

**RED HOOK TOWN BOARD MEETING
FEBRUARY 25, 2009**

Public Hearing – Public Contract Reform Ordinance

A Public Hearing of the Town Board of the Town of Red Hook, Dutchess County, New York was convened in public session at the Town Hall, 7340 South Broadway, Red Hook at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Councilman James Ross, Deputy Supervisor
Councilwoman Micki Strawinski
Councilman Harry Colgan
Councilman Robert McKeon
Town Clerk Sue McCann
Also Present: Attorney for the Town Christine Chale
Absent: Supervisor Sue Crane

Deputy Supervisor Ross welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. He then opened for a public comment period on any items not pertaining to the ordinance.

There were no comments.

Deputy Supervisor Ross then opened the Public Hearing. He asked that speakers limit their time to three minutes and asked for decorum. He asked Councilman McKeon to give a brief summary of the proposed Public Contract Reform Ordinance.

Councilman McKeon gave a summary of the proposed Local Law. The ordinance would regulate the contracting procedures for the Town of Red Hook. It seeks to place limitations on who Red Hook would do business with based on campaign contributions. It attempts to try to separate the relationship that may or may not exist between political contributions and the awarding of contracts within our community. He handed out a description of which situations would be covered. Under the current draft the proposed legislation would only impact contracts or services with firms doing business at a level of \$3,000 or within a twelve month period when not subject to low bid or state contract. He tallied some of the firms the Town appoints annually (there are about a dozen or so) and he tried to do a quick analysis of how many of those contributed to the relevant campaigns that are articulated in the draft of the ordinance. There seem to be about five or six that are impacted. He referenced court decisions in Connecticut, New Jersey and New York City's pay to play ordinance. He recommended continuing the Public Hearing so people have time to consider the legislation and for time for people to give input.

Town Clerk Sue McCann read the public hearing notice published in the official newspapers Kingston Daily Freeman and the Poughkeepsie Journal.

Deputy Supervisor Ross read a letter composed by Supervisor Sue Crane, dated February 19, 2009, regarding her opinion of the proposed Local Law.
(Copy Attached)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Francis Donahue – opposed to the proposed ordinance and agrees with Supervisor Sue Crane. He referred to Article 4, Section 2 of the US Constitution. Mr. Donahue stated that the Constitution is the law of the land and referenced that in the Constitution of the United States. He believes this law would be voided.

Susan Mora - is in favor of the proposed ordinance because it is common sense. It can be detrimental to the taxpayers. She pays taxes to both the Village and Town and thinks there should not be undue influence. There are ways to get around bidding.

Steve Zarchzek – is opposed to the proposed ordinance. This is a small community and we don't have that many businesses and or professionals locally. Dutchess County has a law stating \$100 maximum and feels this ordinance is restrictive. He printed out the Town's Ethics Law and referred to Article III, 13-5, G.

Maureen Haege— this is unnecessary legislation. Our officials are already sworn to conduct themselves under the Town's Code of Ethics and guidelines established by campaign contribution law. She referred to the Town's procurement policy. She agrees with Supervisor Crane's concerns. Such a law flies in the face of the First Amendment and freedom of speech. She asked Councilman McKeon to look at his own actions and behavior on the Board. Scheduling this meeting on a night when he knew the Town Supervisor would not be available and refusing to provide information requested by the Supervisor at the last Board meeting is behavior not becoming of a public official representing the citizens of our Town. She asked that all Board members work together for the good of Red Hook.

Paul Fredricks - against the proposed ordinance. He doesn't know of an instance in this Town where people used their political contribution as a bribe to do business in the Town. We have full disclosure in this community and doesn't see why that isn't enough. If a business bids on work then reveal full disclosure.

Dan Pullaro – is a homeowner and taxpayer in the Town of Red Hook. He asked who was filming the meeting and who they represent. He finds it shameful that (Councilman) Harry Colgan, (Councilwoman) Micki Strawinski and (Councilman) Robert McKeon voted to hold this Public Hearing in the absence of Supervisor Crane. The arrogance and disrespect associated with that motion speaks volumes about their character and motivation. There are two concerns about this ordinance. The first is constitutionality about freedom of speech and thought. This limits freedoms under the First Amendment. The second concern is financial. If this is to be enacted the Town will undoubtedly be sued for violations of the First Amendment. The costs of defending those lawsuits will be passed to the true taxpayers of this community. It would also impact the costs in obtaining goods and services essential to running our Town. He gave examples of services that would fall under this ordinance.

