

TOWN BOARD  
MARCH 24, 1993

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

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

ABSENT: Frederick C. Webster, Councilman

- - -

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I would like to call the meeting of the Bethlehem Town Board to order. Like to welcome all the students who are getting in here just before the marking period ends, as usual and I think we have some Boy Scouts here too. I thought I saw them in the hall. First item on the agenda tonight is a public hearing to consider Local Law No. 3 of 1993 amending Article Section No. 119 of Article VI, Section 119-28 to increase the speed limit on the Delmar Bypass Extension. I will ask the Town Clerk to read the call of the hearing please.

Public  
Hearing  
To increase  
speed limit  
on the Delmar  
By-pass Ext.  
Local Law No.  
3 of 1993

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
TOWN OF BETHLEHEM

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held by the Town Board of the Town of Bethlehem on the 24th day of March, 1993 at 7:30 p.m. to consider Local Law No. 3 of 1993 amending the Code of the Town of Bethlehem as follows:

AMEND VEHICLE AND TRAFFIC SECTION 119, Article VI, Section 119-28, Schedule II as follows:

Delmar By-Pass Ext. 45 m.p.h. between Elm Avenue and VanDyke Road. All interested persons and citizens will have an opportunity to be heard at said hearing.

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

Dated: February 24, 1993

- - -

State of New York  
County of Albany

KATHRYN OLSEN of the Town of Bethlehem, being duly sworn, says that she is the bookkeeper of THE SPOTLIGHT, a weekly newspaper published in the Town of Bethlehem, County of Albany, and that the notice of which the annexed is a true copy, has been regularly published in said THE SPOTLIGHT ONCE A WEEK FOR 1 WEEK consecutively, commencing on the 10 day of March 1993.

/s/ Kathryn Olsen

Sworn to before me this 11  
day of March 1993.  
/s/ Bruce A. Neyerlin  
Notary Public

- - -

STATE OF NEW YORK)  
COUNTY OF ALBANY) ss:

KATHLEEN A. NEWKIRK, being duly sworn deposes and says that she is the Town Clerk of the Town of Bethlehem, Albany County, New York and that I posted on March 10, 1993 a Notice of Public Hearing, a copy of which is hereto attached, on the sign board of the Town maintained pursuant to subdivision six of Section thirty of the Town Law.

/s/ Kathleen A. Newkirk

Sworn to before me this  
16th day of March, 1993.

/s/ Catherine T. Picarazzi  
Notary Public

---  
SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you, Kathy. Motion to indent.

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

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

---  
SUPERVISOR RINGLER: This public hearing is being conducted as a result of an investigation that I asked our Traffic Safety Committee to complete since the Delmar By-Pass Extension has been completed. I asked them to analyze the speed limits on both VanDyke Road and the By-Pass Extension. The report to us on February 12th, they indicated to us the By-Pass Extension which is currently now posted at 30 miles per hour was built through to VanDyke and is now open to traffic. This highway has 24 foot wide paved asphalt surface with a 70 foot wide right-of-way. Speed data was gathered which indicates that 85 percent of the vehicles are traveling at speed 0 to 48 miles per hour. In addition, a ball bank indicator test was conducted on the horizontal curve west of Elm Avenue. This test indicated that the curve signs supplemented with an advisory speed of 35 miles per hour be placed on the east and west lane of this highway. Based upon their investigation, they recommend that the speed limit be increased on the By-Pass Extension to 45 miles per hour but they also recommend that the 35 miles per hour that is currently in existence on VanDyke Road remain the same and not be changed.

The format for the public hearing, will be to first of all open it to any questions that anyone might have and then anyone who would like to speak in favor and opposition may do so. Does anyone have any questions regarding this proposed ordinance, local law, excuse me?

There were none. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of it? There were none. Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition? There were none. If not, I will entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to close the public hearing at 7:35 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

*Kathleen A. Newkirk*  
Town Clerk

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I have a question.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Yes, Charles.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I am sure that they will sign it so people will notice if they go 45 down the extension that they have to slow down to 35.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Right.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Just so that they are placed properly.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: There is one other thing I am going to recommend to the Board if we pass this tonight, is that since this first came to us we have had a structural problem on a portion of that road. I don't know if any of you have ridden over it lately. There is a serious undermining in the older section that the developer put in 8 years ago. My recommendation to the Board if we pass this that we do pass it but it not be implemented until the Highway Superintendent makes the appropriate improvements which he hopes to do in early April because he can't get to it with the weather and so forth and the blacktop plants being open.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: You indicated that that had been put in by the developer. Are there any bonds outstanding?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: We are looking into recovering... we are looking into that at the moment.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Okay.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay because we feel he has an obligation to take care of that but I just want you to know it wasn't a road that Gregg built that is falling apart. But, I do recommend that if we do pass that tonight that we notify the Secretary of State upon advisement from the Highway Superintendent that the appropriate corrective measures have been taken in the road structure. Anyone like to make the motion or do you want to hold off on it?

Adopt Local  
Law No. 3, 1993,  
Increase  
Speed limit  
to 45 mph on  
Delmar By-pass  
Extension

The motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to adopt Local Law No. 3 of 1993 amending the Code of the Town of Bethlehem, Section 119, Article VI, Section 119-28, Schedule II regarding 45 miles per hour speed limit on the Delmar By-Pass Extension between Elm Avenue and VanDyke Road. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

LUMAC  
Update  
and  
Discussion

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next item on our agenda is an update from the Land Use Management Advisory Committee (LUMAC). Jeff Lipnicky is here along with the entire LUMAC committee -- Sam Messina, Jim Blendell, Martin Barr and Ted Putney. Welcome and I will turn it over to Jeff.

