

TOWN OF CLIFTON PARK TOWN BOARD

May 19, 2026

The meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Clifton Park was held in the Town Office Building at 7:01 p.m. Supervisor Barrett presiding.

Pledge of Allegiance

Present: Supervisor Barrett
Councilwoman Bellamy
Councilman Fantini
Councilman Manir
Councilwoman Reid
Town Clerk Fantini

Also Present: Town Attorney Dailey
Mark Heggen, Comptroller
Daniel Clemens, Director of Parks, Buildings & Recreation
Norah Hoefer, Communications and Technology Coordinator
Megan Babendreier Director of Parks & Recreation
John Scavo Director of Planning & Zoning

MINUTES

MOTION by Councilwoman Reid seconded by Councilman Fantini to approve the Town Board minutes of the May 5, 2026 as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir,
Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Abstain: None

Noes: None

MOTION CARRIED

ANNOUNCEMENTS & COMMUNICATIONS

Councilwoman Reid announced that the Country Knolls, Clifton Gardens, and Barney Road pools will open for the season on Saturday, May 24. She stated that individual memberships are \$220 and family memberships are \$290, and noted that pool passes can be purchased through the Parks and Recreation office or online at cliftonparkny.gov. She also highlighted available summer programming through the Parks and Recreation Department, including camps in field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, art, volleyball, cheer, preschool, adventure challenge course, basketball, tennis, archery, and a half-day summer camp, with registration information available online or through the Parks and Recreation office. Additionally, Councilwoman Reid announced a public information open house on Wednesday, June 24 from 4:00–6:00 p.m. at Town Hall (Wood Room) regarding proposed design improvements at the intersections of Route 146, Miller Road, and Tanner Road, as well as Route 146 and Waite Road. She explained that the session will allow residents and stakeholders to review draft roundabout designs, speak with the project team, and provide feedback, emphasizing the town's ongoing commitment to public participation in planning processes.

Councilman Manir reported that on May 16, the Tree Committees held a workshop focused on removal/disposal of invasive species. He stated that a training session was held on Saturday at 9:00 a.m. at Veterans Memorial Park, presented by Addison Kubik of PRISM and organized by

Danne Parker of the Tree Committee. He noted that 26 participants attended and learned how to properly identify, handle, and dispose of invasive species and related items.

PUBLIC PRIVILEGE 7:04 p.m.

Kevin Goggins of Thoroughbred Way expressed concerns about transparency in the Town Board's process, stating that agenda materials are sometimes distributed with limited notice, which he believes reduces the public's ability to review and provide informed feedback. He encouraged the Board to publish agendas earlier to allow more time for review and research. He also raised concerns about state-level authority over local land-use decisions related to solar development, arguing that such oversight limits Town control. He suggested the Board consider a resolution opposing state authority in this area and urged broader advocacy at the county level. Additionally, he commented on broader state policy and energy issues, including electricity costs, solar investment, and the closure of Indian Point, and cautioned against increased local spending and potential future taxation. He encouraged continued public participation in Town meetings and accountability in local governance.

Supervisor Barrett responded that Town Board meetings had historically been held on Mondays, with agendas typically posted publicly on Fridays. He stated that one of the reasons given for moving meetings to Tuesdays was to allow the public more time to review agenda materials in advance. He further noted that while state requirements mandate agendas be posted at least 24 hours prior to meetings, the Town had historically exceeded that minimum by several days. He stated that since January, agendas have generally been provided only within the 24-hour minimum window, rather than earlier as previously practiced, and asserted that the stated goal of providing more advance notice has not been fully met.

Councilman Fantini stated that the Town Board has made several improvements to transparency. He noted that public privilege has been moved before votes rather than after, allowing residents to express their opinions prior to decision-making. He added that Planning Board and Zoning Board meetings are now available on YouTube and that additional opportunities for public comment have been incorporated into those meetings. He stated that these changes have improved public participation, particularly in cases where residents previously did not have the opportunity to speak before votes were taken. Councilman Fantini also stated that he supports maintaining Clifton Park as a Town without a property tax and expressed that he has no intention of supporting tax increases, adding that Clifton Park remains a desirable place to live, work, and recreate.

Councilman Manir noted that the Agenda Session is now being broadcast live so the public can hear the decisions being made. He stated that, unlike in previous years when the sessions were closed, the meetings are now open in an effort to promote transparency and ensure decisions are made in public view. He also expressed hope that taxes will not be raised in the future.

Supervisor Barrett clarified that the Agenda meetings were not closed-door meetings, noting that they were always public meetings. He stated that describing them as "closed door" could imply that officials were meeting surreptitiously or clandestinely, which was not the case.

Councilman Fantini clarified that the meetings were not livestreamed to the public.

Supervisor Barrett stated that the Board had never previously advanced a major project, such as an eight- to nine-field sports complex, with only 24 hours' notice on an Agenda. He emphasized that large and important projects traditionally underwent a long and thorough planning process, referencing the Town Center Park project, which took approximately 18 months to plan despite having broad community support and being a passive-use park. He said he was concerned about discussions regarding fencing and the potential placement of eight to nine playing fields on the property near Windhover, noting that the proposal came as a shock to many residents.

Councilman Fantini stated that the purpose of the Agenda Session is to allow the Town Board to have open discussions and clarify ideas in a public setting. He said there had been no resolution, proposal, or formal action regarding the playing fields discussed by Supervisor Barrett, emphasizing that the matter was only a discussion item. Councilman Fantini rejected the notion that the board was not being transparent, explaining that Agenda Sessions exist so Board

members can publicly discuss ideas because they are not permitted to meet privately in groups of three or more members. He added that no law, resolution, or official change had been proposed.

Supervisor Barrett responded that the Board had, in fact, acted on a resolution at a Town Board meeting to move the project forward. He stated that shortly afterward, the Town Attorney met with contractors at the Windover property, and questioned claims that the matter had only been a discussion item.

Attorney Dailey disputed Supervisor Barrett's statement, responding that the claim was not true.

Members of the public responded stating that they had personally seen people at the site.

Attorney Dailey acknowledged being present at the site but clarified that he was not meeting with any contractors.

A member of the public stated that while the Town Attorney claimed not to be meeting with contractors, they believed he was present at the site along with possibly other council members, but no neighborhood residents were included or informed. The speaker questioned whether this constituted a public meeting, suggesting it appeared to have occurred without public awareness.

Councilman Manir referenced the prior meeting recordings where he said he would not vote for any proposal unless all feasibility studies were completed, all committees were involved, and public hearings were held. He reiterated that these statements were part of the official record and emphasized that he would not support any proposal without proper studies and public input. He added that such processes take years and cannot be completed quickly or within a single day.

Supervisor Barrett reiterated that the majority of the Board had acted on a formal resolution to move the initiative forward, rather than it being only a discussion item at an Agenda meeting as previously described. He emphasized that this action was clearly recorded and encouraged others to review the meeting recordings to verify the proceedings.

Councilman Manir responded that, according to the meeting recording, the discussion during the Agenda Session was limited to understanding the cost of constructing a fence and did not go beyond that. He stated that this was the extent of what was discussed and characterized it as informational rather than a formal decision-making action.

Supervisor Barrett stated that his concern was why the Board would consider constructing a fence in support of a project when there was no established plan, no completed studies, and no public input.

Councilman Manir stated that he had previously put his position in writing and reiterated it in an email sent afterward, stating that the project should not proceed until all required steps were completed. He characterized the discussion as part of an Agenda Session and referred to it as a "wish list," emphasizing that no formal action was taken.

Councilwoman Reid stated that during the Agenda Session she made a motion not to bring the project forward, and that she and Supervisor Barrett were the only members who voted to keep it off the agenda. She added that Councilman Manir voted to keep it on the agenda. She also referenced an email she said indicated a request to cancel the public forum.

Councilman Manir stated that the discussion at that time was limited to an initial inquiry about the cost of building a fence as a starting point for the project. He characterized it as an early-stage, informational discussion focused on basic cost estimation rather than a developed proposal or formal plan.

A member of the public stated that they did not recognize Councilman Manir and had never seen him before, but said they were aware that he had been on the property behind the houses.

Councilman Manir stated that he had been present at the property and clarified that he was there only to view the site.

A member of the public stated that no officials had stopped by their home to provide information or engage with residents. The speaker expressed frustration that, in their view, there was an attempt to move forward with or vote on the matter without first informing or consulting nearby residents.

Councilman Manir stated that he did not deny participation or engagement in the process.

A member of the public responded that Councilman Manir did, in fact, vote against a motion, and asserted that this vote amounted to denying the proposal or action in question.

Councilman Manir clarified that his position was that the proposal was premature and stated that he had asked for the matter to be removed.

A member of the public asked how many people supported the resolution at the time it was voted on before it was passed.

Councilman Manir responded that there was no resolution.

Councilman Fantini stated that there was no formal resolution, explaining that only a titled agenda item was discussed. He added that, to his knowledge, no resolution document existed and requested that it be produced if one was being referenced.

David Miller of Hidden Valley Lane thanked several committees and individuals involved in Town initiatives, including the Farmland Preservation Plan resolution and related advisory committee work. He described the Farmland Preservation effort as a significant long-term initiative that supports both preservation and future growth of local farms. He also acknowledged planning efforts for upcoming Town celebrations, including a planned 2028 event marking a 200-year anniversary reenactment of the first Town Board meeting. He noted progress on naming the 41-acre park and preserve along the Mohawk River as “River View Preserve,” and mentioned plans for a ribbon cutting and improved site access. Mr. Miller also said he was interested in the public forum discussion regarding the Windhover property and open space impacts, and urged that the matter be approached through a comprehensive feasibility and public involvement process. He emphasized that decisions should be made through a structured process involving studies and public input, citing prior long-term planning efforts as an example, and encouraged a measured, collaborative approach moving forward.

Caryl Hugg of Jonathan Drive stated that moving the Town meetings from Monday to Tuesday appeared to reduce public attendance, noting a scheduling conflict with a School Board vote that is typically held on the third Tuesday of the month. She raised concerns about transparency and the role of what she described as unelected individuals in town decision-making. She referenced a FOIL request she submitted regarding the Ethics committee and communications involving the Town Attorney and other individuals and read part of an email she attributed to the Town Attorney regarding Ethics Board candidate selection and political affiliation considerations. She interpreted the content of the email as suggesting a candidate might change political affiliation to obtain a board position. She also referenced the prior meeting discussion on the Windhover Farms issue and questioned comments made regarding who introduced a related resolution, stating that the Town Attorney had provided information on the matter. Finally, she expressed support for the expansion of the senior center parking lot and asked a question directed to Councilwoman Bellamy regarding that topic. Ms. Hugg stated that she is frequently present at the Commons and has observed a strong need for the Senior Center parking lot expansion. She said she is not opposed to the project and referenced prior comments suggesting willingness to bring forward a related resolution. She then asked for clarification on the intended end goal and the overall plan of the resolution, noting that she was seeking a clear explanation of the proposal she understood had been introduced that evening.

Councilwoman Bellamy reported discussions with Senior Center and Building and Grounds representatives regarding parking shortages at the Senior Center, which serves approximately 1,600 members with only 87 parking spaces. Several options for additional parking were explored, including areas near the basketball courts and behind the Senior Center. Discussion also included possible relocation of the highway garage, following the loss of the previous facility to a fire, to free up space and address future parking needs. Bellamy noted these considerations formed the basis of her proposed resolution.

Ms. Hugg asked Councilwoman Bellamy to clarify the purpose of the proposed resolution and outline her plan for moving the project forward.

Councilwoman Bellamy explained that the area could be leveled and used for parking. She noted that the Tree Committee supports replacing removed trees by planting oak trees around the perimeter and adding other trees elsewhere. She stated that many of the existing trees are older Christmas trees planted in the 1960s and are nearing the end of their lifespan.

Ms. Hugg asked what steps would be required before moving forward with the project, including whether surveys, environmental impact reviews, or other assessments would need to be completed as part of the planning process.

Councilwoman Bellamy responded that if the resolution is approved, these assessments can be made. She then asked whether Ms. Hugg believed the proposed location was a suitable site.

Ms. Hugg stated that she was not qualified to determine whether the proposed location was appropriate, but noted that when presenting a proposal, you should have a clearer plan and understanding of the direction, including any necessary studies.

Supervisor Barrett opposed the proposal, stating that additional parking at the Senior Center is rarely needed despite membership growing from approximately 620 to 1,600 members, as not all members attend at the same time. He noted that he has extensive experience with the facility and helped keep it operational during a difficult period in 2016. Supervisor Barrett argued that expanding parking would be costly, require removing trees and natural buffers between Town facilities, and would address a problem that does not currently exist. He characterized the proposal as unnecessary and expensive.

Grace Valente of Holbrook Drive expressed concerns about the proposed lacrosse field project, stating that residents were not adequately informed or consulted before plans to clear land and install fencing were discussed. She criticized the lack of transparency and public engagement, arguing that the project appeared to be moving forward without sufficient notice or explanation. Ms. Valente raised concerns about potential impacts on the neighborhood, including increased traffic, noise, parking issues, trespassing, and public safety risks. She questioned whether studies had been conducted regarding emergency access, road capacity, pedestrian safety, environmental impacts, drainage, wildlife habitats, and stormwater runoff. She also expressed concerns about effects on quality of life and property values. While not opposed to discussions about the property's future use, she urged the Board to increase transparency and ensure residents' voices are heard before proceeding.

Kris Fitzgerald of Thoroughbred Way Expressed concerns about project costs and emphasized the need for clearer budgeting and financial transparency before moving forward with Town projects. She stated that, in her professional experience working on municipal projects, budgets are typically established in advance to ensure accountability. Ms. Fitzgerald also raised broader concerns about transparency in Town governance, referencing issues related to appointments and changes involving the ethics board. She questioned recent decisions and expressed concern about potential conflicts of interest involving the town attorney in relation to development projects. She concluded by reiterating that transparency and accountability are key concerns for residents.

