

JULY 14, 2022

The Work Session Meeting of the Town of Hartland Town Board, Planning Board, and Zoning Board was held on Thursday, July 14th, 2022, at the Hartland Town Hall, 8942 Ridge Rd, Gasport, New York. Supervisor Annable called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM. Members present:

Supervisor:	W. Ross Annable
Councilman:	Joseph Reed
	Clifford Grant
	David Huntington - Absent
	David Hill
Assessor/ CEO:	Michael Hartman
Attended by:	Sign in sheet attached

Minutes:

Supervisor Ross Annable began the meeting by asking those in attendance to pledge to the flag.

Supervisor Ross Annable: Please hold your questions until the end so we're not interrupting. Write them down and we will hear them after we've heard both presentations. Mr. George Van Nest is an environmental attorney partnered with Underberg and Kessler. Andrew Reilly is the Director of Planning and Environmental Services from Wendel. We have been having discussions to get to this stage. Let's go around the room to have everyone introduce themselves and Mr. Van Nest will give us a briefing.

Mr. George Van Nest: Thank you Supervisor. I'll just try to give a high-level review of the process and how we got here in New York State. I'll give you a sense of how that feeds into the zoning and planning processes as well as the updates to the Comprehensive Plan. Basically in 2019 as part of the New York state budget, Governor Cuomo adopted what is called the Climate Change Leadership and Community Protection Act or the CLCPA. This basically sets a standard of goals to try to address climate change here in New York state. Without getting into the plusses and minuses of that, the goals are very aggressive. At the time it was adopted, it was part of the New York state budget. It was not adopted as standalone legislation. The Association of Towns, the New York State Planning Federation, and the New York State Conference of Mayors were all opposed to the process and were concerned about what they were doing with the CLCPA because of the impacts on local communities and their decision-making abilities. There are clear infringements on local communities' master plans, zoning restrictions, and land use restrictions.

That entire set of concerns was steamrolled as part of the budget process. Basically, what the CLCPA did was set a greenhouse gas emission target of 40% reduction by 2030 and 85% reduction by 2050. To do that, the renewable energy generation targets were set to 70% by 2030 and 100% by 2040. Essentially the Governor opted to follow California's regulations. California regulates small engines, cars, and things of that sort. At the time of the 2019 adoption, the Governor thought he was going to be more aggressive than the California greenhouse gas emission reduction. These goals and standards lead forward into further steps taken by New York State. In 2020 a further act was adopted which was the Accelerated Renewable Energy Growth and Community Benefit Act which set the stage to create the Office of Renewable Energy Services (ORES). ORES is charged pursuant to the statute of section 94C of Executive Law. ORES was set up in 2020 and into 2021 and were charged with producing a comprehensive set of regulations to set permitting, documentation, and operation procedures for solar and wind energy projects. They have a comprehensive set of regulations that they have adopted that spell out all the requirements of how a permit is submitted, the process for a permit review, the public participation requirements of an applicant and ultimately a draft permit process. The basic process is that the applicant for a major renewable energy project has to meet with the community, and has to have public input, prior to submitting an application to ORES. They document that process and submit an application to ORES with all of the requirements, details, and documentation, which are significant. The regulations for ORES are about 120 pages. ORES will review the application within 60 days and make notice of whether the application is complete or incomplete. At that point, they decide whether or not a draft permit will be issued. If it is issued, it will be put out for public comment. At that point the community and other stakeholders and interested parties have a right to weigh in on it. One thing the local communities do, is identify whether the application and project is in compliance with local laws. A Statement of Substantial Compliance needs to be submitted from the community to ORES to say whether or not that is the case and identify deviations and the significance of that. If ORES determines that there is a substantive and significant issue for granting the permit under Local or State Law, they will have a hearing on the application. One of the main issues that has come up, is that the state uses the aggressive CLCPA goals as a reference point to basically overrule Local Laws that are more restrictive than the CLCPA targets and regulations will allow. I'll quote from the regulations: "ORES may elect not to apply in whole or in part any otherwise applicable local law or ordinance it finds is unreasonably burdensome to the CLCPA targets and environmental benefits." The point of this is, local communities basically have limited options in terms of how they can restrict and how they can adjust with these major projects. If you go into this by trying to update the master plan and zoning code to restrict the project, it is pretty likely that ORES will find these as unreasonable restrictions on the project. You all work on the town boards as I have, and most local land use is determined by municipalities to make sound decisions of time place and manner for best use within your communities. The CLCPA changed that. Whether we agree or disagree with the goals, those are the changes that have been made at this point. We have to work within the process of what is available to us. I would suggest working with consultants and

your boards to update the zoning code relative to levels of operations for all types of use, not just solar and wind uses, to try to make reasonable and appropriate restrictions. If you go too far, you have a whole set of ORES regulations that spells out the requirements, and ORES can just come to a determination that the local regulations are unreasonable. You will not be in a position to accomplish complete preemption of a project because of how the system is put in place. That is concerning on many levels for a lot for municipal clients. The process was not the best political or adoption process for these major pieces of legislation but that is how it worked in New York. We're sitting here in Upstate Western New York and our voices aren't always factored into what goes on in Albany. I just want to be upfront and set the expectations of the process and what the considerations are for the regulatory agency and how to go about doing a planning or zoning code update that will benefit you as a whole. Do not have an expectation that the Town or other municipalities are going to prevent a major solar or wind project going forward.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Thank you for coming this morning. Remember, 94C is new and there is not a lot of projects that have gone through the entire process. Article 10 used to take care of this, but this is a new process. Mr. Van Nest and I are keeping an eye on projects that are a little further ahead than your project and just as he stated these local communities than have one of these projects have objected. They have submitted large 1000-page document of objections to things these projects weren't meeting and basically ORES overruled them on every issue. They basically told them that to meet the goals of the State of New York, they cannot meet these local regulations. This is a strong rule. I would say that in my world and the planning world is that we all talk about Home Rule but the State of New York giveth and taketh away. They enable you to have Home Rule, and they can take it away and 94C pretty much took home rule away. They gave you some process to object, but they in the long run make the decision. They don't appear before the Planning Board or Town Board. They just do some public outreach. The Ridgeview Solar Project has been proposed in your community. EDF was recently awarded some money from the State of New York and the other projects that were awarded money have accelerated their project. So, they are telling you right now that they are not submitting their application until the end of next year, but I would be very nervous about that. In other towns they were told the same thing, then money was awarded, and now all of a sudden, applications are going in January of this coming year. They are really fast-forwarding the project. So, I don't know if that's the case here because they have issues that they need to resolve. Once they submit the application, they are going to believe that they have addressed all the issues. To decide which communities they want to propose projects in, these companies come in from all over the world and go to the State of New York and get mapping to illustrate where the major transmission lines are. They can quickly determine where the capacities are and what improvements are needed. They need to get approval from the power company to tie into that system. So that's the first thing they do. I suggested to the Town of Hartland for future projects to ask NYSERDA to map out where transmission lines and show you where the capacities are, and they will do it for free. You can do the same studies that these companies and figure out where these things are. Then they do a lot of research for things that are going to stop the project such as wetlands, etc. If they don't find

