

TOWN BOARD  
JUNE 30, 1992

A special 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 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Kenneth J. Ringler, Supervisor  
Frederick C. Webster, Councilman  
M. Sheila Galvin, Councilwoman  
Charles Gunner, Councilman  
Sheila Fuller, Councilwoman  
Bernard Kaplowitz, Esq., Town Attorney  
Kathleen A. Newkirk, Town Clerk

- - -

Supervisor Ringler called the meeting to order. He stated at this meeting we will be discussing the Election Districts. He asked if anyone had anything to offer. He assumed someone does.

Mrs. Galvin informed the committee she has something to offer. She didn't know whether Mike had anything to continue with that he started the other day. (A beeping noise went off. Mrs. Newkirk inquired who was beeping? Supervisor Ringler requested everyone to check their beepers. Mr. Webster said not me. Mr. Gunner informed the committee it was his beeper. Mrs. Newkirk didn't think it was hers.) Supervisor Ringler told Mrs. Galvin to go ahead. Mrs. Galvin stated, first of all we have done this with a visual aid to try to make it a little simpler in terms of she had raised questions at the Board Meeting back on Wednesday night. As a result of those questions, she has graciously been provided with copies, with the enrolled, proposed number of voters in each district by Kathy and Mike, who provided us with copies on, she believes it was Thursday of the new proposed the new election districts she subsequently asked for. Copies of the old currently existing election districts and she received those on Friday. And she would like to give special thanks to Kathy who came through in the crunch and on Sunday at 5:45 p.m. came in provided us with a copy of the County Legislative district maps and descriptions so it was a big help that Kathy provided them with both the maps and descriptions because in certain instances they do not agree, which made it more of a challenge. She however, she would like to give thanks to all of those people because they made a special effort to provide this material so they had the opportunity to review it.

Discussion  
and  
Approval  
of Election  
Redistricting

Mrs. Galvin continued, first of all it was her understanding at the last meeting, that one of the issues that had been raised, had been an issue regarding when these districts had to be filed, voted on and delivered to the Board of Elections for final filing. She at that time was told July 1st was the date. She was not sure what that was based on, because in pulling the Election Law Section 4-100 and she is leaving some of the visuals up, they had done them for display through out so that the committee could refer to them as they go along. Section 4-100 of the Election Law subdivision 5, in particular which said previously, that the changes to the Election District shall be made on or before July 1st, has been amended and the amendment which has appeared in the supplement now indicates that any creation, consolidation, division, alteration of Election Districts, in any year shall be made on or before January 15th and shall take effect immediately continuing, it says except further that when required by creation or alteration of a political subdivision other than the election district in which candidates are to be voted on at the next election. Such creation, consolidation, division or alteration shall be made and shall take effect immediately upon creation or alteration of such political subdivision, indicating no date other than the previously referred to January 15th date. Basically, Mrs. Galvin stated, she will leave that up for their reference, also something that is of interest in the amendments, ... Mr. Gunner had a question; he wanted to know if Mrs. Galvin would accept a question. Mrs. Galvin replied, anytime he wants. Mr. Gunner's question was, that's the January 15th following the July? In other words, this is 92, that would be January 93. Mrs. Galvin replied, it would appear to read that way, she could not find any

cases directly in point on the amendment, but that would appear to be the right way it reads.

Mrs. Galvin stated, the next point of interest in 4-100 and there are several others, which we will be dealing with later, is an election district shall contain not more than 950 registrants or with the approval of the County Board of Elections not more than 1150 registrants but any election district may be divided at the convenience of the voters and an election district in a city or town may divide a block. She said these are just certain points, noting there are other points that she will be bringing up on that as we go along. Also, for the convenience, and she thinks this may have been removed as a necessity since Kathy has already prepared the old and the new district number on total registered voters with certain areas marked -- for example, district 1 258 in the new proposed, all of these are in new proposed, district 6 at 891, 16 at 393, 21 at 900 and 26 at 185. She said the map and again, she said she was not a surveyor, she is not licensed by the State of New York to draw these neat little lines in the right places necessarily but from the material that they had, they prepared maps, again they did not have the official town map, they just used what they had to give you sort of a visual aid to try and show what they are talking about.

First of all starting with the highlighted areas -- the highlighted yellow area is the 12th county legislative district and contains only district 10 of the town. The pink area, according to Ms. Galvin, is the 10th county legislative district, the green denominates the 33rd, the blue or aqua is the 35th, the uncolored or white area in the center is the 34th and the large orange area is the 36th. She said these are the proposed county legislative districts. She said inside the county legislative districts, the numbers in the circle denote the proposed new town election districts. She said the object of this is to show which proposed town election districts are in which county election districts. She said this map, also for reference, is strictly marked to show the new county election districts for reference as we go along.

Over on another stand, is a section marked errors, Ms. Galvin said, indicating they are not certain whether these are errors but they appear to be errors based on the information that has been provided to us at this point. She said the top portion comes from the County legislative district material that has been provided to us. She said the map to the left indicates an area which is primarily in the new county 35th with the exception of an area at the bottom and they will be dealing with this in more detail later. She said where you see the pink loop, that area according to the map is in the new county 35th legislative district, however, if you notice the black line which denominates the border of the county legislative district this would be the 36th, this would be the 35th, indicating on the map. Ms. Galvin said when you read the meets and bounds description... Councilman Webster asked what the loop was. Ms. Galvin said the loop is the error in the county material. Mr. Webster asked what it encompasses. Ms. Galvin said it is basically Bernard Place but the county legislative meets and bounds description which would govern over the map, says then southwesterly along route 9W to its intersection with Hague (misspelled) Boulevard then westerly in a curvilinear fashion along Hague (again misspelled) Boulevard to its intersection with its intersection with Bernard Place then southwesterly along Bernard Place with its intersection with Elm Avenue East. She said what this black line that the County has drawn on their map does, follows Hague Boulevard, it does not go over Bernard Place at all. She said it totally misses Bernard Place, therefore, since the normal fashion the meets and bounds governs over the map, the map is incorrect and the looped area in pink would in fact be included in the 35th legislative... the very inside would be in the 36th legislative district not the 35th as it appears on the map which gives us a problem when you get down to their district 24. And, again, Ms. Galvin said you will be hearing more about this one later.

Ms. Galvin said district 24 as proposed would include areas in two county legislative districts. She said this area is the new county 35th, the part marked in yellow. She said the part marked in black is the Bernard Place area which is our friend, the error up

here carried over because the map was incorrect that the county provided. Therefore, Ms. Galvin said the 24th is proposed in its interesting shape would include part of both the 35th and 36th legislative districts. She said the next one is one that Mr. Cirillo might be able to explain as we go along. She said they had a mystery and noted this one she had to say was a challenge. She said the area outlined in red according to the map provided to us which refers to it as map of election district number 20 dated June 19, 1992, would appear to be the 20th and you will notice that there is a bright yellow area in the center, this presented a challenge. She said on the map below, new map of election district number 11, dated June 19, 1992, the yellow, the yellow fits inside the 20th. She said they had a challenge, they were not sure whether the voters in the 11th got to pick where they voted or whether they got to vote twice. She said either one seemed to be an interesting choice but they were unclear based on the material that was provided to them.

Councilwoman Galvin said now she would go onto some quick run through of some overheads so that they can be a little more specific. Again, she said we are back to 4-100 of the Election Law and as she pointed out, this was subdivision 5 that was amended. Now, she said the supplement indicates -- again as she had said -- the January 15 and the exception language that she read before. Supervisor Ringler asked that Ms. Galvin go over this again, now that the Town Attorney is here. Ms. Galvin said sure, in the original portion of 4-100 it provided that any creation, consolidation, division, alteration of an election district in any year shall be made on or before July 1st. She said in the supplement, subdivision 5 was amended to provide that any creation, consolidation, division, alteration of election districts in any year shall be made on or before January 15th and shall take effect immediately with the exception, except further that when required by the creation or alteration of a political subdivision, other than an election district in which candidates are to be voted for at the next election, such creation, consolidation, division or alteration shall be made and shall take effect immediately upon the creation or alteration of such political subdivision. As she understood from Kathy, she said as of Sunday, the county maps were not filed. Ms. Newkirk indicated she has not had notification from the Albany County Board of Elections that they received information that these were the approved or accepted maps. Councilman Webster said when they are filed, they become effective immediately. Ms. Galvin said those would become effective immediately. She said she scrounged for case law under this but it would appear that we do not have any particular time limit in which we have to act and we would have an opportunity to take a look at things and at least give it some study in order to comply with subdivision 5. She said again, there is no case law and she defers to the Town Attorney but it is a challenge. Attorney Kaplowitz asked Ms. Galvin what that says in her... Ms. Galvin said that is a real good question, it would seem... Supervisor Ringler said he was glad the lawyers were having a problem with it. Ms. Galvin said it would seem to say that... Councilman Webster said we are not bound by their date, that is for sure. Ms. Galvin said this was right, that is number one, we are not bound by their date. Supervisor Ringler said July 1. Ms. Galvin said we are not bound by July 1st in her opinion, again as she said, she defers to the Town Attorney in this but it would appear January 15th, except in a year where there is an alteration of a political subdivision -- which is this year and then our maps would for changes in districts would take effect immediately when we make the change but it does not seem to compel us to make the change within the time frame that the county is trying to impose.

