

**TOWN OF DRYDEN
TOWN BOARD MEETING
August 20, 2020
Via Zoom**

Present: Supervisor Jason Leifer, Cl Daniel Lamb, Cl James Skaley,
Cl Kathrin Servoss, Cl Loren Sparling

Elected Officials: Bambi L. Avery, Town Clerk
Rick Young, Highway/DPW Superintendent

Other Town Staff: Ray Burger, Planning Director
Khandi Sokoni, Town Attorney
Sherri Crispell, Payroll Clerk
Amanda Anderson, Bookkeeper/HR Director

Supv Leifer opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

CORNELL REOPENING PRESENTATION

Gary Stewart, Joel Malina and Karen Brown spoke to the board about Cornell University’s reopening plan and answered questions from the public.

TOWN CLERK

RESOLUTION #102 (2020) – APPROVE MINUTES

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

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the meeting minutes of July 9 and July 16, 2020.
2nd Cl Servoss

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

RESOLUTION #103 (2020) – ADOPT RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULE

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

RESOLVED, by the Town Board of the Town of Dryden that Retention and Disposition Schedule for New York Local Government Records (LGS-1), issued pursuant to Article 57-A of the Arts and Cultural Affairs Law, and containing legal minimum retention periods for local government records, is hereby adopted for use by all officers in legally disposing of valueless records listed therein.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with Article 57-A:

(a) only those records will be disposed of that are described in Retention and Disposition Schedule for New York Local Government Records (LGS-1), after they have met the minimum retention periods described therein;

(b) only those records will be disposed of that do not have sufficient administrative, fiscal, legal, or historical value to merit retention beyond established legal minimum period.
2nd Cl Skaley

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

BOOKKEEPER

Cl Servoss introduced Amanda Anderson who started working for the town on Monday as Bookkeeper/HR Director.

**PUBLIC HEARING
PROPOSED ZONING LAW AMENDMENTS FOR
HAMLET OF VARNA (continued from last month)**

Supv Leifer explained this is a continuation of the public hearing opened in July.

David Weinstein, 51 Freese Road, read the following statement:

You have received an overwhelming number of messages from the public asking you to vote to approve the amendment to the zoning in Varna, unanimously recommended by the Dryden Planning Board. In addition to a letter co-signed by 99 people in support of this amendment, to my knowledge you have received specific letters or emails from at least 11 individuals documenting their support, as well as support from the Varna Community Association. Four of us spoke in favor of passing this amendment at the last meeting.

The following additional people asked me to make sure their email of support for the amendment is included in the record. To save time, I'll just read their names and addresses, and trust that you will read their emails to see the specifics comments of support.

John Svensson 516 Ellis Hollow Creek Road
Chris and Mike Kimball 97 Freese Rd
Hilary Lambert 1676 Hanshaw Road

Add to those numbers the people who are speaking in favor tonight.

In contrast, to my knowledge you have received one letter opposing the amendment, and 3 individuals spoke against it last month, with a couple of others indicating they see pluses and minuses to the amendment. Yes, County Planning told you to keep the current zoning based on a myth that higher density will lead to more affordable housing even though the evidence says there is no record of that happening.

It is clear that the vocal public sentiment strongly supports adopting this amendment.

Why do folks feel so strongly? They see no chance that Varna can achieve the goals and directions that were so carefully formulated and articulated in the Varna Plan if the zoning stays the way it is, without amendment.

They see the track record since the current zoning was put in place of getting one dense apartment complex after another, all looking basically the same, with little diversity of housing options being offered.

That's not what the folks who live in and around Varna see as the kind of hamlet they want to in the future. And it's not as if they didn't make it clear what they thought was necessary to maintain their quality of life.....The Varna Plan outlines that specifically.

I understand that you as a board have to make decisions based not only on public opinion, although that's a very good place to start. However, in this case, your public and the detailed local Plan they created all tell you there is only one appropriate way forward, adoption of this amendment to change the zoning in Varna.

Judy Pierpont, 111 Pleasant Hollow Road, read the following statement:

I have submitted my comments several times before orally and in writing, both to the Town Board and the Planning Board. I am in favor of the revised zoning law, which, as required by State law, attempts to align zoning with the Town comprehensive plan, in particular the Varna section of it.

At the same time, I think that the Town and County should seek to encourage the building of more affordable housing. The proposed zoning would not be at all inconsistent with realizing this goal; it is just that developers don't want to do it. As we have seen, building with greater density, as under the current zoning, does not lead to building affordable units. Building with increased density has been going on in the County for at least a decade, but still developers are not able to build affordable units. They cannot make the profit they want and will not do it. The only way is to get *funding* for affordable housing, to engage builders who are willing to apply for and build such housing. Perhaps, what should be written into the zoning is a requirement that developers who want to get a permit in Dryden must build a certain percentage of affordable units, forcing them to apply for the necessary funding.

Densification as is now occurring is itself not a goal. Neither is the kind of uniformity of style or mass student housing. The new zoning as proposed would allow considerably more growth than the original Varna plan and some increased density. It is a reasonable compromise. The proposed 8 units per acre would not *at all* preclude building dedicated affordable housing along with other units that fit the character of Varna. Combined with a specific percentage of required affordable units per development, the Hamlet could grow in the desired way. Under the current zoning, the density will increase in a helter-skelter unmanaged way, as is happening now, with no guarantee of any affordable housing. The current zoning was never the intended zoning for Varna; it was just mistakenly allowed to stay on the books. I urge the Town to belatedly align the zoning with the Comp Plan, but first find a way to stipulate the requirement of a percentage of affordable housing be built.

Janet Morgan, 940 Dryden Road: The current zoning for Varna is unmistakably friendly to developers with deep pockets and unfriendly to residents who need affordable housing. Thanks to the current law, developers can maximize profit by cramming many more housing units on to parcels than would be allowed if the town supported the Varna portion of the town's comp plan. This makes developers happy and puts money in their pockets. And then there are the residents. The current resident unfriendly zoning for Varna recently saw multiple families, couples and singles uprooted. Not by choice, but because the developer who owns these properties plans to sell to an even bigger developer. She displayed:

1. A photo of a home recently vacated by a family of two adults and two teens because the property owner was hoping to close a deal with Trinitas Corporation. The family had been a part of the Varna community for five years and the dad had kept an eye on the Varna Community playground and made repairs when necessary. That home has been vacant since June 1. An affordable home lost to a developer's dream project.

2. A photo of a three-family home. The three units have also been vacant since June for the same reason. Tenants lost their not fancy, but reasonably priced housing and had to move out.

3. A photo of a house that once belonged to delightful lady named Aggie. Following her death the property was purchased by a developer and split into apartments. For the past three months the apartments have been vacant while the developer waits for Trinitas to buy the property. More reasonable priced housing that has disappeared thanks to the starry eyed plans of big developers.

4. A photo of an empty house that was home to three adults and two kids until they were told to move out. Mark, who spoke to the Town Board about his concern that he would lose his home if the Trinitas project moved forward, has seen his fear come true.

These folks were our neighbors. Who will replace them? If you let current zoning stand, there will be no new neighbors like these, folks who often scrape to make ends meet. Rather, there will be hundreds of new people who can afford high priced units because that's what the current zoning allows and that's what big profit-minded developers build. I still hope that Dryden is a place where people are valued more than big profits, where community means something more than high-priced housing units around a swimming pool and where decisions do not discriminate against people who cannot pay high prices for housing. The proposed zoning law is a step in the right direction. Please take that step and vote to approve the Planning Board's proposal before you.

Mason Jager, 956 Dryden Road, said as a recent addition to the hamlet of Varna and a homeowner along the 366 corridor, he is firmly in favor of the amendment to decrease the density of future developments in the hamlet. As he understands it the issue is very simple. The current zoning laws are out of sync with the Varna plan which under New York State law takes precedence. This amendment simply seeks to bring the zoning law into compliance while also allowing a reasonable increase in density for new developments. The residents of Varna have clearly voiced their opinions, both through the Varna comprehensive plan and through local community leaders. He was seriously concerned at the last hearing that three local developers who profit from blocking this amendment were seemingly given more attention than the letter of almost 100 residents voicing concern. He is not against development in Varna and in fact sees great potential for growth in the hamlet both through new small businesses and new housing options. However, he thinks that a 700% increase in the allowable density is too much. He thinks the increase proposed in the amendment under discussion, a compromise, is much more appropriate. A unanimous vote in support of the amendment from the Planning Board speaks volumes. Until the town sets appropriate boundaries, the only proposals coming before that board are going to be maximum density behemoths that erode the hamlet character that drew he and his husband to buy their first home here. He echoed the previous statements that rejecting this amendment does not improve the availability of the affordable housing options in the hamlet. He asked that the board please consider the wishes of the community over those of the developers and county officials that do not live and raise their families here.

John Burger said he would like the board to adopt the amendment for the reasons already mentioned. He read the Varna plan and it touches his heart and is not anti-development at all. He likes the idea of nodal development, but more development isn't better. The way that people were thinking in the plan was very systemic. He appreciates that the

board supports a one-lane bridge on Freese Road. That helps to support a sense of community. That is a great feature. Protecting Fall Creek and having development not be so much and so fast are great features and should be supported. That would definitely help the community flourish and help people feel like they're living in a place where they want to stay. Why have Trinitas and developers like that chosen Varna? Have they made proposals in Brooktondale or Enfield or Newfield or Jacksonville? Part of the reason is obviously because of students and sometimes developers are not being honest about why they are proposing projects in the first place. He feels this plan addresses both the needs of the people who live in the community and their willingness to realize that there needs to be development and thing changes. He thinks it is a good balance.

Joe Wilson, Planning Board members, said the conflict that exists now between the Varna plan and the Zoning Law puts him as a board member on the horns of a dilemma each time he reviews a project in Varna. He doesn't know whether he should emphasize the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning Law. It makes decisions unnecessarily difficult. Making the Zoning Law more compatible and conforming with the Comprehensive Plan would make their job and their work more efficient.

Martha Robertson suggested that this is not the only tool that's available. She has discussed with Jim Skaley the idea of inclusionary zoning. This proposal has the same requirement that all projects have to have a certain percentage of units be affordable in order to be built in the town. This doesn't appear to have been considered by the Planning Board and she proposes that this is the answer that is needed. We all recognize the need for more housing, especially affordable housing. Inclusionary zoning is a completely appropriate, legitimate tool that many communities have used around the country. If there is a way to propose a moratorium at this point while the town looks into inclusionary zoning, she would completely support that and thinks it is a step in the right direction. She feels somewhat offended by the idea that the Planning Department in the County is using a myth. Their 239 review is important. They did go into the details on all of these reviews, and supporting documents were sent to the town going back to 2012 or earlier. There is long, documented research on our local market and the problem of affordable housing in general. In 2006 they did a housing needs assessment and found they needed to add 300 units a year. In 2016 it turned out we needed 520 units a year in order to meet the need. We've done a lot of building, but we haven't brought the prices down. It's because more and more people want to live here. A lot of our commuters are deciding to live here. It's not a static market. The more housing that gets built it seems the more people come in. She proposes that the Town Board consider something different, which would be a moratorium and a real investigation of inclusionary zoning as a tool that you have available to you but haven't investigated.

Buzz Lavine, 719 Ringwood Road, said he used to be on the Planning Board in the town for 20 years, was a county planner for ten years and the idea of developing zoning and using zoning that is in conflict with the comprehensive plan is just a major no-no. He doesn't think the existing zoning should be allowed to continue at all at this point. The idea of a moratorium while looking into other options is fine. He was an architect as well as a landlord locally and has absolutely nothing against developers trying to make the biggest buck they can on their investments. He just doesn't think the town should be making zoning in the hamlets conflict with the comprehensive plan. The hamlet of Varna is the one in the hotseat. The history of proposals in the hamlet of Varna and near the hamlet is pretty significant over the last five or six years have not had any affordable housing in them. They do reach the limits of density that the current zoning allows. We have to make it consistent with the comprehensive plan. That is New York State law and that is what we should aim for. We should not allow this zoning to continue.

