

York Town Board Meeting  
November 19, 2015  
6:30 p.m.  
Presentation of I.R.G.

Present: Supervisor Gerald L. Deming, Council Members: Lynn Parnell, David Deuel and Frank Rose Jr.

Absent: Norman Gates

Others: James Campbell (Town Attorney), Davies Nagel, Roberta MacLean, Larry Smith, Patricia and Dean Gardner, David , Lola and Lucy Rose, Molly Cummings, Kirk Richenberg, Becky Lewis, Lee Gratwick, Amos Smith, Anne Roth-Blizzard, George Worden Jr. and Dustin Geiger

Supervisor Deming opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m., and invited Mr. Nagel to begin the Presentation of Findings from the Impact Research Group (IRG).

Mr. Nagel read aloud the objective for the group: In December of 2014 the Town of York passed a one-year moratorium on all high volume hydrofracking activities in the town. Subsequently, the Town Board facilitated the formation of a research group to attempt to gauge the impact on our community if the high volume hydrofracking industry (HVHF) came to York. Mr. Nagel stated the committee members will present their findings this evening, with the anticipation of attending next month's board meeting (December 10<sup>th</sup>) to answer or clarify any comments or questions. The hope is for the Board to render any possible action by their January meeting. Mr. Nagel introduced David Rose to discuss his topic, "Residential Property Values".

Mr. Rose stated his concerns centered around if fracking was allowed in our township, the impacts on such property values. The majority of the research was obtained by speaking to people and online information. Mr. Rose outlined a specific testimony submitted by Elisabeth Radow, Esq. to the New York Senate, and read a portion of it.

*The Ability to finance a residential purchase represents a critical component to most home purchases. Gas drilling introduces hazardous activity and hazardous substances, practices which are expressly prohibited by standard mortgages. Lenders such as Key Bank, JP Morgan Chase and Santander do not want gas drilling on their borrowers' property. According to JP Morgan Chase, servicers and lenders are becoming more unwilling to approve a loan on these properties. Santander Bank now requires all residential borrowers to sign a mortgage rider which prohibits them from entering into a gas lease.*

Mr. Rose commented where properties have activity, if they wish to sell their home, it is becoming very difficult for prospective buyers to obtain loans.

Mr. Rose recommended to the Board three (3) possible avenues:

- 1) Let the moratorium expire
- 2) Extend the moratorium by 1 year
- 3) A Ban, prohibiting all HVHF as well as all storage and/or treatment of HVHF waste products.

Mr. Rose stated it would be his recommendation for a Ban. If we chose to do nothing, we are not in charge of our own land. A moratorium should not be a stalling tactic, which the IRG has not done. This group has done their due diligence, and highly recommends a Ban, allowing us to choose our own destiny.

Attorney Campbell asked Mr. Rose if he is recommending an extension to the moratorium if a lengthy period of time exists before a Ban. Mr. Rose replied he would not be opposed to an extension for a month or two until the paperwork could be completed to put a Ban in place. Supervisor Deming asked Attorney Campbell what the upcoming process would be if the Town Board was to consider a Ban. Mr. Campbell answered, a Ban would be a legislative action, requiring filing of a Local Law. The proposed law would need to be crafted to weave the new wording with our existing codes in order to be seamless. Once the law has been drafted and presented to the town Board, no action can legally be taken for 10 days, then a Public Hearing can be scheduled. Part of the process is also to submit the Livingston County Planning Department a copy of the potential law, for review and recommendation. Mr. Campbell states with all steps involved he feels 2-3 months would be a fair time table assessment. Supervisor Deming asked, what is necessary to extend the present moratorium. Mr. Campbell replied in order to extend the moratorium only a few quick changes would be necessary along with documentation of the work completed to warrant the extension. Ms. Lewis commented due to the fact that Livingston County Planning has already reviewed the existing moratorium, she doesn't believe it would take too long for them to make a second recommendation, since they have already approved the original. Attorney Campbell stated they may handle it with ease and rather quickly, only having to address the newest information. Timing is a factor, they only meet once per month. David Rose expressed once again, he is not opposed to the moratorium expiring as long as there is not a large gap in time. Supervisor Deming asked if any realtors were approached regarding property values, which Mr. Rose replied they were not.

Mr. Nagel introduced Becky Lewis to discuss "Quality of Life". Ms. Lewis read aloud the introduction of her report.

