now a change that an affiliate of the project sponsor, owns this site with the Planned Development zoning which is not in place on the proposed site. One of the tenants of SEQR when you are looking at alternatives, the whole point is to do an evaluation as to whether there is an alternative available that potentially reduces the significant adverse environmental impacts that may occur from the proposed site; potentially decrease the significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed site.

Ms. Korona said that to continue and highlight something said earlier and what is meant by this hard look and what it means to take a hard look at a SEQR question. The first point to highlight is the mere fact that the project has changed does not necessarily give rise for the need for a SEIS. The SEIS may be required only if environmentally significant modifications are made after the issuance of the DEIS. Whether or not a modification, or in this case the changed circumstances, whether or not the modification is significant for the lead agency to decide is after identifying the relevant areas of concerns and again taking the hard look at the potential impacts and making a reasoned elaboration on the record for the basis of your determination. This "Hard Look" is looking at all the facts, all the information and distilled down through that information and then applied it in the context of the regulation that you are looking at; 617.9, paragraph 7. Most important of anything that you will do tonight is to engage in interactive dialogue amongst yourselves and ask questions where you want to, whether it be myself, and the authors of the letters submitted, Ms.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

Spencer, Ms. Champion, Mr. Sciramammano to ask any questions about the materials that you have in front of you. At the end of the day, this decision is yours and the most important thing you can do is make sure that decision is reflected in the record, in the minutes, as the outcome of dialogue and focusing on the right factors. Any questions at all on the right factors, you have every right to ask those questions.

Ms. Spencer said that this is very common under SEQR, there is a lot of case law, guidance, regulations; this happens all the time. You as the lead agency, SEQR gives you quite a bit of latitude and discretion to make decisions like this that arguments for and arguments against; you are the local body, the lead agency, you know the Town, you know the project and you make the decision. It is not that unusual where something like this that is not quite black or white that comes before a Board such as you and you just make a decision.

Ms. Korona said that is a great point. If you engage in the dialogue and make a reasoned decision based on the relevant, important facts in the law, then the courts are going uphold your decision because it is rational and reasonable and not arbitrary and capricious. That's the standard. The courts aren't in the business in second-guessing the Town Boards because nobody knows the business the way that you do. Ms. Korona asked the Town Board to begin. 32.10

Supr. Marshall asked if Ms. Champion had any comments.

Ms. Champion said this issue was framed very well by Ms. Korona and Ms. Spencer and our position is set forth in our letter. The one point that she wouldn't want the board to stray from that Ms. Korona raised a couple of times, it is not just a change in circumstances that triggers the need for a SEIS. It is a change in circumstances that results in new or inadequately vetted environmental impacts. There is the larger rezoning process in which the board is going to look at everything and whether or not just generally, they think this project is a good idea. The SEQR process is a process that is limited to environmental impacts. Just because there is a change in the project or a change in circumstances unless those changes are triggering new impacts that were not fully vetted before, SEQR is not the appropriate place to be re-examining the project or the new aspects of the projects. We deal with projects all the time that are this size or larger where there is no EIS at all. From our view, having a change to having on site utilities to public utilities and saying that will somehow is going to triggering new environmental impacts that require a SEQR review is quite a bit of a stretch. Even if we hadn't included the onsite utility plan within the DEIS, which we did and people commented on it; person after person were saying "if you could only hook up." It wasn't as though this is all of a sudden a new thing that no one had contemplated and now we have to figure out what it means. There was an alternative included in the we included in the impact statement; even if we put that aside, even if we hadn't mentioned anything about on-site utilities; I look at it very similar as our original plan was to have a wind turbine or solar farm to generate our electricity and now we are hooking up to the grid; we are not adding new impacts or making anything worse. We are hooking up to available quasi-public utilities and because of that the project is shrinking, the amount of land disturbance is shrinking the amount of trees being cut is all shrinking so the project is getting better. If precedent is being set that any project change even projects that lessen impacts is somehow going to get kicked back through environmental impact process; that is not really the goal of SEQR, most projects change throughout the SEQR process and that's the whole point. You want

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

to start in the beginning with the worst case scenario and take the feedback from the engineers and the other involved agencies and the public and you do whatever you can to pare the project down and to make it the best project possible. At the end, the goal is to have changes in a project that reduce impacts and we think that is what we have done here. Similarly with the purchase of the adjacent property which is not purchased by this exact project sponsor which is a requirement under SEQR; it was purchased by an affiliated entity that has its own business, its own accounts, its own property, it is completely separate. And that is another issue that we didn't address that alternative in the DEIS, not only because that property wasn't owned by the affiliated entity but because that project is not sufficient to host this. That spot might be okay for just a spa but what we are talking about here isn't just a spa. It's a lakefront inn, resort, spa, restaurant, bakery and the current Bristol Harbor site is not a viable alternative and wouldn't be from the developers' perspective, an alternative to explore because it's not viable. 39.15 And even though that wasn't included at the public hearing and during the public comment period, people brought it up, *why can't you go across the street?* And that is something we are addressing in the FEIS so again it's not an issue that is going to be overlooked by the impact statement without having a SEIS.

