

# **TOWN OF WILTON**

**22 TRAVER ROAD**

**WILTON, NEW YORK**

**PHONE: 518-587-1939**

**FAX: 518-587-2837**

Susan Baldwin, Town Clerk

## **REGULAR TOWN BOARD MEETING**

The town board meeting for the Town of Wilton on May 7, 2026 was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Supervisor Sturm

Supervisor Sturm requested a moment of silence in recognition of the May 6, 2026 passing of Mr. Richard "Rich" McCane, a longtime employee of the Highway Department. Mr. McCane had worked for the department for over thirty years, retired approximately five years earlier, and will be deeply missed by his colleagues. A moment of silence was observed.

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Supervisor Sturm opened the meeting, and those present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **ROLL CALL**

Roll Call by the Town Clerk showed the following board members present:

Toni Sturm-Supervisor  
Connor Rohan-Councilman  
Joe Keneally-Councilman  
Ray O'Connor-Councilman

Erinn Kolligian-Councilwoman was excused

Also present was Ryan K. Riper, P. E., Director of Planning and Engineering, Maria Moran, CPA, Comptroller and Mark Schachner, Town Counsel.

## **PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE HONORING ROBERTA (ROBIN) CORRIGAN**

Supervisor Sturm presented a plaque to the family of Mrs. Robin Corrigan. She explained that Mrs. Corrigan, the former director of the Senior Center, had been very active in her role and was known for her care and attentiveness to the seniors who visited the center. She often went out of her way for them, including preparing meals and generally going above and beyond her formal duties. Supervisor Sturm invited members of her family to come forward, including her sister, Mrs. Collins; her brother, Mr. Steve Green; and her father, Mr. Ralph Green. Supervisor Sturm noted that Mrs. Corrigan's husband was unable to be present but was there in spirit.

A plaque bearing Mrs. Corrigan's photograph and a written expression of appreciation was presented to the family. The family's wish was that the plaque be displayed at the Senior Center, and Supervisor Sturm agreed that this would be appropriate. She expressed condolences to the family, acknowledging both their loss and the community's sense of sorrow at Mrs. Corrigan's passing..

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Pickett explained that he wished to address an issue concerning a parcel of property that the town had obtained from him approximately three years earlier, intended to be used as public open space. He described the property as approximately eighty-seven acres on the east side of town, off Ruggles Road and extending back toward Edie Road. The property had been transferred to the town as part of a transfer of development rights arrangement, under which a developer received transferable development rights to create additional lots elsewhere instead of developing this parcel, which was then conveyed to the town.

Mr. Pickett stated that he believed the property was not being adequately maintained as open space. He reported increased use of the property by off-road vehicles, including motorcycles and ATVs, and noted evidence of dumping, such as construction debris, burn barrels, and other materials. While he could not definitively state that this activity was coming from adjoining property owners, he strongly suspected that it was. He pointed out that the town parcel effectively surrounds one private property on three sides and another on two sides, and that he had seen the situation worsen between the previous fall and the present time.

He described the creation of motocross-style trails, with mounds and ruts that disturbed the soil, and said that trees had been cut or pushed over using equipment such as a front-end loader or tractor with a bucket. Mr. Pickett said his purpose was to bring this situation to the town's attention and to request action to improve it. He indicated that he would be very willing to work with the town to address the problems. He also noted there were specific access points from adjoining properties directly onto the areas of concern. He concluded by stating that if the town did not wish to maintain the property as open space, he would be willing to take the property back.

Mr. Riper said that the property had been acquired through the transfer of development rights process, which took about two years, and that the parcel was officially transferred to the town in June 2023. The relevant town board meeting and sections of the town code governing the transfer were referenced.

Mr. Riper, together with Scott Harrington, from the town, had visited the property the previous year, observed some debris, and believed that new signs had been posted at

that time, as the property is a single town-owned parcel. They had not, however, visited yet that year.

After reviewing the photographs supplied by Mr. Pickett, Mr. Riper acknowledged that the trails now appeared to be more heavily used than they had been the prior year. Mr. Pickett noted that he had seen one sign on a gate at Ruggles Road but had not observed any signs at other access points; if additional signs had been installed, he believed they had been removed.

Mr. Riper stated that additional “No Trespassing” or similar signs could be posted and that code enforcement officers could contact nearby property owners to make them aware that using the land in that manner constituted trespassing and damage to town property. They also mentioned that the Sheriff’s Office could be involved if necessary.

