

448

TOWN BOARD
SEPTEMBER 22, 1993

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: Kenneth J. Ringler, Supervisor
Frederick C. Webster, Councilman
Charles Gunner, Councilman
Sheila Fuller, Councilwoman
Daniel Santola, Acting Town Attorney
Catherine T. Picarazzi, Deputy Town Clerk

ABSENT: M. Sheila Galvin, Councilwoman

- - -

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Good evening, welcome to a regular meeting of the Bethlehem Town Board. Tonight, as we have advertised, we do have a public hearing. But we are going to take about 5 minutes for a very special presentation that in the form of a gift to the Town of Bethlehem by the Tawasentha Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Claudia Englehart is regent of the DAR is here and she is going to be presenting a photographic reproduction of the Tantillo of the Nichols-Sills house as it appears on the cover of the BETHLEHEM REVISITED. Claudia there is a microphone right up here if you like to use it.

Presentation
of gift from
Tawasenta
Chapter DAR

MS. ENGLEHART: I project fairly well. So if anyone can't hear me, you can raise your hand.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Can you hear her?

DEPUTY TOWN CLERK PICARAZZI: No.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: We can't pick you up on the...

MR. ENGLEHART: I have to use a microphone?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes, because we want to get this on the record.

MS. ENGLEHART: Good evening. Tonight the members of Tawasentha Chapter, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, are here to present a gift to the Town of Bethlehem. Since the gift is the representation of the oldest house in our town, it is fitting that our Society should be offering it to be on permanent display, as a record of the early settlers who came to Bethlehem to make their livelihood.

We are a chapter with a long history. For on January 1907, a group of ladies met at a Slingerland home to initiate the first meeting of Tawasentha Chapter. Our Chapter takes its name from a valley, through which course is the Normanskill Creek, called Tawasentha, by the Indians.

Over the years we have presented many patriotic and historic activities, as in 1915 when it was the suggestion of Tawasentha Chapter, the citizens of Slingerlands paid high tribute to the Liberty Bell. Which passed through the village on the D&H Railroad, on route to its resting place in Philadelphia. About three hundred persons assembled at the Slingerlands Station, where patriotic exercises were held under the offices of the Chapter.

In May of 1917 began the marking of the graves of the Revolutionary Soldiers in the Towns of Bethlehem and New Scotland. We published a booklet listing the locations of all these 126 graves. We also placed markers at the Hamilton Glass works in Guilderland, the site of the deep massacre in Berne and a granite bolder in a New Scotland church cemetery to commemorate revolutionary war soldiers. We placed a bronze plaque on the Helderberg escarpment to honor pioneer geologist and two years ago we worked with the State of New York to construct a viewing platform so that people could better see the plaque.

Youth has always been an interest of our members and since 1911, we have donated prizes of money and scholarships to young people in our local schools, in an effort to stir their interest in history and patriotism. In both War World I and II, we contributed money and many volunteer hours to many phases of war work. We also recently placed on permanent display, in our Town Hall the Civil War Flag made by one of our members, Mrs. Leah Slingerland Haswell, in 1861. These are just a few highlights of Tawasentha Chapters many years of service to our Town and our Nation. We hope and expect to continue this service in the years to come.

At this time I would also like to recognize the individual contribution of Julie Kelly who conceived the idea of having the photograph done and the painting reproduced by Mr. Tantillo and gave our Chapter the idea and also helped to bring it to fruition. And thank you very much. And also the other members of our Chapter who have worked very hard during the year to raise money, so we can do projects like this.

We are happy also tonight to introduce the artist of the painting, of Bethlehem House, Mr. Leonard Tantillo. He is a well known and talented area artist who has done numerous renditions of historic scenes in the Albany area, the lower Hudson Valley and western New York State. Most of his work is done in the medium of acrylic and he very indepth and accurate historical reconstruction of early times. The original painting of Bethlehem House was done with acrylic on hard board and was a panel of 8X10 in size. What we are presenting here is a photographic reproduction of the original painting. The house is shown not as it was built 1735, but as it appeared after an enlargement of the house in 1795.

I would also like to introduce Mr. Floyd Brewer, who is Senior Editor of the book on which the painting appears, BETHLEHEM REVISITED and he would like to make a presentation.

MR. BREWER: You know I should of made a presentation like this sometime ago, we are a little tardy on this. In a way I am glad we waited, because I have an opportunity to say this in public. If I heard that book is beautiful, I have heard it a hundred times, over the last, more than that I think; because 1,400 copies have been sold Len. So, you know your painting is getting around.

At any rate, I feel, I felt so good about this, and particularly about Len's contribution to our book, that I wanted to write a words in the front of his book and present a copy to him:

TO LEN TANTILLO: with appreciation for the careful,
for his careful attention to historical detail and
his beautiful rendering of the Nichol-Sill house,
for the cover of BETHLEHEM REVISITED. Signed.

Okay, thank you Len.

MR. TANTILLO: Thanks Floyd. And I would also like to thank the Tawasentha Chapter of the DAR, for their enthusiastic support of my work and for the, I like to thank Floyd and the other members of the Bicentennial Committee, for selecting my work for the cover of the book. I hope that the print that is being donated to the Town of Bethlehem, serves as a reminder to everyone who lives here, what a rich, historical tradition, we have here in this community and this area. Thanks again.

MS. ENGELHART: I would like everyone in the Tawasentha Chapter to now adjourn to the Board room.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Before you leave, on behalf of the Town, I like to thank DAR for this beautiful gift, Mr. Tantillo for sharing his skills with our community and addressing that cover as it is so beautifully and now I would like to entertain a motion from the Town Board to accept this gift with a great deal of gratitude.

450

Motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mr. Fuller to accept this gift with a great deal of gratitude. The motion was carried by the following vote:

AYES: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Webster.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you very, very much. And this is going to hang in the Board room, we already have a spot picked out for it. Thank you.

Catherine T. Kcaicjzj
Deputy Town Clerk

PUBLIC HEARING BEGAN: 7:37 p.m.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: The next item on our agenda is a public hearing, to consider Local Law No. 7 of 1993, to consider repeal of the Provisions of Real Property Tax Law, Section 1903, concerning Homestead Base Proportions of the Town of Bethlehem. Ask the Town Clerk to read the call of the hearing.

Public
Hearing
Local Law
No. 7, 1993
Repeal of
Homestead

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
TOWN OF BETHLEHEM
ALBANY COUNTY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Town Board of the Town of Bethlehem, Albany County, New York will hold a public hearing on September 22, 1993 at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Hall, 445 Delaware Avenue, Delmar, NY to consider proposed Local Law No. 7 of 1993, concerning the Possible Repeal of Local Law No. 2 of 1993 pertaining to the Provisions of Real Property Tax Law, Section 1903 concerning Homestead Base Proportions Town of Bethlehem.

All parties in interest and citizens will have an opportunity to be heard at the said hearing. The Town of Bethlehem provides reasonable accommodations for the disabled.

Disabled individuals who need assistance in order to participate should contact Dave Austin. Advanced notice is requested.

BY ORDER OF THE TOWN BOARD
TOWN OF BETHLEHEM
Kathleen A. Newkirk
Town Clerk

- - -

STATE OF NEW YORK }
COUNTY OF ALBANY }

KATHRYN OLSEN of the Town of Bethlehem, being duly sworn, says that she is the bookkeeper 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 8 day of September of 1993.

/s/Kathryn Olsen

- - -

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.:
COUNTY OF ALBANY)

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 I posted on September 3, 1993, a Notice of Public Hearing, a copy of which is hereto attached, in 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
17th day of September, 1993
/s/Catherine T. Picarazzi
Notary Public, Albany County

- - -

452

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: A motion to indent.

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

AYES: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Gunner.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Ms. Galvin.

- - -

Discussion
Local Law
No. 7, 1993

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Tonight's public hearing is, as we just said, to consider repealing the provisions of the Homestead, which is a two-tiered tax system currently in effect in the Town of Bethlehem. This tax rate is different on Homestead, Non-Homestead properties for the Town and highway taxes only within our Town.