Chuck Geisler, 517 Ellis Hollow Creek Road, read the following statement:

Our town is over a barrel when it comes to Varna development. In different letters over 100 citizens have supported the zoning amendments before you and your PB has unanimously recommended the same. The 239 Review says otherwise, creating an impasse. We need a breather to pull the community together on a milestone zoning decision. I ask that you pause this highly fraught situation and vote for a 6-mo. moratorium to find the right course of action. A moratorium makes sense for four reasons:

1. Dryden currently does not have the funds to extend sewer & water to the larger development under consideration and won't know until late winter if and to what extent NYS will assist. If it does assist Dryden, the first priority should be repairing the failures in the 1960s S&W infrastructure serving current Varna residents. It's 60+ years old and a priority. That needs discussion.
2. We have yet to figure out how new development proposals in Varna deliver the affordable housing our Town and County are pledged to—that also needs discussion. Are we going to embrace inclusionary zoning or aren't we, and, if yes, does it apply only to Varna or to all of Dryden?
3. The County's 239 Review holds us to its Nodal Development standard, but it's far from clear what this means in practice. If we conform to Nodal Development, will the County provide assistance to assure affordable housing in Varna? If not, it's double talk. Let's discuss this in earnest.
4. Failure to amend our zoning law is a legal quagmire no one is denying—Dryden zoning out of kilter with our Comp Plan. Let's sit down in the cold light of morning and talk about a better zoning road map for the whole community rather than have a legal skirmish.

Please, pass the amendments or seize the breathing room of a moratorium. A moratorium isn't a cop-out, it's an opportunity to serve a viable public purpose—long-term affordable housing--and move beyond a significant impasse. You have made no legal commitment to the larger developer as yet and the second developer's application is not yet complete. We win by waiting and working together.

Debbie Lecoq, 935 Dryden Road, asked that the board go with the amendment to the zoning law. She has lived in the hamlet for 28 years and likes the community like it is. To stay compliant with the Varna plan would be very helpful.

She read the following statement from Hilary Lambert:

I am writing with a simple request:

Please demonstrate that you respect and support the Varna Plan.
Please adopt the amendment to Varna's zoning, so that it is in compliance with the Varna Plan.

I have watched with dismay as those outside Varna repeatedly strive to override and ignore Varna's control over its future, as expressed in the Varna Plan.
This zoning loophole allows developers to push projects that greatly exceed the density and neighborhood character standards laid out in the Plan.

As long as this loophole exists, we will have to fight the same battle over and over and *over* again.

Each time a new, ghastly, overbuilt proposal is put before the Town that ignores the Plan, Varna residents and supportive neighbors *yet again* muster the energy to say, "No, the is not in compliance with the spirit or the specifics of the Varna Plan. Please reject it."

And each time, the Planning Department and Town Board get caught up in a years-long, tedious process of hearings and more hearings, dealing with angry developers and stalwart Varna residents.

Please end this time-wasting conflict once and for all.

Get us out of this Groundhog Day situation!
Adopt the amendment.

Supv Leifer said he received a text from **Chip Ray** who lost his internet connection: Please if possible voice my opinion that I am opposed to the passage of the proposed amendments.

There was no further public comment and Supv Leifer closed the public hearing at 6:58 p.m.

Cl Skaley moved a resolution to adopt the proposed amendment. There was no second to the motion.

Cl Skaley read the following statement:

Zoning requires a vision—it's not just a density table.

Ten years ago, residents and businesses in the community gathered to create their vision for the future that evolved into a Plan. The award-winning Varna Community Development Plan was regarded by reviewers as a model approach for development in hamlets by promoting a mix of housing options, improving transportation safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Now we are on the cusp of having the potential to realize important aspects of the Plan with the DOT finally scheduling in 2022 an upgrade for 366 that will allow for sidewalks and crosswalks to promote pedestrian safety and increase safe connections within the community. Over the past few years, the community center has been an incubator for a number of small food operations in the commercial kitchen including minority owned. The Center has also sponsored for the past four years an after-school program for families. Families make a community work because those that settle in the community have a stake in that community to make it work. Today the Center supports a food cupboard along with volunteer contributors which is showing daily increases in needs as people come to secure necessary items.

Much is at stake—the zoning amendment promoted by the planning board recognizes that the 2015 zoning does not support the goals and objectives of the Varna Plan—does not guide developers to build a diversity of housing options as asked for in the Varna Plan. Diversity of housing options for both rent and ownership promote stable sustainable communities that allow for people and families of various income levels to live in Varna.

Yes, we want affordable housing—it is likely that INHS and HUD programs to support such are necessary to acquire affordable housing for sale or rent. It's been suggested that we have inclusionary zoning. I would favor some proportion of units to be included as such, but this requires a separate review. Should inclusionary zoning be just for Varna or Town-wide?

At present we have heard from well over 100 signers of letters and statements to move forward in support of the Varna Plan and the amendment while only three persons have spoken against the amendment—all developers. The amendment before us does increase density by about three times than that initially suggested in the Varna Plan but it also promotes more diversity in housing options for builders that will build a community that is in tune with the character of the hamlet.

Shouldn't this Board consider the unanimous decision of our Planning Board and the strong support of residents in the community advising this Board in support of this amendment?

The board discussed the possibility of enacting a moratorium on development in the hamlet of Varna. Cl Lamb is concerned about exposure for a lawsuit. Atty Sokoni can prepare something for future consideration. Cl Servoss said this is the first step and asked R Burger if he has heard from the two developers that have applications in. R Burger said he has heard from Maifly that they are expecting to submit a full site plan later this month for review by the Planning Board. He has not had a response from Trinitas.

Atty Sokoni said there is exposure. Things to consider include whether the action of the moratorium is reasonable and whether there is a valid public purpose to be served in enacting the moratorium. The duration should not be unreasonable. Typically, six months is considered reasonable. The greatest risk is the people who have pending applications because you get into the issue of whether they have vested. She would prefer to discuss the details in executive session.

M Robertson said investigating inclusionary zoning has not been considered by either the Town Board or Planning Board and goes directly to the concern of the residents to support affordable housing. The town's contribution to the Community Development Fund indicates the town's interest in affordable housing. Those are entirely appropriate predicates for a moratorium. It seems a simple and strong case.

RESOLUTION #104 (2020) – DIRECT PREPARATION OF DRAFT LOCAL LAW FOR A MORATORIUM ON DEVELOPMENT IN THE HAMLET OF VARNA

Cl Skaley offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that the Town Attorney is hereby directed to prepare for consideration a document for a six month moratorium on development in the hamlet of Varna pending further discussion related to inclusionary zoning and other aspects of moving this zoning amendment into compliance with the comprehensive plan.

2nd Supv Leifer

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**PUBLIC HEARING
BORGER STATION ELLIS HOLLOW CREEK ROAD
SPECIAL USE PERMIT**

Supv Leifer opened the public hearing at 7:13 p.m. Ray Burger introduced the project. Dominion Energy Transmission has submitted an application for a special use permit and site plan review for what is termed the Borger Turbine Replacement Project. This is comprised of replacing two of the three existing turbines at the facility. There are also some ancillary pieces such as adding an oxidation catalyst and three new micro turbines and upgrades to various piping and fencing around the facility. There was a formal introduction of this in July. One of the actions in connection with this is to obtain a County review. They have a 30-day timeline that expires at the end of this month and they have not yet submitted their 239 review letter yet. So the board is unable to take action tonight other than to declare lead agency for purposes of SEQR.

Don Houser, of Dominion Energy, introduced Shawn Miller, Director of Engineering Services, Jeremy Ross, Manager of Engineering Projects, John Currie, Engineer on the team, Richard Gamble, Director of Environmental Services, Liz Gayne, Manager Environmental Services, Gary Comerford, Environmental Air Consultant, and John Munsey, Managing Scientist and Principal, C.T. Male Associates, and Gene Kelly, Attorney with Harris Beach.

John Munsey summarized the application process to date. There was a preapplication meeting with the town on March 17, 2020. They then sent information to the town and had a virtual meeting with the town on March 20 to go over the contents of the application. On June 10 they submitted their initial special use permit and site plan application including several attachments on the design of the project, the need for the project, gave what they thought was the proper classification of Type 2 under SEQR. Also included were permit application forms, site development plans, limit of disturbance figures, architectural drawings, a revised lighting package, a proposed landscaping plan, visual renderings, a complete stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). For purposes of completion of the SUP application they submitted a Part 1 full EAF and they also submitted a noise survey. July 9 was the first meeting with the town board and they received some comments during that meeting. On July 15 they also received comments on the SWPPP from the town's engineering consultant, TG Miller. Only July 30 they responded to the town board comments generally explaining the reduced air emissions for criteria pollutants associated with the project and provided graphs comparing the existing and proposed replacement air emissions in what's called a potential to emit comparison. On August 10 there was a conference call between the town's consultants and Dominion's consultants to go over the SWPPP, which is quite detailed in terms of the hydrologic analysis. On August 12 Dominion received additional town comments provided by Ray Burger. On August 13 they revised the SWPPP and site plans in response to the town and TG Miller. On August 17 they provided response to the town to three comments received from R Burger and also provided some information regarding the SEQR classification review. They are here now as a team and are prepared to answer questions as they come up.

Supv Leifer read the following letter from Stu Berg:

My name is **Stuart Berg**. My wife and I live roughly 1500 feet northwest of the Dominion Gas Plant, Borger Station.

My concerns with the upcoming construction at the gas plant are in two areas; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Other Pollutants. These concerns were raised after reading the C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES letter dated July 30, 2020, that was sent to Mr. Ray Burger, Director of Planning, Town of Dryden. The subject was "Borger Replacement Project - Special Use Permit Application Response to Questions - C.T. Male Project No. 19.9727".

Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

First, this is a short explanation of CO₂ versus CO₂e because I wasn't familiar with the difference and others might not be as well. CO₂ is just carbon dioxide emissions. CO₂e is the carbon dioxide emissions equivalent which means it is CO₂ plus whatever other greenhouse gas emissions are present. In creating that combination, the other gasses are weighted in proportion to CO₂'s ability to cause greenhouse heating of the earth. This calculation is a simple adjustment that gives you the entire effect of all greenhouse gas emissions.

The C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES letter listed the existing Carbon Dioxide Equivalents (CO₂e) at 83,320 tons/year. After the construction project it lists the projected CO₂e at 110,060 tons per year, an increase of 32.09%. This raises the following questions:

1. What are the other gases involved in this calculation?
2. Why are these improvements to the gas plant causing a significant increase in CO₂e?
3. Are there any changes that can be made to the project to reduce the CO₂e?

Other Pollutants:

After Methane and Carbon Dioxide (CO₂), the next five pollutants emitted from New York compressor stations are Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), Formaldehyde, and Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}), all of which can have a negative impact on the health of the surrounding community. There are three pollutants that C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES did not specifically list in their letter. Those pollutants are Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), Formaldehyde, and Particulate Matter PM_{2.5}.

1. Although C.T. MALE ASSOCIATES mentioned “Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)”, precisely what pollutants does that cover?
2. What are the levels of each of the mentioned pollutants, currently and then after the project is completed?
3. Are there any changes that can be made to the project to reduce the levels of these pollutants?

Carol Chock said she spent ten years on the Tompkins County Legislature. She lives in the City of Ithaca. She doesn't often speak to Town Boards because she knows they want to hear from residents. But in this case, she felt compelled to do so. During her time on the legislature she chaired a number of committees related to hydrofracking, to gas planning, was on the Tompkins County Energy Roadmap and the Tompkins County Gas Drilling Task Force. In particular she chaired a committee on land evaluation and tax revenue implications related to the whole industry of natural gas. In all cases that they looked at, and it has been borne up across the country since then, the tax revenues were never anywhere near what was promised. Only in places where gas was hit big and nobody wanted to live there anymore. Dryden residents were particularly active in all of what they did, and not only energy activists. They worked with bankers and people concerned about roads and people concerned about their businesses of many sizes. Tompkins County and New York State now have ambitious climate goals. They aren't ambitious enough, but they exist, and this project, an expansion of any kind of gas, we don't really need. She has also spent the last year and a quarter working as a party on the NYSEG rate case where the company agreed to a new model to ramp down the use of natural gas and present people with alternatives. In that context, it doesn't make sense, either from a financial standpoint, a tax value standpoint, expected revenues or climate goals to ramp up any compressor station. It's time to ramp them down.

She urged the board to look very carefully at this, saying she didn't think the board had complete information unless more has been circulated. Carbon dioxide emission equivalents must be considered. There are scientists who will talk about the relative emissions of this activity. You won't really receive tax revenues.

