

**TOWN OF WATERTOWN**  
**Special Meeting**  
**Municipal Building**  
**April 17, 2026**

Members Present: Joel R. Bartlett, Supervisor  
David D. Prosser, Councilman  
Joanne McClusky, Councilwoman  
Michael Perkins, Councilman  
Robert Slye, Councilman

Members Absent:

Supervisor Bartlett opened the meeting with a roll call of members present at 1:00 pm. Attorney Burrows was also present.

Supervisor Bartlett moved to suspend the customary flag salute and public comment period and to proceed directly into Executive Session. The purpose of the Executive Session was to discuss a proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), including related legal and contractual matters, involving three parties in connection with a proposed road construction project off NYS Route 3 within the Town of Watertown.

The motion prompted discussion among Board members regarding the appropriateness of Executive Session.

Councilwoman McClusky questioned whether Executive Session was appropriate, arguing that the matter involved a public contract and should remain open to public discussion, particularly given its impact on the community. Concerns were raised that engineering input had not yet been fully incorporated and that entering Executive Session at that stage would be premature. The Supervisor responded that engineering personnel would be included in Executive Session discussions.

Attorney Burrows provided clarification on the legal standards governing Executive Session under New York State Public Officers Law. It was explained that Executive Session is permitted for certain narrowly defined purposes, including matters involving attorney-client privilege or discussion of confidential legal advice. It was further stated that a contract discussion alone does not automatically qualify for Executive Session unless legal advice is being sought. He noted that if the Board formally moved to obtain legal advice from the Town Attorney and properly seconded and approved the motion, Executive Session would be justified.

The Supervisor referenced a previously distributed memorandum of understanding and indicated that it included anticipated amendments, suggesting that portions of the discussion could fall under attorney-client privilege. The Board and counsel reiterated that Executive Session would be appropriate only for legal consultation and not general contract negotiation. It was decided to resume the meeting in a public forum.

The floor was opened for public comments.

Joe Meyer, Co. Rte. 60 (Floral Drive), requested that the contents of the proposed agreement be read aloud or made available to the public to ensure transparency. Attorney Burrows stated that copies of the proposed contract and associated sketch had been prepared and could be distributed to members of the public for review.

Discussion continued regarding the proposed road project and associated infrastructure. Highway Superintendent Clement raised concerns about a provision assigning the Town responsibility for costs associated with operating, installing, and maintaining a traffic signal at the NYS Route 3 connection. The Supervisor responded that any traffic signal modifications would remain under NYSDOT oversight and that costs were anticipated to be with Cor Development or minimal to the Town, depending on final agreements with the developer.

Ralph Green, town resident and former City of Watertown employee has prior experience building, maintaining and overseeing traffic signals for the city. He explained that the existing

traffic signal is maintained by the New York State Department of Transportation and funded in part by COR Development who pays \$1,251 per year to NYS as well as the electricity to it. Any modifications to the signal would require traffic signal engineer plans, structural analysis, and NYSDOT approval. Estimated costs for signal upgrades were discussed, ranging from approximately \$50,000 for upgrades to up to \$250,000 for full replacement depending on engineering requirements. It was emphasized that only NYSDOT-approved contractors may perform work on state traffic signals.

Supervisor Bartlett asked Mr. Altieri whether the initial costs identified by Mr. Green such as construction, design, and materials had already been submitted to the Department of Transportation (DOT).

Mr. Altieri responded and elaborated on the permitting process. He explained that the DOT now utilizes an online portal system requiring applicants to submit all aspects of a project simultaneously under a single application. While elements of the project may be divided among parties (for example, the Town and a private entity such as Stewart's), the DOT requires one primary applicant who assumes responsibility and liability for the entire project.

He further noted that components such as curb cuts, driveways, traffic signals, traffic studies, drainage studies, and any utility modifications within the right-of-way must all be included in one comprehensive submission. He stated that, in similar projects, a single entity, often the developer handles the permitting process in its entirety.