The Comprehensive Plan for the Town of York presents the following vision for the community:

*The town of York will remain a predominantly agricultural and rural residential community with a small town character.*

*The planning program will emphasize the protection of York's important natural resources, productive agricultural soils and the Community's significant environmental assets.*

*This Comprehensive Plan for the Town of York serves as a guide for growth and preservation within the community and to accommodate future development in a manner that best protects the environment, preserves current community values and maintains the rural character of the Town. This Plan represents a summary of the desires, opportunities and policies of the Town of York at this point in time.*

Ms. Lewis referred to a recently published collection of Scientific, Medical and Media findings, demonstrating risks and harms of Fracking. Documentation states that since December of 2014, more than 100 peer-reviewed studies on the impacts of drilling and fracking have been published, with overwhelming results that there is significant potential for “harmful air impacts, environmental, and other risks from infrastructure”. Ms. Lewis summarized the Town of Avon’s study on HVHF, stating, “there are currently over 1,000 chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing that have been detected in flowback and produced water. Some of these chemicals, such as benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene are known carcinogens. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, a single hydrofracking well can result in 15,000 gallons of chemical waste from fracking fluids.” Ms. Lewis commented with what is being uncovered, this industry is very dangerous and we don’t want it in our community. The Gas and Oil industry is not very transparent with their information. The amount of water used is huge. We have larger amounts here, but we know it will be affected if the industry comes. We have roughly 500 homeowners on a well, the industry may negatively affect those properties.

Ms. Lewis read aloud the following statistic, “In 2014, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection released data on 243 cases of contaminated private drinking water wells due to gas and oil production, from 2009 to 2014. The problems included methane gas contamination, spills of wastewater, and wells that dried up or became undrinkable”. Ms. Lewis stated that air quality is also affected, compressor stations have various sources of air emissions: tanks, heaters, engines and potential leaks. Depending on the size of the station and the composition of the gases being compressed, these may release contaminants including carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxides, hazardous air pollutants, volatile organic compounds, fine and coarse particular matter, nitrogen oxides and greenhouse gases such as methane and carbon dioxide.

Ms. Lewis referenced an issue in “Reviews on Environmental Health”, reviewing scientific evidence that the volatile organic compounds from compressor stations pose a threat to human developmental and reproductive health, including birth defects, infertility, low birth rates and miscarriages. Ms. Lewis stated that the Quality of Life Committee recommends and supports a Ban to prohibit all HVHF as well as storage and/or disposal of such waste products, in order to preserve the quality of life in our area.

David Rose asked if traffic patterns were documented, which Ms. Lewis stated they were not, her committee focused on air and water.

Mr. Nagel introduced Patricia Gardner and Larry Smith to discuss “Economics”.

Mr. Smith read aloud from their report:

## Impact Research Group Report Economics for the Town of York

### Facts About the Town of York

- The population of the Town of York was 3,397 at the 2010 census.
- There are about 10,000 cows distributed over 10 farms in York.
- The total area of the town is 49.15 square miles.
- About 25,000 acres are in the Agricultural District of the Town.
- The Town has about 1,200 housing units at an average density of 25.1 per square mile.
- There are at least 7 east/west roads and 6 north/south roads.
- Only Routes 36, 63, and 20 are capable of industrial use.
- Crops are grown to feed the dairies; vegetable crops are produced for fresh sale. A large acreage of wheat is grown along with soybeans and edible beans.

### Things As We Know Them Now

- The Town of York is a Right to Farm Community.
- The 2007 Census of Agriculture said that 87% of farms were owned and operated by individuals or families. In 2012 this Census said 97% of U.S. farms were family owned.
- Agriculture is the largest industry in the Town of York (and also in Livingston County).
- There are nearly 3 times as many cows in the Town as there are people.
- The *tax base* (needed tax revenue) currently rests on our farmers (dairy, crops, and farm output), and our residents (with city jobs); in addition to several other enterprises within the Town.
- The *roads and bridges* (infrastructure) in the Town of York are already challenged by Agricultural use. (Milk, grain, and manure are outbound, silage is inbound). The Town of York Highway Department Appropriation is the Town's largest expense.
- The *soil* in the Town of York is prime and productive and is among the best in , Livingston Country. The river laid soil comes from the Genesee River Valley and upland lake soils created by glacial activity. Soils deposited by the Genesee River are some of the best in the world. Soils deposited by glacial activity are also some of the best.
- Historically, *water* quantity and quality have always been an issue in the Town and we still feel the effects from the 1994 mine collapse in Retsof.
- Only parts of the Town are on Public Water Supply (coming from Conesus Lake). Others are served by private water wells (about 500).
- Streams and aquifers typically provide the water supply necessary for animal consumption. Public water is necessary for washing equipment and in times of drought when ground water is less available.
- **(NOTE: Dairy cattle need to drink 30 gallons of water per DAY to produce. We are already one of driest regions in N.Y.S.)**