Mr. Pickett then recounted that, when he still owned the property ten to twelve years earlier, he had cooperated with the town, including working with Mr. Mark Mykins, to involve the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, because riders had been traveling across his land, the town’s land, and into adjacent Nature Conservancy wetlands. At that time, the County Sheriff’s Office had also been involved, and there had been direct conversations with those responsible. He stated that this combination of enforcement and the fact that some of the riders had aged out of minor status, and thus faced more serious consequences, had been effective in reducing the activity.

Mr. Pickett thanked the board for listening. He was asked to leave his contact information, including his telephone number, so that the town could follow up. The board and staff thanked him for bringing the matter forward, and public comment on that issue concluded.

Public comment continued with Ms. Joanne Klepetar. Ms. Klepetar raised two matters. First, she referred to ongoing difficulties in having the speed limit reduced on Parkhurst. She asked whether, in light of those difficulties, the town could instead install “Slow Down” signs on Parkhurst, similar to those already in place at Gavin Park.

Second, she referred to expenditures related to the town’s pickleball project, as reflected in the Comptroller’s report. She stated that she expected Ms. Moran, the Town Comptroller, would explain the details later in the meeting, but expressed concern that the project might have been underbid merely to secure the contract.

## **MINUTES**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #143**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the minutes from the April 2, 2026 meeting, as typed.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

**11 ROSE TERRACE-LAND CONVEYANCE**

Supervisor Sturm said the next item concerned the property at 11 Rose Terrace and a request for a lot line adjustment. The applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Wertans, introduced themselves as the owners of 11 Rose Terrace. They explained that on one edge of their driveway, between the driveway and a stormwater retention pond constructed as part of their subdivision, there is a narrow strip of land that is technically owned by the town. The property line runs along the edge of their driveway, and in fact, a portion of the paved driveway lies on town-owned land.

Mr. and Mrs. Wertans said that they had been maintaining this strip as part of their yard since they moved in. The area consists of lawn, bushes, and some trees, and includes a small shed that sits on gravel and is not a permanent structure. They emphasized that the strip is not large enough to support separate development. They therefore requested a lot line adjustment so that the strip could be formally added to their property. They presented a map and photographs to the board to show the location and character of the strip.

Mr. Riper explained that the strip lies within a stormwater management area that buffers the retention pond. However, he stated that transferring ownership of this particular strip to the homeowners would have no detrimental impact on the stormwater function. There is a substantial vegetative buffer, and the access needed for maintenance of the stormwater facility is located on the opposite side. He said that the town's primary interest in this land is as a buffer area and that, if the strip were conveyed to Mr. and Mrs. Wertans, they would effectively continue to maintain the buffer as they already had been doing.

The homeowners recounted that, at the time of their home purchase, they had been led to believe that this strip was part of their lot. On the day of closing, some crushed stone that had extended their driveway farther into the strip was removed to correct an encroachment issue so that the transaction could proceed. Shortly thereafter, the builder, Mr. Dave Trojanski, had the driveway repaved to restore its full width and told them he would resolve the underlying property issue with the town. Mr. and Mrs. Wertans said they had been told over the course of roughly eight and a half to nine years that the matter would be taken care of, but then Mr. Trojanski sold his own home and left the area, and the issue was never formally corrected.

They noted that the situation is problematic for potential resale, because they would be obliged to disclose that only part of the driveway is actually on their property. They also mentioned that their sprinkler heads extend into the strip that is technically town-owned, which they have mowed and landscaped as part of their yard for nearly a decade.

Board members asked Mr. Riper whether there were any restrictions on landscaping within that portion of the stormwater area, such as limits on shrub or tree sizes or types of plantings. Mr. Riper responded that the homeowners would not be expanding beyond the existing buffer area and that their current use—grass, shrubs, and ornamental plantings—would not adversely affect the stormwater system. He noted that access for maintenance of the retention area is via a gravel drive that lies behind a row of white pines that had been planted by Mr. Trojanski.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan raised a broader concern about how to prevent similar problems in the future, where a builder appears to represent or treat land as part of a lot when it in fact belongs to the town or to a homeowners' association. It was acknowledged that this situation likely arose from a surveying or subdivision layout issue and that, while unfortunate, it is somewhat unusual.

There was general agreement among board members that, given Mr. and Mrs. Wertans' long-term maintenance of the strip, their reasonable belief at the time of purchase that they owned it, the practical need to have a full, usable driveway, and the limited independent utility of the strip to the town, it was reasonable to convey the strip to them.

