

**Town of Greenport Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes for October 25, 2016**

The Planning Board meeting of October 25, 2016 was called to order at 7:30 by Chairman Stiffler with the Pledge of Allegiance. There were 9 people in attendance. Present:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Edward Stiffler, Chairman      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul D’Onofrio, Member        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robert MacGiffert, Co-Chairman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandy Kipp, Member            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Bucholsky, Member      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ray Jurkowski, Engineer       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Benedict, Esq.        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Pinkowski, Secretary |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Genevieve Trigg, Esq.          | <input type="checkbox"/> John Florio, Building Inspector          |

Mr. Bucholsky motioned to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2016 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. MacGiffert. All in favor, and carried.

**Old Business:**

**Benjamin Funk and Shirley Unger** – Ms. Unger and Dan Russell were present. Ginger Benedict, Esq. stated she had received the deeds and was satisfied with them. 7:31 p.m. the Public Hearing began. Chairman Stiffler asked if anyone was present to speak for or against the project. There was no one.

Mr. MacGiffert motioned to close the Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Sandy Kipp. All in favor, and carried.

Mr. MacGiffert motioned to approve the project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bucholsky. All in favor, and carried. Sub-division approved. An invoice was provided to the applicant for the Public Hearing fees.

**Sunstream Solar** – Attorney, John Privitera was present on behalf on Sunstream. He gave an introduction and asked that the board approve the project, including the interconnection structures. He provided a binder to the board with their record of proceedings with the planning board to date. Genevieve Trigg, Esq. stated that this began when the Greenport Code Enforcement Officer visited the site and realized there were a number of poles erected that were outside of the scope of the approved site plan. At that time, he contacted Dynamic Energy to let them know this was not in accordance with the plans, at which time Dynamic Energy acknowledged that the poles were not on the original plans and asked what the procedure was to apply for an amendment. Mr. Privitera stated that this was Sunstream’s first building project and they didn’t understand the procedure. He also stated that when the original plans were approved no one knew what the engineering would be with respect to the interconnect facilities that are required by state law, noting that there is a paper trail on that including notes from the county planning board stating that they knew the engineering had not yet been designed. The first preliminary drawings were received from National Grid in July and August of 2015. In December of 2015 the final drawings of where the poles were to be located, were

submitted to the Greenport Building Department. In February 2015 Sunstream received their building permits and began building. Mr. Privitera stated that Sunstream's position is that interconnection facilities are not covered by SEQRA and are exempt and they are exempt from planning board review. He stated that the Uniform Building Code does not cover utility structures, that they are exempt from the building code and are not inspected by the building inspector. The easement submitted shows that all of the equipment along the easement are owned by National Grid. The number of poles required and necessary equipment on them are mandated by National Grid.

Brandee Nelson stated that an as-built site plan has been submitted to the board. She discussed the changes to the site plan beginning with the number of current panels that are a reduction from the original number of panels that they had submitted. She explained that it shows the perimeter fence and the gates, the relocation of the inverter and transformer pads and a 12' by 12' concrete pad that will be the location for a storage shed that will house the equipment for the maintenance of the panels, and the addition of the utility poles that originally flagged the building inspector's attention.

Chairman Stiffler made disclosures that he has a working relationship with Mr. Jones and Ted Guterman through the Columbia Economic Development Corp. and asked the board, the applicant and the public if anyone has any objection to him participating in this review and Public Hearing. There were no objections.

Mr. D'Onofrio and Sandy Kipp also stated that Mr. Guterman is their lawyer as well. Chairman Stiffler asked the board, the applicant and the public if anyone had an objection to those two members participating in this review and Public Hearing. There were no objections.

Chairman Stiffler opened the Public Hearing and asked the applicant to begin. Attorney, John Privitera stated that he doesn't feel a mistake was made. They were unable to find any instance of a visual impact analysis of a public utility structure folded into SEQRA. Water towers are always at a higher point. He doesn't believe it interferes with the view of or from a park, it's largely camouflaged by a grove of trees, and it is next to an existing power line with lots of other structures on it, including some transformers that are invertors nearby, stating that it is an industrial end of town. Mr. Privitera states that there are other high tension wires and high voltage lines, and a working hard rock mine adjacent to it. There was a junk yard in front of it prior to Sunstream's purchase, which they cleaned up.

