Village of Scarsdale

Jonathan I. Mark, Mayor

Matthew J. Callaghan
Carl L. Finger
Deborah Pekarek
Marc Samwick
William Stern
Jane Veron

Office of the Village Manager
Scarsdale, New York 10583
914-722-1110
Fax: 914-722-1119
www.scarsdale.com

Stephen M. Pappalardo
Village Manager

Village Board Agenda
June 28, 2016
Agenda Committee Meeting – 7:30 PM – Trustees Room
Village Board Meeting - 8:00 PM - Rutherford Hall

	Action
Roll Call	
Pledge of Allegiance	
Minutes	
➢ Village Board Meeting of June 14, 2016	
Bills	
➢ Trustee Veron	
Mayor's Comments	
Manager's Comments	
Public Hearing	
➢ Local Law to Amend Chapter 179 of the Scarsdale Village Code, Entitled Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and Chapter 243 of the Scarsdale Village Code, Entitled Recycling - Elimination of Grass Clipping Collection Operation and Other Necessary Updates	
➢ Local Law to Amend Chapter 256 of the Scarsdale Village Code, Entitled Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places	

Public Comments _____

Committee Items

Law Committee – Trustee Finger

- Resolution re: Adopting Road Restoration Standards _____

Personnel Committee – Trustee Veron

- Resolution re: Appointment of Fire Chief _____
- Resolution re: Appointment to the Advisory Council on Human Relations _____
- Resolution re: Appointments to the Advisory Council on People with Disabilities _____

Municipal Services Committee – Trustee Pekarek

- Resolution re: Awarding VM Contract #1202 – Furnish & Install a New 60' x 120' Full Span Fabric Salt Shed Structure _____

Other Committee Reports _____

Liaison Reports _____

Written Communications (23) _____

- Revaluation (20)
- Robert Malenitza – Grass Clipping Pick-Up
- Michelle Sterling & Ron Schulhof – Food Waste
- James Shenwick – Motorcycle Parking Permits

Future Meeting Schedule

Monday, June 27, 2016

- Committee of the Whole Meeting – 8:00 PM
    - 2016 Property Tax Assessment Revaluation Project – Status Report on Assessment Grievance Proceedings for the 2016 Tentative Assessment Roll

Tuesday, June 28, 2016

- Agenda Committee Meeting - 7:30 PM
- Board of Trustees Meeting - 8:00 PM

Tuesday, July 12, 2016

- Agenda Committee Meeting - 7:30 PM
- Board of Trustees Meeting - 8:00 PM

Village Hall Schedule

Monday, July 4, 2016

Independence Day – Village Hall Closed

THREE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-SIXTH

REGULAR MEETING

Rutherford Hall
Village Hall
June 14, 2016

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale was held in the Rutherford Hall in Village Hall on Tuesday, June 14, 2016 at 8:00 P.M.

Present were Mayor Mark, Trustees Callaghan, Finger, Pekarek, Samwick, Stern, and Veron. Also present were Village Manager Pappalardo, Deputy Village Manager Cole, Assistant Village Manager Richards, Village Attorney Esannason, Deputy Village Attorney Garrison, Village Treasurer McClure, and Village Clerk Conkling.

****

The minutes of the Board of Trustees Regular Meeting of Tuesday, May 24, 2016 were approved on a motion entered by Trustee Pekarek, seconded by Trustee Samwick, and carried unanimously.

****

Bills & Payroll

Trustee Stern reported that he had audited the Abstract of Claims dated June 14, 2016 in the amount of $864,517.43 which includes $36,214.15 in Library Claims previously audited by a Trustee of the Library Board which were found to be in order and he moved that such payment be ratified.

Upon motion duly made by Trustee Stern and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, that the Abstract of Claims dated June 14, 2016 in the amount of $864,517.43 is hereby approved.

****

Mayor's Comments

Due to the size of the audience present, Mayor Mark stated that he was required by law to read the following:

"Fire exits are located out the double doors into the left and right sides, also down the stairs. In the event of a fire you will be notified by announcement. If notified, please move in a calm and orderly fashion to the nearest exit. Thank you."

Mayor Mark made the following comments:

"Revaluation 2016: The 2016 Town/Village Tentative Assessment Roll reporting the results of the 2016 Village-wide revaluation was posted on June 1, 2016. This Board is aware of the unhappiness of many residents with the revaluation results reflected in the tentative roll. We have read many of the comments in the electronic media that follow the Village as well as the article, letter to the editor and editorial in last Friday's *Inquirer*. We understand the anger and upset of those residents whose assessments increased dramatically and sympathize with them.

That said, the process for those aggrieved by their assessment is no different this year than in past years. Residents who wish to grieve their assessment should do so. The deadline for filing a grievance is Thursday [sic, Tuesday], June 21, 2016. This date is set by state regulation and cannot be waived by this Board.

In the past, there has been some question about what needs to be filed by the deadline. As we have said previously, the grievance form which is available on the Village web site and in the Assessor's Office at Village Hall must be completed and filed by the statutory grievance day of June 21st. If a resident is unable to supply supporting data, such as an appraisal, by that date, this additional information may be supplied at a later date as the resident's matter comes up for consideration by the Town Board of Assessment Review. The critical step is that the completed grievance form be filed by June 21st, so those who intend to grieve, do not miss that date.

A few process points with respect to grievances:

What is the time period that the board of assessment review is required to meet on grievance day?

Real Property Tax Law (RPTL) section 525 requires the board of assessment review to meet at least four hours during grievance day, two of those hours must be after 6 pm in the evening. Because of the number of residents requesting to appear before the Board of Assessment Review in 2014 and the number expected this year, the Board will extend its hours beyond the hours required under the law to accommodate as many homeowners as possible. On June 21, 2016, the Scarsdale Board of Assessment Review will convene to hear complaints relating to assessments during the hours of 10:00 am – 12:00 noon; 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm; and 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm.

How late will complaints be accepted on grievance day?

RPTL section 524 provides that "complaints with respect to assessments may be filed with the assessor at any time prior to the hearing of the Board of Assessment review or with the Board of Assessment Review at such hearing ...." Based upon the meeting schedule for June 21st just mentioned, grievance filings will be accepted by the Assessor and Board of Assessment Review until 8:00 pm. In the event that the Board of Assessment Review is still presiding over hearings after 8:00 pm, for those homeowners who arrived prior to 8:00 pm, grievance forms, will continue to be accepted until such time that the Board of Assessment Review adjourns for the evening.

What is the maximum reduction in assessment that a residential property may receive from a small claims assessment review proceeding?

RPTL section 730 limits small claim assessment review matters to one, two or three family owner occupied structures used exclusively for residential purposes. That section also limits the amount of reduction requested by an applicant to twenty-five percent of the assessed value of the property.

Residential property owners who desire more than a twenty-five percent reduction in their assessed value, must bring an action pursuant to Article 7 of the RPTL. Commercial property owners wishing to challenge their assessment must also bring an action pursuant to Article 7 of the RPTL.

Many of the complaints have questioned the revaluation process and what it involved. This time around, the Village has posted on its web site a Final Report of the consultant who performed the revaluation, J.F. Ryan Associates, Inc. with a view to providing an additional level of transparency into the process than was the case in 2014. Residents who are interested in this matter are urged to read the report."

Mayor Mark addressed the Village Manager, stating that he understood, pursuant to requests and a view to transparency, that the property cards will be available on the system.

Village Manager Pappalardo replied affirmatively, stating that the detailed data sheets will be made available on the Village's website, www.scarsdale.com.

Mayor Mark continued, "it is assumed that many of you are here tonight to convey your views on the revaluation to us. You will have a chance to speak during the Public Comment session of the meeting. However, to the extent you intend to speak about your particular property and why in your view it was over-valued, please keep in mind that this Board, and this meeting, is not a forum for addressing those concerns. The grievance process is the framework for addressing individual property valuations, with your first opportunity to do so at the June 21st Board of Assessment Review proceedings.

Other comments we have heard include questions about future Village-wide revaluations and whether they can be expected at two year intervals into the future. It is likely that the frequency of future revaluations will be a decision to be made by future Village Boards, not this one. My own view is that it would seem that intervals of four to five years – possibly longer -- would be more likely for the next and subsequent revaluations – and in any case, not two years. However, that is just my view and it is certainly not a position that would bind a future Board faced with determining whether or not to initiate a Village-wide revaluation. Any such determination would be based on the facts and circumstances at such future time.

It is noted that we have been asked to supply information on how many assessments went up, how many went down and how many stayed the same. The Village staff has been asked to compile that information as this Board would also like that information. However, in terms of timing for providing that information, we are aware that the Village Assessor's office is presently responding to resident requests about the grievance process and assisting them with procedural matters in connection with grievance filings. Given the June 21st deadline—one week from today – we believe the staff should give priority to resident assistance and can turn to compiling the requested information once the filing deadline has passed.

One other point that may be worth making is to explain the inter-relationship of the property assessment revaluation and real property taxes. While valuation and taxes are inextricably related, they are concepts that are analyzed and determined independently from each other.

The revaluation, as we are aware is a process that assesses each property in the Village to arrive at a value for each property and as a result, an aggregate assessed value for the real property in the entire Village.