The format of the hearing -- and we will not have a lot discussion -- first we will open it right up to questions, because we have had many, many discussions on this issue and I think the questions should be asked at this point in time. Before we open to the public, does the Board have any further questions at this point?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Would you rather have any comments from the Board now or later?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: It's up to you. Whatever your preference might be.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I'll make mine now.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay. If you would, Charlie, get closer to the microphone. Mr. Gunner.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Thank you, Ken. This Homestead thing has been kicking around for awhile. There have been people who have been unhappy and there have been people who have been happy. Some of you I look at with.. have heavy faces now, say "who could be happy?" Well there are some, because some small amounts of money do mean things to people. And, of course, large amounts of money also mean things to people. Nevertheless, I think I would like to just go through some ruminations about myself and how I figure about this... what's going on.

I looked at all of the figures that happened over the years. Starting with 1991 and coming right into 1993, getting in preparation for the 1994 budget. And, most of you probably are aware that at first... for example, the total taxable in the Town, in 1991 -- before we went through the reassessment -- was \$104,288,523.

When we went to reassessment, and I am sure, any of you if are like me, when you got your full statement of disclosure, were quite shocked to find out that the total taxable value is now 2 million, excuse me, \$2,014,288,523. What a change. But it shouldn't of really changed too many people's taxes. Some would go up and some would go down. Well, it probably changed more than were happy with it because we had a record number of grievances, certioraries, and also small claims court.

But, hopefully, it would all shake out in time and it would go on down. I guess the thing that amazed me is that we started with a full disclosure statement in homestead of \$1,195,674,400. and we ended up with a final role for 1993 of \$1,205,939,431. Wow, those numbers even frighten me. But, we get used to them as we dealt with them and we adjusted.

I guess the big difference that shows is that the base of percentage, the percentage that the homestead -- which is primarily... was primarily residential is still primarily residential but has gone from actually in 1991 their percentage of the tax in the Town was almost 57 percent, 1/10 or 1/100 of a percent off. And, the non-homestead base which was primarily commercial, industrial and at

that time it was farms and vacant lands as well, plus utilities and things like that -- and theirs was 43 percent. A little 100, 300ths over.

Then as we moved along at full disclosure, the homestead base percentage was 59.34, the non-homestead went down to 40.66. At the tentative roll, the homestead base percentage of their levy was 60.6 percent and the non-homestead base was 39.39.

At the final roll in 1992, you remember those of you as you waded through these steps, it was 60.96, almost 61, just short of 61 percent and the non-homestead was for all effects was 39 percent.

We came to 1993, depending upon which figure is used, the homestead percentage at the present time would be 63.77 or 64.79 and that deals on what is really the final roll. I had a little trouble deciphering it. I believe it is 66.5 -- is that right David?

MR. LEAFER: The current base proportion?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: No, the final amount of money, taxable -- excuse me, percentage, base percentage. Yes, but that is based on the... my figures that are different there.

MR. LEAFER: It is 63.77, that is the class current percentage.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: That is the class current...

MR. LEAFER: The class base percentage which is based on '92 is 60.96. The class current percentage is 63.77.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, I guess the thing that made it a little different for me, I have one figure of the 1993 final roll for the non-homesteaders \$680,342,606 and I have another at \$655,087,870 and I am sure it is my not understanding it rather than your error but I guess I got it from this piece of paper right here that you gave me.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: David, would you use the microphone, please so people can hear you. Thank you.

MR. LEAFER: As we discussed on several occasions...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Here, so you know what I am talking about. I called your office.

MR. LEAFER: As we discussed on several occasions, in one spot in making the calculations, you work with the total Town taxable which includes special franchises. In another spot in the calculations, you work with the total Town taxable less special franchises and the special franchise portion of the assessment is \$29,000,000. and some change. That is the reason why you have a difference in one spot where you are using \$684,000,000 and in the other spot you are using \$655,000,000.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I guess, David, the thing that threw me off is right underneath the heading, total taxable value, on your right and you just went down -- it is where you subtracted it. In your hand writing, I guess, the bottom of the page.

MR. LEAFER: That is correct.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: And, so that was the total taxable I went by.

MR. LEAFER: For that one spot on the report.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, that -- is that figure going to be used or is the other figure going to be used?

MR. LEAFER: They are both going to be used in the calculation of the...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: What is the taxation? I have both figures worked out here. What is the true taxation?

454

MR. LEAFER: By true taxation, you mean the final rates or the final base proportions?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, what will be used for the base percentage for coming up with the final roll?

MR. LEAFER: The current base proportion is 63.... the current class current percentage or class current percentage is 63.776166 percent for homestead.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay, then the sheet that you gave me you wrote on the back is an error then. That is not the taxable value.

MR. LEAFER: No. No, it is all right because in this spot as I explained...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I don't want to go through that -- I just want to know about this figure here.

MR. LEAFER: This is the total taxable value with special -- this 684 with special franchise included. However, for purposes of a calculation as we are required to do by the dictates of E&A, this figure of 655 is used at one point in the calculations and it represent having taken out the special franchises as we were told we were supposed to do.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay, so you are going by what figure on that?

MR. LEAFER: The actual figure...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: For the heading.

MR. LEAFER: For the heading, the actual figure is \$684,000,000.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay. I saw this in your handwriting so actually the numbers I have been using is the ones that we talked about, so no problem. So, just to go back now and I can pick up from there. The percentage of the homestead has increased from 56 almost 57 percent up to almost 64 percent. And, that is part of what has created the problem and there are a lot of things that created the problems -- New York State was one of them. They passed the homestead act, all right, however, I will read what I wrote so people don't say I said different things.

New York State Homestead Act was passed by Bethlehem Town Board by a 3-2 vote in March of 1992 as an effort to temporarily mitigate the impact of reassessment on residential property owners in the Town of Bethlehem. The New York State Legislature enacted the Homestead legislation to help mitigate large shifts in tax liabilities that happen too quickly from one class of properties to another. During this year, a raise of 4 percentage points from approximately 61 percent and I... in the percentage of the tax levied on the homestead properties was reduced to 57 percent. The same percentage that was paid by the homestead properties in 1991. That is your base percentage that David was just speaking about.

And, the same percentage that was paid by the non-homestead properties in 1991 prevailed for 1992 and that was 43 percent, give or take a hundred here or there. They generally expected that in the time of a few years the homestead and the non-homestead percentages of the levy would come closer together and the homestead act would be repealed and a uniform rate would be applied.

Understandably there was strong opposition to the non-homestead... by the non-homestead property class members. I am sure, understandably, if the situation was reversed, the homestead class of property owners which are primarily residents would also have provided opposition. Unfortunately, homestead only comes into play after a Town goes through reassessment. Bethlehem was forced into action by a law suit which ended in the courts requiring the Town to take action on a reassessment program. I think eventually almost every town in the State will have to do it. We are not the first and we won't be the last.

There are opportunities to soften the tax burden on the non-homestead class by applying only a percentage. That would be roll back that could have been chosen anywhere between 10 and 90 percent of the percentage that was rolled back on. Neither side appeared to be interested and no such motion was made by any Town Board member. Consequently on November 2, 1992 the base proportions for 1993 taxes of 57 percent and 43 percent. I rounded them, I want you to know that because there are hundreds of tenths involved there but that is about it. Was approved by unanimous resolution of the Town Board for the levy. Actually the issue of applying the resolution was almost missed and we could... could have resulted in something like a pocket veto and we wouldn't even be sitting here. However, it was acted upon. There were, however, several political actions that helped mitigate the impact on homestead... of the homestead tax upon the homestead properties or the 1992 and will also carry through in 1993 if the homestead act is sustained. The lobbyists of the farmers and the landowners, particularly, was... and the Chamber of Commerce... was successful in reaching Governor Cuomo and Legislators who amended the existing New York State Law and moved farms and vacant land that is in residential zones into the homestead class of properties. The Bethlehem Board of Education also opted not to use the homestead act and in my opinion, the Town administration was pro-active in seeking reductions for the homestead class properties. Time and leadership were also needed and there was little of either forthcoming. You remember we were in a jam getting all the meetings in and everything leading up to the March 25th, 27th and the time before it and we had to get notices of open hearings and so forth all of that out.