Mr. Privitera stated that there is no room to move on this at the financial end, stating that Sunstream is at the end of the construction loan and it needs to be turned into permanent financing, as the IDA has assisted with. They have been unable to find any Public Service Commission rule that allows a generating facility that is ready to go on line that can be blocked from going on the grid, that they require a performing generating facility like this to be patched into the grid. He states that St. Peters Hospital has a contract with Sunstream that will provide immediate saving of fifty thousand dollars a year, as well as the Center for Disability Services. He states that the overall visual impact is diminimis and is nothing compared to the lines that

are already there. Mr. Privitera states that they cannot think of any way to mitigate the visual impact, they can't lower the poles by more than a couple of feet, and they can't bury it. They are willing to take suggestions but they cannot take things apart and they are ready to deliver power to the grid. National Grid's final inspection is just before Thanksgiving.

Brandee Nelson spoke in response to the letter from Ray Jurkowski, the town's engineer, in regards to the changes made to the site after the original site plan approval. The poles were designed by Dynamic Energy after site plan approval and after the Coordinated Electric System Impact Review (CESIR) per the design specifications of National Grid. The CESIR report was given in July 2016 at which time the pole design commenced. Each pole has a specific piece of electric equipment on it that are installed as well as the wires that connect the system to each pole. All of the plans for these poles were submitted with the building permit application on December 9, 2015. With regard to access around the panels, there was originally a twelve foot access way. There are two locations that do not meet that minimum twelve foot access and the owner of the property is going to have the fence relocated in those two areas to allow for it. Ms. Nelson stated that she would get a copy of the as-built to the board after that has been done. Also, there was a comment about a road being constructed and there was never an intent to construct a road as the sub-soil in that area is gravel. Chief Mazzacano has looked at it and is satisfied without a road, also noting that there was discussion of minimal disturbance. Also, the main gate is parallel to the driveway making it difficult for a firetruck to enter at that location so they asked the owner to relocate the fence in that area as well so the gate will go across the driveway. There was a question regarding the spacing of the poles and the poles are twenty-five feet apart as there is a twenty-five feet minimum per National Grid. There isn't a maximum specified but they do need to be fairly close.

Greg Boyer from Dynamic Energy spoke about the prior facilities they built, stating they have done over one hundred installations throughout the Northeast with between six and eight in New York State that are similar in size. He states that this is the standard way everyone does it because there is a primary line overhead to do it. The utility poles and all the equipment on the poles is specified by the utility. The utility is the only entity that uses that equipment. All of their equipment and all of the lines going to the interconnection point are underground. There are no overhead lines within the facility until they get to the interconnection point, which is all dictated by the utility, therefor making it a utility structure.

Tom Burke and Christopher Johnstone of 79 and 87 Blue Hill Road presented pictures. They purchased a property to use as a rental property across from the solar farm after it had been approved, which they support. The poles were being erected as they were remodeling the apartment to bring it up to code and went through a rigorous process with the building department. They decided to build decks instead of the minimal fire escapes to take advantage of the view of the Catskill Mountains. Their total investment so far has been about \$60,000. Mr. Burke states that in regards to a prior comment this is not an industrial part of town, it is residential with pre-existing businesses. He proposed moving this to the other side of the property. He states that he understands that millions have gone into this and a hospital will be saving \$50,000 but whose economic viability should be impacted and who decides that. Mr.

Burke notes that these poles are not camouflaged by the existing trees as they now have no leaves. Only a few poles were camouflaged when there were leaves. He wondered how they were subject to such rigors as making sure the handrails on their decks were up to code but Sunstream was able to put up twelve poles without further review.

Amanda Henry of 202 Blue Hill Road stated that she was thrilled to see this project but disagrees that this is an industrial part of town. For those residence have taken on repairing historic homes and invested in them they should have been asked. This is their livelihood and she feels a mistake was made.

Mark Keeler represented Mr. Grafton who owns the property on the south side. He states they would be opposed to moving the poles there as there is no easement for it and that doesn't solve the problem. It just relocates it to their property. He doesn't believe Sunstream's poles are comparable in any way to other poles. Mr. Keeler states that other high tension lines are more remote and more spacing is provided between them (up to 500 feet).

