

SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING
LOCAL LAW GOVERNING WIND ENERGY FACILITIES IN HAMLIN

April 24, 2008

A Special Town Board meeting was held in the Hamlin Town Gymnasium located at 1658 Lake Rd., Hamlin, New York. The meeting was called to order by Supervisor Dennis Roach at 7 pm who explained the location of the fire exits and defibrillator.

Present: Supervisor Dennis Roach, Councilperson Tom Breslawski, Councilperson Michael Marchetti, Councilperson Paul Rath, and Councilperson David Rose

Also present: Conservation Board Members Aaron LaFaro and Mark Reeves, Recreation Director Pat Batty. Residents: Tim Slossar, Harold Suhr, Scott Rytlewski, Ann Breslawski, Jill Breslawski, Bob Kruger, Karen Betz-St. John, Amy and Gordon Wright, David Herring, Rich Parker, Linda Rabjohn, Dan Shapiro, Kim Spellan, Flora and Jerry Borkholder, Don Nichols, Joe Impellizzeri, Connie Mosher, Marilyn Miller, Dean Brightly, Carol and Art McFarlane, Elise Draper, Lloyd Lochner, Mary Ann Hurlburt, Eileen Preston, Dorothy and Paul Lapinski, Mike Henner, Marty Howden, Renee Cliff, Diane Grimm, Ronald and Barbara Brown, Pam Nesbitt, Tricia and Troy Nesbitt, Linda DeRue, Melanie Lavacca, Ted and Kathy Habgood, Denise and Andy Simpson, Alayne and Jim Doan, Ed and Judy Doan, Krisann Craney, Heather Snyder, Jack Shevlin, Rich and John Goslau, Mr. and Mrs. Dorney, Sharon and Ellie Grugel, Stephanie Veale D&C, Bud Lowell, WXXI, Sue Ritzenthaler, Ann Yockel, Anthony Callari, Matt MacDonald (several other names that were illegible due to vandalism to sign in sheet).

Supervisor Roach asked that Councilperson Rath recuse himself for the Wind Tower Local Law review portion of the meeting.

Supervisor Roach explained that the purpose of this portion of tonight's meeting is for us to assure ourselves that we have heard and considered all the public comments and complaints – particularly the setbacks – and that we believe the proposed local law adequately accommodates them or not and why.

Supervisor Roach also wants to be assured that Town Board is satisfied that these determinations are based upon our own joint research and study and we have not had a predetermined/prearranged outcome and that we do not have a financial interest/expect financial gain.

Supervisor Roach intends to review each of the items of concern noted at the two public hearings and will ask each board member to discuss whether they believe, and justify with their own findings and research where possible, that the proposed local law considers the concern or issue, appropriately provides for it and if not, why not.

To ensure each concern considered, Supervisor Roach compiled a list of them from the two public hearings on February 7 and April 10, 2008.

This was a quick count and may not be exact. The same concern may have been given by same person at both meetings. Each time it is mentioned it is counted. This doesn't reflect the personal comments/insinuations. Supervisor Roach started with the concerns which were mentioned the fewest number of times and end up with the most mentioned concern—Setbacks.

<u>Concern/No. of times mentioned</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
Variations/1	A comment was made at the public hearing that he would like to see the local law as such that there is no room for variations. Supervisor Roach confirmed that that is something we cannot deny, the opportunity for a variance to be made. Variance criteria included in Article N, pg 17.
Removal of Soil/1	Supervisor Roach indicated that this is referenced in the Ag & Markets requirements and addressed in the regulations (refer to Article J 1.q, pg 14)
Use Local Labor/1	Supervisor Roach indicated that this is not addressed in the regulations. Per our attorney, it is a matter than can be discussed during an application, however, the town is not in a position to dictate this.
Add Fire District/Dept/1	Supervisor Roach stated this is now included in the Regs.
Birds/1	Supervisor Roach states that DEC requires strict avian studies (refer to Article H.1.q.10) We added the need to seek input from US Fish & Wildlife as requested by NY Audubon
Water Wells/1	Supervisor Roach indicated that article H.1.q.8 was added to address this issue to study impact on water wells.
Made it easier for developers/1	Councilman Breslawski indicated that the Law has 400-foot height limitations, and the strictest sound level written by our attorney, which will actually make it more difficult for a developer.
Height/1	Supervisor Roach stated that we do have the 400 foot limitation, and appropriate fall zone protection.