Supervisor Ringler asked about the mechanics of conducting elections, for example, what Kathy is telling us is that the county says they have to do their petitions by such and such a date, where does that leave us if we are not ready to give them the information as to where people are voting. Ms. Galvin said it is a real good question because especially with errors existing in the material that has been provided by them, she thinks at the very least, they have to have that clarified before we know what we are doing. Attorney Kaplowitz asked what the political subdivision is that is being created or altered. Councilwoman Galvin said the county legislative districts, if that is a political subdivision and she said that is an

if. Attorney Kaplowitz said that was his point, he is not so sure it is a political subdivision. He said he did not know he would have to look it up. Councilwoman Galvin said she could not figure out whether that was going to qualify as a political subdivision or not. She said assuming it does, this would be -- the worst case scenario -- assuming it does not, it is January 15. Attorney Kaplowitz said the county is a political subdivision but he does not think county legislative lines are a political subdivision. He said they are not changing or altering the lines of Albany County. He said they are just changing the election districts within Albany County. He said the first blush, he does not think they are altering or creating a political subdivision. Councilman Webster said you say there is nothing there that would bind us to the first day the petitions are due then. Councilwoman Galvin said this was right. Supervisor Ringler asked what this does to our candidates. Councilman Webster said yes, what does it do. Councilwoman Galvin said good question. Councilman Webster asked morally, don't you feel we should by all possibility have it be in before that date. Ms. Galvin said she thinks they are bound first and foremost by 4-100 and by what the law imposes on us. She said to that end, there is another and this is something that will become apparent as we go along exactly how important the language in this is. She said this is part of subdivision 3a as amended in 4-100. She said each election district shall be in compact form. She said that is a shall, not a may -- that means it is mandatory. She said except as provided in paragraph b of this subdivision, election district boundaries other than those boundaries which are conterminous with boundaries of other political subdivisions mentioned in this paragraph, must be streets, rivers, railroad lines, permanent characteristics of the landscape which are clearly visible to any person without need to use any technical or mechanical device. She said she thinks it is very important that we keep this in mind, this is mandatory, this is one of the amendments to section 4-100 of the Election Law that we are bound by in preparing our districts.

Councilwoman Galvin said, Bob, if we can go on with the old and the new. Councilman Webster asked what is any more compact than the 26th. Ms. Galvin said we have some. She said what she is going to be doing now, is going through and showing you the old districts and the new districts. She indicated the old first district and indicated that had to be changed because of the change in the line over here between the 33rd and the 10th new legislative district if they drew them in the right place and she said she is leaving this open. She said that would be along here and there is absolutely no question that the bottom half which and as she goes through -- what she is going to be referring to goes back to 1989 enrollment books. She said that is what she had, that is the only set that she had for the whole town and given the fact that they did not get all of their material until -- thanks to Kathy they finally knew what to ask for on Sunday night -- she said they did not have time to get whole new sets of enrollment books so they could do a full nose-by-nose count but they did it as close as they could from a combination of 1989 numbers and the 1989 numbers mixed in with the new projections that Kathy and Mike have prepared. She said this is the primary population in the old 1st and that was lobed off of the old first. She said the new proposed 1st, as you will see, has that area marked up and again, she made no representations that they drew absolutely on the lines, not being surveyors and not being licensed to do it, they came as close as they could. She said the new 1st has 258 and the old 1st had had 921. She said in order to make it readily apparent where these areas are, you will notice on the overlay, this is the old 1st, this area was chopped off, this area was chopped off, this area is however, not a high density population area.

Councilwoman Fuller asked Ms. Newkirk what figures were used to compile a listing of the number of voters. Ms. Newkirk indicated these were the old 1991 figures and the new 1992 projected numbers. Ms. Galvin said we have to deal with what we have today.

Supervisor Ringler interrupted Ms. Galvin for a question from Councilman Gunner. He said he thought he hear Ms. Galvin, there was a difference in figures of about 658. Ms. Galvin said they were using the figures that Ms. Newkirk had provided to them on registered voters from the 1991. Ms. Newkirk explained the numbers she used

were from the spring election and that is where the difference is. Ms. Galvin said these were the numbers that came from the registered voters for the burn plant election -- not just residents but the listing of the most recent one, June 1992. Ms. Newkirk said if she could clarify then, on the list that she presented the Town Board, the existing district total voters is from the registrant books that she has, that are 1990-91. The new districts are the numbers that Mr. Cirillo has compiled due to census figures, Ms. Newkirk explained. The figures that Councilwoman Galvin has as the old figures, represent the number of voters that voted on the incineration question, she further explained, noting that also included people that are not registered to vote in the enrollment books from the Board of Elections. Councilwoman Galvin said to please excuse her but she begs to differ with Ms. Newkirk but -- Ms. Newkirk noted that was from the incinerator, that is what the figures are. Ms. Galvin said from the 1991-92 enrollment -- she did not use votes cast. Ms. Newkirk said that was okay, she understood. Ms. Galvin said she used the column titled total registered voters. Ms. Newkirk indicated that was out of the new books. Ms. Galvin said it was the current editions, registered Board of Elections. Ms. Newkirk indicated those were the newer books then. Councilman Webster said that was not that important any way. Ms. Galvin said that is registered voters, that is the column she used, total registered. Councilman Webster said that is not much difference anyway.

Councilwoman Galvin said moving along to District 2, since we have a few to cover, this is the old district 2, 642, nice, neat and compact. The new district, Ms. Galvin said, still nice, neat and compact but we have enlarged it and gone up to 800 voters. Now, she said, here is where the difference came on that -- and again, she apologized, they were not perfectly neat on their overlays -- this is the old 2, picking up here and a little down here and 2 is in the 34th County Legislative District. Mr. Cirillo asked if he could interject as we go along -- part of the reason for that is that cut off from the 26th by the legislative districts. Ms. Galvin said right. Mr. Cirillo said it was a piece that we had to apply to another district that was adjoining the second and attached it to the 2nd. Ms. Galvin said that made the 2nd go from 642 up to 800.

Councilwoman Galvin said the 3rd old, 628 and the 3rd again, had some as she recalls, there were no changes in. Mr. Cirillo said that was right. The 3rd stayed the same, Ms. Galvin noted, indicating the old 3rd is the same as the 3rd new.

Councilwoman Galvin said the 4th, old 620 voters and here we have the 4th, right up in here, the new 4th. The new 4th, according to Ms. Galvin, picked up some area and we have gone up to 766 voters. Mr. Cirillo said again the southern part was cut off by the legislative district, it had to be applied to another district.

Councilwoman Fuller said she hates to send her back to the -- but was it the 3rd you said there was not a change. Councilman Webster said it was the same boundaries. Councilwoman Galvin said it was the same. Councilwoman Fuller said there is still 628, now there is more people in that area. Councilwoman Galvin said apparently because the 3rd goes up to 766. Mrs. Fuller said okay. Ms. Galvin said so they picked up this area and we picked up this area and some here too.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 5th had 743 voters and we are talking about in this are now. The new 5th, according to Ms. Galvin, has 745 voters and it has picked up. Mr. Cirillo said it was further south than that, it actually -- the old 5 -- he said he was sorry he was thinking of another district. Ms. Galvin said it has picked up area up in here and it has picked up area over in here. She said it doesn't appear to have lost any area but it has only picked up 2 voters for this additional area and that is right in here. Mr. Cirillo asked if he could say something on that. He said the legislative district went down the center line of 9W, the houses that were on the westerly side of 9W were included in the 5th before. He said they no longer are included in the 5th so that the 5th has lost everything west of 9W for -- he thinks 150 or 200 feet. Ms. Galvin said the line is not on Route 9W. Mr. Cirillo said the line is right

down the center of 9W, the legislative line, which the new boundary line of the district is. Ms. Galvin indicated yes.

Councilwoman Galvin said the 6th, the old had 800 voters in it and on the old 6th, we are talking about down in this area. She said the new 6th has expanded and has gone up to 891 voters, a rather large number of voters for a district and it has picked up area over in here, over in here, little there, little there.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 7th and on the 7th we are talking about over in this area. She said the old 7th had 598 voters and that one has stayed the same. The number of voters in the new 7th has gone to 540, it has gone down, Ms. Galvin said. Councilmen Gunner and Webster said 563. Mr. Webster said she was down one line. Ms. Galvin said, okay, 563, they have gone down a few.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 8th had 652 voters and that is this area in here. The new way, Ms. Galvin said, has gotten a little bit smaller and didn't enlarge very well and we have 540 voters. Mr. Cirillo said there again, if you would superimpose them, that portion is a legislative line, Kenwood Avenue, so that there was really nothing you could do with that. Ms. Galvin indicated this area, the top portion of 8 is changed. She said this was another change... in here another legislative line.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 9th had 536 and we are getting into the area that is a little hard to see in here, that is the old 9th. The new 9th has 680, Ms. Galvin said, that is... According to this the new 9th has 535, indicating she was sorry about that.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 10th, did not quite make it as compact -- it traveled around like this and we are talking about up in here. She said this change was necessitated by the change in the legislative line and the new 10th is now the compact area, it is real easy to see, it is in bright yellow up there. She said that changes strictly because of county legislative lines.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 11th, this is our challenge area -- we think this is the old 11th at 631 and we believe that this is the new 11th at 626. She said those did not have a tremendous amount of change, there was a change in the area. Mr. Cirillo said they lost a section from the Delmar By-pass easterly and then they were added up to Fairway. Ms. Galvin said okay.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 12th, 683 and the new 12th went down to 380. Now, she said on the overlay, you will notice that this area and that is one side of the street, right Mike. Mr. Cirillo said yes, let him look. He indicated yes, that is 500 feet northerly of Delaware Avenue, is where that line is. Ms. Galvin said this does not run along the street. Mr. Cirillo said that line is 500 northerly of Delaware Avenue line. Ms. Galvin asked if it runs along the street, it does not run along a road or a... Mr. Cirillo said no. Councilman Webster asked if it was a stream or something. Ms. Galvin said nothing. Mr. Cirillo said it is a line running parallel to and 500 feet northerly of Delaware Avenue. He said that is the same line as the old district -- so he does not know where the line below it is from. Ms. Galvin said that was where they thought it picked up one side of the street and not the other. Mr. Cirillo said no. Councilman Gunner said that is a Town line, not a county line. Ms. Galvin said it is a Town line, not a county line, it does follow a road, stream or any natural visible boundary.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 13th had 802 voters. Mr. Cirillo said that follows the same line, if he may -- this is the same line that was on that drawing there. Ms. Galvin said it is not along the road. Mr. Cirillo said this was right, it hasn't been since 1985. She said it was a survey line. Mr. Cirillo said well, it is just a call for a line running parallel to and 500 feet northerly of Delaware Avenue. She said the new 13th has 549, okay.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 14th and we are talking about this area, had 808 voters and the new 14th has 838 voters and it has picked up this area in here. Mr. Cirillo said it has lost that