Town Counsel, Mr. Mark Schachner, was asked to explain the legal steps required. Referring to prior guidance from the office of Mr. Brian Reichenbach, he explained that, under New York law, before the town may convey town-owned property, the board must first determine that the property is not needed for town purposes. Once that determination is made, the town must establish the fair market value of the property or of any easement

to be granted. Upon establishing that value, the town board may adopt a resolution authorizing the conveyance, subject to a permissive referendum.

Mr. Schachner then explained the permissive referendum process. He stated that it does not mean the matter automatically goes to a public vote. Rather, after the board acts, a statutory period follows in which a sufficient number of qualified electors may file a petition requesting a referendum. Only if such a petition is properly filed would the matter go to a public vote. He described this as an older mechanism that is rarely invoked in practice.

The board then discussed how to establish the fair market value of the strip. The size of the parcel was estimated to be approximately 180 feet by 35 feet, or roughly 6,300 square feet. Board members asked whether the town assessor could provide a value. Mr. Schachner stated it would be appropriate for the Town Assessor to provide an estimate or assessment of fair market value.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

#### **RESOLUTION #144**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the sale of a 6300 sf +/- adjacent portion of tax map number 154.-5-7 at fair market value, from the Town of Wilton to Scott and Susan Wertans, subject to permissive referendum.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

#### **CODE AMENDMENT-TEMPORARY MERCHANT CERTIFICATE**

Deputy Supervisor Rohan explained that the proposed amendments were the result of the committee's recent work. He stated that "temporary merchants" are businesses that come into town to operate for a limited period without establishing a permanent physical location. A typical example would be a seasonal fruit stand operating in a parking lot or on a roadside parcel for several months each year.

He said that the current section of the town code governing temporary merchants is more complicated than it needs to be. At present, the code allows a temporary merchant certificate for only five months and requires additional Planning Board review for merchants who wish to operate in subsequent years. The proposed amendments would extend the allowable duration to six months and remove the requirement for repeated Planning Board approvals in future years, provided that certain basic conditions continue to be met.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan emphasized that the primary goals were simplification, streamlining, and ensuring that temporary merchants are properly documented and insured. Under the revised language, a temporary merchant would need to demonstrate permission from the property owner for use of the land, provide proof of liability insurance, and obtain the necessary certificate from the town, but would no longer be subjected to unnecessary layers of repeated review once established and operating in compliance.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan clarified that short-term food trucks appearing for a single event or for one evening at a park festival would not ordinarily be treated as temporary merchants under this section. By contrast, a vendor such as a fireworks seller who sets up a tent and operates in one location for a week or two would be considered a temporary merchant and thus covered by this code section.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan noted that the town's Counsel, Brian Reichenbach, had provided comments on the draft, and that some wording changes would be made before the public hearing. These changes would not alter the substance of the proposal, which remains focused on simplifying the process and making it more predictable for both merchants and the town.

Supervisor Sturm summarized that the intention was to make it easier for legitimate temporary merchants to do business in Wilton, while ensuring that the town still has appropriate oversight and that landowners and the public are protected. Deputy Supervisor Rohan agreed that this was an accurate description of the committee's intent.

On a motion introduced by Councilman Keneally, the board adopted the following resolution:

### **RESOLUTION #145**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT  
RESOLVED,** to set a public hearing  
on June 4, 2026 at 7:00 p.m. for the

proposed code amendments for a Temporary Merchant Certificate.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O'Connor, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

### **BESS MORATORIUM**

Deputy Supervisor Rohan began by explaining what battery energy storage systems are. At the residential scale, they can take the form of home battery units paired with rooftop solar panels, allowing homeowners to store electricity generated during the day for use at night or during power outages. At the commercial or utility scale, BESS facilities are large installations composed of extensive banks of batteries that can store and later release substantial amounts of electrical energy drawn from the grid or from renewable generation sources. Their operation is typically governed by pre-programmed schedules or algorithms that determine when they charge and discharge.

He noted that throughout New York State, many municipalities are experiencing significant development pressure from companies seeking to site large-scale BESS projects. Because the technology has developed rapidly, many local zoning codes, including Wilton's, do not yet contain detailed, up-to-date provisions that specifically address where and how such facilities should be located. In some communities, this lack of clear regulation has led to proposals for BESS installations in locations that may be incompatible with surrounding uses or that do not adequately account for emergency response considerations.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan explained that BESS technologies are not all the same. They differ in battery chemistry, design, and safety characteristics. Some use newer and more stable chemistries with enhanced safety features, while others rely on older or less expensive chemistries that may pose greater risks in the event of malfunction or physical damage. These differences have direct implications for public safety, environmental impact, and the demands placed on local fire and emergency services.