As to taxes, the starting point is the Village budget. The budget for 2016-2017 is already adopted. It was the product of a months-long budget process that analyzed the funding needed to maintain Village services and to address certain capital projects. The budget for 2016-2017 is approximately $55.5 million, of which approximately $38.5 million is expected to be raised from real property taxes. The 2016-2017 adopted budget is posted on the Village website.

The tax rate is derived arithmetically by calculating what rate would be required to generate the budgetary funds called for based on the aggregate assessed value of real property in the Village. The effect of the assessment is to allocate the aggregate real property tax among all property owners."

Mayor Mark asked the Village Manager what the Tentative Assessment Roll shows as the assessed value of real property in the Village.

Village Manager Pappalardo responded that the total taxable assessed valuation to be calculated used to compute the 2016 tax bills that will be going out in July is currently at $9,033,215,035. The total Village-wide taxable assessed value per the June 1, 2016 Tentative Assessment Role is $9,081,031,940 which is an increase of approximately $47,816,905. These are tentative numbers and they will decrease as there are SCAR proceedings and all of those procedures take place. Village Manager Pappalardo clarified that the assessed value of $9,081,031,940 will be utilized for the 2017 County, School and Village tax.

****

Manager's Comments

None.

****

Public Comment

Josh Frankel, Black Birch Lane, gave the following statement: "Good evening. My name is Josh Frankel, and I live on Black Birch Lane.

I'm here tonight to address the 2016 Ryan revaluation. For the record, my assessed value rose approximately 7 percent, and sits now essentially flat from where it was pre-Tyler (the 2014 revaluation). In other words, for me, it's as if we never had either revaluation. But this is neither about me nor about any individual parcel.

In November 2014, when the 2016 revaluation was under consideration and faced some vocal opposition, then-Mayor Steves said the Board should "better explain why we feel the need to do it again in 2016." That never happened. There was no additional discussion of the revaluation until the passage of a resolution authorizing it on January 29, 2015, said resolution mentioning that "John F. Ryan…was the monitor for the 2014 Scarsdale revaluation providing him with the requisite revaluation project and Scarsdale real estate market knowledge . . . ." Which is to say that Ryan had looked over Tyler's shoulder in 2014 and had – or should have had – an intimate knowledge of Tyler's methodologies and models.

At the April 14, 2015 board meeting, during the public comment period, then-Scarsdale League of Women Voters President Susie Rush cited a comment made by then Village Manager Al Gatta that the 2016 revaluation was "necessary to address the properties that are "outliers.""

Incoming Mayor Mark made extensive comments at that April meeting, rebutting various criticisms that had been raised. In his comments, the Mayor said that he viewed the new reval as "a good faith attempt to finish off what was largely completed in 2014" and "an

effort to refine what was done," to "eliminate a number, though perhaps not all, of the inequities that may still exist . . . ." The Mayor mentioned the need to "refine and correct" twice more in his comments.

In short, residents were told that the 2016 reval was necessary to address the "outliers," to "refine and correct" lingering inaccuracies and inequities from 2014. It was to be, in a word, a tweak. Except we see now that it was anything but. A quick look at some numbers is very revealing.

Looking at Ryan's results Village-wide – just over 5900 parcels – 2,820, or 48%, saw their assessed value change by more than 10% up or down. Nineteen percent of properties – 1 in 5 – saw their assessed valuation rise or fall by more than 20%. Within the village, I looked very broadly at our seven major residential zones which represent well over 5,000 parcels. It is clear from the data that much of what was done in 2014 has been undone in 2016 – another major shift has taken place.

The aggregate assessed valuation – the total value of all properties - in Zone A1 declined by over 6%. In AA1, the decline is 3.5%. The relief in those areas was simultaneously spread across the other zones with increases, most notably A4, which is up 7.11% in aggregate, and A5, which increased by almost 8% in aggregate. The A3, A4 and A5 zones, some 3,934 parcels rose, in the aggregate, by just over $200 million or, on average, just over $50,000 each, while the 394 parcels in the A1 zone went down by, on average, $243,000. The percent of homes rising and declining in those areas, and others, bears this out. (There is a chart in Mr. Frankel's statement which he indicated).

While it may be the case that the statistical outcomes of this revaluation conform to accepted norms for mass appraisals, such as coefficient of dispersion and price related differential, no one should mistake this for a tweak, a refinement, a correction, or an adjustment of outliers. This was a reval done anew, inexplicably using different methodologies and models. Hence an entirely different result, which is what we got, should come as no surprise. The question is why, given that Ryan was Tyler's monitor during the 2014 reval, approval was granted for what is essentially a complete overhaul of Tyler's work, resulting in the shift that is apparent in the data.

Two specific questions:

1. On page 18 of his report, Ryan presents a table of land values, yet there is no explanation as to how they're derived. Where did they come from?

2. Ryan's "Sales Base" data, from July 2014 to September 2015, provides data on 220 sales. My download from the NYS Office of Real Property Services for the same dates yielded about 370 rows of data. Is it conceivable 150 were invalid? If not, where did they go?

Finally, while it is true that residents always have the option of filing a grievance, it can be burdensome, time consuming, and expensive to do so, with no guarantee of success. And the onus should not be on residents to clean up after the Board.

Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez, 19 Fox Meadow Road, stated that since the revaluation results came out on June 1st, she has spent over 200 hours collectively with her husband Brice and neighbor Nickolai Baturin of 23 Fox Meadow Road. They have been reverse engineering results of the model. She noted that their professions are modeling, quantitative statistical analysis and the instruction of models to non-quantitative professionals. The J.F. Ryan Associates model has significant errors and omissions and unfortunately the revaluation process has been very opaque to Scarsdale residents and pays no attention to model risk. This is an admission that the model can be completely wrong.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez explained models and model risk governance to the audience and how they are developed. There is no evidence on the Ryan model that any back-testing was done, which is comparing an expected result with an actual one and you look for errors and make any corrections. Model risk governance was extremely weak in this case. He was awarded the revaluation in a non-competitive bid and proceeded not to disclose in a granular manner to the public the model inputs and assumptions. He did not disclose what calculations were chosen and how they would perform and whether or how the model was tested. There is absolutely no evidence that an independent party validated Ryan's assumptions and data. There is no proof that someone independent of the whole process audited the model. These steps are essential in creating and implementing a robust and credible model.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez asked the Board why the Village completely switched the methodology from the previous assessment which involved property visits and cost millions to complete. One of her neighbors had a nearly 89% rise in assessed value. The unpredictability will give pause to potential property buyers in Scarsdale resulting in lower property values for everyone.

Brice Kirkendall-Rodrigues, 19 Fox Meadow Road, noted that the 2014 revaluation raised the valuation of their home approximately 7 1/2 %, which was modestly higher than their purchase price. However, the Ryan assessed valuation has added and additional 35%. As Mr. Frankel already pointed out, the 2016 reval was supposed to be a tweak. He stated that he hardly considered a $400K change in their home value to be a tweak. This certainly made them consider what was in the model. The Ryan model was based on the sales of 220 properties; just about 4% of all residential homes in Scarsdale. The key advantage of the Ryan approach is that sales are recent and presumably give one the best assumptions of current market conditions. However, the homes actually sold on average In Fox Meadow were larger and on larger lots than the population in Fox Meadow. By contrast, the average size and lot size of homes sold in Heathcote were about 10% smaller than the population for Heathcote. There is a sampling bias off the bat.

In his opinion, Ryan attempted to correct for this through his model by applying his model to the sample. However, if there are any flaws in the initial assumption in the model, you will have amplified flaws in the result. Amplified imperfections will lead to large swings in home values. The result of the Ryan model bears this out. Less than half of their neighbors landed within the 10% band of change. More than half changed by 10% or more.

Mr. Kirkendall-Rodrigues stated that the amount of change both in percentage and breadth of participation suggests that the Town now considers the Tyler valuation to be null and void. If the new reval is intended to replace Tyler and upend the market once again, then there needs to be a strong case made with data to prove that we should throw everything away done by Tyler two years ago. However, there are fundamental flaws in the model that cannot be corrected for all homes through a grievance process.

Nickolai Baturin, 23 Fox Meadow Road, stated that he worked with Mayra and Brice on the reverse engineering of J. F. Ryan's reval model. They downloaded all the Ryan sale data and he presented to the audience several poster boards indicating the dollar value of each house against the square footage of the homes, as well as the land value. Small homes will tend to be slightly over-valued and large homes will tend to be strongly undervalued. There are a lot of parameters in the model and each one is determined by the 220 data points. It is a case of over-fit relationship that is being offered as the best model for Scarsdale. They question why there is such a huge departure in the methodology that is used from the previous style of reval to this 2016 Ryan reval.

Judy Kerr, 15 Fox Meadow Road, stated that she would like to deliver a petition to the Board of Trustees to ask for their help to void this Reval because it is based on an apparently fraud model and opaque process. Please note that it is not only those residents who have received overvalued revals have signed the petition, but also concerned residents signed the petition as well. The residents are asking for the Board's leadership and governance in implementing a correct and useful revaluation model for the sake of the financial security of the community. There are approximately 200 signatures on the petition and signatures are still being gathered.