Gina Cacioppo said she has been a concerned resident of Dryden since the day she found out she was pregnant and discovered what the tubes in the ground at Borger were all about. She applauds the work done in building a relationship with them and members of the community particularly Mothers Out Front. She is hopeful after hearing the words spoken by Cl Lamb in relation to Varna and hopes that the same energy is brought into Borger with the idea of research, looking into an attorney and getting an eye-opening view before making a decision.

She implores the board to do due diligence here. We need as a town, an expert to fall back on in cases of Borger. There's too much that we don't know as lay people. She applauds Stu for digging into the fact that CO₂e hides a lot of what we could be approving that would be horrible for the community. It works directly against the community's Comprehensive Plan and it is unfair that as community members work to bring down their emissions, we would be allowing Borger to ramp up theirs.

She thinks with a 32% increase for the community environment, learning that methane is 25 times more potent than carbon dioxide and methane has 85 to 100 more global warming potential, we really need to look into this before we make any decisions. It is time to truly comprehend what this impact will have.

In the event that the board gives approval, her big ask is that stipulations are put on approval. We need to make sure that they are using the best and most efficient equipment to capture and reduce emissions with a way to hold Borger accountable for doing so, not what is in the best interests and profit margin for the company.

Her second ask is a stipulation of time. With working with Borger and with the town in the past, she sees potential for giving approval and then no authority to check in on what was approved. We need a time limit where maybe they get approval for one year or three years, and we revisit to make sure they are putting the proper, best technology to capture emissions on.

She asks the board to implement safety measures and time. She hopes the board will act in the best interests of the community by hiring an expert that can be referred to before making any decisions. She implores the board to think about stipulations and not a blanket approval.

Judy Pierpont, 111 Pleasant Hollow Road, said she lives about two miles from Borger and the pipeline runs through their property. She read the following statement:

While it is a *good* thing that Borger's new turbines will protect us from "criteria pollutants," the proposed changes could increase green-house gas emissions by 30%. I understand that a Borger representative has said that the facility will run at only 20% capacity for the foreseeable future, but I do not think we should grant a special permit based on this assurance.

I believe that Dominion's plans to increase gas flow are the significant driver of the installation of new turbines. For the last 6 years, I along with many others, have followed Dominion's New Market project. From the beginning, the company planned to increase gas transmission through its pipeline by 112,000 dekatherms per day, transporting gas to National Grid subsidiaries Niagara Mohawk and Brooklyn Union as well as serving growing markets in the Northeast and Long Island. It now connects to the Iroquois pipeline, which runs from Canada south through New York and western Connecticut to Brooklyn, passing within 12 miles of the newly operational Cricket Valley power plant in Dover, NY, to which it supplies gas.

We followed the buildout of the Dominion pipeline as they constructed brand new compressor stations in Madison County and Chemung County, upgrading another in Montgomery County and here at Borger. They did this expensive and hugely controversial buildout in preparation for *planned* increases in gas through their pipeline, not just because maybe someday in the unforeseen future, they might want to increase the flow.

With the addition at Borger of turbines that can handle 29.9% greater flow and run 24/7 instead of one or a few hours a day, it appears that in our town there could be a massive increase in climate-altering emissions—some CO₂ and a great deal of CO₂-equivalent of an uncertain composition. At the proposed limit, it would double the green-house gases emitted by the whole Town in a year.

I urge the Town to properly study the potential CO₂e emissions and require 100% mitigation. Otherwise, all of Dryden's efforts to date in reining in climate-damaging emissions will be completely undermined. The County and the State have strong climate action goals; the State's CLCPA mandates the phase out of fossil fuels. But it is obvious that these goals cannot be met if companies like Borger go on increasing their emissions and if at the municipal level,

such increases are not stopped. Perhaps Governor Cuomo should be asked to weigh in on such proposed increases at the municipal level to help us control them.

Please assure us that the Town will do everything it can to salvage the climate and protect the future livability of our town.

Elisa Evett, 298 Bald Hill Road, Town of Caroline, read the following statement:

I am a member of Mothers Out Front Tompkins, the chapter of a nationwide organization whose mission is to work for a swift, complete and just transition away from fossil fuels to clean and renewable energy. We are dedicated to the idea that it will take us all to do what we must do to avert climate catastrophe, and no effort is insignificant in that goal. With that in mind we address local climate change related issues that affect us and our neighbors.

Our local chapter focused on the Borger compressor station beginning in January of 2017 and we have been involved ever since. We are determined to engage in actions that would protect the residents in the Ellis Hollow community most threatened by the potential health effects of emissions from the facility. While we are still concerned about what Borger calls 'criteria emissions,' given our broader mission, we are also concerned about the larger picture, namely the climate crisis effects of methane.

Missing from the information presented in the application are the following facts that should be a great concern to anyone who understands why we need to wean ourselves off fossil fuels:

-Dominion's New Market (DNM) pipeline takes gas from the Pennsylvania border to the Albany area (passing through Ellis Hollow on the way) where it connects to the north/south running Iroquois pipeline. The Iroquois pipeline carries gas to Canada for export, and south to the newly opened Cricket Valley Energy Center, a 1,100 megawatt natural gas fired power plant in Dutchess county, north of New York city and the CPV power plant, a 630 megawatt gas fired power plant in Orange County.

-The energy produced by these two plants serves the New York City area whose energy needs are predicted to grow.

In fact, it appears that the owners of Iroquois, which Dominion owns a controlling interest in, are banking on future growth as they are proposing an expansion in order to move more gas. And where will that gas come from? One well might suppose from the DNM pipeline. This seems to cast doubt on Dominion's claim that it will be running at only 20% capacity. Surely as the move to close nuclear power plants in the state and the blocking of other natural gas pipelines continues, who wouldn't expect Dominion to take advantage of the demand for more natural gas to fuel these facilities. If that turns out to be the case, how can the Town of Dryden trust that Dominion will not up its capacity, and thus its emissions, by far more than the 20% it claims?

So in addition to asking the town board to hire an environmental engineer to analyze carefully the contents of Dominion's application for a Special Use Permit, I would ask that the board pursue an inquiry into the final destination and the amount of the gas going through Dominion's pipeline in the future and to consider the larger issue of the effects of increased use of natural gas as a potent greenhouse gas contributor to the climate crisis.

Katie Quinn-Jacobs, 52 Sodum Road, said she has raised three kids in Dryden and built a homestead farm about 2 miles as the crow flies from the Borger Station. She is a volunteer with Mothers Out Front and also with the town's Safety and Preparedness

Committee. She first began working on issues related to Borger in January of 2017. During that time she has done her best to study a variety of topics, including technical aspects, regulatory issues and policy issues that surround the compressor station. Standing back from all the details, however, her lay person's assessment after three plus years of working on this is that it would be to the town's benefit to establish a relationship similar to the one it has with TG Miller with an environmental engineering and policy consultant. That consultant could be relied upon to provide the community and the board with accurate, independent assessments for projects like the one currently under consideration. This would be the process as is done with other projects that come before the board requiring special skill sets or knowledge base, like cell towers or development projects. Borger is part of this community, is part of this town's portfolio, and we need to be prepared to answer questions from the community and be proactive about assessing applications, reporting, and other documentation that arise from the compressor station.

This project began as an improvement project. It was a win for the town, a win for Dominion and a win for the DEC. It still may be. In fact, it is her earnest home that it is. There may be trade offs that have to be made between criteria emissions and greenhouse gasses. But we need to assess the new information that came to light on July 30, just over two weeks ago, regarding significant increases in CO₂e emissions and particulate matter. The community would be best served if this assessment came from a professional source that does not have a vested interest in the outcome. Although the information from Dominion is essential and we are grateful for it, it shouldn't be our only source.

I am urging the town to engage an outside consultant to provide us with an independent professional assessment of the Borger project before an SUP is issued.

Dana Magnusun, 5 Sunny Slope Terrace, said she lives with her family just under a mile from the Borger Station. She has been involved since they moved here almost four years ago. It has been a constant Mach-speed, googling, trying to figure out what everything means and working together with the community to find out what is being proposed and what is happening at Borger Station. She was thinking driving to work today to Ithaca that it is just fascinating that there is this beautiful solar farm right down the road from this fossil fuel plant. The increase of greenhouse gas of 32% is not only mindboggling, but is that acceptable? Does anyone know? Is anyone weighing in on that fact? We are Dryden. We are a thoughtful community. We were the lion with fracking and what happened to that?

She feels like we are going backwards and is concerned that the greenhouse gas increase is getting glossed over. She isn't a professional and doesn't understand how the SEQR is considered a Type 2. It's not a replacement in kind. She knows the DEC pegged it as that with the air quality permits and she doesn't know if the town piggybacked on that thought. It is proposed new buildings. There is the increase in greenhouse gas emissions. It's not apples to apples. She doesn't accept that it is a Type 2. In Dominion's defense, they submitted a robust application with the full environmental assessment form and then the town walked back what was required by saying it was a Type 2 SEQR and that they don't have to do anything. She questions that and hopes the town hires experts to interpret the information given for the community.

Lisa Marshall said she has been thinking while listening to the comments about what a special community Dryden is. She thinks we've all learned during Covid how important it is to build our local communities and what it means to be a good neighbor and how we maybe have to think about how we rebuild all the systems that we rely on because Covid is showing us how deep the cracks are and how people get left behind and she is very worried about that.

She lives in Horseheads, New York, and Dominion built a brand new compressor in her community at the same time as they were expanding Borger. That application to the DEC was

full of many, many errors and untruths. They have not proven to be a good neighbor. She remembers when all the people were gathered in the Varna fire hall in May of 2017 and Dominion representatives were asked what the increase in volume of gas would be and what the current volume of gas would be. They said that was proprietary information and wouldn't share it. The group asked about the greenhouse gas emissions and got evasive answers.

We know that looking at the big picture in New York State, the Constitution Pipeline was denied and the Williams Pipeline was denied. The default plan is to push more and more gas through the existing aging pipelines. She is 52 years old and parts of the Dominion pipeline are older than her. We know there is a lot of safety issues. There is the climate impact of increased gas, there is the cost to our community. She noted that many people who spoke here today don't have access to gas and have put geothermal in their own homes to heat and cool their homes at their own expense. Because the costs to this community are there but the benefits are really not for this station. There's absolutely no reason for Dryden to consider Dominion neighbor. Or should she say Berkshire Hathaway, because partly due to our efforts here and in Virginia and other places, Dominion has decided to get out of the gas transmission business. She can't help but think that all of the work done here was part of the reason that they made that decision.

One thing that is different besides Covid in rethinking how we treat each other is that now we have New York's Climate Law on the books which we did not have in May of 2017. That law says that everything needs to be reconsidered. We also have New York State's Department of Public Service Commission undergoing an 11 or 12-month process to do a gas planning procedure where they will tell the utilities what their future plans should be with regard to gas. Just look at the explosion that happened in Baltimore last week and the ones in Merrimac Valley in Massachusetts. Look at the financial reports of the gas industry. We know that gas is not safe. We know that gas is not reliable. And we know that our future lies somewhere else. She urged the town to do as much due diligence as they absolutely can. If they get in over their head, ask for help.

They asked at the May 2017 meeting about the Dominion plans for New Market Two and have not gotten answers about that. We know that the plan is that if they can establish gas transmission at a higher volume they will build a bigger compressor and then the pipeline will need to be expanded and enlarged. We know all this is in the plans. At what point do we just make it stop?

Martha Robertson, County Legislator for this district since 2002, said she lives on Ellis Hollow Road so Borger is not far from her house. She has been on lots of the county's committees on fracking, on the environment, and is also on state and national committees on energy and the environment. She wants to commend Dryden for its history of leadership with respect to energy. She pointed out that thanks to opposition to the pipeline extension that NYSEG wanted to put in across West Dryden Road that led to an intensive effort with the Public Service and NYSEG and the first non-pipeline alternative initiative in the state of New York. That has now become the gold standard for what we do in New York with respect to fossil fuels, which is to reduce the demand, and replace existing use of fossil fuels with clean alternatives. That really got started in Dryden.

She urged the board to demand a full EIS before anything is approved. She understands through SEQR that the applicant, Dominion, would pay for that consultancy. The town gets to choose the consultant so there's an arm's length there and it is not something that would come from the town budget.

