

TOWN BOARD
OCTOBER 25, 1995

A regular meeting of the Town board of the Town of Bethlehem was held on the above date at the Town Hall, 445 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY. The meeting was called to order by the Supervisor at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Sheila Fuller, Supervisor
Frederick C. Webster, Councilman
George Lenhardt, Councilman
Doris M. Davis, Councilman
Freeman T. Putney, Councilman
Donald DeAngelis, Esq., Acting Town Attorney
Kathleen A. Newkirk, Town Clerk

ABSENT: George Lenhardt, Councilman

- - -

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Good evening and welcome to a meeting of the Bethlehem Town Board. We will begin tonight's meeting with a Public Hearing on our Town Budget. Before we begin I would like to ask Judi Kehoe, our Comptroller, to go through the changes that have been made from our initial presentation of the budget.

MRS. KEHOE: The changes really aren't all that extensive from the initial presentation of the budget. We held two sets of budget workshops earlier this month. The only change resulted from that, was an increase in the police contractual line item, or the equipment line item, where we increased the budgeted amount for vehicles by \$10,000. When the draft budget had been prepared, we didn't have the final state contract in, the prices came in subsequent to that initial preparation and realized we were \$10,000 under, so we increased that by \$10,000; and that was the extent of all the increases pending the budget workshops.

Comptroller
notes change
in budget

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Thank you, Judi. I will ask the clerk to read the call of the hearing.

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING UPON PRELIMINARY BUDGET
TOWN OF BETHLEHEM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Preliminary Budget for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 1996 has been completed and filed in the Office of the Town Clerk at the Town Hall, 445 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY where it is available for inspection by any interested person during office hours.

Public Hearing
for Preliminary
budget for 1996

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the Town Board of the Town of Bethlehem will meet and review said Preliminary Budget and hold a public hearing thereon at the Town Hall Delmar NY at 7:30 pm on the 25th day of October 1995 and that at such hearing any person may be heard in favor of or against any item or items therein contained.

Disabled individuals who are in need of assistance in order to participate should contact David Austin at 439-4131, Advanced notice is requested, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 108 of the Town Law, the proposed salaries of the following officers are hereby specified as follows:

Supervisor	\$65,379.00
Councilman	\$9,127.00
Town Clerk	\$45,006.00
Superintendent of Highways	\$62,581.00
Receiver of Taxes & Assessments	\$32,656.00
and	

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such Notice shall be published once in the following newspapers: THE SPOTLIGHT, the official newspaper for the Town on October 11, 1995 and the TIMES UNION an Albany newspaper, on October 16, 1995.

BY ORDER OF THE TOWN BOARD
TOWN OF BETHLEHEM
KATHLEEN A. NEWKIRK
TOWN CLERK

Dated: September 27, 1995

State of New York)
County of Albany)

Mary Ahlstrom of the Town of Bethlehem, being duly sworn, says that she is the Assistant Publisher of THE SPOTLIGHT, a weekly newspaper published in the Town of Bethlehem, County of Albany, and that the notice of which the annexed is a true copy, has been regularly published in said THE SPOTLIGHT ONCE A WEEK FOR 1 WEEK consecutively, commencing on the 11th day of October, 1995.

/s/Mary A. Ahlstrom

Sworn to before me this
13th day of October, 1995.
/s/ Kathryn Olsen
Notary Public, Albany County

State of New York)
County of Albany) ss.:

KATHLEEN A. NEWKIRK, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is the Town Clerk of the Town of Bethlehem, Albany County, New York and that I posted on October 11, 1995, a Notice of Public Hearing, a copy of which is hereto attached, on the sign board of the Town maintained pursuant to subdivision six of Section thirty of the Town Law.

/s/Kathleen A. Newkirk
Town Clerk

Sworn to before me this
20th day of October, 1995
/s/ Kenneth P. Hahn
Notary Public

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Putney to indent the Notice of Public Hearing, Affidavit of Publication and Affidavit of Posting on the minutes of the meeting. The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney and Mrs. Davis.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Mr. Lenhardt.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: If anyone has any questions on the Budget this evening please come to the microphone. If you have any questions we will take those first. Anyone wishing...anyone wishing...