## Concluding Thoughts

### Definition of Economics

1. *of or having to do with the management of the income, expenditures, etc. of a household, private business, community, or government*
2. *of or having to do with the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth*

### Definition of Opportunity Cost

1. *a benefit, profit, or value of something given up to acquire or achieve something else*
2. *the loss of potential gain from other alternatives when one alternative is chosen*

"Among the many staggering costs ignored by the [fracking] industry are air pollution and health costs, road damages, increased demands on police, fire, first responder services suffered by municipalities, declines in property values, and the deterioration of industries crowded out or otherwise incompatible with an industrial landscape and/or risk of water, air, and land contamination."

*From "Economic Realities of Shale Gas Development in New York State"*  
by Jannette M. Barth Ph.D.

The Comprehensive Plan for the Town of York serves as a guide for the growth and preservation within the community and to accommodate future development in a manner that best protects the environment, preserves current community values and maintains the rural character of the Town. (2006)

### Things About Hydrofracking in the Town of York that We Don't Now Know the Answer to

- effect on animals (sound and lighting, for example)
- effect on the livelihood for dairy farmers
- amount of increased truck traffic
- water usage demand and disposal
- potential for contamination of water and/or leakage

Mr. Smith stated that the Economics Committee recommends:

- 1- Updating the Comprehensive Plan (from 2006)
- 2- Create a “Conservation Advisory Group” to help preserve the rural character of the Town
- 3- Be cognizant of jeopardizing the Agricultural/Economic balance in the Town and possibly destroying the generational livelihood for many of our residents.

Mr. Smith added that his committee is not recommending a Ban or a moratorium, but emphasized creation of the Conservation Advisory Group to preserve and focus on where to head into the future.

David Rose asked Attorney Campbell, if the State lifts the existing Ban, can the Town adopt one thereafter. Mr. Campbell answered, it would depend on what happens after the Executive Order and then followed by legislation. It potentially could be taken completely out of our hands, or could be more restrictive. There are many different options, it is very hard to predict.

Mr. Smith commented with all of the documentation obtained, it is pretty remote that fracking will come to this area. Attorney Campbell stated some areas would not be appropriate, where other areas may be more viable to receive an application. Mr. Smith asked how storage is affected by a Ban. Ms. Lewis replied we could add wording to include Ban of storage waste as well. Mr. Rose added that the courts have upheld the Dryden Ban. Attorney Campbell agreed, under Home Rule the Appellate Court did uphold the Dryden Ban, but if legislation changes, it could alter Ban approvals.

Mr. Nagel discussed with the Board, “Land, Natural Resources and Waste Management.” Mr. Nagel posed several important questions in his report to consider.

- 1- What did the recent EPA Hydrologic Fracturing Study say?
- 2- What could we do now to protect our water in the future?
- 3- What would be the effects of an increase in truck traffic (i.e. fracking waste) especially along Route 63?
- 4- How do we better “understand the trade-offs, such as increased economic activity verses environmental degradation or harm to public health, that policy makers and community members face with respect to energy production”?
- 5- How should we look at our supply of freshwater in the Town of York?

Mr. Nagel stated the jury is not in yet on the issue of economy and environment, but many studies continue to be done. He questioned how a community balances the economics with the potential risks associated with this industry. Mr. Nagel commented he grew up in an area with relatively clean water resources, but the world’s situation is ever changing. Mr. Nagel stated he recommends that the Board consider a Ban including storage of waste. A regulatory Ban can be changed more quickly than a Legislative Ban.

Town of York - Impact Research Group (2015)  
Land, Natural Resources & Waste Management  
D. Nagel

1. What did the recent EPA Hydrologic Fracturing Study say?

*No widespread impact on drinking water, but does confirm specific instances that led to water contamination that the oil and gas industry has always denied. Unfortunately, there was no before and after baseline testing and the data was provided by the industry so more study is recommended. <http://www2.epa.gov/hfstudy>*

2. What could we do now to protect our water in the future?

*Baseline study of each of our creeks (\$40 Brockport.) A new report from the Environmental Working Group, leaving just a 35-foot buffer between fields of corn or soy and neighboring streams could significantly reduce nitrogen runoff and phosphorus runoff and so possibly may also be an important way to protect the water from any fracking runoff. As a personal side note, these hedgerows seem to be disappearing even though they are an important habitat for the many pollinators that are responsible for one-third of the food we eat. If a hedgerow is going to be removed there are groups that will relocate any honeybee colonies that may be found in the area.*