We need to make a sharp U-turn on fossil fuels. We had our own heat waves this summer. Look at California. This is beyond too late and anything that is built now to encourage or enable additional use of fossil fuels is shortly going either be a stranded asset,

something that rate payers will have to pay for for years when we are trying to get off the fossil fuels, or it is just going to be more of a facilitator of increasing global warming. We really need to consider the upstream and downstream impacts. The State's Climate Leadership and Community Protection act is finally recognizing that thanks to research here by Cornell Professors like Tony Ingraffea and Bob Howarth. All of these effects need to be considered and the town should hire a consultant to do a full EIS.

Charles Aquadro, 283 Ellis Hollow Creek Road, said he and his wife are the closest neighbor to Dominion. They have sent their concerns to the town and they are posted on the website. They share the concerns raised about increased amounts of carbon dioxide and methane and have a couple other points as well. All of noise assessments focus on the compressors. Having lived there for 31 years, they live right next to this, Borger has done a really good job to try to reduce the sound coming from the compressors. But what is mitigated is the regulator fields. The regulator fields are not included in any of the testing. It would be if the regulators were squealing at the time, but it is something that occurs periodically and is actually pretty annoying and it carries a long way. They are probably not the only people affected. He knows that this can be reduced because a previous station manager would tweak it when he was called.

There is a more serious concern (it came up in this report and in the New Market report as well) and that is there are a number of very false statements concerning the proximity to publicly accessed scenic or aesthetic resources. It is specifically checked no. It says that any trails or such are greater than a mile away when in fact the entrance trail to the Ellis Hollow Nature Preserve is 300' from the compressor building. It is not just in this report, but was falsely stated throughout the New Market thing.

He raises other things in his letter but wanted to point out that many of the assessments have been made on completely inaccurate depictions. People are walking within 300' of this facility and that hasn't been taken into account in any of the discussions to date.

Buzz Lavine, who lives approximately a mile from the station, said he is concerned for the coming generations, everyone's kids and grandkids. We have to do everything we can to stop global warming. Without that we are all sunk. And we only have maybe ten years to do that. If you look at the ten-year time frame for methane emissions, it's over a hundred times as damaging to global warming as is CO2. Many scientists in the field believe that methane is probably the most important thing to try to reduce to keep us from going over the feared tipping points that will happen in the next ten years. If we can't solve that issue with methane, we won't solve the issue. That is what most scientists seem to say. He used to be an energy analyst in his professional work so he knows something about that.

Going back to what John Munsey said earlier, they've done a full EAF. It is his understanding that on the EAF that was submitted, they did not bother to answer questions about methane, which are explicitly a part of the EAF. That should be looked into. Maybe the methane issue is not such a big issue if the Borger Station does not increase its throughput drastically in the near future. If they stay within what they claim would be 20% of capacity, then perhaps it isn't such a big issue. But if they go over that, it becomes a very, very big issue. He recommends that we should find a way to ask them to not go over that 20% capacity number. That would solve the issue. Otherwise, he thinks we have to have an expert consultant work with us to help us understand the details of this methane issue. That's perhaps part of a full EIS, which would be appropriate here. He thinks the town should require the 20% of capacity as a limit to any approval made and he thinks we should require a full EIS so that we could then hire, at Borger's expense, the consultants that would be needed to review it at an expert level.

Kathy Russell, said she and her partner live 2.5 miles from the Borger station. She is not in favor of the special use permit and asks that the board do its due diligence getting some experts, specifically Tony Ingraffea. He said something in his remarks posted on the website which is that we can't really believe that Borger compression station is not going to increase its gas emissions. She doesn't believe them. We in this country are almost at the mercy of the fossil fuel industry. They have tremendous amounts of power in this country and in the world. We need to take that into account. Dryden is the little town that could. The whole world was looking at us so we need to consider our reputation as leaders in the opposition to fracking and the opposition to the fossil fuel industry. She wants us to pay attention to the precautionary principle. The precautionary principle says that we need to find a way to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects. We know that fossil fuel use causes global warming. We know that there is a massive infrastructure of pipelines, of compressor stations, of fracking fields, all over this country and indeed the world. We need to oppose them at every level. We can do that here. We can do it now. She'd like the board to do its due diligence and follow the law, but she wants them to follow moral principles. This is a moral decision. It's not simply technical. You can bring in experts and she thinks they should be brought in, but it's a moral issue. You need to follow the precautionary principle. You need to continue to be leaders. The whole world is watching.

Joe Wilson thanked everyone here tonight. With just a few weeks to try and digest the implications of this permit, together as a community we've raised the awareness of the residents and the Town Board members about Borger plant's harmful emissions. The information seems incomplete and we haven't had the benefit of the interpretation of an independent expert to explain to us the tradeoffs that would be involved in supporting the permit being accepted as proposed or some other variation. It seems that the notion that it is take it as proposed, or forego the benefits of the reduction of the criteria pollutants is simply an unacceptable approach to community decision making and the way a town board ought to interact with its own community. What is abundantly clear, however, is that the proposed special use permit as it stands is an exceptionally good deal for Borger. If accepted by the town and community, it assures Borger will have less, not more, state regulation of its polluting of our air with its criteria emissions. But the proposed improvements don't cover all of the criteria pollutants. The permit as proposed will allow Borger to add to its global warming gas emissions at least 7,000 tons per year, or 1300 more cars on the road, or/and up to a theoretical maximum of 26,064 tons per year or 4,912 more cars. In making those assertions I'm using Borger's data and the EPA's carbon emission calculator.

Moreover, there is no time limit on the proposed permit. Borger will have this ability to increase its emissions decades into the future without the town ever again having any legal recourse. This permit will allow Borger to gain all these legal rights before the State's new CLCPA law takes effect and forces reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Judy, Lizzy, and Lisa have all explained and provided evidence of why it is likely that sooner rather than later Borger will compress more gas and run its plant for more hours, not less, and that that will go on into the future. This will result in more emissions, not less emissions. More impacts on global warming, more impacts on our health. Given its history, the idea that's been advanced that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) will intervene and curtail these increases is simply pie in the sky. While we have lately been informed the town cannot legally do a SEQR review to get more facts, it does have a site plan review process governed by state and town law which can be used to raise environmental impact issues. The town board could attach relevant conditions to a permit for Borger to constrain emissions.

It still seems that it would be helpful for the board to have expert guidance and share that guidance with the community. Again, it would be helpful to see board members decide what to do and what their rationale is. In sum, we need an expert. We need stipulations on the permit. We need time to digest and engage in a respectful discussion with our town board

members so that the best outcome is realized. And that could benefit Borger as much as it can benefit the community.

Supv Leifer asked Borger representatives to address matters brought up by residents.

Connection through Albany to Cricket Valley – D Houser said their pipeline going north connects to the Iroquois pipeline at the Canajoharie connection point in the town of Minden north of Dryden. The Iroquois pipeline is owned 50% by Dominion Energy and 50% by TC Energy (the former Trans Canada). That pipeline then takes natural gas southeast into downstate New York. Cricket Valley is not a customer of Dominion Energy. Dominion doesn't service that line; they don't have a service going into that facility. Their pipeline goes north to the capital region. They would be a customer of Iroquois pipeline, not Dominion Energy. Iroquois is a separately run company. Dominion and Trans Canada are partners in it, but they do not operate the system.

Is Iroquois a customer of Dominion? D Houser said it is a company owned by Trans Canada and Dominion Energy. They have receipt points on the Dominion line and receipt points in Canada for Trans Canada to put gas in the pipeline. That gas flows southeast through Connecticut into downstate New York.

Does the gas that goes through Dryden make it to the downstate system? D Houser said it does. National Grid is the customer off of that line for Dominion. That was the New Market project. The Brooklyn Union Subsidiary National Grid was the customer for New Market and National Grid Subsidiary is in the capital region. They were the two customers for the project. Dominion doesn't have customers serviced off the Iroquois line. Those are customers of the Iroquois Gas Transmission Company. That pipeline is a separate company run by separate employees. It's not run by Trans Canada and it's not run by Dominion Energy who are partners in ownership of it.

Are there new permits needed to send gas to Iroquois? If Iroquois is finding customers on the line and servicing customers, they would go through a process for them. If they need new interconnects for new customers they would go through their process for regulation and permitting. They do not do it at Dominion for the Iroquois system. It's a separately run entity.

If Iroquois needs more gas, Dominion can already give it to Iroquois? Iroquois has different receipt points along their pipeline system. Dominion connects one time with the Iroquois system. They are one supplier on their system, connecting at the Town of Minden.

The plant is running at 20% right now? Liz Gayne of the air team addressed how those figures were put together. When they looked back at the Borger station over the last five years the 20% rate that you hear is the worst-case annual run time over the last five years. That happened to be 2015. That was the year of the polar vortex. When they looked at other years in that five-year period, operations were actually below 20% capacity.

Cl Lamb said people are concerned about a ramp up and that more gas will flow because of this project. That's not why everyone began to discuss this three or four years ago. It was about emissions. He asked L Gayne to clarify what the project is about and provide some sort of clarity on that issue. He is attracted to the criteria pollutant reductions. That is in our constituents' best interests – to have the HAPs reduced by 92%, the VOCs by 92%, the CO reduced by 74% and nitrous dioxide reduced by 74%. There are significant reductions being offered that we want, but we have to be convinced that it's worth the tradeoff. He'd like the applicant to make the case why these reductions are significant. He understands it is in our best interests in terms of health. He has spoken with emissions experts at NYS DEC and they said they would take this trade-off in a second because it is in the public health's interest.

L Gayne said she understands the concerns about ramping up or increased operations. What drives operations for this station is weather impact and demand. They need to have weather impact and increased demand in order to operate the station more. Currently their permits allow them to operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week, but they don't. The worst case in the last five years was around 20% of the time because the demand is not there. The project proposed is not for any additional customers. It is not for increased demand. It really is for taking the next step in the betterment of the environment. In the last 12-18 months Dominion has established quite a few different commitments to bettering the environment and to climate actions. One of them is reducing their methane emissions by 2030 by 55%. They are just over 50% right now and getting close to that. They understand the conversations being had today, the importance of actions to minimize climate impact, and minimizing the environmental footprint is part of this project. It doesn't have to do with increased customer demand. If the demand was there, they would be running more already.

D Houser said this project was developed through several meetings with the community and elected officials. The concern was reducing criteria pollutants in the area and they strived to do that. They worked to do that and put together a package of state of the art equipment for this with oxidation catalysts on those engines and putting one on engine #4, which doesn't have one, at the request of the town to really drive down those criteria pollutants. They are proud of that. They appreciate the interaction with the community and the town to do that. They are doing this all without a customer. They have chosen like horsepower engines to make this a maintenance project, a replacement project, and put them in without a customer and without customer demand. He noted the application to the DEC for the air permit strictly outlines that, that this is not for a customer, and they would not be increasing throughput with this project. This is strictly a maintenance project to reduce criteria pollutants in the area. That is an important part of direct health consequences for the surrounding neighbors and the employees who work at the station.

Cl Lamb asked them to explain more about methane capture.

Jeremy Ross said already mentioned is the pressurized hold accomplished through the installation of the electric driven CO gas booster pumps on unit 4, and then 5 and 6 that they intend to install is just one of the reductions in methane that will take place during start up and shut down of each unit. Also portable compression that will be utilized to reduce the volume of methane vented to the atmosphere during plant maintenance and pigging of pipelines associated with Borger Station. They are looking at leak detection and repair (Ldar) at Borger. It's another way to mitigate and identify sources of fugitive methane emissions. They have implemented some of these things in other areas and it has been very successful.

Where does the extra CO2 come from? L Gayne said the CO2 that has been discussed in the report comes from the turbines themselves. Complete combustion of fossil fuels results in water and CO2. Or when you don't have perfect combustion you get byproducts of combustion which include nitrogen oxide (NOx) or carbon monoxide (CO). When this project was first discussed, it was focused on the criteria pollutants, the nitrogen oxide and CO, and working to increase the complete combustion to drop the NOx and CO levels as low as possible. The tradeoff for that complete combustion in minimizing nitrogen oxides and CO is an increase of CO2. If you think of it as a sliding scale, it's an inverse relationship between the two. The increased CO2 is coming from these new lower NOx and CO emitting units.