Robert Berg, 32 Tisdale Road, stated that his property valuation decreased approximately $50,000 in this revaluation. On May 31, 2016 the Village had a very accurate property assessment role, the result of an excellent 2014 Town-wide revaluation, the first in 45 years, effectively handled by the biggest mass appraisal firm in the county, Tyler Technologies. Any mass appraisal will have some hiccups and Tyler at least handled a transparent program throughout and provided several important procedural safeguards to residents to improve the accuracy of the roll. Property owners were mailed the property data cards and were able to discuss any errors with Tyler. Tyler also provided taxpayers with a preliminary evaluation in March 2014 and held informal sessions with many residents who had problems with Tyler's valuations of their properties. Many adjustments were made during this process and were reflected in the June 1, 2014 Tentative Assessment Roll. Then the Village went through two grievance periods in 2014 and 2015 during which residents

were able to file challenges to their valuations about 1,200 out of 6,000 property owners did so over the two year period. Many over assessed properties were adjusted downward as a result of this process and that is why by May 31, 2016 Scarsdale's assessment roll was probably as accurate as it could get. This all changed on June 1, 2016 when the Assessor filed the Tentative Assessment Roll based on the new J. F. Ryan Revaluation. The Village now has the train wreck he warned them about. He and a few others, including Robert Harrison and Howard Nadel strenuously opposed doing the second Ryan revaluation immediately on the heels of the Tyler reval.

Mr. Berg stated that most recently, at the April 26, 2016 Board meeting, he and Bob Harrison begged the Board to bail out of this reval disaster. Ryan's reval is bad because the fundamental assumptions are bad. In an effort to simplify the model, it eliminates important variables that drive values and many of these valuations are totally off the mark. He gave some examples using the sales base that Ryan used to develop his model and how this drastically changed the values of some of the homes in Scarsdale.

Mr. Berg stated that this Ryan revaluation is so seriously flawed that it is actually unconstitutional under the Equal Protection clause and should be voided. If it cannot be voided, the Town must implement a third revaluation to correct this travesty. After spending more than $1 million on the Tyler revaluation, the Village Board spent another $250,000 in a no-bid contract with J. F. Ryan, undoing all the good work done by Tyler and leading to chaos in the Assessment Roll and tremendous anxiety and uncertainly among the residents. This is bad governance. The Board's decision to go forward with the reval in spite of the red flags raised during Ryan's reval process reflects inexcusable poor judgement. It calls into serious question whether the time has come to replace the non-partisan system of uncontested elections for Village office with something else where voters have a choice and where candidates have to let the voters know their positions on important issues in Town like another revaluation or historic preservation.

Gary Matzkin, 10 Griffen Avenue, stated that he has lived in Scarsdale for almost 20 years and this is the first time he has been to a Board meeting. He noted that his house went up a little bit in 2014. Now it has gone up 20% - $250,000. How does this happen? Either Tyler was wrong or Ryan is wrong. He is told that it is land-based. His piece of property, .63 acres is worth $1 million according to Ryan. When he goes to grieve this, which he will, he will have to hire someone to do it. If he is able to get the $250,000 back, he will still have to pay the person he hired 50% of what is saved. That will be about $6-8,000 in savings, but will cost him $3-4,000 because of this stupid revaluation the Town just had.

Michael Kerr, 15 Fox Meadow Road, stated that if the person that drove by his house was accidently looking at another house and bumped everything by accident, how is the onus on him to file a grievance? He should not have to do anything. He purchased his house three years ago. He understood the first revaluation and the fact that his taxes went up. In the last year since, his house went up $500,000. He stated that he didn't know how

this happened. He should not have to explain it at all. There should be responsibility taken for the mistake that has been made here. All of these people should not have to go through grievances because of the mistakes that have obviously been made. The model is flawed. There are so many things that could have gone wrong here. He has done nothing to the house since he bought it 3 years ago. Ryan agreed that it is worth what he paid, but somehow someone thought it is worth 50% more. He stated he doesn't want to have to explain this or hire someone to explain it, but wants an apology.

Robert Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road, noted that he was a Trustee at the time Tyler Technologies was hired in a competitive bid. Tyler is one of the 2 or 3 best firms in the nation to do a revaluation. J. F. Ryan Associates has three or four people in the firm. He questioned why Mr. Ryan or the Assessor was not at the meeting this evening.

Mr. Harrison stated 936 homes went up in assessed value 10-20%; 433 up 20-30%; 159 up 30-40%; 57 up 40-50%; 36 up 50-60%; 18 up 60-70%; 13 up 70-80%; 16 up 80-90%; and 4 up 90-100%. Mr. Harrison then cited specific property owners and their assessed values, including some of the Village Board members.

Mr. Harrison stated that J. F. Ryan should be fired and at the very least the Village should not finish paying for his services. He urged the Board to void the reval and perhaps the residents need to bring a class action suit against J. F. Ryan Associates.

Kai Tang, 22 Ridgecrest East, stated that he moved into Scarsdale in late 2013. At the time he purchased it the house was listed for well over a year. He negotiated a small discount although he did not underpay. In 2014 he received the new assessment from the Tyler reval and his assessment was $10,000 less. He has now received a 62% increase in assessed value from the Ryan reval. He stated that he worked for many years as a test engineer – millions of data points. First thing he does when he gets the data is to do a 'sanity' check. The Ryan reval does not pass the sanity check, and in fact it doesn't pass the smell test.

David Zhaohui, 137 Madison Road, stated that he just moved to Scarsdale last year. He stated that he spent hours getting all of the data from the website from each property. He works as a quantitative analyst and is very interested in data. He wrote a program to download all of the data from the website – 5,683 properties. He then did a comparison between all the properties that were sold between July 2014 and September 2015. That it is the data point used by Ryan Associates to calibrate the model. If you do a simple comparison between the assessed values of those homes sold in the sample period you can see the increase in assessed value is significantly higher than the increase in the assessed homes that were not sold during that period. For a lot of features in a home, the value if fixed and cannot be manipulated. However, there is greater freedom to manipulate the data for the construction grade. He noted that he has all the data but not enough time to show all of the results.

Scott Coplan, 1 Black Birch Lane, thanked the Board of Trustees for listening to everyone this evening. The 2016 Ryan revaluation was flawed. If the Board can understand that the reval was flawed, now is the time to do something about it. The Board needs to rectify the situation. His house went up in assessed value by 50.5%. Now he is going to have to pay a grievance company and that company is going to get 50% of the reduction, whatever that is. The Board needs to make a decision and quickly. The Board needs to understand what has happened. The Board should reverse this revaluation and void it.

Piero Olcese, 121 Brown Road, stated that his assessed valuation has gone up 20%. He told the Board that what they have done with this reval is to knock on his door and say it is time for him to leave. The Board needs to think of what kind of impact this is going to have on the Village. The Board is forcing him to leave the Village and hopefully sell to a family who will come in with four to six people and tax the services of the Village. For the same taxes you are receiving now for two people, you're going to have to provide services for more. It doesn't make any sense. He is emotional about this because he just retired and he and his wife were hoping to spend the next 25 years in Scarsdale. They cannot afford the uncertainty and asked the Board to look at what they are doing to their residents because it is not fair.

Dennis Meehan, 5 Barry Road, stated he has lived in his home for 40 years. Over the past 40 years he has never challenged his assessment and always paid his taxes on time. In 2014, a representative from Tyler went through his house and his taxes went down slightly. This year, a drive by assessment of his house determined that his assessment would go up $135,000. He and his wife are senior citizens in their early 70's and both work part time so they can continue to live here. Does this Town want to keep its senior citizens?

Karen Coape-Arnold, 1000 Post Road, stated that she is a real estate attorney and works out of her house. What concerns her the most is that people will now be attracted to smaller lots which have lower taxes and we will see larger homes being built in their place. On Drake Road, a small colonial with a pool in the backyard was torn down and an enormous 4,500 sq. ft. home was put in its place. The developers will now be buying the smaller lots in Edgewood and putting up large homes and it will destroy the neighborhoods. She noted that she lives across the street from Village Hall, the Fire station and next door to the homeless house (Arlene is a great neighbor), a gas station, no leaf pickup, no road repair, no snow removal, etc. Her taxes went up $900,000.

Dorothy Levin, Overhill Road, stated that she has been paying taxes on her home for almost 36 years. She loves her house. We who are now retired have some kind of plan. Her original plan was to age in place – she has wonderful neighbors that look after her. She can't start in a new community again. Her tax increase is going to keep going up and she will have to change her plans. She thought there were many others like her in Scarsdale. As the elected officials of the Village, she urged the Board to see the human point of what this nonsensical reval is doing.

Alan Frommer, 150 Nelson Road, stated that his taxes went up 15% in 2014 and 15% this time. In comparison it is not as bad as everyone else. It seems everyone here has a negative opinion as to the 2016 Reval. He stated that he would like to know what the bottom line is on the process and when is this coming up for a vote.

Mayor Mark thanked everyone for coming and offering their comments. He stated that the short term process is the process for every year. They should file grievances by June 21st. What if anything this Board might do or could do with respect to the Reval as a whole, recognizing all the criticisms that they have heard, they will have to give some thought to. He stated that he did not know what the Board's options are at this point. There is a statutory obligation to have a final assessment roll in place by September 15th and the Tentative Assessment Roll that has been filed is the basis for that as it will be adjusted by the results of the grievances. He stated that he did not have a quick and easy answer for Mr. Frommer; at the moment the Board will give it thought and certainly take all comments seriously. The Board does hear the residents and hears the shock that many residents are in.