[http://www .takepart.com/article/2015/02/03/ag-runoff-drinking-water-pollution-solution](http://www.takepart.com/article/2015/02/03/ag-runoff-drinking-water-pollution-solution)

3. What would be the effects of an increase in truck traffic (i.e. fracking waste) especially along Route 63?

*Most people understand the safety issues involved especially at the intersection of 63 and 36. Newer research has focused on the health issues involved along a truck corridor, especially stop and go traffic. Diesel exhaust, a suspected carcinogen, and brake pad dust that can contain asbestos, lead and other heavy metals are both major health concerns. There is a higher risk of asthma for children living within 1/2 mile of a highway and there is a higher risk of asthma when exposed to traffic pollution at school. That's why our Comprehensive Plan puts a high priority on putting footpaths, trails and an open space on the north side of Route 63 across from the school. This configuration tends to slow down the traffic as it makes the area look more residential.*

[Driving Harm: Health and Community Impacts of Living near Truck Traffic The Impact Policy Brief Series January 2012.](#)

4. How do we better "understand the trade-offs, such as increased economic activity versus environmental degradation or harm to public health, that policymakers and community members face with respect to energy production?"

*This fall (October 2015), Elaine Hill, a researcher at the University of Rochester Medical Center has been awarded a \$1.25 million National Institutes of Health grant to "support her study of whether air emissions and water contamination from gas drilling increases the risk of adverse health outcomes for individuals living nearby." In 2012 her research focusing on children born to women living near HVHF drill sites in Pennsylvania revealed "that mothers living near active drill sites were about 25 percent more likely to birth to infants that were underweight and that received lower scores on a basic health assessment done shortly after birth." This is just of one of the many studies being conducted to help determine what the risks of fracking might be. Needless to say the science regarding this question is far from complete.*

<http://www.democratandchronicle.com/story/news/2015/10/15/urmc-researcher-earns-125-million-grant/74003830/>

5. How should we look at our supply of freshwater in the Town of York?

*Less than 1 percent of the world's freshwater is easily accessible. In ten years, according to studies by the United Nations, "two-thirds of the world's population [will be] living in water-stressed regions as a result of use, growth, and climate change." Living in York with our relatively clean streams, wells, and ponds may have caused us to take this all for granted but, one needs only to read the news coming out of California regarding their protracted drought to understand how lucky we are to live in an area with abundant freshwater. "The challenge we face now is how to effectively conserve, manage, and distribute the water we have." Looking at our water supply in this way should make us very unwilling to take any risks that may jeopardize this most important resource.*

<http://environment.nationalgeographic.com/environment/freshwater/freshwater-crisis/>

Final Recommendation: At this time my recommendation to the Town Board would be to pass a ban on all high volume hydrofracturing related activities. This would be along the lines of the New York State DEC regulatory ban but, because it would be voted upon by the Town Board, it would be a Legislative Ban and carry an additional level of protection for the town.



Mr. Nagel introduced Roberta MacLean to review, “Government and Services”. Mrs. MacLean commented that she was able to look at the report completed by the Town of Avon as starting point, and began by outlining major points of her report:

- Road damage and Maintenance
- Tax Issues and Bonding
- Emergency Response and Preparedness Training
- Social and Human Resource Impacts
- Regulations and Enforcements

Mrs. MacLean stated the report focuses on potential issues and challenges that our Town could face if the High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing Industry came to operate in our area. Since the State’s Ban, late last year, Mrs. MacLean questioned if DEC has followed through with any additional work on the issue. With the State’s existing Ban, activity may provide a sense of security to some, but if the Town was to Ban as well, we would be able to protect our area especially the freshwater resource. Mrs. MacLean commented, if a person or industry thinks they can make money on an operation, they will try it! Mrs. MacLean added, the Avon report has many resources to tap into. Mrs. MacLean stated her recommendation is that the Town of York proceed with a Ban for another layer of protection.

**7:15 P.M.** –Councilman Gates arrived at this time.

Mr. Nagel introduced David Deuel to speak on “Town of York Geology and Shale Gas Development”. Mr. Deuel began by saying, throughout the presentation this evening he did not recall anyone make mention to the fact that the industry would come to this area, mainly because of the geology. At a 2012 Planning Department workshop, they too conveyed the unlikeliness that Shale Natural Gas Industry would come here, and according to map #1 in his report, the Utica Shale Fairway is nowhere near Livingston County. Mr. Deuel stated based on its depth (less than 300 feet from the surface) the Marcellus shale is not drillable in the Town of York. The Marcellus shale is 25-50 feet thick in York, at a minimum, 50 feet of thickness is needed for fracking. The Utica shale is also questionable to drill. The Utica depth in York is 3200 feet, approximately 50 feet thick and has a total organic carbon content of 0.5%. In order to make an area desirable to drill, favorable gas producing shales are at least 4,000 feet deep, have a total organic content above 2% and at least 200 feet thick. For the Town of York, the Utica shale does not meet any of the listed requirements. Mr. Deuel commented, in his report maps #3-5 show in detail the information he discussed. Mr. Deuel stated the geology in York does not support shale gas development and stated he does not have a recommendation for the Board.

