

TOWN BOARD  
AUGUST 25, 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  
Bernard Kaplowitz, Esq., Town Attorney  
Kathleen A. Newkirk, Town Clerk

ABSENT: M. Sheila Galvin, Councilwoman

- - -

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Like to call the regular meeting of the Bethlehem Town Board to order. This is not a public hearing tonight. It is a business session of the Town Board, however, with past practice if anyone has questions as the Board addresses items on the agenda, if you raise your hand and time permits, we will try to answer them. At the end of the meeting anyone can bring anything they would like to the attention of the Board. Like to note a special welcome to Trevor Burns who is working on his Citizenship badge for his Boy Scouts tonight. Trevor, welcome.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Welcome, Trevor.

MASTER BURNS: Hello.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Are you happy to be here, Trevor?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Trevor spent about a half hour in my office the other day, so I think you better be careful. I think he might be a candidate for Supervisor before the night is over with.

TOWN ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: I will talk to you after the meeting.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: He is a little smarter than that, I think.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I won't go on with the conversation. I think we should end it right there.

First item of all, a request from John Flanigan, Building Inspector, for approval of attendance of 4 Building Inspectors at the New York State Building Officials Conference to be held the 22nd to the 24th at Kerhonkson, NY with expenses paid and use of a Town vehicle. As with past recommendations on this, this training is available locally, therefore, we recommend that the registration fee and transportation fee be allowed. Anyone like to offer that motion?

Building  
Officials  
Conference

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the attendance of 4 Building Inspectors at the New York State Building Officials Conference to be held September 22-24, 1993 at Kerhonkson, NY with registration fee paid and transportation by Town 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 I would entertain a motion to appoint Republican Election Inspectors and Poll Clerks as recommended by the Bethlehem Republican Committee on the attached list.

Appoint  
Republican  
Election  
Inspectors  
and  
Poll Clerks

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the appointment of Republican Election Inspectors and Poll Clerks as recommended by the Bethlehem Republican Committee as follows:

Dist. 21 - Robert W. O'Neill, Election Inspector  
Patricia Cummings, Poll Clerk

Dist. 27 - Linda and Isabella Williams - Poll Clerk

Dist. 24 - John Gardiner, Poll Clerk to share with Mr. Alford

Dist. 18 - Eleanor Atwood - Poll Clerk.

The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

Appoint  
Seasonal  
Personnel  
Parks and  
Recreation  
Dept.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from David Austin, Administrator of Parks and Recreation, for appointment of seasonal personnel as per the attached list.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to approve the following appointments as per the recommendation of David Austin, Administrator of Parks & Recreation:

Lifeguard at a rate of \$5.85 per hour:

Patrick S. Gallagher	Benjamin Pierce
38 Maple Avenue	35 Maple Avenue
Slingerlands, NY 12159	Slingerlands, NY 12159.

The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

Seminar  
New World  
Systems Users  
Police Dept.  
MIS Director  
and  
Computer  
Programmer

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next a request from Chief LaChappelle for authorization of Sgt. Sleurs, Jeffrey Dammeyer, John Esposito to attend New World Systems Users Group meeting to be held 21st to the 24th in Troy, Michigan with expenses paid. This is part of the installation of our new system and he has the money in the budget for the system to do so.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to approve the attendance of Sgt. Sleurs, MIS Director Dammeyer and Computer Program Esposito to attend the New World Systems Users Group meeting to be held September 21-24, 1993 at Troy, Michigan with expenses paid. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

Conference  
NYS Accred.  
and Police  
Professionalism

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: The next is a request from Chief LaChappelle for authorization for Lieutenants Holligan and Vanderbilt to attend the NYS Accreditation and Police Professionalism Conference, September 22-23, 1993 in Binghamton. This is required training... meeting to continue with our accreditation program.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the attendance of Lieutenants Holligan and Vanderbilt at the NYS Accreditation and Police Professionalism Conference to be held September 22-23, 1993 in Binghamton, NY. 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 Peter Bishko, Town Justice, for approval to attend the Magistrates Certification Training Program to be held October 10-13, Rochester, NY with expenses paid. Again, this is required training. It is only offered in 2 places, at the Association of Towns Meeting -- which I believe our other Judge went to -- and at this meeting.

Magistrates  
 Certification  
 Training  
 Program  
 Justice Dept.

The motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the attendance of Judge Peter Bishko to attend the Magistrates Certification Training Program to be held October 10-13, 1993 at Rochester, NY with expenses paid. 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 a recommendation... a request from Barbara Hodom for approval to attend the 14th Annual New York Associates of Magistrates Court Clerks, Inc. conference to be held the 10th to the 13th. As this is not required training for Barbara, all we are recommending is paying... the registration fee for this and transportation.

Magistrates  
 Court  
 Clerks, Inc.  
 Conference

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: We don't... if they serve on an executive board or as an officer or something like that?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: We allowed her to do that.. we pay her expenses to go to the Association of Towns in January because she teaches at that particular course.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Oh, I see. Okay.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: And, when she was President at this one, I think we did this as well.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the attendance of Barbara Hodom, Court Clerk, at the 14th Annual New York Associates of Magistrates Court Clerks, Inc. conference to be held October 10-13, 1993. 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 a recommendation from Mr. Secor to authorize the Supervisor to sign an agreement regarding the Bender Lane Water District Extension. This particular document has been reviewed by Counsel, bond counsel -- Town Attorney and Comptroller and I believe is all in order.

