State of New York
County of Fulton
Town of Caroga

Minutes of the Caroga Town Board emergency meeting called by Supervisor Glenn on Monday July 27, 2026, and held on July 29, 2026, at 7:00 pm at Town hall with the following board members in attendance.

Supervisor John Glenn - Here
Council Member Richard Sturgess - Here
Council Member Matthew Cooper – Here
Council Member Kimberly Walker – Dailey – (AKA Walker)
Council Member Greta Frasier – Here

In attendance were Town Attorney Chris Langlois, Highway Superintendent - Roy Stock, Steve Stedman – Greenskeeper, Anita Long and Dave Cummings members of the Comprehensive Planning Committee, Former Town Supervisor Scott Horton and his wife, Gazette reporter Todd McAdam, and four members of the public.

The meeting began at 7:11pm. Supervisor Glenn noted items on the agenda to be discussed were bonding, and to accept/discuss the grants that are being written that are to be turned in on Friday. He wanted to make sure everything is in position for that.

Supervisor Glenn checked the dam on East Caroga Lake maintained by Brookfield. He texted the gentleman who monitors the dam and told him that though the dam is intact, the water levels are raising very quickly. He asked that they keep a very close eye on it, and to open the dam if he thought it was necessary.

The Supervisor noted Mr. Harazin brought forth a resolution to rent a satellite phone for the invasive species program.

RESOLUTION #2026-077 for the Rental of a Satellite Phone for the Aquatic Invasive Species Program was offered by Supervisor Glenn at the regular meeting of the Caroga Town Board held on July 29, 2026.

WHEREAS, The Town of Caroga wishes to assure that the safety of the staff and visitors at the remote Invasive Species Boat Inspection Station at West Lake which has no access to power or cell phone coverage, and

WHEREAS, the Town has grant funding through the New York State Invasive Species program to help reimburse for seventy-five percent of the cost of the rental, and

WHEREAS, the Canada Lakes Conservation Association has agreed to help cover the twenty five percent local match required for the state funding for rental of the satellite phone, and

WHEREAS, there are funds in the Town budget for the boat wash to cover this cost by transferring funds in the Boat Wash budget from Personal Service to Contractual Expenses, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, by the Town of Caroga, Fulton County, New York does hereby move to approve allocating an amount of $1,500 for 2026 pay for the rental of a Satellite phone and cover additional program contractual costs through the remainder of the boat inspection season.

Seconded by Council Member Sturgess

Discussion: Council Member Sturgess asked if the board had already passed a resolution to purchase walkie talkies/satellite phones. The clerk replied no, and noted he was still getting prices at the last meeting. The clerk noted that the price was under $1,000.00 so he just has one quote.

Council Member Cooper asked if this was an annual thing or just during the season. The Supervisor stated it would be used during season, but it will be an annual renewal. Council Member Cooper wanted to know if the satellite phone would be available for the highway department or anyone else to use after the boat season. The clerk stated the quote says it is for the time period of July 31, 2026, to October 17, 2026. The price was $808.45. Council Member Sturgess noted next year it will be a little different because the program starts prior to July 31st. Council Member Walker asked if this was through Starlink. This is through Starlitephonestore.com.

Adopted by a vote of five (5) Ayes: Glenn, Sturgess, Cooper, Walker, Frasier

Supervisor Glenn noted that Glenn Sullivan from ReadyScout who put ProcellaCOR in the lake two years ago, will be in Caroga next week to survey the lakes with Luke Horst, the program coordinator.

Council Member Frasier asked if the board was in agreement that they could approve an expenditure of up to $400.00 in youth program for two bikes. One male one female. They would be given to the best camper of the season for the summer recreation. She was unable to review the line item and thought it came out of the general fund. Council Member Frasier stated the director has done it in the past. She has criteria – being kind, caring, helpful. Council Member Frasier thought it could come out of the general fund, celebrations, or tourism fund.

Council Member Sturgess asked why this wasn’t budgeted for in her budget. Why does all this happen after the budget is given to the board. Council Member Frasier could not answer for her. Her thought was because of the expense of the things she buys for the program just for them to function. Council Member Walker thought they received a grant this year. Council Member Frasier stated she had to hire another councilor because of the numbers. Council Member Frasier stated she could reach out to other people in the community and see if she could get donations for the bikes.

Council Member Sturgess noted there is a reason for a budget for the department. If is something that has happened in the past it should be in the budget for it to happen. This happens all the time with this program. There are always additional expenses that are not included in the budget that we do every year for that purpose. Council Member Frasier will find out if it was done through the budget or donations in the past. She just thought about it driving up here and hasn't talked to Colleen, the program director, about this. Personally, Council Member Sturgess would rather go the donation route. She was asked to get back to the board.