any, they have to go find people who want to lease their land. A lot of times, you won't know about it and they do it very quickly and efficiently. If someone comes to a farmer and says they want to lease their land for \$1000 per acre and they are having trouble making ends meet, a lot of them are going to sign on. There's a lot of money involved. The solar company offers this money and leases the property and, in some respect, they're actually buying the property. Most of the bigger companies are still trying to lease because they don't want to own. So that's kind of where you are today. They are preparing materials to make application for the State of New York. My opinion based on working on about a half dozen of these projects, talking to ORES, and talking to NYSEERDA is the one problem they made in this rush process is that the pre-application process is flawed. The only thing they really have to do with you is come out and meet with you and give you some information and do public meetings. There is not a lot of other communication. Under Article 10 there were a lot of communication requirements but in this process there is not. When I've done these statewide presentations and talked to ORES they understand that and companies like EDF have stated that they are going to work more with local communities and try to address those issues up front. By the time the company makes the application, it's done. You can do all you want but, in my opinion, now is the time to find changes needed for this project. Once they make application, they don't want to change the project. They don't want to start all over again. They don't want any problems are they are going to object to everything. They have agreed, and I have a PowerPoint presentation from EDF where they say they have agreed with communities, that they will supply money to the community up front so the community can go out and hire consultants and attorneys to work with them in the preapplication phase. By the state law, they don't have to supply these intervenor funds until after the application goes in. They have said they know the process is flawed and they need to get people involved now so that you hopefully have a little more say in what happens with these projects. It is a little bit like pulling teeth right now, but I am going to look at EDF and say I've gone and listened to three of your presentations and you say you're willing to supply intervenor funds and sit down with communities and work out all the things before making application. It doesn't mean the Town is going to be able to chase the project away, but they're going to sit and listen to your concerns and work with you. I believe that hopefully in the next few months we can work with EDF and try to point out what the local concerns are. I think a big win would be adjusting the project to reduce those impacts. As Mr. Van Nest said, don't think we're chasing them away. This is a hundred plus million-dollar project. They are moving forward. They've probably spent millions of dollars already. My opinion is that they are going forward with the project. The only time I've seen a project die in this part of the process is if they find something that's going to be problematic to them, not you. It would be a big problem that they hadn't picked up in the early work where they see a mistake was made. One of the things in Niagara County that they thought they made a mistake was the raptors. They were having problems with the raptors. Originally the DEC said that you can't mitigate the northern harrier habitat and you need to avoid those areas. Now we're finding out the DEC is saying you can mitigate. For example, in the Town of Cambria they found large areas

where there were these raptors. My understanding was these projects are supposed to avoid those areas, but they resolved those issues with the DEC by saying they will create a similar habitat for the raptors to exist. I don't like that, and I've talked to the DEC, and I don't think that's a relevant way of doing it because you're supposed to avoid areas with those species. That's just an example of things that can happen. Obviously, they are going to try to avoid wetlands and those things. In your handout, I tried to put a synopsis together of 94C regulations of all the things they're supposed to do. These are things they're trying to identify: wetlands, oil and gas wells, public safety and security, noise, visual impacts, cultural resources such as geology, terrestrial ecology, habitats, threatened and endangered species, and water resources. If you haven't gotten the calls yet, they have to contact everybody that has a ground water well in the area to get information about the well. I warn the Town that we know when this is happening because they start getting calls from citizens asking the Town Board why they are getting these calls. They also have to look at agricultural impacts. In my opinion, the Department of Agriculture and Markets was one of the most powerful agencies in the state, and they've stepped back on this one. They have formed a group to study agricultural impacts of these large wind and solar projects, but it is going to take them three years. In three years, it's going to be too late. They are at least acknowledging and looking at and doing the study. Other states have done those studies ahead of time. They have to look at transportation and road use agreements and things like that. Decommissioning, and site restoration are big issues too. I have talked to NYSERDA and ORES about the idea of coming up with a value for a bond. What they don't understand in their analysis is that collecting on a bond is a pain for a municipality. It has to go out to public bid, and the Town will have to pay the prevailing wage. I believe the estimates for decommissioning are way undervalued and we'll talk about that in the future. There are electrical system requirements and ordinances. They have to put a whole section in there saying how they're trying to meet local laws and ordinances. I haven't seen any of them try to meet setbacks. They have basically pushed them aside and said it's in the regulations. In the beginning of this we've heard a lot of people complaining that they're picking these rural small communities to do these projects and that there is no environmental justice in that. Well, that's where the land is affordable and that's where there's power in the system but, they seem to be picking on the smaller communities.