MR. KELLEHER: I have some questions.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: On the budget?

MR. KELLEHER: Yes.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Okay. Come ahead Mr. Knelled. We will do in favor and opposition of the budget after the questions on the budget.

MR. KELLEHER: I am Bill Kellerher and all my questions have to do with the new water supply in the budget items that are in there. I have a question for Mr. Secor or Mr. Fraser. Are there any costs over runs for the 14 million dollar water project? Do you anticipate any cost over runs?

MR. SECOR: No, the project is within its budget.

MR. KELLEHER: And the contractor hasn't any claims for over runs, over costs?

MR. SECOR: The contract is within its budget and we will final out the payments with the contractor but, there is no additional costs beyond the maximum amount.

MR. KELLEHER: All right, thank you. Has there been any discussion between Mr. Secor and Mr. Fraser, the design engineer, indicating that the yield from the infiltration galley would be lower than 60 millions gallons of water per day? And along with that same question, what are the flow rates planned for each of the pump stations, 2, 3, and 4?

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Mr. Fraser... Mr. Secor

MR. SECOR: I would be happy to answer the questions. Each of the pump stations will pump more than 2 million gallons a day. There is a pump in there which will be about 2.5 million gallons each, we expect to see from each one of those wells. We have already test pump, the well in #2, which you are aware of. The flow rate was exactly as predicted. We are going through now and start up with each of the phases. Again, I have given you draw down information which verifies the original report that was filed in 1993. I don't know what else to tell you, Bill.

MR. KELLEHER: Well, Mr. Secor, your interpretation of what a pump test is, and what my interpretation is, are entirely different. Now, I will ask you a question along with that. What was the pump rate for the actual pump? Not for some sump pump, that you put in there. The actual pump that we bought and paid for? What was the pump rate that you pumped, and what was the draw down?

MR. SECOR: As I explained to you, Mr. Kelleher, you have one pump in, which we had pumped. We have the pump station up over 1,500 gallons a minute, where the one pump that is in there. We are still going through testing on the other pump so I really can't give you that, because we are still doing start up. I have explained this to you.

MR. KELLEHER: Okay. In other words you don't know.

MR. SECOR: I just told you what the pump rate was for the initial pump that we have tested. We had the other one, there was one more pump that was installed...

MR. KELLEHER: No...I am asking you a question.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Mr. Kelleher, if I may interrupt you for one second.

MR. KELLEHER: Yes.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: If we can take the budget questions that pertain to the budget first, then we can come back to your questions.

MR. KELLEHER: Well this is very important, because as you know I...

SUPERVISOR FULLER: I know it is.

MR. KELLEHER: ...claim, that you will not get two...you will not get even 2 million gallons of water a day out of this so how can you...

SUPERVISOR FULLER: We will come right back to you.

MR. KELLEHER: ...possibly plan a budget? Now, obviously, we have a difference of opinion here. So that get's to my next question. Will a two month draw down curve at the safe yield of the well be obtained as is normally done for a well of this size? In other words, will a satisfactory pump test be made to determine the long term yield of the well? And it is impossible, and again it has to do with the budget. It is impossible, completely impossible, for you to make a budget out, when you don't even know what the yield of that well is.

MR. SECOR: Again, just to respond. The first section of the well was built in 1993, we did a two month draw down test...

MR. KELLEHER: No you didn't.

MR. SECOR: It's on file at the library. Bill, you are interrupting me here. Are you going to let me speak? Finish?

MR. KELLERHER: Yes, I am sorry.

MR. SECOR: All right. You asked me will we do a draw down test? The answer is yes. We are going through start up now. We have one pump in place, the other one was set today, the next one will be set next week. And when we get the pump station on line and everything is ready to go, yes, we will be doing draw down test as is normally done. We have to go through the normal start up procedure and the normal sterilization. Everything is being done, as it should be done.