Mr. Altieri advised that the Town could serve as the primary applicant; however, doing so would require the Town to assume the associated costs and liabilities. He concurred with the previously discussed cost estimates, indicating that an initial investment of approximately \$50,000 would be typical, though he cautioned that costs could vary depending on DOT requirements.

Mr. Altieri strongly recommended that the Town avoid committing to specific timelines in any agreement, as the duration of the permitting process is uncertain and dependent on state agency workloads.

The Town Highway Superintendent referenced language in the MOU stating that the Town shall obtain all required highway work permits, including but not limited to drainage approvals, and shall install the curb cut at the Town's sole cost and expense. He then questioned whether, the Highway Department is responsible for obtaining the permit, the Town would also be responsible for completing all associated work within the highway right-of-way including the curb cut.

Mr. Altieri noted that if the Town is designated as the responsible applicant, it may carry out the work through the Highway Department or designate qualified contractors to perform the work. As part of the process, once initial approvals are obtained, the applicant must identify and obtain DOT approval for any contractor performing work within the right-of-way.

It was further clarified that while the Town Highway Department could perform certain aspects of the work, specialized components, such as traffic signal installation would require qualified contractors with the appropriate expertise, bonding, and insurance.

Discussion also addressed costs and liability. While many DOT-related fees may be reduced or waived when the Town is the applicant, there may still be minor costs, such as insurance requirements or escrow deposits. However, it was emphasized that acting as the applicant carries potential liability. Any incidents, claims, or issues arising during construction could expose the Town to financial risk, which may outweigh the benefit of reduced fees.

It was concluded that assuming responsibility for the permit and project involves not only cost considerations but also an acceptance of risk and liability.

Superintendent Clement stated that he wanted to make it clear that the Town Highway Department is not responsible for the repair of the traffic signal.

Supervisor Bartlett stated that the Town Highway Department would not be reasonable for the maintenance of the traffic light. He anticipates the agreement being forthcoming from NYSDOT for the Board to review soon.

Councilwoman McClusky asked what the cost would be for an engineer's report.

Supervisor Bartlett responded the engineering work, including design and survey has already been completed.

Mr. Altieri clarified that the remaining costs relate to the overall permitting process, including the traffic study and associated submissions. He estimated the total cost for these services to be in the range of \$25,000 to \$50,000, depending on the requirements imposed by the Department of Transportation (DOT) throughout the review process.

Mr. Altieri also noted concerns with the project map that had been provided, stating that it does not clearly identify which party is responsible for specific portions of the work. He further observed that the design does not appear to include adequate provisions for a turnaround area to accommodate snowplows and ongoing maintenance. He advised that these issues should be addressed if the project is to move forward.

Councilwoman McClusky asked whether additional costs could arise for permits or the curb cut, and expressed particular concern regarding the extension of sewer infrastructure.

Mr. Altieri responded that some related items had already been revised, but questioned the distinction being made between sewer and water costs, noting that the connection requirements are generally similar. He stated that, typically, such infrastructure extensions—particularly sewer connections—are considered a developer responsibility. In most cases, the developer is responsible for constructing and funding connections from their project to the existing Town system.

Joe Meyer, Floral Drive, questioned the rationale for relocating the proposed entrance further down the road rather than utilizing the right-of-way already owned by the Town. He questioned the exchange of property with the developer. He expressed concern that the adjustment appeared to require additional work and land exchange without a clear benefit.

Supervisor Bartlett responded that the proposed alignment is the only configuration that has been deemed acceptable by the Department of Transportation (DOT), as it aligns with the existing traffic signal.

Mr. Meyer further noted that the proposed entrance is not as wide as the one across the street.

Discussion took place concerning the ownership and maintenance of the proposed road as well as Alexander Drive.

The Board discussed a proposed five-foot property line adjustment intended to align the roadway and traffic signal geometry. It was clarified that the adjustment would involve an equal exchange of land between the Town and the developer and would not negatively impact existing sewer easements or utility rights-of-way. Mr. Altieri confirmed that sewer infrastructure would remain within recorded easements and Town-owned right-of-way.