David Rose asked Mr. Deuel if he looked at the storage aspect, which Mr. Deuel replied, storage of gas or waste? Mr. Rose answered waste storage. Mr. Deuel stated, most are aware of the lease he has with Lenape, which does not have any verbiage regarding the storage issue. In current leases they would have to be re-negotiated with the land owner before any additional activity could be done. In the states of Ohio and Oklahoma they have primacy (meaning the state has control of the process) to assist with storage of waste issues, but New York does not. In New York the EPA would control it. For waste disposal

you must have layers that are compatible, and is quite a process, if the chemistry is wrong, it will plug up.

Mr. Richenberg asked Mr. Deuel if he knew of a recent seismic activity report, which Mr. Deuel replied he believes the last report on file took place in the 90's. Mr. Richenberg commented from 1990 until present, shouldn't we have seen activity in that time frame. Mr. Deuel answered, after that report nothing further has been filed pertaining to seismic graphing. Mr. Deuel added in the 80's the Federal Government offered tax credits to the industry, and the actual price in Pennsylvania to drill in the Marcellus shale was \$16.00 per 1,000 cubic feet for gas. In 2006, to drill the price was \$13.00 per 1,000 cubic feet. Mr. Richenberg asked if it was offset by tax incentives, which Mr. Deuel replied it was, and commented again that the government offered credits and incentives at that time, here in York as well. Mr. Deuel reported if you were to look at permit requests on the DEC site over a ten (10) year span, there are very few for this area:

- 1- in Caledonia
- 1- in Avon
- 2- in Livonia
- Only other –Leicester (salt mine)

Mr. Nagel concluded by stating that after much research the committees have two basic recommendations:

- 1- Four subcommittees (1,2,4,and 5) recommend the implementation of a local law that effectively prohibits all HVHF as well as all disposal, treatment, storage or use of HVHF waste products. One committee (3) recommends the local Ban if the New York State regulatory Ban is revoked or in danger of being revoked.
- 2- Five subcommittees (1,2,3,4 and 5) recommend encouraging land use and community engagement as well as preserving the rural character of the Town by instituting a Conservation Advisory Council.

Mr. Nagel informed the Board of another potential source to assist the Town. After reviewing their website, the National Resource Defense Council, would be willing to review our zoning in order to make a recommendation on perhaps preparing Ban wording, at no cost to the Town. Mr. Nagel added he did have the opportunity to view what they have done for others and suggested that the Town make contact. Mr. Nagel stated he wished to thank the Town Board for facilitating the process and especially the committee members who devoted a great deal of time and effort.

Supervisor Deming stated on behalf of the Town Board he wanted to thank the IRG for their effort and dedication throughout this year. The Board will now review the entire report. Mr. Nagel commented the committee will be returning for the December meeting to answer any questions that may arise.

**\*You may review the entire report on the Town's website: [www.yorknny.org](http://www.yorknny.org)**

RESOLUTION offered by Mrs. Parnell and seconded by Mr. Rose to close the IRG Presentation meeting at 7:35 p.m. Voted on and approved, Yes-5, No-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine M. Harris, Clerk

Regular Town Board Meeting  
7:30 P.M.

Present: Supervisor Gerald L. Deming, Council Members: Lynn Parnell, Norman Gates, Frank Rose Jr. and David Deuel

Absent: None

Others: George Worden Jr. (Highway Superintendent), Patricia and Dean Gardner, Amos Smith, Kirk Richenberg and Dustin Geiger

Supervisor Deming opened the Town Board Meeting at 7:45 p.m. and invited Mr. Worden to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

RESOLUTION offered by Mr. Gates and seconded by Mrs. Parnell to approve the minutes of the November 5<sup>th</sup> Town Board Meeting. Voted on and approved, Yes-5, No-0.

HIGHWAY REPORT

Mr. Worden reported the following for the Highway Department:

- Much work has been done by the Department assisting the County with the flooding matter up by Craig Station. New pipe was installed, which was paid for by the County.
- The department wedged Federal Road for the County as well.
- All trucks are now ready for the winter season

Supervisor Deming asked about the status of Cowan Road. Mr. Worden stated repairs to be done are located on the same side of the barn. We can see where the pavement is checker boarded (broken up) and believe moisture is under the road. The solution will probably be to re-tile and re-construct the base. Mr. Worden added, none of the Town's existing roads had construction fabric under them.