MR. LIPNICKY: Basically, we are here tonight to give the Town Board an update of our progress and where we are at with the Master Plan at the present time. The plan 2 years ago when we were before this Board, we had a lengthy discussion about the amount of time that it would take to complete the plan. At the present time, we still have not completed it and expect that it will take us a little bit more time to have everything put into final form and submit it to the Board. Right now we would like to update the Board a bit about where we are with this.

I guess the best place to start is to initially say that our concept in putting this thing together -- our general concept of what should drive the whole master plan and whole master plan process are related to 6 factors.

1. That land use should respect the environmental constraints of the land.
2. That it should respect the environmental sensitivities of the land.
3. That the land use plan should be in conformance, as much as possible to existing community character and when we say community character what we are talking about is existing land use patterns, community design patterns such as the existing scale of the community, height of buildings, spacing of buildings, set backs and things of that nature and the design relationship between them, landscape features such as topographic conditions, respect for ridge lines in other especially important landscape features which are very sensitive aesthetically to development impacts, the transportation network of the Town -- not only in terms of the carrying capacity of the Town's roadways but also in terms of access to parcels. In other words, the land use plan should coincide with the requirements of different uses for access. For example, warehousing, industry and the like with heavy truck traffic -- requires obviously large flat sites most appropriately and preferably with locations near the interstate and regional transportation networks.

Third, but not about third but about 5th or 6th down here, infrastructure. What are the capacities of current infrastructure in Town, how will the future growth influence those capacities and also whatever the current utility lines located and can we minimize cost by directing growth towards where those facilities exist and in combination with that, what is the availability of water, ground water sources both from unconsolidated aquifers and also from bedrock aquifers. And, finally, the desires of the community which was reflected in the survey that we did. The Town Board has a copy of a summary of tasks that we went through. This summary was taken essentially from the outline of the work program for LUMAC and indicates those tasks which have been completed and those tasks which are still in progress. To go through it somewhat quickly as a general overview.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Excuse me, Jeff, while you stopped for a second, with respect to a general overview. Can you explain what the difference is between incomplete, partial and the other category is in progress and remains?

MR. LIPNICKY: Okay. Those which are labeled as remains...

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: I was looking for a body but I didn't find one.

MR. LIPNICKY: Yes, essentially no work has been done to date on those that are identified as remains. Those that are in progress, essentially they are things that we have started working on. Those that are labeled omitted, we haven't done and haven't intended and don't intend to do. And, essentially partial and incomplete should really be the same thing and basically what that means is that at the present time, we have most of the stuff that we want, there is more stuff that we would like to have but we haven't been able to get a hold of it.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Thank you.

MR. LIPNICKY: So, basically, for those we can't get a hold of it, we live with what we have.

To go on a bit, the initial part of our process was to identify the various issues that residents had in mind as we started this process and what their concerns were with land use and development in the Town, as well as other issues. As part of that process, we conducted a number of community workshops, conducted a very extensive planning survey of residents of the community, conducted a survey of outside agencies including County Social Service agencies, Department heads here in Town Hall -- to identify what their concerns were in their particular areas of expertise. From this, we put together preliminary statement... preliminary listings really of issues...

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Excuse me, Jeff, can I stop you there for a minute. You were going through the list on sub 3 and I noticed in that you marked business community survey omitted. Why was that omitted?

MR. LIPNICKY: At the time back then we had spent so much time on putting together the survey... the Town-wide residents survey that it was felt at that point in time that we had to move this process along and therefore, did not get involved in putting together a business community survey.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: So there was no input specifically requested from the business community in the Town.

MR. LIPNICKY: Only to the extent that they were... they came to or got involved in community workshops that were held. There was no attempt to go out and produce a survey or anything of that nature.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I thought Mr. Brownell did attempt to do something or started that with the Chamber at one point?

MR. LIPNICKY: He had started it but he had never really shared what he had found or if he had actually followed through on it. I am not aware that he had. I don't know if any of the other committee members are.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Did you ever check with him?

MR. LIPNICKY: No, but we can do that.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay, thank you.

MR. MESSINA: Jeff, I think it is worthwhile noting that Doug Brownell was on LUMAC partly because of his responsibilities with the Chamber of Commerce and his knowledge of the business issues. So at least, no survey, at least he participated for a fairly long period of time on LUMAC.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I don't think that was the point. I think the point I was making... if there is something out there and he is not aware of it... not that it is going to change now... but just so that they... so it just isn't left hanging there and somebody doesn't get at least some compliment for having done the work.

MR. MESSINA: Doug was pretty clear that there was not anything coming out at the time.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Oh, there was nothing came in.

MR. MESSINA: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay.

MR. LIPNICKY: Okay. The next really phase of what we did was put together some base line mapping or I should say base mapping from which we could do all these mappings, produce them in reproducible form so that all mapping can be reproduced. We put together essentially a property map.. property line base map of the Town from tax map sources, put together -- well, it wasn't really a photo reproduction type thing of topographic maps, street maps and property... rather stream maps so that we could have a basis for which to put all this information on.

The first... the largest task, I think, that we have had in the ... is really the collection and analysis of data in a number of different areas. These areas included the natural environmental, social and economic conditions, land use and zoning, and development activity in the Town and also infrastructure and transportation, water and sewer and the like. Most of this mapping here, reflects the inventory that we did plus there are a couple of other maps that we didn't bring down that also reflect some of the information.