Authorize  
 Supervisor  
 To sign  
 Bender Lane  
 Water  
 District  
 Extension  
 Agreement

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Gunner to authorize Supervisor Ringler to sign the Agreement regarding the Bender Lane Water District Extension. 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 discussion of information from Mr. David Leafer, Assessor, regarding the homestead tax option. The Board a couple of weeks ago received a rather lengthy document from our Assessor with all the numbers that have been crunched this year as a result of changes and how they might affect the assessments. I

Discussion  
 Information  
 regarding  
 Homestead  
 Tax Option

420

know several of the Board members have been in and asked many questions of David and David is here tonight and I would ask him to give us an overview of what would happen if homestead continues in the upcoming year to the best of his ability.

MR. LEAFER: Okay. Actually, I will try...

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: Please don't put that too far away, I need to hear you.

MR. LEAFER: Oh.

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: That is recording.

MR. LEAFER: Actually Trevor agrees with... Let me reposition it then after I get this set up. Can everyone make that out with the light? I have given to all of the Board members a copy of what is on the chart. Is this okay where it is, Kathy?

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: Yes.

MR. LEAFER: Okay. I am a shirt sleeve person, so forgive me.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Tonight that is very acceptable.

MR. LEAFER: In order to stay out of your way, I am going to pull out a weapon which I inherited years ago, still functional except the cap tends to come off, so duck if it comes flying in your direction.

All the calculations that we did for the report really were to kind of arrive at a final result of what the rate will be for this year, the tax rate for homestead and non-homestead. The major part of the calculations was involved in developing a current base proportions for homestead and non-homestead. All of those things are lengthy from the questions we have had back and forth and the discussions we have had back and forth, they really haven't got as much meaning, I think, as coming to the bottom line. What does... What do the figures actually mean in terms of dollars and cents to the tax payers. So, if you will bear with me and the most important part is probably the bottom line. So, when we get to this part of I put you to sleep, I am going to wake you up because I am going to be stressing a couple of things at the very end that I think are important.

First of all, what I would like to do is to take the rates that have been developed and look at them on the basis of 2 properties -- one designated homestead, one designated non-homestead. Can everybody hear me? I have a tendency to be soft once in a while. And, I... this last column I'll simply indicate to you, are the calculations that would occur were homestead not in effect or were it to be rescinded. For the moment, forget that it is here because we will tie it in when we get down to here.

We have 2 properties, one homestead and one non-homestead. Both are assessed at the same amount, \$100,000. In '92, the tax rate applied -- and what is important to understand here is that of all of the different tax components that we pay, only 2 are affected by homestead and non-homestead -- the Town General Tax and the Town Highway Tax. I will address something related to those and the total tax later on down here.

Last year tax rate of '92 based on the Town levy, the Town highway levy, was approximately 51 cents per thousand. Translated into dollars which is more meaningful against the assessment of that \$100,000 on that homestead property it meant that the homestead property was taxed \$51.05. The non-homestead property received... well, let me drop further down -- this year, the... No, I will stay with it, I am sorry, bear with me for a second while I get oriented here. The non-homestead property last year was assessed at a slightly higher rate of about 63 cents per thousand and based on that rate, applied against the \$100,000 assessed value, the total dollars that the homestead, non-homestead property tax holder had to pay in Town general taxes was \$63.81. The difference between the 2 was

approximately \$12-13. The non-homestead paying about \$12 or \$13 more in terms of Town tax.

Dropping down in terms of the Town highway tax, the rate for last year for the homestead property was about \$1.30-\$1.31 per thousand and for the non-homestead \$1.63-\$1.64 per thousand. This translated into actual taxes on the total tax on the \$100,000 assessment of \$130.82 for a homestead and \$155.78 for the non-homestead. So, last year for the Town highway taxes the property owner who had a homestead designated property paid approximately \$33-\$32 something more than the non-homestead property owner based on equal assessments.

This year assuming the same tax levy, in other words, assuming there is no increase in the budget -- and that is the only thing we can assume -- okay, there isn't any other direction we are going, we are assuming we are going to try and hold budget but it makes for the best unit of comparison and the only sensible unit of comparison we have.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Just let me interject -- at this point, there is... the new budget is not prepared so there is no way you can use it. So, what you are doing is comparing the assessment based upon this year's assessed valuation and the dollars that had to be raised last year to have a comparison because you don't have any idea what the budget will be this upcoming year.

MR. LEAFER: Correct, exactly, thank you.

So that the tax rate based on last year's levy calculates this year to approximately 51 and a half cents per thousand. That's about 1/2 of a cent higher than it was last year. The non-homestead portion calculates to -- this is the tax rate for this year, about 60 cents per thousand, so the rate there is about... in terms of the rate, the rate is about 3 cents per thousand lower this year, the rate here again was about 1/2 a cent higher. In terms of the actual dollars, this year based on last year's levy, the total tax for homestead properties would be \$51.52 into the Town general tax and for non-homestead it would be \$60.78. The different is approximately \$9. give or take in favor of... less for homestead than for non-homestead.