area. Ms. Galvin said she was sorry, it has lost that area, you are right Mike.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 15th had 495 voters and this is another area where there has been a change in county legislative lines -- we are talking about the 33rd abutting the 10th. She said the new 15th has a proposed 800 voters. She said that involves picking up area up in here primarily and area up in here and a little down here.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 16th -- not exactly going to make a compact shape but the old 16th had 633 voters in it and the new 16th -- she hoped they were not trying to send a message to the people in the 16th, has 393 voters in it. She said basically, we have changed from one not compact to another not compact.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 17th had an interesting shape with curl and the 17th has stayed the same. She said it had 532 in the old 17th, according to the figures they had -- and according to this is an unchanged at 521. She said we lost a few voters somewhere.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 18th had 551 and again, we are back in the area very difficult to see, the small areas and the new 18th is proposed to have 825. She said this was a rather significant increase.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 19th and we are talking about over in here, back in the orange, the old as we currently have it, has 521 voters in it. The new 19th, not particularly compact, according to Ms. Galvin, meanders around over here and has 680 voters in it.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 20th had 674 voters in it. Again, she said we are not going to win an award for a compact district and the new 10th is the area which we have not done an overlay for because -- she would refer them back over to the diagram over here, they believe the outline of the 20th to follow the red exterior markings but since that contained the 11th, they did not bother to do an overlay because they could not make any sense out of it.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 21st may look a little strange -- but remember that this is the Town -- the dividing line between the Town and the City of Albany and that is the 21st with 656. The new 21st has a new jut on it and Ms. Galvin said proposed going from 656 up to 900 voters because that has picked up primarily this area in here.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 22nd had 797 voters and that area is the area in here which goes down like that. Okay.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 23rd had 703 voters in it and the new 23rd has 586 voters. She said the change on that one she is not even going to try and overlay because they had major problems getting this one to line up. She said she does not want to hold things up any more.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 24th had 609 voters in it and the new 24th is our friend from over here, with the problem given to us by the county in the Bernard Place area, up in here. She said we would be seeing more of the 24th in a couple minutes.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 25th had 1,209, we were over on that one, over the Election Law limit anyway, but we have created a new 25th with 760 and it has ears. She said it does not quite make it as a compact district. She said again, this is in this area. She said the odd shaped 25th, abutting the odd shaped 24th.

Councilwoman Galvin said the old 26th which you heard about last Wednesday night, has all over here and came along with 407 voters, the new 26th has not improved its shape very much and does not make it as compact either and has only 185 voters in it. Ms. Galvin said this has changed the line previously did not run on Orchard Street

and still does not run on Orchard Street. She said it runs back off of Orchard Street, it does not run along a road, stream or anything like that. She said it is a man-made separate line that has been drawn. Councilman Webster asked if it encompasses both sides of Orchard. Mr. Cirillo said yes. Ms. Galvin said yes. Mr. Cirillo said it has been that way since 1985. Councilman Webster said there is nothing else other than what is on Orchard anyway. Mr. Cirillo agreed.

Councilwoman Galvin said okay, the old 27th and we are talking about the pink area. The old 27th had 551 and the new 27th contains 833 voters. She said this --- Mr. Cirillo said all that included was the area to the west of Blessing Road, it was added. Ms. Galvin said this was one of the questions she had. She said we have picked up -- gone from 551 voters up to 833 voters and we have only picked up the west side of Blessing Road -- asking if this was.... she asked what we have picked up. Mr. Cirillo said that is it. Ms. Galvin said just the west side of Blessing Road. She said basically after doing these -- one of the things they did was drive around and did visuals of the areas -- and she found the number of houses, with the exception of the new Brookview that is under construction, to be so few that you could count them on one hand. She said she was not clear as to where we went from 551 up to 833. She wondered how we did that. Mr. Cirillo said what may have occurred in there and he would have to check that -- we have Beverwyck that is proposed, Krumkill Manor that is proposed that is in that area and we have Brookfield as Ms. Galvin has mentioned. He said what may have occurred in that particular one is that we were trying to get an estimate as to the amount of development and maybe that figure was the one that was given rather than the 500 and something. Ms. Galvin said she has been very confused as to whether we are districting for actual registered voters or whether we are projecting people. She said under the Election Law, we are supposed to be doing our districts based upon the number of actual registrants in the district, not on projections. Mr. Webster asked Mr. Cirillo if that included Olympian Gardens. Mr. Cirillo said Olympian Gardens is in there. Ms. Galvin said that was in there before. Councilman Webster asked if it did not include the Googas Estates and not the Swift. Mr. Cirillo said the Googas is in the 10th. Mr. Webster asked if Mr. Swift's is in the 10th too. Mr. Cirillo said it was in the 10th. Mr. Webster said it is the north side. Mr. Cirillo said Belmonte and Indian Hills is in the 10th. Councilwoman Galvin said she could not account for how we went up close to 200 voters, where she drove along and counted maybe a half a dozen houses. She said they must be awfully busy in those houses but she does not know -- big houses, that is it. Councilwoman Fuller said lots of children. Ms. Galvin said that is it.

Councilwoman Galvin said not that we have finally finished going through everything once, she was sure everyone was breathing a sigh of relief, we are back to our old friend the 11th and the 20th. She said basically if you put the 11th where it appeared to go, you either have a 20th and an 11th or one 20th or -- she said she cannot explain it no matter what she did. She said since she did not have the meets and bounds, all she had was the map descriptions. She said they could not do a meets and bounds description on the 11th and the 20th but that proved to be one of the mysteries of the deep.

Councilman Gunner asked if it was County error. Councilwoman Galvin said these are Town election districts, this would be the new 11th -- Mr. Cirillo asked Ms. Galvin what map showing the map for the 11th and the 20th district -- Ms. Galvin said the one that she had indicated down here. Mr. Cirillo said he had the original. Ms. Galvin said Mr. Cirillo has now shown her and this gives her just as big a problem to be perfectly honest -- that this area in green Mike, is the 20th. Mr. Cirillo indicated it was. Ms. Galvin said she has a problem with that being a compact district but that is the 20th. She said sorry Sheila you can only vote once. Mrs. Fuller said not yet, we have not resolved this yet.

Ms. Newkirk showed the boundary of the 11th. Ms. Galvin said the yellow is the 11th and the 20th is the green. She said the map that she had indicated that it came down -- it appeared that the line came down here -- that is why they did not do the overhead projection

on the 20th. She said they were sure where the 11th was but was very unclear where the 20th was. She said she could not believe that this was the 20th with the zigzags when they were trying to make compact districts. Councilman Webster said that shows on Mr. Cirillo's map that he gave them. Ms. Galvin said the once she had appeared to have a dark line running along the bottom of it. Ms. Newkirk indicated that was the Delmar By-pass. Ms. Galvin said okay but without the meets and bounds description it was almost impossible to tell.

Councilwoman Galvin said just a quick run through to show you the districts that abut each other with the old districts with varying number of votes to show you how they went. The 23rd abutted the 12th -- 703, 683. The 23rd and 14th -- 703, 808. She said these are all old districts. The 22nd and the 5th -- 797, 743. She said believe it or not this really does have a purpose, which we will get to in the end. She said in this area, you will find they were much more balanced -- the 18th 551 and the 9th 536. The 20th 674 and 11th 631. The 13th 802, the global high, the 20th 674 and 11th 631. She said the 4th and the 22nd -- 620 and 656. She said the 1st, 4th and 21st -- and one thing you have to remember in these, we are talking about crossing county legislative lines. Now, we are talking about old lines before, Mrs. Galvin said. The 1st 921, that is quite high, the 4th 621 and the 21st 656. She said the 1st and the 27th, again the 1st was a big one 921 and the 27th 551. The 1st, 10th and 27th, picking up the 921, 525 and 551. She said the 1st and the 10th, 921 abutting a 525 district. She said the 18th, 2nd and 16th, 633, 642 and 652. She said those are well balanced. The old 19th and 6th with the 6th at 800 -- a little on the high side -- and the 19th at 521. She said the 10th and 27th -- 525 and 551. She said the old 26th and the old 12th -- 683 and 407. The 15th and 4th -- and the 25th something was going to have to be done with that anyway because that is 12,9... exceeding the number we are supposed to have in it -- and the 24th at 609.