In any event, the areas that we looked at range from climate and factors which affect land use, such as prevailing winds and their

effect... potential effect on residential areas from odors, potential air pollutant sources and the way topography, relief of slope and we looked at a slope analysis and an analysis of relief in the Town, geology -- bedrock geology and surface geology of the Town, the fault of which has large influences on things such as septic systems are suitably located, on things such as what areas of Town really have potential for individual wells, water supply and the like. Look at the hydrology of the Town, delineated the drainage basins in Town, looked at all the water quality reports that have been done by the State through the Town. Unfortunately, there is not a lot of decent recent data, the Town's in a program of what they call rotating basin study so they haven't gotten to this area of the State for quite some time. Nevertheless, we looked at the information that was available.

Looked at the ecology of the Town, identified all those areas where there are known occurrences of threatened or endangered species. Also, areas where it is known that migratory species of threatening danger to rare species have been identified. Mapped and located flood plain areas in Town from existing sources, State wetland areas. We have also put together... is a map that we call hydric soils and basically what the hydric soil map shows are those areas in Town that, at least I am 99 percent certain, they are federal wetlands. Hydric soils are one of 3 criteria for the delineation of federal wetlands. The other 2 being hydroquatic vegetation and also hydrology, soil hydrology. Basically, where you have one, you usually find the others.

We looked at and conducted an extensive historic resource survey of the Town both from State sources, from secondary sources from residents of the community -- which is this map here -- the Town right now, there is only one building that is on the national register of historic places but we also have an historic district in the Onesquethaw valley area. There are also about 15 structures that have been nominated for the State register. We did a complete photo inventory of all those sites taking pictures of the buildings and what have you and putting it together in a binder for future reference and also for any future... as a start toward any future attempts to get some of the properties registered for the State or national listing. Also, identify the archeological sites in Town both from the State Museum's data banks and also through contacts with the local Bethlehem Archeology Group.

We looked at various community design parameters, again trying to identify what we believe most people would agree were scenic vistas, promontories and things of that nature. Also very important to us was the identification of important street scenes in town and really most important the identification of areas that really set the image of the community. In other words, those areas of Town that we as residents of the community, have shared visual experiences. Sort of things like major roadways in Town, which we all have a common ground for for understanding what the community looks like, entrances to the community, major landmarks in the community and also major nodes or what otherwise might be called intersections of the community.

We took a look at, in addition to that, socio-economic data, passed population trends and projections into the future, population characteristics of the community, household and family characteristics, and projections of households. Housing both in terms of growth... past growth trends in the town through both Planning Board and Building permit data, compared what is happening in town in terms of all these growth facts, housing population, in terms of what is happening at the regional level, the county level and in the other suburban communities in the region and how we are doing comparatively to them in terms of growth.

We looked at regional employment trends. Employment trends... mostly our reason for looking at them was to get some indication of what types of land use might be expected to come to Bethlehem in the near future. For example, all projections are that manufacturing in the Capital District will continue to decline in terms of the numbers of employment in manufacturing, so the question to us in one sense becomes -- does it make sense for us to have all this area in town that we have zoned for industry and light industry to remain for heavy and light industry when in fact, manufacturing as I said, is in

decline over all of the region and the State. Projections in town have been declining in employment in manufacturing also.

We looked at recreation facilities, what we have in town and compared them to standards that are available from National Parks and Recreation Association. Again, we looked at things like this so that when... in concert with population projections, what are we going to need in town to maintain current standards in terms of additional park land and the like.

We looked at land use, the map in the back there all the way to the left, is a parcel by parcel inventory of land use in the Town of Bethlehem that was constructed from Assessor's records, from ... photo interpretation and from site visits when we were unable to determine exactly what the parcel land use was. Again, that is at the site scale that we did that inventory and our main purpose in doing it to site scale was that so when we sit down and draw a zoning map, we know exactly how much non-conformity we are going to create in doing that and also to start... or to be able to draw zoning district boundaries to try to incorporate as many parcels within a district that will remain like a confirming way. We simply will... zoning we reviewed the zoning regulations of the town, again, trying to identify some of the short comings particularly in areas such as the compatibility of uses within the various districts, the compatibility of uses at district boundaries and things of that nature.

In concert with Capital District Transportation Committee and also NYS Department of Transportation and Albany County Dept. of Public Works, conducted traffic counts at many locations in the community, divided the Town into 133 different traffic analysis zones, delineated a transportation network through the town consisting primarily of the federal wage system which is all secondary... all primary roads and arterials and also included important secondary roads as well as roads that we anticipated may have problems in terms of conflict between transportation and land use. So, what happened with the traffic counts that we collected, at the same time as I said, we did a parcel by parcel inventory of land use and assigned it to each traffic analysis zone in terms of the number of housing units by housing units type. In addition to that, we did a total inventory of non-residential floor area in the town which was an input to the traffic model also. So, by various land use categories, we have the amount of floor area in town and again signed that to the traffic analysis zones in order to create a computer model of traffic in town that will be good for the town for 50 years from now, you will be able to utilize it. What CDTTC did at that point in time, was to conduct an analysis of the level of service at all the intersections of where our roadway networks merged and also an analysis of capacity on the main line or the links between the intersections. In addition to that, we did a level of service analysis of all those intersections and also along all the main lines so that we have a complete inventory at this point in time of every roadway which has capacity of level of service problems and every intersections that has capacity of level of service problems.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Excuse me, Jeff, did the Capital District Transportation group provide the mapping for us on that?

MR. LIPNICKY: No.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: They didn't, we had to do the mapping?

MR. LIPNICKY: Well, what they provided us was mapping it at a scale about like that.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So, we increased the scale.

MR. LIPNICKY: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: So, they provided the maps.

MR. LIPNICKY: So, what we did was we took what they had and transferred it to...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay, thanks.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: What was the total cost for that?

MR. LIPNICKY: To do that portion of it?

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: That is right.

MR. LIPNICKY: I don't know off the top of my head.

MASTER MOON: How much money has been spent so far?