MR. KELLEHER: Let me ask you this question. You fully anticipate, you are telling me now, and you Mr. Frasier, you will verify this, that you can pump 6 million gallons of water a day for two months out of that well? You know that for a fact?

MR. SECOR: We have already test pumped a section of it. The numbers were exactly as we were expected. They are recorded. We will report back to the Board when the test is done. I fully expect that the yield of the thing... of the well system will be as designed. Everything we have tested so far has been exactly as has been designed. I have given you the numbers, I have given you the draw down numbers.

MR. KELLEHER: I asked you in my question -- did you obtain a two month draw down curve? Are you going to obtain a two month draw down curve for this particular infiltration gallery? This particular well?

MR. SECOR: And I have answered your question. Your answer to that question is yes.

MR. KELLEHER: You are going to? Do you admit that, that will take until around January 1, before you will have any idea of what the capacity of this well will be? That is all I want to establish. That is fine.

MR. SECOR: That is not a true statement. We have already test pumped for an extended period the first section of the well to verify yield and those reports are on file in the library.

MR. KELLEHER: Mr. Secor. You are telling me, that that pump test you ran was a generate pump test? You got a draw down curve for two months? I will tell you right now you did not. How could you when the contractor was de-watering you next section? You know that is not true. That is not a legitimate draw down curve.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Mr. Frasier, can you respond to this please?

MR. FRASER: Yes. In the first place, it's not necessary to test pump the well for two months to determine what the yield of it is. The normal test for a well is anywhere from 72 hours to a week or two. A hydrologist worth his salt, can determine what the long term yield of a well is going to be.

On this system, when it is placed in operation, we are going to be operating everyday for an indefinite period of time from here on out. We are going to be gathering data from pumping results and we are going to be able to know exactly what the yield of this system is.

MR. KELLEHER: Well I did...

MR. FRASER: It's not going to be necessary to do a pump to your specifications. We are going to do it to our specifications.

MR. KELLERER: Well, very good. I am glad you mentioned that. In other words... you heard what Mr. Fraser says, that he is going to establish what the yield of this well is going to be. Not you, not you... the Town Board.

Now, I have a fourth question. Please don't miss interrupt this. Is anyone keeping track of the amount of time town employees, using town equipment, are working on this 14 million dollar project? As an example, I understand the town employees use a portable gasoline powered pump, to fill the raw water reservoir. And it took about one month. Now, was that paid for by the contractor or by the town?

MR. SECOR: One man went down there for about an hour a day to check the pump. That was paid for out of the same crew that maintains all the rest of our system. And it is not a charge to the contractor. It is a charge to the water district.

MR. KELLEHER: Yes. I understand. I can understand you doing this. I just like to point out though, I think it is important, that we not set a precedent, that we do too much of the work that the contractor should be doing. That's all.

MR. SECOR: We are not doing any work that the contractor should be doing.

MR. KELLERHER: Okay. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Is there anyone else who has questions on the budget for this evening? May I ask those to speak in favor of the budget to come forward. Is there anyone in favor of the budget before the town this evening? Is there anyone opposed?

MR. DAVIES: Good evening. My name is Sherwood Davies. I would ask that my comments be in the minutes as verbatim. I will give the clerk a copy of what I am going to essentially read.

Public Hearing on Bethlehem's Preliminary
1996 Budget
Comments By Sherwood Davies

My name is Sherwood Davies. I am opposed to the proposed water and sewer budgets because it provides misleading information, fails to provide tax rates and other charges and the specific sources of income and revenue.

The Budget message indicates that in 1996, a property assessed at \$130,000 would pay \$387.48. If you include water rents, sewer rents and front footage charges, the total would be \$650. The water and sewer costs alone would be 64% of the total bill. All special water and sewer district charges are established by the Town Board, that is the elected officials sitting at this table. And, I believe they should be included as a part of our budget.

Regarding the Water Fund.

I am opposed to the preliminary 1996 water budget.

1. The budget fails to show the water property tax rate, tax rates in water district extensions and the Cogen water rate. Officials have stated that industry will pay for the new water project, yet the revenue to support this new water project has not been identified.