Same thing applies down here. This is the rate that we calculate based on last year's levy for this year. For homestead for Town highway taxes, the rate would be about \$1.32 per thousand. For non-homestead, about \$1.55 per thousand. Total taxes, dollars again -- the thing that make the most sense -- on that \$100,000 assessment, the total tax in '93 based on last year's levy, would be \$132.03 for homestead, for non-homestead it would be \$155.78. This year that would represent a difference of about \$23, almost \$24.

Come down to the bottom, because now we have rates -- what we want to do now is take a look also and see what will happen -- what is actually being saved compared to what would have been saved or what it would have cost in addition to one of the other of these party were homestead not in effect. Okay. If there is any questions, jump in. If I am confusing anybody, throw out a question and I will be happy to backtrack.

If you take a look at this column, this column represents and we call it uniform -- it represents the uniform rate that would be applied to both of these 2 properties were homestead not in effect. All right. So, if you look at the Town general tax for '92, the difference between what was... what the tax payment actually would be, was \$55.01 compared to what it would have been had homestead not been in effect which would have been about \$4.81 higher for... would have been about \$4.81 higher had homestead been in effect or that the homestead property owner received a savings in terms of the general tax of about \$4.81 because it was in effect. The same thing if you drop immediately down here, the homestead owners saved -- they paid \$130.83, they would have paid \$143.15 had the homestead not been in effect.

422

So, therefore, the savings to the homestead property owner in terms of the Town highway tax last year was actually about \$12.32. If you add the two together the total savings for the homestead property owner last year was approximately \$17.13. On the other side of the coin, the non-homestead property owner last year paid \$63.81. Had homestead not been in effect that property owner would have paid \$55.86 in total tax, again, on the \$100,000. And, the difference is \$7.95. So, in effect, by being on homestead, the non-homestead property owner paid \$7.95 more than they would have if they were not on homestead.

The same token, down under the Town highway -- the non-homestead property owner paid \$163.53, versus \$143.15 had homestead not been in effect or they paid an additional \$20.38 because homestead was in effect. Or, because homestead was in effect, they paid an additional \$28.33 total tax based on \$100,000 assessment. Based on this year's rate, using, again, the same levy as last year, the difference would be if homestead were rescinded, and were not in effect, the difference would be the \$51.52 that will be... I won't say will be because again, we don't know what will be -- this rate may change slightly as the final budget figures come in. But, assuming this same levy as last year and if it turned out to be the same, the non-homestead... the homestead property owner will pay \$51.52 with homestead in effect, \$54.87 or about \$3 and 30 some, \$3.35 higher, if homestead is in effect. In other words, the homestead property owner will save \$3.35 this year. If you notice, it is down slightly from what they saved last year.

Under the Town highway for this year, the homestead property owner will pay with homestead in effect \$132.03 versus \$140.63 if it were not in effect or a difference of \$8.60. Therefore, in '93 assuming the same budget fee or levy as last year, the homestead property owner this year would have a savings on that \$100,000 assessment of \$11.95 or approximately \$12. A somewhat smaller savings than it was last year. The reason being the rates have actually come together and this happens as you proceed through the years with homestead, the two rates tend to come together in some fashion slowly or some pace. So, in reality what would happen between last year of '92 and this year assuming the same levy is that there will be about a 30 percent with homestead in effect, there will be about a 30 percent reduction in the amount of savings that the homestead property owner will realize.

And, I want to address that further but I want to finish the other side first. Non-homestead going back in '93 will pay \$60.78 with homestead in effect, \$54.87 if it is not in effect or a difference of \$5.91 total tax on the \$100,000. The same token, Town highway taxes, the non-homestead property owner would pay \$155.78 with homestead in effect, \$140.63 without homestead being in effect for a difference of \$15.15. The total -- now these are costs, these are the amount of additional cost to the non-homestead owner versus what they would pay if they were not, if there was no homestead program -- or a total of \$21.06. Again, you can see that there has been a decrease in the amount of cost this time, not the savings. The savings to homestead, cost to non-homestead. The difference in cost is now a decrease of approximately 25.6 percent or from \$28.33 down to \$21.06 that they would see this year.

One other figure I want to throw in. Let's not get into what school district it might be in but in general, one of the figures we have used across the board for all of the taxes paid by let's say this property in a particular school district last year -- County, school, Town, highway, water and sewer, what all else, fire and so forth -- was about \$25. per thousand assessed value. \$25 per thousand of assessed value was the total tax rate for all of the taxing entities that you see in your tax bill in two different portions, school and then general. Based on \$100,000 assessment it means that this property owner under homestead would have paid approximately \$2500 in taxes. It would be a little less because you have to factor in that there is a little difference in the 2 rates when you get to deal with the Town and the general and Town highway but, it is approximately \$2500 dollars. Of that the savings realized by being in homestead 2343 approximately \$12. That works out to less than 1/2 a percent of the total tax, less than 1/2 of 1 percent. By the same token, the

same situation applies. The non-homestead property owner would have paid a total of approximately \$2500 in total tax, total property tax, were homestead... well, in general, were homestead not in effect. With homestead in affect, the cost to them was about... would be about \$21.06 more so we are now talking somewhere around a little less than 1 percent, maybe 8 percent... 8/10 of a percent. Not even quite a full percent. So, the relative amounts in terms of total dollars are fairly small.