MR. LIPNICKY: On the traffic study, off the top of my head, I don't know. I would guess that about 1/3 on the traffic study at this point.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: A third of the budgeted amount has been expended, so we have two-thirds more to go?

MR. LIPNICKY: Yes. Off the top of my head...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I thought the original figure was \$30,000. on that study.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Yes, \$30, 32, something like that yes. That help you with your question.

MASTER MOON: Yes.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Okay, let me just explain how we do this as far as questions go, okay for the public. At the end of Jeff's presentation, the Town Board will ask any questions they have and then if we have time, we will let you ask questions. Just raise your hand and we will let you ask some questions, okay. Thank you.

MR. LIPNICKY: The total cost of the traffic study to us was in the neighborhood of \$30,000. There is also a share that was kicked in by federal funding and also by CDTC.

In any event, in addition to the level of service analysis and capacity analysis, we also identified areas in town based on established criteria where there were transportation land use conflicts. Basically the criteria relate to type of roadway and housing units along that roadway versus traffic volumes on those roadways. The traffic analysis was done through the p.m. peak hour primarily because that is generally the worst condition or worse case scenario for the capital district and also here to the Town of Bethlehem plus some additional intersections were added where we thought we might have a.m. or morning rush hour problems. Okay.

Again, as I mentioned before, we reviewed the recent water and sewer reports that were put together for the Town of Bethlehem. I think they were both were done by Fraser Associates, if Bruce is here. So, that basically constituted our inventory of the Town.

The next thing that we did was to take all this information and try to come up with a preliminary land use concept for the town. What we did essentially in order to that, was to divide the town into 18 different planning areas. And, the Town was divided into those areas based largely on similar land use, environmental characteristics where there are major cultural or natural barriers to movement such as the Thruway and other areas like that. Basically, excuse me, with our development of the land use plan entailed was for each of those planning areas to overlay the map to identify all the environmental constraints in each planning area to identify all the environmental opportunities in each planning area and to identify all the environmentally sensitive areas in each planning area as a starting point.

The next was to overlay all of the infrastructure information. Was the area approximate to water and sewer. Could water and sewer reasonably be extended to the area utilizing gravity, their having to get into pump stations and things of that nature. We looked at that as a consideration. We looked at as a consideration again things

like ground water availability for wells and also soil conditions for septic systems or other on site disposal systems. We looked at the land use in the area, in factors such as would a change in land use in the area impact a lot of parcels. Things like what types of land uses were compatible with what already existed there. Things like what types of land uses are suited to the characteristics and constraints of the site. Also looked at the existing zoning for the area and from there is what we did was put together a concept plan for each of those 18 different planning areas. Took that which was on the concept plan and then redrew it to the scale that this nature onto property line base mapping so that at that scale, what we can do is throw these other maps underneath and really begin to define where the land use boundaries should be. So in other words, the land use boundary considered areas that were environmentally sensitive be considered where property line may be currently the dividing line between commercial and a residential area and the like.

The next thing we did was to test whether or not, or take a look at whether or not what we come up with a concept was compatible to the goals and objectives we had established for the plan. We have gone through a lengthy process, I had mentioned that a lengthy process of identifying from survey information from workshops and what have you what the town's land use goals and objectives should be and took a look at the mapping and tested it against that as to whether or not it is consistent. What we wound up with was really about 30, actually about 39 different what we will call, land use categories for the moment. And, what we mean by land use categories is the direction for that particular area of town whether it be... not particular area of town but those particular sites. That might be anything from office park, research and development as a land use category with the emphasis should be on development of office buildings, research and development type uses and what we might call "campus like setting" to heavy industrial to transportation to residential with various densities, planned residence districts and various types of commercial areas be they something we are calling neighborhood commercial to something we are calling highway commercial. For each of those land use categories we basically defined the purpose and intent of those types of districts and then under what types of conditions they would be appropriate. In other words, one of those conditions could be access to major transportation arteries, such as for warehousing and industry.

After doing that, what we also did is identified the appropriate uses that would be... that should be allowed within those different land use categories both in terms of those uses which we preferred, those uses which we considered to be compatible for those type of uses which we considered to be appropriate under certain conditions.

Having said that, the next thing that we began to look at largely for the purposes of the transportation study and also to get some sense of what might happen in the future if the current zoning plan continues, was to develop future projections for housing for non-residential floor area in town, for population and then to take that information and spaciouly distribute it throughout the Town to the various traffic analysis zones. Essentially what that entailed was taking the floor area information that we got and the land use information in our inventory, taking that making projections out to the year 2010 and doing it for 3 different scenarios -- what we will call a low growth scenario which essentially involves CDRPC projections of growth (CDRPC being the Capital District Regional Planning Commission); secondly in-house projections of growth to the moderate growth scenario -- which were based more on past housing growth trends in town, if you look at housing growth in town over the past 4 years, the growth rate has been like 25 percent, 25 percent, 20 percent, 20 percent, irrespective of what the population increases in town have been and really to some extent, irrespective of the household increases in town -- so, it is something that there really wasn't.... actually I should say it is something that is really acting independently of population to a large extent.

So, given those past growth rates, we also looked at and identified all development activity in town that is currently occurring. The location of all development projects and began to distribute housing units essentially among those different development projects so that

making some assumptions about how fast each project would move and the like so that we could come up with what amounts to a year 2000 guesstimate of how housing units and floor area in town would be distributed and a year 2010 estimate of how housing and floor area would be distributed. This information is critical to the transportation model because what the transportation model will do is then translate that information into traffic volumes on all the areas roadways and will also allow us to do intersection analysis or for CDCT to do analysis and again, main line capacity analysis for all these roadways and all these intersections that are on our network. From that point in time, we can begin to identify -- although we already have large suspicions of where new transportation corridors are necessary but nevertheless, the model will help us identify those and be able to test whether new corridors at certain places would relieve future congestion whether road widening be the answers in some areas or whether simple intersection improvements are the answers in some areas.