2. The budget indicates that residential consumer rates will remain at \$1.07 per 1000 gallons and industrial rates will increase to \$1.25 per 1000 gallons of water.

The water property tax, plus water rents, paid by residential users results in many residents paying twice the amount for every 1000 gallons of water than what industry pays. A minimum use residential user may pay twice the amount as their neighbor because of the property value alone. Our elected officials should establish the rational for all these charges.

3. The preliminary budget shows that the 1996 cost of the new water project to be \$1,498,210. What is the projected revenue from Cogen under the Bethlehem-Cogen water agreement and the industrial rate increases? A realistic assessment indicates revenue to be less than \$1.1 million or a \$400,000 shortfall.

4. The budget shows that only one operator, to be paid a salary of \$53,000, will be assigned to this new water plant. The new plant is a high tech package plant with ozone treatment which reportedly will be operated 24 hours per day, 7 days a week. Will the health and safety, as well as, the Town's multi-million dollar investment be in jeopardy without full time operators on site 24 hours a day? Who made the decision to have only one operator?

5. The budget indicates the water fund offers a decrease in the tax levy and residential water rents will remain at \$1.07 per thousand gallons. It should be noted that the district water property tax rates increased 20% in 1993 following property re-evaluation.

In 1993, the water budget was overfunded by \$460,000 in part due to this rate increase. The balance in the Capital Reserve Fund as of Dec. 1994 was over \$600,000 earning over \$25,000 in interest. Past rate increases and overfunded budgets should be reviewed.

6. In the 1996 water budget, property taxes paid by Bethlehem to other municipalities, New Scotland being at least one, is projected to be \$300,000. This is \$104,000 more than the actual taxes paid in 1994.

In 1994, the Water Fund budget request for property taxes was \$432,000 and Bethlehem in that year, paid only \$196,109 in property taxes. The request that year, was 120% more than what was actually paid. Where is the budget oversight?

Although not in my written notes here, I would just like to add, that the interest on this new plant alone, costs us \$2600 a day -- \$2,600 dollars every day. At the end of today that's what it costs. If there is a delay of one month, this is \$90,000 and if we delay three months, it's a quarter of a million dollars! This is a lot of money. And I think if a corporation were involved in paying banks this amount of money, the Board of Directors would be reviewing that about every week. I have heard no discussions by this Board with regards to this project and when it will be on line specifically and what these costs might amount to.

I would like to comment on the Sewer Fund.

I am opposed to the proposed preliminary budget for the sewer fund for the following reasons:

1. The preliminary budget fails to show the front footage assessment rate for the sewer rent charges.
2. The budget fails to separate the revenue produced from the sewer property tax, sewer rent and front footage assessment.
3. Item No. G1001 in the preliminary Sewer Budget shows a District Property Tax revenue of \$2,521.27. This is not correct in that it reflects revenue from not only the property tax but also sewer rent charges and front footage assessments.

Article 14F of the General Municipal Law requires that a sewer rent fund be established. Bethlehem has not established a sewer rent fund and fails to separately identify sewer property tax revenue from sewer rent revenue.

4. The 1986 Bethlehem sewer ordinance requires properties in the sewer district to be tied into the sewer. A number of properties in the Sewer District using significant amounts of water, pay no sewer rent charges. Why? Does the Board determine who pays and who does not pay?

5. In 1992 and 1993, the sewer fund was over budgeted by \$382,000. The sewer Capital Reserve Funds as of December 1994 exceeded \$400,000 earning over \$16,000 in interest.

Excess monies in the Capital Reserve Fund should be used to reduce our taxes and not as a potential "slush fund".

6. Many properties receive partial exemptions from the sewer property tax. Has the Board established a policy for exemptions?

The Town Board acts in behalf of the water and sewer district taxpayers. The two funds represent a \$7.0 million a year operation.

The Board needs to provide more detailed oversight. The water and sewer district taxpayers pay over 60% of their total town tax in the form of water and sewer charges.