Mr. George Van Nest: One of the complaints about Section 10 processes was that it took too long, and not enough large-scale projects were being permitted. That was part of the CLCPA push from Governor Cuomo. So, this whole process from start to finish is supposed to take 12 months but if you have a brownfield or land fill site, it's supposed to be 6 months because it is already a disturbed site. This feeds into these industrial areas and environmental justice.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: That is why, when they submit the application, and it is deemed complete they have 12 months to approve the project. If they don't approve the project and give them the permit, they are supposedly automatically granted the permit. That's what the law states. That is the expediting of the process. So far on every 94C application, they have issued a notice of

incompletion. I believe the state is doing that because they don't have the staff to run all the reviews so they're trying to delay the process to give them more time. Cambria is on their third notice of incompletion. Shelby went through quickly and they only had one notice of incomplete application. There are telecommunication impacts and this last one about socioeconomic impact, and that's something we're going to work out with Mr. Van Nest. In Article 10 there was a lot of talk about PILOT and host community agreements. In 94 C they don't even talk about those things. When they submit the application on ORES website it is all redacted so I can't even find out what other communities have done. All I can say is that Ripley had just completed theirs and they negotiated a host community agreement PILOT which is going to pay the town of Ripley I believe a million dollars a year for a period of 30 years. That is part of the process. We also have to find out what will happen if Niagara County keeps their moratorium on PILOTS because my understanding is that 94C is going to overrule that. I'm not an attorney and I can't give legal advice, but I've told the county to look into it and how it will affect things. There are not many 94C projects in Niagara County right now. There is Cambria and yours. Somerset is coming. They have a potential application. Included in the packet, is a copy of the ORES website that shows where the application process is in the State of New York. It shows which ones are in and which are in pre-application stage. If you want to commiserate with other communities in New York State with these large-scale projects, you can look at this list and identify them. I've been told this list is going to double in the next 6-8 months. As Mr. Van Nest has said, you need to have good laws in place. I think you've been working on updating your solar law. You need a solar law because there are other things beyond the 94 C process. But understand that you need to be reasonable with your law. One of the things you definitely need is a battery energy storage law. If EDF decides to not move forward with the battery energy storage component of this process with this project, and some other company comes in six months from now and says they want to do a battery energy storage project in your community, it does not fall under 94C. I've actually gotten ORES to give me something in writing to acknowledge that. That would not be a producer of power, it is a storage of power and does not fall under 94C. If it is not directly associated with an application under 94C, then it will fall under local rules and regulations. There is a 100-watt, 8-acre battery energy storage project proposed in the Town of Tonawanda right now and it falls under local regulatory rule. They can't go to ORES to say the law is unreasonable. In Cambria, they were going to do battery energy storage but the company there decided towards the end that they were not going to include battery energy storage with that project. Now that town has good battery energy storage laws in place so if a private company comes in to do battery energy storage they are under local law. Private developers now are getting into battery energy storage systems. The Code Enforcer said that probably wouldn't be allowed in the town but make sure the laws are strong. What people can do is a simple way to make money by setting up a battery energy storage system. Then they purchase the power at night when it's cheaper and sell it during the day when you can sell for more. It's a simple profit margin. Then the larger scale projects are being put in to supplement the system. By the way the system is going to change. They are running a brand-new transmission line from Niagara County

to Erie County, and everyone thinks it is to fix the system we have. If you read the legislation, a large portion of that project is specifically for green energy projects. Anyone along Alden and Newstead is going to get projects like this. Companies have been tracking that and will jump in on it. I think this is where we are in explaining the process. Mr. Van Nest has talked about the 94C regulations. We are here today because the Town together has to work through Mr. Van Nests office and EDF and try to point out concerns at the pre-application phase and try to get the best negotiations. All EDF's presentations say they will work will communities to make the project as good as they can for the communities. So, we are going to hold their feet to the fire and hopefully work with them to at least try to address the concerns. If you tell them we don't want the project, it's not going to work. You need to point out what those issues are to try to address local concerns. A big issue is usually property values. Property values have been excluded. They are not going to talk about property values. What I tell people is when you're concerned about property values, talk about why you believe a property value is going to be impacted. Is it a visual impact? If so, we can address that. Are there other impacts you believe are going to cause your property value to decrease? If you just talk about property value issues, it's not going to go anywhere. It was specifically excluded early on in the process by judges. Plus, it's not really a local zoning matter. You can't use that as a debate even if you had a local zoning decision. We're here to get some input from you to make sure we're articulating our concerns also as you articulate your concerns. It'll also help you develop local legislation that I still think you need. You need to work on updating local legislation and its very important that you have a battery energy storage law because if it doesn't go through with this project, you're going to have others and you can regulate that. I've been told repeatedly by ORES that you get to regulate that no matter the size. It doesn't mean the State of New York can't change the regulations in the future. I'm waiting for that because right now the projections are that they need 5 – 6 thousand megawatts of battery energy storage within New York State in the next 5 years. If they start having problems with that you know the state will step in and try to resolve that problem. They need that storage. Otherwise, you should go out and buy a lot of generators because there are going to be a lot of brown outs and black outs if they don't have that storage within the system. There is no way green energy is going to provide that amount of power without storing it somewhere in the system. You don't have power plants anymore, and you can't turn them up and down. You're going to have systems that rely on mother nature. If the sun isn't shining, there's no power being produced and when the wind is not blowing there's no power being produced. By the way the wind industry has gone down a lot and they believe solar is the way to go. I think I've touched base on everything. Have I explained how we move forward with all of this?

Supervisor Ross Annable: We appreciate both of your comments. We're looking to develop those additions to current laws, and this was just a process to update all the boards about where we are at and go forward the best that we can. I did speak to a representative from EDF this week and explained to him that we had our report that was issued and some of the concerns and they recognize that and agree to sit down with us during this process and work on some of these

issues. In fact, one of these issues involving a fifty-foot set back from the roadway they've acknowledged is too close so that's one small bite of the apple.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: When they proposed those regulations, I submitted a letter to them that said they made a mistake in the regulations. They said the front yard setback is 50 feet from the centerline of the road, but they should have said it was 50 feet from the right of way. I got no response, and they adopted the law that way. The NYS DOT and other agencies have said no one does setbacks from the center of the road. The regulations themselves are wrong. Fifty feet from the centerline of the road on most state highways would put the project in the road. I pointed it out to them and thought they'd change it but that's what we got.

Supervisor Ross Annable: Another thing I asked about was, because the intervenor funds don't come until the project is permitted, maybe they could put a portion of those funds up prior, and they said they would. So, they will be sending information on that which we will forward to our attorneys. That is the first step in our process. Now I will open up to any questions.