Also did that to some extent at least in a very cursory fashion take a look at what those projections mean in terms of, again, impact on infrastructure of water, sewer and the like in terms of capacities. In addition to those low, medium and high growth scenarios what we also did was look at the build out scenario for the town. Okay, and with the build out scenario entailed is when you eliminate all the land in town that is currently developable and when you eliminate all of the land in town that has severe environmental constraints, the land that is left -- what is its development potential. So, essentially by zoning district, we calculated what the development potential of the Town is under existing zoning. And also presented that to CDPC to do an analysis of what that... I shouldn't say analysis, its really a quick run of what that means in terms of transportation impacts in the community. And, this was done to some extent really as a consciousness raising exercise as to what our zoning code currently permits.

So, that's largely where we are right now, okay. And, basically, what do we have left to be done to finish this. First is to finish the traffic study which, again, entails running all these scenarios through the model and also entails an evaluation of what various improvements could do to relieve future congestion. What it also means in terms of transportation is to identify some access conditions in town along various roadways and how we might improve the efficiency of those roadways through access standards to parcels. What is also left is to do some... put together some site development standards to go along with the land use plan to look at major areas where we feel... that is to identify major areas where we feel zoning code improvements are necessary and again, these types of things we have been talking about for quite some time already and it really is a matter of flushing out what we think the recommendation should be both for site development standards really zoning coding amendments, things like resource conservation, policies, economic development policies, utility type of policies, utility extension policies.

Those are the, again as I said, things we have been discussing all along but it is time to try to get some consensus on what we believe those policies should be.

The other things that are left are also the final report. There is a lot of narrative that needs to be written and also report graphics that have to be put together. The mapping graphics, as you can see, are basically... essentially done and all that involved is reduction to a size that is compatible with the report. The way out of the report, how it fits all together, editing and printing. And, obviously that last portion or those last portions -- graphics, narratives, layout, editing and printing -- all are somewhat time consuming, elements to finish. Well, we had discussed this... the Committee, it was basically our opinion that what we would need to properly have this thing put together and finished would be a range between 3 and 5 months. It was me who said, or myself who said 3 months and the Committee, who essentially told me that I have never been right on my estimates of time before, so that they thought that 5 months were appropriate in terms of how much time it would actually

take to finish this thing. So, that is basically where we are right now.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Jeff, thank you very, very much. Any other committee members like to add anything at this point in time or should I just let the Board ask some questions? Do you have anything to say? There was nothing. Questions of the Board?

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Go ahead, Charlie.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I am waiting until I can get his attention, I don't want to interrupt.

MR. LIPNICKY: Lisa just went up and grabbed where we are at in terms of billing on the traffic study. Right now the billing is at \$20,676. out of the contracted amount of \$36,925 plus about \$11,000-\$12,000 in federal highway funds.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Charlie.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: I want to thank you, Jeff, for telling us about how you came to 3-5 months. I would tend to agree with the committee and I just would like to know -- because when I agree with their statements -- is that real? Your explanation helped me a lot because I would tend to agree with them completely. Do you think that that's -- that would be in August?

MR. LIPNICKY: Again, the major stuff that we have are things that we have been discussing all along, to put them down. The major time consuming aspect of it is going to be the narrative, putting that together. I think it is a realistic projection but, again, I certainly have been wrong in the past in terms of how much time...

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: They have provided a little cushion for you and I think they were wise.

MR. BLENDALL: I think that we are basically in agreement with our recommendations, the Committee, I don't know that there is an awful lot of disagreement there. So, I don't see the Committee itself not being able to come to a decision very quickly on all the items but it is going to take a big effort to put it all together.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Who is responsible for putting the narrative together?

MR. BLENDALL: That has fallen on Jeff's shoulders.

MR. LIPNICKY: It is essentially myself.

MR. MESSINA: I think one of the things that might help knowing is throughout the process even though what you are seeing here tonight are primarily visuals and maps, certainly part of the project -- there is an awful lot of materials already written. All of the issue statements are written. All of the goals and objectives are written. All of the concepts for the areas of town that we looked at are written. So that there is already a lot of material already prepared that need to be edited but it is there.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Sam, that brings me to a question for Jeff. On page 2 of your cover letter on your submission to the Board, number 6, you said a draft land use plan has been prepared delineating proposed land use in all areas of Town and corresponding density. Conceptual plans were prepared for 19 sub areas in town with a valuation of land use planning factors for each. What are you referring to in that?

MR. LIPNICKY: I am referring to what Sam just talked about.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Who has that report?

MR. LIPNICKY: Each of the committee members.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Has it ever been... a copy of that ever submitted to this Board so that we could review it? I have never seen it.

MR. LIPNICKY: At this point in time, it is not our proposal at this point in time. It is not complete. It needs to be tested against traffic, it needs to be tested against a lot of other factors. So, they are going to be adjusted.

MR. BARR: It is our intention to incorporate this in the LUMAC report.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: My only concern, that report hasn't been circulated any place else besides the committee.

MR. MESSINA: No, it hasn't.

MR. LIPNICKY: Other than the committee.

MR. PUTNEY: Everything is in draft form. Lots of balls in the air... there have been a lot of balls in the air for upwards of 4 years now and they are all coming down and coming into place. We are probably 98 percent complete now.

MR. LIPNICKY: To answer your question, the only other entity that has a copy of it is CDTC because we are working with them on the transportation.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: When will this come to the Town Board, your finished product, for the Board to take a look at?