He emphasized that from the standpoint of local fire departments and emergency responders, BESS facilities pose unique challenges. In particular, the phenomenon of "thermal runaway" in certain battery chemistries can lead to fires that are difficult or impossible to extinguish using conventional firefighting methods. In some cases, the safest course may be to isolate the affected unit and allow it to burn out under controlled conditions, which raises concerns about toxic emissions and prolonged incident management. He noted that many departments across the state, including Wilton's, do not yet have all the specialized training, equipment, and procedures needed to respond optimally to a large-scale BESS incident.

At the same time, Deputy Supervisor Rohan acknowledged that BESS technology offers significant benefits. When paired with solar power, BESS can extend the availability of clean energy beyond daylight hours. When used to store electricity during off-peak times and release it during peak demand, BESS can help reduce reliance on fossil-fuel-powered peaker plants, which may lead to more stable energy costs and improved environmental outcomes for residents.

He stressed that the proposed moratorium is not intended as a permanent prohibition on BESS facilities in Wilton. Instead, it is a temporary pause, proposed for a duration of twelve months, during which the town would not accept or process applications for new BESS facilities. The purpose of this pause is to give the town sufficient time to conduct a thorough review of the technology, consult with subject-matter experts and emergency services, gather input from the public, and draft comprehensive code provisions that clearly define where BESS facilities may be located and under what conditions.

During the moratorium period, the code and zoning revision committee would work on identifying appropriate zoning districts for BESS, establishing siting and setback standards, specifying acceptable battery chemistries and system designs, and ensuring that any future projects include robust safety, monitoring, and emergency response plans. The goal is to ensure that once the moratorium expires, any BESS projects considered in Wilton will be evaluated under clear, well-considered regulations that protect public safety and the environment.

Town Counsel, Mr. Mark Schachner, then addressed the language of the draft moratorium law. He proposed three minor but important textual revisions. First, in the section titled "Moratorium Imposed," he recommended that the phrase "no application shall be accepted" be revised to "no application shall be accepted or processed," making explicit that both the acceptance of new applications and the further processing of existing applications are suspended during the moratorium period.

Second, in the section titled "Termination," he suggested clarifying that the moratorium "may be terminated by the town board upon its discretion and/or earlier than the expiration date upon the enactment of local legislation." This wording confirms that the town board has the authority to end the moratorium earlier than twelve months if, as a matter of policy, it determines that appropriate permanent regulations are already in place.

Third, he requested that all references in the draft to "town attorney" be corrected to "town counsel," which accurately reflects his and his firm's role for the Town of Wilton.

Mr. Schachner also advised the board and the public that even with a local moratorium, there remains a possibility that very large BESS facilities could, in some circumstances, be approved through state-level processes administered by the New York State Office of Renewable Energy Siting. In such cases, state approvals can supersede certain local actions. Nevertheless, he emphasized that adopting a moratorium and then detailed local

regulations is still an important step, as it will govern those facilities that fall within the town's direct jurisdiction and will provide a clear statement of the town's standards and expectations.

Members of the board briefly discussed the broader legal framework. It was mentioned that BESS facilities, particularly at larger scales, may be treated similarly to other utility infrastructure for zoning purposes, which can make outright, permanent bans difficult to sustain legally. Careful and well-reasoned regulation was viewed as the more defensible long-term approach.

The board also noted that the Emergency Services Planning Committee had expressed strong support for a temporary moratorium, given the unresolved safety and response issues. It was expected that representatives from the fire department and emergency medical services would attend the forthcoming public hearing to share their professional perspectives.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

### **RESOLUTION #146**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to set a public hearing for proposed Local Law #3 of 2026 for a twelve month BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) Moratorium for June 4, 2026 at 7:01 p.m.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

### **BUILDING DEPARTMENT FEE UPDATES**

The supervisor explains that this topic is something the town has been working on, primarily through the two main staff in the building department, John Herlihy and Marcus Hart. The town has not updated its building department fees in many years, and these fees are a significant source of revenue.

To prepare the proposal, the building department gathered information from nearby towns on what they charge. Copies of an oversized spreadsheet are available on the table, showing a comparison of fees among surrounding communities. The intent is to bring

Wilton's fees up to date in a way that is appropriate for current conditions and consistent with neighboring towns. The supervisor adds that the Town of Wilton has no town tax, so its fees should probably be most closely aligned with a town like Malta, which has a similar population of about 18,000 and also has no town tax.