Isabell Prescott of Riverview Road expressed appreciation to the Town Board for supporting the Agricultural Protection Plan. She stated that the plan helps preserve farmland, supports local agriculture, and maintains the rural character of the community. Ms. Prescott noted that it will benefit farmers and residents by ensuring access to local food and protecting farmland for future generations. She concluded by stating her support for implementing the plan and its positive long-term impact on the Town.

Supervisor Barrett thanked Isabell Prescott for her continued partnership with the Town and for her involvement in developing the Agricultural Protection Plan over the past several years. He expressed appreciation for her leadership and acknowledged that while such plans take time to complete, progress is made through continued collaboration.

Katelyn O'Leary of Clifton Country Road opposed the proposed moratorium on Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar energy systems (Resolution 8 of 2026). She referenced jurisdictional distinctions between

state oversight and local authority and argued that the town should not impose a moratorium at this time. She stated that delaying solar projects could cause the Town and residents to miss federal tax incentives tied to project completion deadlines, and emphasized potential economic and energy benefits of continued solar development. Ms. O'Leary also argued that expanding solar energy could help stabilize utility costs, reduce reliance on fossil fuels, and support both homeowners and farmers by providing alternative land-use opportunities.

Andrea Leo of Grooms Road expressed concerns about the proposed Windover Farms development, particularly the plan for approximately nine athletic fields across from her home. She stated that she and her fiancé chose to live in Rexford for its rural character, open space, farms, and wildlife, and are worried the project could significantly alter the area. Ms. Leo raised concerns about environmental impacts, including effects on an ecological corridor, wildlife habitat, drainage patterns, groundwater recharge, and private well water supplies. She also cited traffic and safety concerns due to increased use of Grooms Road, noting existing visibility issues and road conditions. She requested a full environmental review, traffic study, and greater transparency and public input before any clearing or construction begins, emphasizing that long-term impacts to the community should be carefully evaluated.

Chuck Alangi stated that he works for the New York Independent System Operator and clarified that his comments were his personal views. He expressed strong support for solar energy and noted that New York has made significant progress in expanding distributed solar generation, which he said helps reduce carbon emissions. However, he cautioned that solar development in the area may be reaching saturation and raised concerns about reliability impacts, particularly when solar installations are underperforming due to conditions such as snow cover and limited maintenance. He also noted that energy storage systems (battery storage) are an important complement to solar but can introduce considerations such as noise and energy demand for cooling. Mr. Alangi emphasized the need for a balanced approach to renewable energy development, supporting continued growth of solar while encouraging careful planning to address grid reliability, infrastructure, and community impacts.

Ann Connolly of Valdepenas Lane questioned whether several items are included in the Town budget, specifically the sports complex fields, ongoing litigation costs, attorney pay increases, and the decision to hire an expensive outside Albany law firm after a prior attorney stepped back from defending a case. According to the responses she received during the exchange, these items were not included in the current Town budget. Her main concern was that the Town board is approving expenditures and initiatives outside the adopted budget while simultaneously claiming there will be no need for a Town tax. She argued that this approach could lead to a budget deficit, which she believes would eventually result in additional taxes for homeowners and higher rents for tenants. She further warned that rising costs and unchecked spending could affect property values and affordability, especially for new homeowners. She concluded that, in her view, it is inconsistent and unsustainable for the Town board to make these financial commitments while asserting that taxes will not increase, and she emphasized that residents will ultimately bear the financial impact.

Supervisor Barrett responded that the discussion being referenced relates to Resolution No. 5, which proposes creating a new position in the Clerk's office along with three salary increases, including two increases for deputy Town attorneys. He clarified that the legal support provided by the outside firm was not limited to a single matter such as the CSEA grievance or lawsuit process, but was intended to be an open-ended arrangement. Supervisor Barrett suggested that, since January, the Town has increasingly relied on outside counsel for ongoing lawsuits and grievances, particularly if the current Town attorney staff is not handling those matters. In his view, the resolution reflects the practical need for continued legal coverage rather than a narrowly scoped or temporary expense.

A member of the audience challenged the decision to hire outside legal counsel, asking whether it is the Town attorney's responsibility to handle Town cases. The speaker argued that if the Town attorney is already employed for that purpose, outsourcing work suggests inefficiency or unwillingness to do the job. They criticized the additional spending on outside attorneys as unnecessary and questioned the logic behind it, suggesting it reflects poor financial management. The speaker also warned that continued spending beyond budgeted limits could contribute to a Town deficit, ultimately affecting taxpayers and residents.

Supervisor Barrett responded by emphasizing his long-term record managing Town finances, stating that over the past 27 years he has worked to keep the Town financially strong. He noted that the Town remains near the bottom in property tax rates compared to other Towns in New York State and highlighted that Saratoga County has one of the lowest tax burdens in the state. He expressed pride in that fiscal record. However, he also cautioned that while the Town does currently have some reserve funds set aside, those funds are being used quickly, implying concern about ongoing spending levels and their impact on future finances.

Councilman Fantini stated that several of the Town’s lawsuits, in his view, were directly caused by actions taken under Supervisor Barrett’s leadership. He referenced specific cases, including a lawsuit involving the Superintendent of Highways, which he said resulted in a settlement and interest payments that he believes could have been avoided. He also mentioned litigation related to the appointment of the Town attorney, which he characterized as a misuse of public funds and unnecessary legal action. Councilman Fantini further argued that additional lawsuits have arisen from decisions made by the supervisor, leading to ongoing legal expenses for the Town. He concluded that these actions have required the Town to spend public money on litigation that, in his opinion, could have been prevented.

Supervisor Barrett rejected earlier criticisms and argued that the issue stemmed from the Highway Superintendent allegedly violating state law in two consecutive years. He said that as a result, paving work that was authorized by the highway department became “unauthorized expenditures.” He stated that, in his role as chief fiscal officer of the Town, he would not approve payments for expenses he considers unauthorized under state law. Because the contractor was not paid, Supervisor Barrett said the contractor filed a lawsuit against the Town. He further argued that the Town board majority later chose to settle the lawsuit quickly in January and, in his view, paid more than necessary in order to resolve the matter. He characterized that decision as an attempt to avoid further scrutiny or controversy involving the Highway Superintendent. Supervisor Barrett concluded by emphasizing that he would not approve spending that he believes is not legally authorized, contrasting his position with others on the Board.

Chelsea Belmonte of Holbrook Drive spoke about concerns regarding transparency in local government, noting that several candidates had campaigned on a promise of openness. She said she felt disappointed by what she perceived as a lack of transparency in how meeting agendas were handled. She specifically referenced the Windhover Park item being added shortly before a meeting, stating that she learned about it too late to adjust personal plans and attend earlier. Ms. Belmonte argued that agendas were not being distributed with enough advance notice, despite claims that scheduling changes were meant to improve transparency. She concluded that if transparency is a stated priority for Town leadership, it should be consistently reflected in how information is shared with residents.

Bonnie Burroughs of Holbrook Drive explained that she and her husband moved to Clifton Park about 37 years ago because of its family-friendly character, strong schools, and quiet suburban environment, and they chose Windhover Farms as their long-term home for those reasons. Ms. Burroughs said residents were previously told that development behind the neighborhood would not happen, but now discussions about a recreation project—including potential fields, parking, fencing, and tree clearing—are raising concerns. She argued that these plans conflict with the area’s character and expectations of preserved open space. Her main concerns focused on impacts if the project moves forward: increased traffic, insufficient parking, safety risks for children and pedestrians, environmental effects (including stormwater and wildlife disruption), noise and lighting, and ongoing maintenance. She estimated that the development could bring a large number of additional vehicles into a small neighborhood, potentially overwhelming local streets. She concluded that many residents chose their homes specifically for the quiet setting and would not have done so if they had known about these plans earlier.

Sue Kimball of Holbrook Drive said she has lived in Clifton Park since 1979 and described her long-term connection to the community, noting that she and her husband chose to make it their permanent home early in the development of their neighborhood. She referenced deed-related documents and suggested there may have been past statements or written notes tied to Town involvement in the area, expressing concern about transparency and how information about the proposed project has been handled over time. A major focus of her remarks was traffic and safety. She described difficult road conditions in and around the neighborhood, including narrow

streets, blind curves, and limited sidewalks, and said added traffic from a potential development could create dangerous conditions, especially for children and grandchildren who walk or play in the area. Ms. Kimball also raised concerns about environmental and infrastructure impacts, including wetlands, fire safety, and the need for proper studies before any clearing, fencing, or construction begins. She emphasized that residents feel the project is moving forward without sufficient notification or input and expressed strong opposition to proceeding without further review and study.

Anthony Morelli of Gloucester Street began by praising the Board's decision to allow public comment earlier in meetings, saying it improves public participation and should be treated as an opportunity for the Board to listen carefully to residents. He then raised concerns about transparency and decision-making, referencing an email that stated that because of multiple complaints, there was "no need to hold a public hearing at this time." He questioned whether receiving complaints should instead increase the need for a public forum and confirmed that Board members were aware of the communication. Mr. Morelli, identifying himself as an attorney, also raised ethical concerns involving municipal legal counsel. He cited rules related to professional conduct and conflicts of interest, arguing that the Town attorney's involvement in certain matters could present a conflict or at least the appearance of impropriety. He questioned why the Board was allowing the attorney to take a leading role in an issue he suggested was controversial and implied that the situation may have been influenced by the attorney's prior professional connections or interests. He concluded by asking whether the matter would have proceeded the same way without that attorney's involvement.

Councilwoman Reid explained that at the previous Agenda Session she had asked which Board member was sponsoring the item under discussion. She noted that, in her understanding, the proposal had not been formally brought forward by any Board member, which was the basis for her question about its origin and how it was being placed on the Agenda.

Mr. Morelli reiterated his concern that the Town Board was not adequately addressing what he believed could be a conflict of interest involving the Town attorney. He argued that, in his view, the attorney should be "walled off" from involvement in the proposal and that the Town should instead seek an independent legal opinion from another attorney or oversight authority. He questioned why the Board was not taking steps to review or manage the situation, suggesting that the attorney was effectively influencing the process. Mr. Morelli pointed to what he described as a pattern of concerns raised by others regarding ethical issues and implied that the Board should not allow the attorney to direct decisions. He concluded by emphasizing that the Town attorney works for the Board, not the other way around, reinforcing his view that the Board should take greater control over legal oversight and decision-making.

Jim Viola of Holbrook Drive thanked the board for allowing public comments before actions are taken, saying it improves transparency and public input. He then stated his opposition to a proposed expansion of athletic fields, arguing that there is no current need for additional fields based on community usage and declining student enrollment in the area. He referenced local sports organizations, stating that groups such as lacrosse programs already have sufficient access to existing facilities. He also noted that some nearby fields, including those at Longkill Park, appear underutilized, suggesting existing resources are not being fully used. A significant portion of his comments focused on environmental and regulatory concerns. Mr. Viola claimed that the proposed site is subject to oversight by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), and that no development activities—such as clearing or fencing—should occur without proper approval and updated wetland mapping. He stated he contacted a DEC representative who confirmed that no application or inquiry had been submitted by the Town regarding the site. He concluded by warning that proceeding with any changes without following proper environmental review procedures could create regulatory problems for the Town.

Joe DiGardia of Holbrook Drive expanded on earlier comments regarding the use of a decades-old special use permit (from 1984) tied to the proposed project. He argued that, under Town zoning law, special use permits are governed by local code and typically expire or require renewal rather than remaining valid indefinitely. He cited provisions of the Town code, stating that permits generally expire after a set period unless a project is substantially completed, and therefore he believes the 1984 permit is no longer valid. He also argued that even if the original permit once applied to the site, it does not automatically justify new or expanded development decades later. Mr. DiGardia emphasized that special use permits are meant to be evaluated based

on current conditions, not past approvals, and that each application must be considered individually based on present-day circumstances. He identified several modern factors the Planning Board should evaluate before approving any project, including impacts on property values, traffic, and parking capacity. He concluded that a new special use permit should be required and fully reviewed before any work on the Windover Park project begins.

Art Tracy of Holbrook Drive described an incident where Town representatives were on or near the proposed field area exploring potential plans. He said he was approached and briefly informed about the purpose of the visit, but when he tried to ask questions, Mr. Dailey declined to answer, which he said was frustrating and uninformative. He emphasized that the land is owned by the Town and argued that residents therefore have a stake in how it is used. Mr. Tracy said the Town Board has a responsibility to consider impacts on nearby homeowners, especially regarding quality of life and property values. He expressed appreciation for some Board members who he felt responded to residents' concerns and supported transparency, while also criticizing the overall process as insufficient and lacking proper communication. He stated that residents would not have purchased homes in the area if they had known about the potential development. Mr. Tracy referenced assurances that any project would require long-term studies, public hearings, and analysis before proceeding, and stressed that no physical work or spending (such as clearing trees or installing fencing) should occur beforehand. He concluded by objecting to the proposed project as currently planned and suggested that, if it proceeds at all, access should be located differently—though he made clear this was not an endorsement of the project itself.

Councilman Manir said he sent an email to the Board after the previous meeting and was concerned that parts of it were being quoted or interpreted in a way that he believes misrepresents his intent. He asked that his full email be placed into the official record.(see attached) He explained that in his email he argued the Town should not proceed with a public forum or move forward with the project until all necessary information and processes are completed. He said his intent was to avoid unnecessary conflict or tension by pausing further steps until everything is properly reviewed and finalized. Councilman Manir expressed frustration that portions of his message were being used to suggest he was taking a different position than what he intended. He reiterated that his view was that the project should not advance further until all required steps are complete, and questioned why a public forum would proceed if the project itself should not move forward at this stage.

