

**TOWN OF DRYDEN
TOWN BOARD MEETING
December 14, 2017**

Present: Supervisor Jason Leifer, Cl Daniel Lamb, Cl Linda Lavine,
Cl Deborah Cipolla-Dennis, Cl Kathrin Servoss

Elected Officials: Bambi L. Avery, Town Clerk

Other Town Staff: Ray Burger, Director of Planning
Jennifer Case, Bookkeeper

Supv Leifer opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. Board members and audience recited the pledge of allegiance.

RESOLUTION #153 (2017) – APPROVE ABSTRACT #12

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves Abstract #12, as audited, general vouchers #818 through #930 (\$537, 443.46) and TA vouchers #29 and #30 (\$4,450.73), totaling \$\$541,894.19.

2nd Cl Cipolla-Dennis

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Cipolla-Dennis	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

Budget modifications are necessary to accommodate payments for the Ag Plan, to Cayuga Lake Watershed for membership, and for toner and office supplies.

RESOLUTION #154 (2017) – AUTHORIZE BUDGET MODIFICATIONS

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the following budget modifications:

From	To	Amount
A7110.411 Rail Trail	A8020.456 Ag Land	8,522.80
A8020.412 Varna Impl.	A8020.456 Ag Land	3,900.00
A8020.412 Varna Impl.	A8020.456 Ag Land	200.00
A8020.412 Varna Impl.	A8790.403 Watershed Monitoring	900.00
A1220.455 Supervisor training	A1220.451 Office Supply	307.00
A1110.105 Court Security	A1110.4 Court contractual	750.00

2nd Cl Servoss

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Cipolla-Dennis	Yes

Cl Servoss	Yes
Cl Lamb	Yes
Supv Leifer	Yes

Cl Lamb announced that the town did well in the economic development council award process. The rail trail received a grant award of \$182,000 from the state. It was the result of a well thought out application to justify the award. It was competitive and is a real tribute to everyone involved in the rail trail effort. The challenge ahead is to use it wisely.

Supv Leifer announced the town received a grant in the amount of \$24,900 for a town-wide housing study to help us understand housing needs across the town.

PUBLIC HEARING PROPOSED ZONING LAW CHANGES

Supv Leifer opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. Ray Burger said two amendments regarding large scale solar were introduced last month. One reduces setbacks to 10' for instances where another large scale energy system is located across the line and zero for fences where adjacent to another solar facility. The other change is for the amount of the initial deposit for escrow for professional services. It was originally set at 1% which could mean a huge amount of escrow in some instances for the town to manage. The amendment provides for a cap of \$25,000 and additional deposits if that amount is depleted.

Joe Osmeloski asked for clarification and noted fences are not specifically defined. Is it fences less than 6' which are aren't structures or fences more than 6' which are structures. Perhaps it should be more specific. R Burger said it should be clarified that this is for all fences of any kind in between the lots as with residential properties. J Osmeloski said this law is a joke and it shouldn't be allowed. Zoning law is in towns to protect the public. The ZBA rules on the zoning laws and protects the laws which in turn protects the public. The ZBA had five specific criteria to rule on and said no to all criteria for an area variance. The ZBA denied the internal setback variance. Distributed Sun then pulled all the applications. If the board goes through with this are saying to the ZBA that it isn't needed; that the town will change the law if they rule against. ZBA makes decisions to protect the public. They ruled based on the law that the area variance/setback should never be allowed. Changing the laws for a company is ridiculous. If you change the laws, change it to help the people of Dryden. If you want to change the setbacks, change the ones that protect people's properties. Don't just change them so that Distributed Sun or any other company can come in and put more panels in. This law is a joke.

Supv Leifer said it was his understanding that the ZBA said the town board should change the law instead of do variances.