Rob Gayne of Swan Road asked for clarification regarding the proposed sewer infrastructure, stating he was having difficulty understanding how the system would be configured.

Mr. Altieri explained that the existing sewer line runs along NYS Rte. 3, then onto Town property, continuing behind Sam's before connecting to the existing system on Co. Rte. 202.

Mr. Gayne question whether two separate sewer lines would be installed, one on each side of the proposed road.

Supervisor Bartlett explained that the plan includes installing a sleeve beneath the road to allow for a future connection. Mr. Altieri explained a sleeve would enable a smaller service line to connect to the larger main sewer line without requiring additional road excavation later.

Discussion then turned to responsibility and cost. It was clarified that Stewart's would be responsible for constructing the road, including approximately 250 feet, and that the Town would not be constructing any portion of the roadway.

Mr. Gayne referenced the language in the agreement indicating that the Town would extend sewer infrastructure to the east side of the new road to allow future connections. Supervisor Bartlett indicated a preference to include this provision in the agreement in the form of a "dry sleeve," which would be installed now but left capped for future use. This would provide access to the main sewer line for properties east of the project area that currently do not have sewer service.

It was further clarified that the sleeve would be installed beneath the roadway and terminate at the appropriate location, allowing future developers or property owners to extend service as needed. The installation would include a capped connection point (such as a tee), enabling future tie-ins without disturbing the road.

Supervisor Bartlett inquired of Superintendent Clement of the anticipated cost of installing the sleeve.

Mr. Clement stated that based on prior experience, installing a 12" sleeve of this type is relatively straightforward. He noted that a typical installation might involve a 20-foot section at an estimated material cost of approximately \$500, with total costs, including labor, likely around \$1,000 if completed concurrently with road construction.

Supervisor Bartlett clarified that the installation would not be performed by the Town, but rather by Stewart's contractor as part of the overall project work.

Mr. Gayne raised concerns that the current draft agreement indicates the Town is responsible for the installation. Supervisor Bartlett responded that Stewart's would be responsible, as the sleeve relates to a new connection, and the affected properties are not yet connected to the sewer system.

Supervisor Bartlett stated that, since Stewart's is constructing the roadway, it would be practical and efficient for their contractor to complete any necessary utility crossings, including the installation of the sleeve. Mr. Gayne suggested that the agreement language should be revised to reflect this more clearly.

Additional clarification was sought regarding whether the properties intended to benefit from the future connection are within the existing Sewer District. Mr. Altieri commented that the properties are within the district but never connected, likely because they previously relied on private systems and had no immediate need to tie into the municipal sewer.

It was confirmed that, based on the project map, the two existing houses on the site would be demolished by Stewart's. Supervisor Bartlett explained that this demolition is a prerequisite for the Department of Transportation (DOT) to issue permits.

Mr. Gayne asked about the cost of a traffic study. Mr. Altieri noted that the cost for such a study typically falls within the previously discussed range of \$25,000 to \$50,000 and is one of the variable components of the DOT permitting process. It was further explained that the DOT may impose specific requirements that can affect both the scope and cost of the study.

Mr. Gayne questioned a previously referenced estimate of approximately \$40,000 for the traffic study that had been removed from an earlier motion, though it was acknowledged that the cost itself would still be incurred. It was questioned whether the Town would be responsible for paying for the study if it serves as the applicant.

Supervisor Bartlett responded that the traffic study process is already underway in its preliminary stages and has been, or is in the process of being, submitted to the DOT. He noted that the DOT does not accept studies conducted during winter months and requires information about the type of business being proposed before proceeding. He added that the project design has been completed for some time and that the majority of those associated costs have already been paid for by the town.

Supervisor Bartlett also addressed public concerns regarding taxpayer expense, noting that some individuals raising concerns are not located within the affected water or sewer districts. He responded to concerns raised by Mr. Gayne and Mr. Meyer, stating that there would be no cost impact to residents living outside the affected water and sewer districts. He asserted that the project costs would not burden those individuals and suggested that objections appeared to focus on preventing additional expenditures that had not already been approved.