Mr. Frommer asked how, as a community, can a vote be called for to void this assessment? He also noted that he was not aware of this meeting and the way he found out about it was by reading a letter in the Scarsdale Inquirer.

Mayor Mark stated that as far as he is aware, there is no process by which the community can call for a vote to void a revaluation. The Village Assessor is the Village Official who is responsible for the assessment roll and that assessment roll can be challenged through the grievance process.

Mr. Frommer asked the Board why they aren't taking the residents' point of view or at least presenting their point of view. Can there be a referendum or a vote? This is absurd.

Village Attorney Esannason stated that the New York State Property Tax law sets forth a process for individuals that are aggrieved by their taxes and the Mayor previously articulated this process. There are a series of steps that can be undertaken to challenge that. This Board does not have jurisdiction when it comes to taxes. The only Board that can alter or change taxes is the Board of Assessment Review. If you are not satisfied with the determination of the Board of Assessment Review, you then have the option to commence a small claims proceeding in small claims court or bring an action pursuant to Article 7 of the Real Property Tax law. Those are the options. The law sets the options. The Board does not determine exactly what the process or procedure should be. This is not something we can enact by local legislation. This is something that is adopted by State law and something that the Village is obligated to follow.

Mr. Frommer asked the Mayor to take the comments heard from the public this evening to heart because this reval is placing an undue hardship on a lot of people.

Tama Seife, 21 Circle Road, stated that her taxes have risen 30%. She is tired of hearing that she can grieve her taxes. She wanted to know how she can grieve the assumptions that were made in producing these evaluations. There is no recourse on that.

Norman Bernstein, 14 Wakefield Road, stated that his assessment was not materially affected by this revaluation. He stated that he is concerned when a series of assumptions are being made that appear to be baseless and arbitrary and capricious. The assumption that the value of a house when it increases in size has to be measured by the square root so if you double the size of the house it only increases 25% in value. That is an arbitrary assumption. There is no basis for that kind of assumption. You have an arbitrary assumption that went into this model with a grossly unequal result. This Board has a fiduciary duty as Trustees and responsibility to this community to un-authorize this revaluation. This Board voted to authorize this revaluation, they can vote to un-authorize it.

A woman spoke from the audience stating that the Board is taking away affordable housing from people through this revaluation. She stated that the Board should be fired.

Ido Stern, 465 Mamaroneck Road, stated that his land assessment went up 85% from roughly $1 million per acre to over $2 million per acre. His overall assessment went up by approximately 45%, and if he goes through the grievance process to which there is a cap of 25%, and pays all the service providers (many thousands of dollars) – he is going to win the court case and will still be way above from where he was assessed before and from where he thinks he should be. Even if he wins, he is going to lose big and pay thousands of dollars to get there. Somebody authorized the revaluation; there must be someone that can annul it.

Peter Gordon, 30 Penn Boulevard, asked the Village Attorney if it is legally permissible for the Board by resolution to declare that instead of following the assessments set forth in the Ryan revaluation to declare in short order that the assessments from the prior year will be reinstated and that citizens therefore should file their grievances based on those numbers. Is this a legally permissible option?

Village Attorney Esannason responded that technically, he believed that the Board could adopt a resolution invalidating the revaluation process notwithstanding the fact that there will be another group or sector of the community that will then also consider challenging that determination. In order to do this there has to be sufficient justification otherwise a court would deem the Board's action to be politically motivated by people who simply came out and opposed the revaluation and opposed their increase in assessments without actually exhausting their administrative remedies. So the Board could certainly appear to be politically motivated and what the courts would do in that instance would invalidate the resolution and the action taken by the Board.

This Board cannot take action that it cannot substantiate and justify. If they did do so, a court reviewing the action that was undertaken by this Board could construe their actions to be arbitrary and capricious and politically motivated.

Mr. Gordon stated that, with respect, he felt Village Attorney Esannason was making an assumption that it can't be formulated an argument for overturning. There has been certain statistical evidence presented tonight so it seemed to him before one can conclude that there isn't a basis one would have to evaluate that information to see whether or not it would support a reversal.

Village Attorney Esannason suggested to Mr. Gordon that it is a very high threshold and the mere fact that you have an expert and data that reflects whatever it shows, there is also going to be contravening data and information and courts don't generally choose one expert over another. They look at the process to see if the process itself was fair and does not in fact constitute arbitrary and capricious behavior.

Stuart Schwam, 19 Lenox Place, stated that he has lived in Scarsdale for 25 years and is currently retired. He stated that he was in touch with the Assessor's office and they can't do much. Although his taxes went up 20% and he is on a small ¼ acre, he was lucky enough this year to have filed a Veteran's exemption and receive a reduction in taxes. The reduction was ¼ of the increase. The Board should have it in its power to be able to work its expertise and leadership and get these things approved for the people they represent.

Village Attorney Esannason stated that it is not the Assessor but it is the Board of Assessment Review that has the authority. They are an independent Board or body that has been appointed by this Board to conduct the appropriate hearings to determine whether or not a grievance has merit or does not have merit. The process is that if you are still not satisfied with the determination of the Board of Assessment Review, you then have the option of pursuing a Small Claims Assessment proceeding or bringing an action pursuant to Article 7. He also stated that the statement that the maximum of 25% reduction in assessment that someone can seek is not necessarily true. An Article 7 process would enable one to exceed the 25% threshold. This Board does not have legislation on its books that enables it to make decisions to overturn decisions to overturn the Tentative Assessment Roll and to get involved in the assessment process. That would be a conflict of interest. The State Law gives the Board authority to appoint a Board of Assessment Review which is an independent Board or body that will consider the grievances that have been submitted. This Board has no jurisdiction. It is improper for them to get involved in the assessment process, it is improper for them to change anyone's assessment, its improper for them to do anything in connection with the assessment matter. He stated that he has reiterated time and time again what the process is.

Mr. Schwam stated that no one wants to go through this process and it is really not addressing anything, it is just hiding behind the legislation. Why isn't the Assessor and the independent board people here and let them explain why they feel these numbers are better

than the other numbers and let them justify it because the Board obviously doesn't have the power. He stated that these residents are wasting their time and their comments are falling on deaf ears – it is very frustrating. Why isn't Mr. Ryan here? These are the people that have to explain why they can drive by a house and tell you what is inside the house and tell you that your basement is finished when it's not, etc. If these numbers were valid they would be more in line with what is existing already. The Board should postpone the payment to Mr. Ryan until the responsible are brought forward to explain the process to the residents.

Mayor Mark stated that Mr. Ryan and the Assessor will not be here this evening. The Board will keep this request in mind.

Howard Weitz, 29 Lawrence Road, stated that he and his wife have lived in Scarsdale for 50 years. He stated that he would like to address the legal issue that was raised earlier. The prior speakers have referred to fiduciary duty and another had questioned why Ryan was hired. He stated that he would like to point out that as a basis for legally being able to void the contract, Ryan is in a terrible conflict of interest position. He was the monitor for Tyler Technologies. In effect, he approved the work that Tyler did. Now Ryan comes back and says that the prior assessment roll was wrong and came up with a new one. There are legal grounds that the Board might be able to explore.

Carol Silverman, 110 Spier Road, stated that residents have already had two years to grieve the 2014 assessment. In her opinion, there wouldn't have been many more grievances on that revaluation. That might be something the Board considers from that point of view. There will be so many grievances for this revaluation and there are probably many more people who are not in the room that will be grieving. If the Board could go back to the 2014 assessment, it would be much easier for the Village.

Phil Maresco, 43 Ferncliff Road, stated that he has only lived in Scarsdale for 7 years and part of the evaluation that he and his wife made when they were looking at their home is the price and the taxes and the value that was set by the Village on the house. They paid a little more than the value than was set; however, that was how they decided whether or not they could afford to live in Scarsdale. When a decision was made to do the 2014 revaluation, one of the reasons was that there were too many grievances burdening the Assessor's office. That was 200+ grievances and after the assessment was done, the Assessor faced over 900 grievances. How many will there be this time? This reval has clearly been a miscalculation. The square footage of his home has been changed since the last revaluation and the condition has been changed again. He stated that this revaluation was a poor job and the Board is putting many residents through another burden of going through the grievance process. He stated that he is very disappointed – if he does not fill out the grievance papers for this revaluation, his taxes will go up 47%. He lives on a small plot and his home is 2,200 sq. ft. These assessments are not fair and encouraged the Board to reconsider this process.

Daniel Neelson, 1109 Post Road, stated that his background is in statistics. Based on some of the observations and some of the findings, there are fundamental foundational flaws with the process, the data, and the model itself. Since 2001, he has done independent valuation of models that are used by banks. Banks are in the business of using hundreds and thousands of models. The purpose of using a model is to predict something. There are fundamental flaws in a predictive framework. Banks have to get an independent party to come in and validate the inputs, the foundational assumptions and then give a matter of opinion on the outputs and if they are reasonable. If you are going to use a model to assess taxes on the entire community, the bare minimum requirement should be to get an independent party to come in and do a validation of this framework. He asked the Village Attorney if there is a legal course to get an independent party to come in, validate the model, and based on the findings of that validation does the Board have recourse to say this is fundamentally flawed and reject this revaluation.