Brian Williams – read a letter on behalf of a resident who could not attend because of religious observance. He asked why a Public Hearing would be held without the Supervisor present. She was voted to be the person to make decisions on behalf of the voters. It seems the interim personnel is at the helm. He cannot see how this proposal will survive legal suits against it. How is it that if a local contractor that does work for the Town, i.e.: Greenplan, donates money or services on behalf of any political party at any level be shut out of working for the Town in the future. The wording of this proposal will prohibit people working in this Town from donating time or money to any local campaign nor could they receive any help in their reelection campaigns bids from anyone who could tentatively do business with the Town in the next few years. This does not seem constitutional and the writer asked what our Town Attorney's have to say about it. He is afraid this is going to be a boondoggle at the taxpayer's expense.

Todd Baright – concerned about this proposal and its financial impact. Consider the huge cost to the Town of litigation that will likely ensue if this possibly illegally and ill advised proposal passes. Consider the increase in costs for services this law would create. This proposal would preclude many otherwise qualified and eligible professional business entities from offering their services. He gave an example. This proposal will be a waste of taxpayer dollars because it is financially and fiscally irresponsible. His other concerns were that it restricts people from exercising freedom of speech by limiting or restricting a person's freedom of political expression or freedom of action. It dabbles in campaign finance law. Disclosure laws are in place in the Town's Code of Ethics. He respectfully requested the Board abandon this unnecessary proposal or at the minimum extend the Public Hearing to the next meeting.

Rick Litton – opposes the proposed legislation. He suggested the Board members read Supervisor Crane's letter. It makes perfect sense. If after reading it they still want the law, he suggested they resign.

Bill Mansfield – opposes the proposal. He referred to the minutes of the February 3rd meeting and he agrees with Supervisor Crane's letter, especially the unconstitutionality of it. Councilman McKeon said he checked with Attorney Jim Cole from the Association of Towns who said we absolutely do have the right to do this and he recommended doing it as part of our Ethics Code. Councilman McKeon also indicated that he would get a written opinion from Attorney Jim Cole. He asked if Councilman McKeon produced, for the public's review, the written legal opinions on the constitutionality of this ordinance. He also noticed that Councilman McKeon attempted to block Supervisor Crane's request to authorize Attorney Chale to get a written opinion from the

Attorney General's Office on the grounds that the Attorney's firm would be impacted by this proposed legislation. He asked what legal opinion of this proposed ordinance has been completed. Why is there a need to protect taxpayers against something that never happened?

Nick Annas – asked why set up two different sets of standard for procuring services for the Town.

Susan Goodman Goldstein spoke on behalf of the Ethics Committee who met and discussed the enactment of this law. It is the Committee's feeling that if this does pass, it does not belong in our Ethics Code. It is more of a legal issue than an ethical issue and it should be a separate law. The Committee is not stating they are for or against this but they do not want it part of the Ethics Code.

Lisa Pullaro – commented that at the very beginning of this meeting we heard statements such that "we want to have time, we want to review this, we want to give the public an opportunity to speak". Yet it is with the utmost sense of urgency that we pushed through this Public Hearing to begin with. She is confused about why this Public Hearing couldn't wait until the Supervisor could be present. Regarding public officials, she did think about them and asked herself it was possible that (Councilwoman) Micki Strawinski might be coerced into supporting this proposal and is it possible that (Councilman) Harry Colgan offered this proposal and is coercing someone else into presenting it? You probably think these are absurd assertions but she asks that because, according to public campaign records, Councilwoman Strawinski accepted a campaign contribution from Councilman McKeon's wife, and Councilman Colgan donated to Councilman McKeon's campaign. She thinks that is a valid concern. She is surprised frankly, given the in depth discussion about transparency and integrity leading up to this Public Hearing, that none of them felt it necessary to reveal the contributions that have floated among them. What kind of perception does that leave? They probably will dismiss that perception as unfounded, but we are here to discuss an ordinance also based on a perception that is unfounded. A perception of undue influence, a perception of favoritism. We have a proposal in front of us to address perceptions and therefore we are willing to talk about limiting freedom of speech to address perception. Over the last two months the Board has claimed to be fiscally responsible while simultaneously leading us down a road of litigation. This proposal will most certainly result in legal challenges that the taxpayers will pay for. Councilman McKeon stated that we have the right to enact this type of law, yet bipartisan opinion clearly states not to take action in this area. Imagine if every municipality in Dutchess County had their own rules, we'd have thirty separate campaign finance laws. This proposal aims to dictate who we do business with. The cost of sending two people to a conference or people opting out of the medical buyout plan will pale in comparison to the cost associated with this legislation.