Councilwoman McClusky countered that Town funds would still ultimately be required to complete the project.

Supervisor Bartlett disagreed, stating that Stewart's would be responsible for the project costs.

Mr. Gayne then raised the point regarding a reported \$2.2 million shortfall in the sewer and water districts, which had allegedly been covered by a loan from the Town's General Fund and had not yet been repaid.

Supervisor Bartlett responded that he would clear this matter up with Mr. Fox, reporter at a later date, stating that the situation had been misrepresented and contained inaccuracies that he intended to clarify.

Mr. Gayne questioned as to whether the Water and Sewer District accounts owed any funds to the Town's General Fund. Supervisor Bartlett responded that, to his knowledge, they did not.

Mr. Gayne noted that a prior statement regarding a potential shortfall had been made at an earlier meeting. Supervisor Bartlett indicated that the matter had since been resolved and stated that the earlier information may have been provided without full knowledge of the updated circumstances. He added that he intended to clarify the issue publicly to address any inaccuracies.

The discussion then returned to the cost of a traffic study. It was reiterated that such studies typically range from \$25,000 to \$50,000. It was confirmed that the Town has not conducted or paid for a traffic study to date, as the study requires specific project details and appropriate timing to proceed.

It was further clarified that the cost of the traffic study would typically be borne either by the developer or, if agreed upon, by the Town. Supervisor Bartlett stated that in this case, the property owner is contributing \$25,000 that could be used towards the studies, in addition to Stewart's covering the cost of road construction and related work.

It was acknowledged that if those funds had instead been allocated solely toward road construction, the Town could have been responsible for the cost of the traffic study. However, it was stated that this is not the intent of the current agreement.

Councilwoman McClusky raised concerns regarding a provision in the draft agreement indicating that payment to the Town would be contingent upon the issuance of a building permit for Stewart's. It was suggested that this could imply the Town must first act on permitting before receiving payment.

Supervisor Bartlett then clarified the permitting process. He explained that the town issues the zoning permit and then the applicant gets the building permits from Jefferson County. He further noted that water and sewer permits are issued by the Town Clerk. The developer is responsible for taking those permits to the City of Watertown for additional permits. Jefferson County oversees code enforcement and building inspections, meaning projects must comply with County rules and regulations.

Councilwoman McClusky questioned whether there was any commitment or timeline for payment, noting the absence of a specified date.

Supervisor Bartlett responded that the proposal involves entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He expressed concern with delaying the project beyond the developer's intended start date and suggested that prolonging the timeline may be intentional.

Mr. Meyer questioned whether funding should be a concern for the developer, noting that the lot reportedly sold for approximately \$1.75 million. He argued that the developer should have sufficient resources to proceed without additional Town support. He also referenced the adopted budget, stating that \$100,000 in federal aid (line DA-4089) had been allocated to the Highway Department specifically for construction of the road.

Supervisor Bartlett corrected that figure, stating that \$300,000 in CHIPS funding was allocated in the current year's budget for road construction.

Mr. Meyer clarified that he was referring specifically to federal aid funds. He reiterated that the adopted budget included \$100,000 designated as federal aid and that prior meeting minutes indicated the developer would contribute \$25,000 toward the road, with the Town supplementing funding through federal aid and other highway allocations. He noted that total projected costs had varied in prior discussions, ranging between \$250,000 and \$400,000. He then asked whether, if the Town is no longer constructing the road, those federal funds could be redirected back to the Highway Department for other needs and such as equipment or vehicle purchases.

Supervisor Bartlett responded that the Board ultimately determines how those funds are used. He explained that, during each annual budget cycle, the Highway Superintendent is required to present a list of road projects, along with associated costs, for Board review and approval. He further stated that any unused ARPA (federal) funds could revert back to the Highway Department, but emphasized that those funds are restricted and must be used only for eligible purposes under the grant guidelines, they cannot be freely reallocated to unrelated expenses.