Village Attorney Esannason responded that anything is possible, but one must keep in mind that there is more than just one opinion with respect to how data is construed, derived and concluded. If one keeps that it mind, one will always understand that there will always be two sides to an argument. One side may be right and the other side may be wrong. Should they go down that path, the Board would be hiring experts to contravene their own expert who they hired to conduct the revaluation. That doesn't make sense. There will be another set of opinions in the community that is going to say what Ryan did is correct.

Mr. Neelson stated that this is not a matter of opinion. There are some foundational assumptions that someone is making.

Village Attorney Esannason stated that you can have another expert look at the same data and come to another conclusion.

Mr. Neelson stated that this is his point; right now you only have a one-sided opinion. The Board does not have an independent party doing a validation and giving the Board an independent view.

Robert Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road, stated that the Board should take a look at the contract that they have with J. F. Ryan. Based on a lot of the comments made this evening, Ryan's model is flawed. Ryan was the monitor for Tyler Technologies – who was the monitor for Ryan? He stated that he hoped that there were options where the Board could cancel the contract with Ryan. Perhaps the Board should not pay Ryan his last payment.

Mr. Harrison also asked to clarify that appraisals could be submitted after the filing date of the grievance up through September 1st.

Mayor Mark stated that this is correct.

Mr. Harrison stated that it has been his understanding that the Assessor is able to meet with residents and negotiate a change in the assessed value of a residence. He stated that he wasn't sure about this process. He asked if this could be done.

Mayor Mark stated that people should be clear to file their grievance by Tuesday, June 21st regardless of whether or not the Assessor can meet individually with residents. It is critical to get that filing in.

Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez, 19 Fox Meadow Road asked if there were a possibility that if proof were to be provided that there are significant flaws in the process that one can contest the fact that this bid was not competitive and that the explanation of the model, inputs, etc. was not transparent. She also asked who vetted this person's expertise – this person has a Masters in Public Administration. The people who have spoken this evening have PhD's in Physics, Statistics, and Math. She stated that she would like to know how the expertise of Mr. Ryan was verified and validated and how is it that he was hired.

Village Attorney Esannason stated that in regard to competitive bidding, under General Municipal Law, Section 103, a municipality is not obligated to seek competitive bids for contracts that involve professional services. For example, if the Board wanted to retain outside counsel for a particular function, they are not obligated to seek competitive bids to obtain counsel. For accounting services, they are not obligated to seek competitive bids. For specialized services such as tax certioraris they are not obligated to seek competitive bids.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez then asked if there are no competitive bids, how is that individual vetted? Is it math or degrees, do they provide a writing sample, show a model that then gets vetted by someone else? How does this work?

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that as Village Attorney Esannason mentioned, when the Village hires professionals they do not have to go out and get competitive bids. They are vetted based on their credentials. In Mr. Ryan's case, he was a known entity, he worked for the Village and was the monitor for Tyler Technologies. When the Board began discussing doing a reval update, Mr. Ryan came forward.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez asked for a clarification of a credential in this case – is it a certificate, or just taking four or five classes at night at NYU? Is he a certified CPA?

Village Attorney Esannason stated that upon the Board's information and belief, Mr. Ryan has the highest designation for appraisal status as an appraiser. In addition to that, he has multiple years of experience in conducting revaluations not only in New York but in Connecticut and various other jurisdictions. Mr. Ryan has an extensive amount of experience in this particular area. There are a limited number of professionals that are

actually involved and engaged in this type of work in this particular area. Mr. Ryan was interviewed and this all took place when he served as the monitor for the Tyler revaluation.

Village Attorney Esannason pointed out that someone was critical that Mr. Ryan was selected to do this particular revaluation – Mr. Ryan was not there to determine whether or not Tyler's numbers were correct or not, he was there to come up with a set up valuations based upon market data and that is what he based his numbers on – not looking at Tyler and saying this was wrong or right.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez asked if there were a website where residents could get more information to figure out what further information they will need to encourage the Board to look at a resolution, whether based on process or on flawed data and assumptions that a number of them present have mentioned and proven? Where can the residents educate themselves about this process and the different kinds of things they may need to do to bring this case further?

Village Attorney Esannason stated that the Village could possibly put information on the website with respect to how residents can grieve. He stated that he represents the Board of Trustees and they are his clients. He is here offering information but he is not legal counsel to the residents – there is a line to be drawn. With that, if residents want advice to potentially challenge this process, he suggested they contact legal counsel and confer with them as to what their options are.

A resident who had spoken earlier stated that although Ryan was a known quantity to the Village as a monitor to Tyler, he has now the opposite position as the person doing this revaluation. He stated that he is having difficulty understanding why the Board considered him.

Mayor Mark stated that the prior Board considered him and considered him for some of the reasons that have been articulated and they put him in place thinking that this would finish the job that was started by the 2014 revaluation.

The resident stated that if the current Board determines now that was a material conflict of interest, perhaps which could be weighed as grounds for voiding the contract.

Village Attorney Esannason stated that the retention of Mr. Ryan as a monitor, his charge was to make sure that the process conformed to general appraisal standards. He was not there to determine whether or not the numbers were right; whether they were wrong or the valuations were correct or not. He was there to make sure that Tyler conducted its revaluation in a manner that was consistent with general appraisal standards. That was his role.

The resident stated that he thought a lot of people were confused that the same person who participated in the 2014 reval turns around and starts anew on a totally different basis.

Village Attorney Esannason stated that another factor that has to be taken into consideration is the change in market conditions from the time of the Tyler revaluation to the 2016 revaluation. The market has changed.

Kai Tang, 22 Ridgecrest East, stated that when the idea of this recent revaluation came up, was there a discussion about bringing Tyler Technologies back?

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that there was not, the discussion was not held.

Mr. Tang stated that Tyler knows and has records on all of the properties – why weren't they brought back? If there were deficiencies from the Tyler reval, they should have been the company to do it.

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that in fairness to this Board, that wasn't their decision; that was the decision of the previous Board to bring John Ryan in to do the update. All the information that Tyler provided with the initial reval was obviously in the Village's possession and was available for utilization in the update.

A resident stated that the previous Board saw the importance of having oversight on Tyler Technologies, so they hired Ryan to make sure there was oversight of the process. So why did the Board feel this time it was not necessary to have oversight of Ryan?

Mayor Mark stated that the Board does not have an answer to that question.

Nickolai Baturin, 23 Fox Meadow Road, stated that he has a PhD in Ocean Physics so he has some knowledge of statistics. He said that he can take the same exact data of 220 sales and can fit a model A and fit a model B. I would look at your house under model A and model B and I will see a difference of up to 20% on average. Be aware of the impact that you might cause by switching to another methodology two to four years down the line. There will potentially massive changes in property values just from switching the method. This creates additional volatility is not caused by the market forces; it's caused by switching methodologies.

Dorothy Levin, Overhill Road, asked that if someone is doing a drive by evaluation or appraisal of her home, do they also stop to look around the corner to see that her tiny backyard is a hill that backs up to two gas stations? If so, does that figure in the assessment at all?

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that there are a number of influencing factors that are utilized on each of the assessments that were done. Traffic, flood plain, wetland –those are types of influence factors.

A resident spoke, stating that he was very angry about what has occurred and that the dust had just settled on the first revaluation. The Board has angered more people this time around. He encouraged the Board to do the right thing and reconsider their legacy as a Board.

Irene Weitzenberg, 236 Rock Creek Lane, stated that if the Village were only tweaking the previous revaluation, why was everything reevaluated? Mr. Ryan did not take into consideration certain issues – she stated that she has an easement on her property. Mr. Ryan doesn't know that. The homes next to her are gigantic, yet her assessment went up 40%. The Board should fire this man; he didn't do a good job.

Stuart Schwam, 19 Lenox Place, asked what the effect would be if the Board fired Mr. Ryan? What would be the effect on the numbers that have been calculated?

Mayor Mark stated that at this point, he did not think there would be any effect because the tentative numbers have been posted. Just that alone would have no effect.

Mr. Schwam asked what would happen when the next Board takes over. Will this carry forward to the next Board and compound itself?

Mayor Mark stated that he has no idea what the next administration will do.

Mr. Schwam asked how this Board ended up taking the recommendations of the last Board and allowed the revaluation to go ahead?

Mayor Mark stated that this revaluation was already in place when this Board came into position.

A resident spoke, stating that there have been two valuations; why can the Village not use the more thorough revaluation that was done by Tyler? He stated that the grade and condition of his home were bumped up and that increased his assessment 50%. That sounds negligent to him; it does not sound like anything that can be legally binding. If something is this flawed, is there something that can be done? Why would we have to stick with it? Can we go back and choose the numbers from the Tyler revaluation?

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that the 2016 taxes are based on the 2015 assessment, so the tax bills that the residents will get this year will be based on the old numbers. These values that are tentative right now as a result of the 2016 revaluation, when the final assessment roll is completed in September, these 2016 values will be for your 2017 taxes. The next tax bill received will be based on the old numbers.

Robert Berg, 32 Tisdale Road, stated that the 2016 revaluation was so flawed fundamentally that it violates the protection clause and can be challenged – someone can bring a lawsuit or a class action lawsuit to void this revaluation. This Board probably has some legal ability to make a similar determination and adopt a resolution voiding the reval. He urged the Village to look into any means that are legally available to it to do so.