Mr. George Van Nest: Can I add a couple things? There are two layers to this which is the zoning code updates which is the battery storage law adoptions, and then the project. I would recommend to the boards that you not look at it from the standpoint of specifically updating the zoning code for this project. Do it in a global sense much like you would do for a variance application or zoning request. Look at it as what are the best revisions to the town zoning code or battery storage law revisions to protect the interest of the town. Ultimately as a project may come forward it can be addressed in due course relative to the specifics of that project. Don't take the project and apply zoning updates to the project, do it from a global standpoint where you have an objective and defensible, reasonable, and appropriate zoning code update for your town.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Erie County gave a whole bunch of communities funding to update the Comprehensive Plan, so they had that big picture information, and so they weren't arbitrary in the writing of their laws. Then they had that big picture information to show what the important things were. They funded about 8 communities to update the Comprehensive Plan and then subsequently updated their laws in accordance with the big picture ideas. They can prove that the law implements the Comprehensive Plan.

Supervisor Ross Annable: In addition to this project, Wendel is going to look at the Comprehensive Plan. There is a grant available to us that needs to be submitted by the end of the month. It would provide 90% reimbursement to the Town for the expenses to update the Comprehensive Plan. So that's a two-pronged approach that we will take a look at.

Mr. George Van Nest: I guess the other thing I would add is kind of a comparison/contrast. There is a lot of discussion in the southern tier about development hydraulic hydrofracturing and energy and gas development. That was ultimately prohibited because of SEQR review by the Department of Environmental Conservation and Department of Health and Governor Cuomo's office because they didn't want to see that type of energy development in New York State. You can agree or disagree but if you look at the impacts and growth in Pennsylvania, we just don't have that. New York state did the opposite with the CLCPA. This is the type of green energy that the state decided they wanted to support. As a municipal environmental attorney, we see legislative updates in proposed regulations all the time but its head-scratching at times how things are going to go from point A to point Z, but the targets were set under the CLCPA.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: They don't necessarily see the big picture. In the 1970s New York City used to put wastewater into the ocean, and they decided we can't do this anymore. They passed regulations and funded wastewater treatments plants. As a wastewater designer back then I said you're not thinking about this. They built all the plants and then they take the sludge and dump that concentrated material into the ocean and create huge dead spots. It's good to produce green energy but they need to look at long term implications of the project. That's what a good environmental person does.

Mr. Steve MacEvoy: It doesn't change the task that we need to do, and I completely understand that. I agree with what we need to do on the local level. My question is looking at the bigger picture. Because all our 94C and regulations are based on extremely aggressive goals, I believe that there are several challenges to the law working their way through the court systems right now. Given the current makeup of the Supreme Court, is it likely that we may get some relief?

Mr. George Van Nest: I wouldn't bank on that. I think we saw recently with the Supreme Court decision with the EPAs ability to regulate greenhouse gases was that there wasn't a specific statutory ability of the agency to do that. I think here, you've got a legislative enactment for better or worse that set the goals and missions of New York State. Without trying to get too far into politics, I think it comes down to trying to change the checks and balances in Albany. Many groups have weighed in to say they didn't take into account any of the cost. The energy companies have said this is not feasible. That's the type of thing you deal with from Albany is somewhat magical thinking. There's also been big discussions lately about what the impacts of green energy will be to the rate payers. Part of our budget was to prohibit the distribution of gas to new infrastructure. It didn't pass but it is out there and that is the thought process.

Mr. Robert Spencer: It's the same thing they want to do with farms. They want to regulate the size of herds to control methane.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: In that respect for farming, I would talk to your legislatures and have the Department of Agriculture and Markets step in. They should do what they were charged to do which is protecting agricultural operations in the State of New York. I think they have to step up

to the plate and say this is having an impact and it isn't being done correctly. So anyway, we've answered your question in saying I don't think anything is going to stop this project at this point. We could see changes in the next three to five years but at this point you guys are one of the early projects. There is only about 12 or 15 that are even close to where you are in the process under 94C. A lot of them converted under Article 10 but I'm not counting those. Did this one start under Article 10 or was it always 94C?

Supervisor Ross Annable: Originally, they were looking at Article 10. Does Ripley have battery energy storage?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Ripley has a battery energy storage law. I don't think there is a battery energy storage project. Most big companies back out from battery energy storage and let other companies do that because it complicates things on the 94 C application. Be prepared that if they drop the battery energy storage with this project, another company will step in, and battery energy storage will fall under your local laws.

Mr. Robert Spencer: It'll be to our benefit to expedite getting a battery law.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Battery energy storage laws would be something that I think would be very beneficial for the community to have because you have a proposed battery. If it falls off of EDF's plan, you want to have that law in there.

Mr. Robert Spencer: So, we as the Town of Hartland should expedite that.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Yes, and there are a lot of great examples out there. Somerset just did one, and Cambria has one. I just worked with the Town of Tonawanda, and they put one in place for this battery energy storage project they have. They had a great committee. They had about 12 or 15 people, emergency service providers, police, and the head of an engineering department. I think it's a decent law that sets all the parameters in place. Again, your big decision with any of these laws is where you would allow it and what the process is that you would use to allow it. Some communities I've worked with have basically said they don't want battery energy storage systems above a certain size. Cambria is like that. If it's not under 94C you can regulate it and make that decision. I think you should have a battery energy storage system. There will be lots of proposals for them in the next few years unless the big one goes in with EDF. I'm telling my friends and small businesses to put a battery energy storage system in because there will be brown outs and black outs in the future. The technology is getting better, and the cost is coming down so you will start to see more of these battery systems than gas generator systems.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: Were you the one who worked on the solar law for Somerset?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Yes, me, and the attorney there, Mr. Norris.

Mr. Robert Spencer: You said there would be hearings on issues. Who would be part of that?

Mr. George Van Nest: Yes if they see it as substantive. There is a threshold to get to a hearing. ORES is basically looking at discrepancies between compliance with the Town law and ORES regulations and determining that if some of those things can be waived. If so, then there is no substantive and significant requirement to be discussed in a hearing. If they do, it will be because you've identified something that meets that threshold then yes, the Town as an interested party would be included.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: For example, in that document where the communities objected, one of the things was a set back and some other issue. They basically said that it would eliminate four megawatts of power from the system, and it was too burdensome for the project. So, this is just an idea of the power that has been granted to them. I think its loose language for them to say it's not an issue and we have to meet the goals of the State of New York.