In the spreadsheet, the first column shows Wilton's current fees, and the last column shows the recommended new fees. Some entries reference specific sections of the town code, but overall, the supervisor feels the building department has put substantial work into these recommendations and that they appear reasonable. The details will be discussed further at a public hearing.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan asks several questions about specific fees. First, he asks about the fees for single-wide and double-wide manufactured homes and who typically pays them. John Herlihy, Senior Building Inspector explains that the fee is generally paid by the applicant. The Supervisor clarifies that, in practice, this is usually the renter who owns the home but rents the lot.

The board member then asks about the proposed fee for commercial stop-work posting and removal and what that process involves. John explains that commercial stop-work orders are not issued very often. In his experience, there have been no recent problems with non-commercial projects, but if a builder is not following approved plans or is doing work on the site that is not in compliance with code, the town will issue a stop-work order and post the site. Work must stop until the violation is corrected. The fee is associated with removing that posting after the issue has been remedied.

The Supervisor notes that Halfmoon, which is in some ways a sister community, charges a relatively high fee of about five hundred dollars for removing a stop-work order, for both commercial and residential cases. By comparison, Wilton's proposal is to charge one hundred dollars for residential and three hundred dollars for commercial.

The board member then asks how revenue from the manufactured home permits is doing in general, and whether the fee is a one-time charge or recurring. John confirms that the manufactured home permit fee is a one-time fee for the permit, not an annual fee.

Next, the board member raises questions about the proposed fees for residential and commercial solar installations. He points out that the proposed amounts are significantly higher than what some other towns are charging, and comments that solar is something the town likely wants to encourage. He asks what the logic is behind setting the fees at that level.

Mr. Herlihy responds that many towns base solar permit fees on the square footage of the solar array, often with a minimum fee. In practice, the minimum is usually what gets charged for residential systems, because the size of the array rarely exceeds the threshold that would increase the fee. He explains that most residential solar systems are installed on the roofs of single-family homes and typically cover about half the roof, which generally keeps them within the minimum fee level of 150 dollars.

The Supervisor notes that the Code and Zoning Revision Committee will be working on broader solar regulations and policy. Given that, she suggests that perhaps the residential and commercial solar fee items should be pulled out of this general fee update and addressed specifically as part of the committee's more detailed work on solar. The board member replies that they could simply leave those items in the draft for now, go ahead and set the public hearing, and then make adjustments later, after the committee has had a chance to discuss solar in more depth at its upcoming meeting.

They agree that the purpose of the public hearing is to put the proposal out for public comment and that modest revisions can still be made between now and then. The supervisor adds that much of the broader policy discussion about solar tends to be organized by system size in megawatts and grouped into tiers, whereas the draft fee schedule just distinguishes between residential and commercial. She notes that the committee will likely examine a more detailed tiered structure—such as four tiers with specific megawatt ranges—when it works on solar code language, and that these policy decisions may later influence how fees are structured.

The board member agrees that the committee can take a closer look at those details on Monday and that any necessary revisions to the solar fees can be made afterward. The supervisor agrees that this approach makes sense.

On a motion introduced by Councilman Keneally, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #147**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT  
RESOLVED**, to set a public hearing  
for proposed amendments to Building  
Department Fees for June 4, 2026 at  
7:02 p.m.

The adoption of the resolution was  
seconded by Deputy Supervisor

Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor  
the motion passed 4-0.

### **DEMOLITION OF BUILDING AT CAMP SARATOGA**

Wilton Wildlife Preserve and Park has requested to demolish an existing building and construct a new one. Councilman O’Conor summarized that, over many months, Margo Olson and members of the Board of Trustees of the Wilton Wildlife Preserve and Park, along with trustees Steve Wilcox and Larry , had been working with Mr. Riper and Scott Harrington on a plan regarding one of the older buildings at the preserve. The proposal was to demolish an ageing structure and replace it with a new building that would consolidate preserve operations and serve multiple purposes.

Because the land is town-owned, a memorandum of understanding was drafted to set forth the responsibilities of both the town and the Wilton Wildlife Preserve. Under the draft agreement, Mr. Harrington would use town staff and equipment to perform the demolition and rough grading, at no additional cost beyond existing staffing and equipment schedules. The preserve would be responsible for contracting and paying for the construction of the new building and for carting away demolition debris. Mr. Riper would assist by overseeing aspects of the work and coordinating between the preserve and the town’s departments.