At this point, I think I will stop and see if I have generated any confusion or questions and let you bombard me with them if I have.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, does the Board have any questions?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Ken, do you expect that our budget will come in at that -- can you say it will come in at the same amount?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I can't say that today.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: You can't say anything.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So then, what does that mean when you are comparing that figure?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: What do you mean?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: That figure doesn't mean anything. I can take the 92s but the 93 is just a subjective number. It is not going to be that number -- why are we dealing with it?

MR. LEAFER: Because it is the only figure we have to deal with.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, good, why didn't we take like -- go over an average amount and find out what the percentages are that the budget has been going up and use that.

MR. LEAFER: I would have to make the assumption that the budget would go up and I am not sure that that is the case based upon what Judi has asked me to do this year, I am almost sure that is not the case.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay, that is all I wanted... That answers.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: That is a figure that is out there, we don't know what it is going to be. We are hoping is not going to be more.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, then, it is not an accurate figure that you dealt with.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: What it is doing, it is comparing what the effects of the assessed valuation would have on the same tax levy.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: But, it is not going to be the same, so you already got the comparison before and that is okay. You don't know for sure what the tax rate will be.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No, you don't.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So, those figures are meaningless.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Well, I don't think they are. I think that they...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, if they are an indication to you, fine but it isn't the exact number. It isn't the beginning, no where near it.

MR. LEAFER: At best, I wouldn't see these unless there was some sort of real drastic increase in the budget. I wouldn't see these rates varying that much.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Maybe not, you may be right.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I am hoping they will go down but I can't say that.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: When you take in revenue if you get more revenue in, you can bring those numbers down, correct?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Absolutely.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Absolutely and you can decide whether it goes to highway or general Town or whatever you want.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: What?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: The revenue?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: What revenue are you talking about? Sales tax...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: All the revenue you get.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No, but as you know Charlie, the revenues some of them are targeted for a particular fund, okay.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I am talking about the general revenue, sales tax would be one, fees.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Sales tax has to go to the general fund, it does not go to the Highway fund. So, it would not affect the Highway fund.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: What does go into the Highway fund? What are some of the funds in there?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: In the Highway fund, you have the tax dollars naturally go in there, any CHIPS money that we get from the State of New York and I believe that is it right now.

MRS. KEHOE: Interest income.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Any interest income that he might have from his tax monies that are put into an account.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Anything from fund balance?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Well, it depends on what his fund balance is.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So, there could be money from fund balance?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes, if he has money over at the end of the year, that could certainly affect it.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay, so then we can... what we are doing is, if our revenue comes in, then it is fine to spend it to keep that down. That's all right, I guess. Is it?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I don't know what your point is, I am sorry.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, as long as get... keep on bringing in revenue, you can drop the tax rate.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: As long as you bring more revenue in and expenditures go down, you can certainly decrease the tax rate.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: For example, if you go and ask for an increase in tax... in the sales tax which the people will pay, then we could reduce our tax here.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: That is an issue we are going to be addressing at the budget time. Yes, okay.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: The reason I didn't bring it up, it was brought up by here. I am just curious, I want to understand what is really happening. I know what has happened in '92 and I accept that completely. The other, I am not sure what is going to happen and neither are you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Right.

MR. LEAFER: No, we are not.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Any other questions on homestead?

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Yes. David, I would like to ask a question about the agricultural exemptions. The number of farms that were here a year ago, how many had applied for the exemption and did they get it?

MR. LEAFER: The number of farms that have applied and have exemptions, agricultural exemptions in one of the forms is 71. Actually 72 but one of those has 2 of the exemptions, 2 of the types of exemptions and they... the exemption -- do you want me to carry forth or... I brought some materials on those.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I also would like to see the agricultural exemptions but to carry it further, if homestead is rescinded, they still keep the agricultural exemption.

MR. LEAFER: Yes, very definitely. And, in some instances that can be somewhat substantial. The way they are calculated -- the 3 different exemptions involves a little bit of discussion. One of them is pretty straight forward, the one involving ag buildings and structures. The other 2, the outside ag district and inside ag district, there is a whole formula for calculating them based on their soil contents and what portion of their soil contents produced what sort of productivity of crop and therefore, what grade they fall under and based on that grade what sort of assessment value, agricultural assessment value is assigned them. You add up the total agricultural assessment value, subtract it from whatever the value is that we have put on it as an assessing unit and that is the amount of the exemption. So, if the ag assessment -- not to get into detail -- but if the ag exemption... ag assessment --

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I think it is important to get into it though really.