Supervisor Glenn noted Attorney Langlois was asked to attend the meeting tonight to discuss the bonding procedure, where we stand, and what he recommends, and for the board to ask questions and give comments.

Attorney Langlois was contacted a little while ago about starting to work on bonds, adopting resolutions, and to borrow bonds to finance two projects. Project one is constructing a building to replace the pro shop that had the fire loss a few years ago and also house the town offices. The other project at a different location is for a town barn/town garage. He thought there was a design concept. But it hasn't been engineered as yet and there is no cost estimate as yet. As for how to move forward step one is getting the right professionals. Typically, a town will need to work with municipal fiscal advisor group. Attorney Langlois mentioned the name of Christian Crowley of Hofman Hospitality Group and secondly the town needs a separate bond council. They will be responsible for helping with the propositions. Attorney Langlois and Supervisor Glenn recently held a video conference call with bond council Connie Cahill. He noted the need to drill down exactly how much money the town is looking to borrow to finance these projects. The attorney knows there are insurance proceeds on hand from the fire loss. The second thing that needed to be done was to adopt a resolution authorizing the issuance of these bonds. Before you can do that from a legal perspective. The bond council will require that we do everything properly and correctly under the law. There will have to be a State Environmental Quality Review, review on both of these projects. That will require any agency, local, state, and town before going forward with the building project like this to do a SEQR to determine if the project will result in any significant adverse impact and if so to mitigate those impacts as much as possible. The first thing is to have the form prepared typically by an engineering firm. The town has been working with CT Male with the golf course project. They can be done on one form or separate forms. Once we have the SEQR the town needs to see if there are any other agencies, other than the town, that would be involved in needing any kind of approval. There can be multiple agencies, the attorney listed the Department of Transportation to authorize a curb cut on a state road, the Department of Health for approval of wells and septic, Department of Environmental Conservation may need to be contacted if the project encroaches upon wetlands. It was noted that the Adirondack Park Agency and the Fulton County Planning Department will also be contacted. After all of those agencies are contacted next a lead agency is picked. If the town is the only agency involved, then the town is automatically the lead agency. Letters are sent stating what the project is and the SEQR is also sent to the agencies. The letter will say that the town wants to be the lead agency but another agency can object within 30 days. Rarely does another agency object. The final step is a written determination of significance will the project result in any significant impacts or not. If the answer is no, then it is a negative (neg) declaration. If yes, then it is a positive (pos) declaration, and the SEQR process continues.

Attorney Langlois wants to assume it is a neg declaration for this project. That determination of significance has to be in writing, and it has to articulate the reasons why the project will not result in any significance adverse impact. It is adopted by resolution the attorney would draft. Once the resolution is done the SEQR is officially done. At that point and only at that point can the board adopt a resolution to authorize the bond.

Once the resolution is adopted there are a couple of choices. The question is will these resolutions be subject to a vote by the public. Local finance law gives two choices: a Mandatory referendum will go to the voters. Depending on when the resolutions are adopted, perhaps it will be at the next general election or perhaps at a special election. The other option is to adopt a resolution subject to a Permissive referendum. That means there will only be a vote if within 30 days a certain number of residents sign a petition that is presented to the town clerk requesting that there be a permissive referendum. If no petition is filed there is no vote and the board move forward with the borrowing. If a petition for a referendum is submitted, then the town would then schedule a special election. A public vote is not required unless the town makes it required by saying it is mandatory. What could happen if you adopt a permissive referendum, and a petition comes in based on where we are now with the timing the town will not be able to have propositions on the ballot in November of 2026. There is not enough time to get done what needs to get done.
Attorney Langlois asked if the board was still thinking of doing both projects together or separately on different timelines? At this point the attorney figured the town needed 45 – 60 days for agencies to do a review.

The clerk noted that the town has SEQR's already. Supervisor Glenn stated there was one for the town hall and pro shop. The clerk showed the attorney the two SEQR's in her files. They were different. The attorney noted that we have to get together with the engineer on this.

Council Member Cooper asked how the vote was done on the highway bond last time. He noted it went to referendum and it was on the ballot for a million dollars. It passed. Former Supervisor Scott Horton didn't recall how it happened. We were under council. Council Member Cooper asked if the town had the SEQR and everything else? Former Supervisor Horton noted we had bond council but didn't know where the file was. Attorney Langlois was not yet onboard with the Town of Caroga yet. He was not comfortable moving forward with a four-year-old resolution and if it was done right. He thinks the bond council would be nervous about it. This will be looked at. Another thing Supervisor Glenn stated is the amount.