Sarah Osmeloski said she doesn't really have an issue with reducing the 50' setbacks. It makes sense, but the amendment does nothing for the perimeter setbacks. You can only put 2MW per parcel, so if we allow the solar companies to put these closer together, they should be able to move their panels back from the perimeter property lines. She feels they should be 100' from all of the perimeter property lines and 200' from any adjacent property that has a residence or a business that is accessed by the public. By taking away the internal lot lines you are reducing the emergency access to these facilities. If you increase the perimeter access the emergency vehicles will be able to get in if there is a wild fire or other disaster. They will have room to maneuver.

There is also the property tax issue. By increasing the setbacks from the perimeter you will mitigate the property tax decrease that the adjacent properties will suffer. That will give

more money to the town, county and the schools. There is also the problem of shading. The people with adjoining properties can plant fast growing trees and they will shade a lot more than fifty feet. By having the setbacks further it would mitigate the shading problems that these companies could have. It will reduce the feeling of encroachment for neighbors. She finds a lot of psychological distress by the thought of having these panels encroaching close to her property. They are unnatural and unmoving and plastic. She thinks they are creepy. Some people think they are wonderful, but they aren't the ones that have live beside them.

She doesn't think this amendment should go through until it is modified to take consideration of the perimeter setbacks.

Bruno Schickel asked whether Distributed Sun paid the deposit of 1% when they made their application. He said it was half a million dollars and asked if it was paid. R Burger said there was a deposit with a reimbursable agreement and they deposited \$20,000. B Schickel asked how that could be if the law says 1% in the law and they are talking about a 50 million dollar project. How could you collect only \$20,000? It seems like the town is changing its law to conform to what the town has let them do already. It seems like you are not following the law.

Sarah Osmeloski made a very good point regarding this amendment. You are closing the setbacks internally. Why not push the setbacks on the external line to solve some of the neighbor issues. They are good points. But it seems like you've a Christmas tree here and you keep adding decorations to it. You are trying to create something as you go along. It's been rushed from the beginning. It's rushed now. This is an opportunity to put a moratorium in place to reboot the law. There is uniform support for large scale solar. Don't be afraid to start a process to bring people together and create unity around the issue. It's not impossible to do, but consistently you are refusing to acknowledge and address legitimate concerns of the immediate neighbors and the general public that will have to look at these for the next 20 to 40 years. By rushing this through and creating an amendment and bending over backwards to accommodate Distributed Sun you will create other problems after this for the next project that comes in. These problems are not going to go away when you are bringing these large scale solar projects in. The law is not adequate to protect the rural beauty of our town. It hasn't been adequate from the start, and what you are doing today is not going to make it any better. 50' setback from the perimeters is simply not adequate. Solar should be out of sight. There is a way you can do that.

Craig Schutt agrees with Sarah Osmeloski and argued some of those facts at the last Conservation Board meeting when they discussed this. He thinks shrinking the internal setbacks makes sense, but then why don't we ask for something to be done with setbacks to adjacent properties. No one wanted to go along with that. The board voted and he was the only no vote and that was his reasoning. He feels we can do better than this. Why rush it through, why not do it right?

Matt Kozlowski, Cornell University Facilities Engineering, spoke in support of this amendment with respect to setbacks. As currently structured complying projects have a larger development footprint with no discernible positive impact to landowners, neighbors or community in general. Projects complying with current law have a net negative effect on land, financial and natural resources with those large internal setbacks. He is in support of the proposed change.

Janis Graham said she is for the decrease in internal setbacks and thinks it is good. She would like the board to speak about why they didn't do anything about the exterior setbacks. She thought because of something that was said earlier that if the internal setbacks were decreased the external ones would be increased. It wouldn't really affect Sun8 because they have already pretty much done that for the neighbors around Dodge Road. There is still a

lot of land around them and both Cornell and the County have said they want to use as much as they can. So moving forward, to have deeper setbacks from the road and neighbors would be good to go with the reduction in the internal lines. For the most part she doesn't believe it will affect Sun8 because they have mostly done that already.