Councilwoman Galvin said we have some new ones for comparisons. She said on these remember that the pink area which was what we are talking about is the county 10th. She said so we do not have much choice about the area, it just depends on where the lines are drawn to create the districts. The new proposed 27th would have 833 and the new proposed 1st would only have 258 -- we are not particularly well balanced. Mr. Cirillo asked if he could point something out at this point. Ms. Galvin said sure. Mr. Cirillo said because you brought up a lot of points and would you please put up the last one -- on this particular one, we are talking about a low number here and a high number there -- the voting place for the 27th is right at Meadowbrook Drive. He said the voting place for here is down the Slingerlands Fire Hall. He said if we could split this up -- for instance, if he had taken this area here that was west of Blessing Road and added it to the 1st there is not that much numbers like was mentioned -- the individuals would have to drive down across the Normanskill Creek, down to the Fire Hall to vote. In doing this, we are trying to minimize the amount of change in each district, according to Mr. Cirillo. He said for the short amount of time that we had to prepare this and we were going by a date which we were preparing this -- we tried to do a minimal amount of change and that was the reason for that. Councilwoman Galvin said one of her questions is also whether or not the 833 figure is a valid number which is unclear. She said the new and in looking at this, you have to remember that the 1st in the 10th county legislative district and the 4th and 21st are in the 35th county legislative district. She said that would be 258, 766 and the whopping 900 over there. She said, again, not having a professional type copier for this type of thing, she apologizes when it gets blurry but we are talking about 18th, 9th and 11th -- keyed at 825 and remember the 18th has been increased, the 9th at 535 and the 11th at 626. She said the 4th and the 21st and these are in the same county legislative district which is the 35th, on these we have the 4th at 766 and the 21st at 900. But, while we are still on that, Ms. Galvin said if you will recall, the 35th leads down around the 8th. So, she said there is some area where adjustments can be made. She said the 12th and 23rd, we have a 380, abutting a 586. She said this is one of her favorites, now you have to recognize that we have crossed over and we have the 36th and the 35th county legislative districts but she is sorry, she could not resist putting the rabbit on the screen. She said we have a very

interesting shape and the 19th is very large and has 680. The 24th which she does not see how it can be considered compact has 835 and the 25th has 760 and ears. She said the 25th started out with one large ear and one small ear but the 24th helped out and made it a better rabbit. The 26th, 12th and 2nd -- the 12th had 380 voters, the 26th has 185 and the 2nd which is in another county legislative district -- that is over in the 34th while these are in the 33rd, has 800. However, Ms. Galvin said what is particularly interesting to note is the 26th with not compact again, 185 voters -- very small and the 12th another very small district with 380. The 19th and the 6th, the proposed 6th would have 891 on the high side to say the least and the 19th would have 680. She said proposed -- and again on the 10th and 27th, remember we are talking about 2 different county legislative districts so there is not a lot we can do about that -- the 10th we are basically stuck with. She said the 10th only has 340 and the proposed 27th would have the 833, if in fact that number is correct, given this add on area. The 10th and 27th -- again they are basically showing the same thing in there. The 15th, 26th and the 12th -- they are all in the same, proposed county 33rd -- the 15th very large with 800 picking up the primary population area out of the old 1st, the 26th having a poultry 185 and the 12th with 380. And the 12th and 26th that we have just talked about again.

Councilwoman Galvin said these are in the same county legislative districts. She said they were talking about the 35th and talking about the 24th and 25th. She said she was fascinated by the rabbit, she was sorry. She said she has a big problem with the 24th not only because of the Bernard Place area which we previously discussed and the error in the county figures but also in the very shape of both the 24th and the 25th, not really being compact districts and again the same thing.

Councilwoman Galvin said now just to make it a little simpler, we tried to show you the 10th county legislative district, they are talking about the pink area over here and that is the area which it encompasses. Again, assuming the county descriptions are right, which she hates to do. She said the county 12th and that is what is our 10th Town election district and that is the one they are stuck with no matter what, if the county line stays. The 33rd county legislative district again, we are just showing you the 33rd over here is the green. She said on this one she has to give an apology, she did not -- she forgot and she did not have an opportunity to add on Dom DeCecco's point of residence but he would be in the 33rd and she tried to do that in the others. The 34th and that is Gordon Morris and Gordon is right up in there and that is the area in the center here with the blue going around, she said. Supervisor Ringler asked if the little tail over there follows the county legislative district. She said right, these are the county legislative districts and that is why she apologizes because she did not get Dom's residence in. She said they ran out of time. And, she said this is the 35th and that is Jim Ross and that is where Jim Ross is in the 35th and that is the blue over here going around like this. She said the 36th which is the orange.

Councilwoman Galvin said they are back to their problem and she is going to be very brief on it, the Bernard Place description, if we go by the meets and bounds which is the proper thing to do on the county description, then this area which is marked in bilious pink, is in fact included in the new county 36th district with the 35th that comes down and abuts it. She said that gives us... Mr. Cirillo said seeing you have mentioned that probably on 4 occasions already, he said he still disagrees with her and he does have some additional information which he wants to provide but... He said finish her... Ms. Galvin said go ahead. Supervisor Ringler suggested they get this resolved, asking Mr. Cirillo to proceed. Mr. Cirillo said let's straighten out Bernard Place. He asked if she had the description that could be read. Ms. Galvin said she does. Mr. Cirillo said they are talking not about a Town line but about a legislative line. He asked that Ms. Galvin pick up the point from the 9W to Hague Boulevard. Councilwoman Galvin said okay, then southwesterly along Route 9W to its intersection with Hague Boulevard, then westerly in a curvilinear fashion along Hague Boulevard to its intersection with Bernard Place, then southwesterly along Bernard Place to its intersection with Elm Avenue East. Mr. Cirillo said okay, Sheila,

this is the tax maps for that area of Dowerskill, Hague Boulevard and Bernard Place do not meet until you get down near Elm Avenue East. In other words, he continued, you have Guilder Lane, Amsterdam, in no way are you going to switch over to Bernard Place until you get down to this intersection. He said one of the things, you have a description and you have a map that was provided with the description. He said the description when he read it, he knew it could not occur unless they were getting the streets mixed up down here. He said you go to the next piece of evidence and that being the map. He said the intersection which they are calling Bernard, they are calling this tie from here to Elm Avenue East as Bernard -- in essence, Mr. Cirillo said the street went through and it is actually Hague Boulevard. If anything, he said, if you want to call the little section here, 100 feet Bernard, that would be the case. He said you may want to further examine it. Ms. Galvin said she still has a problem using... Councilman Webster asked to have it read again where it says Hague intersects Bernard. Supervisor Ringler asked that it be gone over one more time. Councilwoman Galvin read then southwesterly along Route 9W to its intersection with Hague Boulevard, then westerly in a curvilinear fashion along Hague Boulevard to its intersection with Bernard Place. Supervisor Ringler indicated it was right here, because that is not Bernard Place, that is Amsterdam Avenue. Councilwoman Galvin said what she liked to point out is if we are referring to that as the intersection of Bernard Place, then we have to go back because that is not the only time that the county lines have been incorrect. She said going back over to -- and she has to find which one it is -- several of them referred specifically to North Street intersecting with Kenwood Avenue. Mr. Cirillo said it is actually Adams. Ms. Galvin said that actually is Adams Street. She said so these have been consistently incorrect, whether they are referring to Amsterdam -- the intersection with Amsterdam Avenue and going up around the loop or whether they are referring to Bernard Place is unknown. Councilman Webster asked why they would assume that it is Amsterdam in this case, when Bernard Place does intersect Hague. Councilwoman Galvin said because in fact if we follow the description that they set forth in here, Bernard Place intersects Bernard Place terminates at Hague. Therefore, Ms. Galvin said the correct reading would be continuing along Hague Boulevard to its intersection with Elm Avenue East, unless they intended to go somewhere else back here. Mr. Cirillo said he believes they misthought that Bernard tied in -- in other words, once you got down here, you swung along Bernard to Elm Avenue East. He said it is more reasonable to believe this than to believe they meant to go up to Amsterdam or up to Guilder and then along Bernard plus they have a map that shows this as being the route. Councilwoman Galvin said the map show only Hague Boulevard, the map does not show Bernard Place at all. Mr. Cirillo said it shows it going straight through. Ms. Galvin said it shows it going straight on Hague, it does not show Bernard, however.

Councilwoman Galvin said she cannot tell what they mean by it because it is wrong. Councilman Webster asked if we would assume... Ms. Galvin said no because if we assume that, then we have to assume that North Street intersects Kenwood Avenue. She said there are a whole bunch of errors in this. Councilman Webster said we assume that they made an error twice, right. Ms. Galvin said many more than twice. Councilman Webster said twice that she had brought to the attention of the Board. Mr. Cirillo said he would pass the map around for the Board's benefit. Ms. Galvin said she didn't... Mr. Cirillo said you will notice down at the bottom here that going along Hague Boulevard and then they come out. Supervisor Ringler said yes.

Supervisor Ringler asked Ms. Galvin to go on. Ms. Galvin said this is the questioned area. Supervisor Ringler said that was right. Councilman Webster asked if that was not easily satisfied with the county. Ms. Galvin said the county has to tell us. Mr. Webster said this is what he said. Supervisor Ringler said in his view, counselor, if this is an issue, if we pass this based upon what is on the maps and what Mr. Cirillo has assumed and tell them that, it would be up to them to come back and correct it with us if it was wrong. Attorney Kaplowitz said he does not know what else can be done. Councilman Webster said it was a minor little thing he meant as far as numbers are concerned. Ms. Galvin said it would be minor

if it were not going back and forth between two... Attorney Kaplowitz asked Mr. Cirillo if he was satisfied with his interpretation. Mr. Cirillo said yes, he was. Mr. Kaplowitz said the only thing you can do is verify it with the county and make sure we agree. Councilman Webster said that was all. Mr. Kaplowitz said if you do not agree, then there is a problem. Councilwoman Galvin said since she received this Sunday night at 5:45 p.m. she did not have an opportunity to verify it. She said they have heard a lot of comments that people only had 2 weeks to get things done and we got these county lines at 5:45 on Sunday and that was only through the graciousness of Kathy coming in to get them for us. Supervisor Ringler asked if they worked 24 hours a day all weekend. Councilman Webster said why don't we just assume it and then if they say no, we just flop it to the other district. Councilwoman Galvin said you cannot tell, it affects numbers and asked if she could continue for a moment please. Supervisor Ringler asked that she continue.