A member of the audience strongly objected to the proposed project and expressed distrust toward Town officials involved in the process. The speaker accused the Board and Town representatives of advancing a hidden agenda and suggested that outside interests could be benefiting financially. They stated that residents are aware of what is happening and no longer support the project moving forward. They reiterated that they oppose the proposal regardless of procedural steps such as votes on estimates or preliminary planning documents, and emphasized that their primary demand is full transparency in decision-making and communication from the Town.

Councilman Fantini responded to concerns about whether the Board had formally voted or committed to advancing the project. He stated that, in his view, there had been no formal vote to move the project forward and therefore no obligation for progress to be underway. He explained that the matter was discussed during an Agenda Session where opposition from residents was acknowledged, and that this is where the process currently stands. Councilman Fantini emphasized that discussion does not equal approval or authorization to proceed, and clarified that no formal plan had been adopted as a result of that meeting.

Alicia Jacobs who serves on Town committees, said she was concerned about the escalating tone and disorder of the meeting. She emphasized that residents and officials should maintain respect for differing opinions and allow everyone a fair opportunity to speak. She stressed three key principles she believes should guide the process: accountability, transparency, and mutual respect. Jacobs expressed frustration that the discussion had become argumentative and chaotic, comparing the atmosphere to a “show” rather than a productive public meeting. She said the situation was becoming embarrassing and called for calmer, more respectful engagement so that concerns can be properly heard and addressed without confrontation.

Brady Ozimek of Tracey Court made a brief statement directed at the Town Board, urging members to either vote for or against the proposal. He warned that continued support for the project could result in voters removing certain officials from office in future elections. He expressed frustration with the Board's actions, accusing it of alienating residents and characterizing the Board's behavior as ineffective and disconnected from the public. He referenced Board's functioning and suggested it reflected poor leadership. He concluded by offering to circulate petitions after the meeting to support efforts to replace elected officials who support the proposal.

Ken Kimball of Holbrook Drive said homeowners were given limited information when making decisions about their properties, specifically referencing deed restrictions that were provided but not clearly explained. He stated that residents were unsure about how certain wording applied to future development. He also raised concerns that residents were not shown updated or detailed plans in advance, including sketches related to proposed fencing and parking layouts near residential areas. He suggested that changes in proposed layouts and lack of clarity have contributed to resident frustration. Mr. Kimball implied that incomplete or late-stage information sharing has led to confusion and concern among homeowners, particularly regarding security, property boundaries, and nearby development impacts.

Jennifer of Holbrook Drive expressed strong opposition to the proposed development and raised concerns about inconsistency between Town statements and observed activity in the area. She argued that installing items like fencing or marking walking paths suggests there is already an underlying plan, even if officials say no formal plan exists. She also objected to the idea of increased parking and access through her neighborhood, warning that it could create serious traffic congestion and potentially block emergency vehicle access. She described existing traffic conditions as already difficult and said the proposed changes would make them worse. Jennifer concluded that the neighborhood was not designed to handle increased visitor traffic and suggested that visible preparations in the area contradict claims that no development plan is in place.

Supervisor Barrett clarified for the record that he did not attend the referenced impromptu site meeting. He also stated that, to his knowledge, Councilwoman Reid was not present either.

Linda Viola of Holbrook Drive explained that when she and others purchased homes in 2019, they were told the land north of Windhover Farms was wetlands and could not be developed. She said homeowners later received documentation indicating the land could potentially be used for playing fields, though details were unclear at the time of purchase. She argued that residents were not fully or transparently informed about the possibility of a major recreation development, and questioned whether notification was adequate or ethical. Ms. Viola described the current proposed project as including multiple playing fields, fencing, maintenance structures, water wells, and gravel parking areas. She raised concerns about traffic volume, overflow parking into residential streets, and conflicts with neighborhood rules prohibiting on-street parking. She also warned about noise, lighting, late operating hours, and increased activity extending into nighttime hours, which she said would negatively impact quality of life. She emphasized that the area is currently quiet and residential and would be significantly changed by the project. She concluded by urging Town officials not to proceed with converting nearby open space into a heavily used recreational facility that she believes would disrupt the character and livability of the neighborhood.

John Ohost of Holbrook Drive questioned the Town's spending priorities, expressing concern about budget overruns and the use of public funds for legal services and studies. He suggested that existing Town staff attorneys should be sufficient, implying that hiring additional outside legal help may be unnecessary. He also raised concerns about the cost of various studies related to the proposed project, including environmental or wildlife-related assessments, and asked who would be responsible for paying for them. Mr. Ohost questioned assurances that the project would not require additional taxes, suggesting that ongoing spending could contradict those claims. He concluded by arguing that instead of increasing expenditures, the Town should consider reducing taxes for residents.

John Kass of Crescent Road offered a personal viewpoint that he generally supports the idea of athletic fields and said he frequently visits local facilities like the Commons, where he observes open space and recreational use. He emphasized that his comments were his own opinion and not

meant to represent the broader community. Mr. Kass asked whether the Town could make public any emails or correspondence from residents or organizations requesting additional athletic fields or recreational resources. He suggested that making such information part of the public record would help residents better understand who is requesting the development and allow for more informed public opinions moving forward.

No one else wished to heard.

Public Privilege closed at 8:34 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS

Verizon Presentation

Supervisor Barrett explained that Paul Trane was present representing Verizon, which is interested in entering into a cable franchise agreement with the Town of Clifton Park. He stated that such an agreement could benefit residents by increasing competition in local telecommunications services. He added that the expansion of Verizon's FiOS network over time has made this proposed agreement possible, suggesting it could improve service options for the community.

Paul Trane, an attorney with a Boston-based law firm representing Verizon, explained that Verizon has already built out portions of the Town with its FiOS service, which provides broadband and telephone services. He stated that Verizon now seeks to expand into providing cable television service in the Town of Clifton Park. He described the regulatory process required in New York State, including negotiating a cable franchise agreement with the Town, submitting an application to the New York State Public Service Commission, and making the proposal available for public review before a required public hearing. Mr. Trane noted that he had discussed the matter with the Town supervisor and was encouraged to attend in person. He acknowledged that prior meetings had been lengthy. He emphasized that Verizon's goal is to introduce cable competition in the Town, stating that the company already operates in many other communities across New York State and is looking to expand further in Saratoga County. He concluded by expressing hope to work with the Town Board to complete the process in the coming months.

Supervisor Barrett noted that, based on the current FiOS service footprint, the issue would not affect the entire town's ability to access cable services. However, he estimated that approximately 25% of the Town falls within the affected cross-section and could experience limited access.

Paul Trane explained that Verizon has already built out service in a portion of the community and is pursuing a strategy to remain competitive in a rapidly changing cable television market. He noted that cable subscriptions nationwide have declined significantly as consumers increasingly choose streaming services such as Netflix and Hulu. According to Mr. Trane, Verizon's goal is to create a competitive offering by bundling broadband and cable television services, providing customers with greater convenience and value to encourage retention. He described this as a strategy that goes against broader industry trends. Mr. Trane stated that the proposed franchise agreement would be for five years, which is shorter than the more typical 10- or 15-year agreements. He explained that Verizon wants to evaluate the success of the service before making a longer-term commitment. Under federal law, there is a renewal process that begins within a specified period before the franchise expires. If the venture proves successful, Verizon may consider expanding service further into the community.

Supervisor Barrett asked whether franchise agreements are generally standardized across New York communities. He inquired about the extent to which the proposed agreement differs from existing agreements and how much variation typically exists when negotiating these arrangements.

Mr. Trane responded that franchise agreements are generally substantially similar across communities. He noted that the Town already has an ordinance governing franchise fee payments, requiring cable providers to pay a franchise fee, which under federal law may be up to 5% of gross revenues. He stated that the town's ordinance sets the fee at approximately 4.015%,

and Verizon would comply with that requirement. He added that the agreement also includes standard provisions, such as providing complimentary service to certain public buildings. Overall, Mr. Trane estimated that approximately 90% of franchise agreements are essentially identical among towns, villages, and cities.

Supervisor Barrett expressed support for the proposal, noting that residents would likely be interested in having an additional service option. He remarked that Clifton Park has not previously had this type of choice and that many communities still lack competing providers. He asked for clarification regarding the estimated service coverage, specifically whether the previously referenced 25% figure represents 25% of the Town's geographic area or 25% of the Town's population. He suggested that this information could be discussed further as the proposal moves forward.

Mr. Trane clarified that the 25% coverage figure would traditionally be measured as a percentage of households, rather than a percentage of the Town's geographic area or total population. He indicated that service availability is typically evaluated based on the number of households that can be served within the coverage area.

Councilman Fantini asked whether the households included within the proposed service area already have access to FiOS, or if the proposal would expand service to new households that do not currently have access.

Mr. Trane stated that the first portion of the service area would consist of homes that Verizon has already passed with its facilities. He said that some of those residents have already subscribed to Verizon broadband and telephone service, while others have not. He noted that those households would have the ability to subscribe to the new service, regardless of whether they currently have Verizon service. He further stated that the initial service area would be limited to areas that have already been built out. As a result, there would not be any trucks or street excavation at the beginning of the process. He added that if the service performs well, Verizon would return to discuss the possibility of expanding service with the Town.

Supervisor Barrett noted that another company, Greenlight, expanded service in the Town during roughly the same period as Verizon. He stated that the town established a permit process that both companies were required to follow and that the process worked well overall. He acknowledged that some residents experienced disturbances to their lawns during construction. However, he stated that companies are required to restore any disturbed property to its original condition.

Mr. Trane stated that restoration of disturbed property is a requirement under cable franchising rules. He said that municipal property must be restored if it is disturbed, and noted that this requirement is included in the franchise agreement.

Supervisor Barrett outlined the next steps in the process, stating that the first step would be to negotiate the contract, followed by bringing it before the Board, scheduling a public hearing, and then moving forward through the approval process. He indicated that this process could proceed fairly quickly. He added that he believes residents would be interested in having the service as an option, and suggested that bundling services could potentially lead to more advantageous pricing for customers.

Mr. Trane agreed, stating that in a competitive environment, pricing typically stabilizes and service offerings may improve due to increased consumer choice. He noted that this has been observed in other areas of New York and across the country where Verizon provides similar services.

PUBLIC FORUM

Proposed athletic fields behind Windhover Farm Development

Start 8:41 p.m.

David Miller of Hidden Valley Lane stated that a resolution had been introduced shortly after a prior visit and was discussed at the May 5th agenda session, where it was voted 3–2 to advance a

resolution related to brush hogging, tree clearing, and fencing costs for a project that he said had not yet undergone feasibility studies, demand studies, public input, environmental review, permitting, or engineering design. He noted that the resolution was later withdrawn. He stated that no resolution has been passed by the Town Board authorizing construction activity such as brush hogging, clearing trees, or installing fencing, and said that such actions would be unauthorized at this time. Mr. Miller also referenced environmental concerns, stating that regulatory guidance (including DEC considerations) would not allow brush hogging during certain months due to impacts on nesting bird species. He suggested that the process should restart with a public forum to assess community needs, determine appropriate scale, and evaluate public interest before moving forward. He referenced previous Town projects, including Town Center Park, the Riverview Preserve (41 acres), and the Dwaśkill acquisition, as examples of using public input and a structured process before development decisions.

Councilwoman Reid stated that the purpose of the public forum is to gauge community interest and the views of residents who would be directly affected, in order to determine whether to proceed with any proposed projects. She questioned the value of conducting studies and applying for permits if there is no demonstrated need or support for the project, stating that doing so could waste time and money if the proposal is not likely to move forward.

Councilman Manir stated that his prior email had been intended as a public record and was sent with good intentions. He clarified that his understanding at the time was that the project was not proceeding. He added that, in his view, bringing additional participants into the discussion could place undue pressure on them, and noted that he had been responding to emails indicating that the project was not moving forward. He thanked those present for attending and sharing their opinions, and expressed appreciation for their input.

Chuck Alangi of Aster Drive stated that he lives near wetlands and shared an account of a prior experience in Cohoes, New York, where development near his former home—approved through zoning and planning processes—resulted in flooding on his property and damage, which he attributed to changes in land and wetland conditions. He said the issue was later addressed with drainage work. He expressed concern about potential development involving multiple athletic fields near wetlands and emphasized the need for due diligence and study of environmental impacts, including stormwater, impermeable surfaces, and aquifer effects. He referenced oversight by the Army Corps of Engineers regarding wetlands. Mr. Alangi urged that planning officials be involved and suggested that data and studies should inform decision-making, noting that some existing fields appear underutilized. He also referenced broader demographic trends, stating that population and school enrollment patterns should be considered in planning decisions. He concluded by urging careful and informed decision-making going forward and emphasized concerns about potential flooding impacts on his property.

Chelsea Belmonte of Holbrook Drive stated that she moved from Albany to Rexford in 2020 to raise her family in what she described as a quiet, small neighborhood with a strong sense of community and outdoor space for children. She noted that, when purchasing her home in Windhover Farms, she was aware of deed restrictions referencing potential playing fields and said she was reassured at the time that such development was not a realistic concern. She expressed concern about a proposed athletic field complex, including the application of what she described as a decades-old permit to a different current context. She estimated that, with multiple fields in use, the number of participants, coaches, referees, and related vehicles could result in approximately 185 to 256 vehicles, not including spectators or overlapping games. She stated that this level of activity could significantly increase traffic through a residential neighborhood where children play and raised concerns about safety, referencing studies suggesting higher risk of pedestrian accidents in higher-traffic recreational areas compared to low-traffic residential streets. Ms. Belmonte also expressed concern about parking capacity, noting that the original permit included 75 parking spaces, which she believes may be insufficient for the projected usage, potentially resulting in overflow parking in surrounding residential areas where on-street parking is prohibited. She concluded by requesting that the Town slow the process and re-evaluate the proposal based on current conditions, including traffic, parking, public safety, neighborhood character, property values, and the use of adjacent residential areas.