Supr. Marshall asked Mr. Sciramammano if he had anything to say?

Mr. Sciramamano said only that it was originally proposed with sewer and water hookups as you may recall. Because of the delays and the inability to secure those hookups and the agreement with Bristol Harbor sewer & water that we went to an onsite system. The impact statement reflected that as well as the alternative of having hookups. Now we are very pleased that the hookups are available which strengths the project, reduces the probably the primary impact that people commented; which was the onsite sewage disposal. We think that it lessens the impact not increase them.

Ms. Champion said in the beginning we talked about we think we are going to be able to have these hookups and we made a conscience decision to move this process forward and give you worst case scenario and we are going to have to fully vet that and we did it and the developer took the time and paid for the engineering to show this board and town and if we have to do it onsite we can do it and we can make it work and we can make sure this is a viable alternative; so we evaluated worst case scenario. We are happy we no longer have to pursue worst case scenario because we have those hookups. But in no way is that a trigger of new impacts that now need to be vetted through this process.

Mr. Sciramammano said he disagreed with one little thing that Kathy (Spencer) said and thinks that this is a 6-month delay, not a 3-month. 38.44 To get through the SEQR process, it took a year. Just to get the DEIS done and the impact statement and everything else, this is the same process over again.

Supr. Marshall noted that he is fully aware of the time and the energy that has been spent on this project.

Councilwoman Goodwin said she didn't think the issues would be as big in scope.

Mr. Sciramammano said for the process, the timelines are the same; whether it is one issue

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

or ten issues, you have to wait 30-days, you have to give a certain period for public comment and respond to the comments.

Ms. Champion, said again, from our perspective, it's the same no matter how many issues there are, we would like, as you are considering this tonight to think about what issues are you even talking about because again we are evaluating in an impact statement aren't changes, they are impacts. What we would be evaluating is the septic system goes away now and some new endangered species isn't going to hang around the site after. There has to be an impact associated with that change so we don't even know what we would be vetting to be honest. 40.04

Supr. Marshall noted that we also had two other residents that also wrote letters and was going to offer them a few minutes as well.

Cecelia Danahar of Seneca Point Road said the decision shouldn't be made on whether it will take 3 months or 6 months; when the decision is made considering all that needs to be considered, and I don't think the issue that wasn't discussed in the original DEIS is the sewer. The issue that hasn't been addressed that would have an environmental impact is the sewer system at Bristol Harbor adequate to supply services to a full build-out at Bristol Harbor and Everwilde. That has not been discussed or vetted or questioned or studied. That is the change that hasn't been addressed.

Supr. Marshall noted that there is a remapping of the (sewer) district that is underway and was going to be on our agenda this evening and has had to be laid over. There is a process underway to examine the facility to determine if it is capable. Is that a part of the EIS? Supr. Marshall didn't know. Mrs. Danahar didn't know either.

Ms. Spencer said she thinks she knows what they are talking about, there would be an environmental review under SEQR not necessarily the impact statement for the action of approving the remapping. In either a supplemental, if that is what you decide, or the in the final, there would need to be some discussion of *now there's this particular development, is the capacity there to serve it?* It wouldn't have to be a big complicated discussion, it would be *now we are going to hookup, how are we going to do it and is there capacity and is entity financially sound?*

Mrs. Danahar continued, said she also wanted to discuss the alternative site of the Bristol Harbor, it is not whether its viable in the developers opinion, it has never been discussed, Bristol Harbor as an alternative and believe Ms. Spencer had said it is as if the entity or something in its control owns a viable alternative site that needs to be discussed. Mrs. Danahar said from what she understands because she lives next door to Bristol Harbor and sees Laura and Todd Cooke there every single day running the show and thinks it is in their control and should be addressed because it has an extremely significant environmental impact and that it would dissipate all negative environmental impacts because it's zoned a PD all ready and you wouldn't have the negative impact on the residential 3-acre proposed site. 43.00

Wade Sarkis said as far as the SEIS and triggers that Mary Jo had mentioned Cecelia hit on a couple of them; the capacity issue of the Bristol Harbor Sewerage Corp. not only at its current state but full build-out of Bristol Harbor Village and the projected number of units there. The

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

amendment of the geographic service area underway, I asked in March if that was a SEQR event in and of itself and didn't know if that decision has been made.

Ms. Spencer answered yes, there will be an environmental SEQR review. Not necessarily an impact statement. It will need to be reviewed under the SEQR law by the Town Board for the mapping change.

Mr. Sarkis said then the project sponsor can offer themselves the sewer hookup and it seems like we are getting the cart before the horse a little bit. If the mapping amendment is a SEQR process and you are talking about hooking up and extending a larger geographic service area proposed project, one has to be accomplished before the other he thought.