There is another peril that is placed upon the property owners and I would think particularly those in the non-homestead and that is the approximately 15 to 20 certioraris that if lost could bring serious tax problems not only to one or 2 classes of the homestead but to all. That... there is one very large certiorari there that is being worked on. However, in most cases I believe the reassessment program caused more problems in number and tax expense to our citizens than the homestead act did. The homestead act added fuel to the fire of many non-homestead property owners. The opportunities for a win-win situations, were missed back in the process. If homestead is not repealed, there is a gain and a basic proportion to about, for homestead people, to about 59.87, almost 3 percentages, 3 percentages up. And it goes down approximately 3 percentages to 40.12, for the non-homestead. If it is, repealed there will be an increase for the homestead class for the average home that is assessed about \$135,000, that's about \$16 to \$18, that includes the Town and Highway tax. Concurrently the uniform tax rates that would be installed, would save the non-homestead class \$32 to \$33 on a similar \$135,000 assessment. And so we are here tonight to listen to any information that you will help us make the decision, help us make that decision, that will be in the interest of the whole community. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you Charlie. Any other questions or any comments from the board at this point in time?

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: No.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, I would entertain any questions at this point in time from the audience. What we will do, is questions first, and then we will open it to those who wish to speak in favor of repealing the homestead; and then those who are opposed to repealing it. You come and you speak to the board, I do ask that you do come to the microphones in the front and introduce yourself for the record. Does anybody have any questions at this point in time? Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of repealing homestead? Turn both around please and use the one your left.

MS. CORNELIUS: Am I on radio here? Thank you and good evening. I'm Marty Cornelius.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Speak a little close please.

MS. CORNELIUS: President of The Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce. On behalf of the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce, I am here tonight to strongly urge you to repeal the Homestead Law. Our Chamber is comprised of over 500 members of the direct interest in the vitality

456

of the Town of Bethlehem. Many of our local business people are also residents of the town. From the chambers inception in the 50's our vision has been a driving force in maintaining the quality of life that has come to be associated with living and working in this community. Bethlehem has always been attractive because of the mix of rural ambiance and a business community offering a wide range of goods and services. But, the homestead provision is a threat to this mix. A wrench in the works of our traditional single tax rate system. There are many important contributions that businesses make to our Town above and beyond their taxes. Local business community, many of whom are represented here this evening, is involved in the healthy development and well being of all our Town citizens. Just about all of our community organizations depend on the generous voluntary support of local businesses for their very survival. I have listed in the papers I gave you a few examples of programs that count on businesses for support. The Bethlehem Music Association, the high school, Little League, soccer teams, Bethlehem Opportunities Unlimited, Bethlehem Network, senior van, senior programs, bicentennial events, community Bethlehem and beautification, local police and fire departments, churches, houses of worship, PTA fund raisers, the DARE program, proms, homecoming, drama and art club, Mickey Mantle, lacrosse, soccer, Dolphins, basketball, the list goes on and on.

Homestead is one more burden added to the backs of small businesses. During the past year, employers have faced substantial increases in health insurance premiums, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, disability, now it appears employers will have to shoulder an increased burden for all of their employees under President Clinton's proposed national health care plan. Something has to give and we don't want that something to be the support that businesses give to their communities. As one business owner told me recently, the additional dollars that I have to pay in taxes through the homestead act make me think twice about being able to renew my commitment to a Little League team this year.

In casting one of two no homestead votes last year, Councilman Fred Webster cited the provision as sending a bad message to the business community. The very businesses that support local organizations, charities, children's education, athletics, music, art, drama, etc. We want to keep an eye on relative competitiveness of our business environment. How have other communities faced the situation? Last year the New York State Board of Equalization and Assessment stated that 90 percent of the towns and cities that have had the option to adopt homestead have not done so. A study done by the Cornell Cooperative Extension of Dutchess County along with the American Farmland Trust examined the ratio of revenue to expenditures for 2 Dutchess County towns. Their findings showed that the residential community requires as much as \$1.36 in services for each dollar in taxes they pay while businesses receive well under \$1.00 and in some cases as low as \$.16 worth of services for each dollar in taxes they pay. That is quite a difference.

Adoption of any provision that facilitates the deterioration of the local business community, such as homestead, might ultimately result in a shift of the tax burden to the residential community and decrease the vitality of the community. Residents would end up paying more and receiving less. So the business people of the Town of Bethlehem are willing participants in the life and well being of our community and on behalf of them, I am here tonight to strongly urge you to vote to repeal the homestead law. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you. (applause)

MR. MEAD: My name is John Mead and I am a resident here in the Town of Bethlehem and I am also a member of the Albany County Farm Bureau Board. We have prepared a position paper for... to be read here tonight and I would like to have Sheila Powers read it for us. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you, John.

MS. POWERS: Thank you. And, if I may, I have copies of this if you would like to have it.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Sure.

MS. POWERS: I would also like to digress just slightly. Just to point out and to bring us back to what actually occurred in the form of lobbying. I want to tell this Board that New York Farm Bureau and, therefore, Albany County Farm Bureau as well as the reverse order of that have lobbied against the homestead act since its enactment. We have been active in every community, long before Bethlehem even discussed it pointing out that each community had its own disaster what happened, please consider carefully what may happen here. Furthermore, Albany County Farm Bureau which was the local operating lobbyist within Albany County did not lobby the State Government at all, as a matter of fact, from the time that you, in the Town of Bethlehem, announced your discussion of the Homestead Act. What we did is what we always do, we enacted... put into activity our local affairs committee which is comprised of the citizens of the Town of Bethlehem who have their opinions and wanted their opinions known to their Town government. That is simply to lay the matter straight.

As far as the farm and protection law being passed, Mr. Gunner, that law had been under way in the Assembly in both... or in the State Legislature, both houses, since about 1988. I have personally been attending hearings on it since then and the enactment finally of the exemption of the farms out of the homestead class simply occurred because the uproar in Bethlehem brought to the attention of the State Government, thank God, the fact that that may be... ought to be attended to right then and there. So, it was included in the conversations of the farm and protection law as it had been under way. Now, I will stop digressing.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Excuse me, since you personally addressed me, I will address you back. I just stated a fact that it happened. I know that it was passed by the Legislature in May. I got a copy of it, I read it, I try to keep in tune with everything that I am supposed to do and that is what I stated. Some way or another it seemed to bother you. I am sorry about that.

MS. POWERS: Well, you have several times said that the paid lobbyists of the Farm Bureau.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I never said any was a paid lobbyist. I don't know who the paid lobbyists are.

MS. POWERS: Forgive me. I don't wish to digress into that.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: No, good. Go right ahead then as long as we settled that.

MS. POWERS: Bethlehem's local law for 1992 adopting the Homestead Act should be repealed. Its 2 tier tax rate has been unjust and a wrongful burden for the Town's business community. It is contrary to the very fabric of America's culture and tradition which is based on the ability of people to choose their way of life and method of earning a living and the ability to work hard to amass wealth, if it is desired, investing that wealth in our future. This right or ability was not possible in Europe causing many of our forbearers to set their sites in the new land and founding as they did so, America. For hundreds of years American businessmen have used their opportunity to make money and have willingly shared the fruits of their labors by building schools, libraries, hospitals, orphanages, parks, playgrounds and museums for public use thereby enriching the communities. Today's businessmen in Bethlehem continues to do this by generously donating materials and monies to booster support for schools, etc. Bethlehem's general population has lived comfortably with this system content to do business locally thereby guaranteeing a well balanced community. Unfortunately, the Town Board adoption of the homestead act in 1992 changed the peaceful give and take in the community doing no one at all any good. The message to the businesses was that their voluntary efforts were not only not respected and appreciated but that residents were being encouraged to resort to the extortion of taxation to get more municipal services and educational items at the expense of local businesses and farms. Effective governmental management and leadership would have cancelled

the taxpayer resident to assist their Town government and Board of Education to spend less money on goods and services rather than demand more of these services because the larger share of the tax burden would be borne by the businesses. Homestead guaranteed that those demanding the most of these services would pay less for them while the businesses who used only 1/6 of the services for the same tax dollar paid would assume a larger percentage of the tax liability regardless of what they thought of it. We are forced to wonder where the sense of social justice was when this law was enacted and how much thought about the long term future of the Town of Bethlehem went into the process. In any case, we urge the Board members at this time to repeal the homestead law in Bethlehem so that the Town's normal rhythms may again flow for the good of all. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you. (applause)

MR. WEBER: I am going to make a very brief and simple statement.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Your name for the record, please.

MR. WEBER: Bill Weber. I have a little written memo and I will give it to the Board when I am through.