Andrea Leo of Grooms Road stated that she was providing additional information related to prior discussion about potential irrigation and well water impacts. She noted that residents in the area are on Town water at the back of the neighborhood and referenced prior disclosure information

she received when purchasing her home. She recalled a past Town meeting regarding the potential extension of town water down Grooms Road, stating that it was ultimately deemed not feasible due to high projected costs. She added that residents had raised concerns at that time about water capacity issues. Ms. Leo further stated that nearby wells may have reduced output, referencing a case where a well reportedly dropped to approximately two gallons per minute, which she said was below typical standards and created challenges for household water use. She also mentioned unsuccessful attempts to drill additional wells. She concluded by asking that this information be taken into consideration, stating that her intent was to ensure the Board is aware of potential water-related concerns in the area.

Kathy Olost of Holbrook Drive stated that she agrees with previous comments made by other residents. She described a past incident in her neighborhood where a large party resulted in a significant number of attendees and vehicles lining both sides of the road, creating congestion. She expressed concern that emergency vehicles, including ambulances and sheriff's patrol cars, had difficulty accessing the area due to the blocked roadway and had to park at a distance. Ms. Olost stated that this experience led her to worry about the ability of local roads to handle additional traffic, particularly in the context of potential sports field development, and concluded that she believes the current road infrastructure would not support increased traffic volume.

Jim Viola of Holbrook Drive stated that there are alternative ways to use the fields for recreation, such as walking or hiking trails, and noted that he has observed residents and children using the area informally for activities like walking and playing with dogs. He questioned the demand for additional athletic fields, stating that it appears to him that only one individual is requesting the project. He suggested that if demand is limited, existing facilities such as fields at the commons could be used instead. Mr. Viola stated that he does not see a need for the construction of eight or nine additional fields unless there is broader community demand for them.

Caryl Hugg of Jonathan Drive asked whether any members of the board have spoken with local lacrosse clubs to determine whether additional fields are needed.

An audience member stated that they had spoken with a member of the board and were told that the lacrosse clubs' needs are fully met.

Councilman Fantini stated that no resolution has been passed, clarifying that the matter discussed involved only preliminary discussion of potential resolutions. He reiterated that the item was at the discussion stage and had not advanced to formal approval or adoption.

Ms. Hugg stated that, to her knowledge, no one had come forward requesting the project except Attorney Dailey. She then asked whether any board members could confirm who was present during a site visit on April 29th, referencing observations about a small number of cars and individuals present. She confirmed with Councilmembers Bellamy and Manir that they were there, Councilman Fantini confirmed he was not there. She then confirmed with Councilwoman Reid and Supervisor Barrett that they were also not at this meeting. Ms. Hugg also asked what role Amy Standaert plays in the matter.

An audience member asked for clarification regarding the identity of the individual referenced.

Ms. Hugg response and identified Amy Standaert as the Confidential Secretary to the Board. Ms. Hugg then asked what that role meant, referencing transparency. She stated in response that Amy Standaert was involved in some lacrosse clubs.

Kris Fitzgerald of Thoroughbred Way asked Attorney Dailey whether he benefits financially from the proposed Windhover project or related dealings, and whether the project involves a client relationship. She requested a direct answer regarding any financial benefit or involvement.

Attorney Dailey responded no.

Grace Valente of Holbrook asked for confirmation that the special permit being referenced was from 1984. She stated that a lot has changed since that time and questioned whether it is appropriate to base current decisions on a permit from that year.

Bonnie Burroughs of Holbrook Drive stated that she appreciated the transparency of Supervisor Barrett and Councilwoman Reid regarding the discussion. She expressed concern about what she perceived as a lack of concern from other Board members and raised concerns about potentially circumventing prior Town Board practices related to due process, including engaging residents before committing expenditures or decisions. She acknowledged prior comments made by Supervisor Barrett agreeing regarding the need for discussion, and referenced a site visit where the council member reportedly said the site “looks good,” adding that they believed the site did not need to be changed. She concluded by stating that just because something can be done does not mean it should be done.

Sue Kimball of Holbrook Drive stated that, based on her experience as an engineer designing tests, the first step in any process is to identify the need before designing a solution. She said that in her view, the discussion is missing a clear understanding of the need for the proposed fields. She emphasized that determining community need should come before any further steps such as surveying or land clearing. She also referenced the scale and cost of similar engineering work she had been involved in, noting that such processes require significant time and due diligence. Ms. Kimball stated that she does not believe the site should be changed and urged the Board to conduct due diligence and establish need as the first step before proceeding further.

Ann Connolly of Valdepenas stated that she had not heard a clear statement of need for the proposed fields from any speakers. She thanked Councilwoman Reid for supporting the public forum discussion and referenced prior comments about the role of Amy Standaert, identifying her as the confidential secretary to the majority Town Board and stating she is a volunteer and former Town Board member who resigned. She also said she is involved in lacrosse. Ms. Connolly expressed support for neighbors who raised concerns and referenced past Town Board decisions where she felt public opposition led to proposals being tabled or reconsidered, including references to ethics committee-related matters. She stated her belief that residents should closely monitor future agendas and referenced the possibility of public protest if the proposal advances. She concluded by stating that residents should be protected and that they will continue to oppose changes they view as harmful to the neighborhood.

Gina Pereira of Holbrook Drive stated that she agrees with her neighbors and is opposed to having athletic fields behind her home. She noted that she and her husband purchased their home in part because of the existing open land and expressed a preference to keep it in its current condition. She requested clarification regarding transparency going forward, asking how residents would be notified if the matter is placed on a future agenda or if additional public forums are scheduled. She asked whether residents in the affected development could receive mailed notices about future meetings or discussions related to the proposal.

Supervisor Barrett stated that residents should be notified when appropriate but explained that the formal requirement is that the agenda is posted at least 24 hours in advance. He noted that the majority of the Board has already acted on a resolution, which means the item could appear on a future agenda at any time. He added that, under the current schedule, agendas provide 24 hours’ notice once posted and advised that residents should monitor posted agendas, as the matter could be placed on an agenda at any time going forward.

Ms. Pereira asked whether, if residents contacted the Board via email, they would be notified if the matter were to be placed on a future agenda.

Supervisor Barrett responded that he may only become aware of agenda items at the same time as residents, implying that he would not necessarily have advance notice beyond what is publicly posted.

Ms. Pereira stated that she found the situation concerning and expressed that she believes the notification process should be changed. She said she was unsure what would be required to change the policy but felt it should be discussed in the future.

Supervisor Barrett explained the former Town Board meeting schedule, noting that agendas for Monday night meetings were historically posted publicly on Friday afternoons before staff left for the day, giving the public advance notice over the weekend. He stated that under the updated 2026 schedule, the agenda is now posted on Monday night prior to a Tuesday night meeting. He reiterated that residents should monitor the posted agenda for updates.

John Olost of Holbrook Drive stated that he has not heard any clear explanation of a plan and questioned the need for the proposed project, noting that he believes a project of this scale would require significant funding and planning. He referenced concerns about prior actions taken by the Board, stating that he believed a vote had been taken to proceed with work and expressed concern about whether proper approvals, including environmental approvals, were obtained. He questioned the legality of clearing brush without Department of Environmental Conservation approval. Mr. Olost also raised concerns about potential conflicts of interest and financial benefit related to individuals or entities involved in the project, including tax-related matters and land transactions. He concluded by questioning whether there is any direct benefit being derived from the proposal.

Attorney Dailey stated that he was responding to a prior question regarding whether he has any current financial interest in the proposed project. He answered that he does not have any financial interest.

John Olost stated that he has not heard public support for the proposal and questioned who is advocating for it. He asked why the Board would pursue the matter and suggested that there may be other priorities in the Town. He expressed concern about the potential cost of studies and overall project spending, and asked which Board members would support spending significant public funds on what he described as a non-essential project.

John Heiden of Droms Road stated that the discussion raises broader questions about definitions and clarity in Town planning, particularly regarding what is meant by open space and how it relates to passive versus active recreation. He referenced property near Windhover Farms and stated his understanding that some land was set aside by a developer to meet zoning requirements and later conveyed to the Town as part of a development agreement. He suggested that clarification may be needed in Town Code regarding whether open space can be developed and whether recreational fields qualify as open space. He proposed that the Town consider reviewing and potentially defining these terms in the code to help avoid future conflicts, citing examples of prior zoning or buffer requirements that were later formalized in Town regulations. He concluded that clearer definitions of open space and allowable uses could help provide consistency and reduce ambiguity in future decisions.

Anthony Morelli of Gloucester Street stated that he walked through the neighborhood and described it as beautiful. He said he understands the concerns expressed by residents at the meeting. He asked the Town Clerk whether there are any written letters submitted either in favor of or against the proposal for the record.

Town Clerk Fantini stated that there were no written letters in favor of the proposal and two written letters in opposition.

Anthony Morelli stated that he did not believe any speakers at the current meeting expressed support for the project. He added that, based on his recollection of the prior meeting as well, no residents had spoken in favor of the project.

Supervisor Barrett thanked the attendees for their comments. He reiterated that residents should monitor upcoming agendas, as no final resolution had been acted upon and the matter could appear on a future agenda at any time. He stated that the Town Board passing a resolution prohibiting future intensive active recreational use of the property could be a potential measure worth considering. He added that this is something he believes the board should consider at the earliest possible opportunity based on the town board schedule.

Councilwoman Bellamy stated that the Town of Clifton Park will proceed with caution regarding any potential use of the property at Windhover Park. She said the Town will review the historic record, current zoning, and any environmental limitations affecting the site. She stated that any future use would require a feasibility study, cost analysis, information gathering, and public input from stakeholders and interested parties. She further stated that no decisions regarding the future of the property will be made in the immediate future until this process is completed.

Supervisor Barrett stated that his proposed resolution would save both time and money. He referenced his personal experience attending youth and collegiate soccer events and noted that

athletic facility standards have changed significantly over time, with modern demand favoring larger, more developed complexes. He described features of contemporary athletic facilities, including turf fields, indoor fields, amenities, and infrastructure, and stated that such facilities are what teams and tournament organizers currently prefer. He stated that a facility of the type being discussed would require significant development work, including field upgrades, infrastructure such as parking and water, and environmental review including wetlands mapping and delineation. He noted that such studies take time to complete. He further stated that even if some development requirements were met, he did not believe the site would be suitable or competitive for attracting tournaments or organized sports use based on current industry expectations. He concluded that, based on his experience and understanding of current recreational facility standards, he does not believe the site would meet the requirements or expectations for a complex of that nature.

No one else wished to be heard.

End 9:20 p.m.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 169 of 2026, a resolution authorizing seven (7) Town Court Clerks and two (2) Town Justices to attend the NYSAMCC Annual Conference in Albany, NY September 27-September 30, 2026.

Introduced by Councilman Manir, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilwoman Reid.

WHEREAS, the State requires all Judges and Court Clerks to attend a training session on a yearly basis, and

WHEREAS, NYSAMCC will provide the necessary training for the judges and court clerks at the annual fall conference held in Albany, NY from September 27-September 30, 2026, and attendance at this meeting would provide a public benefit to the Town; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that seven (7) Town Court Clerks and two (2) Town Justices, are hereby authorized to attend the NYSAMCC annual conference in Albany, NY from September 27-September 30, 2026, to be paid from A-1110-001 (General Fund – Municipal Court - Training & Conferences); and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Justices are authorized to close the Courts at their discretion during this time.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to heard.

Resolution No. 170 of 2026, a resolution increasing Justice Court revenues and expenditures by \$15,666 for office construction projects and a record management software purchase with funds received from a Justice Court Assistance Program (JCAP) Grant.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS, the Town Board passed Resolution No. 214 of 2025 authorizing the Clifton Park Town Court to apply for a Justice Court Assistance Program Grant towards remodeling of the Court office room and purchase of record management computer software, and

WHEREAS, the Clifton Park Justice Court was awarded \$15,166.24 from the JCAP Grant; now, therefore be it,

RESOLVED that the Comptroller is hereby authorized to increase Justice Court Revenues (A-3089) by \$15,666.24, and, also, to increase Expenditures A-1110-200 (General Fund – Municipal Court – Equipment) by \$2,166 and A-1110-15 (General Fund – Municipal Court – other Contractual) by \$13,500, as detailed on the attached JCAP Award Reconciliation Report.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to heard.

Resolution No. 171 of 2026, a resolution re-appointing Joseph S. Gulyas as Chairman of the Ethics Board.

Introduced by Councilman Manir, who moved its adoption, seconded by Supervisor Barrett.

WHEREAS, Mr. Gulyas's previous term as Chairman of the Ethics Board expired on December 31, 2025, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board recommends reappointing Mr. Gulyas, of Clifton Park, NY, to the position; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that Joseph S. Gulyas is hereby re-appointed as Chairman of the Ethics Board, term to expire December 31, 2026.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Manir, Supervisor Barrett

Abstained: Councilman Fantini, Councilwoman Reid

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett stated that Mr. Gulyas has served as Ethics chair for several years and described him as a solid individual. He expressed opposition to the Town Board selecting the ethics committee chair, characterizing it as part of broader changes to the ethics code initiated by the Board majority earlier in the year. He referenced prior meetings and resolutions related to changes in the Ethics code and stated that, in his view, the process used to make those changes did not follow proper procedure. He concluded that he supports Mr. Gulyas as chair but expressed concern about the process by which the town board selects the Ethics committee chair, stating he believes it represents an inappropriate shift in the structure of the Ethics Board.

Councilwoman Reid stated that she supports Mr. Gulyas. She expressed her view that there has been no legitimate change to the law despite a vote at the prior meeting. She stated that she does not recognize the Town Board's attempt to appoint the chair of the Ethics committee and believes that, under existing law, the Ethics Board retains the authority to appoint its own chair.