She submitted the following letter from Leslie Appel:

To the Dryden Town Board,

It is hard to believe that months and months, almost one year, after first learning about the Dryden Solar Project, I yet again find myself in a position of writing a letter in protest to this Board. One sad thing I realize now is that this letter will not even have an impact, as it is clear to me that the Board will do anything to get this commercial solar project done.

As a resident with property directly adjacent to the commercial solar site, I can say that we, the adjacent residents, do not feel like the Board cares about our feelings or concerns. I cannot believe that after everything that has transpired over the past months, that the Board is now going to change a law to make this project happen. The neighboring residents have accepted that this project has been approved, We understand that the solar project will be built on a commercial level in our residential community. But please, do not change a law for this one project. If the law needs to be changed, please take the time to evaluate exactly what has to be changed for the overall Solar Plan for Dryden, not just to get this project through.

As a Board, you pass laws for a reason. So, to change a law to fit a particular project does not make sense and is absolutely not right. The law should not be modified to fit a project, but rather projects should be modified to fit the law! If a law needs to be modified, then the law should be modified in relation to a solid and comprehensive plan for Dryden overall. If for example, the law is changed to decrease the setbacks within a solar project, care should be taken to consider then increasing the setback from the road to account for adjacent neighbors. In this case, if the setbacks are decreased within the project field, then the setbacks should be increased from the road, which could spare the cutting of trees and help maintain more of the feel of the neighborhood. But, the law should not be written just for this particular project. A law should be written that covers the comprehensive solar plan for all of Dryden, to ensure that solar projects are done in the best possible way for Dryden neighborhoods and for consideration of properties directly adjacent to all projects.

Thank you, Leslie Appel 78 Dodge Road

Cl Cipolla-Dennis addressed the reason that was not included in this amendment. If the board were to say that the exterior lot lines have to be increased by the same amount that the interior lot lines are decreased, they can only stipulate that on that one piece of property. Because of the PSC Rules, each 2MW array must be on its own separate lot. So an applicant takes a fairly large lot and subdivides it and then you have these 2MW arrays. As this is written, it allows the Town Board to have the flexibility to address this during site plan review. During that process, the Town Board can say a certain portion of a lot is closer to a residence and ask for 100' or 200' setback. If it is put in the law it becomes really restrictive and may not be the best thing for the neighborhood. The idea is to allow that flexibility during site plan review to make those external lot line setbacks wider in places where it makes sense but not where it doesn't make sense and is not a good use of the property. This amendment gives flexibility for the Town Board to require developer to provide a larger setback where it makes sense. Sun8 has done this on their project where it makes sense. The decision was to write this amendment in this way so that it could be addressed during site plan review by the Town Board.

D Weinstein reminded the board that the Planning Board after considerable debate about this and careful discussion about the implications voted to support this amendment. It was essentially overlooked when the law was put together and is a good improvement to the law.

Susan Ashdown, 12 Forest Lane, is in support of the amendment. She feels it is protecting her and it makes sense to have smaller internal setbacks to maximize use of the land and minimizes the footprint. She understands that the zoning law can't give larger setbacks in front because there are so many different circumstances. When as a society we first started putting up telephone and electric poles some thought it was horrible, not natural and not part of the landscape. Now we don't even see them. We will reach that point with solar panels. Solar panels are protecting us and protecting our land and making it possible for us to survive on the land and keep the land healthy. It is a great company you are working with and this seems a reasonable thing to do.

Martha Robertson, 1655 Ellis Hollow Road, supports the amendment. It is a very common place thing to develop a law and go through the boards and see where things can be improved. It shows the board's willingness to listen to its boards and realize the ramifications of the policies and laws that it makes. The ZBA's role is to apply the law as written. It is then the job of the Town Board to make the laws and revise as necessary. It is the job of policy makers to do that. The town attorney or ZBA will advise when they identify something that looks like it needs fixing. This is the right thing to do. She doesn't think the board has rushed anything. They have been listening to public comment for months and months. It's time to move this project along. She is delighted that Distributed Sun has stuck with the town of Dryden. They have invested a lot in this town and will continue to do so. She can't wait to sign up. The board has done a lot of due diligence and it is really impressive.