MR. LIPNICKY: The end of the 5 month period.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: The end of the 5 month period.

MR. LIPNICKY: Right, the 5 month period is being requested to have the report finished, printed and everything put together.

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: And, there will be nothing coming to the Board ahead of time, a head of the 5 months?

MR. LIPNICKY: It hasn't...

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: I know you are asking for the 3 to 5 month extension, but I am asking for information sake, as far as when we will see this whole plan in place. We will wait the 5 months?

MR. LIPNICKY: Unless the Board wishes to approach it otherwise, it has been our intent to submit everything as a package deal.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: When you say at the end of 5 months, are you talking about having it in our hands by September 1st?

MR. LIPNICKY: Yes, to have it printed and everything finished.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Or before.

MR. LIPNICKY: Or before...

MR. BARR: He may turn out to be right.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I would rather have you be right.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: I remember when we were going through the budget workshops, in particular there were a lot of representations about specific time frames and about... we made budgetary considerations about extensions of time of extra help for you Jeff, because of this. And, we were shooting at the March 31st deadline and we took that into account in budgeting for your department and that is a major concern because now we are looking at least an additional 5 months which means an additional period of time beyond that for continued staffing.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: But, we did reduce the staffing through the current budget year and in addition to that, he has been one staff member short for the last couple of months. So, for budget purposes, his budget is in good shape.

MR. LIPNICKY: Before December.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: I recognize that but at the same time, representations were made to us when we made those determinations and my concern is are we going to be looking at a request for additional staff in order for you to be able to meet this deadline?

MR. LIPNICKY: Right now the Planning Board has had discussions amongst themselves and with me to try to fill the currently vacant position to provide enough support for the Planning Board's activities. That position has been advertised, resumes have been received. I have not yet conducted any interviews with regard to it.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Martin, you are being serviced all right?

MR. BARR: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Thank you.

MR. BARR: I am not about to say we have been... we have had adequate service.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Okay.

MR. BLENDALL: We did discuss the possibility of a partial report but I think everybody agreed that to do that leaves a partial report out there without the supporting documentation. So, if you make a recommendation and say just land use and you don't provide all the other supporting documentation, it can be easily attacked because you don't have the supportive documents and that is why we really came together and decided we really think you should have the entire plan with all its supporting documentation.

MR. PUTNEY: Along with that, since the traffic portion of it is so critical, the effectiveness of the final plan and that is one of the pieces still not quite completed. It would be foolish to make any valid recommendations for your consideration until that part of it is in place.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: First time I heard the word tonight a recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Blendell. The presentation was fine, everything was good except I never heard the word recommendation. They are all recommendations coming out of all these analyses and everything like that in each case.

MR. PUTNEY: Oh, absolutely, there is a plan.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: This wasn't said.

MR. BARR: The plan is a recommendation to the Town Board.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Well, I assumed that but I didn't hear the word recommendation and I thought if all we are going to do is get analyses and maps...

MR. BARR: It has always been assumed by us.

COUNCILMAN GUNNER: Yes, well, I didn't hear it but I thank Mr. Blendell for mentioning it.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: I will say one thing, as a former Chairman of the Planning Board, this inventory alone is worth its weight in gold. We have so many times in the past have developers coming in telling us what the status of our community is, now we are going to have data that either refutes or is in agreement with what they have to say. So, the Planning Board will have some outstanding tools to work with here in any project that comes forward. Outstanding, I think a lot of time has gone into this. I know a lot of us are concerned about the time but I have the sense that when this gets

done, it is going to be a product that will give us a guide to make some decisions and we certainly will have the background material to make those proper decisions. And, I thank you all, I think you have done a super job. Is there any other questions or comments?

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: I have a couple for Jeff. Jeff, are there any more consultants who are going to be retained before the completion of the plan because this was the first time I had heard Fraser Associates.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: That is existing material he is using.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: That's existing.

MR. LIPNICKY: No, yes, that is existing.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: That was not anybody who was retained for this. He was using existing Fraser reports on previous water districts and so forth.

MR. LIPNICKY: My consultant for water and sewer is Bruce.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Okay. Are there any other consultants who are going to be needed?

MR. LIPNICKY: No.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: And, is the CDTC report going to come in within budget, within the contract price? Or, are you looking at any overruns?

MR. LIPNICKY: That is absolutely no problem. You have to understand that CDTC wants this information as much as we do. Okay and that is why they are financially participating in it, for their regional model.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: When you referred to the \$11,000 dollars in additional highway funds, what money is that coming in... is that coming out of any other funds, any highway funds?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Federal money.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Is it any money that would otherwise be relegated to the Highway Department?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No, this is monies that CDTC has.

MR. LIPNICKY: No. This is not ours. This is money that is allocated by Capital District Transportation Committee from Federal funding and by the State.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: It is not our Federal funding?

MR. LIPNICKY: Not our money.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Let me just comment on funding and so forth. In addition to all the things that this committee has done and Jeff has spent and I have been bugging him 90 percent of his time, sometimes I think a little less on this. But, over the last year and a half, the monies that through his reports and efforts that have come into this Town or will come into this Town are phenomenal. The State fought us for years on a traffic light on the corner of Elsmere Avenue and Feura Bush Road and Jeff kept harping on that and kept giving them the data needed and we now have \$50,000. traffic light there. Tomorrow we will... as a Member of the CDTC policy committee, I will be voting on the TIP program that still includes and will include 7.7 million dollars to build a bypass around Selkirk, 396. Last year through his efforts, we were given a grant of \$250,000. for a bike path and also the \$700,000 value of that park land down along the river. So, Jeff, thank you, you have done a super job.

MR. LIPNICKY: Any other questions?