Tony Jones read a letter on behalf of Columbia Economic Development in support of Sunstream. It states that it supports the goals of the Governor's Clean Energy Standards, it meets the objectives of the Regional Council to create more renewable energy capacity in our region, and it provides significant energy cost savings to the health care organizations involved. It is a ground breaking project for which the Greenport Planning Board can be congratulated for supporting and advancing. The letter also states that the project is appropriately sited in an area of town where industrial uses are already predominant including the passage of high-tension power lines. It is to their understanding that, despite confusions arising from the fact that the National Grid interconnection process operates outside any sort of planning or zoning review, this project has met the stated requirements of the Greenport Planning Board approval process. They therefore urge its speedy final approval so the project can go live by the necessary November date to meet its financing, regulatory and production requirements. They are concerned that anything less than this speedy approval – quite apart from being a serious and risk-filled set-back for Sunstream Solar – will constitute a very public black eye for the county in economic development terms, since it would indicate going forward that a developer could not rely upon the local municipal approvals made in the normal course of project development.

Mr. Privitera stated that there were representatives present from National Grid to answer questions. He stated that there is a piece of critical equipment on each of the poles and they cannot be lowered. He clarified that they were willing to take suggestions on how to mitigate the visual impact and it should be noted that before Sunstream came to the site that there was no view of the Catskills because there were more trees on site that they cut. Mr. Privitera stated that it is great that they have invested in fixing up a house and wishes them the best of luck but doesn't believe there is a tangible impact based on what can be seen from one side of the yard, and states that there are lots of views looking the other way that aren't depicted in the photos, including the view to the right. One of the pieces that has not yet been hung on these poles is a critical piece of radio controlled equipment that allows National Grid to shut off

the system in case of a problem by a clear radio wave to the substation. They can't be moved because of that.

Tom Higgins a technical consultant for National Grid on this project and Casey Kirkpatrick from the retail connections engineering department were present from National Grid.

Paul D'Onofrio asked why some of the feeders couldn't be buried with a duct bank and come up to connect to three or four poles, stating that he had been upstate and had seen other solar farms with less poles than this one. Mr. Higgins replied that this is what the applicant proposed to National Grid and it met their standards so they designed to the overhead system. Mr. MacGiffert asked who proposed the overhead system to them and Mr. Higgins response was the developer. Mr. Bucholsky asked for clarification if the developer designed this system or did National Grid. Mr. Higgins reply was that they take in the design from the developer, though National Grid doesn't always know what equipment they may require and it may be sent back to the developer to make adjustments. Mr. Bucholsky asked is this is a standard design or are there other options. Mr. Higgins reply was that this is by large the standard design. He stated that an underground system can be done but the equipment still has to be located somewhere. Mr. Kirkpatrick noted that this is being treated as two two-megawatt projects as it was applied for, which is why there is twice as many poles. Mr. Jurkowski clarified that one is associated with the southerly portion while the other is the northerly and Mr. Kirkpatrick replied that is correct. Mr. Higgins stated that as per the Public Service Commission each of the two two-megawatt parcels require their own interconnection to National Grid's system. They could not have been consolidated to one pole. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated three of the poles are National Grid owned, one that is in line with the road, and then the first pole in from each of the two systems has a disconnect switch so that National Grid can disconnect the system from their lines. Any additional poles are customer owned.

Mr. Privitera asked how many poles have to be above ground regardless of the design. He stated that the paper trail is very clear that National Grid wouldn't discuss it until Sunstream had site plan approval. After looking at National Grid's design criteria Sunstream came to the conclusion that this was the only feasible design for a solar array like this one. He noted that all of the equipment is National Grid's including the radio equipment. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that they (National Grid) design for radio solution based on the overhead poles, so they do need to be above ground at that point. Mr. Privitera then referred back to Mr. D'Onofrios' reference to other solar farms with less poles, stating that if they had less than it was probably two-megawatts or less. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that the original discussion stated one pole and in reference to his early comment about there being no public dispute at the first public hearing, that was because Sunstream claimed there would be only one pole, so no one had an issue with that. Mr. Privitera responded that they had no idea of the engineering at that time and it was clearly stated.