MR. LEAFER: Yes, I can. I haven't -- again, that is basically how they come up with... the State comes up with the ag assessments. They have done a study over the years of different soil contents of productivity of different farms of what these different soil contents will produce. Okay, in terms of not only crop but therefore, from crop what they are getting on the market in terms of price and when they take.. the person comes in and applies to the conservation and soil people for a break down of their particular property -- the property sketch or whatever is put on a map that shows their particular property in that district and what the soil contents are. The Conservation Department assigns specific percentages of their property to these different soil groups and they are categorized and assigned an assessment value. Those assessments values are added up for all of the categories within that particular property and that becomes the agricultural assessment. Let's take a property that is 50 acres that the person has applied for an ag exemption... and, they have to meet other criteria but this is if they meet those criteria, this is the one thing that they then go to determine how the exemption is calculated. Assume a property with 50 acres, a person applies for, it is determined that the ag assessment figure equals \$50,000. We as an assessing unit have determined through market value and what all else that the property assessed value or the fair market value of the property is \$100,000. The exemption that person qualifies for is \$50,000 subtracted from the \$100,000 or \$50,000. So, the... and that carries on for the outside/inside ag district exemptions, that carries on indefinitely. Well, it carries on indefinitely but in the inside district they have to commit to an 8 year period. And, there are penalties if they leave being an ag producing type situation where they qualify for the ag exemption and put the land to some other use like housing development or something like that. There are some penalties involved.

The third one is pretty straight forward. It is a building exemption much like the new construction exemption that new businesses would get. Where new business puts on a major addition, a warehouse

426

addition, and they are allotted over a 10 year period a step wise amount of exemption starting with 50 percent and decreasing to 0 at the end of the 10 years. In this case, a farmer let's say puts on a new building, the whole building -- and we have determined that that building adds \$100,000 to the fair market value of the property or \$100,000 more to say the \$500,000 assessment bringing it to \$600,000 -- if he is using... or she is using the entire building for a production of the crops that permit them to get the ag exemption, then they will receive the full exemption of the increase in assessment or the \$100,000. If he is taking that building and it happens to add \$100,000 to the assessed value of the property but he is using half the building to store his classic automobiles, and the other half is housing the dairy processing equipment for his dairy farm, for instance -- then only 50 percent of that assessment increase or \$50,000 would be allotted as an exemption and in that case, it is only good for a 10 year period. But, it stays at \$50,000 over that 10 year period.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: And, most of our farmland did apply for the agricultural exemption.

MR. LEAFER: Yes as near as I can tell from going through...

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: It appears to be if you said 71 from the number we had a year ago.

MR. LEAFER: It seems to be, as we look through the records, as we were looking through the records in the office... appears to be pretty much everybody. And, they were pretty much welcome to come in and do that and Brian, you know, worked with all of them... encouraged them to do that and did come in.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Actually, some of those assessments were up to 70 or 80 percent reductions?

MR. LEAFER: Yes. I think they were. I haven't gone through each and everyone to be perfectly honest about it to recalculate. I did one of these this year. I calculated one ag exemption prior to going away to take the course on exemptions, but fortunately, I used Brian's material and it was good, as a copy pattern it turns out to be pretty precisely about the way it is done. So, I have had really one 1 experience in calculating them. One of the things I will probably have to do in the future is go through and look at each one to make sure they have been, you know, properly assessed and calculated. But, there are 71 and they appear all happy at this point.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Will any of those 71 fall within the 10 acre limit now on the automatic exemption?

MR. LEAFER: Well, under the new law, all of them... all of those property owners whose property qualify, there 50 acres qualifies for an ag exemption. That 50 acres now is no longer non-homestead, it is homestead.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: The whole thing is.

MR. LEAFER: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: That was one of the changes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: That law was passed last May.

MR. LEAFER: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: July.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: It was signed by the Governor in July. It was passed by the Legislature in May.

MR. LEAFER: And, that amounted to a shift of may about somewhere in the neighborhood of 1.4 million and in terms of assessed value. Now, this is not an increase in assessment, it is a shift of assessment from the non-homestead category to the homestead category. The same

is true of the... all 10 acre parcels -- to clear the records as to exactly what is included in this new law -- all 10 acres parcels that fall in a residential zoned area permitting only 1, 2 and 3 family residential properties, went from being non-homestead -- which they were classified as vacant property, vacant lots -- to homestead. It didn't go to being homestead until such time as the developing, previous to the law, until the building was constructed on that.

So, that affected 2 or 3 of our major newer subdivisions.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So actually those 2 laws was a sizeable shift into the homestead.

MR. LEAFER: Yes, we shifted in a 3 week period, we shifted... we worked with 1400 properties. Polly in our office worked on the computer because we had to check them against the zoning to be absolutely sure that some of those on the fringes could be construed as being in zones other than permitted to 1, 2 or 3 family residence. We weren't mistakenly shifting into a homestead category but in the 3 week period, we were able to move 1400 properties and approximately shift about \$30,000,000. of total assessments -- of the total assessment from the non-homestead category to the homestead category. Didn't increase the total assessment, just shifted it.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: It did affect the amount of tax which is...

MR. LEAFER: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Which is probably at least 50 percent reason why homestead has less value today.

MR. LEAFER: Yes, it has definitely had an affect on it. Even though they come together each year, it did have an affect on bringing the 2 rates closer together.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, they may, there are several districts who have been in it for a long time and they haven't...