I urge that you, our elected officials, request a written response from the Town's administrator on the above comments. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Judi, would you like to respond to any of this, this evening? Or do you want to spend some...? I know that you and Sherwood have met repeatedly on these.

MRS. KEHOE: I would like to respond to the comments on the reserves. Mr. Davies repeatedly makes references to the monies that are in the reserve funds and for the record and for the Board, to understand this -- those reserve funds are, in fact, going to be resulting in future tax benefits to our residents. Those reserves are allowing us to plan ahead for future sizable capital projects. They are not "slush funds", they are funds that are available for projects that are designated specifically by the Board.

The budgets are not over funded. The budgets are a plan for spending and when the actual results come in, they will differ from what this plan shows. This plan is something that we are working on. We are planning ahead 12 months. You can't predicate accurately what every dime you receive and every dime you spend is going to be. If there is an under expenditure as per the budget, the Board has the right to transfer those monies into the reserves and it is fiscally prudent to transfer those monies into reserves to be used for these future projects.

MR. PUTNEY: Question if I may. Judi, does the Comptroller of the State of New York have some sort of guide lines relative to the reserve levels?

MRS. KEHOE: To the reserve levels, no.

MR. PUTNEY: Okay, I thought there was a cap that was used.

MRS. KEHOE: No, not on the reserve funds.

MR. WEBSTER: We are talking about reserves as relation to the long term Park programs, repairs, etc.

MRS. KEHOE: Yes, we have numerous reserves for projects designated by the Board.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: I thought that's what it was.

MRS. KEHOE: That is so that when you have, when the time comes...

MR. PUTNEY: It is part of the appreciation.

MRS. KEHOE: ...when the time comes you spend the monies on these projects, you don't have to go out and incur bonding which gives you interest costs, which increases the total project cost.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Thank you, Judi. Bruce, the concern about the ozone, the decision only one employee for the Water Plant...

MR. SECOR: In the budget workup, or in the original design of the plant, we went around and toured a number of plants. For example, the Town of Guilderland near us, uses a very similar treatment technology. It's a basically automated plant and they have operators on during the day shift and either shut the plant down at night when they go home or run in an automatic mode. This particular type of plant that we are using, there is over 300 of them in operation in the United States, they have decades of operational experience.

The decision was made to staff the plant one shift per day, seven days per week and that is what we are operating under. We have one person down there now, going through training and is there during the start up. And in the normal operation mode, would be to have that, there is actually money in there for one and half employees and they would share some days when they would do additional maintenance. There is also other money in there for normal maintenance that you would expect in...like you maintain your car or your home, there is maintenance money in there.

Another point that was raised, it was about the revenue of the sales to industry... will amount between 1.5 - 2 million dollars a year in additional revenue, which was pointed out to the Board at the time of the Public Hearings. We have presented the documentation to the Board and the cost estimates that have been provided. There is no short fall. This is a cost saving measure. We have brought in new jobs. We have brought in new industry. We have lowered taxes.

Did I cover both points you asked for?

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Yes. Is there anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the budget?

MRS. BURTIS: Can I ask Bruce a question about the ...(did not come to microphone could not hear what this person was asking)

SUPERVISOR FULLER: She has to come to the mike, we can't get her. Can you come up to the mike, Linda?

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: I can't pick you up.

MR. WEBSTER: She couldn't pick you up.

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: And this has to be verbatim because this is a Public Hearing. I'm sorry.

MRS. BURTIS: Good, make my night. Ozone is in the plant according to Mr. Secor and according to Mrs. Davis for health reasons. The reason that you ozonate water, is because when you use chlorine, a bad thing happens. You get THM's, or what the scientists call trihalomethanes. So the only reason that this town added Ozone, which is a futuristic high tech kind of a high energy, labor intensive item -- I have been told by a RPI Engineer -- is for health reasons. Now, we're going to... so my question is, since the plant is going to be divided, you are going to use the water for industry and you are going to negotiate contract with Albany and use back up water from the Alcove Revisor for the residents -- how many... why... why are, why are you still staying with the Ozone. Why don't you keep the Ozone out of it?