Ms. Spencer said it would be cleaner if it was; it doesn't necessarily has to be gone through SEQR before this FEIS is finished but it would be cleaner if it was. It would facilitate things a lot more if we knew there were no environmental impacts of the remapping and if you evaluate those impacts and put that to bed. One of the issues in that that you and I have discussed we need to know capacity at full build-out and financial solvency just for the remapping. And then something specific like this there would be questions *Can it handle the spa and how would it be connected, would there be capacity?* And apply the specifics. 45.32

Mr. Sarkis continued, and thinks that a significant number of us feel now that we are beyond the DEIS when significant changes come to the plan and there is no more opportunity for public input there is a potential for a level of frustration among many of us. Indeed the Planning Board, last October, discussed the fact that if indeed this hookup were available they would anticipate seeing the plans all over again. That is in their two meetings minutes they had back in October; they are very concerned scope creep and many changes from the original planned that they reviewed and they made great mention of wishing they could revisit their prior recommendation and we feel the Board has the right and obligation to require a SEIS. Regarding the alternative site analysis I wanted to correct Ms. Spencer, the plan sponsors do indeed own a potential site, one they presented to the Town of Canandaigua on Middle Cheshire Road; at least when they submitted the DEIS they still owned that property. That proposal was never turned down by the Town of Canandaigua. In fact, Everwilde was on the agenda in early 2014 before they found out about the other property on Seneca Point Road; they subsequently withdrew their application. As far as Ms. Champion comments about different owners, corporate shells aside, it's the same owner it's the same controller and thinks that is pretty clear. 47.33 The Bristol Harbor site as an alternative he thinks is a game changer as far as our anticipation of review of alternative site. It will provide the purported benefits of the proposed plan while eliminating all the environmental concerns and certainly it will meet the project sponsors goals and objectives. We sincerely hope the Board will require a detailed analysis and review Bristol Harbor as an alternative site as required by SEQR in the FEIS.

Ms. Korona noted that whether or not the rezoning is a good idea or not is not before the Board tonight. The issue of whether this entity out there is or is not affiliated for SEQR purposes is something you may consider in the context of requiring or not requiring the SEIS because you don't know. You don't know all the facts tonight about that so called affiliate; unless I'm wrong you may have questions about that.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

Ms. Champion said from our perspective you can assume it's the same, it is not a viable alternative, this project will never be built on that property by this developer; you can assume it is the same exact entity that's fine it is still not workable from their perspective, given the size 49.19 of the land that is actually left available over there to do what they want. Like I said, they may be able to add a spa onto Bristol Harbor but you're not going to be able to do the size or even the all the different offerings you are not going to have the lake frontage that they are looking for with this project.

Ms. Korona stated, then again what Ms. Champion has just stated to you is exactly what Kathy Spencer was talking about; about it being a possible, viable alternative. Okay?

Supr. Marshall asked the Board for questions, discussion.

Councilman Wohlschlegel stated that in his view hooking up to the Bristol Sewerage Corp. is a plus, but as stated, he didn't know that the capacity is there to handle a spa plus restaurant, bakery all at Bristol Harbor and thinks that study needs to be conducted and if that falls under Supplemental, that needs to be done. 50.53

Councilman Cowley agreed.

Councilman Wohlschlegel asked what happens to storm water, is that going to the lake or is that going to the sewage treatment plant and if you have overflow of the sewage treatment plant, what is that environmental impact on the Canandaigua Lake if you have sewer water or storm water going into that?

Mr. Sciramammano said he could put that to rest, that is not allowed or ever be allowed.

Councilman Wohlschlegels said those are concerns.

Ms. Spencer said in a normal process and we were at the point where we were writing the FEIS, one of the required parts of the impact statement is "*what has changed, what are the project changes?*" so, like Mary Jo said there can be project changes, its normal, as Ashley said. Usually, they are in the right direction and would expect those issues to be addressed in the FEIS. Since the FEIS rests with you (the Board) and me, they will be addressed. Ms. Spencer said she would have to pull the information from them, but because the project changed, we will want to know if they hookup, does it work?

Councilman Wohlschlegel said that information was not originally in the DEIS.

Ms. Spencer answered, no, and that is okay. The question is *Are there changes that rise to a level that raise new significant adverse impacts that were not addressed?* It changed because of the hookup, in her opinion a hookup to Bristol Harbor sewer and water is reduce some of the adverse impacts and yes, there will be changes, but it is not adding new impact. We don't have impacts that we haven't all ready addressed. It will have to be evaluated in the final anyway. The question is, *Are there things that might cause significant adverse impacts?* Having said that, the hookup to Bristol Harbor probably would not and to me that leaves the question of *this alternative site*. The

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

reason it is difficult to make the decision is because when you look at an alternative site, it is not going to adding significant adverse environmental impacts, if you are just looking at an alternative site. 53.46 The question is, *Is there a possibility there that might reduce some of the significant adverse environmental impacts with the proposed site*, which is the point of alternative site analysis. That might be the crux of your decision. Some of your questions are going to have to be answered in the final anyway. There won't be the hard look at the alternative site as there would be if you required a supplemental.

Ms. Korona, the DEIS does not include an analysis of alternative sites.

Supr. Marshall said the question he also had with the time frame for the supplemental, 3 months to 6 months. If we said no supplemental impact statement is available, what is the next step in the process?

Ms. Spencer answered the next step would be, it's her understanding that the project sponsor has ready, or nearly ready, a first crack at the FEIS. That would come to LaBella's office and typically those things are written from the point of view of the project sponsor so there is some re-writing that is typically done. Ms. Spencer said she would rewrite some and bring it to the Board, you take a look at it, tell me the concerns.