MR. LEAFER: Yes, there were other factors that entered in to this year. We added as Mr. Gunner and I were discussing today -- in addition to this shift, we worked with about 700 properties that involved new construction or additions to homes or things like decks, pools, etc. Don't think we are assessing every deck that comes along but anything of a decent proportion that would add to the market value, we added whatever we felt would be added to the market value, not the cost of the deck. And, that resulted -- I think we figured that was about \$60,000. But, at any rate...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, no, that plus a few other things which I had forgotten what you said, you went through a whole list of... come to the other 30 million of the interest.

MR. LEAFER: That is right, it was 30 million. So, we added quite a bit this year. Some of it was carry over that we weren't able to really get through prior to last year's grievance and what not but we did it this year and got all of them on.

Now, will we see that kind of shift next year, no, unless somebody changes the law on us again or zone it... if zoning were to change then we would have to go back through the process and reevaluate all the properties in Town.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Or certioraris did. That could affect the non-homestead too. Okay.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, other questions? Comments.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I would like to request that we have a public hearing.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Second. Is that a motion? I am sorry a request or a motion.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay.

428

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: It is a motion, it is an order.

TOWN ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: Since this was adopted by a Local Law, you are going to have to pass a Local Law to repeal it or adopt it or whatever.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: The purpose in having a public hearing is to give the community an opportunity to come in and speak to the Board. How soon can we do this legally?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, now what you are suggesting and I was just going to start with the options are for the Board. One of them would be to consider repeal. To do that you would have to have a public hearing, as you are suggesting on a Local Law that would be to repeal the homestead. Is that what your motion is to have a public hearing on a Local Law repealing homestead?

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I didn't say I was repealing homestead.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No, I know you didn't say that...

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I am asking for the public hearing.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: The public hearing has to be on a Local Law of some sort doing something. And, I am not saying we are repealing it but is that what you are suggesting?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Public hearing on that law to give consideration to the existence of the law.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Very good.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Doesn't have to be repeal, may be.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I may consider repealing it.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Exactly. To do that we would have to advertise. We could do that on September 22, 1993 at 7:30 p.m. to get the proper advertising done.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Proper advertising is what 10 days, Ken?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Is that the next meeting? No, that would be the second meeting in September.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Is that your motion to schedule a public hearing at 7:30 on the 22nd of September?

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Correct.

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

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Gunner to set a public hearing on September 22, 1993 at 7:30 p.m. to consider Local Law No. 7 of 1993, to consider repealing the Homestead provisions. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

- - -

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you, David.

MR. LEAFER: You are welcome. And, if anyone has any further questions, you know where to reach me.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I am pretty much questioned out, Dave, okay.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: This has been a pretty difficult assignment for a new Assessor to go through and learn all this considering the fact

that I don't think E & A understands half this stuff that they have put into effect.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, I know that, I spoke with David and I publicly want to thank him, he was a big help to me and spent about 4 or 5 hours with me one day and was a big help.

MR. LEAFER: I thank you all for your patience in waiting for this document to get to you a little bit later than I originally had hoped it would but, blame it on the new guy.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: You did fine. I don't think an old guy could have done it any quicker.

-----

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next item on our agenda is a request from Kathleen Newkirk, Town Clerk and Records Management Officer regarding going to bid for renovation and construction to create centralized storage for records and to consider proposed Local Law in regard to Records Management. As the Board knows, Kathy has been very successful in receiving some grants from the State of New York for a Records Management Program. At this time, the second portion of that grant -- a \$16,000 check has been received and we are at the point of beginning the second grant process. What we would be doing here, in this would be to build a centralized storage area for records under the Inactive Records category. To do this, we are going to have to go to bid for the contract to do this work and Kathy... I would entertain a motion to go to bid to begin... to go to bid for this work in construction in the basement for centralized storage.

Go To Bid  
Renovation  
and  
Construction  
To create  
Centralized  
Storage  
For Records

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Can I just ask a question on that?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Sure.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: I will ask Bruce, how this will fit in with our capital projects about the Town Hall expansion, renovation?

MR. SECOR: This was not included. This item was not included.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Would this in any way affect that program?

MR. SECOR: No, it would not.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Well, that's fine.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: It wouldn't?

MR. SECOR: No because the records management is in an area that wasn't considered in the capital projects.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Oh, I am talking about it would give more room in all the offices, considerably, I mean it states that throughout the report.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: It could conceivably, yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: And that is what I am trying to get at.

MR. SECOR: Well, it would loosen up storage place, yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So it may impact on that.

MR. SECOR: Okay, from that evaluation yes.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: But in our evaluation that will be considered.

MR. SECOR: Yes.

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

WHEREAS, the Town desires to advertise for bids for renovation and construction work in regards to the creation of a centralized storage area for the Records Management Program, pursuant to law,

430

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk advertise for such bids in THE SPOTLIGHT issue on the 1st day of September, 1993 and that bids be received up to 2:00 p.m. on the 16th day of September, 1993 at which time the bids will be publicly opened and read.