MR. SECOR: Again -- not to put my back to the Board, but -- when we went through the approval process from the Health Department, the water industry is moving in the direction of ozonation for the same reasons you talked about because of the trihalomethanes issue and they are looking at the drinking water standards. We are providing potable water for the industrial area for a number of reasons. Not only are there existing users to have both potable and non-potable uses, there are future customers that are coming in and what we didn't want to get into is a situation where a customer had to double pipe this whole plant. Where you would have non-potable piping and potable piping. Through out the plant, they can use this water where ever they chose. Just the way you do in your home. Out of all the water you buy from the water district, how much do you actually drink? Most of the water you buy is used for washing clothes, washing your body, for flushing the toilet or whatever. There is no difference between your own household use and what is going on in the industrial area.

As a water company, we are in the process of providing a very good quality product to the industrial areas so we can bring in new industry and create additional jobs. As new industry has come to us, one of some of their first questions are, can we have 500,000 gallons a day of water, what's the price, those are the types of questions that we get.

So, yes, this is a very necessary thing, it was part of the approval process because we are providing a potable water source to go into the industrial area. It is not a waste of money, even though a lot of the water will be used for non-potable uses. We then have a common system, which anyone can use for any purpose that they require.

MRS. BURTIS: Well, what you originally did, was you built a system so that 28,000 people would have drinking water from this new system. How many people are we talking about right now who are going to be drinking water from this system?

MR. SECOR: Again, it would be the people on site in the industrial area. So, there is Owens Corning, General Electric and Selkirk Cogen would be the basic primary users and any additional growth you would get in the railroad yards.

MRS. BURTIS: So, from 28,000 people we go down to how many people?

MR. SECOR: About 1,000.

MRS. BURTIS: I understand it is about 70 workers at Selkirk Cogen.

MR. SECOR: Well, there is 70 workers at Selkirk Cogen, there is about 600 on the GE site, about 700. 400 at Owens Corning.

MRS. BURTIS: Okay. Owens Corning uses bottled water for their workers.

MR. SECOR: They don't like the reservoir water either?

MRS. BURTIS: That's what the manager of the plant... that's their intention is to use... they are doing it now.

MR. SECOR: Most of the water they get from Albany so if they don't like the water...

MRS. BURTIS: Okay. So, what we have done is... I mean, I hope people understand what we have done in this community and here is one big... we are talking about budget and here's one big concern about waste is we have put in this high tech, high end process, ozone, which nobody would have recommended if somebody in the town had had the vision that this was going to be water used for industrial purposes because you don't need to keep cooling pipes from getting cancer.

MR. SECOR: That is not a true statement. There is no waste. If you look at the industry and where the industry is headed, and you may even see it for the same reasons you talked about because of trihalomethanes, ultimately you may see this at our existing water plant, at the Alcove plant. You may eventually see ozone in a lot of these service supply plants because trihalomethanes in service supplies are much more difficult to deal with than from ground water source like we have. So, there is no wasted money. This is a project being paid for by industry. Taxes are going down to the residents. We have brought in new jobs and no matter how many times you try to twist it or say it... it's still... it's a good project where taxes are going down, it is being paid for by industry.

MRS. BURTIS: It is being paid for by the residents and you wouldn't do the ozone if you had built it just for industrial purposes. You don't need to keep cooling pipes from getting cancer. But, you said yourself the reason that it is in there is for health. We are not worrying about the health of the industrial pipes. I am just quoting Mrs. Davis and Mr. Secor.

SUPERVISOR FULLER: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in opposition of the budget? May I have a motion to close the public hearing?

The motion was made by Mr. Putney and seconded by Mr. Webster to close the public hearing. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.

Noes: None.

Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

Kathleen J. Newkirk
Town Clerk

Supervisor Fuller convened the regular Town Board meeting following the public hearing. Mrs. Fuller noted November 8th at 7:30 p.m. the budget will be on the agenda for discussion and adoption.

The next item was to adopt resolutions pertaining to Election Inspector and Poll Clerk appointment changes from the Republican Committee.