Larry Heller, 1167 Ellis Hollow Road, said it seems that most of us are ok with that 10' change, mainly because of the explanation of how the law and site plan would work. This is the first time he has been to a meeting and heard anyone from the board actually respond to questions from the audience. He applauds the board for finally doing that. He hopes that when companies come and want to put in a site, the board will request that they minimize tree cut. There is so much open farmland in this town. He thinks it is awful that Sun8 proposes to cut 38 acres of trees. If we want to save the world, he doesn't feel cutting trees is necessary. He hopes that is a consideration for site plan; that the board looks at how many trees they are planning on cutting and try to minimize that. Dryden has lovely trees and hills. We don't live here for amenities of antique shops and restaurants, it is surrounding beauty. He understands the need for black panels, often on vacant unused land, but cutting of trees sets a precedent. When the site plan is taken into consideration he would like tree cutting kept at a minimum. Sun8 says they selectively cut trees, but the biggest and most beautiful trees are cut because they cast the most shade. Cutting them when there is so much open land just doesn't work for him. He hopes the board takes that into consideration when looking at site plans for these developments.

Cl Lamb said he agrees with him on trees. He has been in touch with Bharath Srinivasan about saving trees. He regrets the loss of trees for the projects but it happens with development. We are a year into this process. He doesn't see this as a project that was fast tracked. The board used a model to create this law, looked at best practices and tried to fit it to the community. Of course the board will make improvements. The deposit issue has to be reconciled. If this project was required to make a 1% deposit it would be half a million dollars and that's excessive. We are improving the law by reducing the size of the footprint of the project by reducing the setbacks. We make no apologies for improving the law. We think it's the right thing to do and what you would want us to be doing.

Marie McRae, 710 Irish Settlement, supports the amendment. It makes logical sense and makes the land use more economical. She would like to second the thoughts on Cl Cipolla-Dennis' explanation of site plan review and how the law gets put together for flexibility.

Sarah Zemanek, Cornell University, supports this change. She reminded the board of Dean Borst's letter again. She is the Dean of the College of Ag and Life Science. There is

concern about change in climate and Dryden is being smart about the way we go forward with this. Allowing us to shrink the footprint allows us to preserve more farmland and minimize impacts. With respect to tree clearing, they have consulted with the Audubon Society and they state that warming of the planet is the single greatest environmental threat. The solar farm proposed is an opportunity to take local action on a global problem. New shrub land habitat is helpful to birds. There are pros and cons to cutting trees.

Supv Leifer closed the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Supv Leifer said what is being done tonight shows why we don't need a moratorium. We are able to amend the law based on what is actually happening. During the review process, we are able to in the special use and site plan stage have the setbacks pushed further away from residences. The ZBA, in their denial of the variance request, stated board should revise the law rather than have them grant variances for something where the intent was to benefit the neighborhood in the first place. This is a deliberative process with contributions from the Conservation Board, Planning Board and public comment. Right now we only have two projects before the town, Sun8 and Delaware River. If we learn anything different from the Delaware River project we can further amend the law to benefit the entire town. This is not to benefit the solar companies. Continued insinuation that this benefits the companies is wrong. There are towns in the state that have smaller external setbacks than this law.

Ray Burger led the board through the SEQR process. There were no comments from the board on Part 1. The board reviewed Part 2 that identifies two impacts determined to be small to moderate. Attachment 3 is an explanation. Cl Cipolla-Dennis said attachment A is well written and sums it up nicely.