WATER/SEWER REPORT

Mr. Worden reported the following for the Water and Sewer Department:

- We continue to work on McVean Road water project. We flushed and chlorinated, but after testing, did not pass. We will be conducting further testing next week. Steve Morsch Pipeline drilled under the creek this past week, that end will be flushed and sampled as well. Driveway work will take place next week.
- Route 36 Water main replacement: Randsco will be proceeding with taps tomorrow, and tie-ins will take place over the next two weeks.
- Retsof Treatment Facility is running smoothly, no issues to contend with.
- After the recent power outage, the sewer stations had to be checked and verified that all were working properly. One alarm went off on Retsof Avenue station due to the fact it was a manual unit, and had to be re-set by hand.

## OLD BUSINESS

### 1) Agriculture Fire Tax Update:

Councilman Deuel stated he has prepared a breakdown of fire tax information for a 4 year period. (See attached sheets) Mr. Deuel commented that he reviewed tax rolls for the years: 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015 in order to give fire tax comparisons between Agriculture, Business and Residential. Mr. Deuel stated he used the same farms to compare total assessment for those 4 years.

Councilman Deuel summarized that Farms A, B & C had the same number of parcels over the time frame, with D & E purchasing more parcels over the years. The assessment you see is Full Value Assessment, including buildings and shops. Mr. Deuel stated farms A & B were pretty constant. Mr. Deuel reviewed the final sheet of his report, noting that if the Town had changed the way they assessed agricultural properties for 2015, the fire tax would have gone from \$.74 cents per thousand (full value) to \$.91 cents per thousand. (Ag. value assessment)

Mr. Richenberg asked Mr. Deuel what relevance this has. Councilman Deuel responded the proposal is to use agriculture value assessment rather than full value for the fire tax. The tax would be lower to open land agricultural properties that require minimal to no service. Mr. Deuel commented, after review of the information, he would welcome any questions in the future on the subject.

**2000**

**Agriculture**

<b>Farm Name</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>Farm "A"</b>	<b>\$ 418,500.00</b>	<b>\$ 1119.00</b>	<b>\$ 337.00</b>
<b>Farm "B"</b>	<b>670,800.00</b>	<b>1643.00</b>	<b>534.00</b>
<b>Farm "C"</b>	<b>567,900.00</b>	<b>1328.00</b>	<b>477.00</b>
<b>Farm "D"</b>	<b>1,080,700.00</b>	<b>3120.00</b>	<b>900.00</b>
<b>Farm "E"</b>	<b>2,188,600.00</b>	<b>5804.00</b>	<b>1824.00</b>

**Business**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>#1</b>	<b>\$4,060,500.00</b>	<b>\$13,219.00</b>	<b>\$3,387.00</b>
<b>#2</b>	<b>246,900.00</b>	<b>725.00</b>	<b>193.00</b>
<b>#3</b>	<b>175,900.00</b>	<b>776.00</b>	<b>150.00</b>
<b>#4</b>	<b>165,700.00</b>	<b>649.00</b>	<b>141.00</b>
<b>#5</b>	<b>98,500.00</b>	<b>435.00</b>	<b>84.00</b>

**Residence**

<b>Family</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>"A"</b>	<b>\$ 88,000.00</b>	<b>\$388.00</b>	<b>\$ 75.00</b>
<b>"B"</b>	<b>98,600.00</b>	<b>435.00</b>	<b>84.00</b>
<b>"C"</b>	<b>128,100.00</b>	<b>565.00</b>	<b>109.00</b>
<b>"D"</b>	<b>29,600.00</b>	<b>131.00</b>	<b>25.00</b>
<b>"E"</b>	<b>80,800.00</b>	<b>357.00</b>	<b>69.00</b>

**2005**

**Agriculture**

<u>Farm Name</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Town Tax</u>	<u>Fire Tax</u>
<b>Farm "A"</b>	<b>\$ 533,370.00</b>	<b>\$1169.00</b>	<b>\$ 417.00</b>
<b>Farm "B"</b>	<b>824,674.00</b>	<b>2017.00</b>	<b>643.00</b>
<b>Farm "C"</b>	<b>805,436.00</b>	<b>1583.00</b>	<b>641.00</b>
<b>Farm "D"</b>	<b>2,077,607.00</b>	<b>4141.00</b>	<b>1610.00</b>
<b>Farm "E"</b>	<b>3,712,066.00</b>	<b>8658.00</b>	<b>2820.00</b>