Barbara Jeck – opposes the proposed ordinance. It would require constant and detailed oversight. Who will manage compliance with this ordinance and at what cost to the taxpayers. Who of those required to enforce compliance will know who are partners, subsidiaries, spouse, children, etc. Give the parameters outlined she questions if this is even enforceable. It sounds extremely unconstitutional and it feels like her rights are being violated.

Rob Latimer – is a former Councilman and has been a local business person for the last 14 years. He stated that last year when he and Councilwoman Strawinski started on the Board she invoked and reiterated the first amendment right in this country in defense of a local website. He was in agreement at the time. His opinion is that if Board members each took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, should this law, which aims to strip individual business owners, their spouses and children of their rights under the First Amendment, be found to be unconstitutional, are those of you who support it prepared to step down from office having failed to uphold the Constitution. As the Assessor has the ability to review tax returns of those who claim certain state provided exemptions, should the people who entrust in these purportedly selfless public servants be allowed to review the business dealings of same. If integrity and transparency are paramount, let those in favor of putting unreasonable controls on local business entities, their spouses and children, first make their own business dealings public.

Brad Keil – does business with almost every Town and County within six counties around here, he does business with the New York State DOT, he a vendor with the New York State Thruway Authority and has never been confronted such an absurd law in his life. He does not agree with this proposed law.

Ben Traudt – agrees with those who oppose this law. He brought up that there isn't any mention of whether or not the Board would prevent residents from serving on Boards such as the Planning Board, Zoning Board, etc, if they've received or made contributions. How far does the law extend?

Susan Simon – loves the turnout here. She commends Councilman McKeon for pushing this because as a result people get together to give their opinions. The beauty of it is you can take this proposed law and perhaps craft it into something that would be workable after hearing everyone's opinion. Why not have contracting for everything over \$3,000. This way people can have freedom of speech and contribute as much as they want to political campaigns, yet everyone is in a fair race to have their services in our community and we won't necessarily lose local businesses. She also commended Councilman Ross for leading the meeting as Deputy Supervisor.

Al Trezza – understands the sentiment behind this law. Everyone said basically everything he wanted to say but he wanted to give an example. If a firm comes in and a spouse makes a substantial contribution, under this law you'd preclude them. If a firm has a gay member who is in a committed relationship with a long term life partner, and the life partner makes a substantial contribution, this law says nothing about that. Are you discriminating against marriage? He gave another example and stated that this law has some serious problems. He is not in favor of pay to play. Locally, Joel Sachs, a Town Attorney, is an excellent attorney and Mr. Trezza thinks very highly of him. Joel is heavily wired to the Democratic Party and he's sure he's contributed to it. But for a lousy few hundred dollars are we going to throw away Joel Sachs firm who took on seven cases against the Town of Red Hook and won every one of them? Are we going to throw away that kind of talent because he made a political contribution? You don't judge professional people on their contributions. You judge them on their skills and abilities. Senator Saland is associated with our current Town Attorney's firm. Mr. Rodenhausen is a heavily involved Democrat. Are we going to throw away Attorney Christine Chale because her firm might support Senator Saland or because Mr. Rodenhausen might make a contribution to the Town of Hyde Park Democratic Committee where he is the Town Attorney? Hire professionals based on their talents. He suggested hiring an independent Attorney to ask the Attorney General's opinion because it affects Attorney Chale's firm.

Pat Kelly – heard compelling arguments both for and against this proposal. Ms. Pullaro commented that Councilmen McKeon, Colgan and Councilwoman Strawinski hadn't disclosed their contribution. As far as state law, he knows that everyone did disclose their contributions. That information is available on line. Regarding the Public Hearing, and it being scheduled when the Supervisor wasn't here, obviously the Supervisor's input is valued. She spoke on this at the last two or three meetings. Councilman McKeon did comment this evening that we should extend this Public Hearing so that more people can weigh in. The Town doesn't stop when someone goes out of Town. He thinks this proposal is well intentioned and thinks it is great this many people are speaking out both in favor and against it. This kind of discussion is something we can all look forward to as we figure out if this is where we want the Town to go.