- Permits/Rezoning/1 Supervisor Roach wasn't sure what was specifically meant but this is what the local law is about.
- Damage to Roads/Repairs/2 Councilperson Rose addressed this. When it comes time for a permit, he feels that the roads should be video taped prior to protect ourselves. He feels that our roads are in good shape due to the fact they handle the current truck traffic from the gravel pits. (refer to L. 1.2 and 3, pg 15)
- Contamination of Wells/1 Supervisor Roach said this is incorporated in Article H.1.q.8.
- Water Run-off:/1 Supervisor Roach said this concern was accommodated in Article J.1.L.
- Fees for small WECS too high/1 Supervisor Roach said this concern was addressed and corrected in Article BB.3.
- Liability/1 Supervisor Roach believes this concern is addressed in the Enforcement Article (refer to Article DD).
- Stray Voltage/1 Supervisor Roach indicated his research showed this to be a low to no risk situation and, therefore, not addressed.
- Benefits to Schools and Town/1 Supervisor Roach indicated that this is addressed in Article BB and CC and Councilperson Rose said he spoke with another town regarding their taxes, which were eliminated. These concerns are dealt with during the application process.
- Turbine life span/1 Supervisor Roach indicated that this is a developer's concern but is addressed in the decommissioning plan. (refer to Article H.1.j)
- Job Availability/1 (see local labor)
- Property Value Loss/2 Supervisor Roach said that we added a special article on this (refer to H.1.q.5). Councilperson Rose spoke briefly regarding property value going up in the Town of Alabama—which lead to an outburst from the audience—he continued to provide facts—which was again interrupted. Supervisor Roach called for order and allowed Councilperson Rose to continue.

- Bonds/2 Supervisor Roach said that a change was suggested at Public Hearing to make this an irrevocable letter of credit. This change was incorporated in Article P.3. Councilperson Rose indicated that the new Town Development Regulations require it be adjusted to account for inflation.
- Decommissioning/2 Supervisor Roach indicated this is contained in Regulations, Article H.1.j and P.3.
- DEC should be lead agency/2 Supervisor Roach feels that this is a matter of opinion and thinks the town would give up its leverage for a host-community agreement if it did this. There are provisions in the local law for the engineering studies and other consulting services to be paid for by the developer. Supervisor Roach stated that he does not have the expertise that someone from DEC might have. Councilperson Rose interrupted Supervisor Roach to ask how many of the audience present have spoken with the various Town Officials in the Towns that have wind towers. Only two responded in the affirmative.
- Increased electric costs/not saving town money in electric costs/2 Supervisor Roach stated this cannot be substantiated with a dollar amount. This is not an issue which can be addressed by our regulations.
- Taxes will increase/2 Supervisor Roach stated this could not be substantiated. Brief discussion continued.
- Flawed Law/2 Supervisor Roach notes that regulations were written by an attorney with a great deal of experience in this area.
- EMI/TV/Cell Phone Interference/3 Supervisor Roach asked the board to comment. Councilperson Marchetti stated that he's talked on his cell phone underneath a wind turbine before with no difficulties. Noted that Article H.1.q.6 and J.1.g address the issue.
- Blade Throw/3 see below
- Ice Throw/3 Councilperson Rose stated that he has spoken with different towns that currently have wind turbines. Blade/ice throw injury issues cannot be substantiated. Councilperson Breslawski stated that his research showed that insurance companies have confirmed icing on wind turbine blades but have not lead to a generalized insurance claim, nor do they feel that ice being thrown from a wind turbine

blade to be a significant possibility. Discussion tabled until Setback issue.

Haven't answered all the questions/4

Supervisor Roach asked the Town Board if they were assured that the questions that were submitted were answered. A heated outburst from a resident disrupted the discussion, whereas Supervisor Roach called for order and asked the resident to leave. Discussion continued and more reaction from the audience. Supervisor Roach again called for order and told the residents if they no longer wished to listen to the continuance of the meeting they were free to leave. Each Town Board member stated his satisfaction that they had reviewed and considered all the questions and issues submitted.

"Health"/"Safety" Issues/5

Supervisor Roach suggested that these issues be included in the discussion on setbacks.