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

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

Consider  
Local Law  
For Records  
Management

-----  
SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next Kathy... as part of this process she would like us to consider a Local Law for Records Management and this is an indicator to the State of New York that we are serious about going ahead with this program and one of the reasons they are giving us money is because we are going ahead in a professional, organized manner and now we are going to have a recommended local law that requires certain actions by our Records Management. She attached a draft of a local law and we would have to have a public hearing, as well. Does anyone have any questions on that? Kathy will gladly answer them or Alicia Jettner who is her Project Supervisor here could also help. Any questions on that?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I have about 10 or 12 questions but I think I would rather sit with Kathy rather than take up everybody's time here because they are sort of questions about the material but I do want to commend them both because I am not sure, even as we sit here now, many of us are aware of how important a project this is. Because, it really cleans up records and once it is up and running in a good way, it is going to improve the efficiency of Town government tremendously.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No question. And, Joe Allgaier who is here our Town Historian has been very helpful in preparing these grants as well and we want to thank him.

How much total monies have you received at this time?

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: I also want to thank Mr. Allgaier because he let us use a computer that was the Historian's and that helped us to put our records management inventory into a computer so that we have that all printed out and of course, thanks to Alicia as the Project Supervisor because she has helped.

The first grant which was the inventory project which was the final report that everybody received we received \$31,610. And, under that program, that allowed us to complete this. There is also, in addition to the final report, a needs assessment that was written and that is in the binder in my office if anybody wants to come in and review that as well.

The second grant which was to go forward with the program in regard to the centralized storage and the local law to establish the program we have gotten \$32,485 of which that \$16,242 is the first payment. So, in total at the end of the second grant period, we will have \$64,095 that has gone into our program to make it complete.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I do have one question.

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: Sure.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: If you will be patient with me. I would like to know, is some of that grant money going to take care of some of the construction that we need to do in formulating the records center?

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: All of the reconstruction, renovation and construction is from the grant money, yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Great.

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: Yes, we will be allowed to go to bid and that will be done by an outside contractor. It will include a sprinkling

system, lighting system, there will be a couple of emergency fire doors with panic bars. Everything that will help do that along with the shelving.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I think that's... Although I know it may not seem like an important document to certain people that read newspapers but I would hope that the newspapers would give it adequate coverage to show that we are trying to bring it up-to-date.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: You know the press always prints everything we ask them to do, Charles.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Would you write the note for them and put the article in the paper I guess. If you do it, that would be fine by me too.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: We can try.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Write it out, Charles.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Motion to hold the public hearing October 13 at 7:30 pm.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to hold a public hearing on Local Law Number 8, Establishing a Records Management Program for 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.

Set Public Hearing Local Law 8, 1993 Records Management Program

-----

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from Gregg Sagendorph, Superintendent of Highways, to adopt a resolution conveying a portion of Old Bender Lane right-of-way to The Meadows at Bethlehem.

August 10, 1993

Bethlehem Town Board  
445 Delaware Avenue  
Delmar, NY 12054

Resolution conveying Portion of Old Bender Lane right-of-way to The Meadows

Dear Board Members:

I respectfully request that the Town Board adopt a resolution conveying a portion of Old Bender Lane right-of-way from the Town of Bethlehem to the Meadows at Bethlehem.

This parcel of land, as described in Schedule A and shown on detailed map (attached) was formerly Bender Lane prior to the construction of the Delmar By-Pass (Route 32). Since that time it has served as access to the Piazza farm, which is now being developed as part of the Meadows project. The parcel of land to be conveyed is approximately 0.70 acres and is no longer needed by the Town.

Also attached, please find copies of the application for discontinuance of a highway, release of damage claims by owner to the Town, and an indemnification agreement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Gregg A. Sagendorph  
Superintendent of Highways

- - -

Questions? Like to offer that resolution.

The motion was made by Mr. Webster and seconded by Mr. Gunner to adopt the following resolution:

432

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF BETHLEHEM  
IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION TO DISCONTINUE A HIGHWAY  
AND/OR RIGHT-OF-WAY, COMMONLY KNOWN AS OLD BENDER LANE

WHEREAS, Superintendent of Highways, Gregg Sagendorph has received an application, dated July 15, 1993, by THE MEADOWS AT BETHLEHEM, A NEW YORK PARTNERSHIP, for the discontinuance of a highway or right-of-way, commonly known as Old Bender Lane, more particularly described in the attached map and description in support of said Application, and

WHEREAS, it appears from the information submitted by the Applicant that a right-of-way which is the subject of said said Application has not been opened and worked as a highway for use by the public since 1960, more than six years before the date of said Application, and

WHEREAS, the Applicant, THE MEADOWS AT BETHLEHEM, A NEW YORK PARTNERSHIP, is the owner and sole party interested in the lands upon which said highway or right-of-way runs, and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has agreed to release and hold harmless the Town for any and all damages and costs that might arise by reason of the discontinuance of Town highway or right-of-way which is the subject of the said Application, and

WHEREAS, it appears that the action requested by the Applicant may be authorized by this Board pursuant to Section 205 of the Highway Law of the State of New York,

NOW, based upon the foregoing it is hereby:

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby consents to the discontinuance and abandonment of the highway and public right-of-way commonly known as "Old Bender Lane" more particularly annexed to the Application of THE MEADOWS AT BETHLEHEM, A NEW YORK PARTNERSHIP, dated June 15, 1993, and it is further

RESOLVED, that Superintendent of Highways Sagendorph shall record in the Office of the Town Clerk a written description, signed by him, of the highway and public right-of-way so abandoned, and upon said filing, any and all use of said parcel of land as a highway or public right-of-way shall be deemed abandoned and discontinued, and it is further

RESOLVED, that for purposes of Section 205 of the Highway Law of the State of New York, the members of the Town Board present shall affix their names to a Certificate of Filing of the written description of the highway and/or right-of-way to be discontinued and abandoned.