Resolution No. 172 of 2026, a resolution in support of the Town of Clifton Park's celebration of the Town's bicentennial to be held in 2028 and authorizing a transfer from Contingency for related expenses.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS, the Town of Clifton Park will commemorate its 200th anniversary in 2028, marking a historic milestone in our Town's history; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 131 of 2023, the Town Board authorized the establishment of a Clifton Park 200th Celebration Committee to coordinate the commemoration of this milestone, and

WHEREAS, Town Law authorizes the Town Board to appropriate funds for the proper observance of patriotic and historical events (Town Law § 64 [12], [14]), and Arts and Cultural Affairs Law § 57.07 further authorizes local governments to appropriate and expend funds for historical purposes within their jurisdiction, including the erection of markers and monuments, the preservation of historical materials, and cooperation with local historical organizations; and

WHEREAS, these statutes provide the legal authority for towns to engage in and support commemorations that are educational, patriotic, and historical in character, including public programming, exhibits, community events, and historical preservation activities connected to the Town of Clifton Park's 200th Commemoration; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Clifton Park hereby expresses its support for the Town's Bicentennial Celebration to be held in 2028, and authorizes the Comptroller to transfer \$1,000 from Contingency (A-01990-00015) to A-07550-00062 (General Fund – Town Celebrations – Town Bicentennial) for initial expenditures related to this Bicentennial Celebration.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

Councilwoman Reid stated that the item under discussion would create a specific budget line for the Town's bicentennial celebration scheduled for 2028. She noted that planning is already in the initial stages. She explained that establishing a dedicated budget line would support planning efforts and allow the Town to begin allocating funds in advance, ensuring sufficient resources are available when the event is executed.

Resolution No. 173 of 2026, a resolution authorizing the appointment and/or re-classification of individuals within departments for the Town of Clifton Park and job title changes related thereto.

Introduced by Councilman Manir, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Fantini.

WHEREAS, through the tenure of three past Town Clerks of the Town of Clifton Park, namely Patricia O'Donnell, Teresa Brobston and Caitlin Fantini, requests have been made to the Town Board for an additional Deputy Town Clerk, and

WHEREAS, the Town Clerk's office has been continuously understaffed and is often overwhelmed with work, and

WHEREAS, the Town Clerk and two Deputy Town Clerks are overworked and under pressure in the performance of their duties to the citizens of the Town of Clifton Park, and

WHEREAS, a comparison of how many residents are served per member of staff, reveals that the Town Clerk's office is burdened with a greater workload than any other municipality in

Saratoga County by a percentage of 35% more than the closest government, being Saratoga Springs. Generally, the Town Clerk’s office serves more residents on a percentage basis, than the average comparable municipality (5000 residents per staff), by a percentage exceeding 150%, please see attached staffing comparison, and

WHEREAS, letters of support from former Town Clerk Patricia O’Donnell, and former Deputy Town Clerk Claudia Fitzgerald, are attached, and

WHEREAS, after years of requests to the Town Board for additional help, the Town Board by this resolution has finally responded and offers the following in response, and

WHEREAS, the Confidential Secretary positions listed in the Town employment matrix are established as a Grade 8 position, and

WHEREAS, the Confidential Secretary in the Town Attorney’s office is listed as a Grade 7 position, for a directly comparable employment position, resulting in a payment disparity, likely as an oversight administratively, and

WHEREAS, Deputy Town Attorney Kevin Luibrand has been assigned duties involving unanticipated litigation, not contemplated in the preparation of the 2026 Town Budget, and

WHEREAS, these various litigation matters are beyond the ordinary scope of duties involved with the Zoning Board of Appeals and involve much additional time, beyond the scope of the Deputy Town Attorney’s position, as anticipated at the time of adoption of the 2026 Town Budget, and

WHEREAS, Deputy Town Attorney Stefanie Bitter has been assigned additional duties by the Town Board in review of written decisions promulgated by the Zoning Officer, and

WHEREAS, Deputy Town Attorney Stefanie Bitter has been assigned the lead role in preparing the Town’s position in regard to the application for a concrete batch processing plant, involving a moratorium and an appeal of a decision of the Zoning Administrator, made to the Town Zoning Board of Appeals, all of which will require an exhaustive and time consuming administrative and review process, and

WHEREAS, as a result, the Town Board has recommended the following changes, re-classifications, new hires and/or appointments within the Town, as listed in Table I, as follows:

Table I

	Name/Address	Dept.	Position	Grade/Step	Rate	Comment
1,	New Appointment, New Position	Town Clerk	Deputy Town Clerk	G6, S1, Y1	\$33.50/hr	Salary for balance of 2026: \$39,400
2,	Cynthia Zlogar	Town Attorney	Confidential Secretary	G8, S4, Y1	\$43.74/hr	Salary increase for balance of 2026: \$4,586
3,	Kevin Luibrand	Town Attorney	Deputy Town Attorney	N/A	N/A	Salary increase for balance of 2026: \$8,107
4,	Stefanie Bitter	Town Attorney	Deputy Town Attorney	N/A	N/A	Salary increase for balance of 2026: \$12,613

Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board endorses and approves of the changes as set forth in Table I, above; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board authorizes the creation of a third Deputy Town Clerk position in the office of the Town Clerk, based on the recommendation of the Town Clerk; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board authorizes the reclassification of Cynthia Zlogar as Confidential Secretary to the Town Attorney, at Grade 8, Step 4, Year 1, effective May 19, 2026; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Comptroller is authorized to make a transfer from Unassigned Fund Balance of \$64,706, based on the attached schedules, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Comptroller is authorized to transfer from Unassigned Fund Balance, \$4,950 for Social Security and Medicare, with \$4,012 to A-9030-101 (General Fund – Employee Benefits – Social Security) and \$938 to A-9035-102 (General Fund – Employee Benefits – Medicare).

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir

Noes: Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett questioned a job title change and referenced several personnel and budget-related items being introduced within the current year, stating that these were not contemplated in the 2026 budget. He noted that the Town is approximately five months into the year and suggested that these changes were introduced after the budget process. He referenced the creation of a new position in the Town Clerk's office, a salary increase for the Confidential Secretary to the Town Attorney, and substantial percentage increases for Deputy Town Attorneys, stating that these were presented as a promotion. He also noted an apparent discrepancy in documentation, stating that earlier materials referenced five individuals, while a later packet listed only four.

Councilwoman Reid stated that she had the same question regarding the use of the term "promotion," noting that it did not appear that anyone was receiving a promotion. She added that she may be missing information. She further stated that the materials reference both "promotion" and "reclassification," and questioned the distinction between the two terms.

Supervisor Barrett stated that he did not believe raises should be granted within a single department, specifically referencing the Town attorney's office. He noted that the Deputy Town Attorneys accepted their positions at the salary established at the start of 2026 and questioned the rationale for granting raises only a few months into the year. He added that the items in question were included as a group in the resolution and stated that he would be voting against them.

Councilwoman Reid stated that, regarding the Deputy Town Attorneys, the previous individuals in those positions had served for several years and were likely at higher salary levels due to longevity. She noted that new hires typically start at lower salary levels. She asked for confirmation and stated that employees generally progress through salary grades over time based on length of service and experience.

Mark Heggen stated that the Deputy Attorneys are not on the salary matrix. He explained that while the Town Attorney is included on the matrix, the Deputy Attorneys are not. He noted that Deputy Attorneys typically receive a cost-of-living increase each year.

Councilwoman Reid acknowledged prior communication during the appointment of the Deputy Town Attorneys regarding employee morale and compensation. She noted that there had been discussion about hiring new attorneys at salary levels comparable to those who had previously held the positions for several years.

Attorney Dailey stated that there is no promotion involved and clarified that the matter in question is a reclassification. He stated that the reclassification applies to the Confidential Secretary in the Town Attorney's office, who is being moved to a higher classification. He added

that it would be helpful if the Town Clerk could read the relevant clauses that explain the resolution.

An audience member asked which resolution was being discussed, referencing “Resolution No. 5” regarding revision of administrative procedures in the planning department. The speaker stated that this item was not listed on the agenda provided to the public.

Town Clerk Fantini stated that she could read out the full resolution being discussed if the Board wished.

An audience member stated that the resolution was included in the packet but was not listed in the table of contents. They expressed concern that the public may not have been able to easily identify the item either in the printed materials or on the Town’s website.

A response was made that the information is also posted online in the same format.

An audience member stated that the item was not available online in the same way it was referenced, and that while adjustments may have been made, those changes were not reflected in the materials distributed at the meeting.

Attorney Dailey stated that the Town Attorney’s office is facing increased workload going forward, particularly related to litigation involving a concrete batch plant. He noted that he recently met with John Scavo to discuss legal and political strategy for the project and indicated that the office anticipates a significant increase in required hours. He stated that the compensation adjustments for the two Deputy Town Attorneys are intended to reflect the additional workload associated with this matter, and added that he will also be heavily involved going forward. He explained that a Confidential Secretary in his office is currently classified at grade seven, while other Confidential Secretaries in the Town are at grade eight, and suggested that the position be reclassified to align with the others. He further referenced staffing changes in the Town Clerk’s office and stated that the relevant provisions in the resolution address those changes. He concluded that prior Deputy Town Attorneys were not previously required to handle the level of additional work now anticipated in 2026.

Supervisor Barrett stated that, historically, Deputy Town Attorneys have attended Planning Board, Zoning Board, and other committee meetings and have taken on additional tasks as needed. He said that, in his view, the current situation is no different from past practice. He concluded by characterizing the proposed compensation changes as “a money grab.”

Councilwoman Reid referenced the third “resolved” clause, which states that the town board authorizes the promotion of Cynthia Zlogar to confidential secretary. She questioned who is making the promotion decision and noted that there is a distinction between a promotion and a reclassification or pay increase, stating that the wording may be a matter of semantics.

Attorney Dailey stated that the term “promotion” should instead be “reclassification.”

Supervisor Barrett stated that the term “promotion” likely relates to a fifth individual that had been included in earlier materials but was removed from the current packet. He noted that the initial version of the packet listed five people, while the revised version included four, and suggested that the promotion reference may have pertained to the removed individual.

Councilwoman Reid stated that multiple employee matters were being grouped into a single resolution and expressed concern that this format would not allow the Board to vote on items individually. She also questioned whether Councilman Fantini would be voting on the resolution or abstaining, referencing that one of the items could potentially benefit his wife’s position.

Councilman Fantini stated that he does not plan to vote on something that would benefit his wife. He added that the Clerk’s office serves the residents of the Town and is the primary point of public interaction with Town government. He stated that he is voting in support of the Clerk’s office. Councilman Fantini added that individuals interacting with the Town Clerk’s office include residents coming in for services such as dog licenses and other routine requests. He stated that he is voting in support of the Town Clerk’s office and in support of Town residents.

Supervisor Barrett stated that Councilman Fantini would be voting to allocate additional resources to the Town Clerk's office, which he noted is held by Councilman Fantini's spouse. He suggested that this situation presents a conflict of interest concern and stated his view that the matter is not appropriate, particularly given that it is occurring early in the budget year and involves increased resources for that department.

Councilman Fantini stated that prior correspondence from former Town Clerks indicated that the office did not have sufficient resources. He described the Town Clerk's office as an important department that many residents interact with more frequently than other departments. He stated that the requested changes have been under discussion for several years.

Supervisor Barrett stated that, regardless of arguments about staffing levels or prior correspondence indicating resource needs, the central issue remained that Councilman Fantini would be voting to allocate additional resources to the department in which his spouse serves as Town Clerk. He reiterated his position that this was the key fact at issue. He stated that even if the department were understaffed, it would not change his view of the situation. He added that, in his opinion, the justification being provided did not address the underlying concern he was raising. He reiterated that the vote would result in additional resources being directed to his wife's department and emphasized that, in his view, this was the fundamental issue.

Councilwoman Reid stated that the issue is not disagreement with adding an additional position in the Clerk's office, but rather a concern regarding a potential conflict of interest.

Councilwoman Bellamy stated that a resident had mentioned earlier in the meeting how quickly a service request was handled. She added that, in her view, the Town Clerk's office does a good job serving residents.

Town Clerk Fantini stated that the Clerk's office is severely overworked and requested the opportunity to speak on the matter as it relates to her department. She stated that the office is behind in workload and that staff are overworked. She referenced the volume of work handled by the office, including dog licenses, marriage licenses, notary requests, and other vital records, and compared current workload levels to prior years and other Towns. She stated that the office is "scrambling" and indicated that an additional staff member is needed.

Councilman Manir stated that he had reviewed letters from previous Town Clerks requesting additional staff in the office. He also referenced population growth as a factor contributing to increased workload demands.

Town Clerk Fantini stated that, compared to other municipalities, the Clerk's office is severely understaffed and outdated, with limited space. She said the office is too busy to reorganize operations and that the workload impacts the ability to serve residents efficiently. She emphasized that the staffing shortage ultimately affects Town residents and stated that the goal is to serve residents to the best of the office's ability. She reiterated that having an additional staff member would help address these issues.

Councilman Manir stated that the Town Clerk's office is the face of the town, as it is where residents often first come for services. He said he does not want any citizens to suffer due to service delays and stated that he supports the proposal.

Councilwoman Reid stated that she does not disagree with the Town Clerk regarding staffing needs. However, she reiterated her concern about multiple items being grouped together in a single resolution, explaining that it prevents the Board from voting on each item individually. She said that this structure makes it difficult to separate agreement or disagreement with specific parts of the resolution.

Attorney Dailey stated that he does not see a conflict of interest in the matter. He explained that, in his view, the proposal is intended for the benefit of the Town Clerk's office.

Resolution No. 174 of 2026, a resolution to authorize the revision of administrative procedures within the Department of Planning and Zoning.