Robert Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road, stated that for those who have children between the ages of 6 and 18, the 32nd year of the Scarsdale Summer Youth Tennis League will start on Monday, July 11th. Everyone is welcome to come to the Scarsdale Middle School Tennis Court. Only $50.00 for four weeks of tennis in the evening.

There being no further comment, the Mayor closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

****

Finance Committee

Upon motion entered by Trustee Samwick, and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution authorizing the Issuance Pursuant to Section 90.00 or Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law of Refunding Bonds of the Village of Scarsdale, and Providing for Other Matters in Relation Thereto and the Payment of the Bonds to be Refunded Thereby was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, the Village of Scarsdale, Westchester County, New York (the "Village") heretofore issued, on June 29, 2009 an aggregate principal amount of $10,500,000 Public Improvement (Serial) Bonds, 2009 (the "2009 Bonds"), pursuant to a Certificate of Determination of the Village Treasurer dated June 29, 2009 (the "2009 Bond Certificate") and bond resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees identified therein, as more fully described in the 2009 Bond Certificate, and of which there are presently $7,340,000 aggregate principal amount outstanding, maturing on June 15 in each of the following years and amounts:

Year	Amount	Year	Amount
2016	$705,000	2021	$840,000
2017	$730,000	2022	$870,000
2018	$755,000	2023	$905,000
2019	$785,000	2024	$940,000
2020	$810,000		

WHEREAS, it appears that it would be in the public interest to refund all or a portion of the outstanding principal balance of the 2009 Bonds maturing in the years 2017 through 2024 (the "Refunded Bonds") by

the issuance of refunding bonds pursuant to Section 90.00 or Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law; and

WHEREAS, such refunding will result in present value savings in debt service as required by Section 90.00 or Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale, Westchester County, New York, as follows:

Section 1. For the object or purpose of refunding the $6,635,000 aggregate outstanding principal balance of the Refunded Bonds, or a portion thereof, including providing moneys which, together with the interest earned from the investment of certain of the proceeds of the refunding bonds herein authorized, shall be sufficient to pay (i) the principal amount of the Refunded Bonds, (ii) any redemption premiums on the Refunded Bonds at their respective call dates, (iii) the aggregate amount of interest payable on the Refunded Bonds to and including the date on which the Refunded Bonds either maturing or are to be called prior to their respective maturities in accordance with the Refunding Financial Plan, as hereinafter defined, (iv) the costs and expenses incidental to the issuance of the refunding bonds herein authorized, including the development of the Refunding Financial Plan, as hereinafter defined, compensation to the Purchaser, as hereinafter defined, costs and expenses of executing and performing the terms and conditions of the Escrow Contract, as hereinafter defined, and fees and charges of the Escrow Holder, as hereinafter mentioned, and (v) any premium or premiums for a policy or policies of municipal bond insurance for the refunding bonds herein authorized, or any portion thereof, there are hereby authorized to be issued up to $7,800,000 refunding bonds of the Village pursuant to the provisions of Section 90.00 or Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law (the "Public Improvement Refunding Bonds or, sometimes, the "Refunding Bonds"), it being anticipated that the aggregate amount of Refunding Bonds actually to be issued will be approximately $7,115,000 as provided in Section 3 hereof. The Refunding Bonds shall be designated substantially "PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT REFUNDING (SERIAL) BOND", or such other designation as shall be determined by the Village Treasurer, including a year, and a series designation, shall be dated August 1, 2016, or such other date or dates as shall hereafter be determined by the Village Treasurer pursuant to Section 3 hereof, shall be of the denomination of $5,000 or any integral multiple thereof not exceeding the principal amount of each respective maturity, and shall mature annually on June 15 in each of the years 2017 through 2024,

or such other dates as the Village Treasurer shall hereafter determine pursuant to Section 3 hereof, and shall bear interest payable on June 15, commencing December 15, 2016, or such dates as the Village Treasurer shall hereafter determine pursuant to Section 3 hereof, at the rate or rates of interest per annum as may be necessary to sell the same, all as shall be determined by the Village Treasurer.

The Refunding Bonds may, if so determined by the Village Treasurer pursuant to Section 3 hereof, be subject to redemption prior to maturity upon such terms as the Village Treasurer shall prescribe, which terms shall be in compliance with the requirements of Section 53.00 of the Local Finance Law. If less than all of the Refunding Bonds of any maturity are to be redeemed, the particular refunding bonds of such maturity to be redeemed shall be selected by the Village by lot in any customary manner of selection as determined by the Village Treasurer. Notice of such call for redemption shall be given by mailing such notice to the registered owners not more than sixty (60) nor less than thirty (30) days prior to such dates. Notice of redemption having been given as aforesaid, the bonds so called for redemption shall, on the dates for redemption set forth in such call for redemption, become due and payable, together with interest to such redemption dates, and interest shall cease to be paid thereon after such redemption dates.

The Refunding Bonds shall be issued in registered form and shall not be registrable to bearer or convertible into bearer coupon form. Principal of the Refunding Bonds shall be payable to the registered owners as shall hereafter be determined by the Village Treasurer. Principal and interest on the Refunding Bonds will be payable in lawful money of the United States of America. The Refunding Bonds shall be executed in the name of the Village by the manual or facsimile signature of the Village Treasurer, and a facsimile of its corporate seal shall be impressed, imprinted, affixed or otherwise reproduced thereon and may be attested by the manual or facsimile signature of the Village Clerk. In the event of facsimile signatures by the Village Treasurer and/or the Village Clerk, the Refunding Bonds shall be authenticated by the manual signature of an authorized officer or employee of a bank or trust company acting in the capacity of the fiscal agent for the Refunding Bonds, and the Village Treasurer is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements containing such terms as he shall deem proper with a bank or trust company to perform the services described in Section 70.00 of the Local Finance Law. The Refunding Bonds shall contain the recital required by subdivision 4 of paragraph j of Section 90.10 of the Local

Finance Law and the recital of validity clause provided for in Section 52.00 of the Local Finance Law and shall otherwise be in such form and contain such recitals, in addition to those required by Section 51.00 of the Local Finance Law, as the Village Treasurer shall determine. It is hereby determined that it is to the financial advantage of the Village not to impose and collect from registered owners of the Refunding Bonds any charges for mailing, shipping and insuring bonds transferred or exchanged, and, accordingly, pursuant to paragraph c of Section 70.00 of the Local Finance Law, no such charges shall be so collected.

Section 2. It is hereby determined that:

(a) the maximum amount of the Refunding Bonds authorized to be issued pursuant to this Resolution shall not exceed the limitation imposed by subdivision 1 of paragraph b of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law;

(b) the maximum periods of probable usefulness permitted by law at the time of the issuance of the Refunded Bonds for objects or purposes for which the Refunded Bonds were issued are as shown on Schedule B attached hereto;

(c) the last installment of each series of the Public Improvement Refunding Bonds will mature not later than the expiration of the period of probable usefulness of each object or purpose, or the weighted average of the periods of probable usefulness of objects or purposes, for which the Refunded Bonds of such series were issued in accordance with the provisions of subdivision 1 of paragraph c of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law; and

(d) the estimated present value of the total debt service savings anticipated as a result of the issuance of the Refunding Bonds, computed in accordance with the provisions of subdivision 2 of paragraph b of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law, is as shown in the Refunding Financial Plan described in Section 3 hereof.

Section 3. The financial plan for the refunding authorized by this Resolution, showing the sources and amounts of all moneys required to accomplish such refunding, the estimated present value of the total debt service savings and the basis for the computation of the aforesaid estimated present value of total debt service savings, are set forth in Schedule A attached hereto and hereby made a part of this Resolution (the "Refunding Financial Plan"). The Refunding Financial Plan has been prepared based upon the assumption that the Refunding Bonds will be issued in the principal amount of $7,115,000 and that the Refunding Bonds will mature, be of such

terms, and bear interest as set forth in Schedule A. This Board of Trustees recognizes that the amount of the Refunding Bonds, maturities, terms, and interest rate or rates borne by the Refunding Bonds to be issued by the Village will probably differ from such assumptions and that the Refunding Financial Plan will also probably differ from that attached hereto as Schedule A. The Village Treasurer is hereby authorized and directed to determine the amount of the Refunded Bonds to be refunded, the amount of the Refunding Bonds to be issued, the dates of such bonds and the dates of issue, maturities and terms thereof, the provisions relating to the redemption of Refunding Bonds prior to maturity, if any, whether the Refunding Bonds will be insured by a policy or policies of municipal bond insurance, whether the Refunding Bonds shall be sold at a discount in the manner authorized by paragraphs e and f of Section 57.00 of the Local Finance Law, or at par, or a premium, and the rate or rates of interest to be borne thereby, and to prepare, or cause to be provided, a final Refunding Financial Plan for the Refunding Bonds, and all powers in connection therewith are hereby delegated to the Village Treasurer; provided, that the terms of the Refunding Bonds to be issued, including the rate or rates of interest borne thereby, shall comply with the requirements of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law. The Village Treasurer shall file a copy of the certificate determining the details of the Refunding Bonds and the final Refunding Financial Plan with the Village Clerk not later than ten (10) days after the delivery of the Refunding Bonds, as herein provided. The Village Treasurer shall file the certificate, approved by the State Comptroller, setting for the present value of the total debt service savings from the issuance of the Refunding Bonds, with the Village Clerk as required by paragraph f of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law.