RESOLUTION #155 (2017) – NEG SEQR DEC – Adoption of Local Law Amending Zoning Law Provisions Regarding Setbacks and Application Deposits for Solar Energy Systems

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

WHEREAS,

- A. The proposed action involves adoption of a local law to Amend Town of Dryden Zoning Law Provisions Regarding Setbacks and Application Deposits for Solar Energy Systems, and
- B. The Town Board of the Town of Dryden is treating adoption of this local law as a Type I action pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") and is the lead agency for the purposes of environmental review, and
- C. The Town Board of the Town of Dryden, in performing the lead agency function for its environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of SEQRA, (i) thoroughly reviewed the Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF"), Parts I and 2, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR §617.7(c), and (iii) completed the EAF, Part 3;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Town Board of the Town of Dryden, based upon (i) its thorough review of the EAF, Parts I and 2, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant

adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR §617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the EAF, Part 3, including the reasons noted thereon (which reasons are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance (“Negative Declaration”) in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that an Environmental Impact Statement will not be required, and

2. The Responsible Officer of the Town Board of the Town of Dryden is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the determination of significance, confirming the foregoing Negative Declaration, which fully completed and signed EAF and determination of significance shall be incorporated by reference in this Resolution.

2nd Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Cipolla-Dennis	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

A comment from the Conservation Board to consider wildlife corridors and fencing’s potential conflict with electrical codes was noted. R Burger said he didn’t anticipate a problem with that. With respect to fences, the language was amended to read zero feet for all fences. The letter pursuant to GML§239 from Tompkins County Planning indicates no detrimental effects.

Resolution #156 (2017) - Amend Town of Dryden Zoning Law Provisions Regarding Setbacks and Application Deposits for Solar Energy Systems

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption.

WHEREAS, the Town has the authority to adopt the local law referred to above (hereafter “the Local Law”) pursuant to Article 9, §1 of the New York State Constitution and §10 of the New York State Municipal Home Rule Law, among other things; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Dryden Zoning Law currently requires a 50 foot setback for ground-mounted large-scale solar energy systems, and a 1% initial deposit for solar energy facilities applications; and

WHEREAS, reducing this setback for certain lot lines where ground-mounted large-scale solar energy systems are also located across the line provides flexibility to reduce visual impacts in certain situations, and revisions to the initial deposit requirement continue to assure adequate funds for application review, and

WHEREAS, the Local Law was drafted by the Planning Department, with input and advice of the Attorney for the Town, and was reviewed by the Planning and Conservation Boards; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting on November 16, 2017, the Town Board of the Town of Dryden reviewed and discussed the proposed local law and called for a public hearing to be held by said Town Board on December 14, 2017 at 7:05 p.m. to hear all interested parties on the Local Law; and

WHEREAS, notice of said public hearing was duly advertised in the Ithaca Journal, and

WHEREAS, said public hearing was duly held on said date and time at the Town Hall of the Town of Dryden and all parties in attendance were permitted an opportunity to speak on behalf of or in opposition to said proposed local law, or any part thereof, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board is treating adoption of the proposed local law as a Type I action pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) and its implementing regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617, for which the Town Board of the Town of Dryden, acting as lead agency in an environmental review with respect to the adoption of this local law, made a negative determination of environmental significance on December 14, 2017, after having reviewed and accepted as adequate a Full Environmental Assessment Form Parts 1, 2 and 3 prepared by the Town’s Planning staff; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board finds that adoption of this local law is consistent with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, which supports large scale solar installations in the Town where their impacts are mitigated through siting and buffering; and

WHEREAS, the Tompkins County Department of Planning reviewed the proposed local law pursuant to sections 239-1 and 239-m of the New York General Municipal Law and issued a letter determination dated November 29, 2017, and determined that this action has no negative inter-community, or county-wide impacts, and

Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Dryden hereby adopts Local Law ___ of 2017 entitled “A Local Law to Amend Town of Dryden Zoning Law Provisions Regarding Setbacks and Application Deposits for Solar Energy Systems”, and it is further

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to file said local law with the Secretary of State as required by law.
2nd Cl Cipolla-Dennis

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Cipolla-Dennis	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

Tobacco Free Outdoor Areas Presentation

Ted Sheeley of Tompkins County Public Health – Tobacco Free Tompkins gave a presentation on the benefit of tobacco free outdoor areas. The main goal is to create tobacco free landscapes and help youth to stay tobacco free. By making tobacco less accessible and providing fewer spaces for its use, they are hoping for a tobacco free generation. The Village of Dryden recently passed a local law in this regard.