Council Member Sturgess noted right now we are looking at bonding a total for all three projects of around \$4.3 or \$4.5 million. That was knowing we had the one million that was already approved by the taxpayers. Plus, there is the \$1.7million (ish) that is the accounts right now. So, the number would now be changed from \$4.5million to \$5.5 million if the bond agency is not comfortable accepting the previous administration's taxpayers go ahead with that.

Former Supervisor Horton asked if Attorney Langlois had this information in his files. He will check his files. It was noted that these are the same people Mr. Horton dealt with.

Council Member Walker asked what happens if the grant goes through. How will that help with the bonding. Attorney Langlois stated it would benefit. In a resolution the town would adopt, it would state up to a certain amount. You can always borrow less if the grant comes in. You just can't borrow more. Attorney Langlois noted the board has to decide if it wants to proceed with both projects, figure out how much money needs to be borrowed for the garage, and figure out if

the prior bonding approval from the voters is still good. We have to drill down on the numbers, so we know what the numbers are and know how much things are going to cost, how much money the town has available, and how much has to be bonded out. The numbers on the pro shop and town hall are pretty much flushed out. He wasn't sure we had that yet for the garage.
Council Members Sturgess and Cooper are heard to say they have given a ballpark price for the square footage, which came to $2.5 million. Council Member Sturgess noted the board has to either hire CT Male or the company that did the Broadalbin garage. It was stated that Phinney is out.

Attorney Langlois again noted the need to figure out what other agencies need to be involved.

Council Member Sturgess stated he was sick of all of the other projects in this town stalling this golf course project. He would love to have the projects all combined – no offense to Roy, but we are right there with the pro shop project, and we don't even have an engineer for the highway garage. He thought it needed to be split up. Council Member Walker agreed. Council Member Sturgess again calculated the amount of money needed and noted the amount of money we are going for with the grant is $1.3 million. Potentially he noted we would try to bond out $3. million with the hopes we get the grant. Potentially we are looking to bond $1.7 to finish the project. He also noted the code compliance part of the policy. So, to put a number on bonding is still a question. Again, you have to let the taxpayers know and $3 million is a lot. Council Member Cooper noted that is where we have to sell this via public meetings. It was again noted the projects would be split and looking for $3million.

The timeline is between 45 – 60 days. 1) get CT Male to clarify the SEQR forms, 2) contact agencies, (Attorney Langlois will send out letters) 3) finalize and contact the bond council. The first week of September we should be in a position to move forward. The board has to decide if it will be a permissive referendum or a mandatory referendum.

Mr. Livingston thought the taxpayers would not be concerned about the three million. He thought it was doable.

Mr. Horton stated the approximate settlement of $1.25 million from the insurance and the code compliance side and with the depreciation (about $644,000) side of it, thought it would be a slam dunk. He cautioned the town to review the drawings to make sure the code compliance (about $644,000) is there to reimburse the town which should be a decent amount. Mr. Horton noted that the maintenance shed is completed and we should be able to get some of the compliance code money back from that. He noted that the town has paid for insurance for a number of years and now we have the benefit of collecting on what we have been paying for.

Clerk asked for clarification. The pro shop project and the town hall project are in a go forward mode, but the grant is only for the pro shop.

The board and Anita Long reviewed the two versions of the SEQR applications. On Friday CT Male dropped of a SEQR document with the address of 1803 State Highway 10. Along with a proposed layout. Via email a version came with an address of 1801. One stated the project was for the construction of a new two-story building with an approx. footprint of 6000. The other says the construction of a new approx. 5960 sq. ft. recreational and community center at the town owned Nick Stoner Municipal golf course. Mr. Stock stated that 1801 State Highway 10 is the current highway garage. It was thought that CT Male thought a separate SEQR was needed for the grant. The SEQR with the 1803 location is for the grant. The grant funding is sought solely for the pro shop.

Council Member Frasier stated the Dept. of Health is the only agency that needed to be contacted, other than the code office. The curb cut was already there on Irvings Pond Road; the design shows access on state highway 10 which is already there. Attorney Langlois noted the need to reach out to CT Male for one SEQR form. It will cover the full building with the downstairs offices. Also, every agency who could possibly have a finger in this were listed as being, DOH, DOT, APA, the Grant funding, and Fulton County Planning Department. Once these letters go out and more than likely no one will object to the town being the lead agency, then that part will be done. Then a SEQR resolution will be created and also the proposition language. The bond agent will be contacted to see if she has a SEQR in her files for the highway barn and if the vote from 3 – 4 years ago can be used.

The clerk asked if we've hired Cahill? Not yet was the response. It was noted that the town has not hired either one. Supervisor Glenn noted when he spoke to Joanne Kilmer, she said it is usually a $3,000.00 bill but it is not payable until the process is complete. Attorney Langlois stated he believed they get paid by a percentage of the total amount once the bond closes.