Attorney Burrows advised ARPA funds could not be used for the purpose of new road construction.

Supervisor Bartlett responded that ARPA funding can be used for infrastructure, particularly new infrastructure. He referenced broader categories such as expansion of the tax base and infrastructure improvements, including water and sewer.

Mr. Meyer pointed out that prior meeting minutes and resolutions indicated ARPA funds would be allocated for construction of the road. He asked that if such use is not actually permitted, whether those funds could instead be redirected toward purchasing needed highway equipment.

Supervisor Bartlett explained that ARPA funds must be used within strict criteria and cannot be freely reallocated. He added that the Town had recently spent approximately \$850,000–\$900,000 on new equipment, some of which had not yet been delivered.

Mr. Meyer countered that at a prior meeting there had been uncertainty about funding even a single truck, which is why the issue was being raised again. He asked about sewer capacity. He asked whether the Town is currently in a position to connect new development to the sewer system, referencing a possible prior moratorium.

Mr. Altieri responded that the Town plans to undertake several projects in the spring and summer to create additional sewer capacity (“a sewer bank”), which would allow for future connections.

Mr. Meyer expressed concerns that permits and planning might proceed without certainty that sewer connections will ultimately be approved, noting the unpredictability of external agency decisions.

Mr. Altieri responding that flow credit requests had been submitted and expressed confidence in the Town's position, though final approval is not guaranteed.

Mr. Meyer pointed out that prior expectations in similar situations had not materialized as anticipated, and emphasized the risk of committing time, money, and resources without a guaranteed outcome.

Supervisor Bartlett concluded by stating that the project will have sewer access, noting that the Town is investing approximately \$300,000 to relocate an entrance pipe at the wastewater treatment plant to create a dedicated connection point. This change is intended to better isolate and manage flows, consistent with DEC objectives related to inflow and infiltration (I&I). The

total sewer flow to the city will not increase; it is simply being redirected through a separate connection point. As a result, this should not create capacity issues and may, in fact, benefit the city by improving system management.

Additionally, the town hopes to work with the city to explore cost-sharing for this improvement. The City already has grant funding allocated for repairs to the western outfall, which may help offset a portion of the associated costs.

Mr. Meyer reiterated much of what they are discussing is still based on projections rather than finalized approvals. While they have a general understanding of how things are expected to proceed, nothing has been formally confirmed yet. He understands the urgency to complete this before the end of the construction season; however, there is a risk in moving forward too quickly. Based on past experience, construction can progress rapidly potentially outpacing our ability to secure and finalize the necessary sewer connection. If that happens, they could end up with completed structures before the infrastructure is in place to properly service them. Given that uncertainty, it may be prudent to ensure key approvals and connections are secured before advancing too far with construction.

Mr. Meyer asked for clarification, if the current sewer moratorium is a blanket restriction across the entire sewer districts, prohibiting any new connections regardless of location?

Supervisor Bartlett commented there is no written moratorium concerning the City of Watertown.

Supervisor Bartlett asked if there was anyone else who would like to address the Council. No one wished to speak the floor was closed for public comment.

Supervisor Bartlett noted that the Board had received a number of comments and suggestions. He stated that it would be beneficial to determine how the Board wishes to proceed. He expressed concern that if the matter extends into late May, timing constraints may limit available options for the developer.

Supervisor Bartlett suggested moving forward and requested that the Town Attorney draft a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the questions and concerns discussed during this meeting.

Discussion was held regarding the lack of current financial reporting and its impact on decision-making. Councilwoman McClusky stated that she was not comfortable proceeding with any additional commitments without complete and up-to-date financial information, including a clear understanding of revenues and overall financial position.

Supervisor Bartlett noted that the 2023 and 2024 financial information had been received and filed with the State of New York, and that 2025 financials were not yet complete and he had filed for an extension. The accountant is currently conducting necessary due diligence.

Supervisor Bartlett stated that the Town remains in generally stable condition; however, the fund balance had been reduced due to prior equipment purchases, resulting in a temporary shortfall that has since been addressed. Financial reports are currently in the process of being compiled.