Rural Character/5

Supervisor Roach stated he does not see how it will affect the rural character. Councilman Breslawski stated that this will deter residential development, assist farmers and preserve farmland.

Flicker/8

Supervisor Roach stated that in his research he found that wind turbine flicker, is harmless to humans and has not been shown to cause seizures. Brief discussion continued.

Noise (Define "ambient")/3

Supervisor Roach prepared an addition to the Local Law to be presented which includes the definition of ambient as obtained from the input received at the public hearing.

Noise (General)/9

Councilperson Breslawski stated that the Town Board has addressed the noise level to meet the DEC level, and that Attorney Spitzer stated it was the most restrictive noise ordinance that he's ever written.

Setbacks (Should be less than 1,700 feet)/11 and Setbacks (Should be 1,700 or more)/34

Supervisor Roach asked the Town Board to justify why the Board chose less than 1700 feet. Councilperson Rose stated that he came from 1,500 feet to 1,200. He stated that the reason he came down was that he does believe 1,200 feet is a safe distance and because the sound level was changed. Of the laws that have been written, by our attorney 30 are at 1,200 feet, 10 are at 1,000 feet, and 10 are more than 1,200 feet. Also from what research Councilperson

Rose has gathered, in flat areas such as Hamlin, noise does not carry as far as what it does in the hill counties. Some disruption from the audience caused Supervisor Roach to call for order and admonish those present for being rude. Councilperson Rose continued, he feels that 1,200 feet is a safe distance. Supervisor Roach asked the Town Board to make their comments regarding ice throw and blade throw. He feels that 1,200-foot setback is appropriate based on his research on ice and blade throw and our noise restrictions. Councilperson Breslawski agreed and stated some of the other laws in the town, e.g. Electric Fence, being 30 feet from the property line is actually more dangerous. Brief discussion continued regarding setbacks and ice/blade throw. Outburst from the audience caused Supervisor Roach to call for order by banging the gavel. Town Board discussion continued. Councilperson Rose stated that he spoke with Mr. Carr who stated that ice/blade throw injuries have not been substantiated, that it was hearsay and had not been documented. Another outburst from the audience caused Supervisor Roach to call for order by banging the gavel. Councilperson Breslawski stated from his research he learned that the average distance of ice/blade throw is 274 feet, the longest was 450 feet. Supervisor Roach stated that from his research he has found that shadow flicker is not important at distant sites, for example, in distances greater than 1,000 feet from a turbine.

Supervisor Roach asked if the Board was satisfied with their findings. Councilperson Marchetti stated that yes; he was; however, he still prefers the original 1,000-foot setback. Outburst from one resident along with several comments from others. Supervisor Roach continued addressing the board. Councilperson Breslawski stated that he has heard and considered every concern and is happy with the information he has. Councilperson Marchetti stated that he too has considered every concern, noted again that he would prefer the 1,000-foot setback to which there was another outburst from a resident. Another outburst from a resident to which Supervisor Roach responded that he is appreciative that the same group of people have been present but is also aware that the Town Board is serving the entire town.

Supervisor Roach stated he wanted to assure the public that each member has done their due diligence and that none has a personal interest involved. Supervisor Roach then read from a letter from Chatfield Engineers:

“Regarding Wind Energy Projects:

Dear Denny and Town Board:

In response to our discussions regarding our involvement in regulation, review and approval of wind energy projects, I offer the following. Since the formation of Chatfield Engineers, in 1992, our focus is and has been to serve municipalities, not developers. We

do no business with wind energy developers. We have had no role with respect to the development of the Town's Wind Energy Facility Regulations.

We have served as the Hamlin Town Engineer for 14 years. I believe that this experience is valuable for review of any project within the Town. If a wind energy project were proposed in the Town of Hamlin, I would expect to review the project for the usual civil engineering concerns (drainage, traffic, etc.). Chatfield Engineers, however, has limited expertise with environmental and engineering concerns specific to wind energy systems. Consequently, we anticipate that a consultant with expertise in this specific area would be retained as a consultant to the Town. This approach has recently been successful for a municipal client in Genesee County.

In closing, our sole concern is to serve the Town of Hamlin, not developers. Please contact me at your convenience, if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,
John Paul Schepp, P.E.”

Supervisor Roach continued:

The Town Board has received a response from Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, which has reviewed and considered the Local Law on Wind Energy Facilities, they have returned that with “No Comment.”