Councilwoman Galvin said now, she has complained about numbers of voters in districts not being equal, complained about districts not being in a compact manner, complained about districts not following roads, streams, or the like -- now, again, disclaimer is that she is working from 1989 numbers and the new as proposed numbers and trying to come up with alternatives. She said she has a proposed alternative in which basically we are talking about 18,000 registered voters in the Town, coming out with 30 districts approximately 600 voters per district and this is an enlarged area of this and also -- she knows one of the other issues that gets raised is proposed polling places -- they have proposed polling places all within a reasonable distance of the 30 districts. She said Bob has a copy of the proposed map for each of you to look at and she knows that this is the same thing that we heard about on Wednesday night, having something dropped on us. She said this is just a suggestion and a proposal, there is a proposed alternative, it is possible to do this. She said they started this basically Sunday night, once they found out exactly where the county legislative lines were and they do have an alternative. She said she has not just come in and complained and made loud growling noises, she also does have a viable alternative to be looked at. She thanked everyone.

Councilman Gunner asked what the impacts are that she sees under the ones that were presented to us. Councilwoman Galvin said basically we are not following the Election Law. She said the Election Law very specifically... we have... this is only going to happen again in another 10 years when we have another census. She said we have an opportunity to correct districts which do not follow the natural streams, roads or visible boundaries that we are required to follow under the Election Law. She further said we have an opportunity to create basically more compact districts and we have an opportunity to get the number of voters roughly equalized. Again, as she said, she was working from 1989 numbers and trying to meld in the new as proposed numbers, not being able to justify most of the new as proposed numbers because they did not match up with what appeared to be the number of registered voters actually in those districts. Councilman Gunner asked what the impact borderline. Councilwoman Galvin said she had no idea.

Supervisor Ringler asked what the law says in regard to the number. He asked if the only number mentioned is that it cannot be over 1,000. Councilwoman Galvin said it cannot be over 950 or 1100 and some odd. Attorney Kaplowitz said if you have 2 machines. Supervisor Ringler said there is no other number mentioned in the law, just the maximum. Councilwoman Galvin said just the maximum. Councilman Webster noted each district has 2 machines anyway, asking if this was correct. Attorney Kaplowitz said just about which is much more than is required.

Supervisor Ringler said you mentioned the term compact on many occasions and asked number 1, what your definition of compact is and number 2, what the principle behind that is. Councilwoman Galvin said the principle behind compact is Section 4-100 sub 3A of the Election Laws amended each election district shall be in compact form and the boundary lines must be streets, rivers, railroad lines or permanent characteristics of the landscape which are clearly visible to any person without the need to use any technical or mechanical

device. She said that is the basis. Supervisor Ringler asked for the definition of compact. He said he guessed his sense is that the rationale behind that is to have a polling place that is convenient to the people who want to vote, this is his guess he stated and said maybe he is presuming something that he is incorrect on. He said this was his guess. Councilman Gunner said he guesses that is why he asked his question, what is the political impact because if you do have spread out areas and narrow areas... Attorney Kaplowitz said the requirements now and this could change, one man, one vote, one woman, one vote, because everybody who runs in the Town election runs in the whole Town -- he suggests it does not make any difference what the size of the districts are. He said an Assembly district is different, you represent only the person in your Assembly district. He said everybody we have runs at large, so to speak, meaning that they represent the whole Town. Councilwoman Galvin said with the exception of committee people in the two parties. Attorney Kaplowitz said well, all right but he... most of that is covered by not the election law, he does not think -- indicating he is not sure -- but by their own political party rules. He said this is what he thinks. Councilwoman Galvin said basically the issue has been raised about polling places and there is a listing of proposed polling places. Supervisor Ringler asked if they were identified on this map. Councilwoman Galvin said they have not been identified on the map per se but she does have a listing which can be provided. Never mind Bob, Ms. Galvin said.

Councilman Gunner asked if this has any impact on where people live... Supervisor Ringler asked Mr. Gunner to talk just a little louder, he could not hear him. Councilman Gunner said he was wondering whether this has any impact on those who are running for County office. Councilwoman Galvin said no, they are within the County legislative districting and has absolutely nothing to do with them. Councilman Gunner asked if that was under Ms. Galvin's new plan. Councilwoman Galvin said and again, this is a proposal, it was done between Sunday night and last night. She said it is a proposal, it is merely to show that it is possible to create compact districts with more balanced number of voters, these have an average of approximately 600 voters in each and they have election polling places which are within the same parameters of distance as the polling places that have been referred to in the currently pending proposal.

Supervisor Ringler stated that one of the things Mr. Cirillo tried to do, as he said, was to try and keep polling places as close to possible as to where they are now. He asked Ms. Galvin if there was going to be a lot of changing in polling places as a result of this for people. Ms. Galvin said no, they are using all the same polling places. Supervisor Ringler asked for individuals on where they vote. Councilwoman Galvin said the majority of them would be in the same polling place. She said the districts have been strictly renumbered because she started with 1 at the top and went through going back and forth 1,2,3. She said that was merely so that there would not be confusion and to try to maintain some semblance of order in following numbering of districts. Again, Ms. Galvin said this is only a proposal but it can be done in a short period of time. Again, she said she was working from the 1989 books and trying to use the estimated number of voter figures that we had basically going off of two things -- the estimates and the registered voters for June 1992 on the incineration plant registration. She said this was a proposal, her primary concern is that they give this adequate study and that we not rush to vote on something without studying what we have without knowing where we stand and without trying to balance districts. She said 30 districts, approximately 18,000 voters, averages out to 600 a district...

Supervisor Ringler said he just had a bottom line question for him, is that you have done a lot of work here and he appreciates her interest and efforts and so forth, where is the voter in the Town of Bethlehem being adversely affected by what Mr. Cirillo did, compared to what she had done. Councilwoman Galvin said in her opinion, a violation of the Election Law in not having compact districts. Supervisor Ringler noted but again, they do not have a definition of compact. He said he could put these up and make squiggles out of them as well. Ms. Galvin said in that case, how about not following

streets, streams or boundary lines. Supervisor Ringler said that is a question he has. Ms. Galvin said we have several districts where we do not follow roads or streams. Mr. Ringler said that is a question that he has and okay, she has made a valid point on that. Councilwoman Galvin said this is just a proposal, that is all this is. Supervisor Ringler said he guesses we are talking about a lot of effort has gone into what Mr. Cirillo did and a lot of effort has gone into what you did and we are trying to do something for -- you know, to get this to the County so that the elections, they can go on here but he guesses he goes back to -- you know, this whole process is as a result -- you know, you talk about rabbit heads and so forth, when you look at the county districts, they use very similar animals and we have to work within that and Mr. Cirillo, he knows, tried to do this in a very short period of time keeping lines similar to where they were so people can vote in the same place and so forth. He said the end result is... the question he has is, yes, if we had 6 months he was sure we probably could scientifically put this in the very, very good form but the point is, if we do go ahead with this and let's say the Board elects to go ahead with Mike's suggestion here, are we causing a problem for the residents of Bethlehem. He said to him, the issue is where they vote and he has one question for Ms. Newkirk and a suggestion to her that she look at the 19th for a possible new voting place because based upon the new lines, he and Mr. Cirillo talked about this, it is not geographically centered. But, he guesses to him that that is the bottom line, is the convenience of the voters and are we inconveniencing them with what we are doing or are we taking any of their rights away. Councilwoman Galvin said one of issues that you have just raised is whether or not we are taking away any of their rights, she does not believe they are taking away any of their rights if we create balanced voting districts in which we have true one man, one vote. She admittedly in Town-wide elections, that does not have a tremendous impact but there are certain elections in which that does have an impact. She said one that jumps to mind is each enrolled voter in a political party in this Town has the right to vote for committeemen, there are two committeemen for each district and a district with 185 voters has two committeemen just as a district with 900 voters in. Supervisor Ringler asked if when they vote within the parties, do they not vote on a weighted vote. Councilwoman Galvin said not always weighted voting. Attorney Kaplowitz said it is supposed to be weighted voting. Ms. Galvin said it is not always done as weighted voting. Councilman Gunner excused her and asked what the... Attorney Kaplowitz said the committees operate under the county rules which flow down from the State rules. He said he can only talk about one party. He said he does not believe and he would have to look at it, but it is not an Election Law problem, it is inner political thing. He said the county rules in Albany County -- he only tell from the Republican side only -- require weighted vote. So that each committeemen votes for the number of voters. Councilman Gunner asked if that was written. Mr. Kaplowitz said it was. Councilman Webster said as he gets fewer voters, he gets fewer votes. Councilman Gunner said he knows what is meant by weighted voting, he is just trying to establish some back-up for what was said.

Councilwoman Galvin said she would like to point out that in her experience, it is not always weighted voting within committees. Mr. Kaplowitz said weighted voting has to do with voting on candidates, he does not think it is used on anything else. Supervisor Ringler said this is a party issue, as opposed to governmental issue. Councilwoman Galvin said it is governmental based on -- we establish the election districts. She said those are the election districts in which the committeemen serve. Attorney Kaplowitz asked if Ms. Galvin was equating compact with equal. Councilwoman Galvin said no, she is equating compact -- compact has nothing to do with equal. She said what she tried to do is as long as she was doing a proposal and redrawing, she tried to make it equal as possible following roads, streams, natural boundaries, readily visible, whatever the Election Law specified. But what she said she would like to have us do is take a look at this, we have an opportunity, a wonderful opportunity now that this is before us from the county, county doing a redraw -- she is not saying she is necessarily thrilled with the way the county did the redraw, they have not helped us in being able to equalize the districts but they have helped... but they have given us a vehicle to get this started to look at it and let's do it right.