Genevieve Trigg, Esq. stated that the point now is that there are significant changes that need to be amended. She stated that it was understandable that Sunstream didn't know at the time what it would look like, but as soon as they did have the final design they should have come

back to the planning board for an amendment. Mr. Privitera's response was that the final design was submitted to the building department. He stated that six days before site plan approval the county planning board sent a letter stating that they knew the interconnection facility had not yet been designed. It was not stated as a condition to come back and they were not asked to do an advanced preliminary discussion with National Grid. He feels it was simply a miscommunication. Mr. MacGiffert stated that the question had been posed many times of how this would connect to the grid and the answer was always one pole. So they had no reason to believe this many more poles would be erected to be able to say they would need to come back to the planning board. There was never any mention of potential additional poles.

Mr. Jurkowski asked if they had the fire chief out since his correspondence. Brandee responded they had not yet as they figured it made more sense to relocate the fence instead of having to have him out twice.

Mr. Burke spoke about how this many poles came to be and said that it seems they went with the philosophy that it's easier to ask for forgiveness than beg for permission. It seems as though they went with the cheaper option for them. Mr. Burke then asked if it is cheaper to go above ground or underground. The answer was that National Grid did not review a plan for underground so the cost could not be determined. Mr. Burke said that they should not have expected the planning board to chase them down for amended plans. And in regards to the letter from the county that this was a well-sited plan, well it didn't go through the proper approval process with the idea that others would be afraid to work with Greenport because it won't go through the correct channels, but if you do go through the correct channels then it could've been resolved much earlier. And going underground was in fact an alternative as stated by the National Grid representatives.

Mr. Privitera stated that at this facility they never investigated the alternatives of what could be built under ground. There is only a 50 foot strip of land there and they think it is probably not feasible because there has to be lots of structures above the ground. You can't put everything in crypts below ground, all you can do is flush build some of it. The interconnection facility was never part of the site plan review so nothing was changed and the planning board didn't ask them to come back. This is the way solar arrays are hooked up and interconnected in New York State, and you won't find any underground. Mr. Privitera states that even if it had gone underground, they don't know that it would have abated the concern over the view because there is a garage there and there were many trees there, where you can still see the stumps. If this had been built flush mounted there is still no saying how much of the view could be seen.

Mr. Keeler asked if mitigation can be done by using fewer poles and double up on the equipment on each pole.

Genevieve Trigg, Esq. stated that she wanted to point out a few things she disagreed with. Among those points of disagreement include the interconnection is not subject to SEQRA or this boards review. The location of all present and proposed utility systems, including electrical systems is under section 101-6 of the Town's Site Plan Review law and is subject to site plan

review. Granted that it wasn't known at the time of the original site plan but this is now an amendment to the site plan and is under the authority of the board. For SEQRA purposes, this interconnection is the most critical part of the project so to segment it or to look at it independently is impermissible and there is nothing under SEQRA that prohibits the review of it in the current application. Sunstream identified the project as a Type II action, as an extension of an existing facility but this is not an extension of a utility. This is a new proposed utility and is part of a larger scale project that affected greater than ten acres, thus this is part of a Type I action and as the changes impact the entire area, it is still considered a Type I action. The board has an obligation to take a hard look at the impacts and analyze those pursuant to SEQRA. Additionally, it was stated that these aren't required to obtain a building permit. However, the electrical bulletins that National Grid has issued explicitly say in each one that they are subject to municipal review, approval and a building permit. The fact that a building permit was issued when the poles weren't indicated correctly on the approved site plan does not prevent this board from reviewing the plans as they are now.

Chairman Stiffler stated that this board fully supports this project and has from the beginning and it's only because of these changes that they are back before the board. There is one hundred percent support for this, but they also have an obligation to this town to address their concerns as well as maintain the law. This is what they are trying to do, not to stop it.

Mr. Guterman spoke on behalf of the Columbia County IDA in support of Sunstream. They had provided a partial tax relief to Sunstream to help make it easier for them. He feels this project will provide indirect benefits to the county as the county residents will be able to use these facilities and it will promote reduced energy bills, as well as efficient energy. Mr. Guterman stated that it supports the goals of the Columbia County Board of Supervisors, as well as the stated goals. Governor Cuomo recognized this project and an article was put out supporting this project. He states that it is important that this project moves forward and is expressing that desire on behalf of the IDA.