Bob Beck said he would like to see the rail trail to be smoke free. Cl Servoss would like to expand to all town properties. Cl Cipolla-Dennis would like to see a discussion of the intent. She agrees that modeling for tobacco-free is best, but it is not illegal to use tobacco. We need to encourage feedback from the public and be clear about the intent.

Rec Department staffing – The first round of applications for recreation coordinator didn’t generate a large applicant pool. The position of Recreation Supervisor has been suggested to expand the applicant pool. The board needs to set a salary range. \$40,000 to

\$45,000 will fit within the budget for 2018 and provide for one full-time and one part-time person. Cl Lavine stated she believes we should allow for other than full time possibilities.

RESOLUTION #157 (2017) – CREATE RECREATION SUPERVISOR POSITION

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby creates the position of Recreation Supervisor pursuant to Civil Service Law and Rules and establishes an annual salary range of \$40,000 to \$45,000.

2nd Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Cipolla-Dennis	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

The date for the organizational meeting was set for January 4, 2018, at 7:00 p.m. A resolution for water rates will be presented next week as well as proposed local laws for the sewer rates.

Cl Cipolla-Dennis announced that she will be resigning from the board effective December 31, 2017, due to personal reasons. A confluence of events have occurred that makes it best for her to step down at this time. She has really enjoyed being on the board and feels that a lot has been accomplished these last two years. It has been a rewarding experience.

RESOLUTION #158 (2017) – APPROVE RECREATION PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the Recreation Partnership Agreement for the term commencing January 1, 2018 and ending December 31, 2022.

2nd Cl Servoss

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Cipolla-Dennis	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

Supv Leifer said he has received material in the mail from a law firm that will audit our cable franchise agreement and is interested in helping negotiate a new agreement. TCCOG has a task force working on this and Charter has not had interest in talking at all. Supv Leifer would like to talk with this firm and see what they have to offer. He would like to get a franchise agreement that has 15 residences per linear mile or fraction thereof build-out clause. They have been asking for that and it is not unreasonable. We need to figure out an approach and the wireless option isn't doing the job. Rural electrical cooperatives are getting funding and using their authority to fight this. It is something to explore. Companies seem to have no interest in getting new customers. The board agreed Supv Leifer should contact this firm.

Proposed agenda next week include public hearings on the Local Law for Conservation Board alternates and Ag and Farmland Preservation Plan, acceptance of the Natural Resources Conservation Plan, a presentation from IV4 about cloud storage vs onsite servers, Bolton Point accounts that haven't been upgraded to new meters. New business will include setting water rates, setting a public hearing on sewer rates (for January 4) and a town hall pet policy.

Cl Lamb said the Rail Trial Task Force has been discussing the possibility of having an engineering study for a bridge over Route 13. There is a possibility for county money, and they've been encouraged to apply soon for that money. There was a question about whether it could be included in the parks grant that we just got. They can't get serious consideration from state reps for this without a serious design. It's nice to get to the creek, but long term if this is a commuter trail that is a detour. There is possible use of the \$10,000 in the budget and we may be able to flex the state parks money. Supv Leifer noted we need to get serious about replenishing the rec reserves.

Malloryville & Red Mill Road bridges can move forward with bonding. We need to get this in place because we will have to start making payments soon unless we reach an agreement with the county with respect to Freese Road and George Road savings.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bambi L. Avery