The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

Approve  
Minutes  
July 28, 1993

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I would entertain a motion to approve the Tow Board minutes of July 28, 1993 which were distributed on August 2, 1993.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to approve the Town Board minutes of July 28, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

Accept  
Deeds and  
Easements  
Meadows  
Subdivision  
Section 2

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next a recommendation from Michael Cirillo, Engineering Services Administrator, for acceptance of deeds and easements for the Meadows Subdivision, Section 2.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: That is the other half of the one that Sagendorph... not the other half but...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: These are rights-of-way for the new streets.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Yes, okay. The new ones that resulted from that.

MR. SAGENDORPH: I abandoned an old section, now we are accepting the new section.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Offer that motion.

The motion was offered by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to accept the deeds and easement in the Meadows Subdivision, Section 2. 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 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 seconded by Mr. Gunner to conduct an Executive Session at the end of the regular Town Board 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 anything anyone else would like to bring to the attention of the Board this evening?

MR. GRIFFERTY: If it please the Board, my name is Steve Grifferty. I am an attorney, I represent the Beverwyck project. Beverwyck was scheduled to open September 1st. Unfortunately there is a matter involving the easements and conveyances, not unlike the last... next to the last agenda items which you achieved tonight.

We did not file with the Board in time to be on the agenda for this evening but I would like to ask the Board's indulgence and a request somewhat unusual in that substantial part of our documentation with respect to the easements and conveyances to the Town have been with engineering staff for some time and what we would request the Board to do so we could meet our scheduling deadline at Beverwyck and realizing we have approximately 43 senior citizens scheduled to move in on September 1st before the next Board meeting when the Board could take action on this issue is to -- subject to verification of approval of the contents of the easements and deeds by the Town Attorney and by engineering staff -- that the Board adopt a motion to approve of that, again, subject to approval and verification through the appropriate engineering and attorney with you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Just comment for the Board's sake, at 10 of 5 this afternoon, these documents were all faxed into my office and the engineering department has not had a chance to review them in final. What has been faxed into the office are the changes that were required by the Engineering department. They had thoroughly gone through all these and have been requesting some changes to the documents so we are pretty close to an agreement on descriptions and so forth but they had to be redone and they weren't available, as I said, until 10 of 5 and when I got them, there was nobody from engineering to review them and naturally I wouldn't put them on the agenda until that was done.

The idea of accepting them contingent upon approval of the Town Attorney and the Engineering Department, I think, would be adequate. Would you have a problem with that, counselor? I mean, this.. we normally accept their recommendations anyway and I think request has merit and that if they did... if we could pass a motion authorizing acceptance of those contingent upon our Engineering Department final

review and approval of the Town Attorney. Does anyone have a question?

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: For the minutes, I would like the attorney to respond verbally.

TOWN ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: No, I have no problem with that.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay. Well, I didn't know...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: He was nodding his head.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I wasn't sure, I want to get you on the record.

TOWN ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: Town Attorney's approval as to those is really as to the form of the deeds and is, I won't say insignificant, but it is not terribly important. Engineering Department's review of what they have agreed to in the negotiations is far more important. But, certainly, I don't see any problem with it. You can certainly adopt it subject to the Town Engineer's approval and my approval.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So, if for some reason, just...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: If it is not approved, we won't given them...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Approved, it just wouldn't come out.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: They would not get their Certificate of Occupancies yet.

COUNCILMAN WEBSTER: Bruce has no problem?

MR. SECOR: No, Gregg is here too and I, there is still bond out on this and we are not releasing the bond, we are just accepting the deeds. So, the bond is still in place. There is some punch list items that have to be completed. The sewers are not ready to be turned into service but again, these folks are going to have to do before the Certificate of Occupancy is issued. The pumping station is all constructed, there again, punch list items have to be checked.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: They are all in the fax machine right now.

MR. SECOR: Oh, no.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I will entertain a motion to authorize that.

Accept  
Deeds and  
Easements  
Beverwyck  
pending  
approval of  
Town Attorney

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster to accept the deeds and easements for Beverwyck, pending the approval of the Town Attorney and the Engineering 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: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Anything else? Entertain a motion to adjourn.

The motion was made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Gunner to adjourn the regular Town Board meeting at 8:17 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

*Kathleen A. Newbirk*  
Town Clerk

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On a motion made by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Mr. Webster the Town Board approved the Civil Service job description for the position of Deputy Receiver of Taxes and Assessments. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Executive  
Session

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