Supr. Marshall said eventually the FEIS will become a town document. You start with suggestions from the developer, and fine-tune it and becomes the towns.

Ms. Spencer agreed.

Supr. Marshall asked if we were to go that route, would the FEIS have to include discussion of these two subjects, connection to the existing utilities and the alternative site?

Ms. Spencer answered it would because it is our document; the difference is the public would not have a chance to comment.

Supr. Marshall said the downside of this is there is no public comment.

Ms. Spencer said when the FEIS is done; the DEC SEQR officials have decided there is no more public comment on it. Whatever happens in your decision making process, but under SEQR, public comment is over unless you have a supplemental.

Councilwoman Goodwin asked, once there is a FEIS you can't do any supplemental after the final?

Ms. Spencer said you can if there was another project change. Just because there changes in the project, they will be included in the FEIS anyway because we will write them in because it will be a concern to us. It won't go before the public to get their input, but it will go before you.

Mr. Sciramammano, in the DEIS we included the copies of the original agreements that were for the 20 homes which included the agreement by Bristol Harbor that they had capacity

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

sufficient for that and those flows were less than we were projecting; so that was in there in terms of capacity. There will be a chance for public comment; you still have to hold a public hearing for re-zoning. To say there is no chance for public comment on this issue is not correct, the public hearing is wide open. People can talk about anything they want. 57.56

Supr. Marshall said he understood that and asked the Board if they had anymore comments.

Councilman Strickland said his concerns are with the capacity and possibly having an alternative site and all his questions he had were answered by their detailed explanation. The capacity and that information was all ready done with the 20 homes.

Mr. Sciramammano agreed.

Ms. Champion said to follow up to Ms. Spencer's about these points are going to be addressed in the FEIS regardless; they are going to be addressed in two ways: one is that we have the onsite alternative hookup plan and the affiliate didn't own this property, both of those issues were brought up during public comment so we are required to address them in our response to public comment anyways when we talk about all of these things. Then there is the additional layer of Ms. Spencer's point was, that is a project change that we will have to talk about that there is capacity for the hookup and that it all works just like any other developer would for any other utility change and with the actual remapping, that SEQR process and knows there was an EAF that was prepared for that and that process will detail any issues with the actual facility the same as any developer who says we have a hookup letter from RG&E for that development you don't do EIS analysis of the grid. You rely on the utility what is saying and that is the fact.

Councilwoman Goodwin noted that there have been a lot of issues around the water/sewer rates at Bristol Harbor and how is it going to affect that?

Mr. Sciramammano said that is outside the scope of normal consideration but beyond that it will only help because you are going to add a significant user which will help the facility. The whole structure of the rates is out of the control of this particular project.

Supr. Marshall agreed that is more of an issue for the remapping whether the rate structure is sufficient enough to handle the additional, potential load. 1.01

Councilman Wohlschlegel asked Mr. Sciramammano that he said the capacity is based on calculations of a future Everwilde project or based on the 20-homes you mentioned?

Mr. Sciramammano said it is based on the 20-homes and is expecting the Everwilde flow to be less than.

Councilman Wohlschlegel said expecting, but would rather have the calculations being that final. 1.02

Councilman Cowley asked if Mr. Sciramammano had those numbers?

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

Mr. Sciramammano said he didn't have them right now.

Ms. Champion said yes, they will be part of the submittal of the EAF for the mapping extension. They do talk about the possible redevelopment of this property so it's going to be covered in more than one place.

Councilman Cowley asked, to clarify you are saying the Everwilde project would be less per day than 20 homes?

Mr. Sciramammano said one of the flows, the sewer or the water, was less than what we projected for Everwilde.

Supr. Marshall asked if the Town Board was ready to make a decision this evening, we are under no obligation to; it would be nice to address this, this evening, one way or the other; a motion to propose the SEIS or a motion not to.

Councilwoman Goodwin said she would like to address it this evening and make a decision tonight.

Councilman Wohlschlegel said he wanted to say one thing before we go on and read from the SEQR information back to (i) *the Lead Agency may require a Supplemental EIS limited to the specific, significant, adverse environmental impacts not addressed or not adequately addressed in the EIS arise from changes proposed in the project, newly discovered information or a change in circumstances related to the project.* Councilman Wohlschlegel asked, do we feel in our minds that any of that criteria has been tripped? Do we need to do a Supplemental Environmental Impact study based on that?

Councilwoman Goodwin said she believes we need to do a Supplemental EIS. Councilwoman Goodwin said that is her opinion and would like to see a study on the sewer and thinks there are a lot of questions on that; they're projections. We need to know capacity, we need to know, is this going to be viable, the hookup?

Councilman Wohlschlegel read from the guidelines, (ii) *The decision to require the preparation of the Supplemental EIS in the case of newly discovered information must be based on the following criteria: the importance and relevance of the information and the present state of the information in the EIS.*

Supr. Marshall agreed and said to take for instance the *importance and relevance* and the potential for a alternative location, and said he would consider that irrelevant himself. In the present state of the DEIS it is not really adequately addressed. On that basis you could make the argument that the SEIS should be required.