Supervisor Ringler said he wished to ask another follow-up question -- not a follow-up another question. He asked supposed we go ahead with what is being suggested from the Engineering Department and so forth and we do this and then 2, 3, 4 years within a census period, are we allowed to change these districts ourselves. Mr. Kaplowitz said you are allowed to split them when they reach a certain size. Supervisor Ringler said no, he means, can we go back and give it a total view and spend the time that Ms. Galvin is suggesting that we might want to do. Attorney Kaplowitz said he does think that is within the Town Board's purview, sure. Councilwoman Galvin said she was not quite sure as to exactly what we can do under the Election Law once we set these districts. Attorney Kaplowitz said it is a Town Board function to set the election districts. He said he does not think you are limited to doing it only every 10 years, you have to do it every 10 years based on the census. Councilwoman Galvin said one of the things that she does not like is the way we are being backed into a corner and rammed with time on this. She said it is a point, it is something that deserves time, study and scrutiny. She said believe me she put time on this since last Thursday looking at the districts, giving them careful study. She said she thinks it is something that they should not jump into something and she thinks it is something that they should not do with a gun to our head in terms of time frame. Attorney Kaplowitz said it is possible -- this is something for you to think about -- he is not sure he knows the answer -- adopt what we have for this year and look at them for next year. He said the reason he says this is the first day to file petitions is July 9. Supervisor Ringler said this is his concern. Mr. Kaplowitz further noted if it does not change. Councilwoman Galvin said her question is since the county maps... Councilman Webster asked what this affected. Attorney Kaplowitz said he was not sure, the only thought he has is that every petition asks for the election district after the person's name. He said he was not sure, he does not know why they ask that to be honest. Councilman Webster said that answered his question, because we in no way, shape or manner can adjust the legislative districts. Councilwoman Galvin said no. Councilman Webster said not the county legislative districts. Attorney Kaplowitz said no, right. Councilman Webster said they are set in gold, in stone rather and those are the only districts that are going to be involved in the up and coming election. Attorney Kaplowitz said there is a Town-wide election which means nothing as far as that is concerned. Mr. Webster asked why we could not stay with what we have currently without any alterations, without any alterations whatsoever as long as we are confident that that law states that we do not have any deadline, go with the current county legislative districts, stay with the election districts we presently have and look at this the rest of the year. Supervisor Ringler asked how do people vote then. Mr. Webster said they vote where they are. Mr. Ringler said how do they vote on the ballot... Attorney Kaplowitz asked Mr. Webster when he said stay with the ones we have, the ones Mike drew. Supervisor Ringler asked Mr. Webster if he was talking about not changing them at all. Mr. Webster said yes, the ones we drew. Councilwoman Galvin said there are a couple problems. Attorney Kaplowitz said Mr. Webster is talking about the ones Mr. Cirillo drew. Councilman Webster said we have to stay with what Mike drew because it overlaps. Councilman Gunner said he thought you were talking about the original. Mr. Webster said no, you can't stay with the old ones because they overlap. Supervisor Ringler noted we all misunderstood you together Mr. Webster. Councilman Webster said he was looking at... Attorney Kaplowitz said that you cannot do, you do not have that alternative. Councilman Webster said he had already spent a lot of time with Mike and he in his own mind, looked at that as the new districts, but that is beside the point. Supervisor Ringler said the existing districts is what you meant.

Attorney Kaplowitz asked Mr. Cirillo if he had something he wanted to tell them. Mr. Cirillo said he just wants to repeat what he said before. He said when... the date is crucial here according to the way we were working on it. Somebody -- it was mentioned to us, according to Mr. Cirillo, that we had a certain date to do something. So, he said if you get a project to do something do you take a blank map and start all over or do you try and make the adjustments to what you have to meet what the new alignment of the county was. He said and that is what we were trying to do, minimize

the amount of voter jumping around from one district to the other and we put things which were adjoining districts into another district. He said he is not totally satisfied with the numbers, one of the things we are using for census and he does not know what is being used for numbers in here, because he had trouble... Councilwoman Galvin said she used Ms. Newkirk's numbers of the registered voters. She said she only used registered voters. Mr. Cirillo said that is good but when you put a dividing line down, how do you know how much was to the right and left of that. He said he was using a census map. Ms. Galvin said they were using the election books. Mr. Cirillo said they were using the census maps and trying to put things together as best we could in the amount of time. He said the county and the state they have these geographical information systems which they can outline a district and with the touch of a key, tell you how many voters are in there. He said we do not have this type of thing where we can balance everything out, we were just trying to make do with what we had in the short period of time. Ms. Galvin told Mr. Cirillo she appreciated all of his time and effort and she knows he did the... you did a very quick job on this but her problem is with the length of time and the fact that we are being again asked to rush and adopt something without having time to give it adequate consideration and without having time to look at any alternatives and basically rushing into another decision. She said we have had problems with that in the past. Supervisor Ringler said he guesses he can agree with her on the significance of that but he does not see where we are adversely affecting anybody by going ahead with this. Councilwoman Galvin said she thinks we are violating the Election Law by... Supervisor Ringler said he thinks that is something subject to interpretation, okay, compact is something that he is still having a problem with. Councilwoman Galvin said she is not talking about compact. Supervisor Ringler said okay, but the district lines again, he does not know the answer to that, as to whether or not you can say by having 500 feet off a street, but those are minor in relation to the big picture and he thinks, his personal feeling is, after listening to all this, yes, at some point he thinks and maybe it is next year -- maybe it would not be a bad idea to spend some time and really look at all this, but he does not see where we are going to cause a major problem for anybody by going ahead with all of this. He said he thinks what is being talked about are minor technical problems. Councilwoman Galvin said she would like to spend some time before we vote on something, look at the minor technical problems, get it corrected and do it right the first time instead of going back and having to patch up a mess.

Attorney Kaplowitz asked if we had to adopt something before July 9. Supervisor Ringler said the county is asking us to do that. He said Ms. Galvin is pointing out legally that she is not so sure that we do have that obligation, correct me if I am wrong. Councilwoman Galvin said that is correct, as far as she understands it, they have not even filed their maps yet, so we cannot be sure that these are the right maps. Councilman Webster asked what happened when people come to their houses with a petition. Councilwoman Galvin said how do you know what the county lines are, as we sit here today Fred if they are not filed. Attorney Kaplowitz said he cannot believe they are not filed, asking who told her that. Ms. Galvin said Kathy said Sunday they weren't. Ms. Newkirk said according to what she has from information from the Board of Elections, the Albany County Board of Elections, they had not as of the date these descriptions were sent to us for the legislative districts. Attorney Kaplowitz asked when that was. Ms. Newkirk said when she first gave them to Mr. Cirillo which was probably two weeks ago. Ms. Galvin said Kathy your note to me... Ms. Newkirk said she wrote that because that is all the information... Attorney Kaplowitz said he does not know that they are but he is just trying to get to the bottom of this. Ms. Newkirk said she does not know either that is what she is saying -- she could only give you what information she had and that was her information. Supervisor Ringler asked if we could make a simple phone call. Attorney Kaplowitz said but 2 weeks have gone by. Councilman Webster said somebody must know whether or not it was filed down there. Attorney Kaplowitz said he would hope so, well, then again, he is not so sure down there. Attorney Kaplowitz noted he was sure we could call and find out. Supervisor Ringler asked if they want Kathy to make a quick call. Councilwoman Fuller said that is what we are asking, isn't it a simple phone

call. Supervisor Ringler said time out. Ms. Newkirk said you can continue, it is running.

Councilman Webster said he liked Sheila's idea of the numbers being more equally adjusted but he thinks we need time. Councilwoman Galvin said she thinks we need time too, Fred. She said that is her big gripe is we need time to do it right. Mr. Webster said that is why he asked can't we temporary... can't we adopt on a temporary basis so that at least when the petitions come out on July 8th, people know where they are and then go into this whole hog. Councilwoman Galvin said she wants to be very sure we have that opened as an option. Attorney Kaplowitz said that is going to be a nightmare also because how are they going to know where they are, what district they are, where the process is changing. Supervisor Ringler said what he is more inclined, is if you can tell me that we can do this next year is to adopt this so people know where they are voting and then go for a major overhaul. Councilman Webster said that is exactly what he is saying. Attorney Kaplowitz said he would have to look at it but he is pretty sure that you can. Supervisor Ringler said he was reading what Sheila said before, he thought that is what you could do. He said you know, except... Councilwoman Galvin said the date that... she can't... Supervisor Ringler said this was done in 1985, that was not as a result of census, I mean... Councilwoman Galvin said those changes were done because districts got too big. Supervisor Ringler said okay. Councilwoman Galvin said you were dealing with a lot of big districts, overweight districts. She said basically what it is talking about ... before January 15th, we are talking about if it was going to be done for next year, it would have to be done so that we could file on or before January 15. Councilman Gunner said except this year is different because we have the elections coming up. Supervisor Ringler except that we have the creation and an alteration of a... Councilwoman Galvin said this year it is different. Supervisor Ringler said any creation, consolidation, division or alteration of election districts in any year shall be made on or before January 15th. He said so, if we went to work on this for next year... a year from November, we have to have it done by January 15th as he reads this. Councilman Webster said that is a hell of a lot better deadline than July 1st, you know. Attorney Kaplowitz said there was a reason for that too. Councilman Webster said he knows it, but... Attorney Kaplowitz said he is sure, there is no question that you... you have the authority, the only group that has the authority to change the election districts is the Town is the Town Board and we split them when they get over a certain size -- indicating we have done that in the past a few times -- and he is sure you can change them any time you want. Attorney Kaplowitz said he cannot conceive of who else who could.