Section 4. Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph a of Section 56.00 of the Local Finance Law, the power to determine whether to issue the Refunding Bonds having substantially level or declining annual debt service, as provided in paragraph d of Section 21.00 and in paragraph c of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law, is hereby delegated to the Village Treasurer. All other delegable matters relating to such Refunding Bonds to be issued by said Village are hereby delegated to the Village Treasurer.

Section 5. The Village Treasurer is hereby authorized and directed to enter into an escrow contract (the "Escrow Contract") with a bank or trust company located and authorized to do business in the State of New York as he shall designate (the "Escrow Holder") for the

purpose of having the Escrow Holder act, in connection with the Refunded Bonds, as the escrow holder to perform the services described in Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law. The Village is also authorized and directed to enter into a contract with a verification agent in connection with the issuance of the Refunding Bonds.

Section 6. The faith and credit of said Village of Scarsdale, Westchester County, New York, are hereby irrevocably pledged to the payment of the principal of and interest on the Refunding Bonds as the same respectively become due and payable. An annual appropriation shall be made in each year sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds becoming due and payable in such year. There shall annually be levied on all the taxable real property in said Village a tax sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds as the same become due and payable.

Section 7. All of the proceeds from the sale of the Refunding Bonds, including the premium, if any, but excluding accrued interest thereon, shall immediately upon receipt thereof be placed in escrow with the Escrow Holder for the Refunded Bonds. Any accrued interest on the Refunding Bonds shall be paid to the Village Treasurer to be expended to pay interest on the Refunding Bonds on their first interest payment dates as may be determined in accordance with Section 3 hereof. Such proceeds as are deposited in the escrow deposit fund to be created and established pursuant to the Escrow Contract, whether in the form of cash or investments, or both, inclusive of any interest earned from the investment thereof, shall be irrevocably committed and pledged to the payment of the principal of and interest on the Refunded Bonds in accordance with Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law, and the holders, from time to time, of the Refunded Bonds shall have a lien upon such moneys held by the Escrow Holder. Such pledge and lien shall become valid and binding upon the issuance of the Refunding Bonds and the moneys and investments held by the Escrow Holder for the Refunded Bonds in the escrow deposit fund shall immediately be subject thereto without any further act. Such pledge and lien shall be valid and binding as against all parties having claims of any kind in tort, contract or otherwise against the Village irrespective of whether such parties have notice thereof.

Section 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Resolution, so long as any of the Refunding Bonds shall be outstanding, the Village shall not use, or permit the use of, any proceeds from the sale of the

Refunding Bonds in any manner which would cause any Refunding Bond issued as a tax-exempt bond to be an "arbitrage bond" as defined in Section 148 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and, to the extent applicable, the Regulations promulgated by the United States Treasury Department thereunder as then in effect.

Section 9. The Refunding Bonds shall be sold at private sale to a purchaser to be selected by the Village Treasurer or, at the election of the Village Treasurer, to the successful bidder at public sale (in either case, the "Purchaser") for a purchase price to be determined by the Village Treasurer (or in the case of a public sale, by public bid), plus accrued interest from the date of the Refunding Bonds to the date of the delivery of and payment for the Refunding Bonds. Approval of the terms and conditions of such sale by the State Comptroller shall be obtained if and as required by subdivision 2 of paragraph f of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law. After the Refunding Bonds have been duly executed, they shall be delivered by the Village Treasurer to the Purchaser in accordance with a purchase contract to be entered into with the Purchaser, or according to the terms of the notice of sale, as the case may be.

Section 10. In accordance with the provisions of Section 53.00 and of paragraph h of Section 90.10 of the Local Finance Law, the Village hereby elects to call in and redeem on June 15, 2018, or such later date or dates as shall be determined by the Treasurer in accordance with the final Refunding Financial Plan, all the callable Refunded Bonds maturing on and after June 15, 2019. The sums to be paid on such redemption dates shall be the par value of the called Refunded Bonds, plus interest, without premium.

The Escrow Holder for the Refunded Bonds is hereby authorized and directed to cause notice of such call for redemption to be given in the name of the Village in the manner and within the times provided in or otherwise applicable to the Refunded Bonds. Such notice of redemption shall be in substantially the form attached to the Escrow Contract. Upon the issuance of the Refunding Bonds, the election to call in and redeem the callable Refunded Bonds and the direction to the Escrow Agent to cause notice thereof to be given as provided in this paragraph shall become irrevocable, provided that this paragraph may be amended from time to time as may be necessary in order to comply with the publication requirements of paragraph a of Section 53.00 of the Local Finance Law, or any successor law thereto.

Section 11. The Village Treasurer and all other officers, employees and agents of the Village are hereby authorized and directed for and on behalf of the Village to execute and deliver all certificates and other documents, perform all acts and do all things required or contemplated to be executed, performed or done by this Resolution or any document or agreement approved hereby.

Section 12. All other matters pertaining to the terms and conditions of issuance of the Refunding Bonds shall be determined by the Village Treasurer and all powers in connection thereof are hereby delegated to the Village Treasurer.

Section 13. The validity of the Refunding Bonds may be contested only if:

1. Such obligations are authorized for an object or purpose for which said Village is not authorized to expend money, or
2. The provisions of law which should be complied with at the dates of publication of this Resolution are not substantially complied with, and an action, suit or proceeding contesting such validity is commenced within twenty days after the dates of such publication, or
3. Such obligations are authorized in violation of the provisions of the Constitution.

Section 14. A summary of this Resolution, which takes effect immediately, shall be published in full in the Scarsdale Inquirer, the official newspaper of said Village, together with a notice of the Village Clerk in substantially the form provided in Section 81.00 of the Local Finance Law.

AYES	NAYS	ABSENT
Trustee Callaghan	None	None
Trustee Finger		
Trustee Pekarek		
Trustee Samwick		
Trustee Stern		
Trustee Veron		
Mayor Mark		

****

Upon motion entered by Trustee Samwick, and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution regarding the Levy of Village Taxes for 2016-17 was approved by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the provisions of Section 17-1722 of the New York State Village Law, the Board of Trustees must levy Village taxes for the current fiscal year not later than the twenty-fifth day of June; and

WHEREAS, in order to allow sufficient time to process the tax bills, it is necessary that this resolution be adopted at the June 14, 2016, Board of Trustees meeting: now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that pursuant to Village Law Section 17-1722, there be levied and assessed against the taxable property in the Village of Scarsdale, as contained on the last completed single Village/Town assessment roll, the sum of $38,454,276, being the net amount to be assessed and collected in accordance with the 2016-2017 Budget adopted April 26, 2016, which sum together with the other revenues estimated in said budget shall be applied to the purposes set forth in said budget, as described in the attached Tax Warrant summary; and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to Real Property Tax Law Section 1432 (1), the Village Treasurer is hereby authorized and directed to collect said amount; and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to Real Property Tax Law Section 1432 (2), the Board of Trustees hereby determines that on all such taxes remaining unpaid after August 1, 2016, a two percent (2%) penalty will be added for the first month and an additional one percent (1%) for each month or fraction thereof until paid; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk shall cause to be published in the Scarsdale Inquirer notice of collection of the taxes levied herein.

****

Upon motion entered by Trustee Samwick, and seconded by Trustee Finger, the following resolution regarding Acceptance of a Gift for the Scarsdale Public Library Addition and Renovation Project was approved by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, the Scarsdale Library Board completed a Master Plan dated June 10, 2013, which identifies a number of building renovations and additions that will increase the capacity of the Library to provide a broader range of rapidly evolving library services while maintaining popular traditional collections and programs by offering a more

balanced utilization of the building space within a safe, attractive and inviting comfortable environment, said master plan supported by the Scarsdale Village Board of Trustees via resolution dated April 8, 2014 (attached); and

WHEREAS, the improvements identified in the Master Plan will transform the Library into a multi-purpose community asset for future generations, maintain its preeminent status among free public libraries in the County and State, enhance its technological capacity to further library services and create a physical environment that will be a welcoming and versatile learning center; and

WHEREAS, the Scarsdale Public Library Board, at their October 21, 2013 meeting, authorized the retention of the fund raising consulting firm of Plan A Advisors, P.O. Box 165, Thornwood, NY 10594, to design and conduct a capital campaign to implement such a project, subsequently identified in the July 20, 2015 Schematic Design Report prepared by Dattner Architects, at an estimated construction cost of $16,500,000 and total project cost of approximately $19,500,000; and

WHEREAS, Edythe Gladstein has offered to donate the gift of $25,000 to the Scarsdale Public Library Addition and Renovation Capital Improvement Project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Policy #106: "*Gifts to the Village of Scarsdale*" of the Village of Scarsdale Administrative Policies & Procedures Manual, acceptance of all gifts valued at $500 or greater must be approved by the Village Board of Trustees; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board hereby accepts the gift of $25,000 from Edythe Gladstein toward the Scarsdale Public Library Master Plan Improvement Project; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Treasurer take the necessary steps to complete the transaction and accept this financial gift of $25,000 and deposit it in the Library Capital Campaign Account; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby extends their heartfelt thanks and great appreciation to Edythe Gladstein for her generosity and commitment to the Scarsdale Public Library and community.