On a motion made by Councilman Wohlschlegel to request the SEIS and seconded by Councilwoman Goodwin.

Ms. Korona said you will want your decision tonight, either way, if you are going to require

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

a supplemental you'll want to identify what trigger, and it may be all of them, but you want to identify what trigger in (a) that you are relying on and if you are going on the (b) trigger, then you are also going to want to specifically identify the information you that you have considered in the context of importance and relevance and also the present state of the information in the DEIS. That is what you have to do in terms of coming in with this requirement under paragraph 7.

1.06

Ms. Spencer said the only thing to say is, if you go ahead with a SEIS it would move things along if we spent just 5 minutes and just talked about the issues of concern so that they can start writing; give them an outline and specifics and narrow that scope to exactly what you want to hear.

Ms. Champion said that they would need to know exactly what the impact is.

Supr. Marshall said that there is a motion and second on the floor and we are going to hold on that for a minute. Supr. Marshall said he did not have an issue with the utility change and didn't believe there would be a problem with regards to capacity when you consider the fact that the owners of the sewer corporation are also, potentially, the owners of the facility and they are going to make sure that it's working and not worried about a catastrophic disaster because of that. Personally, the big issue to him is the potential for a viable alternative site and it does not appear that was not adequately addressed in the DEIS and it should be for no other reason than to allow public comment on it. 1.11

Ms. Champion asked Ms. Spencer and Ms. Korona, as for the issue requiring a review in the SEIS of an alternative site and our answer is *this is not a viable alternative site* and said her question to you is the sense of going through a public comment period when the site is not viable.

Ms. Spencer said if that is what they want to hear about, then you would go into, first of all moving the project wholesale to Bristol Harbor as well as moving components. There are probably a couple of reasonable iterations that you could come up with and would want to see those documented out. If it is truly not a viable site, then document it out.

Supr. Marshall said the question to him is he has not had anyone explain to me why it would not be a viable site.

Councilwoman Goodwin said we haven't received any specifics on that.

Ms. Spencer agreed and said no we haven't.

Ms. Champion said the question was raised during the public comment period and so the specifics would come in the FEIS is where we would put them together.

Ms. Spencer agreed and believed that you are but nobody has seen that and not through any fault of yours but because we were instructed not to give a FEIS until this decision was made.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

Ms. Spencer spoke to the Board, make sure that is truly, you know as well as I do that during the SEQR process it is almost a negotiation so maybe there is something that you could move over there that would make everybody happy, happier. Give it an honest evaluation instead of *that doesn't work* or *there's not enough room*. Maybe there is truly something that would reduce the size of the development on the hilltop there. Ms. Spencer didn't know the possibilities but don't hand-wave it because I'll throw it right back and say *Let's get a serious evaluation of this* because maybe Laura Cook would give her approval.

Ms. Korona said we have been focusing on what your decision making needs to be like in case of a decision in supporting a SEIS; by the same token your record really has to show our reasons and rational for not requiring a SEIS. Then you are back into Subparagraph 7, *We don't think these things have been triggered by these reasons*.

Supr. Marshall noted that the reason I would be in favor of the SEIS is because I consider the other location relevant information and the current state of the DEIS does not include adequate information about an alternative location. Supr. Marshall said he also went on to say that he did not consider the connection to the utility to be nearly adverse enough to be a concern.

Ms. Korona said your position is clearly on the record.

Supr. Marshall said he wanted to point out for the record that all that information and correspondence that we received from Ashley Champion, Frank, Cecelia Danahar, Wade Sarkis and Karl Essler; we have all that documentation and has been reviewed and is part of the decision making process that this Town Board has had to go through. Supr. Marshall said a motion was made by Councilman Wohlschlegel to require a SEIS and seconded by Councilwoman Goodwin and asked for any other additional discussion. 1.16.42

Ms. Champion asked if this is one issue, then, the alternate site?

Supr. Marshall agreed and said that is the one issue.

Councilwoman Goodwin said her issue is with the study for the capacity with the sewer .

Supr. Marshall agreed and said there would be no harm in providing the information about the capability of the sewer.

Ms. Champion said that is different than whether or not that is an impact we are evaluating under a SEIS. We have to provide that anyways.

Supr. Marshall agreed and said that information will show up in the FEIS, is it not?

Ms. Champion said yes.

Mr. Sciramammano said we are trying not to have the public hearing to open up into a forum on Bristol Harbor utility, its rate structure; previous mapping whether it is inadequate or not is all stuff that will be covered in the remapping. We don't want drag that into this. Don't

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

forget, your approval can be conditioned on having the hookup and the hookup is conditioned on the DEC and DOH approving it; they look at capacity and all the other issues regarding hookup. Again, just the fact that you open it up to public comment and drag in all the issues regarding Bristol Harbor Sewer and Water Corp.

Supr. Marshall asked Ms. Korona with regards to public comment, is the public hearing mandatory; the comment period is mandatory.

Ms. Korona agreed and answered that the public hearing is not mandatory.