Introduced by Councilman Fantini, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS, the Town Board finds that legal review of draft advisory written communications related to Special Use Permits, Site Plan Approvals, Zoning Law Interpretations, and Use Variances prepared by the Zoning Administrator or Zoning Enforcement Officer can promote accuracy, consistency, and compliance with applicable laws; and

WHEREAS, nothing in this resolution is intended to delay or interfere with the issuance or filing of any official administrative determination required by New York Town Law; and

WHEREAS, nothing in this resolution shall be construed to limit, direct, or influence the independent statutory authority of the Planning Board or Zoning Board of Appeals, or to restrict the information those bodies are entitled to receive in the course of performing their duties; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby adopts the following internal administrative procedure for the Department of Planning and Zoning:

1. Draft advisory written communications prepared by the Zoning Administrator or Zoning Enforcement Officer relating to Special Use Permits, Site Plan Approvals, Zoning Law Interpretations, and Use Variances, and intended to provide guidance to Town staff, applicants, or Town boards, shall be submitted to the Office of the Town Attorney for legal review prior to issuance.

2. Draft materials subject to review under this resolution shall be transmitted to the Office of the Town Attorney through CitizenServe, or through such other electronic system as may be designated by the Town Attorney or Deputy Town Attorney.

3. This procedure shall not restrict or delay the transmission of any information or documents required by the Planning Board or Zoning Board of Appeals in the exercise of their independent statutory authority.

4. The Town Attorney may establish reasonable guidelines for the timely review of draft materials submitted under this resolution.

; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Department of Planning & Zoning is directed to implement this procedure immediately and to incorporate it into its internal administrative protocols.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir

Noes: Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett stated that the resolution being discussed was, in his view, an “exhaustive” resolution affecting the planning and zoning department. He characterized it as part of what he described as ongoing pressure or intimidation toward Town employees, referencing prior actions and processes, including the transition team and continuing into 2026. He stated that, in his opinion, the resolution extends that pattern into administrative functions and asserted that this was the purpose of the measure.

Attorney Dailey explained that the resolution concerns changes in administrative procedures involving the Town’s planning and zoning processes. He stated that Scott Reese serves as the Town’s sole administrative officer and has a background in stormwater management, which he described as his primary area of expertise. He said Mr. Reese was later assigned additional responsibilities involving zoning and planning review, including review of applications for special permits, use variances, and related matters requiring written opinions. Attorney Dailey

stated that, in the view of the Town Attorney's office, Mr. Reese has been performing work that should be reviewed by the town attorney before issuance. He stated that the purpose of the resolution is to ensure legal review of such opinions to protect both the town and Mr. Reese from potential issues or litigation. He added that Mr. Reese contributed to drafting portions of the resolution and that his input lengthened it. He further stated that Mr. Reese performs well in his role, is respected by the zoning board, and is a valuable employee, and reiterated that the intent of the resolution is to clarify responsibilities and provide proper oversight going forward.

Supervisor Barrett stated that he disagreed with the characterization that the resolution was intended for protection. He said that, in his view, the resolution was not about protection but rather about intimidation of Town employees. He added that he believed this had been a continued focus of the board majority over recent months.

Councilman Fantini stated that the Town is currently involved in litigation regarding zoning determinations related to Exit 8. He suggested that, in his view, if the proposed administrative changes had been in place earlier, such litigation might have been avoided. He stated that there have been other decisions where legal review would have been beneficial, though he did not elaborate on specifics. He concluded that the proposal represents an opportunity to ensure the Town is acting correctly from a legal standpoint.

Councilwoman Reid referenced item number four in the resolution, which states that the Town Attorney may establish reasonable guidelines for the timely review of draft materials. She asked what would be considered a "timely review" and requested clarification on the standard being proposed. She also asked whether the proposed changes would result in delays for matters coming before the Town boards.

Attorney Dailey stated that the referenced paragraph was added by Scott Reese and had been discussed with the Town Attorney's office. He explained that the intent is to review matters as they come in, and that more complex issues may be reviewed by multiple Town Attorneys. He emphasized that the goal of the provision is not to delay processes, but to ensure matters are handled as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Resolution No. 175 of 2026, a resolution to authorize the creation of a plan for an increase in the parking lot capacity at the Clifton Park Senior Community Center.

Introduced by Councilwoman Bellamy, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Fantini.

WHEREAS, membership at the Clifton Park Senior Community Center has increased dramatically, and

WHEREAS, there is not an adequate number of parking spaces to accommodate senior citizen members, where many patrons must, as a result, park on lawns or in the right of the way, creating dangerous parking situations for seniors with walkers or in wheelchairs, and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that clearing of a number of trees on an immediately adjacent area at Clifton Common may be necessary, and

WHEREAS, the Clifton Park Tree Committee has visited this location and has determined that the trees have reached the limits of their natural life, are not native, were likely associated with a former Christmas tree farm, and have little value as a stand of healthy trees, not being native trees or customary native species, with correspondence from Chairwoman Diana Leis Delker, attached, and

WHEREAS, Sue Leonard, Director of the Clifton Park Senior Community Center, has made an appeal to the Town Board seeking to expand the parking lot, and

WHEREAS, in order to provide adequate parking for patrons at the Clifton Park Senior Community Center; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Director of Buildings, Parks and Recreation, the Town Highway Superintendent and the Director of Planning are authorized to examine the area adjacent to the

Clifton Park Senior Community Center and to formulate a plan to determine how to best provide additional parking at the Senior Center, to include possibly the removal of the aforesaid trees and further to determine if certain aspects of the parking plan as formulated can be accomplished in-house by cooperation between the Highway Department and the Buildings and Grounds Department; and be it further

RESOLVED, that if outside construction work is required, including tree removal, then and in that event, that the additional work contemplated and the plan to proceed, with bids and otherwise, shall be referred back to the Town Board, with a report and a request for further authorization.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid

Noes: Supervisor Barrett

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett stated that he had previously raised concerns earlier in the meeting regarding the removal or reduction of the remaining group of trees on the common area designated for general recreational use. He described the area as a significant and remaining natural buffer on the property and noted that it contains a substantial number of trees. He expressed concern that the proposal would eliminate this buffer and stated that the undertaking would be costly while offering, in his view, limited or questionable benefit. He concluded that he did not believe the plan was appropriate to move forward in its current form, or possibly at all.

Councilman Fantini stated that senior residents need convenient parking access at the senior center due to mobility considerations, and that requiring seniors to park near the soccer fields would not be practical. He also referenced prior discussions with a trade committee, noting that correspondence had been provided to the Board. He asked whether that correspondence should be read into the record.

Councilwoman Bellamy read the following correspondence into the record:

“Dear Tree Committee colleagues, as you may know, the parking situation at the senior center has become extremely difficult due to a shortage of spaces. The director of the center, Sue Leonard, has appealed to town officials to expand the parking lot because people are currently parking on the grass when there are no more spaces. The logical area to expand the lot is in the back, which involves removing a stand of trees. The positive news is that before taking action, our town attorney reached out to the Tree Committee for our input. Steve Morris and I met with Kevin Dailey in the parking lot at the senior center this morning to discuss the problem. After looking at all options, it is clear there is only one solution: expanding the parking lot by removing the trees at the back of the lot. While we also discussed expanding the front of the lot, there is a master plan in place that would prevent this. Although every tree is precious, there is no easy solution to save these trees, and we must be mindful of our senior citizens and their needs. And there are many senior citizens on this Tree Committee. Kevin said that a fence would be erected to separate the parking lot from the work area used by Building and Grounds, and we suggested that if there is room, planting some trees in front of the fence would be a good step. After meeting, I asked Steve to put his assessment in writing for Kevin and the rest of the Tree Committee. I didn’t bring this issue to you for a vote because I think this matters beyond our authority. At the same time, we should be thankful for the Town Board who cares about the environment, our community forest, and who sincerely wants our input and perspective. Please see Steve’s assessment: Below are my observations regarding the trees we reviewed that could potentially be removed to facilitate the parking lot expansion. The area in question is largely populated by Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), a non-native species originally introduced for timber, pulp, or Christmas tree cultivation. Examination of aerial imagery suggests that this stand was established sometime between 1960 and 1968. Your recollection of harvesting a Christmas tree at this site aligns with evidence that the area functioned as a Christmas tree lot before being left to grow without further management. The stand itself covers approximately half an acre and is isolated from other wooded areas. Expanding the parking lot to match the grade of the existing

lot would require a substantial reduction in elevation. Such a modification could leave portions of the stand vulnerable, potentially resulting in hazard trees if some are left standing.
— Steven Morris, retired forester, Tree Committee member.”

Supervisor Barrett stated that he regularly visits the senior center multiple times per week for special events and is familiar with its operations. He referenced his involvement in 2016 when the senior center was experiencing difficulties following the departure of a private operator, noting that he worked on-site for several months during that period to help maintain operations. He stated that membership has increased from approximately 620 members at that time to about 1,600 currently, and emphasized his familiarity with the center’s history and growth. He concluded that, in his view, the proposed option regarding the site remains a “bad option.”

Councilwoman Reid asked Councilman Bellamy whether he had met with the Tree Committee and whether he had walked the site with them.

Councilwoman Bellamy responded that she did not walk the site with the Tree Committee. She stated that she had walked the site on her own.

Councilwoman Reid asked whether there were any legal issues related to the proposed removal of trees at the site.

Attorney Dailey stated none that he was aware of.

Councilwoman Reid stated that she was questioning why the Town Attorney needed to walk the site with the Tree Committee. She suggested that clarification was needed regarding the Town Attorney’s involvement in the site visit and the purpose of that participation.

Attorney Dailey responded that he attended the site walk because he was available at that time.

Supervisor Barrett stated that there is a question regarding whether trees can be removed from parkland of this type, indicating that it may involve additional legal or procedural considerations. He noted that this issue was separate from the immediate discussion and suggested that it had not been fully addressed in the current context.

Councilwoman Reid asked whether there was a map or diagram available to help clarify the specific area under discussion for the proposed tree removal and parking lot expansion. She requested visual documentation to better understand the location and scope of the project. She added a follow-up question asking whether the discussion was referring to the line of trees that serves as a buffer between the grassy seating area and the performing arts stage.

Councilwoman Bellamy responded that the trees being discussed are not the ones near the performing arts stage. She clarified that the area in question is located behind the building and grounds department, where one would turn left and go through a wooded area toward the senior center. She further described the area as containing saw horses, barrels, and other equipment, identifying this as the specific section of trees under discussion.

Councilwoman Reid clarified that she was not referring to the trees behind the stage, but rather a line of coniferous trees located between the senior center and the performing arts stage. She stated that during events at the performing arts stage, the lawn in front of the stage is often filled with people, and that this row of trees is situated in that area.

Attorney Dailey clarified that the location being discussed is not the area between the senior center and the performing arts stage. He stated that the correct area is west of that location and described it as a roughly square-shaped area, approximately one-third of an unspecified larger area.

Supervisor Barrett asked what the actual parking demand would be if there is a need for additional parking, specifically requesting clarification on how many parking spaces are required.

Councilwoman Bellamy stated that the current parking supply is approximately 87 spaces and referenced an estimated senior center membership of about 1,600 people. She suggested that,

assuming maximum simultaneous usage, an additional 25 to 30 parking spaces might be needed. She noted that the senior center hosts multiple activities, including Zumba, yoga, orchestra performances, and jazz performances. She also added that there had been discussion of potentially adding an indoor stage.

Councilwoman Reid asked for clarification on what the Board was approving, specifically whether they were approving a finalized layout or simply authorizing the creation or development of a layout. She added that, from a planning perspective, it would be helpful to review a map or visual reference. She stated that this would clarify the discussion and asked whether the area being referenced was the farthest corner of the parking lot near the front entrance.

Councilwoman Bellamy clarified the location under discussion, stating that if one exits the front door and goes left, there is a pump station. She added that continuing slightly past the pump station leads to a wooded area, which she identified as the area being referenced.

Councilwoman Reid asked why, instead of removing trees, the Town could not pave the grassy area where people are currently parking. She suggested this as an alternative option to address the parking shortage.

Supervisor Barrett responded that the grassy area is already used for parking during major events, particularly on Saturdays for soccer activities. He stated that a large portion of the grass area has historically been used for parking on many occasions throughout the year.

Councilman Manir stated that the senior center has been requesting additional parking for approximately three to four years. He emphasized the importance of safety for senior citizens and stated that providing a parking lot would allow seniors to walk more safely to the facility. He stated his understanding that the current proposal is only for the creation of a plan rather than immediate construction, and confirmed that understanding. He added that Councilwoman Reid would have an opportunity to participate in the process, work on the proposal, and provide feedback.

Councilwoman Reid asked whether there is a budget allocated for the proposed parking lot expansion and related planning work.

Councilman Manir responded that there is currently no budget established for the project. He stated that a budget cannot be determined without first developing a plan. He explained that the process would involve creating a plan first, after which costs and a budget could be evaluated. He added that initial planning steps do not require funding approval at that stage.

Resolution No. 176 of 2026, a resolution to authorize a change to the adjournment date of the Concrete Batch Mixing Plant facilities public hearing that was held on April 21, 2026 and to re-notice the re-convening of the public hearing.

Introduced by Councilman Fantini, who moved its adoption, and seconded by Councilwoman Bellamy.

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by the Town of Clifton Park Town Board for a moratorium on the establishment of Concrete Batch Plants, held on April 21, 2026, which was adjourned, and not closed, at the conclusion of the hearing on that evening, and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the hearing, the Town Board, by a yea or nay voice vote, voted to adjourn the meeting until the Town Board meeting to be held on June 5, 2026, and

WHEREAS, subsequently, it was determined that a reply to the referral sent to the Saratoga County Planning Board would not be received by the Town until after the meeting of the County Planning Board on May 21, 2026, and

WHEREAS, to allow sufficient time for the reply to be received and which reply must be read into the minutes of the public hearing, it is necessary to postpone the adjourn date until such time as the reply is received; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the aforementioned public hearing shall be adjourned until the Town Board meeting to be held on June 16, 2026 at 7:05pm and that the previous oral yea or nay vote adjourning the public hearing date to June 5, 2026, is amended accordingly, and extended to June 16, 2026 as set forth herein; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk is hereby directed to re-notice the date of the re-convening of the public hearing to the adjournment date as is set forth herein; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this curative and corrective measure is hereby adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Clifton Park.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to be heard.