Councilwoman Galvin said after reading that Section 4-100 she is not clear that they tell us. Attorney Kaplowitz said the State of New York shall be divided into election districts which shall be the basic political subdivision...blah, blah, blah... the creation, consolidation, division or alteration of election districts shall be done by the legislative body of the city or town within which the election district is contained except in -- mentions some of the big cities -- and then it deals with the cities. Councilwoman Galvin said there is no question that we can do it it is just when. Attorney Kaplowitz said there is no question that you can do it, any time during the... Councilwoman Galvin asked why we have to do it now. Attorney Kaplowitz said he is not sure he knows the answer to that. He said there was a period where you could change it and unless, it was done -- for instance, January 15, 1990 because they knew the census was coming and they did not want any changes made so that is all passed.

Councilwoman Galvin asked under Section 4-100 there is also the provision that you cannot do it in years ending with a 7. Councilwoman Fuller said and continue along here, there is something ending with zero. Mr. Kaplowitz said the zero is the one he remembers. He said he thinks they just knew the census was coming every 10 years, he thinks, but he does not think there is any question that they can do that. Councilman Webster said the next two years do not end with a 0 or 7, do they. Mrs. Fuller said they might. Councilman Galvin said it depends on what the county adopts. Attorney Kaplowitz said it is not a question of do you have to change

it, he thinks you have to change them because of the county legislative races. He said you do not have a choice. He said you cannot use the old ones, if you want to take time and adopt this and then look at the other and do the whole thing, he thinks that makes the most sense. Mr. Webster asked what... Attorney Kaplowitz said he also thinks you cannot do anything because then you are violating the law, your election districts do not balance with the county districts. Councilman Webster said wouldn't we also have the benefit of the new total number of people that are eligible to vote as a result of the November election. He asked if the books would then be updated for us, won't we have a better handle as to how many people are registered voters. Attorney Kaplowitz said he does not think it tells you much, you get a little bit in a presidential year because you get a bigger turn out. Councilwoman Galvin said she did not think you can wait that long. Councilman Webster said we have until January 15th. Councilwoman Galvin said again, it would be under the gun, when those numbers from November would come out. Attorney Kaplowitz said the numbers are available but the enrollment books do not come out. Councilman Webster said Kathy would have those prior to election. Councilwoman Galvin said it is the enrollment books that show you which side of the street they are on and where they are if you are drawing lines down the middle of the street. Councilman Gunner said we are not looking for how many people voted, we are looking for registrations. Attorney Kaplowitz asked if the census blocks give you that kind of information. He said he has never seen what they look like. Mr. Cirillo said the census blocks just give you the dwelling units. Attorney Kaplowitz asked if you could tell one side of the street from the other. Mr. Cirillo said yes, you have to follow blocks. They give you them in blocks and they give you the number of dwelling units in those blocks and that is what we utilize in this.

Councilman Gunner said we will wait for the Supervisor, Mr. Webster said we could vote without him. Mr. Gunner said he guesses what our problem is as we sit here and listen, is that we are concerned that we will confuse the issues when people go out for the county elections because they go by... Attorney Kaplowitz said that is why we are going through this, because the law requires us not to confuse them with the county redistricting. Mr. Gunner said so, we have done it so it would coincide, everything will be okay. Mr. Webster said they will be turning in bad petitions if we do not. Mr. Gunner said that is what he is trying to get at, okay. He said in order to have the petitions they have to know what division they are in and we have to have it ready to go by the 9th, asking if this was true. Attorney Kaplowitz said that is the date so far.

Councilwoman Galvin asked Ms. Newkirk for the information she obtained. Supervisor Ringler asked for a clarification. Ms. Galvin said the answer please. Supervisor Ringler said Mr. Kaplowitz's answer was the right answer. Ms. Newkirk said she is not sure she has the answer but we have as much as we have. Ms. Newkirk said Cathy Ragowski, Board of Elections, said the maps that they have and that we have gone through all of this work on, are the maps that they are assuming are the approved maps. Ms. Ragowski also said they do not have anything in writing from the officials as far as the maps are concerned to this date -- and this is right to today. Ms. Newkirk continued, they have nothing in writing. They have the legislature approved the maps, the maps then go to the state. Attorney Kaplowitz said that was what he wanted to know, the legislature has adopted the maps. Ms. Newkirk continued they have adopted them but there is nothing in writing. Supervisor Ringler asked from whom. Ms. Newkirk said from the legislature to the Albany County Board of Elections. So, therefore, Ms. Newkirk continued, they are using these maps to do all of this work. Attorney Kaplowitz said they are not saying that they are not legal maps or not adopted or anything. Ms. Newkirk said no, she is just saying she does not have anything in writing, which is what Ms. Newkirk specified in the beginning. Attorney Kaplowitz said he was not questioning but he does not know if Ms. Ragowski is entitled to anything if the legislature adopted them. Ms. Newkirk said she did not know about that part of it. Ms. Galvin asked, they are not valid until they are filed are they. Ms. Newkirk said Ms. Ragowski said she has nothing in writing to verify that they were the adopted maps. Attorney Kaplowitz said she has the maps so they are filed. Ms. Galvin asked

if she has the maps, are they filed with her. Ms. Newkirk said she has the maps -- Ms. Newkirk indicated the maps that she received are the maps that Ms. Ragowski has. Ms. Galvin asked if they were filed with the Board of Elections or are these just things -- how did she get them. Ms. Newkirk said she did not specifically say filed. Supervisor Ringler asked if the legislature gave her the maps. Ms. Newkirk said Ms. Ragowski said she has nothing in writing to verify it. Attorney Kaplowitz said okay. Ms. Newkirk said the bottom line right now is... Ms. Galvin said she has a big problem. Ms. Newkirk said everything that is piling up is the fact that without the new districts there are problems with the legislature. She said the people cannot go out with their petitions because they do not know what people to go to. So, she said you are looking at holding that up, you are also looking at the polling places, the election inspectors -- because they send the post cards out to each one of them and consequently all of this gets held up at this time, so that the bottom line is, if this has to be done, in order to go forward with anything from there, she said by July 9th they are supposed to have... or July 8th rather they are supposed to have new enrollment books with all of the people indicated in their districts to the State. Ms. Galvin asked how they can do that if they do not have anything in writing showing what the county districts are. Ms. Newkirk said she does not know what the procedures are as far as the County Board of Elections. Supervisor Ringler said what you are telling... Councilwoman Galvin said how can we vote on county districts when the Board of Elections does not have anything from the county saying that these are definitely what it is. Supervisor Ringler said we received a letter from the Board of Elections, did we not telling us to do this. Ms. Newkirk said she did not receive a letter. Supervisor Ringler asked what the letter was that she showed to him this morning. Ms. Newkirk asked what letter. Supervisor Ringler said telling you to get your enrollment books up to date or something along those lines, or maps will be coming. He said Ms. Newkirk received the maps from the County Board of Elections. Ms. Newkirk said she got a copy of them and requested them by telephone because she said to Ms. Ragowski will you send me a copy of the maps that you are saying are the correct maps. Supervisor Ringler said if Mr. Hoblock wants us to pay for the Board of Elections, he is going to tell him... Attorney Kaplowitz said he would probably want 15 more employees.

Supervisor Ringler said the bottom line is he is concerned about the people in the Town of Bethlehem and having the opportunity to vote and get their names on the petitions and so forth. He said to do this, this work has to go forward even though the people at the hierarchy do not seem to be passing the information down correctly. He said the decisions have been made at the county legislature, they have passed them, the Board of Elections has said that the maps they have given us are the maps they want it done by and again, his feeling is that we should go ahead and reevaluate this for next year. He said we are acting in good faith and we are concerned about our residents and what more could people ask us for. He said he agrees that these squiggles as a result of the legislative districts look a little silly but again, he does not think anyone is getting hurt by the proposal. He said he is concerned with polling places, convenience of voting and things like that and he said he does not think they have violated that in any form or manner. He asked if there were any other thoughts.

Councilman Gunner said not a thought but just a clarification for himself. He asked if what you are saying is that we will go ahead with the ones Mike presented at the Town Board meeting, however, so that the petitions will be known and the people will all get a chance to vote. He said that sounds logical. Attorney Kaplowitz said among other things, one of the reasons for doing this timely, is the Board of Elections is required to notify every single one of those voters where their polling place is, in many cases it will be new polling places.

Councilwoman Galvin said one of her concerns is that if we adopt something now and then change it next year, we are really going to confuse them. Mr. Gunner said that is his second point, if we do this and it obliges us to let the public know why we have done it and that it will be done to conform in the future and whatever that