Ms. Spencer said if you are defining the content of the SEIS to really focus on the alternative site and not the hookup then any comment that comes in are considered irrelevant and won't be addressed in the FEIS. If somebody gets up and speaks about endangered species again, unless it has something to do with that alternative site, it is irrelevant and we dismiss it during the compilation of comments.

Councilman Wohlschlegel read from the Everwilde EIS, *The Everwilde project currently contemplates an on-site sewer and water system. The original intent was to connect to the existing Bristol Harbor sewer and water system, however, Bristol Harbor sewer system is undergoing a review by the Town of South Bristol resulting in an indefinite delay in such a connection. As a result, the project sponsor has developed an on-site system for sewer. In the future, if the connection to Bristol Harbor system becomes feasible, the project sponsor will connect to those utilities. If this occurs prior to the on-site approval, construction of site plan can be modified to more closely reflect the original proposed layout resulting in less site disturbances more fully discussed in Section 4. It is understood by the project sponsor that, consistent with the Planning Board on rezoning, in the event referral sewer connection is feasible a referral will be made by the Town Board to the Planning Board to review the aspect of this project.* Councilman Wohlschlegel thought he would bring that up but it really doesn't mention capacity and things like that.

Ms. Spencer said there are two ways to handle the hookup to Bristol Harbor. If the decision is to require a SEIS and you want to limit to the alternative site, then you limit it to the alternative site. When the FEIS is finally written it has to discuss changes that have occurred between the draft and the final. All that hookup information would have to come out then. There are actually a number of changes; the parking lot redistributed, the storm water pond is moved, changes in setbacks. There are a number of changes to the site plan that result from the hookup and all of this would definitely have to be discussed in the FEIS if they are not discussed in the SEIS. You are going to get them one way or the other; you could restrict the SEIS to just discussion of alternative sites and what the possibilities there are for moving or using that alternative site. It may very well be that there aren't, that the project doesn't fit or doesn't meet their objectives but then they document that and would have that record.

Supr. Marshall asked the Board again, there is a motion and a second on the table and with this discussion are there additional changes, does the motion stay?

Councilman Strickland asked if we are restricting this to an alternative site?

Supr. Marshall said it sounds like we are.

Ms. Spencer said the Board can decide whether you are going to have a supplemental or not and then can discuss the range of issues that need to be decided on that.

Ms. Korona said if you are going to decide on the SEIS, you are going to have to identify why and it may very well be that you the why is limited to the fact that we have this potential viable alternative and this new information in the form of the acquisition of the property by a project affiliate; what does that mean? And the fact that the alternative site is not included in the current draft of the EIS. Or you may say that you want to go broader than that and suggests that the supplemental is required because the changes, i.e. the hookup issue, to constitute or give rise to a significant adverse environmental impact was not address or adequately addressed. You can decide to use both of those concepts within the context of deciding on the SEIS or limit it to the project modification is narrowly defined by the hookup issue or defined by this issue of existence of the affiliate that could provide an alternative site, a viable alternative site and have that address in the context of a discussion of alternative sites.

Supr. Marshall asked the Board if the motion include consideration of the capacity of the sewer? Councilwoman Goodwin said we ought to get the motion down then discuss the rationale.

On a motion made by Councilman Wohlschlegel and seconded by Councilwoman Goodwin, to request a SEIS was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

Ms. Korona said now the Board needs to specifically what it is relying on and its reason for requiring the SEIS; then we go into what the scope is.

Supr. Marshall said what we are asking for is information regarding the viable alternative location and also the potential to connect to the existing sewer system was discussed and under changes proposed it is now happening and all we want to know is some relevant information for capacity and suspect that will not be difficult to obtain especially once the Town and Bristol Sewer Corporation can rectify the mapping.

Mr. Sciramammano said he needed to clarify something; we are not going to discuss the rate issue, just capacity?

Supr. Marshall noted that the rate issue is strictly with regard to mapping; a totally different subject.

Councilman Wohlschlegel said his issue is with capacity because you build a spa based on studies and then all of a sudden you have to put in another aeration based on that.

Mr. Sciramammano said that is a capacity issue.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

Ms. Champion said that we will show the sewer and water companies both have to have capacity for the project and then the reasons or our analysis of a Bristol Harbor site as an alternative location for the Everwilde Project.

Mr. Sciramammano said either in whole or part.

Ms. Spencer wanted to clarify, that you as the Board are comfortable in waiting for the other changes to the site plan as a result of this hookup; there's going to be changes. You are comfortable waiting until the FEIS to have those lists described and listed?

Supr. Marshall said he was as did Councilman Cowley and Councilwoman Goodwin.

Ms. Spencer said that the supplemental will come through and talk about the connection with Bristol Harbor and capacity and this alternative site possibility or possibilities and document why it is not a viable site. 1.28

Councilman Wohlschlegel said for this supplemental, can we do just a put the information on our website or do we need to have a public meeting?

Ms. Spencer answered that we have to follow the full procedure; it will be online and will be distributed again.

Mr. Sciramammano said all the notices; same thing and the Board will decide whether or not to hold a public hearing.

Ms. Korona said, to clarify; this requirement, the SEIS, is based on all three of the triggers, (a), (b) and (c), is that correct or incorrect?