Mr. Robert Spencer: Any idea what the average set back is usually involved with this?

Mr. George Van Nest: The ORES regulations for solar are as follows: any participating residential property line set back is 100 ft; from the centerline of the road is 50 ft; from non-participating property lines is 150 ft.; and from occupied residential non-participating lines is 250 ft. So, the setbacks are fairly low.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: In some communities, and I've worked on 6 or 8 of them, they have agreed to put larger setbacks in place. Again, they are trying to get your support. They want to get to the end of the application and say we worked with the Town, and we've done our job. In two of the projects, they have offered larger setbacks because of the lay out of the site without losing power. Remember, they cost estimated this project. They know they need an economic return on this. So, that would be their decision-making tool. If they can do it and still make money, they're going to do it. Have you seen a draft map from EDF for where they would place this facility? I had one for another project and they walked in and completely changed their layout of the system. They had options on much more property than we understood, and they completely changed it. We told them that they would have to go through the public outreach process all over again and they agreed. It was very surprising to us.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: For the company to come in and offer money for something that would be 50 ft off the road goes against our Comprehensive Plan. We put water down the road, and we had planned to have small farms there. There will be no more growth in our town. If we were to as a Town, look at our own property, maybe a street with no houses or water and just farmland, we could say this won't impact our visual sight and growth. Can't we do that instead of them saying, we want to put it right here because it's a big flat piece? Can we say they can have a different flat piece?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: I'm going to say, because I've worked with the companies, they are going to say that they have looked at all of that. This was the best place because A. someone was willing to sign a lease with us and B., we don't see other problems that may come from placing it

on another site. They are looking at these as big picture requirements and they know if they don't meet those the project will be dead anyways. There are some where it was too far away from the connection point and drives the cost up too much. I know that's one of the issues here, is them figuring out how they're going to get to the connection points and getting the easements to get to those lines. There is a lot that goes into it but unfortunately a lot of it is not the issues that are important to you. It is about the issues that are important to them because they have to make the project work and be permittable and profitable. These are private companies, and they need to make money. They aren't in it to meet the goals of the state, they're in it to make money.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: Prime farmland means nothing?

Mr. Robert Spencer: Doesn't state law address 50% or more of prime farmland?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: So far, the Department of Agriculture and Markets is trying to tell them to avoid prime farmland soils. But, in the cases where I've seen it, they've basically said they need to do the project and they are moving forward. There is no law that says they need to preserve 50%. That is part of the three-year study because Massachusetts did that and identified that they didn't want a certain amount of farmland to be removed. The State of New York hasn't done that. That is why they're doing the study now but they're doing it after they've already passed the regulations.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: Kathy Hochul said 2% of farmland could go into solar. However, in our town it would be 17%.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: What I've argued with the Department of Agriculture and Markets and NYSEDA and ORES is that they don't understand the synergistic impacts of removing agriculture. By removing this piece of agricultural land, that a farmer is leasing from another, that farmer loses the ability to lease the land. Then that farmer may not have the ability to do what they need to do, and other lands will not be farmland anymore. That's why I'm pushing the study. It isn't just about removing a certain percent. Again, it's over our heads and the local legislation. Most towns have written a law about protecting prime farmland with the hope that someone will pay attention to it. When Newfane wrote their laws, they included their orchard areas because it would take so long to rebuild an orchard. The theory of the system is that once the solar panels go away were going to return it and people are going to farm again. It's hard but that's what the State of New York is trying to do. Hopefully they will identify that and change the state regulations, but I am not holding my breath for that. From your standpoint, you can identify those things, but I don't think it's going to have too big of an impact on the decision under 94C. Obviously, if you have some very important areas like Newfane's orchards, maybe. Some parts of the town may be more important farmland to you than those with the best agricultural soil. I think you need to address those issues but whether they will acknowledge them, or say they are overly burdensome I can't say.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: Doesn't New York even say they recommend that is the way the law should be written?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Lockport had a small 5-8-megawatt project proposed, and the Department of Agriculture and Markets came back and did their job and said no because they were impacting too much prime farmland. The applicant went in and mitigated until Department of Agriculture and Markets told them they could move forward with the project.

Mr. Dale McCollum: The Town Board didn't listen to any of the community, and they still did what they wanted. It had so much opposition and it never should have gone forward.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: If it is a non-94C project it requires local regulatory approval. Anything under 25 megawatts or doesn't go through 94C, you have the local ability to regulate. Local Laws and the people who put those in place have to have a process and follow the rules of your community. What other questions do you have about a 94C project? We can help with that. It's going to be going to application at some point in the future. Your issue is, make sure you have a good process in place for non 94C project, so you have the ability to say no if it doesn't make sense for you or uses too much prime farmland.

Mr. Dale McCollum: It shouldn't have gotten this far right now. The Town should've stuck up for us and said we do not want this. I think most of the people in the Town of Hartland do not want this.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: If it was a non 94C project then yes.

Mr. Dale McCollum: It wasn't a 94C project. We've been dealing with this thing for almost two years now. I own a lot of land in the Town of Hartland along the power lines. Does the Town of Hartland think we ought to plant it all with solar panels and give up farming?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Talk to the Town of Cambria. You could've said no all you wanted. From day one the Town of Cambria has battled that project and spent hundreds of thousands of dollars and that project is still going forward. Eighty-five percent of people in the Town of Cambria do not want that project. It doesn't mean it's going to stop the project. They're doing the best they can but it's under 94C. You have some influence, but you are not the approval body for that.

Mr. George Van Nest: This really goes back to the CLCPA. As a former Planning Board member and member of a community myself, it is offensive. They took away local land use control under the offices of CLCPA. A lot of people weren't aware of it at the time. This is what New York State decided to do. If it gets into 94C and you get a project of that size, you are subject to those processes. ORES is finding the balance for CLCPA targets. Until the Department of Agriculture and Markets pushes back and does the job they were charged with, which is protecting the farmlands that they are supposed to, you've got this huge push for green energy in Albany. We can pretend it doesn't exist and be optimistic about it, but we are better off

addressing the issues we can address and stick with the big picture. Ultimately if there is a project with additional requirements above and beyond the 94C regulation ORES will recognize that there has been communication on additional requirements, not requirements that are unreasonable because at that point the applicant will just seek a waiver and frankly it will probably be granted.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: I've had a bunch of communities say basically that their zoning doesn't allow it. That is not stopping the project.