Resolution No. 177 of 2026, a resolution accepting funds from the Clifton Park Rotary Club and authorizing the Department of Building and Grounds to purchase four (4) white oak trees at Garnsey Park.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS, the Clifton Park Rotary Club has offered a donation of up to \$538 for the purchase of four (4) white oak trees at Garnsey Park, and has offered volunteers who will plant the trees, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board, as stewards of Garnsey Park, wishes to accept the donation from the Rotary to offset the cost of the four white oak trees at Garnsey Park, and

WHEREAS, Daniel Clemens, Director of Buildings, Grounds and Recreation, advises that Bob’s Trees, 1227 W. Galway Rd., Hagaman, NY, has four such trees available for a cost not to exceed \$538; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Comptroller is authorized to increase revenues to A-02705 (General Fund-Gifts & Donations) by \$538, and increase expenditures in A-07160-00090 (General Fund-Garnsey Park- Trees) by \$538, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Director of Buildings, Grounds and Recreation is authorized to accept the quote of Bob’s Trees, as lowest responsive quote, for the purchase of four (4) white oak trees, at a cost not to exceed \$538.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to be heard.

Resolution No. 178 of 2026, a resolution authorizing the purchase of landscape material for the Longkill Playground within Longkill Park District #1.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 205 of 2025, the Town Board authorized the installation of capital improvements for the Longkill Park District #1, which included a new playground, and

WHEREAS, Daniel Clemens, Director of Buildings, Parks and Recreation, requested quotes to purchase 335 cubic yards of mulch for the new playground, and

WHEREAS, S.M. Gallivan, LLC submitted the lowest conforming quote for the mulch, in an amount not to exceed \$9,883; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board as Commissioners of the Longkill Park District #1, hereby accepts the price quote from S.M.Gallivan, LLC, for the 335 cubic yards of mulch to be installed at the new Longkill Playground at the Longkill Park District #1, at a cost not to exceed \$9,883, to be paid from SP5-7123-200 (Longkill Park District #1 – Longkill I – Equipment).

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett questioned the terminology used in the resolution, asking whether the reference to “mulch” should instead be described as “wood chips.”

Daniel Clemens clarified that the material referred to in the resolution is playground mulch or playground wood fibers, commonly described as wood chips. He stated that while the terms are used interchangeably, the product is a type of mulch. He further explained that it is not standard mulch, but rather a sifted and cleaned fiber material designed for playground use.

Councilwoman Bellamy stated that a resident had asked why wood chips are used instead of river stone for playground surfacing, noting that river stone may be less harsh on feet. She added that she was uncertain whether children might be playing barefoot and did not provide a further conclusion.

Daniel Clemens stated that walnut-based playground ground cover is preferable to stone, noting it provides a softer landing surface and is easier to maintain. He explained that the material can be refreshed or “fluffed up” annually rather than fully replaced. He also stated that stone tends to scatter into surrounding grass, which can create additional maintenance issues.

Resolution No. 179 of 2026, a resolution authorizing additional professional service costs for construction administration and environmental testing related to the decommissioning of existing fuel tanks as part of the Highway Fuel System Improvements Project.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilwoman Bellamy.

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 239 of 2021, the Town Board designated funding to analyze and advance improvements and replacement of the underground gasoline pumps and tanks at the Town Highway Department facilities; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 218 of 2023, the Town Board authorized the Supervisor to execute an agreement with Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI) to provide engineering design, environmental, and construction administration services for the Highway Fuel System Improvements Project; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 161 of 2024, the Town Board approved a contract amendment with Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. in the amount of \$17,800 to address design and layout changes associated with the Highway Fuel System Improvements Project; and

WHEREAS, construction of the new fueling system experienced schedule delays due to seasonal and logistical factors, resulting in an extended construction duration and a winter shutdown of certain construction activities; and

WHEREAS, during the winter shutdown period, the new fueling pumps were completed, tested, and placed into service, and are currently operational; and

WHEREAS, due to winter conditions, removal and decommissioning of the existing underground fuel tanks and legacy fueling system was deferred and is now scheduled to commence in May 2026; and

WHEREAS, Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. has submitted an Authorization for Professional Services dated February 12, 2026, identified as Additional Services #3, requesting additional compensation in an amount not to exceed \$8,150 to complete construction administration and environmental services through final project closeout; and

WHEREAS, the original scope and cost for construction administration and environmental services were based upon estimated hours and assumed conditions, and as construction activities progressed on this approximately \$834,000 Capital Construction Costs Project, additional time and effort were required to address field conditions, coordination issues, regulatory compliance, and testing needs as they arose, resulting in adjustments reflecting actual time and materials expended; and

WHEREAS, said additional services include construction administration associated with the extended schedule, oversight of tank removal, demolition of the existing fueling station, site restoration, final inspections, review of contractor payment applications, and responses to requests for information; and

WHEREAS, the additional services also include environmental inspection, soil sampling, laboratory testing, and preparation of a closure report by Ambient Environmental, Inc., a subcontractor to GPI, reflecting current 2026 laboratory testing rates and regulatory requirements for petroleum-contaminated soils; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Planning and Zoning has reviewed the proposed additional services and recommends approval in order to ensure regulatory compliance, proper project closeout, and protection of public health and safety; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby authorizes a contract amendment with Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. for Additional Services #3 for the Highway Fuel System Improvements Project in an amount not to exceed \$8,150; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Supervisor is hereby authorized to execute all necessary documents to effectuate this amendment; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Comptroller is authorized to transfer from A-00914 (General Fund - Unassigned Fund Balance) \$8,150 to A-05132-00135 (General Fund — Highway Garage — Engineering).

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett thanked John Scavo for leading the project and acknowledged Daniel Clemens for providing support. He expressed appreciation to both individuals for their contributions.

Resolution No. 180 of 2026, a resolution to adopt the Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan, and for the Plan to be adopted and incorporated into and to become part of the Town of Clifton Park Comprehensive Plan.

Introduced by Councilman Manir, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilwoman Reid.

WHEREAS, the Town of Clifton Park authorized and funded the preparation of a Draft Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan, with a \$25,000 municipal planning grant from the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets and with local matching funds, to retain professional planning consultants team led by Community Planning & Environmental Associates to work with a Town advisory project committee to conduct a public planning process to create the draft plan, starting in 2024 through Spring 2026; and

WHEREAS, the Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan was developed under NYS Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AAA, Section 324-a, and includes all the elements set forth in Section 324-A of the Agriculture and Markets Law; and

WHEREAS, the purpose and intent of the plan was to identify and communicate the community's long-term vision and shared goals for the future of agriculture, to gather public input in the creation of the draft plan, to better understand the current state of farming in Clifton Park and the role it plays in the local economy, landscape and community identity, to document existing conditions, evaluate the economic value of farming, to understand the challenges and opportunities for farming today in Clifton Park, and to outline strategies to support farm viability, protect working farmland with willing landowners, and ensure agriculture remains an important part of Clifton Park balanced with the community as it continues to grow; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board accepted the Draft Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan from the project advisory committee and consultants on March 17, 2026, commencing the public review period with the draft plan available online and hard copy at the Town Clerk's offices; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Clifton Park, acting as Lead Agency, reviewed the Full Environmental Assessment Form, classified the adoption of the Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan as a Type I Action under SEQR pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.4(b)(1), with coordinated review, and adopted a SEQR Negative Declaration for the Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan, by Resolution No. 87 of 2026, and filed, published and circulated the Negative Declaration in accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617; and,

WHEREAS, the Town of Clifton Park Town Board held a Public Hearing on April 21, 2026, to hear all interested parties and listen to public comments on the Draft Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan during its regular meeting and the Town Clerk has recorded the public comments received during the Public Hearing and any written comments provided before, during or after said Public Hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan focused on the consideration of goals, objectives, principles and policies for agricultural uses in Clifton Park, in the context of natural resources, such as soils, existing farms, the local agricultural economy and sensitive environmental resources, and the existing location of utilities and infrastructure among other data and resources inventoried; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Clifton Park includes parcels enrolled in the Saratoga County Agricultural District #2 and includes lands receiving agricultural assessments, and thus continues to be subject to the provisions of Article 25-AA of the NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets Law; and

WHEREAS, as Saratoga County Planning Board Referral Review #26-55 – Comprehensive Plan Update, the Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan was approved for incorporation into the Town of Clifton Park’s Comprehensive Plan by the Saratoga County Planning Board; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby adopts the Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan and hereby affirms and adopts this plan to be incorporated and become part of the Town of Clifton Park Comprehensive Plan; and be it further

RESOLVED, upon adoption by the Town Board, that the Town Board hereby authorizes the submission of this Plan to the Saratoga County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board for their review and approval, and also authorizes submission to the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets for review and approval.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett thanked John Scavo, who was present, as well as volunteers who have been involved over the past couple of years in the project. He acknowledged the participation of members of the farming community and others who took part in meetings and study groups, including charrettes, that contributed to reaching the current point in the process.

Resolution No. 181 of 2026, a resolution establishing the Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Advisory Committee.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS the Town of Clifton Park recognizes the importance of agriculture to its economy, community character, environmental health, and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the Town has recently completed and adopted the *Town of Clifton Park Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan*, which outlines goals, strategies, and actions to support the long-term viability of farming and farmland within the Town; and

WHEREAS the Town Board desires to establish a committee that will assist in the implementation of this Plan, provide ongoing guidance on agricultural matters, and help ensure agriculture remains a valued and protected component of the community; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Clifton Park hereby establishes the Agricultural and Farmland Protection Advisory Committee (“the Committee”), and adopts the following purpose, structure, and scope of work:

Section 1. Purpose

The purpose of the Committee shall be to advise and assist the Town Board, Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Town departments in promoting, protecting and enhancing agriculture, farmlands, and active farms in accordance with the goals and recommendations of the adopted Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan.

Section 2. Composition

The Committee shall consist of seven (7) members appointed by the Town Board, representing a diversity of agricultural interests and community perspectives including but not limited to: active farmers, farmland owners, agri-business representatives, members of relevant Town committees/commissions, and residents with expertise or interest in agriculture and farmland protection. The Town Board shall designate a member of the committee to act as Chair for a one-year term, appoint all the members, and appoint a liaison from the Town Board. The

members of the committee first appointed, shall serve for terms as follows: three (3) appointees for one-year terms, and four (4) appointees for two-year terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be for two (2) years and vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term only.

Section 3. Scope of Work

The Committee shall have the following responsibilities:

- a. Inform the Town Board, Planning Board, and Zoning Board of Appeals about agricultural issues, and make recommendations to address such issues.
- b. Review proposed development projects in the vicinity of farmland, including but not limited to those located within 500 feet ² of a certified Agricultural District to assess potential impacts on agriculture, providing verbal and graphic presentation, and supported by written comments, during the review process. Such review will be sent to the respective Planning Board or ZBA for consideration as an advisory opinion.
- c. Serve as an advocate for the agricultural community by educating and communicating with Town officials, residents, and property owners; and by partnering with organizations and agencies to support the goals of the Town's Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan.
- d. Collaborate with the Town's Open Space Program and other town committees/commissions to identify and integrate priority agricultural lands into the town's land protection efforts.
- e. Encourage, assist, and support applications to farmland preservation programs, including but not limited to the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets' Farmland Protection Implementation Grant Program (FPIG).
- f. Review and recommend updates or amendments to Town codes, rules, and regulations that relate to agriculture and farmland protection.
- g. Maintain mapping and inventory of farms, farmland, and agricultural resources.
- h. Monitor agricultural and development trends to identify emerging issues and provide early guidance to Town officials.
- i. Help implement the Town's Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan.
- j. Offer policy guidance to Town officials on matters affecting agriculture.
- k. Promote the integration of agricultural priorities into regional and countywide planning and economic development initiatives.
- l. Serve as a liaison between farmers, the community, and the Town government to enhance communication and understanding.
- m. Educate policy makers by preparing briefings and presentations for Town boards and local officials on agricultural lands and relevant agriculture topics.
- n. Assist, coordinate, and integrate with public outreach, education, and awareness campaigns related to agriculture and farmland protection.
- o. Advocate for cost-share programs, tax incentives, conservation practices, infrastructure investments (including small-scale processing facilities), and other measures that support agricultural viability.
- p. Encourage the use of host-community benefit agreements with developers to help generate funding for farmland protection initiatives.

Section 4. Reporting Requirements

The Committee shall provide a bi-annual report to the Town Board summarizing its activities, findings, and recommendations, along with any updates to mapping or inventories and progress toward implementing the Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan.

Section 5. Effective Date

This resolution shall take effect immediately.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to be heard.

Resolution No. 182 of 2026, a resolution authorizing a lease agreement with National Business Technologies for a Kyocera copier/printer for use by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Introduced by Councilman Manir_, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilwoman Reid.

WHEREAS, Megan Babendreier, Director of Parks and Recreation, has requested that the new Copier/Printer lease be authorized for 36 months for use by the Parks and Recreation Department; and

WHEREAS, the proposed cost for leasing the copier has been budgeted per the attached schedule; and

WHEREAS, quotes were received with National Business Technologies submitting the lowest quote of \$330.20 per month, plus copy charges of \$0.00770 and \$0.049, for black & white and color copies, respectively, for thirty-six (36) months, and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the use of an installment purchase contract to finance the Copying System is a cost-effective method of acquisition of such equipment and is consistent with General Municipal Law Section 109 (B); now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Supervisor is authorized to enter into a lease agreement for the Parks and Recreation Department, with National Business Technologies, for a Kyocera MZ5001 ci copier/printer, for thirty-six (36) months, at a cost not to exceed \$330.20 per month, plus copy charges of \$0.00770 and \$0.049, for black & white and color copies, respectively, to be paid from A-7021-003 (General Fund – Parks & Recreation - Copier).