Supervisor Bartlett said this road project would be at minimal cost to the town.

Councilwoman McClusky addressed potential project costs, including permits and associated liabilities.

Mr. Altieri noted that some permit-related expenses have already been initiated, though the process is not complete and additional costs will be incurred. The exact amount of these costs is currently unknown.

Supervisor Bartlett stated that cost would be paid by Stewart's.

Councilwoman McClusky noted that is not the way it is written in the MOU agreement. She does not want to be rushed into a decision.

Supervisor Bartlett stated that he was not establishing specific timelines and noted that project scheduling is influenced by external parties, including the developer and Stewart's construction schedule. He emphasized that these factors are outside the Town's control. He reiterated that his objective is to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) incorporating the Town's comments and expectations, and cautioned that extended delays could risk the developer withdrawing from the project.

Discussion followed regarding the developer's proposed timeline, including submission deadlines to the New York State Department of Transportation by April 30, 2026. Concern was raised that the Town may not be able to meet the proposed timeframe, which could present potential legal or liability risks.

Mr. Altieri suggested not agreeing to a time table. He noted that the project has not yet received all necessary approvals, including Town and County Planning Board review, and that prior consideration had been tabled pending resolution of outstanding issues.

Supervisor Bartlett suggested that each member independently submit their comments and proposed revisions for inclusion in the MOU to the Town Attorney within the next week. It was proposed that the Town Attorney compile these comments into a draft MOU for Board review, with the goal of considering action at the next regular meeting.

Attorney Burrows provided clarification on the purpose and function of an MOU, describing it as a mutual understanding between the concerned parties. He further explained considerations related to the proposed road, including the distinction between private and public roads, applicable design and construction standards, and the process by which a developer-constructed road may be offered for dedication to the Town. He noted the intent of this appears to be a public road. Typically, the developer constructs the roadway; it would only become a public road upon formal acceptance by the Town Board following completion, inspection, and approval by the Highway Superintendent, Town Engineer, and potentially other agencies including Jefferson County and NYSDOT. It was emphasized that any future dedication would require the roadway to meet applicable engineering and safety standards, including proper width, turnaround capacity, drainage, and structural compliance suitable for municipal maintenance.

He also noted that acceptance of a public road would carry long-term maintenance responsibilities for the Town, including snow removal and infrastructure upkeep, and that adequate design considerations such as turnarounds for municipal vehicles would be required.

He clarified that the submitted plan is a conceptual sketch and not a finalized or engineered design. He noted that additional detail and review would be required before the Town could consider acceptance of the proposed road. This would include evaluation by the Highway Superintendent and the Town's engineer to ensure the design meets applicable standards, including roadway width, turnaround requirements, and overall constructability for public use.

He further explained that the process of dedicating a road to the Town involves multiple steps, technical review, and associated costs, requiring input from qualified professionals. It was emphasized that the current proposal lacks the level of detail necessary for approval and would need to be developed into a formally engineered plan, including appropriate certifications in accordance with New York State requirements.

Discussion followed regarding potential costs associated with necessary design modifications and infrastructure improvements, including turnaround areas for highway operations. It was noted that responsibility for such costs would need to be determined by the Board.

Supervisor Bartlett added that any proposed road would also require review and approval by the County, as the County Highway Department would be involved in maintenance and plowing of the road.

Attorney Burrows confirmed that the current sketch, as presented, is not sufficient for public dedication. He reiterated that a more detailed engineered plan, signed and stamped by a New York State licensed engineer or architect, would be required for submission. Such a plan would be subject to review and approval by the appropriate Town and County officials, introducing an additional layer of review and coordination.

He noted that the Board has devoted significant time to reviewing the matter and, if it chooses to proceed, will provide direction to his office. He stated that technical input from the Highway Superintendent and the Town's engineer would be necessary to address the required level of detail.