COUNCILWOMAN FULLER: Jeff, did you check with your LUMAC committee to see if they are willing to stay?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: They are the ones that wanted 5 months remember.

MR. BLENDALL: But, we wanted to know if there is any consulting money left.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you all very, very much, you are doing an outstanding job, appreciate it. Thank you. Are there any questions from anybody in the public? I promised you a question.

MASTER MOON: Like I said...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: What is your name, just so that we get it for the record.

MASTER MOON: What is all this costing us?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Well, right now, our guesstimate is for us to do this in-house, okay...

MASTER MOON: Oh, it is just an estimate, we are just doing a survey here?

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: No, no, no, I am talking about... I asked for some rough numbers today as to what it is costing us, of our resources, to do a master plan. And, our best guess at this point in time -- because we are doing this basically with our staff with the help of the Capital District Transportation Committee that it is going to cost us between \$100,000 and \$150,000. Now, if you look at that and compare that with other studies, I think we are getting a good bargain because the County of Albany and the Town of Colonie did a master plan for 10 acres around the Albany County Airport...

MR. LIPNICKY: 10 square miles.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Ten square miles, excuse me, and our Town is 50 square miles, that study cost \$225,000 for a consultant to do. The level of documentation and analysis was -- I don't know if it was as good as this or not -- but I know the Town and the County had spent a year and a half trying to rewrite it because of the changes that they wanted to make to the consultant's report. So, all in all from a fiscal perspective, I think the direction that we have taken is the most conservative.

MASTER MOON: Okay.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Any other questions? Yes, sir.

MR. CARR: My name is Brian Carr, I live at 16 Sheffield Drive.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Oh, I know who you are, that's right.

MR. CARR: I was wondering if you could tell me what organizations provide the information on the environmental studies.

MR. LIPNICKY: There are hundreds, really hundreds of data sources. Everything that ranged from the Soil Conservation Service to New York State DEC to Federal Fish and Wildlife to Albany County Planning to US Geological Survey, NYS Geological Survey. The list is endless.

MR. CARR: Okay, so you consider that worth its weight in gold?

MR. LIPNICKY: Yes, well, I wouldn't...

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Gold is a very expensive item.

MR. LIPNICKY: The best way to put it is, it's the best available information.

MR. CARR: Okay.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Welcome home, Brian. Any other questions? Yes, sir.

MR. BERGAN: Mike Bergan. There has been some reports in the media recently that housing that is being built in this area, our town, is generally of the upscale variety and that the housing stock in the lower price range, starter houses for new families, is in short supply and not being addressed. Is that a consideration that has been taken into account and how have you addressed it?

MR. LIPNICKY: The committee is very cognizant of that problem and what we have looked at and are looking at and again, this will be part of the recommendations in the area of housing -- but, we have been looking at things such as density bonuses, the provision of what we would call "affordable housing", also some possibly some special zoning provisions that would encourage affordable housing. Unfortunately, density bonus provisions have been tried in a number of areas with mixed success. I mean, there are a number of cities that have utilized them and have been quite successful, suburban communities have really been less successful with that type of an approach. But, there are a number of different options that we are looking at. I mean, there are some options that are out there -- that I don't want to speak for the whole committee -- but I think that we would reject outright such as what a lot of communities do is allow things such as shadow housing. In other words, what will happen is, essentially allow construction of a second housing unit or a second building on a particular lot to... if it is done for affordable housing purposes, for in-laws or things of that nature. But, given the current density of various areas in town, something like that would probably be inappropriate in the Town of Bethlehem.

MR. BERGAN: How about lot size? Is that a consideration that you have looked at?

MR. LIPNICKY: Well, lot size from what we have seen, does not have a direct relationship to what housing prices sell for in this town. You go out and you take a look at some of the \$500,000 homes that are being built and they are being put on 1/4 acre lots. Well, not 1/4 acre, 1/3 acre lots. Since I have been here in town, you know, I have heard the argument over and over again, of about how lot sizes drive up the cost of housing. Well, you know, I have seen very few homes being built in the town that are really under the \$200,000, \$150,000 price range. John, if you are aware of any, you know developments in that price range, I am not.

MR. FLANIGAN: A few modulars.

MR. LIPNICKY: But in any event, you know, here we have seen real not relationship between the two.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Again, thank you.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: The next item on the agenda is a request from Terrence Ritz, Department of Public Works for approval to advertise and receive bids for Precast Concrete Manhole Blocks, Precast Reinforced Concrete Manhole Sections and Iron Castings. We could advertise on March 31, 1993 and open bids on April 12, 1993 at 2:00, 2:10, and 2:20 p.m. respectively.

Go To Bid  
Precast  
Manhole Blocks,  
Precast  
Reinforced  
Concrete Manhole  
Sections and  
Iron Castings

The following resolution was offered by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller:

WHEREAS, the Town desires to advertise for bids for Precast Concrete Manhole Blocks, Precast Reinforced Concrete Manhole Sections and Iron Castings for the year beginning May 1, 1993 through April 30, 1994, pursuant to law,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk advertise for such bids in THE SPOTLIGHT issue on the 31st day of March, 1993 and that bids be received up to 2:00, 2:10 and 2:20 p.m. on the 12th day of April, 1993 at which time the bids will be publicly opened and read.

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

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

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next, I think we are finally going to have enough people here to vote on some minutes if the people do not have to abstain. Kathy get ready to write. I think we have to do these separately because we need to note on each.

TOWN CLERK NEWKIRK: I think you better.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Minutes of January 27th.

Approve  
Minutes  
Jan. 27, 1993

The motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the Town Board minutes of January 27, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Minutes of February 10th.

Approve  
Minutes  
Feb. 10, 1993

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approved the minutes of February 10, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Minutes of February 24th.