Supr. Marshall said he wasn't sure that the Board addressed the change in circumstance as much as we did; *changes proposed and newly found information*.

Ms. Champion said we didn't address the first half of that which is the new impacts; we are just going to do it over.

Ms. Korona said in terms of change in circumstances you might want to disclose the fact that an affiliate of the project/developer has acquired that property across the street.

Supr. Marshall asked if that wasn't considered newly discovered information?

Ms. Korona answered, it is, but you still have to get those triggers in, in case of newly discovered information and to (a) and (b). You certainly have enough information to hit all three of those triggers and it is potentially in some respects, easier to hit (c) then it is (b) but we have hit (b) all ready.

Ms. Spencer said, just to answer Ms. Champion's question, the whole point for this alternative site analysis is to see if there is a viable alternative that can reduce the significant

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

adverse impacts that are all ready known and have been evaluated for the proposed site. That is where the significant adverse impacts and its cause come in. Having an alternative site won't create more impacts, but it will reduce impacts that are on the proposed site and that is the whole thrust of the alternative site analysis; we will need to look at the adverse impacts on the proposed site and state how they can be reduced if any of these alternatives are viable.

Supr. Marshall said that this concludes our conversation for the SEIS thanked everyone for attending.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On a motion made by Supr. Marshall to move into EXECUTIVE SESSION to discuss pending litigation and seconded by Councilman Wohlschlegel was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

The Town Board exited into EXECUTIVE SESSION at 8:32pm

The Town Board came out of EXECUTIVE SESSION at 8:42pm by a motion made by Supr. Marshall and seconded by Councilman Wohlschlegel.

Supr. Marshall said the Board discussed pending litigation in EXECUTIVE SESSION and no final decision was made; it was strictly an advisory from our lawyer.

FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS FRANCHISE AGREEMENT

Supr. Marshall noted that he intended to have copies for the Board and get it all to them; we aren't going to answer this tonight and needs the Board to look at the franchise agreement from Frontier Communications. The Town Attorney, Jeff Graff, will review the agreement and will find that it is pretty generic and next month will vote for or against the agreement. The big argument for approving the franchise agreement is Time Warner is competition and maybe this will have something to do with their pricing.

BHSC MAPPING CHANGE

Supr. Marshall that the Bristol Harbor sewer district map changed has been taken off the agenda tonight. We are waiting for all the financial data which is almost complete.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

HIGHWAY

Councilman Cowley read from the Highway report:

The Board will need to pass a Resolution recognizing Middle Brook Rd. as a Town Road. Apparently it has never been included on the LHI (Local Highway Inventory) with the State. We also need a Resolution showing the vineyard loop on Granger Point as it is maintained as a Town Road. We are currently just getting credit for the spur that goes in off Route 21. There is no rush on this as the information will not change at the State level until next year. Our CHIPS funding remains the same.

1. Will have color samples for the salt barn roof. Construction on that project will commence late August/ early September. Supt. Wight said that the construction company will honor a 5-year roof warranty and submit the insurance certificates.
2. Interviews are being scheduled this week to fill the MEO position.
3. Chip seal (oil and stone) is scheduled for the week of August 24th, Bopple Hill, Hicks Road, Stemple Hill Road.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

4. Roadside mowing continues. Supt. Wight said there were potholes that have been brought to his attention.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

COUNTY SNOW PLOW CONTRACT / NAPLES ROADS

Supr. Marshall said the Board has a copy of the snow plow contract; it is not the plow contract for the County Roads in South Bristol but a contract to plow the roads in the Town of Naples. The Town of Naples has chosen not to plow for the County this year and we have been asked if we would consider the contract. It starts out with the standard \$5,500 per centerline mile and which will cover the 8.7 miles which includes County Road 21 and a price of \$48,125 and because we are doing another Town's County roads they are adding an additional \$800 per centerline of road which brings another \$7000. Because of County Road 21 is located on the other side of Naples and is the Italy Valley Road we would need to drive through the Village of Naples to do that and they will pay us to drive through the village to do this.

Supr. Marshall said that while discussing this with the Board of Supervisors the made an argument with the Chairman of Public Works that we had this discussion, Supt. Wight, Councilman Cowley and Supr. Marshall, that we would need a dedicated truck could be used for this. The plow truck would go all the way down County Road 12, and continue on and plow County Road 21 and come back to finish County Road 12. The concern was running out of material before we got back.

Supt. Wight said the bigger concern was not getting County Road 12 completely plowed at a reasonable time.

Supr. Marshall noted that County Road 12 will be plowed completely first so that County Road 12 is done in a timely manner. Thus the need, possibility, for a special truck for County Road 21 so the argument to pay South Bristol the 3.9 miles to go through the Village of Naples they will now pay the Town from the Town Board to County Road 21 for approximately 10 miles which he was told the County would agree to. Supr. Marshall suggested said we not sign the contract yet and ask for the additional money and go from there.

Supr. Marshall said he did go down and speak with the Naples Town Supervisor in the interest of being good neighbors and they understand and are okay with it. The Highway Supt. in Naples refuses to plow for the County.

Supt. Wight asked whether or not this will continue next year and be our responsibility from here on out?