Is methane part of the CO2e? Yes. The increase in numbers seen in the application are coming from CO2, which is a part of CO2e. When you look at the CO2e and the total increase, the total increase of methane is around 5 tons of methane per year, whereas the CO2 portion of the CO2e number is between 20-25,000 tons. The majority of what we are talking about here is the CO2 portion, which comes from combustion from the turbines. So methane is a very small portion of that CO2e number being discussed.

Where does the extra methane come from? Part of it comes as part of combustion from the turbines. The other piece of that is fugitive emissions from piping and components. And they are implementing a leak detection and repair program to minimize those fugitive emissions.

The replacement turbines are functionally equivalent. There is a slight difference in horsepower due to the equipment that is available today from vendors. The increased CO₂ is not relational to the change in size of the units, it related to the change in combustion technology.

The problem is in the combustion chamber so that they cannot control all the emissions? It's an inverse relationship. When you decrease NO_x and carbon monoxide, there is an increase of carbon dioxide (CO₂). The more complete combustion of the fuel the turbine has, the more CO₂ emissions come from that turbine. The byproducts of complete combustion are water and CO₂.

Can the CO₂ be captured and inserted into something else? At this time that is not a technology that is installed in this type of station. That is a question they look into. Cl Skaley said it appears that this project could potentially double the CO₂ equivalent for the whole town of Dryden. D Houser said it would be a result of adding customer and demand to the line and that is not what this is. It would require a FERC 7C process.

With the current turbines, does the current air quality permit that is being operated under limit the amount of gas that can go through the pipeline? Does the air permit for the new proposed turbines naturally reduce the amount of gas that can be put through the pipeline? They are on a runtime restriction on engine two that they would like to replace with this project, but there is no restriction on engine four. Engine four could pick that up, but this historic demand on that pipeline and the customer demand necessitates run times. It only runs for those hours based on customer demand. They see a utilization factor of around 20%. They are operating under a Title 5 permit now and with this project and the draft permit from the DEC, once installed this would then be a State Facility Air Permit and not a Title 5.

Is that more regulation or less? They still have the same emission limits. They still have to maintain their annual emissions and report them to the state agency. They still have to do emissions testing to demonstrate that they are in compliance with emission limits.

What are the emissions limits under the State vs Title 5? They are the same. The difference between the State and Title 5 are because when they replaced units 2 and 3 (older units) with units 5 and 6, the criteria pollutant emissions of 5 and 6 are greatly reduced for NO_x and CO and that puts them below the threshold for needing to have a Title 5 permit.

Is there a chance that if they increase run times they would go back to a Title 5 with these new turbines? Under the existing permit from the state, unit 2 did have an hours restriction of about 50% of the year. That was the only unit that was restricted. Under the new State permit, because the emissions are so greatly reduced with the cleaner running engines, the replacement for unit 2 (unit 5) will be able to run full period. That means all units at the station will be able to run 24 hours, 7 days a week, under the State permit. For the air permit that is correct. But there still are demand issues, and the volume that goes the pipeline and what it services. In theory it could run 24/7 365 days a year, it wouldn't do that. Nor do any of them in New York State.

How long is the permit for? Is it renewed? Permits are not renewed. If the facility were to make any changes to the equipment on site, then they would go through a new permitting process. Any changes to turbines would trigger a new permit.

If better equipment becomes available, will Borger be forced to change? D Houser said he doesn't believe the CLCPA directly affects operations at Borger station. It is more for power producing facilities, not what they are doing in gas transmission.

There have been questions related to lighting and containing it on site. The lighting plan calls for LED downward directional lighting with hoods on top to make sure the light goes downward and will be the best night sky compliant lighting they can find. The plan shows the existing lighting plan and the proposed plan. It shows how they're reducing the light spread through the station. It is a better fit for the community and keeps the lighting inside the station and downward directional.

How is runoff from the slope controlled? Is there a stormwater plan that is more comprehensive than planning for a 100-year storm? J Munsey said the soils on this site are highly transmissive. When they did infiltration tests at the site, pretty much as fast as they could put water into the ground it would run into the ground. There are no stormwater basins per se, where water is stored onsite, but rather infiltration galleries are being used such that the runoff created by the new impervious surfaces at the site will be discharged back into the ground for the project. There should be no net increase of stormwater flow off the site as a result of what is proposed. It does require continued maintenance by the facility so that it continues to operate. This method was used successfully on site at the New Market project. There will be no increased runoff to the town's ditching with this project.

There's been a call for a full environmental impact statement, would the applicant be amenable to that? Gene Kelly said in order to get to the possibility of an environmental impact statement the board would have to issue a positive declaration. It's clear that a project like this can't result in a positive declaration. It's a Type 2 action. It's a replacement in kind of an existing facility. The regulation (Part 617.5) is very clear about what constitutes a Type 2 action and this is a Type 2 action. DEC, who also has a permitting role here, has already issued a determination that this is a Type 2 action. The law and the regulations that govern whether an EIS may or should be done doesn't support that kind of determination. We aren't talking about a new facility with actions that have never been considered. The Type 2 action was designed for this kind of project. It is an existing facility and you are swapping out equipment that is similar in kind and function.

Yet it increases the carbon emissions by 30%. Gene Kelly said that is not correct. The increase talked about tonight is potential to emit. That is premised on the idea that it runs 24/7 365 days a year. It is clear that is not the history of this unit. It's unlikely that it will ever come anywhere close to that. This historic average for the past five years has been in the 20% range, so there is no plausible set of circumstances that would lead anybody to believe that the emissions for this unit will come anywhere near the potential to emit. The potential to emit is the hypothetical maximum. It's not a real number.

If existing customers need more gas you can send it to them? Correct.

If you are not running at capacity and a new customer comes along, do you have to go to FERC? Yes.

D Houser explained that the system is designed to serve all the customers on the line if everybody called for their firm capacity at one time. That does not happen 365 days a year, 24 hours a day. Those demands are very much weather dependent. The station doesn't run in warm weather. There are historical run time and hours for that station, for all the stations, and that's how for this particular project they were able to give a very conservative 20-25% utilization factor at Borger station.

Supv Leifer said people are concerned that gas will come through Borger to run an electric power station that runs regardless of the temperature. D Houser read from the air permit application to DEC for the project: DETI will maintain current subscribed deliverability without exceeding the current volumetric capacity. He said this project is not intended to increase volume and capacity on the line.

But would it allow for increased capacity if an electric power plant were to draw gas through the system? Supv Leifer said people are concerned about that type of 24/7 customer. D Houser said he has heard that power plant name and they are not a customer of Dominion and they are not on their line.

Are they a customer of one of the co-owned companies? D Houser said the Iroquois company has to service their customers as designated by FERC. Customers and rates are all approved by FERC and they have to go to them when customers are added.

Iroquois is partially owned by Dominion, Iroquois is a customer of Dominion, and Cricket Valley is a customer of Iroquois. So if Iroquois has to pull more gas to Cricket Valley, it's like really the same company. Iroquois has a similar number of what its capacity is on the line and they have similar receipt points to service that transmission line like Dominion does and they could call from any number of customers and suppliers on their line to serve their customers. There are interconnects with different pipelines all throughout the country. The Iroquois line is not the only system that Dominion interconnects with. They interconnect with many pipelines throughout the network in the Mid-Atlantic states. It's not the only one and Dominion is not the only interconnect with Iroquois. What is getting lost is that this project is not about Iroquois, it's not about Cricket Valley, it's about reducing criteria pollutants and improving the life and health of area residents. It's not about a power plant that is not on the Dominion system.

Cl Lamb asked and D Houser confirmed that they are operating at 20% of their potential to emit now and there is nothing preventing them from operating at 5-6 times that. Cl Lamb said that we are worried about a hypothetical right now, but the reality is that Dominion could go up to 83,000 tons of CO2 right now. D Houser confirmed that and said they could go up to the limit of Title 5 on NOx right now.

Cl Lamb said there are benefits to reducing criteria pollutants. NOx causes asthma; carbon dioxide causes immediate health problems. He would like some assurance that Dominion will not go up to potential to emit. He's heard that and the DEC has said that potential to emit is a hypothetical number. He asked why Dominion is doing the project if they don't intend to move more gas and what's in it for them.

D Houser said at a meeting in May of 2017 they heard Dryden residents and their neighbors say they wanted the equipment that was being installed at other stations, not just new coolers; that they wanted the old equipment replaced. Meetings and communications followed with recommendations for types of engines. It's about improving the health of the community and bringing down the criteria pollutant numbers that community members are concerned about. For Dominion, they will run cleaner. It fits with the internal goals of Dominion Energy of reducing pollutants in the atmosphere and in communities. Additionally, new engines are more reliable. But the number one driver of the project was community driven. The community came to them and asked them to do the project. That's what brought them here with a project to reduce the criteria pollutants.

He noted that the internal combustion in these new engines uses more fuel to lower those criteria pollutants and still drive out the same horsepower without changing the volumetric capacity of the pipeline.

Cl Skaley asked how this requires a special use permit and what is the town's action.

R Burger explained this is an expansion of the land use within the facility. It is not a simple replacement. They have to put two new buildings on the property to house the equipment. When it is up and running they can decommission the old equipment. So there is a land use impact on the site and that is why they are coming for a special use permit and site plan review.

If the plant only operates at 20% capacity, is this over-engineered? They are using similar horsepower engines. If every single customer along the line calls for 100% capacity, they need to be able to deliver that with redundancies in the system. The FERC dictates the equipment and ensures they are able to serve 100% of the customers demand at any given time with redundancies. So if an engine is down for maintenance here, another will be able to pick it up there.

G Kelly said 2015 was the most recent high year for operation of this facility because of the polar vortex. You never know when you'll get one of those and thinking about the interstate and intrastate pipeline, it's very connected and one part relies on another. You have to have greater capacity than what your need might be. He doesn't know whether the station ran at 100% during the polar vortex, but if the capacity hadn't been there, there would have been severe effects across the northeast for folks when they needed to heat their homes the most.

There is a tradeoff between the criteria pollutants and CO2. The criteria pollutants have a direct impact on human health. That's why they're regulated under the Clean Air Act. For this project to reduce the criteria pollutants to the extent that it does, even though there is a small tradeoff and a slight increase in CO2, it has great benefits to human health. The health impacts are very important. The CO2 is more of a global issue. But it has no effect on local health. Whereas the higher levels of criteria pollutants that are being put out with the existing equipment have impacts on people's health. This project will address those impacts so it's really important from that perspective.

Another valid concern raised tonight was what if downstate New York drives greater demand for this facility. The state of New York has procured 2400 megawatts of offshore power on Long Island. That is now moving through the approval process and will get built. In the coming years there will be a minimum of 2400 megawatts of offshore wind power capability that is being produced emission free to address the downstate need. That energy will serve entirely Long Island, New York City and downstate areas for the most part. That will diminish the demand for this project to serve that area in the future. These things are all connected, and it is important to consider them in the macro and not look at individual small pieces in isolation.

Cl Lamb asked D Houser to comment on whether Dominion would be agreeable to the conditions that were suggested if the board were to approve the special use permit. Those conditions were that the plant would not run at more than 20% run time and Dominion reporting to the board on an annual basis that it is running at the bandwidth it expects to do with this project. There may be a condition to use the best available technology for methane capture.

D Houser replied they had been asked what Dominion was doing or going to do to reduce fugitive methanes at the station knowing that the replacement turbines burn more fuel and would produce more methane. Jeremy listed the things they will do as far as added equipment on to these turbines, the stops and shutdowns and capturing that gas in-house, so that it isn't released to atmosphere on startups and shutdowns and having an Ldar program. It is also in the air permit from DEC where they will have a pretty aggressive leak detection and

repair program where they go around and find any leaks and repair them. The other example is pigging. When you take a piece of equipment meant to have gas flow through off line, you want to be able to capture that gas and methane and not admit it to atmosphere. There is now control technology to use and attach it to the equipment so the gas is not released. This is all about capturing fugitive emissions.

The board wants transparent, actual data. Dominion will come in whatever time of the year the board wants them to. They will give a year's data of how much gas has gone through, how many run hours on each engine, and they will be able to give the town exactly what the emissions are on each engine. The town then can build an inventory over time of criteria and non-criteria pollutants. They will disclose whatever the town wants to know about the ability of the engines to run, how much they run, what the hours are and what the actual emissions are. They are happy to show that, and they would adhere to that as a condition of approval.