He further commented that, while agreements can be drafted with substantial detail, their effectiveness ultimately depends on the party's willingness to adhere to them. He emphasized that the intent is for all parties to continue working in good faith, and expressed confidence that the Board will provide clear direction on next steps.

Mr. Meyer stated that he supports Stewart's and he is not against proposed development; however, he expressed concern regarding the use of Town funds for a project that may not fully meet public needs. He emphasized that his concern is not opposition to development in general, noting his prior support for other proposed projects, but rather the financial implications given the current lack of clear financial reporting. He cautioned that proceeding without a full understanding of the Town's financial position could impact future budgeting decisions.

Supervisor Bartlett clarified that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He noted that Board members have provided comments and suggested revisions, which will need to be incorporated into a draft MOU by the Town Attorney and submitted to Stewart's for consideration.

He further stated that timing remains a concern, as delays could impact the developer's construction schedule and ability to complete the project within the desired timeframe. He noted that future Board actions may be required, including consideration of dedication of any constructed infrastructure and its addition to the Town's inventory.

Councilwoman McClusky inquired whether the Town currently performs plowing in the Alexander Drive area.

The Highway Superintendent responded that the County does not intend to assume responsibility for maintenance of this road, and that the Town would be responsible for plowing and upkeep. He noted that the County Highway Department has indicated it does not wish to take on additional maintenance obligations for this area.

Supervisor Bartlett asked for any additional comments or questions and suggested that Board members submit any remaining concerns for incorporation into discussion at the next Town Board meeting.

No formal action was taken during the meeting, and the matter was left pending further revision of the proposed MOU and continued coordination among the Town, developer, legal counsel, and engineering representatives.

Michael Fitzgerald, Gotham Street Road, presented himself to the Board and requested to submit a complaint regarding zoning and permit codes. He provided copies of the document to the Town Clerk for distribution. The Clerk indicated that copies would be made and the document would be emailed to all Board members for review.

Supervisor Bartlett noted that the matter would be addressed at a future meeting.

The Board then discussed scheduling changes of the May Town Board meeting.

#### **MOTION#59-2026**

Motion by Supervisor Bartlett to reschedule the May Town Board meeting to Friday May 15, 2026 at 7:00 pm, motion was seconded by Councilman Prosser.

Ayes All

Superintendent Clement raised follow-up items from the prior Board meeting regarding the hiring of a mechanic at an hourly rate of \$33. He noted that the position had previously been discussed but no formal action had been taken. Application was reported as on file.

Discussion occurred regarding the appropriate wage rate, with reference to prior consideration of \$31 per hour. The Superintendent described the candidate's qualifications, including prior Town experience, possession of specialized tools and diagnostic equipment, and ability to service current and incoming municipal equipment. It was also noted that the candidate currently holds employment elsewhere but has expressed interest in returning to the Town position.

Board members discussed the operational need for the position, including maintenance of plow trucks and heavy equipment, and potential cost savings due to the candidate's ownership of required tools and software. It was noted that the candidate would be required to obtain necessary Town employment approvals, including civil service and retirement system requirements, as applicable. The Union representative reportedly indicated no objection to the appointment.

**MOTION #60-2026**

**WHEREAS**, a position is available in the Highway Department for a Public Works employee with mechanical ability; and

**WHEREAS**, Michael McDonald possesses the qualifications and experience necessary to fill the position of Mechanic/Public Works Employee;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Town Board hereby creates the full-time position of Public Works Mechanic at an hourly rate of \$33.00 per hour, with full-time benefits, recognizing that the individual hired shall be responsible for all mechanical work and shall assist with snow plowing and other Public Works duties as required; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Michael McDonald is hereby appointed to the position of Public Works Mechanic at an hourly rate of \$33.00 per hour.

A motion to adopt the foregoing resolution was made by Supervisor Bartlett and seconded by Councilmember Slye and upon a roll call vote of the Board was duly adopted as follows:

Supervisor Joel Bartlett	Yes
David Prosser	Yes
Joanne McClusky	Yes
Michael Perkins	Yes
Robert Slye	Yes

Superintendent Clement provided an update on the proposed packer truck purchase, noting that the item had been previously discussed during the budget process. He requested direction from the Board on whether to proceed and indicated that the vendor had identified a unit consistent with prior specifications. He noted that the existing packer unit would be removed and transferred to a newer chassis.