Supervisor Roach then stated he would like to read his comments and have them become part of the record:

I would like the following items to be made a part of the record before I vote:

- Over the past 18 months, the entire Town Board and I have endured numerous false allegations and insinuations made against our motives and our reputations.
- The Town Board has been accused of supporting the developers by those opposed to wind towers and caving in to the opposition by those in favor of wind towers.
- We have heard at public forums about houses that can't be sold because of the possibility of wind towers to find out that a neighbor, opposed to wind towers, tells interested buyers that they shouldn't buy here.
- Despite the above circumstances and allegations that Town Board and I have not done our homework, I want the record to show that that is far from the truth.
- We have attended numerous seminars and public information sessions on wind towers presented by experts, wind power proponents and wind power opponents.
- We have all personally visited wind farms.
- We have properly and legally publicized all meetings and hearings and additionally publicized wind tower information via local media including the Town's newspaper, which is delivered to every household.
- Over the past 18 months, we have received daily on average about three pieces of correspondence, news articles, email, letter, or comments regarding wind towers, pro and con. I have reviewed, listened to and considered each one.
- I have personally responded to numerous emails.

- I have personally responded to the written questions received at the two public hearings. Those being posted on our web site.
- I have personally responded to the 9 questions the wind tower committee said they weren't provided time to complete. Those are posted on our web site.
- I have listened to and considered countless comments regarding wind towers, pro and con, at public forums, public hearings and public information meetings.
- I have read and considered the numerous reports, pro and con, sent to me from residents, professionals, experts, town officials, engineers, developers and attorneys.
- I have done a tremendous amount of research on my own and have prepared a written study comparing our proposed regulations to recommendations of the wind tower committee to ensure that their items of concern, issues and recommendations were addressed.
- I have personally spoken to elected officials in towns, which have wind energy facilities installed.
- I have discovered that there are multiple truths to the wind tower issue. Anyone, pro or con, can find data to support their particular position. In developing a local law on regulations, it is the Town Board's difficult responsibility to assess and balance these multiple truths for the benefit and welfare of the entire town.
- I want every resident in this town to know and the record to show that I have heard and considered every comment, every concern and every recommendation made. I have made every effort to ensure that those are addressed in our proposed law. If they are not included or not written as desired, I want it to be known that it was not done capriciously nor with any intent or prospect for personal gain or to favor any party or individual. I can assure you that much deliberation, research and consideration was given to all issues.
- As we prepare to vote on the regulations, I want it explicitly known that neither I nor any family member nor any associate has any personal or financial interest in the development of wind towers in the Town of Hamlin or in any location throughout the world nor do I, any family member nor any associate stand to gain personally in any way – monetarily or otherwise – with the development of wind towers in the Town of Hamlin.
- My motivation and stance regarding wind tower regulations remain the same as when we began this endeavor and that is to attempt to provide balanced, reasonable and defensible regulations.
- Finally, the regulations we are about to vote on do not approve the siting of any wind generating facilities in the town of Hamlin. This proposed legislation creates procedures and regulations only. No specific site is involved and no facility is permitted.

Councilperson Marchetti stated that he has nothing personally to gain and no one in his family has anything personally to gain.

Councilperson Breslawski stated that neither he nor his family has any contract with a wind energy developer, and neither he nor anyone in his family has anything to gain from the installation of wind energy in the Town of Hamlin.

Councilperson Rose stated that he has nothing to gain from wind energy in Hamlin nor has any ties with anyone who has Wind Towers nor has he ever had any family that has ties with Wind Towers. He will not gain anything financially whatsoever.

Supervisor Roach continued:

REQUEST THE ISSUANCE OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR LOCAL LAW NO. OF 2008.