Ms. Olson noted that the preserve had received a state grant that would reimburse a portion of their project costs. She explained that she was working with the state to modify the original grant scope from “renovation” of the existing building to “demolition and new construction.” She also reminded the board that, under an earlier town board resolution securing the grant, the town had committed to providing “in-kind” contributions to support the project. The proposed demolition work by town staff would fulfill that prior commitment in a different but equivalent form.

Mr. Riper mentioned a few minor edits that would be made to the memorandum of understanding before signing, including clarifications that the town’s work would be limited to demolition and rough grading, and that the preserve would apply for all necessary building permits and comply with building department requirements.

A question was asked whether all expenditures for the building project would be paid directly out of the Wilton Wildlife Preserve’s accounts, and Ms. Olson confirmed that the preserve would issue and pay the construction invoices, as had done in the earlier phase of the project. The town’s role was limited to the in-kind demolition and grading work.

A question was also raised as to the expected duration of the demolition work. Ms. Olson indicated that volunteers would be cleaning out the building immediately so that Mr.

Harrington could proceed efficiently once he was ready to schedule the demolition. It was noted that Mr. Harrington was approaching retirement, so there was an interest in beginning the work soon. The Comptroller indicated that she would like to record the value of the donated capital asset on the town's books when the project is complete and asked the preserve to provide total project cost figures at that time. Ms. Margo agreed to coordinate on that.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #148**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the Memo of Understanding (MOU) between the Town of Wilton and Wilton Wildlife Preserve and Park.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

**ADA COMPLIANT DOORS-REQUEST TO BID**

Supervisor Sturm said there is a request for authorization to solicit bids for the installation of ADA-compliant automatic doors at town facilities. The Supervisor explained that currently none of the main town buildings have doors that can be opened via push-button by persons using wheelchairs or others who require such accommodation. The proposal was to install one ADA-compliant automatic entrance door at each of the principal facilities: Gavin Park, Town Hall, Town Court, the Senior Center, and the Highway Department building. The estimated cost per door installation was approximately eight thousand dollars.

The Supervisor noted that a potential economic development grant might be used to offset some or all of the cost, but that this had not yet been finalized. In the absence of grant funding, the town could treat the improvements as capital assets and fund them from the town's fund balance.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #149**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the request to bid for ADA accessible doors for Town Hall, Town Court, Senior Center, Highway Department and Gavin Park.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.Ms.

### **RESIGNATION-BOARD OF ASSESSMENT REVIEW**

Supervisor Sturm noted Marty Ladue, a longtime member of the Board of Assessment Review has resigned from her position. The Supervisor stated that the board needed formally to accept the resignation.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board accepted the following resolution:

### **RESOLUTION #150**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to accept the resignation of Marti LaDue from the Board of Assessment Review, with regret and gratitude for her many years of service.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

### **30 DAY WAIVER FOR LIQUOR LICENSE**

The board considered a request for a 30-day waiver related to a liquor license application by Rustic Pizza, owned by Mr. Brian Brumley. The Supervisor explained that Mr. Brumley had previously requested such a waiver but had run out of time and was therefore making the request again. The waiver relates to the standard 30-day waiting period for municipal

review that the State Liquor Authority observes before issuing certain licenses. Mr. Brumley was applying to serve beer, wine, and cider.

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, the board adopted the following resolution:

### **RESOLUTION #151**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to waive the 30 day advance notice for a liquor license application for Rustic Pizza.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor the motion passed 4-0.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Deputy Supervisor Rohan reported first on the Safety Committee, which oversees safety for town employees and buildings. He stated that the Highway Department had recently completed AED and CPR training, and he thanked both the organizers and department staff for their participation.

He then reported on the Code and Zoning Revision Committee. He noted that the committee had recently had a productive meeting at which they had recommended the BESS moratorium and the temporary merchant code amendments that the board had just acted on. He mentioned a third pending code revision concerning “breakaway points” on cell towers, which the committee was still reviewing, including consultation with cell service providers.

Deputy Supervisor Rohan stated that the committee’s next meeting would include several additional topics: lighting regulations, as the town’s current code on lighting is limited; temporary sign regulations, in light of the United States Supreme Court decision in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, which restricts content-based sign regulations; and review of “gap analysis” reports from subgroups working on BESS and solar, on the comprehensive plan’s alignment with current zoning, and on the development of hamlet-style zoning to encourage more village-like mixed-use areas.