Mr. Burke states that he understands the goal is to get this project through as quickly as possible, but it should also be understood that it should be done through the correct process and asks the board to consider other options when making their final decision.

Mr. Jurkowski started with thanking the National Grid representatives for coming to the meeting as it has been a great help as far as clarifying information. He asks if the poles that are installed by the owner along with their equipment is then turned over to National Grid to operate and maintain. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that the first pole in each pole line are National Grids with their disconnect switch on it. With the additional poles, they do require to review the equipment on there. Greg Boyer from Dynamic Energy stated that all the equipment on the poles were for National Grid's use. There is an easement for National Grid but it is owned by Sunstream.

Mr. Jurkowski asked about the distance between poles. It states that there is a minimum of 25 feet between poles but there was nothing stating the maximum. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that

though there is no specified maximum, you don't want to go more than 150 feet to 200 feet, and it's specific to the equipment and wires on the poles.

Mr. Bucholsky asked if a direct feeder could go from Sunstream's poles to the substation. Mr. Higgins replied that that possibility wasn't analyzed, though to do so would require significant modification to a substation so that it can accommodate, and there may be easements to acquire. Mr. MacGiffert asked if this feeder would feed into that substation and Mr. Higgins replied that it would.

Mr. Privitera asked the National Grid reps about the ownership of the equipment on the poles. Mr. Higgins states that they do not own the equipment. It was stated that the easement makes the equipment National Grid/Niagara Mohawk owned. Mr. Privitera stated that in section four states that it is agreed that the facilities will remain the property of the grantees.

Mr. D'Onofrio asked Greg Boyer from Dynamic Energy if there was a reason he chose the distance between poles instead of spreading them out further to use less poles. Mr. Boyer responded that this is a typical installation. Putting them closer would end up shading the array of solar panels causing less sunlight to get to them. Mr. Higgins added that National Grid has a requirement for when people go out to work on the meter that they be able to see visible switches on both sides, so if they're spread out too far you lose visibility and that causes a safety factor.

Chairman Stiffler asked for confirmation that a solar company could not approach National Grid until they received approval from the planning board. Mr. Higgins responded that they would not review something without knowing that it could be built.

Genevieve Trigg, Esq. stated that there was a lot of information brought tonight and the board should proceed in the review of this application, including SEQRA review. The public hearing cannot be closed until SEQRA is complete.

Chairman Stiffler asked Brandee when they could provide new plans for the as-built. She responded that they would look into it. He stated they would need any new paperwork by November 7th, as well as a new SEQRA form. Genevieve Trigg, Esq. added a full EAF should be submitted.

Mr. Jurkowski noted that there has not been any option put forth by Sunstream and recommended Brandee get together with the engineers to see what mitigation could be done. Ms. Nelson replied that she would look to the board for guidance on what exactly the board is looking for. Mr. Jurkowski stated that they keep hearing from Sunstream that this is the only feasible design, but National Grid said that there may be others. Mr. Privitera stated that there is no other economically feasible design. The construction loan has just been extended and will be in default if they don't go into permanent financing by the end of next month.

Chairman Stiffler asked if it would be possible to consider an underground alternative if the board provided a year to 18 months grace period to recover some of their costs. This was provided as an option to explore.

Brandee Nelson asked to come in Monday to discuss that option. Chairman Stiffler stated he would be there. He also asked for \$5,000 be added to the escrow account to cover the engineering and attorney costs.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated for the record that he didn't agree with providing them an 18 month grace period. He feels the maximum distance between poles should be looked at instead of just saying it can't be done.

Tammy Cossack, daughter of Kenneth Crane spoke in support of Sunstream. She feels her father would have supported this and would like to see the poles be over-looked as a sacrifice for the greater good of this facility.

Sandy Kipp motioned to extend the Public Hearing at the November 22nd meeting at 8:30 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. MacGiffert. All in favor, and carried.