I speak as a homeowner and a businessman in the Town of Bethlehem for the past 42 years. I strongly request the Town Board to repeal the Homestead Act as soon as possible. It is my feeling that we all, homeowner, farmer, businessman, should pay our fair share of the taxes. After just completing Town-wide reevaluation to establish equity for all, and then adopting the Homestead Act, which in effect puts a surcharge on business and some agriculture use, in my opinion, this is unfair and counter productive. In my opinion, the principal of the Homestead Act, is incorrect, sends a very negative signal to many businesses that serve our community.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you.

MRS. CAULFIELD: Good evening. I didn't prepare a written statement. But, I came to express my strong support for a repeal. My name is Lois Caulfield. I am speaking as a homeowner, for myself and my husband. As a former committee member for Cubscouts, I would like to add Cubscouting to Marty's long list.

MRS. CORNELIUS: Sorry.

MRS. CAULFIELD: I was really overwhelmed a few years when I had, when I volunteered to go and get goodies to be given out as awards to the scouts at one of their big banquets. I just, I couldn't believe the generosity of our businesses in town. And thirdly, I am speaking as a businesswomen, as a Welcome Wagon Representative, I represent several of the fine business in our town. And I think it was a real kick in the seat to give them this Homestead Act. I don't think disgruntle businesses in any way contribute to the spirit of community, that we enjoy so much in our town. And I am only sorry that I didn't have an opportunity to express an opinion about this before it was passed in the first place. And maybe help some of you not to make that decision in the first place. And I do hope you will do consider, very carefully and repeal the act. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you.

MR. GLAZIER: For the record my name is Joe Glazier. I am a resident and homeowner here in the Town of Bethlehem. Before going into any detail, first I would like to thank the Board for doing this tonight. Bringing forward the possibility to repeal. For me it is a mixed blessing having been with the Farm Bureau and the business community last year, when we went forward and initially fought the proposals that brought about homestead. And looking at where we are tonight, we must consider how we got here. Not in detail, but by the virtue of the fact that we have been a long road on this issue. The speech that Sheila gave tonight, was not much different then the one she gave to the School Board last year. Marty Cornelius, is in the same boat, many of our community businesses have been now hit for one year with a tax they are not going to get back. Let me look at it from my point of view as a homeowner and what it means to me. As a

homeowner, when I get up on a Saturday morning to mow the lawn, I go out to a gas station in the Town of Bethlehem. In part of what I am paying, is going to go to make up in an incremental fraction, what it costs them to pay for the increase tax on their property. Finding a new spark plug, I go to the Hardware Store, I get a new spark plug. And I paid a little bit there for the tax that has been levied upon our businesses. And I do that everyday that I shop in Bethlehem. And with the numbers that Mr. Gunner just quoted to us, it's clear that we have an increase in proportion of residential properties and a decrease in proportion of non-homestead or of homestead properties. What we are looking at, in seeing that, is that we are really seeing one of two possible things. Without knowing the parcel numbers, and other details; we are either seeing a decrease, in our businesses and our farms, or an increase in the proportion in residential properties. Either way, that is not good for the tax base of the town of this size. A town of this size can not sustain itself solely on residential properties. We won't be able to pay for our schools, we won't be able to pay for our road, we won't be able to pay for the services that we need, if we don't continue to maintain business in this town. There is no more simple point than that. We need more then residential properties paying our real property taxes. With that in mind, I ask you to take this opportunity to undue what was done last year. The timing of this and what is being done now, in a sense is good. It will give us a clean slate to start the new year. On the hand, if there are overtone of politics involved, then maybe that is how we can say, that the process is worked. We have come around one full year, and the people have kept the pressure on and it has brought us back here. So when you make your decision, remember what we have been through in the year and how important it is to keep our businesses, our community and residents together. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you.

MR. CLYNE: My name is Matt Clyne and I am a candidate for public office out here. I just would like to express my view point that the Homestead Act is inherently unfair. I don't think that it can be justified from an administrative stand point. I attended the hearing a couple of weeks ago and from the figures the Assessor gave, it would seem to me, that the meager revenues that are generated by this taxing scheme, are almost completely off set by the cost implementing the program. So from bocurely administrative view point, I don't think it can be justified, and I think more fundamentally it sends a poor message and reflects adversely on the community. Because I think homeowners and non-homeowners alike, understand something that is unfair. And that's really what it boils down to, a question of principal and we all live in the same town, we all should be treated equally. So I would urge you to repeal this legislation. Thank you.

MR. STANIELS: My name is Peter Staniels and I am also a local homeowner and business person. I didn't get a chance to ask a question earlier, Ken, because of the time. I was trying to figure out exactly what Mr. Gunner had talked about. These statistics that were available, I don't know if I missed them somewhere, but I the question I had before, in my opinion was, Mr. Gunner, you talked about the...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Excuse, me, you can't hear him? Could you get closer, you are a little tall, you gotta hook that right up...there you go. Now ask your question.

MR. STANIELS: That's better. Sorry about that. Should I start over?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No.

MR. STANIELS: No? My question for Charlie is the fact, is the, is it still on?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes.

MR. STANIELS: Okay. You were talking about a progression in a percentage of homeowners versus non-homeowners paying taxes in your statistics that you were giving before. It seems to be that maybe, maybe I am wrong, but it looked to be a little bit both apples and

oranges. You talked about the percentage in 1989, then you referred to the percentage now, but you also indicated that the farms was taken out of one category and put into another. Is that correct? At which case would the percentages that you were talking about reflective of that? Or were we talking about one group plus farms?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: That was part of it, yes.

MR. STANIELS: So there was a difference between the figures that you were talking about in 1993 versus the figures in 1989?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I never talked about 89, I, the furthest back I went was 91.

MR. STANIELS: Which ever. It seems to me that, even so, be that is may, that the difference of the type of properties being classified, are self, isn't the impact. We are talking about the impact to the homeowner of about \$30? As in savings by virtue of this?

CHAIRMAN GUNNER: At what level of assessment?

MR. STANIELS: I figured you would give me...

CHAIRMAN GUNNER: I said it would be a cost of about \$16 and we went to unified, I said it would be a cost of about \$16 to \$18 to the homestead person and would be a savings of about \$31, \$32, #33 for the non-homestead.

MR. STANIELS: Okay, the savings seem to negligible. What I am more concerned with here, is not the fact the homeowners are gonna save about \$10, \$20, \$30 or the businesses. The small business is going to pay about \$10, or \$20, \$30 more. It is what is the impact of the big players, I know GE, the Owens Corning, etc, that is coming in. I know they really have a significant impact on our tax base. Our we sending that kind of a message out, at a time when right now we are looking at attracting business and we are not looking at attracting just little businesses, even though they are very important. But the major businesses. And if we lose one of those, doesn't that truly work out any impact of any benefit gained by all the homeowners by virtue of this two-tiered system. Which is something that has to be looked at, and obviously only in a crystal ball. I think this stuff of a two-tiered system may have far reaching effects that can't be calculated here in the employment base in the area.

The other thing that I would just like to say is sometimes we use business and the connotation as business, is one of being a deep pocket organization with a big bottom line. I think maybe in this economy we should perhaps change the word and say employer because of the fact we are talking about taxing businesses and we are talking about taxing employers and a lot of people out there are looking at jobs as being something that they would like to be able to have more choices in righth now. If, in fact, we are going to tax businesses, aren't we taxing employers and aren't we sending messages to local employers. And, with that I would just urge that you repeal this act.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you. (applause) Anybody else who wishes to speak?

MR. AHLSTROM: Gentleman and this venue. Dick Ahlstrom. I would just like to address the point of the small employer and the small business person in the Town. I am a homeowner and a property owner, so I have hands in both pockets.

The business today is much different than it was 3, 4, 5 years ago. Business is very difficult out there. We in our printing business have seen many, many printers go bankrupt, go out of business. In our publishing businesses we find that many businesses are having a very difficult time today in running their businesses, paying their expenses and big portion of this is the total tax situation that businesses in New York State find themselves in. With the unemployment increases, the workmen compensation increases, with the increases in the miscellaneous fees that our State has put upon us instead of regular taxes, and with such things as the homestead provisions -- which also is a tax which increases -- businesses are

finding it more and more difficult to do the job that they are basically in which is to do business. We spend too much of our time paying monies to the State and to the Town, etc., and a higher proportion of our sales income is going to these expenses and I think at this time, it is very important to take a look at where we are and where we should be going and the direction we should be going which I think is a very important aspect of how we look at the homestead issue and I recommend that we repeal it.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you. He got up just before you when you were walking up there before. You're next, I promise.