Beth Jones – referred to two items she read in the proposed ordinance. This ordinance seems to apply to people who contribute \$3,000 or more. It does talk about the bidding process which she believes everyone should have to do to do business with the Town. We have an Ethics ordinance that everyone says they abide by however she's seen people vote on things they should recuse themselves from that they have no business voting for. The intention of this ordinance is good but we need to vet it a little further. We need to get a grip and we need transparency. Why nobody would want transparency she has no idea.

Vince Murry – thinks it is a clever tactic to use the First Amendment of Freedom of Speech as a wedge. If someone wants to peddle influence money is the way to go. The law needs to be clarified.

Deputy Supervisor Ross asked if there were any further comments from the public. Being none, he read letters regarding the proposed ordinance.

Those letters against the proposed ordinance were from the following:

Build It Right, Hudson Valley Building and Construction Trades Council is concerned that if adopted, the proposed ordinance would cause the Town to restrict doing business with their members because of their involvement in the County and State political process. To prohibit such a broad array of legal practices would limit the Town's ability to do business with many local and regional businesses. To prohibit doing business with a labor organization because a contractor's spouse contributed to a State political action committee is too far reaching and questionable at best. They fear that too many of the Hudson Valley's businesses and their members would be barred from doing business with the Town simply because they chose to participate in the democratic process. They respectfully requested the Town withdraw this proposal and consider enacting more appropriate legislation.

Rosemarie Zengen – this would appear to be a direct abridgement of an individual's First Amendment rights under the US Constitution as well as a violation of one's civil rights. These are rights that have always been held "most dear" by the Democratic Party, whose ideals and support Mr. McKeon has espoused. Before passing such an egregiously improper law, the Town Board should seek the counsel of its own attorney, in writing, and an opinion, in writing, from both the Association of Town's legal staff and the NYS Attorney General's office. The Town Board should not place the Town in jeopardy of a law suit and unnecessary legal fees without first doing its homework and due diligence. To do otherwise would be a disservice to their constituents and taxpayers. During our present economic crisis, Councilman McKeon should be finding ways to save taxpayer's money, not waste it.

Marcus Molinaro spoke to Councilman Ross who contacted the Legal Director at Common Cause. They are going to have their Attorney's review it but their initial response was that they are concerned about the constitutionality of this proposed law.

Gale Scheltmeyer – after reading the document on the Town's website and talking with other citizens of the Town she felt compelled to write in opposition to the proposed ordinance. Councilman McKeon continues to refer to this as a remedy for "pay to play" politics, yet not one member of the Board has given a single, concrete example of undue influence concerning a Board member and/or Purchasing Agent of this Town. What we have heard and seen is that Councilman McKeon intends to have the Board dedicate time to this proposal with or without the supervisor's cooperation. We heard Councilman McKeon state that legal opinions are "not of one mind" and therefore, cannot be relied upon. She asked where all the documents and legal opinions are that back up his proposal. There is no evidence of "pay to play" politics but what we appear to have is a new era of "play McKeon" politics. As a working taxpayer trying to keep her home she resents this self-serving proposal and the very real potential for litigation resulting in even greater cost to the taxpayers. She is appalled at the decision to move forward with the public hearing after the Supervisor requested it be postponed to a later date. There is already a Code of Ethics that outlines how officials should conduct themselves. The remedy is personal responsibility on the part of Board members. She strongly urged the members of the Town Board to consider rejecting this proposal after full and transparent Town board consideration. She asked that we go forward as an example of change for the unity of our Town.

Richard Wambach – the proposed amendment as it is presented flies in the face of small town/close community cohesiveness and partnership. It restricts, with total disregard, an individual citizen's exercise of their rights and freedoms under the First Amendment. The proposed ordinance would seem to override NY State Election Law which already has in place safeguards to specifically prevent the kinds of conflict alluded to in the draft document. He thinks the document is an insult to our collective intelligence. It will only serve to negatively impact local cooperation and infringe on our rights while at the same time drive the costs of doing business with the Town higher than necessary or that can be sustained in these difficult times. The unconstitutionality implied in the document would lead to the town having to defend itself from severe litigation, whose defense fees would be heaped on the backs of taxpayers who are already suffering mightily with high taxes. This law makes no sense and he strongly objects to its passage into local law.

Those letters in favor of the proposed law were from:

Don O'Shea – stated his public support for the Public Contract Reform Ordinance. He read the ordinance and it seems within the limits of good governance.