Supr. Marshall said that is a valid question. Supr. Marshall mentioned that the Chairman of Public Works asked about South Bristol having the proper insurance. The insurance company then told him that the insurance is calculated on the number of miles we plow; \$36.17 per centerline mile which will increase our premium \$350 to plow those roads.

Supt. Wight said if the county is going to pay for the dedicated truck that is even a better situation. Supr. Marshall agreed.

Councilman Cowley said, as long as you can do all of this physically and in a timely manner.

Supr. Marshall agreed and worries about any accidents. 13.20

ADOPTION OF THE NYS DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN

Councilman Cowley said that a request by the Town Employees for the compensation plan. This is for municipal employees only and for municipalities with less than 100 employees.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING

August 8, 2016

We need a resolution tonight to approve and from there a local rep will come down and explain the program. The deferred compensation is before taxes for retirement and the cost comes out of participant fees; no cost to the Town.

Councilwoman Goodwin said she would take care of contacting the local rep to get things started for the employees.

On a motion made by Councilman Cowley and seconded by Councilman Strickland, to adopt the NYS Deferred Compensation Plan was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

APPOINTMENT TO FULL TIME POSITION - DIANE SCHULTZ GRAHAM

Supr. Marshall needs a motion to move Diane Graham from a Temporary Part-time position to a Full-time permanent position.

On a motion made by Councilman Strickland and seconded by Councilwoman Goodwin, the motion was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

SETTING DATE FOR PRE-BUDGET WORKSHOP

Supr. Marshall noted that the budget season is upon us and we need to schedule a Budget Workshop by the first of September. Supr. Marshall said he would like to have a pre-budget workshop and would be sending out forms to the departments for the anticipated budgetary needs. One of the things the Town hasn't done much in the past and really need to start doing is forecasting for the future.

The Board discussed suggested workshop dates.

VIII. REPORTS: ASSESSOR

On a motion made by Councilman Wohlschlegel and seconded by Councilman Cowley the Assessor's Report for July 2016 was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

CEO

On a motion made by Councilman Cowley and seconded by Councilman Strickland, the CEO Report for July 2016 was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

Councilwoman Goodwin requested the list of addresses for building permits issued be added to the report.

Supr. Marshall noted that this year there are a number of properties that have gone sometimes referred to as zombie properties. Supr. Marshall said that we have the assistant to the CEO working on this and contacting the owners. One of the options for this is to have the Town mow the properties and charge them on their taxes; we don't want to do it but there seems to be more properties than normal that have become overgrown. Supr. Marshall noted that on County Road 12 there are 4 properties you have to be concerned about a fire.

TOWN CLERK

On a motion made by Councilman Cowley and seconded by Councilwoman Goodwin the Town Clerk’s Report for July 2016 was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

**IX. ACCOUNTING:
SUPERVISOR’S REPORT**

Supr. Marshall noted that there is not a Supervisor’s Report this month and will have it next month. We haven’t received the bank statement for the bookkeeper to close out the month.

BUDGET TRANSFERS

On a motion made by Councilwoman Goodwin and seconded by Councilman Cowley, the Budget Transfers were ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Transfer From | A1010.411 | Town Bd- Conference/Train to | \$748.02 |
| | A1010.415 | Town Bd – Fiscal Policy/Plan | |
| | A1650.41 | Central Comm Systems to | \$3,208.59 |
| | A1650.41 | Central Comm Contr Internet | |
| | DA5130.22 | Mach – Equip Loader to | \$634.72 |
| | DA5130.2 | Mach – Equip | |
| | EG8160.450 | Home & Comm – Pers Serv CD | \$693.90 |
| | EG8160.4 | Home & Comm – Pers Serv Cont | |

BUDGET TRANSFER CORRECTION

Supr. Marshall noted that the transfers from the July 11, 2016 need to be corrected.

On a motion made by Councilman Strickland and seconded by Councilman Wohlschlegel the Budget Transfer Correction was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

| | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Rescind: | A1220.11 | Supr. – Admin Serv | |
| | A1220.41 | Supr. – Contr Outside Services | |
| Approve: | Account 1430.1 should have been used instead of A1220.11 | | |
| | A1430.1 | Personnel – Per Ser/Bookkeeper | |
| | A1220.41 | Supr – Contr Outside Serv | \$15,000.00 |

APPROVAL OF VOUCHERS

On a mtion made by Councilman Cowley and seconded by Councilman Strickland, Abstract No. 8, Vouchers no.365 – 413 totaling \$40,059.11 was ACCEPTED. Voting AYE: 5. Voting NAY: 0. Voting AYE: Marshall, Goodwin, Wohlschlegel, Cowley and Strickland.

SOUTH BRISTOL TOWN BOARD MEETING
August 8, 2016

X. 2nd PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Alan Braun of Bristol Harbor asked the Board that when they look into the capacity of the sewer district that currently services 684 Planned Unit Developments at Bristol Harbor and where it may go in the future.

Also, there will be fireworks at the Bristol Harbor Lodge at to please let the Bristol Harbor residents know in advance.

XI. ADJOURN: 9:10PM

Respectfully submitted:

Judy Voss
South Bristol Town Clerk