Discussion included clarification of the proposed equipment, with confirmation that the intent is to acquire a compaction unit mounted on a newer truck. The Superintendent reported that the vehicle has approximately 17,000 miles and is available at an estimated cost of \$54,000, with a \$5,000 trade-in value for the existing unit included.

Board members discussed funding options for equipment purchases, including historical use of bonding for fleet replacement and concerns regarding fund balance usage and long-term budgeting impacts. Questions were raised regarding the feasibility and appropriateness of bonding for used equipment purchases.

Additional discussion occurred regarding the condition of existing equipment and potential alternatives for waste handling operations. Comparisons were made to practices in other municipalities, including use of drop-off containers and roll-off systems, as possible operational models.

Councilwoman McClusky inquired of Attorney Burrows whether ARPA funds could be used toward the purchase of the proposed equipment.

Attorney Burrows responded that ARPA funding may be utilized if the equipment is new; however, eligibility for used equipment was uncertain and would require further review. He noted that bonding may be permissible for used equipment depending on applicable local finance law provisions, including considerations of useful life.

He further advised that procurement requirements under General Municipal Law, including competitive bidding thresholds and the Town's procurement policy, would need to be reviewed prior to the purchase of used equipment. He cautioned that additional compliance requirements may apply depending on the nature and cost of the equipment.

There was also discussion about the need for a newer gradall. The current one is being heavily used and becoming increasingly unreliable, with frequent hydraulic failures and aging components, making replacement a practical concern. Discussion took place of the possibility of trading in old equipment to offset costs, which is generally allowed if recommended by the highway superintendent and approved by the Board. The estimated cost of a used gradall was around \$79,000 which includes the trade-in of \$6,000, and there was consideration of whether to combine financing for both the gradall and packer into a single bond or separate them depending on useful life requirements.

Attorney Burrows advised that if the Board proceeds with financing, a bond resolution would be required, which requires a majority vote of the Board and a statutory waiting period of approximately 50 days, including publication of an estoppel notice. He noted that, depending on the amount, the Town would likely utilize either a bond anticipation note or a statutory installment note rather than serial bonds, in order to reduce costs and increase flexibility. He further stated that the process for borrowing typically takes a couple months to complete.

Discussion followed regarding the use and condition of existing equipment, including the gradall, which was identified as heavily utilized and nearing the end of its useful life. It was noted that replacement options may need to be considered due to ongoing maintenance issues and equipment downtime.

Attorney Burrows inquired whether the Town currently maintains an equipment reserve fund. Supervisor Bartlett responded the town does not. Attorney Burrows suggested that the town provide specific information so that a preliminary bond resolution could be prepared for consideration at the May 15th meeting to begin the financing process.

Discussion also addressed procurement considerations, including whether the proposed vendor is part of a state or county bid contract. It was noted that the vendor is not currently on either list. Questions were raised regarding compliance with the Town's procurement policy and prior purchasing practices.

Attorney Burrows indicated that, based on the information provided, the Board may consider a bond resolution not to exceed approximately \$80,000 for a gradall and \$54,000 for the packer truck. He further noted that bonding is typically structured based on the useful life of each piece of equipment, and separate resolutions may be required unless otherwise justified.

The Superintendent advised that, while the gradall remains in continued daily use, it is experiencing increasing mechanical issues, including hydraulic failures and general component wear, and may require replacement. He noted that the Board could defer action on the gradall if it chooses, but emphasized that the packer truck requires more immediate attention.

It was agreed that further information would be compiled and provided to counsel for preparation of a proposed bond resolution for Board consideration.

#### **MOTION #61-2026**

Councilman Prosser moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:38 pm seconded by Councilman Perkins.

Ayes All

---

Pamela D. Desormo, Town Clerk