Council Member Sturgess stated that he felt he was in the dark. The supervisor contacts the attorney and then he hears the information second hand from him. There are a ton of things you talk about that the board doesn't hear. "You can't relay every sentence back to us." How can there be better communication on this project? Supervisor Glenn offered telephone conferences. Council Member Sturgess suggested phone calling another board member in when there is communication on this project. Council Member Glenn wondered if it could be all of the board members. Attorney Langlois noted the time that it would take to get all five board members together. He noted the need for board members to know what was going on. Attorney Langlois offered to email the board with updates after each phone call. He did not want the process to slow down because it is hard getting people together to have a conversation. Council Member Sturgess noted that it has been seven (7) years and there isn't a shovel in the ground yet. The email makes him feel better. The first thing to be done is to contact CT Male and finalize the environmental assessment form. When we are done with that Attorney Langlois will send an email to the supervisor summarizing it and the email will be copied to everyone.

The CT Male contact information was shared with the attorney for the engineer Jake Gordon – j.gordon@ctmale.com, and for the grant writers Jim Thatcher – j.thatcher@ctmale.com, and Melanie Krause m.krause@ctmale.com. Anita Long suggested also including the clerk, Linda Gilbert.

Attorney Langlois noted the need to have a signature by the supervisor tomorrow. Supervisor Glenn noted he would be in meetings all day at the county. Council Member Sturgess noted there was an email with a list of documents needed for the grant. Anita and the clerk responded with documents that were needed. He asked if there was anything else as a town board that was needed besides what was talked about with the attorney? Just the SEQR short from was the reply. Council Member Cooper noted that the signature was needed tomorrow. The attorney knew what version they were going to go with. He will ask CT Male to include the agencies.

The board and attorney reviewed and discussed having the supervisor sign page three of the SEQR which won't change.

Council Member Sturgess asked how the grant gets submitted. Ms. Long noted it is done through a portal.

Council Member Frasier noted the need to confirm that the original bond for the highway garage is still acceptable.

The clerk noted that question #5 was not complete. Council Member Sturgess also noted that question #21 was not completed either. The Clerk also noted an email from the APA regarding the change in zoning.

Supervisor Glenn read question #5, is the proposed action a. permitted use under the zoning regulations, b. consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The board discussed this and the boxes were checked yes for both. Attorney Langlois approved the change and noted it did not change the application. Council Member Sturgess then reviewed question #21. Is this project located within half a mile of a disadvantaged community? If no, could the impact of the project affect disadvantaged community. The clerk noted that a premises of the grant is that we are a disadvantaged community. This application was done four days ago it was noted. The attorney discussed this question using the analogy of if this was for a city and the project of a coal burning plant. Would it be placed in a well-to-do area or the poorer side of town? Council Member Sturgess noted that disadvantaged doesn't necessarily mean poverty struck. This is a question for Melanie and Jim. Attorney Langlois and the board discussed if there was an impact. Supervisor Glenn thought both boxes should be checked no. Council Member Sturgess googled disadvantaged community, and the meaning was low income. The zip codes in Caroga also contains Gloversville. Ms. Long noted the Consolidated Funding Application (CFA) has the community defined according to zip code. Attorney Langlois will talk to CT Male about this. One of the SEQR forms had question 21 marked no to both. Council Member Cooper then googled the address of the proposed pro shop on the NYSERTA website, and it does not meet the criteria identified for a disadvantaged community. Attorney Langlois stated question #21 should be answered with two noes. Former Supervisor Horton thought that CT Male has to weigh in on this thing. They are doing the grant writing and assessment. We have to make sure whatever they say doesn't conflict with the grant that Anita put together. Attorney Langlois noted that Melanie who worked on the grant checked no for question #21. He feels more confident that is the correct answer. Council Member Cooper noted we are answering questions all the time we have to be able to respond as to what it means. Attorney Langlois again stated he was comfortable with Supervisor Glenns signature on the form.

Supervisor Glenn will work with the attorney and bond council and financial council. The next question to be decided in September is the board adopting these resolutions by mandatory referendum which means you will definitely be holding an election or adopting these by permissive referendum meaning they will only be allowed if signatures are filed. Mr. Livingston asked how many signatures were required. The percentage was thought to be 5 %.   Attorney Langlois noted the board has control because the board has to decide when they are adopting the resolution to have this election. There is a timeline… maybe the board doesn't want to have it in December or maybe the board wants to do it in February. This is part of the thinking here.   When is the ideal time to have this election?

At 8:28 pm Supervisor Glenn asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was made by Council Member Sturgess and seconded by Council Member Walker.   All board members were in favor of the motion: Glenn, Sturgess, Cooper, Walker, Frasier.

Submitted by Caroga Town Clerk

Linda Gilbert, CMC, RMC