Resolution #128 Motion was made by Councilperson Marchetti, seconded by Councilperson Breslawski, to request the issuance of a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance for Local Law No. of 2008 as follows:

TOWN OF HAMLIN TOWN BOARD

**Resolution of the Town Board of the Town of Hamlin
Issuing a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance
for Local Law No. - of 2008**

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Hamlin has considered the proposed Local Law No. - of 2008, the Wind Energy Facility Law of the Town of Hamlin, New York (the “Local Law”); and

WHEREAS, the Local Law is an Unlisted Action, and the Town Board is conducting its review of the local law pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA); and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Hamlin has duly considered the Short Environmental Assessment Form, the proposed Local Law in its entirety, and the criteria for determining significance set forth in 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.7(c) of the SEQRA regulations, the comments made at the informational meetings, the public hearings, and such other public comments as received by the Board and such other information deemed appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has identified the relevant areas of environmental concern, has taken a hard look at these areas, and has made a reasoned elaboration of the basis for its determination.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Town Board of the Town of Hamlin as follows:

1. The Town Board declares that the proposed Local Law No. - of 2008 will not result in any large and important impacts, and therefore, the approval of the Local Law does not include the potential for any significant adverse environmental

impacts. Accordingly, the Town Board issues the attached negative declaration under SEQRA for the Local Law.

2. The reasons for the decision are stated in the attached negative declaration.
3. This resolution shall be effective immediately.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF HAMLIN on the 24th day of April, 2008.

Outburst from the audience asking where the positive declaration was, to which Supervisor Roach replied that this negative declaration is on the proposed law. This is not an application for wind turbines where a positive declaration would be needed. Supervisor Roach indicated that the written determination of non-significance for the negative declaration is available in the Town Clerk's Office.

Supervisor Roach asked the Board if there were any other comments or need for clarification. He also went on to clarify that this declaration was for a proposed regulation. There is definitely a need for a positive declaration for any application as set forth in the proposed law. The proposed law is regulations only, it has no effect on siting, approvals or facilities.

Members polled: Councilperson Breslawski aye, Councilperson Marchetti aye, Councilperson Rose aye, and Supervisor Roach aye. Motion carried.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LOCAL LAW NO. GOVERNING WIND ENERGY FACILITIES

Resolution #129 Motion was made by Councilperson Rose, seconded by Councilperson Breslawski to approve Local Law No. 2008 Governing Wind Energy Facilities in the Town of Hamlin with the following addition: Add to Section 125.45.D.1. Definitions, as subparagraph D.1.a. (1). AMBIENT NOISE LEVEL—The noise level which is exceeded 90 percent of the time (expressed as L₉₀) or 54 minutes of every hour.

Supervisor Roach once again asked if there were any questions or comments. He also stated that there was not a need for another Public Hearing to add the definitions.

Members polled: Councilperson Breslawski aye, Councilperson Marchetti aye, Councilperson Rose aye, and Supervisor Roach aye. Motion carried.

Councilperson Rath re-entered the meeting at approximately 7:45 pm.

Continuation of the meeting was briefly disrupted as several outbursts from those residents present who oppose Wind Towers in Hamlin left the meeting.

Supervisor Roach continued to the next order of business.

Discussion concerning a petition to create a joint Hamlin Clarkson Town Line Road water district. Supervisor Roach stated that he has spoken with the Town of Clarkson and they have tentatively scheduled a Public Hearing on May 27, 2008 at 7 p.m. at the Clarkson Town Hall. It would be appropriate for this to be a dual Public Hearing as long as each Town has filed the appropriate legal posting and each Town Board has a quorum to conduct a public hearing.

PROPOSE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED HAMLIN CLARKSON TOWN LINE ROAD WATER DISTRICT FOR MAY 27, 2008 AT 7:00 P.M.

Resolution #130 Motion was made by Supervisor Roach, seconded by Councilperson Rath to approve a Public Hearing for the proposed Hamlin Clarkson Town Line Road Water District for May 27, 2008 at 7:00 pm at the Clarkson Town Hall. Members polled: Councilperson Breslawski aye, Councilperson Marchetti aye, Councilperson Rath aye, Councilperson Rose aye, and Supervisor Roach aye. Motion carried.

Discussion regarding options for reevaluation of the Town of Hamlin. Reval Company AVS—Assessment and Valuation Services.

AVS is a single-person operation—David Miller

Time Frame: Start Summer 2008, implement 2010 tax roll.

Data Collection (Not done by AVS.)

Town to hire all data collectors

Recommends using assessors from other towns on a part-time basis.

Door-to-door at about \$25 per improved individual property x 2,600 properties.

Door-to-door at about \$35 per commercial property x 125 commercial properties.