Emily Houpt – Thanked the Board for their hard work and expressed her support for the elimination of the “pay to play” system of awarding public works contracts. It would be a step in the right direction to restoring the public’s confidence in our elected officials and their ability to make decisions in the public interest instead of private pocketbooks.

John Schmitz – was originally against the law but is now for it because the Town listened to the concerns of him and others and then made some changes which he believes make it a better law. This law basically aims to limit the influence of money on our Town government specifically limiting campaign contributions to government officials and political organizations that support those officials and/or candidates. The citizens of Red Hook and surrounding communities have complained that they’d been shut out of doing business with the Town because they did not “pay to play” i.e. because they had not contributed to certain campaign or political organizations. The proposed law aims to “level the playing field” so that any firm has the same chance of winning a contract with the Town. The law applies only to future donations made after it would go into effect. It is not intended as a punitive measure against past behavior, rather a positive step for the future. It only applies to donations \$3000 and up, smaller donations would not limit a firm from being hired where work involves a competitive bid process. The law makes exceptions for emergency situations. He gave a web address regarding a recent version of the law being considered.

Vicky Perry – the reform ordinance is a welcome proposal. The citizens of Red Hook have the right to establish rules for contracting with businesses. It is sound business practice. The end of “pay to play” will ensure that Town money is wisely spent. Three benefits from the proposal are that it protects taxpayers, it protects Town leaders, and it still allows individuals full “freedom of speech” to support their leaders as they see fit. She said those who oppose the legislation are candidates who want no restrictions to hamper their fundraising. They will claim this is about limits to campaign finance and they are wrong. Those who may consider that “business as usual” in Red Hook can include buying influence, also, lobbyists who would pressure our leaders instead of letting the free market determine who gets Red Hook’s business. A Public Contract Reform Ordinance will usher in a new era of trust.

Bryan Cranna, Deputy Mayor of Tivoli, used an example and asked about emergency situations. The reason the Town might want a firm to come back and do an emergency repair would be because they were the ones to do the work in the first place. When it comes to emergency situations, elected officials have a responsibility to ensure public safety. He doesn’t think they should look during an emergency whether someone’s donated to someone. What about fire extinguishers, fire equipment? We need to look at the safety of the residents we represent.

Councilman McKeon pointed out Section VII, Emergency Procurement, of the draft which excludes those situations that Mr. Cranna pointed out.

Al Trezza asked how far this would extend. Do we exclude the best talent in situations if their firms are involved? If you are hiring a professional person, respect the fact that those people are professionals. He was a Town Attorney for 38 years and was never offered a bribe. If you discover something unprofessional is happening fire them. How do you enforce this law? You’re asking for a sworn statement. If a person is going to be so crass as to bribe a public official you think they are going to go by a sworn statement?

Richard Hansen – in concern for the taxpayers, we are paying by the hour for our Attorney. The reorganization would allow the Attorney to go on retainer and all of this would be free so to speak rather than be charged for the hour. We found an Attorney and because of this action you held up the reappointments. By the time this is passed you may have used up your whole budget. He thinks the Attorney for the Town should be reappointed because it would be much more economical to do so. If you find they’ve done something unscrupulous, get rid of them. In the mean time this standoff between the majority and minority factions are costing the taxpayers a lot of money. You’re not really acting in the interest of the taxpayers.

Brian Williams – questioned enforceability. How do we get financial records of each of you? There are going to be donations. People figure out ways to get things done and always will.

Susan Mora attended an Ethics meeting once and certain things were discussed. She and her husband asked what teeth they had to enforce something they considered not to be within the

Ethics Code. They were told that all they could do is make suggestions they don't have teeth to enforce. Basically they can just make suggestions. Everyone is saying we have an Ethics Code but if they have no power what good is it.

Fred Cartier, Chair of the Ethics Committee said that all we can do is make recommendations to the Board, and then the Board would have to make the decision.

Lisa Pullaro – revisited a point made by Councilman McKeon saying that there are several cases that substantiate the particular proposal. She referred to a particular case in New York City. It has no relevance other than in New York City because NYC has been granted the right to impose their own campaign rules due to the history of corruption in the city. The Towns in the State of New York don't have the same right. In the case in NYC, contributions are still permitted by contractors and service providers, unlike our proposed ordinance. It would be false to portray that decision as comparable to that being proposed here. She encouraged people to listen carefully and ask questions because we've seen examples of half truths and misrepresentations and we owe it to ourselves to do our own research.