Mr. Dale McCollum: If no one in the Town of Hartland had signed up for leases, would the state still come in and do it?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: That's a very good question and right now that has been raised. These are private companies trying to meet state requirements. They have no powers of eminent domain. Right now, they are private companies and have to get private leases with private landowners to be able to do that. That is why the project is no longer in Newfane. They couldn't get the leases they needed in Newfane.

Mr. Dale McCollum: So, if that happened here and no one had signed up, this problem wouldn't be going on.

Mr. Robert Spencer: I have friends that have said the company told they will get that their land whether they want them to or not.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: You can tell them they have no power of eminent domain.

Mr. George Van Nest: They have no power of eminent domain.

Mr. Dale McCollum: Not yet, but they've done everything else to this point.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: It would have to be done a different way. You can never grant eminent domain to a private company. If the power company could step in, they could use it. Right now, they have no powers of eminent domain. They can't take people's property. People have to understand that if you don't want to lease you don't have to lease. You can't be forced to lease your property.

Mr. Steve Urtel: What we have in this town is a large amount of wetlands. I've found where they are starting to deal with all the runoff from these solar panels. This is one of the largest projects in New York State. They're finding that the runoff from the solar panels is washing the fertilizers and things out of the farmland where they're supposed to have it and into the wetlands where of course we will get drinking water.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: The State of New York has covered that issue. They have basically said solar panels are not an impervious surface and if designed correctly they will not cause drainage problems. Farmland has a runoff coefficient with it, or it runs off in a certain

way. The theory is the rainwater hits the panels and falls to the ground. The ground has grasses planted and has a lower runoff coefficient than the previous farmland. So, there is less water running off that property than what there was before. That's why you don't see drainage ponds for solar projects. The studies I've seen from the one state that is looking into this right now, is in Virginia the way the water runs off the panels in strips creates other problems. So far New York state is still studying that. Every other state in the country agrees that it is not an impervious surface. We research it all the time too because we want to know where it's going. We do drainage design and that's the theory behind it. The biggest problem we're having is during construction. You can create some terrible problems during construction. Typically for smaller projects they limit them to five acres at a time. I don't think they're going to do that with a 94C project because they're putting in 2000 acres of solar panels. There's a variance they can get to do more than that. During construction I would be very nervous because I've seen problems causing terrible runoff problems. If this is farmland, the Department of Agriculture and Markets has put together a package on how they should develop the site so they preserve the farming soils and they can return them to active farmland in 30 or 40 years. So, yes there are issues. Pay attention to the drainage ones. For now, the State of New York is saying we are sticking with our regulations.

Councilman David Hill: What about drainage setbacks from ditches and town drainage. Are there setbacks we can build into this?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: I don't believe there are setbacks from drainage systems. Obviously anytime you build something you have to talk about the impacts to the local drainage system. They try not to regrade the soil. They want to set it on existing grade because they want the same amount or less water going where it was before. The problem with these projects is road construction and other things that can affect drainage because sometimes they need to change the grade. Even if we review that when they submit the full drawing the state is just going to say they need to fix the problem. But it's a good thing to do if its designed wrong.

Councilman David Hill: But, what about setbacks from all our drainage and existing easements for cleaning ditches?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Two of the communities I'm working with now are talking about acquiring drainage easements. It's nice to address those things now during the preapplication process. Work with a good attorney and you'd be able to go in on an emergency basis. The company has to convince the landowner they are leasing form to grant the easement.

Highway Superintendent Keith Hurtgam: We have 150 miles of off-road ditches, and we have permanent easements. We've cleaned a lot of them but now they need recleaning.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Hopefully the company who is doing the 94C has identified those. The deeds and leases should have the easement recorded and they should be incorporating that into their design and voiding those areas. I don't know what the easement says on how large they are.

Highway Superintendent Keith Hurtgam: It doesn't have a width, but we need 80 feet or more to clean the ditches.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: That's a great comment to be saying for all those areas that have those drainage easements. Hopefully those landowners have acknowledged those drainage easements to the applicant. We need to say that we need 80 ft. We don't have it in our easement, but we need to be able to bring a vehicle in.

Highway Superintendent Keith Hurtgam: We need at least 80 feet on one side because we've got to have that much room

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Give us that input if you think that's a drainage way that would need an easement and we can go about it that way.

Highway Superintendent Keith Hurtgam: We don't clean anything that we don't get a permanent easement for.

Mr. Steve Urtel: That's the problem on my property. There is a drainage ditch that goes from Gill Rd across the back of my property and right down the middle. That's the old drainage and the new ditch is further north. It ties in all the way over to Hosmer. So, whatever is over on Gill Rd goes over to where they are going to put solar and that's all draining onto my property.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Does the Town have a map or something showing where all of those are?

Highway Superintendent Keith Hurtgam: We have them all in GIS.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Good. We should sit down with the applicant and point that out to them because if they weren't knowledgeable of that it could impact their project because, as you know, if you have a legitimate drainage easement and there is a problem where you have to get in there, and they put solar panels in the way you can remove the solar panels. We need to get something to the applicant and provide them the information and say to them we want to see these setbacks so we can get equipment in there and not have to tear out your solar panels.

Highway Superintendent Keith Hurtgam: We mow them every year.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: That is a very good point.

Mr. Steve MacEvoy: They should already know about the easements because they have asked to put connector lines down the easements that you're talking about on my property over to Hosmer. So, I know they are aware of it. They wanted to put it right down next to the ditch. I didn't tell them yes. That was better than the first one though because they wanted to go right across my back yard. I said no to that one so then they wanted to go down the ditch.

Mr. Robert Harris: Without the eminent domain ability, how are they going to get power into the grid if a farmer says no?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Then they are in trouble. The applicant doesn't have power of eminent domain so somehow, they have to get the power to the grid. The big problem in Busti, is a different thing. They didn't realize there is a whole bunch of oil and gas wells in Chautauqua county. They thought they would meet the New York State set back requirements for the oil and gas wells. The property owners said absolutely not. Now they're trying to reconfigure their layout because the people that held the leases had the ability to tell them no. This is what the lease says, and they can control what happens on that property. That's a big issue down there that they're trying to resolve but they don't have the power of eminent domain and they can't go against what the lease agreement says. They had to change their project because of that.