**Pondside Nursery** – Jake Watts was present on behalf of Pondside Nursery. He gave a brief introduction of his proposal. Ginger Benedict, Esq. stated that she had reviewed the easement and if the state requires he move the bridge for any reason, he will need to comply. Otherwise, Pondside will have access to the bridge.

Mr. MacGiffert motioned that this was a diminutive change. The motion was seconded by Sandy Kipp. All in favor, and carried.

**Condition:** The greenhouse must be moved off of the residential property.

**CO-ARC Cardinal Hall Relocation** – Bruce Drake, Chief Operating Officer, and Chris Smailer, from Dutton Architecture was present on behalf of CO-ARC. A new site plan was provided to the Planning Board. Mr. Smailer gave a brief summary of the changes.

Mr. D'Onofrio motioned that this was a diminutive change. The motion was seconded by Sandy Kipp. All in favor, and carried.

**Condition:** Provide the board a parking agreement with Enterprise Car Rental.

Mr. Bucholsky also recommended they add a Knox box and was told that they already had been doing that at their other facilities.

**Ann Onet** – Surveyor, Dan Russell was present on behalf of Ann Onet. He presented a new application for a two lot sub-division and a letter withdrawing the major sub-division application.

The fees that were paid by the applicant for the major sub-division will be applied to the minor sub-division application. It was noted the county highway permit was approved for the driveway on County Route 14 and the on-lot septic was approved by the Columbia County Health Dept.

Mr. Jurkowski read Part II of SEQRA. All the questions were answered by the board as small to no impact.

Mr. MacGiffert motioned to close SEQRA with a Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Sandy Kipp. All in favor, and carried.

Mr. MacGiffert motioned to set the Public Hearing for next month. The motion was seconded by Sandy Kipp. All in favor, and carried. The Public Hearing was set for 7:32 p.m. on November 22, 2016.

**Colarusso Quarry Co.** – Chairman Stiffler stated that all correspondences have been sent by both the City of Hudson and the Town of Greenport Planning Board's and an email was received indicating that a decision is being formulated by DEC.

**Dziubelski Apartments** – No one was present on behalf of Dziubelski Apartments. The board received a letter outlining their progress, stating they have received approval from the Health Dept. and NYSDEC, and they still need NYSDOT approval.

**TRG Property Management** – No one was present on behalf of TRG. There is no new information.

#### **New Business:**

**Verizon Wireless/Lorenz Park** – Hyde Clarke and John Terry were present on behalf of Verizon Wireless. Mr. Clarke gave a brief introduction of the proposal. There was discussion about the use of the water tower on Joslen Blvd. Mr. Clarke said they had a copy of the deed that states the use was restricted and to be used as a water tank only. After review by Ginger Benedict, Esq. it was determined that they may not be restricted from adding a pole to it. Chairman Stiffler postponed the Public Hearing to determine if this was a viable alternative.

#### **Other Business:**

**Greenport Auto Sales** – Chairman Stiffler gave an update stating that the site plans for Greenport Auto Sales were stamped and signed on October 17, 2016.

**Bopp, Barca, Barca & Grabowski** – Chairman Stiffler gave an update, stating that he has not yet signed the sub-division plans as the board is still waiting for a copy of the easement.

**TRG Façade** – Chairman Stiffler gave an update, stating that a letter was received from the Fire Chief approving cut outs. The site plans were stamped and signed on October 17, 2016.

**Public Comment** – Jerry Grossman asked about what erosion control was being used at the Mental Health site as there didn't appear to be any. Mr. Jurkowski stated that they would be installing a silt fence.

Mr. Bucholsky motioned to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded by Sandy Kipp. All in favor, and carried. 10:04 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

The next regular Planning Board meeting will be held Tuesday, November 22, 2016, at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Pinkowski  
Greenport Planning Board Secretary

cc: Edward Stiffler, Chairman  
Sandra Kipp  
Robert MacGiffert  
Paul D'Onofrio  
Michael Bulcholsky  
Ray Jurkowski

Attorney Virginia Benedict  
Town Clerk Sharon Zempko  
Building Inspector's Office  
Fire Chief Gary Mazzacano  
NYS DOT  
Columbia County Planning Dept.  
Rapport Meyers (Via website)