**Business**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Town Tax</u>	<u>Fire Tax</u>
<b>#1</b>	<b>\$4,630,000.00</b>	<b>\$15,982.00</b>	<b>\$3705.00</b>
<b>#2</b>	<b>233,587.00</b>	<b>803.00</b>	<b>186.00</b>
<b>#3</b>	<b>311,413.00</b>	<b>1241.00</b>	<b>251.00</b>
<b>#4</b>	<b>146,848.00</b>	<b>547.00</b>	<b>118.00</b>
<b>#5</b>	<b>138,478.00</b>	<b>572.00</b>	<b>111.00</b>

**Residence**

<u>Family</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Town Tax</u>	<u>Fire Tax</u>
<b>"A"</b>	<b>\$116,630.00</b>	<b>\$482.00</b>	<b>\$ 94.00</b>
<b>"B"</b>	<b>113,478.00</b>	<b>469.00</b>	<b>91.00</b>
<b>"C"</b>	<b>133,804.00</b>	<b>553.00</b>	<b>108.00</b>
<b>"D"</b>	<b>91,630.00</b>	<b>378.00</b>	<b>74.00</b>
<b>"E"</b>	<b>103,152.00</b>	<b>426.00</b>	<b>83.00</b>

**2010**

**Agriculture**

<b>Farm Name</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>Farm "A"</b>	<b>\$ 675,400.00</b>	<b>\$ 1110.00</b>	<b>\$ 519.00</b>
<b>Farm "B"</b>	<b>916,200.00</b>	<b>1624.00</b>	<b>709.00</b>
<b>Farm "C"</b>	<b>1,098,600.00</b>	<b>1578.00</b>	<b>857.00</b>
<b>Farm "D"</b>	<b>2,524,200.00</b>	<b>4261.00</b>	<b>1931.00</b>
<b>Farm "E"</b>	<b>5,033,300.00</b>	<b>9020.00</b>	<b>3778.00</b>

**Business**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>#1</b>	<b>\$2,496,200.00</b>	<b>\$9695.00</b>	<b>\$1953.00</b>
<b>#2</b>	<b>254,800.00</b>	<b>1068.00</b>	<b>199.00</b>
<b>#3</b>	<b>323,700.00</b>	<b>1357.00</b>	<b>253.00</b>
<b>#4</b>	<b>171,000.00</b>	<b>717.00</b>	<b>134.00</b>
<b>#5</b>	<b>130,000.00</b>	<b>545.00</b>	<b>102.00</b>

**Residence**

<b>Family</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>"A"</b>	<b>\$144,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 604.00</b>	<b>\$ 113.00</b>
<b>"B"</b>	<b>155,400.00</b>	<b>651.00</b>	<b>122.00</b>
<b>"C"</b>	<b>155,400.00</b>	<b>651.00</b>	<b>122.00</b>
<b>"D"</b>	<b>84,600.00</b>	<b>354.00</b>	<b>66.00</b>
<b>"E"</b>	<b>120,000.00</b>	<b>503.00</b>	<b>94.00</b>

**2015**

**Agriculture**

<b>Farm Name</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>Farm "A"</b>	<b>\$1,090,200.00</b>	<b>\$ 1436.00</b>	<b>\$ 806.00</b>
<b>Farm "B"</b>	<b>1,409,700.00</b>	<b>2141.00</b>	<b>1039.00</b>
<b>Farm "C"</b>	<b>2,066,700.00</b>	<b>2428.00</b>	<b>1528.00</b>
<b>Farm "D"</b>	<b>4,042,300.00</b>	<b>7085.00</b>	<b>2953.00</b>
<b>Farm "E"</b>	<b>8,809,500.00</b>	<b>11,954.00</b>	<b>6423.00</b>

**Business**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>#1</b>	<b>\$2,780,700.00</b>	<b>\$11,230.00</b>	<b>\$2058.00</b>
<b>#2</b>	<b>254,800.00</b>	<b>1085.00</b>	<b>189.00</b>
<b>#3</b>	<b>392,700.00</b>	<b>1673.00</b>	<b>291.00</b>
<b>#4</b>	<b>171,000.00</b>	<b>728.00</b>	<b>127.00</b>
<b>#5</b>	<b>130,000.00</b>	<b>554.00</b>	<b>96.00</b>