Resolution to
Election Inspector
and Poll Clerk
Republican Committ
changes

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mrs. Davis:

RESOLVED, that pursuant to Article 3 of the Election Law, the following person be and she hereby is appointed Election Inspector as recommended by the Republican Committee to serve for the period July 15, 1995 through July 14, 1996 as follows:

Election Inspector:

District 7	Phyllis Harwood, 17 Elwood Rd., Delmar
15	Patricia Bannan, 219 Winne Road, Delmar

Poll Clerk:

District 3	Nicholas Peek, 34 Bridge St., Slingerlands
------------	--------------------------------------------

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

- - -

The following resolution was offered by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mrs. Davis:

RESOLVED, that pursuant to Article 3 of the Election Law, the following persons be and they hereby are appointed Election Inspectors as recommended by the Republican Committee as indicated:

Election Inspector

District 2	Leo Schoos, 45 Woodstream Dr., Delmar
5	Ann S. Drew, 52 Euclid Ave., Delmar
8	Elva Dootz, 25 Charles Blvd., Delmar
6	Frank Martin, 481 Orchard St., Delmar

Poll Clerk

District 2	Susan Almindao, 450 Elm Ave., Selkirk
5	Jean Forbes, 58 Euclid Ave., Delmar
8	Adelaide Skaskiw, 14 Brockley Dr., Delmar

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

The following item was to adopt a resolution authorizing the Supervisor to execute a deed and accept property from the U.S. Department of Interior for the so called Job Corps premises, Route 144, Glenmont. Councilman Putney asked the price of the property. Supervisor Fuller indicated there was no charge. She noted it is to be used as a park area and will add to the park system.

Resolution
to execute a
deed and accep
property from
US Department
of Interior

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Interior has agreed to convey the so called Job Corps excess land to the Town of Bethlehem; and

WHEREAS, the Town has agreed to accept said property subject to the terms and conditions contained in the deed; and

WHEREAS, a deed has been received from the U.S. Department of Interior which must be executed by the Town Supervisor,

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, that the Supervisor of the Town of Bethlehem is authorized to execute the deed and accept the property.

The above resolution was presented for adoption by Mr. Putney, seconded by Mrs. Davis and duly adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

Approval for
construction
trailer for
Trinity Manor
Subdivision

The next item was a recommendation from John Flanigan, Building Inspector, for approval of construction trailer for Trinity Manor Subdivision, Beaver Dam Road, Selkirk.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Putney to approve a construction trailer for Trinity Manor Subdivision, Beaver Dam Road, Selkirk, as recommended by Building Inspector, John Flanigan. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

Parks and
recreation
for seasonal
appointment

The next item was a request from David Austin, Administrator, Parks & Recreation Department, for approval of seasonal appointments.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Putney to approve the appointment of the following seasonal personnel:

Recreation Instructor I at a rate of \$4.80 per hour	
Shauna M. Dowd	Maggie Erlich
8 Venture Terrace	37 The Crossway
Glenmont, NY 12077	Delmar, NY 12054

Recreation Instructor I at the rate of \$5.10 per hour	
Erin H. Gerstenzang	
12 Parkwyn Court	
Delmar, NY 12054	

The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

Planning
receipt of
conditional
approval for
Mountainview
Estate
Planning
Final Plat
Approval
Glen Manor
Subdivision

The following item was to acknowledge receipt of Conditional Approval for the Mountainview Estate 1 lot subdivision, Orchard Street, from the Planning Board for information purposes.

The next item was to acknowledge receipt of Final Plat Approval for the Glen Manor Subdivision, Feura Bush Road, from the Planning Board for information purposes.

Planning
Board receipt
of Final Plans
Phase II, Beverwyck

The following item was to acknowledge receipt of Final Plans for Phase II, Beverwyck, Krumkill Road, from the Planning Board for information purposes.