Approve  
Minutes  
Feb. 24, 1993

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the Town Board minutes of February 24, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Minutes of March 1st.

Approve  
Minutes  
March 1, 1993

The motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the Town Board minutes of March 1, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: Can I interrupt here just for a second? To the best of my knowledge there is absolutely no requirement that you be at a meeting in order to approve the minutes. If you have another reason that is fine, but if you read the minutes, familiarize yourself with them and are satisfied there is no reason why you can't vote to approve them. The fact that you weren't here doesn't make any difference.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: I have to on the ones that I am voting on.

ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: I wasn't questioning anybody, you may have reasons.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Because of the issue of client representation. I have intentionally...

ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: No, I understand there may be other reasons but I just wanted to make it clear that the fact that you weren't here doesn't mean a thing.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Thank you, counselor. Minutes of March 10th.

Approve  
Minutes  
March 10, 1993

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the minutes of March 10, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: I just want to get the minutes off the agenda.

---

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Minutes of March 15th.

The motion was made by Mr. Gunner and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the Town Board minutes of March 15, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

Approve  
Minutes  
March 15, 1993

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

-----

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next item on our agenda is a request from Terrence Ritz, Department of Public Works, for assignment of proposed house numbers and street name designations for Village Drive, Regina Court and Cherry Avenue Extension.

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the assignment of proposed house numbers and street name designations for Village Drive, Regina Court and Cherry Avenue Extension as per the request of Terrence Ritz, Department of Public Works, effective 6 months from the date of adoption. The motion was passed by the following vote:

House Nos.  
Village Dr.  
Regina Ct.  
Cherry Ave.  
Ext.

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

-----

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from Mr. Hahn, Receiver of Taxes and Assessments, for approval of repayment of overpayment of water rent for the month of February totaling \$3.15.

Refund of  
overpayment  
of Water  
Rents

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the repayment of overpaid water rent for the month of February totaling \$3.15 as per the memorandum from Kenneth P. Hahn, Receiver of Taxes and Assessments, dated March 5, 1993. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from Mr. Flanigan, Building Inspector, for approval of construction trailer for the Cedar Ridge Subdivision. It is a one year permit.

Construction  
Trailer  
Cedar Ridge  
Subdivision

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to approve the construction trailer for one year for the Cedar Ridge Subdivision located as per the application. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

Approve  
Attendance  
Seminar  
Assessor

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from Mr. Leafer, Assessor, for approval of attendance at a certification course, Fundamentals of Data Collection, to be held April 12-19, 1993 in Guilderland. This course is paid for by the State and is required for the Assessor.

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the attendance of M. David Leafer, Assessor, at a certification course, Fundamentals of Data Collection, to be held April 12-19, 1993 in Guilderland, New York. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

Acknowledge  
Receipt  
Final Plat  
Colonial  
Woodlands

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I would like to acknowledge receipt of Certificate of Approval of Final Plat No. 143-S1-F for Colonial Woodlands Subdivision from the Planning Board for informational purposes only.

Approve  
Seasonal  
Personnel  
Parks and  
Recreation  
Dept.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a request from David Austin, Administrator of Parks & Recreation Dept., for appointment of seasonal personnel, Alice Hahn.

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to approve the appointment of Alice Hahn, South Bethlehem, NY for the position of Senior Attendant at a rate of \$5.55 per hour. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

Award Bid  
Turf Utility  
Vehicle

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I have a recommendation from Mr. Austin, Administrator of Parks & Recreation, for award of bid for the Turf Utility Vehicle to S.F. Moffett Company, \$10,800.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Question for Bernie on that.

SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Question for Bernie on this bid.

COUNCILWOMAN GALVIN: Bernie, have you looked this one over with respect to the lockout device on the specs.

ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: Yes, I talked with Dave on a couple occasions and Bruce on a couple occasions. There was some misunderstanding at first. They didn't think that one of the bidders was able to provide the lockout device and that turned out to be wrong. We are getting it in the lowest bid as I understand it.

MR. AUSTIN: That is correct. The salesperson was misinformed from Moffett.

ATTORNEY KAPLOWITZ: But, the bid was proper and did it show?

MR. AUSTIN: The bid was proper, the bid didn't show that they couldn't provide it.

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to award the bid for one Turf Utility Vehicle to S.V. Moffett Co., Inc., West Henrietta, NY at a price of \$10,800. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----  
SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next a request from Mr. Secor, Commissioner of Public Works, for permission to go to bid for Contract 1E, Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Go To Bid  
Contract 1E  
Wastewater  
Treatment  
Plant

The following resolution was offered by Mrs. Fuller and seconded by Ms. Galvin:

WHEREAS, the Town desires to advertise for bids for Contract 1E, Electrical, Modifications to the Wastewater Treatment Plant, pursuant to law,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk advertise for such bids in THE SPOTLIGHT issue on the 31st day of March, 1992 and that bids be received up to 2:15 p.m. on the 20th day of April, 1993 at which time the bids will be publicly opened and read.

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

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

-----  
SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Next I would entertain a motion to conduct an Executive Session to discuss a personnel matter.

Executive  
Session

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mr. Gunner to hold an Executive Session to discuss a personnel matter following the regular Town Board meeting. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

-----  
SUPERVISOR RINGLER: Is there anything that anyone else would like to bring to the attention of the Board this evening? There was nothing. You didn't think I would get through the second part of that so quickly, did you students. Entertain a motion to adjourn.

The motion was made by Ms. Galvin and seconded by Mrs. Fuller to adjourn the regular Town Board meeting at 8:40 p.m. The motion was passed by the following vote:

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

*Kathleen A. Newkirk*  
Town Clerk

EXECUTIVE SESSION

There was no action taken at the Executive Session.