Mr. George Van Nest: As part of the permit application under the ORES process they have to show the state that they have the property access and control to do the project.

Mr. Robert Spencer: If the person who owns the land puts it into a conservancy, and that conservancy is still in place, it has to go with the deed right? So, let's say that the landowner wants to let people onto that land, they can't override that?

Mr. George Van Nest: I don't want to get too far field into legal advice but generally speaking if those deed restrictions were conveyed to the lease or purchaser, they'd have to abide by it unless they were extinguished or resolved in some way consistent with the local regulations and restrictions.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: There is a Walmart built in Hamburg and they had a deed restriction that it could never be developed because it was farmland but there is always a way around that. How they had it written up, allowed for the restriction to be released from the property.

Mr. Robert Harris: We were told that the amount of monies being offered to farmers and lease holders was low compared to what this company is going to yield in terms of profit. How negotiable are these rates for the Town?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: They're not for the Town. They are for the private property owners who have decided what the value of the land is. There are attorneys out there that are trying to

get the word out to rural communities that if they are approached by these companies, they should call for help in negotiating the lease. Unfortunately, that doesn't always happen, and people think if they are offering a thousand dollars an acre for 150 acres, they're going to get \$150,000 for the next thirty years and they want to sign up. In down state they get a lot more money for leases, but the value of land is more. They just have to figure that profitability. It's just about how much profit they are going to make depending on how much they lease the land for. The Town had no involvement with them acquiring leases from private property owners. That was between the property owners and the company that came in and said they wanted to do the project.

Mr. Robert Harris: What about the host agreement?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: The host community agreement is a different thing. That is a payment to the Town and that is where this is going to be interesting. I believe they are in the range of about \$5000 per megawatt between PILOTS and host community agreements etc. That number could be higher or lower. You're talking about a 350-megawatt project here, so that's 1.6-1.7 million dollars a year. How that is split is the difficult thing. That is where you get good legal advice. Some of that money goes to PILOTS, some goes to host community agreements. If you collect money in PILOTS, it can affect your tax cap. It's also not just money. Sometimes they will do projects for the town and things to mitigate. There are things I can't disclose because it was a private offer to another community, but they can get very creative with these benefit agreements. There is kind of a going rate of benefit out there. If this project goes forward the Town of Hartland will be impacted for our lifetime. It's going to impact the community. So, what can you do to minimize that impact and also get benefit from that project? The Town of Sardinia has a landfill. No one wants a big, huge landfill in their community, but it pays all the town taxes in the community, and they have other things that have been done for the community and it has been designed in a way to hopefully minimize the impact. That is what we're trying to do. We want to minimize the impact as much as possible. I realize you'd rather not have the project but if we can minimize those and then also get other things that are benefits to the community, we will do that as much as possible. If there is something you are going to leave here today with, if this project goes forward and that will be a decision made by the applicant, not of you or the Town Board, is how can you make this project as best you can for the town because it's going to impact you for the next thirty to forty years or longer.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: The Planning Board presented a law. They basically took the Somerset law and copied it. We were told that it was too strict. You were involved in that. So basically, we have that law, did you see a copy of it?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: We can take a look at it. It's up to you to write that law and remember, it's going to affect non 94C projects. I think that is the issue of understanding. We wrote the

law for other projects. They know they have a thousand-acre solar project that has been in the works. They knew that law wasn't going to have a tremendous amount of impact on that project. That's why you should have the different tiers in your law. You have roof top and backyard installations, you have some middle ground of installations, up to a certain size has an impact. The Town will consider that and move forward. I think the Town has done a wise job of focusing on the 94C project for now. Get the law in place and understand what those issues are. But for now, I try to turn the conversation to understand the impacts of the 94C because we're going to have to sit down with that company over the next six months and having reasonable conversation with them. If you walk into the room and tell them we just don't want their project, it's not going to go anywhere.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: What is a reasonable thing?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: Reasonable things are, we've seen the layout, but this area has a lot of houses, and ask them to set it further back or maybe ask them to do more landscaping in that area. One of the projects wanted to plant bee-friendly pollinators on the site and the farmer across the street said no. He didn't want them planting pollinator species because it would take the bees from his property over to that property. He asked them to bring some beehives and more bees instead. They were all excited about putting in pollinator species and the farmer said no way. He was running an orchard and said he had enough problems getting the bees to his property.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: Would we go parcel by parcel?

Mr. George Van Nest: From a legal standpoint, I would suggest keeping this at a high level during the zoning update process. There may be a 94C project or smaller projects, but you don't want to get into a situation where you take a proposed map and try to zone out a project. Then, you're going to face legal scrutiny as to how you did that and what you did as opposed to having various boards look at it in comparison to the Comprehensive Plan and making sure the Zoning Code is consistent with the plan and making sure you have reasonable time place and manner restrictions for how these projects can be put forth. We understand that there may be a major application and that application is going to go through a high level of review at the ORES office and when it's submitted, through the process with the Town and review through various boards. A lot of those technical details will have to be evaluated. Discrepancies will have to be evaluated. In the first instance, try to work on getting the zoning law updated the way that you feel is reasonable and appropriate for your community with reasonable restrictions. I haven't specifically looked at Somerset. I've worked on other zoning, solar, and battery storage laws for other communities for different projects. So, we have a sense of what those restrictions are, what the health and safety restrictions can and should be, and local community codes, and New York State fire codes. I would look at it that way instead of

backing into it from a project. If you back into it from a project, the applicant, if disgruntled, is going to have an excuse to say that you zoned them out.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: If you have a street that has 15 houses on it and they are going to go fifty feet off the road, and put solar panels that street is a lot different than a road that doesn't have any houses or water. We're kind of out of loop as far as who they talked to and what they did, so we have to look at it as zoning or planning and say that's not unreasonable to say I want the set back so far.