MR. MESSINA: I want to thank the Town Board for the opportunity to speak with you tonight about the homestead act.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Name for the record, please.

MR. MESSINA: My name is Sam Messina. I am a resident of the Town of Bethlehem for 20 years and as some of you know, not too many years ago, I used to come before the Town Board and the Planning Board and sometimes speak out in favor of preservation, in favor of planning, in favor of those things that would not allow uncontrolled development to impact our Town. But on the issue of homestead, I am here tonight to ask the Town Board to consider the information that has been provided both by Board Members, as well as, residents and business persons on not just the data, but the impact that homestead will have on the vision of this Town. I know this is a tough issue. It is a tough issue because on the one side, residents are dealing with higher tax impact and particularly with our senior citizens, with individuals on fixed incomes and families on fixed incomes, that is a tough issue and a real economic issue. On the other issue, on the other side of the ledger are those more difficult to measure, I think the responsible job is to assess the impact that homestead has on both open spaces in this Town, as well as, a sound business development base in the Town of Bethlehem. And, there is where the need for trust and vision is important, as well as, just what data tells us.

I would just like to site a couple of things, if I may, that at least helped me focus on this issue and perhaps, they would be useful to the Town Board as the matter is deliberated further. I refer to 2 documents and it will only take about 2 or 3 minutes to go through this.

The first document was a survey that was done of Town residents in 1990, some 1700 residents in the Town were surveyed about their perceptions of the Town. About what they wanted it to be and there are some questions in here that at least lead me to believe that the Town wants to preserve its existing character and, believe it or not, that character means a sound economic base as well as the preservation of farming and open spaces to the degree possible consistent with balanced growth in our Town. There are only 2 questions that I would like to refer to here and then I will go to talk about just a minute what our master plan, which is in draft state right now and the Town Board has copies of says. The 2 questions which are interesting to me is there is a need to maintain open, undeveloped land in Bethlehem. 85 percent of the residents surveyed say they strongly agree or agree with that phenomenon. I would say that a divergent would disparit or differential tax base does not further that goal. So, I would say 85 percent of the residents in this Town -- and I think when you survey 1700 people in the Town, that is a pretty good statistical base. And, that was 1700 households. 93 by the way... it's 93 percent if you include those that are neutral or undecided.

Another point, question was or the issue was, there is a need to protect the environmentally sensitive areas such as steep slopes, mature forests, wetlands, rivers and prime farm land. I accent prime farm land because I think the people in our Town recognize that that is a significant part of the character of the Town and although the Town may be gradual and subtle, homestead has an impact as it is currently structured to encourage a change in farm land from that use

to some other use. There were 91 percent of the people surveyed in this Town that strongly agreed or agreed with that statement.

Here is a question that gets really close to the pocketbook. It is a tough question to ask and in 1990 when our State, local, national economy was even worse than it is now, it is a darn tough question to answer and that is -- it sort of says, are you willing to put your money where your rhetoric and your talk is. And, the question is, it would be worth paying higher taxes to preserve the existing character of the Town. Now, having... without having seen the answers to that, I would have anticipated that people might have rebuffed that, backed away from that even in this Town but what is interesting is 63 percent of the people that responded to the survey -- that's well over 800 -- said that they strongly support that statement, they agreed with it and a small percentage of that was neutral.

I make these points only to indicate that division, to hold the asperation of the Town's residents, I think, go beyond the pure impact of dollars and cents to what we want the Town to become and this law has an impact on that.

May I just comment on a couple of points that set forth the goals that are in the draft master plan which you have. These goals are general but what they come from are things like the Town-wide survey. What they come from are Town-wide meetings and meetings in various geographic areas of the Town of which Mr. Gunner was part and other Town Board Members in the past have been part as the Land Use Management Advisory Committee did its job to try to pull together a recommendation to the Town Board of actions and alternatives.

Let me just cite a couple of these goals and I think you can see, where at least we believed that the Town wanted to go. Primary goal on natural resources was to protect the important natural resources of the Town and the diversity of landscape features which contributes to the unique character of the community. I would argue that part of that unique character of the community is open spaces and open farm land. On earth resources the primary goal was to maintain and preserve the important and unique earth resources of the Town particularly those that contribute to character of the community or pose constraints or hazards to development. Again, part of what came through in all of our work was, part of the character of the community is open land and is Town land.

Let me touch on cultural resources for a moment, if I may, where the principal goal was to protect those resources important to the cultural identity of the Town, its history, landscapes and architecture. Another major goal from that area was to enhance and protect the significant visual resources of the Town including its scenic landscapes. On architecture.. on agricultural resources, which was another primary area of study, I would note that the goal that came out of the comprehensive master planning work was to encourage and promote the continued viability of farming in the Town.

Under human resources and community resources regarding populations and households, the primary goal was to manage the rate and location of future population and household growth to preserve the rural, semi-rural, suburban, and village like character of the Town and respect its natural resources.

I think there is only one more that I want to mention, if you would give me a moment. This one relates to commercial development. Believe it or not, even in a Town that wants to preserve its character, what we learned -- I keep digressing into my LUMAC role here when I want to speak as a member of the public and just a citizen and resident of this Town -- was that there is a desire to have a sound economic base and to encourage that development which continues the balance of our Town. And, therefore, what we received back from the residents were to encourage office research type development as a preferred form of non-residential development to strengthen our tax base.

I guess the bottom line of all of what I am saying here is that this one is not easy to do analysis on and to reach the right decision but speaking for myself and the research that I have done, I would ask

the Town Board Members that have voted for homestead to consider that the issues of homestead relate to what the vision of our Town will be not just the dollars and cents or the economic impact on taxes. So, thanks for your time and I appreciate it.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. CLEAVES: I guess I am in the slight minority here. I have taught school in this Town for quite a number of years, since about 1946, retired about 10 or so years ago, living on a fixed income and low and behold this year my Town and highway tax went up 170 percent. The Town and highway tax went up 112 percent. Now, is there any business here that can come close to that figure?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Sir, we have to hear you in the microphone and would you put your name in. I am sorry, I did not get your name.

MR. CLEAVES: Earl Cleaves.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay.

MR. CLEAVES: Now, it seems to me, that in deciding an issue, you should consider the benefit to all the people in the town. Now, the question is, what percentage is the people in the town are in the homestead. What percentage of the people in the town are under the non-homestead, people is now. People. And what should happen is, this should be decided on the basis of what benefits the most people. That's democracy, isn't it? What benefits the most people. Not what benefits the special interests, we hear enough of that. We hear it every single day, regarding federal issues. And we hear it tonight regarding local issues. We hear, a kind of a block tail. If this doesn't happen, we won't do this. Well, it's a two way street. What about the consumers in the town? Think of that. Now, that's the main point I wish to make. I think it should be considered, with the effect of all the people in the town and not just the special interest groups, wanting it their way and the majority of town. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Again, we are still in the area of speaking in favor of, opposed will certainly get equal time. Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor at this point in time?

MR. DURLACHER: My name is Glenn Durlacher, I am a resident of the town. I would like to speak in favor of repealing the Homestead Act and would also like to make a statement; that I am really upset and appalled by the way the town treated me, when I tried to open a business, a nice delicatessen in this town. And, you talk about business growth and what not, I just feel I was treated quite unfairly. Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor? Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to repeal it?