Councilman Keneally reported on the Alternative Transportation Committee. He stated that the committee had met the previous day and discussed the proposed bicycle access

project at Gavin Park. Between earlier meetings, he, the Supervisor, Steve Bederian and Joanne Klepetar had met with the town's insurance broker to ask specifically whether the proposed bicycle access at Gavin Park, including related signage and markings, would affect the town's liability exposure, particularly given that the long-planned Carr Road multi-use path connection has not yet been built.

The insurance broker, with decades of experience in municipal insurance, reportedly advised that such bicycle access improvements and signage would not create additional liability exposure for the town and that he had never seen such a project create insurance problems in his experience. This information was important because a town board member had previously expressed concern about liability at the interface between a designated bicycle path and adjacent roads where a multi-use path does not yet exist.

Councilman Keneally indicated that, in light of the broker's input, the Alternative Transportation Committee was considering returning to the board, perhaps as early as the next month, with a request to apply for a county trails grant to support the bicycle access improvements at Gavin Park. The intent would be to implement these improvements in anticipation of the Carr Road multi-use path project, which is expected in a future year.

The committee also discussed the topic of electric bicycles. Councilman Keneally noted that the issue is complex because New York law distinguishes between different classes of e-bikes: lower-powered pedal-assist types that are akin to bicycles and higher-powered types that are essentially electric motorcycles. Regulations differ between these classes, and there are separate considerations for town roads, town trails, and town-owned lands. It was reported that electric motorcycles have already posed issues at Forest Grove, where young riders are using them on paths not intended for motorized vehicles. The committee recognized that any change to allow certain classes of e-bikes on town facilities would require careful study of state law, safety concerns, and enforcement.

Councilman Keneally explained that, at this stage, the committee had a preliminary discussion but was not ready to make a recommendation regarding changes to the town's laws on e-bikes. There was not strong enthusiasm to move quickly on the issue without more analysis, and any eventual proposal would likely require coordination with the code and zoning revision committee and town counsel.

The meeting segment concluded with recognition that the Alternative Transportation Committee is also exploring options for a resident survey to gauge public interest in bicycle routes and alternative transportation access more broadly.

Councilman Keneally's continued with a report on the Emergency Services Planning Committee. He explained that the committee had recently held its first meeting and that Mr. Mike Hewitt, Chief of the Wilton Fire Department, had agreed to serve as co-chair, bringing substantial operational experience to the group. Other members include Mr. Nash Alexander, head of the Wilton Volunteer Ambulance Emergency Corps; Mr. Duane Bogardus, representing the Greenfield firehouse; Mr. Paul Coneski, a career emergency medical services administrator and life member of the Maple Avenue Fire Department; Mr. Nate King, affiliated with the Maple Avenue Fire Department and the Wilton Emergency Corps; and Mr. Zach King, Chief of the Maple Avenue Fire Department. Councilman Keneally emphasized that this is a highly experienced group of dedicated first responders.

Councilman Keneally noted that Mr. Hewitt had suggested the committee focus on five- and ten-year horizons for planning, particularly regarding the sustainability of volunteer fire and EMS services. It was reported that sustaining a fully volunteer fire service has become increasingly difficult over time, in part because of the intensive training, certification and ongoing recertification requirements, and the substantial time commitments required of volunteers who also have full-time employment.

He said that he had invited the committee to use the upcoming town newsletter as a way to reach residents and encourage new volunteers for both the fire department and EMS, stressing that the town depends heavily on volunteers for emergency services. The committee also discussed the possibility of future town-level incentives, such as property tax benefits for qualifying volunteers, although no specific proposal was yet ready to bring before the town board.

The committee's discussion also touched on pending state legislation that would provide an income tax credit to volunteer firefighters and EMS personnel. It was noted that the proposed credit amount under one bill was approximately two thousand five hundred dollars and that such a benefit could be meaningful to volunteers. There was some uncertainty as to the bill's current status in the State Legislature; it appeared that procedural votes had delayed, rather than definitively defeated, the measure. Members suggested that local advocacy to state representatives, including Assemblymember Ms. Carrie Woerner, could be helpful to support the legislation.

Councilman Keneally reported that the Emergency Services Planning Committee had also discussed interactions between fire and EMS agencies and the town's Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. He stated that fire officials were sometimes frustrated when their recommendations—for example, regarding additional fire hydrants or changes to site access in new developments—were not adopted because the projects met only the minimum code requirements. The committee felt there might be areas where local standards, particularly for hydrant placement and access, could reasonably exceed minimum state standards in order to improve safety and ease of response. It was

acknowledged that any such changes would need careful review to balance safety benefits against the financial burden on developers and property owners.