Katie Quinn-Jacobs said the Safety & Preparedness Committee's recommendation is for an outside expert. That would help us decide which part of the equation is the better one to choose (criteria emissions or GHG emissions). That assessment could be made by an outside entity. Potential remedies for capturing methane and natural gas might be explored. There may be some things we haven't thought of that an outside expert would consider. The issue of particulate matter hasn't come up much tonight. In the CT Male graphs it looks as though it goes from 8 tons per year to a potential of 14 and she wonders what the sources of that are and what remedies there could be. It is also important to say when they first were presented with the information, they got the carbon monoxide data and the NOx data. But they didn't get the other half of that which is a potential increase in the CO2e. If they'd had that right from the start, they could have been considering it all this time. They didn't have the opportunity because they didn't know. There's a table in the application to the DEC and in May of 2019 the line for CO2e is blank, but there are some sublines underneath it that she thinks would apply, but there's no comparison between what the current system is putting out and what the proposed system is putting out. It's great that it was in the CT Male document that came out July 30, but all that intervening time they could have been addressing this issue. They didn't because they didn't have the full information. She wanted to be clear about that.

D Houser said the potential to emit is 14 tons with the new equipment for particulate matter. Using the 25% utilization factor it would be approximately 3.5 tons. To be a major source is 100, so its very small. He has not addressed ozone and with this project they will see a decrease in ozone for the facility as well. That didn't make the bar graphs but is another talking point of how well these engines perform in reducing NOx and VOCs would then equate to a reduction in ozone as well at Borger station with this new proposed equipment.

J Munsey said the initial SUP application to the town did show the increased carbon dioxide levels for the project. He suggested that instead of hiring a consultant the town should consider talking with the Department of Health, the Department of Environmental Conservation and some public health experts that would be able to help them do the comparison between the offset of the increased emissions associated with carbon dioxide largely as the result of using more fuel to power the reduction in the criteria pollutants. He would suggest that going to public health officials would be a better route.

Cl Lamb said he spoke with someone at DEC at length who said when you increase efficiency and reduce criteria pollutants you do decrease efficiency in terms of the amount of fuel used. It would be a 3% reduction in efficiency if you want to scrub the emissions more. He was helpful in helping him understand the perspective of criteria pollutants vs CO2, which is bad, but he said criteria pollutants will kill you. He was given the name of someone at NYS Department of Health that he will also consult. He thinks we need to determine whether the tradeoffs are worth it and isn't sure that a full EAF will answer that. The tradeoffs will get into some subjective stuff and he doesn't think a consultant will be able to draw a bright line that

we all like. They will be looking at the same data we are looking at and there will be the same dependent variables and independent variables. We can get some experts at the state level to weigh in.

Joe Wilson asked if Borger would be accepting of a condition in the permit that spoke to best practices and best available equipment to identify and suppress the methane emissions.

L Gayne said right now across the industry what is seen for best available equipment to suppress methane emissions is a leak detection and repair program. It is what the EPA recommends in their methane challenge and gas star programs, which are voluntary methane programs, and in that is a program that they will be implementing at Borger. The leak detection and repair program is also a requirement in the draft air permit from the DEC. So they will have a requirement to do leak surveys on a quarterly basis and repair all leaks that are found.

Supv Leifer said he understands this project would be grandfathered under the CLCPA and people would be interested in having the station comply with state law and regulation as it changes too. We don't want to be stuck with it when there's better equipment ten years from now.

D Houser said they agree and will comply with all state regulations. The DEC regulates them by air but they will absolutely comply with all state regulations that are enacted and promulgated. They would accept that as a condition of approval. States are continually working on regulations with regard to methane and other things and they will comply. They continually modernize what they are doing, are continually putting in newer best practices as technologies come online and continually adapt to new state and federal regulations in their operations.

G Kelly said just last week DEC announced new comprehensive greenhouse gas limits under the CLCPA. There will be two virtual public hearings scheduled in October, a public comment period, and these regulations are being drafted now. He doesn't think its accurate to say that anything is going to be grandfathered at this time. We're entering a phase where DEC is going to ratchet down the level of greenhouse gasses to a point where there are no sacred cows. Everything that is producing greenhouse gasses will be subject to deeper regulations. We need to recognize that the regulatory landscape is changing, and this site will be as subject to these evolving regulations as any other one will be.

Dana Magnuson asked if the County 239 review has been received for this project and was told it has not.

Cl Servoss asked if the quarterly leak detection and repair reports could be included with the other reports provided to the town. L Gayne responded that they provide those to the EPA annually and a copy could be provided to the town.

RESOLUTION #105 (2020) - DECLARATION OF THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF DRYDEN AS LEAD AGENCY IN CONNECTION WITH THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS FOR THE BORGER TURBINE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

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

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Dryden ("Town Board") is in the process of reviewing an application from Dominion Energy Transmission, Inc. for a Special Use Permit to replace two turbines at the Borger Station at 219 Ellis Hollow Creek Road, Tax parcels 66.-1-18 and 22. The Borger Replacement Project also includes adding an oxidation catalyst, 3 new microturbines and upgraded pipes and fences; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (the "SEQRA") and the regulations adopted pursuant thereto by the Department of Environmental Conservation of the State of New York, being 6 NYCRR Part 617, as amended (the "Regulations"), all discretionary actions by the Town are subject to environmental review in accordance with SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, 6 NYCRR Part 617 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and its regulations require that a Lead Agency be established for conducting environmental review of all discretionary actions in accordance with local and state environmental law; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board wishes to comply with the SEQRA Act and its Regulations with respect to the Special Use Permit application and Site Plan application, and

WHEREAS, SEQRA and its accompanying regulations specifies that for actions governed by local environmental review, the Lead Agency shall be that local agency which has primary responsibility for approving and carrying out the action, and pursuant to Section 1201(B) of the Dryden Zoning Law, all Special Use Permit and Site Plan reviews and approvals are under the jurisdiction of the Dryden Town Board,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF DRYDEN, NEW YORK that as the local agency with primary responsibility for approving this Special Use Permit, it hereby declares itself Lead Agency for purposes of conducting the environmental review required by SEQRA and its accompanying regulations.

2nd Cl Sparling

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

The public hearing was left open at 9:30 p.m. and will be continued at the September 17, 2020 board meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Next month's public hearings will also include First Light Fiber Shelter SUP at 1622 Dryden Road at 6:05 p.m. and 2150 Dryden Road Solar Facility Interconnect Site Plan Review at 6:15 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING
PROPOSED LOCAL LAW TO
OVERRIDE THE TAX LEVY CAP**

Supv Leifer opened the public hearing at 9:33 p.m. and explained the board generally passes this each year since the Governor put the tax levy cap law on the books. It doesn't mean that the board intends to exceed the levy cap, but will be able to should the need arise. Special district budgets also count toward the cap, not just the four main funds. He noted that the ambulance district tax doubled last year with a great result for the community, but things like that affect the tax cap. There were no public comments or comments from the board and the hearing was left open at 9:35 p.m.

COUNTY BRIEFING

Mike Lane reported that census workers are knocking on doors for people who have not responded to the census online. The census is important and there is concern about the

results because of Covid and the student population. He recently toured the new customs facility at the airport which is all ready to go. It will be staffed with inspectors from the Syracuse area. The DOT project is moving along rapidly and as soon as that is done this fall, they will auction the downtown DOT facility. There is a 2-million-dollar minimum bid. They hope that whoever comes along will understand the importance of that 8 acres on the waterfront in Ithaca. The Etna Lane bridge project is in the planning stage and is moving along as well as the Ludlowville Bridge which is now under construction. That is important because the State will begin tearing down the large bridge on Route 34 later this year. The county bridge will need to be done as a detour for that project.

Martha Robertson reported New York State's rate of completion for the census is currently 59.9% and the national rate is 64.1%. Dryden is 65.8%. She thanked the board for considering going to a moratorium on the zoning re-write and looking at inclusionary zoning. The city of Ithaca took a look at it a few years ago and then backed down. Dryden could be a leader on this.

With respect to budget, the County is looking at a tax levy cap of 0.73% and they passed their override law on Tuesday. They have already cut around 5 million dollars out of the 2020 spending and are looking at probably a 7 to 11 million-dollar gap for 2021. There is no way they can do this with either raising taxes or cutting spending or moving capital money or laying people off. It will have to be a combination of a lot of things. They've had a lot of meetings already and will get a formal presentation by Jason Malino on Tuesday, September 8, and that will start their series of expanded budget meetings. They have been trying hard to get the Federal government to do something and the fact that they won't move on aid to state and local governments is a tragedy. The Governor has been withholding 20% of payments due to local governments and school districts pending a decision by the Federal government.

Supv Leifer closed the public hearing on the tax levy cap override at 9:45 p.m.

RESOLUTION #106 (2020) – ADOPT LOCAL LAW TO OVERRIDE THE TAX LEVY CAP

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

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby adopts the following local law and directs the Town Clerk to file the same with the Secretary of State of the State of New York:

A LOCAL LAW TO OVERRIDE THE TAX LEVY LIMIT ESTABLISHED IN GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW §3-C

Be it enacted by the Town Board of the Town of Dryden as follows:

Section 1. Legislative Intent: It is the intent of this local law to override the limit on the amount of real property taxes that may be levied by the Town of Dryden, County of Tompkins pursuant to General Municipal Law §3-c, and to allow the Town of Dryden, County of Tompkins to adopt a town budget for (a) town purposes, (b) fire protection districts, and (c) any other special or improvement district, and Town improvements provided pursuant to Town Law Article 12-C, governed by the Town Board for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 2021 and ending December 31, 2021 that requires a real property tax levy in excess of the "tax levy limit" as defined by General Municipal Law §3-c.

Section 2. Authority: This local law is adopted pursuant to subdivision 5 of General Municipal Law §3-c, which expressly authorizes the Town Board to override the tax levy limit

by the adoption of a local law approved by vote of at least sixty percent (60%) of the Town Board.

Section 3. Tax Levy Limit Override: The Town Board of the Town of Dryden, County of Tompkins is hereby authorized to adopt a budget for the fiscal year 2021 that requires a real property tax levy in excess of the limit specified in General Municipal Law §3-c.

Section 4. Severability: If any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, or part of this Local Law or the application thereof to any person, firm or corporation, or circumstance, shall be adjusted by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unconstitutional, such order or judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, or part of this Local Law or in its application to the person, individual, firm or corporation or circumstance, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment or order shall be rendered.

Section 5. Effective date: This local law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.
2nd Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

HIGHWAY/DPW DEPARTMENT

Supv Leifer announced that Rick Young was pulled away to a fire call. He was going to update the 284 Agreement but will do that next month. He has asked the board for authorization to sell an excavator, skid loader and wood chipper.

RESOLUTION #107 (2020) – AUTHORIZE SALE OF EQUIPMENT

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

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby authorizes the Highway Superintendent to sell the following equipment at a surplus auction, by advertisement to bid or to a public entity and directs that the proceeds from the sales of equipment be put into budget line DA5130.2:

- 2015 313 D Wheeled Excavator, Serial #CATM313DEK3D01024
- 2016 Bob Cat S220 Skid loader Serial #530711378
- 2010 Salsco Wood Chipper 813C Serial #4S9PC313CC171016

2nd Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

All submissions have been turned in for CHIPS reimbursement.

NEPTUNE FIRE DEPARTMENT

Supv Leifer said Neptune will be talking to the town at budget time about purchasing an air compressor at a cost of about \$90,000. No Dryden department has one presently (other than a small one in a truck that can do 5 packs at a time). Dryden has been going to Cortlandville Fire Department to fill their packs. Supv Leifer will have more details shortly and in conjunction with their budget request for 2021.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

2150 Dryden Road – Noah Siegel, of True Green Capital, said they have submitted an update to the approved site plan and special use permit for the 2150 Dryden Road solar projects. The project is under construction under the current SUP and site plan, but they have moved into the final interconnection layout phase with the utility company. They have prepared a final design and corresponding visual impact. They have taken a comprehensive look at all the different vantage points that they know to be important to folks in the town. The interconnection is near George Road in the northeast corner of the 2150 site. The majority of the equipment is located on the property itself, not along the road. The vantage points include the Willow Glen Cemetery, the Dryden Rail Trail and neighboring properties, as well as views from Dryden Road and George Road. The majority of the system will be visually screened. He noted that previous approvals and landscaping management plans still stand, and they are now in the process of procuring the various plantings. The goal is to have the plants in place so they can root before the winter.