date... the group wants to set. Ms. Galvin said January 15th is the day it has to be filed by. Mr. Gunner said by January 15th. Supervisor Ringler said again, that is a determination, you know, he said let's get a sense on that -- Sheila has made a point that she would like to see the numbers more equitably distributed -- if the Board concurs with that, then we review it. Councilwoman Galvin said it is not just numbers more equitably distributed, it is following the requirements of the Election Law on the boundary lines of the districts and also... Supervisor Ringler said as he understood that, there is a question in the 12th and 26th. She said there are a couple of others, she didn't belabor this. Supervisor Ringler said what you are saying is that it follows a street and Mike is saying it follows a street but 500 feet from the street and whether or not that is technically correct. Ms. Galvin said what it very carefully tells us is that it is not supposed to be... it is supposed to be readily apparent and visible not by means of mechanical device. Supervisor Ringler asked in these particular areas where that follows, aren't there ravines behind the areas that basically... Ms. Galvin said no. Mr. Cirillo said the intent in some areas were that but the individuals would be one street. He said in other words, the houses on both sides would be in one district rather than go down the center line, the neighbors across the street in being in another district. He said that is why they picked a rear property line, for instance 100 foot back, that is why it went that way. He said that is the existing districts, they have been that way -- like he said, we are not doing anything new. Attorney Kaplowitz said that is preferable to splitting it down the middle of the street if you can avoid it, he would think. Ms. Galvin said lots of them do though and that is the Election Law directive. Councilman Gunner said the only possibility of impact anywhere in the ability to people to vote for whom they want or to become candidates, is within the parties that are represented within these districts that Mike drew. He said he was not giving you ownership but... Attorney Kaplowitz said he does not even know how the Democratic party operates, he has no idea of what they do. Supervisor Ringler said these numbers have been dispersed over the years and they have not seemed to have a problem with it. Councilman Gunner said but if what you said earlier, Bernie, that it is in the by-laws, he would assume... Attorney Kaplowitz said it is in the Committee By-laws, local or state or something. Mr. Gunner asked what it was for this Town. Attorney Kaplowitz said there is no such thing. He said they stop at the County line. Mr. Gunner said it does... it could affect the committee votes. Attorney Kaplowitz said the committee operates under the county rules, the Town committee operates under the county rules. Mr. Gunner asked if that was in the by-laws. Attorney Kaplowitz said yes. Ms. Galvin said it does not always follow weighted votes. Mr. Gunner said but if that is in the by-laws... Ms. Galvin said we do not have anything that says that, the county committee does but the Town does not. Attorney Kaplowitz said the Town does not have any rules because the law does not recognize towns political committees. He said every committeeman, republican, democratic or what else is a county committee person. Mr. Gunner said he sees. Mr. Kaplowitz said that is why we have county committee rules. He said if you were to look in the Election Law, he is pretty sure you will find there is no mention of the Town committeemen but there is mention of county committees. He said that is where as low as you go, so to speak.

Attorney Kaplowitz said the Election Law is written so nobody can understand it and he does not say it jokingly. Supervisor Ringler said you 3 attorneys what we were in today or two attorneys. Mr. Kaplowitz said if you could talk to people who work in the legislature on it, they want the two major parties to have a few people who understand it and absolutely nobody else to understand it. He said he is telling you that is intentional, they do not want liberals, conservatives to understand it or minor parties or too many republicans, just themselves to understand it and reading it is a challenge.

Councilman Gunner said he is amazed when he listens to things like that, how the state and federal government exist and if this happens at this local level, he is very happy he can be learning so much at this point in his life, but he has learned there is a lot of confusion. Councilwoman Fuller asked Mr. Gunner to identify for her what he has learned. Mr. Gunner said he has learned that the

beginning is not the end and that the end is not the beginning but when you go to the beginning you have to get to the end or you can go backwards and go from the end to the beginning. Mr. Kaplowitz said he has a lot of squeezing in to do in a few years. Mrs. Fuller said she agreed with him.

Supervisor Ringler asked the Board what they would like to do. Councilman Webster said it would not be to our benefit to use Mike's districts as such and maybe combine the 12th and 26th, would it. Supervisor Ringler asked if they vote in the same place. Mr. Webster and Ms. Galvin said no. Mr. Webster said they are both small districts but... Supervisor Ringler noted, Mr. Webster was saying eliminate one district. Mr. Webster said eliminating one district for now, yes, until we redo it. Councilwoman Fuller asked if that was the 12th and 26th. Mr. Webster said yes. Supervisor Ringler said he was looking at the wrong map, he was looking at Ms. Galvin's map. Ms. Galvin said she did that to confuse him. Mr. Webster said the 12th has only has 380 and 26 only has 180. Attorney Kaplowitz said 180 is awfully small. Ms. Galvin said the 180 adjoins the 300 and some odd. Councilman Webster said if we combine, temporarily, the 12th and 26th. Ms. Newkirk noted that there would be the elimination of a number if we do that. Supervisor Ringler said they will have to renumber everything. Ms. Galvin said no because 26 is just next to... Mr. Webster said 27 becomes 26. Ms. Galvin said it would just make 27, 26. Ms. Newkirk said you are eliminating a number. Mr. Webster said you eliminate 27 and move it up one and 26 becomes 12. Attorney Kaplowitz asked, you are eliminating a district. Ms. Newkirk said yes, if you do as Mr. Webster suggested. Mr. Webster said that is what you would be doing. Ms. Newkirk said if you combine 12 and 26, you are eliminating one election district. Mr. Webster said he was just looking at the small numbers. Attorney Kaplowitz said he hated to see the Board eliminating a district. Supervisor Ringler noted the 12th votes at the high school and the 26th votes over at Slingerlands Grade School. Mr. Webster said you already have 2 at the high school. Councilman Webster said it was just a suggestion, if not, go with the way it was, he did not care.

There was a discussion of the numbers and districts by everyone in attendance. Supervisor Ringler said ladies and gentlemen, there is another possibility here that will not take a lot of work from what Mike tells him. He said it might give a little more to the 26th, if that is what you are trying to do at this point in time as being the smallest district. He said of course, it makes a more interesting diagram for you to look at. Ms. Galvin asked if it had ears. Mr. Ringler said he did not know but he asked Mr. Cirillo to tell the Board. Mr. Cirillo said this is the legislative line here, Font Grove Road to railroad down to 85 and this was the portion that was cut out from number 1 because of the county line, that was applied to the 15th. He said the 26th is indicated at its low numbers, we could come up to New Scotland Avenue where it comes up to now and wrap around and come over to the Font Grove Road railroad tracks, down the railroad tracks, apply this which may add another couple hundred. Councilwoman Galvin said that would probably roughly add 400 to 450 voters. Mr. Cirillo said to the 26th. Ms. Galvin said the 486. Mr. Cirillo said this would take them away from the 15th and that at this stage of the game -- he did not know where Kathy is as far as -- Supervisor Ringler asked Mr. Cirillo what that did to him. He said there is an awful lot of work in process here, that is the only problem. Ms. Galvin said that is easier than eliminating a district. Ms. Newkirk said she has not touched the enrollment books so it is just the street index that would have to be altered. Councilman Webster said that sounds good. Supervisor Ringler said basically, what you would be doing, as he understands it because you mentioned it to him, is it was coming from the 1st to the 15th because the 26th wraps around here, give that to the 26th that will bring that very low one of 185 up to 600 or 700. Attorney Kaplowitz said that is better than eliminating one. Supervisor Ringler said he is concerned about doing away with a district and polling place. Councilwoman Galvin said she thinks we should be adding to them, not eliminating them. Councilman Webster said that sounds good. Attorney Kaplowitz said you are talking about 30, there is no point in dropping a district. Mr. Webster said that sounds good. Mrs. Fuller said fine, that is a much better idea.

Supervisor Ringler said he would like to offer a motion that we... Councilman Gunner had a questioned but said he would like to hear the motion and then make a motion.

Supervisor Ringler said the motion would be to proceed and authorize Mr. Cirillo's districts with the change that is being suggested and he can identify that for the record specifically before he finishes and that is basically it -- that we approve these. He said if the Board wishes to they can add a caveat to that... and also that the 24th be investigated with the County to be insured that that is correct. Attorney Kaplowitz said he did not think you need that in the motion. He said just have Mr. Cirillo do it. Councilman Webster said we should do that anyway. The Supervisor said the motion could say to change the 24th according to a County line. Councilwoman Galvin said if they can figure out where they meant it to run.

Councilman Gunner said so, however, the people are going to be voting in districts this year that will be different, conceivably, from the following year. Supervisor Ringler said some are. Councilman Gunner said many, maybe. Supervisor Ringler said yes, from the previous year you mean. Mr. Kaplowitz said yes. Councilman Gunner said well, from what we vote now. Supervisor Ringler said this was right. Councilwoman Fuller said no, he is talking about if we change it again. Councilman Gunner said they are going to get changed now, they are going to get changed again. Supervisor Ringler said if the Board is so inclined. Mr. Gunner said if the Board is so inclined to... if they go along with what you just did in the resolution. Supervisor Ringler said he did not say anything about changing again in that motion incidentally. He said that is a later decision. Councilwoman Fuller said he is only talking about Mr. Cirillo's motion. Supervisor Ringler said all we are talking about basically approving these with that change and look at that. Councilman Gunner said so now if we do change them again after this and we do it by January 15, there is plenty of leeway there before the people get notified, but he was just concerned to make sure the people were notified that there could be another change coming in some way or another, he did not know how you could do that. Supervisor Ringler said whenever it is changed, they are notified. He said they get a written notification. He said he guessed that as he thinks of this, he does not know when it is more proper to change. He said he knows we could straighten some things out, a couple things that Councilwoman Galvin wanted to look at but he is also thinking that we have a couple subdivisions on maps and so forth that may proceed, that we may want to even wait two years, he did not know. He said the Board... he does not know if the Board has to decide that today or not. He said you may want to give it some leeway and look at it in a couple years, you may want to do it next year, he did not know how important it is that we look at at this point in time. Mr. Ringler said Ms. Galvin feels we should, if the rest, if the major again feels that we should and he could go either way on that one. He said he does not have a problem with doing that but, you are right, if we do do it, there are people that will have conceivably over a three year period, three different districts. Councilwoman Galvin said she thinks that is something that we can look at very carefully because when she did the redraw that was done very quickly again, most of the polling places did not change. Most of the people could vote in their old polling places, Ms. Galvin noted. Councilman Webster said the district number changed, that is all. Ms. Galvin said she changed the district numbers strictly for convenience going from 1 down so we would not get confused. Supervisor Ringler said that is a point, just because their district changes, that does not mean the polling place changes. Councilwoman Galvin said it does not necessarily mean it changes. Councilman Gunner said that helps because his polling place did change. Supervisor Ringler said over in his area they change regularly between the fire house and the middle school.

Supervisor Ringler asked if anyone would like to offer the motion. The motion was offered by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Ms. Galvin that the proposed redistricting be approved with the change indicated in District 26. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

- - -

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to adjourn the Special Town Board Meeting at 2:45 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

*Kathleen A. Newkirk*  
Town Clerk