The committee further raised the issue of winter maintenance around fire hydrants. In some areas, hydrants are located within or adjacent to private yards, and there is currently no strong mechanism to ensure that residents consistently clear snow around hydrants, which can slow response times in emergencies. Councilman Keneally indicated that this was an issue to be studied further, potentially in coordination with the code and zoning revision committee and town counsel.

The committee also discussed the condition of the Wilton Emergency Corps building. The existing structure is composed of sections that are, respectively, approximately forty-five and twenty-four years old and is reaching the end of its functional life. The Corps had developed a concept for renovating and expanding the existing building but, with the acquisition of additional land, there is now a possibility of constructing a new facility instead. A new building could be designed to better accommodate current and future EMS needs and might also be configured to serve as the town's Emergency Operations Center.

At present, the town's designated Emergency Operations Center is the conference room at Town Hall, which lacks dedicated, permanently installed systems for communications and coordination. During a major emergency, staff would need to bring in equipment and set up ad hoc. Councilman Keneally suggested that, if a new EMS building is pursued, it could be designed with a built-in operations center, and such a project might qualify for particular funding streams aimed at enhancing emergency management capabilities. He noted that further information, including approximate cost estimates, would be compiled by Mr. Alexander and other Corps leaders for future consideration by the town board.

## **COMPTROLLER'S REPORT**

Ms. Moran she explained the need to fund a federal "single audit" for 2025, to be paid in 2026. She noted that the town had expended more than one million dollars in federal funds, triggering the requirement for a single audit under federal regulations. The federal expenditures included use of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds, which had to be fully disbursed by December 31, 2025, as well as the federally funded portions of preliminary engineering and design work for two roundabout projects. Because these projects are funded at eighty percent by federal aid, the town's spending of federal funds would likely continue above the threshold in subsequent years, requiring single audits in 2026 and 2027 as well. Accordingly, she requested a budget transfer to increase the line for audit services.

Ms. Moran addressed a change order for the pickleball court project. She stated that, after the project began, it became clear that certain work related to the posts and sleeves for the nets was necessary but had not been included in the original bid specifications. None of the bidders had included this work in their bid proposals. The additional cost for this omitted work was seven thousand two hundred dollars. Mrs. Moran reported that she and staff had reviewed all original bids to confirm that none had priced this work, in order to ensure the integrity of the bidding process.

She explained that the low bidder, R.M.M.I., had originally bid approximately one hundred eighteen thousand dollars. The second bidder's price was about one hundred sixty thousand dollars, and the third bidder's price was about one hundred seventy-seven thousand dollars. Even when adding the seven thousand two hundred dollar change order to the low bid, the adjusted total remained well below the next lowest bid. She stated that this confirmed that the change order did not create a situation in which a different bidder would have become the low bidder on a comparable scope. She defined a change order as a formal modification to the contract price caused by changes or clarifications in scope encountered after the contract is awarded, which can increase or, less commonly, decrease the contract amount.

### **1) Budget Transfers**

On a motion introduced by councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

#### **RESOLUTION #152**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the 2026 budget transfers (1-3) requested for and listed in the Comptroller's 05/07/2026 Report to the Town Board.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 4-0.

### **2.) Budget Amendments**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #153**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the 2026 budget amendments (1-5) requested for and listed in the Comptroller's 05/07/2026 Report to the Town Board.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 4-0.

**3.) Personnel**

**a.**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #154**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the hiring of Gregory LaPann to the vacant Building Maintenance Mechanic position, Step 2 at a rate of \$27.30 per hour with full benefits pending the successful passing of all pre-employment screening. Start date to be determined.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 4-0.

**b.**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O'Connor, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #155**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve overnight travel for Highway Superintendent Michael Monroe to attend the 2026 annual Highway School from June 1-June 3, 2026 in Ithaca, New York.

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman Keneally, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 4-0.

**4.) Disposal of Assets**

On a motion introduced by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the board adopted the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION #156**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to approve the placement of the following items on Auctions International:

- (3) Retractable Bollards**
- (1) Concession Trailer**
- Used Dump Bodies**
- Various miscellaneous items**

The adoption of the resolution was seconded by Councilman O’Conor, duly put to a vote, all in favor. The motion passed 4-0.

**Adjournment**

On a motion introduced by Councilman O’Conor, seconded by Deputy Supervisor Rohan, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.