With regard to the installation near George Road, they have a number of design constraints that have impacted how they needed to lay out the poles. These include state regulations for the size of each interconnection to the grid. It includes the utilities standards and procedures for safety and equipment. There are also unique characteristics of the site, such as avoiding disturbance to Virgil Creek. They are crossing the creek rather than having disturbance to the creek itself. There are few factors at play here that they've incorporated along with those visual impact considerations. There is more information in the report for the board to review.

This matter is scheduled for 6:15 p.m. on September 17, 2020.

Planning Board Training Credits – R Burger has asked the board to approve training credits for Planning and Zoning Board members.

RESOLUTION #108 (2020) – APPROVE TRAINING CREDITS

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

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves continuing education credits at the rate of one credit per hour of participation for the following trainings:

Stream Buffer Protection Webinars by Hudson River Watershed Alliance – 4 one-hour webinars offered September 9, 16, 23, and 30.
2nd Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

It was noted that First Light will be submitting a corrected site plan for their hearing on September 17.

There will be a virtual public meeting on the Route 13 Corridor Study on September 3. Details will be posted on the town’s website.

The TCAT T-Connect scheduled to roll out in Dryden has been delayed until spring. There will be a pilot program in Etna on weekends.

EMS Resolution

Cl Lamb explained that this is something that came out of a TCCOG subcommittee on EMS funding. They have an idea to ask the state for a new formula for funding EMS services. He will bring the proposed resolution to next month’s meeting.

Town Hall Air Assessment

Last week the board authorized Sherri Crispell to get a quote for an air evaluation for town hall and she has obtained a quote from Abby-Owen Environmental. Supv Leifer said we need to find out whether there are mold or other issues in the building. The evaluation is expected to be no more than \$1,000.00.

RESOLUTION #109 (2020) – AUTHORIZE AIR EVALUATION FOR TOWN HALL

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

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby authorizes Sherri Crispell to schedule an air quality assessment of Town Hall with Abby-Owen at a cost not to exceed \$1,000.00.

2nd Cl Skaley

Roll Call Vote	Cl Sparling	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Skaley	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

Code of Ethics (Personnel Manual)

Cl Servoss said there are a few minor changes and the final version is on the website. It will be on the agenda next month.

Citizens Privilege

None.

Borger Discussion

An EIS is not required for a Type 2 action. Is there information that can be obtained from a full EIS that we don’t already have? Atty Sokoni said if an action is on the Type 2 list it means the state legislature has already pre-determined that anything on that list has no significant environmental impact. If something squarely fits in that category, we cannot override it. She would look to the content experts for a determination that this is an in-kind replacement. If that is the determination, then we are stuck with it being a Type 2. Type 2 is predetermined. We cannot override it. They can volunteer to do an EIS, but she thinks that is

an issue where you would have to make a positive declaration and she doesn't know how you'd get there if it is truly an in-kind replacement.

Cl Servoss asked what information we might get from an EIS that we wouldn't get from an explanation from a DOH expert.

Cl Skaley said anything that was discussed tonight could be added into an EIS. The question is whether or not to issue a permit, and do we have enough understanding of the technical aspects to be able to do that in a coherent way?

Atty Sokoni said you need to make a distinction between the SEQR determination and just the evaluation of the permit application. As far as SEQR is concerned, if this is truly a Type 2, then it ends there. The law is clear if something is on the Type 2 list, there is no further environmental review in connection with SEQR. As far as the special use permit itself, you can attach reasonable conditions to a permit. So we need to make that determination. Adding conditions on the permit is very different from an EIS for SEQR purposes.

Supv Leifer said we may need an engineer who understands this stuff to help us figure it out, even whether some of the conditions discussed are sufficient. Some of that information may come from Department of Health. It seems like that is something that can be done by September 17.

Cl Skaley said there is also a policy related issue in terms of how the plant will be operated in the future. The permit that is issued will stand in perpetuity and that is disconcerting given that everything else is changing.

Cl Lamb said a permit issued for a minor source polluter would be in perpetuity. A major source, Title 5, is also in perpetuity. They have a permit now to run their current machines. What are the other questions that we would ask an outside consultant? An EIS is a large thorough four-part document that looks at the proposed action, cultural, social and economic impacts. That seems like a lot of information that we aren't interested in in this case. He wants to know if the health impacts/benefits are worth it. What other reason is there to hire an outside consultant?

Cl Sparling said we do know based on the data that stuff will impact the air environment. If a project were to emit 100% more greenhouses gasses and the DEC said it was a Type 2, would it raise red flags. CO2 is not a criteria pollutant, and isn't regulated, but ten years in the future it may have an impact. He understands the new engines will solve the immediate health concerns, but he is thinking about long term environmental health. He thinks an outside consultant would better guide this.

Supv Leifer said he understands that folks want to know is the effect on climate change. The trade-off is the improvement on the criteria pollutants locally versus the global impact on climate change.

Cl Lamb will contact the Department of Health and see if we can get an environmental expert to explain the impacts. R Burger will ask TG Miller and LaBella if they can recommend anyone to assist with this.

ADVISORY BOARD UPDATES

Broadband Committee – Will meet tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. The county is now interested in broadband and there is a group of towns that are looking to possibly work together.

Planning Board – The comp plan survey is open until August 31 and the steering committee will meet again the second Wednesday in September.

Conservation Board – Has discussed ditching and are looking for some more technical information on how we could do a better job.

Ag Committee – Hasn't met.

It was noted we need to figure out how to do hybrid meetings.

Rail Trail Task Force – Is currently working on the bridge over Route 13 and securing an easement. Work on a long-term agreement with DEC for the Game Farm property is ongoing.

South Hill Rec Way – Last fall the board approved an MOU with NYSEG. There may be another version coming because other towns did not sign on. It looks like NYSEG is willing to give a ten-year auto-renewing license to use the property.

Other Business

Freese Road bridge – no update.

438 Lake Road issue – Atty Sokoni reported the contractor has not been paid by the bank from the construction loan and the contractor is in a bad spot. This will be taken up at the next meeting.

Budget – Budget request sheets will go to department heads next week at the latest. After discussion, the board decided to hold the first budget workshop on September 29 at 6:00 p.m. Supv Leifer said he would like department heads to submit budgets with no increase.

There being no further business, on motion made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bambi L. Avery
Town Clerk

Zoom Chat – Town Board meeting 8/20/2020

00:50:10 Mason Jager: I'd like to speak

01:23:55 Carol Chock: I'd like to raise my hand for Borger please.

01:25:25 gina caciooppo: I as well for borger

01:25:56 Martha Robertson: Could the Town Board ask the Planning Board to consider inclusionary zoning? And propose a 6-month moratorium in the meantime?

01:32:48 Martha Robertson: If you're proposing an arbitrary moratorium, it could be challenged. But I would think that investigating inclusionary zoning is a very legitimate reason for the delay. For starters, I could ask County Planning to come make a presentation about inclusionary zoning.

01:40:04 David Weinstein: Martha,

01:45:22 David Weinstein: I sent Martha the graph that shows that all of the addition of housing that has been added over the past 5 years has not resulted in the average rent of apartments in the County decreasing. In fact, it has been increasing rapidly. Therefore, all this building has not resulted in the creation of affordable housing. If any wants to see this data, send me an email (daw5@cornell.edu) and I'll send it to you as well.

01:56:21 Buzz Lavine: I'd like to speak re Borger too.

01:58:55 gina caciooppo: gina 829 ringwood rd. Bambi has my notes

02:13:00 Jason Leifer: DETI will be answering questions after public comment

02:16:25 gina caciooppo: I use heat pumps!

02:16:58 Elisa Evett: So do I !

02:20:10 Lisa Marshall (she/her): YES!!!!

02:21:10 Lisa Marshall (she/her): In fact, Martha suggested something similar on May 1, 2017 and we heard crickets from Dominion.

02:25:11 Lisa Marshall (she/her): False statements are in their DNA. Their application said there were 9 homes within 1/2 mile of the Horseheads compressor, we counted 50!

02:26:28 gina caciooppo: people made such great valid points. We need an expert to research for us to be "eye opened" to this

02:27:56 Elisa Evett: Dryden Town Board members take note of Dominon's record of evasion, if not outright lying.

02:40:01 Lisa Marshall (she/her): They are a customer of Iroquois

02:40:22 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Which Dominion co-owns . . .

02:41:48 Lisa Marshall (she/her): National Grid sold Iroquois to Dominion and now they're the customer . . .

02:42:49 Carol Chock: Do any of the various companies buy or sell gas from others?

02:43:59 Elisa Evett: These answers are exactly why the town needs an expert.

02:44:53 Lisa Marshall (she/her): So, that's all pre-upgrade and pre Cricket Valley

02:44:56 gina caciooppo: The past does not indicate the future

02:47:31 Lisa Marshall (she/her): There's also the health up and down the pipeline. The health of the folks in PA being fracked. The health of the folks in Minden where the compressor is highly polluting and the health impacts for everyone of the climate emissions.

02:47:39 Kathy Russell: Demand for natural gas will increase in the future.

02:47:42 gina cacioppo: weather is getting more unpredictable due to climate.

02:48:17 gina cacioppo: Sorry but bullshit. They will always try to increase demand and thus profit

02:48:42 Lisa Marshall (she/her): That's simply not true. Look at the Iroquois presentation they gave at the Northeast Gas Association, they laid out the increased demand and supply. Major supply source was New Market and New Market II.

02:49:19 Lisa Marshall (she/her): No, because Indian Point hasn't been fully shut down. When it is, the demand on Dominion goes up.

02:49:25 tony ingraffea: why is my chat turned off?

02:49:37 gina cacioppo: tony welcome to the chat

02:49:43 tony ingraffea: I can only chat with Jason and Bambi, why?

02:49:48 Jason Leifer: I turned off private chat

02:49:51 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Tony, we can see you

02:49:56 Lisa Marshall (she/her): We can see your chat

02:49:59 Jason Leifer: Tony, we can see you

02:50:28 gina cacioppo: The fact that there are 5-7 Dominion people here is why we need an expert to represent public

02:51:15 tony ingraffea: why no private chat? is that SOP during the mtg?

02:51:51 Jason Leifer: yes

02:52:01 tony ingraffea: ok, thanks

02:52:06 Jason Leifer: The chat file is part of the recording

02:52:24 tony ingraffea: got it.

02:54:24 tony ingraffea: In other words the proposed new turbines burn cleaner, and in the process tradeoff criteria pollutants from incomplete combustion for CO2 from "cleaner" combustion

02:55:18 tony ingraffea: the question was whwre does the additional methane emission come from?

02:56:47 tony ingraffea: no methane cannot come from combustion. from leakage from the turbines, bypassed methane that does not get burned in them

02:56:59 Katie Quinn-Jacobs: What portion is from the micro turbines and new boiler?

02:57:30 Lisa Marshall (she/her): The bottom line is, they can reduce harmful air pollutants at Borger locally, but the increase in GHG emissions will go way up with this project. And overall pollutants to communities up and down the pipeline from well-head to flame tip and the climate will go way up.

02:58:41 Lisa Marshall (she/her): And the increased volume through the pipeline. What about that?

03:00:05 tony ingraffea: no, not correct. ideally, burning ch4 produces only co2 and h2o. but in any real turbine, that does not happen. in a real turbine, the burning of ch4 creates NOX, CO, etc, criteria pollutants. the proposed new turbines will reduce these pollutants but increase CO2 production, getting closer to the ideal chemistry.

03:00:09 gina cacioppo: then we will re-hear your proposal once you have the technology to capture your harmful bi-products.

03:01:13 tony ingraffea: double the hours, double the emissions

03:01:34 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Precisely!

03:01:48 gina cacioppo: Great questions James Skaley

03:02:05 tony ingraffea: all emissions, criteria pollutants and CO2e

03:02:26 Joe Wilson: And,FERC never turns down increases like Skaley is describing

03:03:41 tony ingraffea: criteria pollutants are SOX NOX CO and VOC's, but not CO2 of CH4

03:03:51 Katie Quinn-Jacobs: Also, Dominion has told us in the past that they must supply customers if they are asked to do so.