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to be heard.

Resolution No. 183 of 2026, a resolution accepting the quote from Durham Charter Services for Town Full-day Summer Camp Field Trip transportation.

Introduced by Councilwoman Reid, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilman Manir.

WHEREAS, on May 12, 2026, quotes were received for the above-referenced transportation, and

WHEREAS, the Town received 2 quotes, however the lowest quote was withdrawn from the vendor, as noted in the attached quote list, and

WHEREAS, Megan Babendreier, Director of Parks and Recreation, recommends accepting the quote from Durham Charter Services for the Full-day Summer Camp field trip transportation, as they submitted the sole conforming quote in an amount not to exceed \$13,300; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby accepts the quote from Durham Charter Services, Waterford, NY, for the Town’s Full-day Summer Camp field trip transportation, in an

amount not to exceed \$13,300, to be paid from A-7320-099 (General Fund – Full-Day Camp – Day Camp Expense).

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

No one wished to be heard.

Resolution No. 184 of 2026, a resolution authorizing the Supervisor to sign a License Agreement with Clifton Park – Halfmoon Piranhas, for use of the Country Knolls pool for swim team practice.

Introduced by Councilman Manir, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilwoman Reid.

WHEREAS, Clifton Park – Halfmoon Piranhas wish to utilize the Country Knolls town-owned pool for a term beginning on June 29, 2026, and ending on July 16, 2026, at a rate of \$55.00 per hour per pool, plus the hourly rate of all Town employees working at the pools during practice hours; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Supervisor is hereby authorized to sign the attached License Agreement with Clifton Park – Halfmoon Piranhas for use and occupation of the Country Knolls Pool, provided that the Town Attorney reviews and accepts a Certificate of Insurance naming the Town of Clifton Park as additionally insured

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

Supervisor Barrett stated that he initiated a partnership several years ago with the Piranhas swim group. He explained that the group uses the Town pool in the early morning hours before regular public hours and that this has been a productive use of the recreational facility. He added that the group pays a rental fee and also covers the cost of Town employees who serve as lifeguards during their use of the pool.

New Business

Councilwoman Reid made a motion to bring from the table the resolution proposing a six-month moratorium on Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar arrays within the town. Seconded by Supervisor Barrett

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED REMOVED FROM TABLE

Resolution No. 149 of 2026, a resolution enacting a six-month moratorium on the review and approval of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Solar Energy System applications.

Introduced by Supervisor Barrett, who moved its adoption, seconded by Councilwoamn Reid.

WHEREAS, Chapter 208 of the Town of Clifton Park Zoning Code establishes zoning regulations, including procedures for the review of special use permits (Article XIV) and site plan approval (Article XVI), which are applicable to Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar energy systems; and

WHEREAS, recent increases in the number and scale of Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar energy system proposals have raised concerns regarding the cumulative impact of continued solar development on Clifton Park's agricultural lands, including prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance; and

WHEREAS, farmers and agricultural property owners in the Town have reported growing pressure from solar developers seeking long-term land leases for large-scale solar installations, which may accelerate the conversion of agricultural lands away from active production; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Clifton Park has prepared a draft Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan, soon to be adopted and incorporated into the Town's Comprehensive Plan, which identifies farmland protection, preservation of agricultural viability, and the minimization of non-agricultural encroachment as core policy objectives; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board finds it necessary to temporarily pause the acceptance, review, and approval of all new Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar energy system applications in order to fully evaluate their potential impacts on agricultural resources, community character, land-use compatibility, and long-term capacity build-out; and

WHEREAS, this temporary moratorium will enable the Town to conduct a comprehensive review of existing zoning, siting criteria, screening standards, environmental review procedures, and farmland-protection measures applicable to Tier 2 and Tier 3 solar energy systems; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that Local Law No. 6 of 2026 is hereby adopted by the Town of Clifton Park to enact a temporary six (6) month moratorium on the filing, acceptance, processing, review, or approval of any new applications for Tier 2 or Tier 3 solar energy systems, as defined in Chapter 208 of the Town Code; and

RESOLVED, that this moratorium shall apply to all applications requiring special use permits pursuant to § 208-79 and all applications requiring site plan approval pursuant to § 208-113, regardless of zoning district; and

RESOLVED, that during the moratorium period, no Board, Department, or official of the Town of Clifton Park shall accept, process, or take action on any application, petition, or request that would authorize or permit the establishment, expansion, or construction of a Tier 2 or Tier 3 solar energy system; and

RESOLVED, that the Town Board, Planning Board, and Planning Department shall use this moratorium period to undertake a comprehensive review of solar siting standards, agricultural protection measures, cumulative development thresholds, and alignment with the draft Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan; and

RESOLVED, that the Town reserves the right to extend this moratorium for additional periods should further study be required; and

RESOLVED, that this resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Councilwoman Bellamy, Councilman Fantini, Councilman Manir, Councilwoman Reid, Supervisor Barrett

Noes: None

DECLARED ADOPTED

PUBLIC PRIVILEGE 10:43 P.M.

Kurt Swartz of Ashdown Road thanked Councilwoman Reid and acknowledged working with her throughout the duration of the project. He expressed appreciation for her sponsorship of the resolution that contributed to the creation of the plan and the formation of the committee they have been working on. He stated that the committee's role is to implement the plan and to help create an environment where agriculture can thrive among both farming and non-farming landowners. He said he looks forward to continued constructive collaboration with the Town Board and referenced using a collaborative and forward-looking approach in their discussions.

Katelyn O'Leary of Clifton County Road asked what the next steps would be in considering the proposed moratorium on solar projects or revising the town's zoning codes related to solar energy. She requested clarification on what the process would look like moving forward and how members of the public could participate and engage in that process.

Councilman Fantini stated that the Town Board and departments should determine appropriate locations for solar development. He expressed support for solar energy in general but stated he does not support siting solar projects on active farmland. He explained that the purpose of the moratorium is to allow time for the Town to evaluate and identify suitable locations for solar installations that would not negatively impact farmland, while still permitting solar development elsewhere in the Town.

Councilwoman Bellamy referenced the Town of Ballston, noting that it has limited the allowable acreage for solar farm development. She described an example where a farmer was slightly over the permitted acreage threshold and was impacted by that restriction. She then asked whether the Town currently has any similar limits on solar acreage or whether applications can continue without a defined cap. She further questioned whether the Town should consider establishing a maximum allowable acreage for solar development.

Councilman Fantini stated that any changes to solar regulations should be made with the goal of protecting farmland. He emphasized that the intent should not be to prohibit solar entirely, but to ensure that farmland is preserved while also identifying appropriate areas where solar development can occur. He expressed concern that restricting solar without a clear alternative could result in other types of development, such as residential development, taking place on farmland instead, which he said would defeat the purpose of preservation efforts.

Supervisor Barrett stated that, in his view, personal property rights would dictate that such use or development would be permitted.

Councilwoman Bellamy stated that she was surprised by comments made at a prior meeting regarding solar development offers to landowners. She referenced testimony from a speaker who indicated that a solar developer had offered approximately \$75,000 for use of 17 acres of land. She expressed that she had not been aware that solar developers were offering that level of financial compensation for land leases or agreements.

Supervisor Barrett stated that solar development is a significant competitor to the Town's open space preservation efforts. He noted that during his tenure, more than 2,000 acres of open space have been protected, but said it has become increasingly difficult to continue these efforts. He attributed this challenge to public funding mechanisms supporting solar development, including money collected through utility bills and additional state and federal funding sources. He described this as public money effectively competing against local open space preservation initiatives.

Councilman Fantini stated that a farm near Droms Road, adjacent to View Orchard, is being converted into a development. He expressed concern about the loss of farmland and reiterated

that his primary goal in supporting the moratorium is to help protect farmland from being developed.

Katelyn O’Leary asked what the next steps would be regarding the moratorium process, including whether there would be additional public hearings or whether the matter would proceed through a committee process. She requested clarification on how the public would be engaged moving forward.

Councilwoman Bellamy stated that in other countries, solar installations are being placed in alternative locations such as along railroad tracks and on top of parking garages, rather than on farmland. She noted concern that farmers may not want to lose potential opportunities related to solar development on their land. She then asked whether the town should establish a workshop or similar forum to further discuss the issue.

Supervisor Barrett stated that landowners have development options and that the Town cannot prohibit both solar and housing development. He emphasized that doing so would not be permissible and referenced constitutional protections of personal property rights.

Caryl Hugg of Jonathan Drive asked questions regarding the newly discussed positions related to the Town Clerk’s Office. She inquired whether the town had considered utilizing a receptionist who had already been approved for hiring to assist the clerk’s office in some capacity.

Town Clerk Fantini responded that the receptionist can occasionally assist with tasks such as stuffing envelopes, but noted that this is typically done only once per month. She explained that the receptionist is generally occupied with answering phones and assisting residents who come into Town Hall.

Caryl Hugg stated that when she calls Town Hall, she is typically connected to an automated phone system rather than a person.

Town Clerk Fantini explained that when residents call the office, the automated system is intended to route calls to the receptionist. She noted that in the past, calls were directed to the Town Clerk due to the absence of a receptionist, but that situation has since changed. She added that staff were previously covering receptionist duties when no dedicated receptionist was in place.

Caryl Hugg stated that she noticed in the materials that demand for notary services has increased significantly. She then asked whether the Town Attorney is a notary.

Attorney Dailey noted that he was.

Caryl Hugg stated that the town attorney could provide notary services and then asked the Town Clerk whether she is a notary.

Town Clerk Fantini responded that she is not currently a notary but is in the process of becoming one. She stated that she is scheduled to take her notary exam soon.

Caryl Hugg asked a question to the remaining residents in attendance, asking how many had received a raise for work they might do in the future. She then asked the Board members whether any of them had received a raise for work they might potentially do in the future.

Councilwoman Reid responded that she had not received a raise for future work. She added that the Board had previously removed the stipend for the Deputy Supervisor role, despite her taking on additional responsibilities.

Caryl Hugg stated that raises are typically given after work has been performed satisfactorily. She questioned how the Board can justify granting raises for responsibilities or outcomes that have not yet been completed or guaranteed to occur.

Chuck Alangi of Aster Drive thanked the Board for its discussion and questions regarding Resolution No. 5. He stated that he appreciated the attention given to the proposed staffing additions and related budget considerations. He commented that, while he was not suggesting

public service work is easy, decisions involving staffing levels and resources should be supported by a more formal analysis of needs, resources, and headcount. He stated that such evaluations should be conducted carefully and thoughtfully. He further expressed concern about combining multiple personnel and budget matters into a single large resolution, stating that he believed the process could be improved by considering items separately and providing more detailed justification for staffing and budget proposals.

Supervisor Barrett stated that, in his view, public sector work is not inherently more difficult than work performed in the private sector. He noted that public employment often includes benefits such as health insurance and participation in a pension system, which he said can aid in recruitment and retention. He stated that these benefits should be considered when evaluating salaries and raises. He further expressed concern about granting raises only a few months after employees begin their positions, noting that in his private-sector experience, merit raises were typically awarded after employees had demonstrated their performance over a longer period of time. He stated that employees generally need to prove themselves before receiving a raise.

Councilman Fantini responded to Supervisor Barrett's comments regarding employee performance and raises by raising concerns about the Supervisor's own job performance. He stated that he had heard reports that Supervisor Barrett had not been spending significant time at Town Hall despite being compensated as a full-time supervisor. Councilman Fantini then asked Supervisor Barrett whether he wished to comment on those reports.

Supervisor Barrett responded that his responsibilities frequently require him to be outside of Town Hall. He stated that he regularly visits Town departments and the senior center and remains actively engaged in Town operations. He further noted that he serves as Chair of the Saratoga County Board of Supervisors, which carries significant county-level responsibilities in addition to his duties as Town Supervisor. He stated that his position encompasses both Town and County supervisory responsibilities. Supervisor Barrett added that over his 27 years of service, he has taken very little time off and has missed very few meetings. He stated that town employees could attest to his attendance and level of involvement throughout his tenure.

Mike Sposili of Jamison Drive stated that he had recently contacted the Highway Superintendent regarding paving work in his area and received an explanation of the town's road paving schedule and process. He noted that, based on his research, some road projects are funded through Section 284 highway funds and referenced discussion from a prior meeting concerning unspent funds from the previous year being carried over and allocated to current-year paving projects. He acknowledged that such carryovers may be permissible under state law. However, he expressed concern about rolling over paving funds from one year to the next during a period of rising asphalt costs. He argued that delaying expenditures may reduce the amount of roadway that can be paved because the same funds purchase less work as costs increase. Mr. Sposili encouraged the Board and the Highway Superintendent to consider expending all available Section 284 funds within the year they are allocated whenever possible. He stated that, from a fiduciary standpoint, carrying over funds while construction costs rise does not appear to be the most efficient use of public money. He further connected this concern to a roadway segment in his area that was not paved as part of a larger nearby project completed the previous year. He noted that the section remains in poor condition and suggested that addressing it later may require additional mobilization and expense that could potentially have been avoided if the work had been completed at the same time as the adjacent project.

No one else wished to be heard.

Public Privilege closed at 11:01 P.M.

MOTION BY Councilwomen Reid, seconded by Councilman Manir to adjourn the meeting to the next regular meeting or any other meeting necessary for the conduct of Town business.

Motion carried at 11:01 P.M.

Caitlin Fantini
Town Clerk