MR. RUSSO: Thank you for letting me appear before you, my name is Angelo Russo. I have been a resident of the town for quite a few years, and I am a little bit disturbed, if I just say this one thing, that I wasn't going to let that one lone gentleman, come up here and speak all by himself. The lady, the young lady that spoke before from the Farm Bureau, she objected when Mr. Gunner referred as a lobbyist. She is a lobbyist. No question about it. So is the young lady from the Chamber of Commerce. She is a lobbyist. She is speaking in favor of the people that pay dues into an organization that she represents. The same as the Farm Bureau. I am a resident of Bethlehem and a retiree, that lives off a fixed income, the same way the other gentlemen does. And I just would like to say, that as a the gentlemen says, you must consider who the people, the majority of the people, the town are. If I had my druthers,, GE would not be in our town. I would not have allowed the glass company to be in our town. We are a bedroom community of Albany. That's the way I see it. That's the way I want to keep it. If we are going to go out and solicit businesses in our town, then we should go to Inland Steel, have them put up a steel mill. Or go to Ford Motor Company, have them put up a car manufacturing company. As far as I'm concerned I

464

don't want that here in Bethlehem. I want to be, a nice quiet, low keyed community? That's what we have started out as. That's what I want to maintain. I'm, I didn't plan to do this. But, when the young lady was talking about the business, I am constantly contributing to the Girl Scouts when they come ringing my doorbell to buy cookies, or the Boy Scouts or any other organization that comes around, the Fire Department, the Police Department and I am always sending checks to them, as donations to them. I just wrote this stuff down, as a retiree I have a lot time to move around here on Delaware Avenue. So I am just going to take you for a little walk from where we are standing now on Delaware Avenue going down towards Albany. I usually stop in, once in a while not often, my nice little store that's down the street down here, and I pick up a little bottle of grape now and then. I enjoy a nice little glass of wine with my meals once in awhile. There is a certain wine that I like, I won't mention the name, and the price is moderate. It was \$4.99, six months ago. Today it's \$5.99. That's about a 20% increase. Tuesday, when we had the open market, at St. Thomas Church, last year I used to buy corn on the cob for a dozen, I use to pay about \$3.00, \$3.10. This year I went to buy corn on the cob, and I was charged \$4.00 a dozen. That's about a 25% increase. I stopped in CVS and I get my prescription, and over the counter medication, my prescription medication increased 17% in the past six months. Over the counter went up 12%. I'm walking down the street further, there is a dry cleaning establishment that I use to bring my suits in and my pants and jacket. I use to pay \$4.50 for a two-piece suit, to be cleaned and pressed. Now I pay \$5.00. Now all these figures are all within the past six months. Now that's a 13% increase. Going next door, I usually stop in and have a cup of tea and a doughnut, because I like those nice fresh doughnuts. Tea use to be 45¢ a cup, it's now 49¢ a cup. That's a 10% increase. The doughnuts use to be 40¢ each, they are now 45¢ each. That's a 13% increase. I also like to go down into the mall down there, where we only have one grocery store, here in the town to shop in. And I sit and have a bagel and a cup of tea in the bagel place. Now, the tea didn't go up in the bagel place. But the bagel did. It went from 40¢ to 45¢. That's a 13% increase. And last but not least, our friendly neighborhood bank. I used to bank with, what I consider to be a nice home style bank, First American. But they are no longer with us. So now we have the neighborhood bank. And it just so happens that two days ago, our, we got the notice that our safety deposit box is due. So we just got the new bill for it. Last year we paid \$17 for the safety deposit box. This year they want \$37, that's over a 100% increase. Now, I bring these out for one thing, as a homeowner, as a retiree, I give my Social Security, and it usually goes up with the cost of living, last year was what, 3.2, somewhere around that figure. I can't go to Social Security, well, the doughnut man is charging me an extra nickel, I want extra here, or I want the wine man to charge me...I can't do that. But the business community can. And they do it nice and quietly. I know the doughnut man didn't put a big sign out and say that I increased the price of my doughnuts from 45¢ to 49¢ or CVS didn't put a big notice out that I increased the price of Cartizan from \$79 to \$99. But, when you go to pay it, is when you see the increase. Businesses can do that. I as a homeowner cannot do that. And that's what you have to take into consideration when you start the voting, and I ask you not, not to repeal the Homestead Act. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

MS. CAULKIN-TOOHEY: My name is Lois Caulkin-Toohey. I own about 43 acres in Slingerlands. I love it. It, I hope I never have to sell it for development.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: They can't hear you in the back.

MS. CAULKIN-TOOHEY: I hope I never have to sell it for development, I love to see the deer. I've lived in this community since 1938, so I have seen it change, certainly greatly. I am up here for several reasons. If I could not afford to pay the taxes on that, and I'll tell you, my taxes went up from about, which was unfair, fairly low \$2,500 to about \$8,000. That's quite an increase, I would say. If I could not afford to pay that, I would sell it for development. So, what I am saying is, many people aren't going to be able to keep

their land. They are going to have to sell it. And what will it go for? Development. And we will lose the deer, and the open spaces.

But, I also want to make another comment. I think, I do a great deal of fund raising. I am almost a professional, a volunteer. And in the past three years, I have raised a considerable amount of money for SPAC, for the State Museum, to retain the educational services, for various places and institutions. The people I find who donate, over and over again, are the small business people. They are not the Macys, are not the Filene's, are not the Grand Unions. The banks did contribute a while back. They are not doing it any longer. I don't know how much money they are in trouble with or whatever. But the small business people do contribute and the ones that contribute are the ones right in your community. And they have contributed to SPAC, to places far out, that benefit all of us.

And so all I can say is, in defense of this of the businesses, the small businesses, and I don't know what this man is talking about. I am sure the pharmacist can't help it if the big pharmaceutical plants up there prices of pharmaceuticals. I think that we are all short sided and we are thinking about just ourselves. And we are not looking at the long range effect of everything. And I think, I would think long and hard on repeal. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition of repealing it at this point. We are in the opposition phase at this point in time. Do you want to go back the other way again?

MR. WEBSTER: I don't know whether they do or not.

MR. HILCHIE: My name is Alan Hilchie. And I am a former merchant in the community a few years back. And I want to say I thoroughly enjoyed the trip that I just had down Delaware Avenue. And I think it is marvelous that there are enough business people left in the community that he can enjoy that trip.

Secondly, it was indeed a pleasure to hear such a sad tail-of-woe. But I noticed he had a safety deposit box. I think that is interesting as well. Maybe he doesn't have such a big one, but that is part of the tail-of-woe.

But I think many of the things that was said here tonight, are very sound. Things that Charlie mentioned. I don't always agree with Charlie. But, I think the, the statements that you have heard certainly are hitting a resounding note, if I can read any of the expressions on your faces.

But I think the biggest thing is not the amount of dollars involved, either way in the Homestead Act or in the absent of same. I think it is the physiological impact of people thinking about coming into the community, that tells me, that you as a government really don't care about us. But, I know that the organizations within the community as mentioned by Marty, they do appreciate having the merchants in the town. I think you should do everything possibly can in this business climate, to help the merchants stay here. Yes, they can raise their prices up to a point, but you've got to remember, that you have Wal-Marts, K-Marts and everybody else that can really bring you down to your knees in a hurry. And if we don't do something to encourage industry, whether is be the Niagara Mohawks, or the General Electric Plant, we could very easily be in difficulty with a big void in our tax base.

A year ago I toured the Niagara Mohawk Plant. And for those who haven't done it, it's a revelation. I went through it back in the year, the second year after it was built. I will tell you, that plant as far as I am concerned, is obsolete. Within a few years we are not going to have it. And I think that, maybe they need a little encouragement too. We should appreciate businesses. I am favor of the repeal.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Speaking at the wrong time, though Al. Anyone else? I do have a few letters I would like read into the record.

466

Sometimes I don't, but we only have six of them and some of them are short.

Bethlehem Town Board:

With increased costs: Workman Comp., Medical Liability, Utilities, etc. I am in favor of fairness in paying town taxes. I therefore, am in favor of seeing you "Repeal" "The Homestead Act" I would like to bring back the old theme, "It is better to do business in Bethlehem".
Thank you in advance,

Dan Formica
Owner McDonald's of Delmar

Bethlehem Town Board:

This letter is to register my objection to a special tax on businesses in our community which is at a higher rate than the residents.

Taxation should always be evenhanded and should not discriminate against any particular person or entity in our Town. The simple fact is that businesses in our Town provide employment to its residents and generates tax dollars and everything possible should be done to encourage businesses to continue functioning here.

Sincerely,

Karl Shrade, Attorney at Law

Bethlehem Town Board:

We understand there will be a public hearing on Wednesday, September 22, 1993, concerning your consideration to repeal the Homestead Law enacted in 1992. Because of a prior commitment, we will not be able to attend this meeting, and we want you to know our feelings and position.

We strongly support the REPEAL of this law bases on the following:

1. Full value assessment was implemented to bring fairness to property taxation in the Town of Bethlehem. This law is not fair.
2. As both taxpayers and business people in this community, we feel that it is your duty and obligation to act in a manner which welcomes and encourages businesses to come and stay in our community. The repeal of this law will signal to businesses that our town wants them, their services, and their taxes to continue.
3. The slight tax "increase" to homeowners is justified in order to create an equal treatment of businesses. A treatment we are convinced will be returned multiple times by businesses to our community.