03:03:55 gina cacioppo: Was this proposal in the works prior to dominion being purchased by Berkshire Hathaway?

03:03:58 tony ingraffea: or CH4

03:04:13 Katie Quinn-Jacobs: Yes, Gina.

03:04:14 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Customer demand will be all day, every day when Indian Point closes and Cricket Valley has to replace that base load power.

03:04:23 gina cacioppo: thank you katie

03:05:15 Alice Green: I'm no longer a Town Board member, so I don't have a vote on this proposed SUP. But if I were still on the Board, I would insist on getting more information about the implications of the GHG emissions that could be increased with this project. I would consider it irresponsible to approve this permit without getting independent, expert consultation on the public health trade offs between air pollution reduction and increasing dangerous GHG's. And I would look to that expert to recommend stipulations that could be added to any permit to mitigate the GHG emissions.

03:05:31 Lisa Marshall (she/her): No Title V means less oversight

03:06:02 Kathy Russell: I agree with Alice Green.

03:06:21 tony ingraffea: Just to be clear, because there is a physical connection between the Dominion pipeline and the Iroquois pipeline, it is physically possible for a methane molecule passing through Borger to get anywhere that Iroquois serves. That is different than contract agreements between owner/co-owner, and current and future customers.

03:07:19 tony ingraffea: The contract agreements direct where the molecules go, the pipeline connections direct where they CAN go.

03:08:29 gina cacioppo: "I don't believe" is a way to be untruthful

03:08:50 tony ingraffea: That is not quite true. the CLCPA will, eventually, moderate emissions from ALL sources in all sectors, not just the power sector.

03:09:01 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Consider the opposite, as demand increases, they will then apply to replace the existing pipeline or add a second pipe and add additional compressors.

03:09:08 Elisa Evett: Exactly

03:09:49 Joe Wilson: If we had an expert to explain CLCPA and all this other technical stuff, we could make a rational decision--not there yet by a long shot.

03:09:52 DMagnuson: Come back to the Board Alice! Pretty please?

03:10:27 gina cacioppo: The board is asking wonderful questions, but we still need an expert. We need an expert to make sure we are asking all we need to know

03:10:44 Martha Robertson: YES - What Alice said! "I'm no longer a Town Board member, so I don't have a vote on this proposed SUP. But If I were still on the Board, I would insist on getting more information about the implications of the GHG emissions that could be increased with this project. I would consider it irresponsible to approve this permit without getting independent, expert consultation on the public health trade offs between air pollution reduction and increasing dangerous GHG's. And I would look to that expert to recommend stipulations that could be added to any permit to mitigate the GHG emissions."

03:11:02 gina cacioppo: YES ALICE!

03:11:33 Martha Robertson: Thanks, Tony; I thought so: "That is not quite true. the CLCPA will, eventually, moderate emissions from ALL sources in all sectors, not just the power sector."

03:11:33 Joe Wilson: They need an expert to focus their questions rather than from the hip as they are doing now; then they/we need an expert to interpret the answers.

03:12:45 Martha Robertson: This could go on all night. The TB is doing well, but this whole discussion is proof that a full EIS by an outside consultant is necessary.

03:13:02 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Hear, hear!

03:13:20 DMagnuson: Thank you Martha!

03:13:28 gina cacioppo: Yes Loren!

03:13:38 Elisa Evett: I hope this recording can be made available to the expert as a part of the analysis .

03:13:59 gina cacioppo: Someone should copy the chat for our record

03:14:17 Lisa Marshall (she/her): The chat is part of the official record.

03:14:34 DMagnuson: Amen!

03:14:50 Bambi: It is. I'll attach it to the minutes.

03:16:01 Martha Robertson: Tompkins County Planning will consider the increase in CO2E in its 239 review.

03:16:19 Joe Wilson: Board could use Site Plan regulations to raise environmental issues if they so chose. Not as good as EIS, but could be a justification for placing conditions on the permit which is requested.

03:16:29 gina caciozzo: Potential means eventual

03:16:40 Lisa Marshall (she/her): The history is entirely irrelevant!

03:16:44 Kathy Russell: History changes. Plans change. I

03:17:18 Martha Robertson: Can someone ask them what they expect will happen to their demand when the nuclear plants (plural) in NYS are closed?

03:17:19 Lisa Marshall (she/her): The previous use of the pipeline before New Market was very different than future plans.

03:17:41 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Exactly, Martha! Indian Point still has one turbine running.

03:17:54 Katie Quinn-Jacobs: We also need answers re: the 75% increase in Particulate Matter that was reported in the CT Male information from July 30

03:18:01 Martha Robertson: or new customers!

03:18:15 Joe Wilson: No answer to Loren's question about an independent expert advising the community and Board. Board could hire its own consultant to parse what Borger is saying and to recommend appropriate conditions.

03:18:50 Lisa Marshall (she/her): They HAVE to give it to them. By law

03:18:59 Kathy Russell: FERC is a rubber stamp for the fossil fuel industry.

03:19:27 Lisa Marshall (she/her): When is the application for New Market II going to be filed with FERC?

03:19:36 Martha Robertson: How many days a year DOES the system run at full capacity or close to it?

03:19:38 Joe Wilson: FERC will never deny a permit to increase fossil fuel distribution--that's FERC's history so the idea that FERC will constrain Borger's operations is not realistic.

03:20:21 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Historically the station ran for winter heating. In the future the gas demand is coming from a power plant that is designed to deliver base load power.

03:20:27 Katie Quinn-Jacobs: But how about demand downstate at the gas electrification plants. That won't be just in the winter. Esp if nuke plants are decommissioned.

03:21:00 Lisa Marshall (she/her): But there's nothing stopping you from increasing volume.

03:21:42 Joe Wilson: But they could still increase gas and run time whether the project is designed for it or not. That's what Potential to Emit is about.

03:21:44 Lisa Marshall (she/her): It's a customer of Iroquois!

03:22:22 Lisa Marshall (she/her): There's a current proposal on the table to double the size of every compressor station on the Iroquois pipeline.

03:22:42 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Why would that be, do you think?

03:22:51 tony ingraffea: Gene Kelly what you said is not correct. you said the ~30% increase in CO2e would be for TPE conditions. that is not correct, that ~30% increase is for 20% of capacity going from old to new turbines.

03:25:51 Martha Robertson: Why NOT do an EIS?

03:26:23 tony ingraffea: Somebody needs to clarify for the Board and the Public the difference between criteria pollutants and CO2E and the tradeoffs between them that derive from new turbines within the constraint (promised) of never going above ~20% of capacity.

03:26:57 DMagnuson: Can you please Tony?

03:28:28 tony ingraffea: As I previously wrote, to reduce criteria pollutants with new turbines, the tradeoff is you get more CO2e at 20% of capacity. One cannot then reduce the CO2 part of the increased CO2e, but one can reduce the CH4 component of the CO2e.

03:29:30 DMagnuson: What a crappy engineering design in 2020!

03:33:27 Joe Wilson: To

03:34:36 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Winter demand is NOT the driver for the New Market project. I was at the Public Service Commission meeting in December. Their report on gas supply for said that existing gas customers are fine even during the coldest weeks of winter.

03:34:43 Martha Robertson: This project assumes no customers - during the whole lifetime of this investment - reduces their use of gas. As we convert customers to heat pumps - as NYS is finally taking steps to do - that 80% capacity you're not using now will be needed less and less over the years.

03:35:14 Martha Robertson: Yes - so increasingly, this plant doesn't need 2 new engines.

03:35:14 Joe Wilson: To Tony's point, the Board should attach conditions on permit that require best equipment and practices to reduce methane emissions.

03:35:28 Lisa Marshall (she/her): The wind farms that have been approved don't come CLOSE to providing the power that will be lost to the grid when Indian Point powers down completely.

03:35:48 Lisa Marshall (she/her): There are only 5 operational offshore wind turbines in the entire United States

03:35:49 tony ingraffea: not true that CO2e has no effect on local health. That would be saying that climate change has no impact on local health. more accurate to say that CO2e has less DIRECT impact on local health; the CH4 component of CO2e does have an effect on local health because it is a precursor to ozone formation and ozone is a criteria pollutant.

03:36:06 Martha Robertson: Town needs an outside expert, for so many reasons.

03:36:24 Joe Wilson: The logic of what Kelly said is that Borger could/should agree to either time limit on permit or reasonable stipulation on not raising its run time on an annual basis

03:37:32 Lisa Marshall (she/her): I think we've approved 500 MW of offshore wind which has a capacity factor of what, 0.6? And we're no where near to building this. That's a total red herring when Cricket Valley is literally powering up now.

03:38:36 David Weinstein: Glad you said that, Tony. I fell back in my chair when he made that statement. We know the point he was trying to make, but even without the ozone generation, warming will have huge effects on us all.

03:38:53 Lisa Marshall (she/her): If Dominion/Berkshire Hathaway is operating in good faith they should embrace a full environmental review regardless of what is required under SEQR.

03:39:24 Joe Wilson: What does "hold feet to fire" mean realistically. If we saw a significant increase in emissions, what could we do about it that would rein in the emissions?

03:39:51 Katie Quinn-Jacobs: So those emissions reports would be calculated not measured?

03:40:33 Gina Cacioppo: great! so we can know what they claim is happening. this has gone on too long . get an expert. it's easy to tell you the pollution when you have no power to stop it

03:40:43 Martha Robertson: If you want transparency, again, why not do an EIS?

03:45:32 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Fine particulate matter has very serious health effects.

03:47:37 Elisa Evett: Our public health officials are rather busy attending other things right now!

03:48:10 Martha Robertson: Good point, Lizzie! If this is such a great idea, then the EIS will show that! Climate change is killing us now.

03:48:55 Lisa Marshall (she/her): What are the pollutants folks are breathing from the CA wildfires?

03:49:46 Lisa Marshall (she/her): It's good practice to get numbers other than those provided by the applicant.

03:51:31 Joe Wilson: What about specific stipulations on how Borger will minimize methane emissions?

03:52:18 Joe Wilson: Yes, is see it as Jason does, Permit requirement would not be "voluntary".

03:52:46 Gina Cacioppo: time limit on any permit

03:52:47 Dan Lamb: Joe, that's in the conditions language I just referred to.

03:53:56 Gina Cacioppo: dan, needs to be reviewed by town every year to make sure then continue to put best emission capturing equipment

03:54:45 tony ingraffea: well said, Gene.

03:54:55 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Right, so better hold off until after the CLCPA is figured out.

03:55:20 Joe Wilson: Not sure we laypeople know what specific questions and expert should address. It seems it would be the other way around. The expert would know the questions to ask about emissions and could explain the tradeoffs for community and Board Members to weigh. The decision would not be the experts decision, but he/she could inform us.

03:55:24 Dan Lamb: that's in the language too! annual reporting on their effort to capture fugitive methane.

03:55:44 Carol Chock: yes to comments by Alice, Tony, and Martha "This could go on all night. The TB is doing well, but this whole discussion is proof that a full EIS by an outside consultant is necessary.

03:56:58 Martha Robertson: THANKS to the Board for allowing this full discussion!

03:56:58 Lisa Marshall (she/her): Article in today's Guardian. FYI:
<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/aug/20/gas-industry-waging-war-against-climate-action>

04:33:13 Joe Wilson: Site Plan review criteria raise environmental issues pertinent to Borger without regard to Type II designation under SEQRA, IMO. Jim seems right--like to see an expert guide Board and community's analysis of application.

04:34:39 Joe Wilson: Someone like Tony Ingraffea that knows engineering and climate science both

04:35:21 Joe Wilson: LaBella could point you to experts I suspect.

04:38:14 Joe Wilson: Consultant would help you formulate the questions. An EIS is N/A.

04:39:58 Joe Wilson: Ask Ingraffea and Howarth for questions and/or names who are technical and climate science experts who could guide you.

04:41:03 Joe Wilson: Ask the consultant to guide you.

04:41:10 Gina Cacioppo: review objectively

04:44:02 GKelly: NYSDEC State Facility permits can be issued for a max. term of 10 years. They aren't of indefinite duration.

04:45:18 Dan Lamb: Thanks for clarifying that.