Release of
bonding regarding
BPA JuniperFields

The next item was a recommendation from Michael Cirillo, Engineering Services Administrator, Department of Public Works for release of bonding regarding BPA Juniper Fields, A.K.A. Adams

Station. Supervisor Fuller noted this is in the amount of \$15,000. to complete the paving work on Juniper Drive. She noted it has been completed.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Putney to approve the release of bonding in the amount of \$15,000. regarding BPA Juniper Fields, A.K.A. Adams Station as recommended by Mr. Cirillo, Engineering Services Administrator, Department of Public Works. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

The next item on the agenda was recommendation from Gregg Sagendorph, Highway Superintendent, for award of bid for fleet fuel management system to Valley Equipment, Schenectady, NY at a price of \$15,975.

Award bid
for Fleet Fuel

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Putney to approve the award of bid for fleet fuel management system to Valley Equipment, Schenectady, New York at a bid price of \$15,975. as recommended by Gregg Sagendorph, Highway Superintendent. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

The next item was a recommendation from Supervisor Fuller to change the regular Town Board meeting of November 22, 1995 to Tuesday, November 21, 1995 due to the Thanksgiving holiday.

Change Town
Board meeting
to November 21,
1995

The motion was made by Mr. Putney and seconded by Mr. Webster to approve the change in the regular Town Board meeting from November 22, 1995 to November 21, 1995 due to the Thanksgiving holiday. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

Supervisor Fuller asked if anyone wished to address the Board this evening. Mr. Joe Duclos said this sort of went with the budget. He asked if all the police officers, 4 of them, are assigned to the meeting. He further asked if they were on the clock. Supervisor Fuller said the officers are in and out of the meetings all the time. Mr. Duclos asked why they were here and not on the street. He asked if they were on break. Lt. Vanderbilt indicated he is the officer of the night and works with the Traffic Safety Committee.

Discussion
why police at
board meeting
Clearwater

Mr. Robert Samsel said he would like to answer that because a few meetings back one of the Clearwater supporters grabbed him by the shirt, spit in his face and called him a lot of names he preferred not to repeat. He said he was glad the officers were in attendance.

Mr. Samsel said several months ago there was an article in the newspaper complaining that the Town Board was going to poison all the people up in the industrial area. He said tonight Mrs. Burdis is objecting to having potable water there. He asked for an explanation.

Mrs. Burdis said they never said the Town was going to poison the people. Mr. Samsel said that was the way he read it. Mrs. Burdis said maybe he read it that way but there is no way that you can go back to a quote and say that anybody from Clearwater said you

were going to poison the people. She said they asked about the source of the water. Supervisor Fuller said it is still not coming from the Hudson River. Mrs. Burdis asked where it was coming from and again, Supervisor Fuller indicated the aquifer. Mrs. Burdis again asked where the water is coming from.

Mr. Samsel asked Mrs. Burdis to answer his question. Mrs. Burdis continued discussing the source of the water. Mr. Samsel said the Town has told Clearwater the water is being separated. Mrs. Burdis again noted they did not say anything about poison.

Mr. Samsel said this was not what he asked. He again said he did not ask for the speech she makes at every meeting. He simply asked Mrs. Burdis to explain her objection to the water being purified. Mrs. Burdis said they are not complaining about the purification. She said she is worried about getting this water since they are using the ozone treatment and she does not want to drink it.

Mr. Samsel said Supervisor Fuller said it is going to be separated, further asking if Mr. Clyne is going to mix it in if he gets elected. Mrs. Burdis said they are talking about... she is not a politician and she is not involved with Mr. Clyne. Mr. Samsel said it was a simple question.

Supervisor Fuller said this was the end of the discussion.

Mrs. Capone asked Mrs. Burdis if she has consulted the City of Poughkeepsie that uses the Hudson River for their water. Mrs. Burdis asked the classification of the river in Poughkeepsie. Mrs. Capone said she did not know. Mrs. Burdis claimed it was classified a. Supervisor Fuller asked Mrs. Capone to not discuss this any further.

The motion was made by Mr. Putney and seconded by Mr. Webster to adjourn the regular Town Board meeting at 8:12 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster, Mr. Putney, Mrs. Davis.
Noes: None.
Absent: Mr. Lenhardt.

Kathleen D. Newkirk
Town Clerk