Cost: Approximately \$60,000

Photos: Options 1. Cameras to each data collector

2. Separate photo drive by

Cost: \$8,500

Supervision/Coordination (Not done by AVS)

Data Collectors

Data Entry

Pulling Cards

Answering Phone/Receiving residents with questions

Cost: approximately \$5,000 if not done by current assessor/staff

Assigning Values (Done by AVS)

Set up land tables, cost tables, valuation models and comps

Commercial valuation factor file

Reviewing values using updated property info cards and current photos

Cost: approximately \$15,000

Informal Reviews (typically done by current assessor/staff but due to such a long time since last reval and anticipated large number of information reviews, AVS feels they should do it with possible assistance from current assessor/staff)

Making appointments

Answering phones

Pulling cards

Cost: approximately \$10,000 if done totally by AVS

Mailings (Can be done by Town)

Required: 2 data mailer (after data collection)

Notice to tax payer (new value prior to the Informal Reviews)

Suggested: 3 Above 2 plus pre-data collection announcement/info sheet

Cost? Printing, envelopes, labeling, postage

Total Cost

100% door-to-door with max participation from AVS: \$100-110,000

Less than 100% door-to-door (door-to-door selected areas, e.g., lake front, farms and drive by others with max participation from AVS) \$75-80,000

Visit and Tour of Town, April 11, 2008

David Miller, AVS and Steve Lauzze, NYS Office of Real Property Services visited Melanie and Denny on April 11 for a discussion of services that AVS could provide and to spend some time in the field to assess condition of property record cards and extent of effort needed to complete the reval. Denny accompanied David and Steve in the field.

Results of Visit/Recommendations:

Overall impressed with the accuracy of property record cards.

Despite being accurate, should still update all property record cards due to the various revisions made to the cards over the years and to ensure they are all on the same card with the same information in the same location.

Should take digital photographs of all properties.

Can probably do drive-by "data collection" on most (75-80%) of properties and selected door-to-door on special interest properties (recommend door-to-door on entire lake front and all farms).

AVS Pro's and Con's (Denny Perceptions)

Pro's:

-Cost efficient

-Can use local "labor" for data collection and data entry

Con's:

-Requires Town to identify and hire data collectors and other staff

- Requires Melanie to act as overall coordinator
- Erratic schedule of data collectors (whenever other assessors might be available)
- More workload on Melanie and Marsha, which would interfere with their ongoing requirements

Melanie's Comments

Informal review for overall reval is generally done primarily by the contractor with some assessor involvement. Dave has presented the informal review as it is handled for an update.

Dave made a point of saying this was a recommendation of how the town might save money by doing the project themselves. Again emphasizing he does not do revals; if we want a reval we should hire a company that does them.

Major importance of realizing Marsha and I must complete another assessment cycle of normal work to complete an assessment roll for 2009. Traditionally a reval is done over one year and local staff are not involved in a mid project roll.

Along with hiring data collectors comes training. We do not have the materials available to handle training. Assuming the few assessors that Dave mentioned might be interested are not available or interested in as much work as we need done other people would have to be hired and trained.

One other thing is vacation. Marsha and I both get five weeks vacation and with the recent decision of the Town Board to cut back on carry over time we must also factor that into the equation as Marsha has several weeks she must cut from her carry over time or she will lose them.

This is a big project of major importance and to approach it in a haphazard fashion could be disastrous. I feel organization and a well-planned project is necessary.

Discussion regarding creation of HRA for employee medical insurance.

REQUEST AUTHORIZATION FOR THE HIGHWAY SUPERINTENDENT TO AMEND THE NEW YORK STATE SNOW AND ICE CONTRACT.

Resolution #131 Motion was made by Councilperson Rose, seconded by Councilperson Rath to authorize the Highway Superintendent to amend the 2007-2008 New York State Snow and Ice Contract to allow for an increase of \$84,696.07. Members polled: Councilperson Breslawski aye, Councilperson Marchetti aye, Councilperson Rath aye, Councilperson Rose aye, and Supervisor Roach aye. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Councilperson Marchetti, seconded by Councilperson Breslawski to adjourn the meeting as all business has been concluded.

Members polled: Councilperson Breslawski aye, Councilperson Marchetti aye, Councilperson Rath aye, Councilperson Rose aye, and Supervisor Roach aye. Motion carried, meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Respectfully,

Kathi A. Rickman, RMC/CMC
Hamlin Town Clerk