Thank you for considering our position. we are confident you will see that repealing this law is the responsible action for you to take.

Sincerely,

J. Michael Olmstead and Linda B. Olmstead

Bethlehem Town Board:

As a business man in the Town of Bethlehem, I feel that the Homestead Law is unfair to the businesses of the Town. I urge you to repeal the law.

Very truly yours,

Frederick K. Morris, F. Kendrick Gallery

Bethlehem Town Board:

We request repeal of the Homestead Tax Law for the town of Bethlehem. Governmental bodies continue to think that the business community is a bottom-less pit of money, but it is not. We are willing to pay our fair share, but believe that the value of our business property should be taxed at the same rate as residential properties.

We are not asking for a "tax Break" -- only equity and fairness.

Very truly yours,

Charles E. Bryant, Jeffrey C. Bryant and Mark T. Bryant

Bethlehem Town Board: (Sherwood Davies)

I support repeal of the Homestead legislation. A residential property owner saves less than \$25 per year of about 1% of the total estimated \$2500 per year property tax bill in the Town of Bethlehem. The 1% savings becomes insignificant compared to the 10% to 30% tax increase for many property owners following re-evaluation.

Homestead legislation applies to only out Town-Highway taxes. Water and sewer district property owners pay considerably more in taxes, assessments and rents than for our Town-Highway expenditures. (See attached graphs)

The increase in our sewer and water district charges established by the Comm. of Public Works essentially receive limited review by the board. I provided written comments to the board at the 1992 and 1993 sewer budget hearings.

Since 1990, the water and sewer operating budgets, exclusive of debt service, increased \$961,000 or over 30% compared to the town Budget increase of \$327,000 or 4%. (See Table I)

In 1992 the town general budget retirement and workmens compensation costs increased \$252,000. Garbage pick up services were eliminated and some personal service costs were shifted from the town budget to the water and sewer for district budgets. Since 1990, the personal services costs for administration, transmission and collection in the water and sewer district budgets increased over 50%. the administration personal services costs in the Towns Public Works Dept. declined 17%. (Table II)

Sewer rents recently established for the DESD represented an additional charge amounting to 160% of the water rents. The subsequent windfall apparently provided an opportunity to shift costs. Inequities in sewer and water district charges significantly exceed the \$25 inequity between the Homestead and Non-Homestead taxes.

I have been unable to find the Boards rationale for the sewer charges or the establishment of the charges via appropriate town board approval or legislation.

I support repeal of Homestead legislation because of inequities in taxes. I urge the board to evaluate the greater existing inequities in the sewer-water charges and to take needed action prior to the 1994 budget hearing.

Sincerely,

Sherwood Davies

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: That's all we have in correspondence. Any other comments from the board or anyone at this point in time?

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Who was that one from?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: That was from Sherwood Davies.

468

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Ken.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Go ahead. Go ahead Sheila.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Charlie had his turn earlier.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Certainly, I would like to began by saying I have been called a lot of things. Number one when this issue started a year ago, we had...

VOICES FROM THE AUDIENCE: We can't hear her.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Sheila would you bring that mic right up close.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Right up close.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: When we started with this issue a year ago, at least we were all present sitting in this room. Some of us are newcomers to the issue this evening. I was hear from start to finish, we know there was a lot of hysteria with Reveal. And it was called Reveal.

We had one week to adopt the Homestead Provision by New York State Law. We did that because we saw down the road, that there were several inequities with the whole process. I myself had asked about the year, to have these things resolved, we would feel much better about it.

My vote was never anti-business. It was never pro-school district. This was a vote that was for the community. As a result of the years event, when most of these inequities had been dealt with.

The hearing has been brought to you this evening, we have taken another look at homestead. I am sure that everyone here knows, that when this was adopted, it was a law that has to be looked at every year. No one said it would remain in effect forever. For this reason the hearing was held tonight, and I have worked very long and hard, as I did when I made the initial decision, to give it 100% of my work.

I can tell you what I have found in that year, is many, many people, be it residents or businesses, have felt this two-tiered system has created a very deviceive community. That is the last thing that I myself wanted to see and didn't think I would see it. Reveal was the problem, reveal, is still a problem. The duel tax rates, is what everyone is complaining about. Let me tell you this was not put into effect to be unfair to any homeowner or any business person. This was to get us through the first year of the reveal.

I feel we have come through it, and I would move that our decision be made this evening. I would make the motion to repeal the Homestead Act.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: There is a motion on the floor. Is there a second.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: I'll second the motion.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Discussion. Charlie.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: First of all, I put an awfull lot of time in the last three weeks to a month. I want to thank David Leafer, our new Assessment. I felt like we were going steady, David. And he is a good teacher, too. I have some idea of what they are, because Earl Cleaves is an excellent teacher and I really do appreciate your help.

I also agree with Sheila, I have found it to be decisive. And a strange part about it, is that neither side, in the people that were speaking to me, these are citizens, probably that weren't as well as

informed as some of you people are; was even going to listen to the other side.

So, we are here tonight to try to find out what is going to happen. Now a motion was just made and seconded it, you have a hearing. Normally, I mean to have a vote. Normally to have a vote at a hearing, I am very consistent, that I don't like to vote the night of the hearing, because I like to weight what everybody has said. My, people and friend on the board know that. Correct?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes, sir. Very consistent.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: And, it appears that it is going to go to a vote and I will be prepared to vote, mainly because of what I have listened to tonight. Although there are other things that I have listened, too. However, I am not going to give the business community a challenge. The two gentleman that spoke against, had the same points I heard over and over from the constituents that spoke to me. They are not making fun. He does... I did have to laugh at your remark about the safety deposit box.

GENTLEMAN: I didn't take it out. I didn't take it out because I don't need it any longer.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay. For \$17 you weren't going to get a big one anyhow. But, it is very serious, we have a large population of senior citizens and people who are... incomes are not going to go up and as the economy does or does not go up, it is going to be difficult for all of us. I am pro-business.

I fought 2 battles in the recent year, one for the small businesses over in the... where the new Ames shopping center is and one for a local restaurant. And, they were small businesses that were begin stepped on, in my opinion. So, I am prepared to vote... I am going to let you wait until you hear my vote.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, I need a motion to close the public hearing.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to close the public hearing at 9:00 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

- Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
- Noes: None.
- Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Caroline T. Ricca
 Deputy Town Clerk

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: We will take a two minute break. We have other business to do. You are more than welcome to stay.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Yes, stay around.

TOWN BOARD MEETING RECESSED AT 9:00 p.m.
TOWN BOARD MEETING RECONVENED AT 9:10 p.m.

Adopt Local
Law No. 7, 1993
Repealing
Homestead

A motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to adopt Local Law #7 of 1993 to REPEAL Provisions of Real Property Tax Law, Section 1903 concerning Homestead Base Proportions of the Town of Bethlehem. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

(Applause)

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I didn't hear your vote.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: You should listen to me. I keep telling you to listen to me.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: You and I are always talking at the same time, Charlie.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I was sitting here, I said yes.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: It is unanimous with 1 absent, homestead is repealed.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: By the way, I do want to say that I think the decorum of the people that were here tonight made a big difference and if we had the time to sit down and talk like this before, instead of all the hullabaloo, I don't think it may have... it may have been a different story.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay. Next item on our agenda is to consider approval of the Town Board minutes of August 11 and August 25th.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the Town Board minutes of August 11 and August 25, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.
Abstain: Mr. Gunner.

Appoint
Project
Supervisor
Records
Management
Program

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next a recommendation from Kathleen Newkirk, Town Clerk, for the appointment of Alicia Jettner, Jettner Associates, as Project Supervisor at the rate of \$12.50 per hour in regard to the Inactive Storage Records grant received for the grant cycle 1993-94 with regard to the records management program. This money is being paid out of the grant they received.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster that Alicia Jettner, Jettner Associates, be and she hereby is approved for appointment to the position of Project Supervisor at a rate of \$12.50 per hour for the Inactive Storage grant received from the State Archies and Records Administration, State Education Department. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from Karen Pellettier, Director of Senior Services, for approval of Caroline Wirth, Outreach, to attend a workshop Therapeutic Interventions with

Depressed Older Adults to be held November 18, 1993 in Albany with the registration fee of \$25. paid.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the attendance of Caroline Wirth, Outreach, at a workshop Therapeutic Interventions with Depressed Older Adults to be held November 18, 1993 in Albany, NY with registration fee paid. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Seminar
Senior
Citizens
Services

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I would like to acknowledge receipt of Amendment to Certificate of Approval of Final Plat No. 124-F-M, dated August 2, 1993 regarding Castlewoods Subdivision.