Mr. George Van Nest: Right, but you don't make setbacks for a project. You make setbacks that are consistent with local zoning and land use restrictions.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: You have the same amount of information that everybody has. It is a schematic picture of where they may put solar panels. As Mr. Van Nest has said, they will have full technical drawings but that is at application time. I apologize for any confusion, and you are focused on your local solar law and those kinds of things and that's fine but I'm also listening to what the issues are so that when we have the conversations coming up with EDF that these are the big picture issues that we want you to address. This area that your proposing has a lot of houses, our law says 250 ft setback and we want you to consider it because it's a more densely populated area. They did that in Busti. They said you have a layout and there's 8 houses right here, can you do something to modify that to have less impact on those people. I just need to understand what those issues are. People don't want to look out their window and see a field of solar panels.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: What about the poor house that is surrounded by them on three sides? I don't know what you can do for that person.

Mr. George Van Nest: But again, you've got to make sure that the updates to the zoning code and solar and battery laws are in accordance with your Comprehensive Plan. You can't just take a potential application and a map and say we have to update our plan to get rid of that or limit that. You've got to make sure that you've got objective, reasonable, and appropriate land use restrictions fully guided by all boards and that the Town Board adopted that is best for your community. So, the map for that area would need to be different because it is an unpopulated street, so the uses are less intense there. I would suggest generally you take those things into account, and you update your maps and plan accordingly. Then the zoning code can take into account the different areas of high intensity use and development and things of that sort. Again, its not taking a project and working backwards. That project or a future project is going to be out there. You need your zoning code to be as tight and refined as you can make it based upon your land uses and future uses are for your community.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: By the way right now, you have an outdated Comprehensive Plan. You're going to try to update it. One of the things I've been looking at, because I can objectively look at that, is the regional plans. I'm using the county's agricultural plan because it is an official adopted document, as guidance. You may not have that issue in your local Comprehensive Plan, but it is in the regional. You have an old Comprehensive Plan that doesn't have a lot of direction to it. I'm trying to use at least the regional plan to come up with where the region does hold weight. When they do their analysis of zoning, they look at all the planning documents. The sustainability plan doesn't help us. But the county's agricultural plan and Comprehensive Plan helps because it was uniformly adopted. So, I am looking at that for at least some information. Your local knowledge also helps but this at least gives me how the county did it.

Supervisor Ross Annable: So, if you could look at the proposed law that we have and maybe come back and make some recommendations, as to what works and doesn't work, we can then go forward with some of those areas. In the meantime, we can put together anything additional from the Planning Board or Zoning Board.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: How long does the grant process take?

Mr. Andrew Reilly: It's the CFA, the Consolidated Fund Application, and it has to be in by July 29th. There won't be a decision on it until the end of the year. You won't get the money until next year, so you won't be able to start. It's a good grant and a brand-new grant program but it takes a while to get the money. By the way part of the Comprehensive Plan process next year, is looking at if the project goes forward, how does the Town deal with that. How does that change the future of the Town? People get mad when I say that, but I have to tell you that. You also have to look at the fact that if this project goes through, how it will affect the long-term vision of the Town and how you incorporate it into the Town.

Mrs. Margaret Zaepfel: That is why we're talking about setbacks, because people that move out here are looking for rural homes and farm homes. They don't want to live in the city. They want to move out and see green grass and sunshine. That's why certain setbacks are our only chance of preserving that unless it's a road where no one else lives. If you can give someone 5 acres so they can come and build a little house, that's great. That's the best we can do. Other than that, there will be no new growth in our Town.

Mr. Steve MacEvoy: Will we be able to regulate when they can work on this project? We don't want them to work 24 hours a day with trucks running all the time. They put a contract in down in the southern tier and they pounded those things into the ground for like a year and a half and that's all you heard. But that wasn't around the clock so that's what I'm getting at. Will the town be able to say you can start at 8 in the morning and you have to be done at a certain time?

Mr. George Van Nest: Part of the permits that are issued by ORES if a project goes forward and gets into that stage, is the layout, installation, hours of operation, and things of that sort. They are accounting for that.

Supervisor Ross Annable: We also have a noise ordinance for construction.

Mr. George Van Nest: That could be a local law that could be called out and complied with.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: I also have to find out how they're putting it in. There are several different methods. They can pound them in, they can screw them in. It depends on the nature of the soil and the site. We had some where they had to go into rock and they actually have to drill through the rock, set the post and put concrete in there. They try to avoid putting concrete in because it drives the cost up.

Supervisor Ross Annable: As we progress with this, we can meet with EDF and try to explain some of those setbacks and concerns and ask what they'd be willing to mitigate.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: We're really putting a law together for the long-term nature of the Town. I'm really trying to find out what those issues are. Your issues and a lot of communities have issues with the setbacks. They tend to negotiate a lot from a general sense and if we want 500 ft setbacks, they might meet that. For your specific project, we can ask for a greater set back where it impacts residential areas. In Shelby that was their one problem. They did end up changing it a little so the people in Shelby Center couldn't see the project. In Busti, these people lived on top of a ridge, and they were going to put the panels in down below and there really was nothing we could do about it. They are three quarters of a mile away but the people living up at that ridge look down and see solar panels for the rest of their lives.

Mr. George Van Nest: As part of any application there is a visual analysis, landscaping requirements, and how it impacts various points. It is taken into account. I don't want to suggest that there will be a game-changer there or that you aren't going to see it somewhere somehow along the scope of a property.

Mr. Andrew Reilly: I'm assuming they did not come, as they have in other towns, and show you the plan of visual analysis. They usually ask for local input to ask if there is a local unique accent that you want them to do a visual analysis for. I know if there is a state or local park, they definitely look at that analysis. When they do those studies, they usually come to you and say here is the visual impact we're going to study and let you input on that. Under Article 10 that was mandated. Under 94C that is kind of hit or miss. We're trying to say we want to see that they are doing the visual analysis. We want to make sure they are analyzing those things that are important to the town. As long as you stay within their reasonable typical distance, they will take a look at it.

Supervisor Ross Annable: I'm going to let these gentlemen go and let them take a look at the current projected law. We will see what recommendations they make, and we will get more recommendations from the Zoning and Planning boards in addition to all the things we just talked about. Then we will have them report back to us on that portion of it and go from there. Thank you all for coming.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rachel M Kushner". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rachel M Kushner

Deputy Town Clerk

Next scheduled regular meeting will be July 14, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.