**Residence**

<b>Family</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Town Tax</b>	<b>Fire Tax</b>
<b>"A"</b>	<b>\$147,900.00</b>	<b>\$630.00</b>	<b>\$110.00</b>
<b>"B"</b>	<b>163,400.00</b>	<b>696.00</b>	<b>121.00</b>
<b>"C"</b>	<b>180,900.00</b>	<b>771.00</b>	<b>134.00</b>
<b>"D"</b>	<b>84,600.00</b>	<b>360.00</b>	<b>63.00</b>
<b>"E"</b>	<b>132,300.00</b>	<b>564.00</b>	<b>98.00</b>



### Fire Tax Comparisons

#### Agriculture

Farm Name	2000	2005	2010	2015
Farm "A"	\$ 337.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 519.00	\$ 806.00
Farm "B"	534.00	643.00	709.00	1039.00
Farm "C"	477.00	641.00	857.00	1528.00
Farm "D"	900.00	1610.00	1931.00	2953.00
Farm "E"	1824.00	2820.00	3778.00	6423.00

#### Business

Name	2000	2005	2010	2015
#1	\$3387.00	\$3705.00	\$1953.00	\$2058.00
#2	193.00	186.00	199.00	189.00
#3	150.00	251.00	253.00	291.00
#4	141.00	118.00	134.00	127.00
#5	84.00	111.00	102.00	96.00

#### Residence

Family	2000	2005	2010	2015
"A"	\$ 75.00	\$ 94.00	\$113.00	\$110.00
"B"	84.00	91.00	122.00	121.00
"C"	109.00	108.00	122.00	134.00
"D"	25.00	74.00	66.00	63.00
"E"	69.00	83.00	94.00	98.00

**2015 Old Fire Tax and Proposed Fire Tax**

**.74/1000 full value, .91/1000 Ag value assessments**

**Agriculture**

<u>Farm</u>	<u>Old Fire Tax</u>	<u>Proposed Fire Tax</u>
<b>Farm "A"</b>	<b>\$ 806.00</b>	<b>\$ 311.00</b>
<b>Farm "B"</b>	<b>1039.00</b>	<b>457.00</b>
<b>Farm "C"</b>	<b>1528.00</b>	<b>605.00</b>
<b>Farm "D"</b>	<b>2953.00</b>	<b>1518.00</b>
<b>Farm "E"</b>	<b>6423.00</b>	<b>3076.00</b>

**Business**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Old Fire Tax</u>	<u>Proposed Fire Tax</u>
<b>#1</b>	<b>\$2058.00</b>	<b>\$2530.00</b>
<b>#2</b>	<b>189.00</b>	<b>231.00</b>
<b>#3</b>	<b>291.00</b>	<b>357.00</b>
<b>#4</b>	<b>127.00</b>	<b>156.00</b>
<b>#5</b>	<b>96.00</b>	<b>118.00</b>

**Residence**

<u>Family</u>	<u>Old Fire Tax</u>	<u>Proposed Fire Tax</u>
<b>"A"</b>	<b>\$110.00</b>	<b>\$135.00</b>
<b>"B"</b>	<b>121.00</b>	<b>149.00</b>
<b>"C"</b>	<b>134.00</b>	<b>165.00</b>
<b>"D"</b>	<b>63.00</b>	<b>77.00</b>
<b>"E"</b>	<b>98.00</b>	<b>120.00</b>

New Business

1) Teen Youth Award Nomination:

Supervisor Deming reported that the Livingston County Teen Recognition Committee has sent us information pertaining to this year's event. If any Board member has a potential nominee, please contact the Livingston County Youth Board directly.

2) Randsco Pipeline, Inc.

Supervisor Deming stated in the bills this evening is Pay Application #2 for Randsco Pipeline, Inc. for the Route 36 water main project. The amount due to them at this scheduled time is \$339,416.53.

3) Board of Assessment Review:

Supervisor Deming reported that the Board received one letter of interest for the position on the Board of Assessment Review.

RESOLUTION offered by Mr. Rose and seconded by Mrs. Parnell to re-appoint Dwayne Dougal to the Board of Assessment Review, for a period of 5 years, term expiring September 30, 2020. Voted on and approved, Yes-5, No-0.

Bills

RESOLUTION offered by Mr. Gates and seconded by Mrs. Parnell to approve all claims brought before the Board.

• General Fund Claim	#368-375	\$ 4,005.91
• Joint Water and Sewer	#272-283	\$ 2,536.71
• Youth Fund Claim	#8-9	\$340,024.45
• Highway Fund Claim	#204-207	\$ 4,031.43

ADJOURNMENT

RESOLUTION offered by Mrs. Parnell and seconded by Mr. Rose to adjourn the Town Board Meeting until December 10<sup>th</sup>. Voted on and approved, Yes-5, No-0.

Town Board Meeting closed at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine M. Harris, Clerk