Acknowledge
Receipt of
Final Plat
Castlewoods
Subdiv.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next a request from Bruce Secor, Commissioner of Public Works, for scheduling a public hearing for Grievance Day for the 1994 Sewer Tax Rolls, be at 8:00 p.m. on October 20th. I am also, not on the agenda tonight, I will be at our special meeting on Monday, asking to set the public hearing on the regular budget for 7:30 p.m. of that evening.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve scheduling a public hearing for Grievance Day for the 1994 Sewer Tax Rolls to be held October 20, 1993 at 8:00 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Set Public
Hearing
Grievance
Day - 1994
Sewer Tax
Rolls

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, I have a recommendation from Bruce Secor, Commissioner of Public Works, regarding a change order for Contract 1A Ground Water Infiltration System. You have the documents. Our consultant has recommended that this be approved. This totals \$15,275.12. Bruce, do you have any comments on that or any questions on it?

Recommendation
from Comm. of
Public Works
Re: Change
order -
Ground Water
Infiltration
System
Approved

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Could not be foreseen at the time of the bid?

MR. SECOR: No, it was something we've had done a lot borings in the area. It was something that was buried under the ground, like the Corps of Engineers ... that area had to be actually... just some wood but there was logs and wood in there and we went to drive the sheeting -- the sheeting wouldn't go down and we couldn't get it sealed and had to pull the sheeting, take the stuff out from underneath there and then drive the sheeting. All we are doing is paying for that extra work.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Sounds like a reasonable price.

MR. SECOR: Yes, it is.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: It is?

MR. SECOR: Yes.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next,...

DEPUTY TOWN CLERK PICARAZZI: You need a motion.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you. Mr. Webster. Mrs. Fuller. Further discussion?

472

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the contract for the 1A Ground Water Infiltration System. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Recommendation
From Commiss.
Public Works
Re: change
order- Elect.
Work - Waste
Water Treatment
Plant

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, next a recommendation from Bruce Secor, again, regarding a change order for Contract 1E Electrical Work for Wastewater Treatment Plant Modifications. This one totaling \$2,644.00. Questions? Motion?

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Gunner to grant the change order for Contract 1E Electrical Work for Wastewater Treatment Plant Modifications. The Motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
NOES: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Building
Officials
Conference

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, request from John Flanigan, Building Inspector, for approval of attendance of five (5) Building Inspectors at the Capital District Building Officials Education Conference to held October 24-27, 1993 at Colonie, NY with registration fee paid.

The motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the attendance of five (5) Building Inspectors to attend the Capital District Building Officials Education Conference.

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Appointment
Seasonal
Personnel -
Parks & Rec.
Dept.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, a request from Dave Austin, Administrator, Parks & Recreation Department, for approval of appointment of seasonal personnel, as per the attached list, with the attached indicated rate.

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

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Recycling
Conference
Highway Dept.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, a request from Gregg Sagendorph, Highway Superintendent, for approval of attendance of Sharon Fisher, Town Recycling Coordinator, at a conference to be held September 28 and 29, 1993 in Syracuse, NY sponsored by the NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation with registration fee paid.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster for the approval of attendance of Sharon Fisher, Town Recycling Coordinator, to attend the Syracuse Conference held by the NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, is a request from Gregg Sagendorph, Highway Superintendent, for permission to sell two vehicles at auction, 1979 International dump, and a 1983 Dodge Suburban.

Permission to sell two vehicles at auction Highway Dept. granted

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner for the approval to sell two vehicles at auction. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next is a request from Gregg Sagendorph, Highway Superintendent, for approval of attendance of Matthew Denton and Scott Myers to attend a pesticide training and recertification program with registration fee paid.

Seminar Pesticide Training Highway Dept.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the attendance of Matthew Denton and Scott Myers to attend a pesticide training and recertification program with registration fee paid. It is \$60 per employee. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, I would to acknowledge receipt of 1993 Town of Bethlehem Highway Equipment Inventory from Gregg A. Sagendorph, Highway Superintendent, in accordance with Highway Law Section 142(3). We are going to be down tomorrow checking this. Oh, Judi has already checked this. No one trusts you Sagendorph.

Acknowledge Receipt of 1993 Highway Inventory

Next, I have a request from Chief LaChappelle, for approval of attendance of the Chief of Police and Lieutenants Holligan, Clark and Vanderbilt at an Executive Development Seminar to be held in Colonie, NY on December 15 and 16, 1993 with registration fee paid of \$45 and the use of the Police Vehicle.

Seminar Executive Development Police Dept.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to approve the attendance of the Chief of Police and Lieutenants Holligan, Clark and Vanderbilt at an Executive Development Seminar to be held in Colonie, NY on December 15 and 16, 1993 with registration fee paid of \$45 and the use of the Police Vehicle. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, there is a request from Chief LaChappelle, for approval of attendance of Lieutenant Clark to attend the National Police Bloodhound Association 1993 Fall Seminar in Winchester, VA, Oct 6-9, 1993 with registration fee paid and transportation and Lt. Clark is responsible for all other expenses.

Seminar National Police Bloodhound Assoc.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to approve the attendance of Lieutenant Clark, to attend the National Police Bloodhound Association 1993 Fall Seminar in Winchester, VA, with registration fee paid and transportation. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

474
Seminar
Public
Safety
Communications
Supervisor.
Police Dept.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next a request from Chief LaChappelle for approval of attendance of Communication Supervisor Bartkus at the 1993 Associated Public Safety Communications Supervisor Conference to be held October 27-29, 1993 at Eastham, MA and he requested registration and associated expenses and I informed him that is not in line with policy. This is not required training. I asked for approval for with the registration fee paid and use of a vehicle.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve attendance of the Communication Supervisor Bartus to attend the 1993 Associated Public Safety Communications Supervisor Conference to be held October 27-29, 1993 at Eastham, MA with the registration fee paid and use of a vehicle. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Accept
Deeds and
Easements
Krumkill Manor

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, a request from Mr. Cirillo, Engineering for acceptance of bond, deeds and easement for Krumkill Manor, these were reviewed by Assistant Attorney, Town Attorney, DeAngeli and there is only one outstanding item and I requested that is be approved on that condition, it's very minor that the Corporate Seal has not been attached. Question? Yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Question now?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: That will be, is that in the motion?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes, that the seal has to be put on it before we accept them.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and Seconded by Mr. Webster to accept the bond, deeds and easement for Krumkill Manor with the condition that the Corporate Seal will be put on. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Award Bid
Tennis Courts
Elm Ave. Park
To Callanan
Industries
Parks & Rec.
Dept.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, a recommendation by Mr. Austin, Administrator of Parks & Recreation Department, for award of bid for Tennis Court Reconstruction at the Elm Avenue Park to Callanan Industries, the bid is for \$115,575 which is a lot less than Dave had originally anticipated this project to cost. This bid has been reviewed by counsel and found to be in order.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and Mr. Gunner seconded the motion to award the Tennis Court Reconstruction at the Elm Avenue Park to Callanan Industries for \$115,575. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Executive
Session

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I would like to entertain a motion to conduct an Executive Session at the end of this meeting, to discuss pending litigation and a personnel matter.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and Mr. Gunner to conduct an Executive Session at the end of this meeting, to discuss pending litigation and a personnel matter. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Is there anyone else, it's all staff, forget it.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yea, and want to be's.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: And want to be's. I entertain a motion to adjourn.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Will anyone see Messina?

DEPUTY TOWN CLERK PICARAZZI: David want to talk to you. Dave Leafer is talking to you.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: He left that on the chair here.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay.

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Gunner. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Ringler, Mr. Webster, Mr. Gunner, Mrs. Fuller.
Noes: None.
Absent: Ms. Galvin.

Catherine T. Peacey
Deputy Town Clerk

There was no formal action taken at Executive Session.