Rick Litton is hearing a lot of innuendos, and challenged the Board to show us where someone has committed such a heinous act as to go through all of this tonight and into the future possibly costing us a lot of money in legal fees. What is so heinous that you would want this ordinance?

Fran Donahue asked if this ordinance has a dual purpose. Is its purpose the weakening of the opposition's party as far as finances are concerned? Think about it.

Tim Ross wants to see the Public Hearing continued until the Town Attorney or Attorney General has weighed in on it. He disagrees with the law. We are spending time on this and we haven't even finished the reorganization. He and two others terms are up on the ZBA. He thinks keeping the Town running is more important than trying to pass unnecessary legislation.

Deputy Supervisor Ross asked if there were any more comments.

There were no further comments from the public.

Councilman McKeon thanked everyone for their involvement in the draft of the law whether they are in favor of or against it. He was asked to provide information regarding court decisions. Whatever the courts say, the resident's opinions are paramount. He did provide those court decisions in his packet. He also provided information about municipalities who enacted this law.

Councilman Colgan expressed that this has been an informative evening for him and the last few weeks have been a challenging opportunity to learn about this issue. Through the Board of Election records he's discovered a number of interesting and troubling things. One issue is that there are firms in Dutchess County who make contributions on a regular basis. It is a profound statement on the kind of interest people have in the political process. He casually looked at those election records. He encouraged everyone to look for themselves. He also thinks we can't deprive people of their right to contribute. People should be allowed to contribute on an annual basis and not have it affect their ability to do business with the Town. The point is he thinks we should protect ourselves from undue influence of excessive contributions. He doesn't know what that number is. He'd rather continue to operate in the future as we have in the past in this Town. He wants to continue to take a look at this.

Councilwoman Strawinski agrees with Councilman Colgan. We are going to spend more time on this and we appreciate the comments made. It is her opinion that the public contract reform ordinance is a proactive measure rather than reactive to anything. It is meant to complement our State election laws and our Ethics Laws. It is an ordinance that she thinks will guide us in the future as our Town grows. This is a time in history where we are hearing over and over about the corruption in government and lack of trust for our elected officials. This ordinance would instill a public trust in Red Hook. She referenced a sample code of ethics from the Association of Towns that said an "official must avoid circumstances that compromise his or her ability to make decisions solely in public interest or create an appearance of impropriety...." Keep in mind that professional services are these "no big contractors" we hear about all too often. This issue raised a lot of concern on the part of businesses in our Town. It is necessary to have these kinds of discussions and she thinks we can shape this into something that benefits everybody.

Deputy Supervisor Ross is opposed to this proposed ordinance. He thinks this is just another layer that is not needed. We have the campaign finance law, we have election laws and our own Code of Ethics and they always worked well for us. In this Town, in doing business for the last twenty years that he knows of, the larger contracts were always sealed bids. Ninety- nine percent of the time they accepted the lowest bidder, unless it was felt that they were not reputable. Smaller projects have always been estimates and that is generally a local contractor and the lowest estimate. He doesn't see the need for another layer that is already governed by State laws which are very clear. Why create something else that is just going to be a problem.

On a motion of Deputy Supervisor Ross, seconded by Councilman Colgan, moved to adjourn the Public Hearing to a later date to be publicized at one of our following Town Board meetings.

Adopted	Ayes 4	Ross, Strawinski, Colgan, McKeon
	Nays 0	
	Absent 1	Crane

The vote was taken after the following discussion:

Councilman McKeon suggested amending the motion and scheduling the continuation of the Public Hearing for April 7th. It will provide nearly a month's time to see how we want to proceed.

Deputy Supervisor Ross is not opposed to the date but if we don't have the information we need we might very well have to change that date. That is why he motioned for a date to be announced at another meeting. When we have the information we need we can continue the Public Hearing. If we don't have the information by April 7th then we might have to postpone it further.

Councilman McKeon said it is easier once you've announced it when the public is here to continue it to a specified date instead of going through the time and expense of re-noticing. He asked if the week after or the week prior would be good.

Councilman Colgan asked why not leave it open. We have meetings before that anyway. We can do it when we know that we can do it.

Deputy Supervisor Ross explained that if we adjourn it we do not have to re-notice it. If we adjourn it we announce it at a public meeting.

Attorney Chale explained that re-noticing should be at the point they made the changes; when you have a new draft.

Deputy Supervisor Ross explained that the decision was to adjourn the Public Hearing until further notice and if there are substantial changes to the proposed ordinance we will publicly re-notice.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue McCann, Town Clerk