****

Law Committee

Trustee Finger stated that the following resolution is entitled "Calling for a Public Hearing on a Local Law to Amend Chapter 179 of the Scarsdale Village Code Entitled Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and Chapter 243 of Scarsdale Village Code Entitled Recycling". Before reading the resolution, he called attention to the memo attached to the resolution and the crux of the issue at hand. He stated that there are a lot of changes that are proposed but the most interesting one is the elimination of curbside grass clipping collection and establishment of parameters when residents and landscapers take grass clippings to the recycling center, which are included in the proposed changes. While there are a number of other items dealing with such items as definitions, etc., that one item is the one he wanted to call attention to.

Upon motion entered by Trustee Finger, and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution regarding "Calling for a Public Hearing on a Local Law to Amend Chapter 179 of the Scarsdale Village Code Entitled Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and Chapter 243 of Scarsdale Village Code Entitled Recycling" was approved by the vote indicated below:

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing is hereby scheduled by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale to be held in Rutherford Hall in Village Hall on Tuesday, June 28, 2016, at 8:00 p.m. to consider two (2) proposed local laws to amend Chapter 179 of the Scarsdale Village Code, entitled Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and Chapter 243 entitled Recycling; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk is hereby directed to publish notice of said hearing pursuant to Village Law.

AYES	NAYS	ABSENT
Trustee Finger	Trustee Callaghan	None
Trustee Pekarek		
Trustee Samwick		
Trustee Stern		
Trustee Veron		
Mayor Mark		

****

Before the vote was taken on the above resolution, the following comments were heard:

Larry Wilson, a landscape contractor from Yonkers, New York, representing the New York State Turf and Landscape Association came forward to speak. He stated that he works in the Village of Scarsdale and respectfully requested the Board to reject the proposal

to eliminate a service for the pickup of bagged grass clippings at curbside. To eliminate a service that has been in place for decades in this environment is unfair. To homeowners that will have to now pay for this service if this change is approved – they do not need another expense due to a service reduction. Whoever is pushing for this is trying to convince the Board that the homeowners should now tolerate a sloppy mess on their lawns or pay a fee to landscapers to remove grass clippings. He requested that the Board not hold this public hearing and give the homeowners a break.

Mayor Mark informed Mr. Wilson that this matter will be scheduled for a public hearing in two weeks from today and it would be wonderful if he could be present at that time to make his comments.

Mike Iorio, Landscape Contractor and President of the New York State Turf and Landscape Association representing over 350 members. He stated that to take away another service from the residents of this Town is unfair. There are some inequities also – for a homeowner cutting their own grass, they will be able to bring the grass clippings to the Scarsdale Recycling Center. However, if as a homeowner you hire a professional landscaper, the landscaper can bring the grass clippings there but will be charged. The homeowner will occur additional fees.

Mayor Mark extended the same invitation to Mr. Iorio to attend the next Board meeting in two weeks when this issue is scheduled for a public hearing.

****

Upon motion entered by Trustee Finger, and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution regarding "Calling for a Public Hearing on a Local Law to Amend Chapter 256 of the Scarsdale Village Code Entitled Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places" was approved by the vote indicated below:

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing is hereby scheduled by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale to be held in Rutherford Hall in Village Hall on Tuesday, June 28, 2016 at 8:00 p.m. to consider a proposed local law to amend Chapter 256 of the Scarsdale Village Code entitled Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk is hereby directed to publish notice of said hearing pursuant to Village Law.

AYES	NAYS	ABSENT
Trustee Callaghan	None	None
Trustee Finger		
Trustee Pekarek		
Trustee Samwick		

Trustee Stern
Trustee Veron
Mayor Mark

****

Upon motion entered by Trustee Finger, and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution Authorization to Execute a License Agreement with the Murray Hill Middle Heathcote Neighborhood Association was approved by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, in 2015, residents of Murray Hill Middle Heathcote approached the Village requesting permission to beautify the Village-owned traffic island located on Ross Road through the implementation of a - February 16, 2016 planting plan (Plan) developed by Elaine Yellen, landscape architect, attached hereto and made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, the Plan, reviewed and approved by IQ Landscape Architects, P.C. on behalf of the Village (report attached), consists of predominantly low growing perennials to bloom at different times of the spring, summer and fall to maintain plant color throughout the seasons while minimizing any visual obstructions for motorists and pedestrians; and

WHEREAS, Section 281-18 of the Scarsdale Village Code allows for the planting of trees, shrubs and other plantings on Village property upon securing a permit from the Village Engineer; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Scarsdale and the Murray Hill Middle Heathcote Neighborhood Association are committed to enhancing the beauty and appearance of the Murray Hill Middle Heathcote neighborhood and believe it is in the best interest of the community to allow the Murray Hill Middle Heathcote Neighborhood Association, through its own resources, to implement the Plan at the Village-owned traffic island located on Ross Road; and

WHEREAS, the Murray Hill Middle Heathcote Neighborhood Association, with assistance from Village public work crews, is desirous of effectuating the plan to plant the landscape materials, understanding that future maintenance is the responsibility of the Neighborhood Association; and

WHEREAS, upon various discussions, meetings and exchanges of correspondence with representatives of Murray Hill Middle Heathcote Neighborhood Association and certain Ross Road residents, Village staff has incorporated the permit requirements of Village Code Section 281-18

in the form of a license agreement to be executed by the Village Manager upon approval of the Village Board of Trustees; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to execute an agreement with the Murray Hill Middle Heathcote Neighborhood Association regarding the implementation of the February 16, 2016 Planting Plan prepared by Elaine Yellen, Landscape Architect, attached to said agreement as Exhibit "A", on the Village-owned traffic island on Ross Road in substantially the same form as attached hereto; and be it further

RESOLVED, that all landscaping planted by the Neighborhood Association within the Village-owned traffic island on Ross Road shall comply with Section 294-1 of the Scarsdale Village Code related to visual obstructions, with the Neighborhood Association providing all future maintenance and care for the landscape plantings.

****

Municipal Services Committee

Upon motion entered by Trustee Pekarek, and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution regarding the Rejection of Bids for VM Contract #1200 – Tree Work was adopted by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, in recognition of the impact of extreme weather events on Village-owned trees, which outstrips available staff resources to adequately respond during such storms, as well as to provide additional support in conducting routine tree care to protect public safety and maintain our Village in a Park setting, it is prudent to engage supplemental contract-supported tree care and maintenance services on an as-needed basis to promote healthy, safe, and beautiful village-owned trees; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees provided an appropriation of $80,000 in the FY 2015/16 General Fund Operating Budget in the Public Works Highway Division for contractor-supported care of Village-owned trees; and

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2016, the Village Manager reports that he publicly advertised for the receipt of bids under VM Contract # 1200 – Tree Work, having solicited proposals via Empire State Purchasing Group (Bidnet); and

WHEREAS, on the bid opening date, Tuesday May 3, 2016, four sealed bids were opened; and

WHEREAS, the bids received were significantly higher than anticipated, with the lowest bid for each of the three proposals (A, B, and C) being between 25% and 60% higher than our current contract for the same tree work; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends rejecting all bids received pursuant to VM #1200 and rebidding using additional outreach in order to cultivate increased bid competition; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board, pursuant to Section 103 of the New York State General Municipal Law and Chapter 57-7 of the Village Code, herein rejects all bids for VM Contract #1200 – Tree Work; and it be further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is hereby authorized to reject the bid documents for Tree Work in accordance with the New York State General Municipal Law, and to perform adequate contractor outreach prior to re-advertising and re-bidding this work.

AYES	NAYS	ABSENT
Trustee Callaghan	None	None
Trustee Finger		
Trustee Pekarek		
Trustee Samwick		
Trustee Stern		
Trustee Veron		
Mayor Mark		

****

Upon motion entered by Trustee Pekarek, and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution regarding Braking Aides Ride was adopted by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, Global Impact, a Section 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization, has requested permission for the Braking Aids Ride to traverse the Village of Scarsdale between 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. on Sunday, September 25, 2016, as riders travel a route from Boston to New York City; and

WHEREAS, the event beneficiary is Housing Works, Inc., a 501(c)(3), whose mission is to end the dual crises of homelessness and AIDS through relentless advocacy, the provision of lifesaving services, and entrepreneurial businesses that sustain their efforts; and

WHEREAS, the Braking Aids Ride is not a race, but rather a fully-supported ride involving approximately 125 persons of all ages, casually riding in a somewhat disbursed pattern along primarily residential streets while complying with all traffic regulations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Braking Aids Ride route (attached) requires the use of local streets, entering Scarsdale from White Plains on Coralyn Road near the Fenway Golf Club and continuing southwest through various Village Roads, exiting Scarsdale by crossing Weaver Street to Daisy Farms Road in New Rochelle; and

WHEREAS, Village staff will provide advance notice of the Braking Aids Ride to the Scarsdale Neighborhood Association presidents in Secor Farms, East Scarsdale, and West Quaker Ridge, asking that they share the information amongst their members; and

WHEREAS, the City of White Plains and Village of New Rochelle have already indicated approval for their segments of the Ride; and

WHEREAS, the Braking Aids Ride organizers will post route directional markers (see attached) using H-frame holders at every turn and promptly remove them as soon as the last rider passes; and

WHEREAS, the Braking Aids Ride does not require any rest areas, comfort stations, or other accommodations apart from authorized passage through the community; and

WHEREAS, Global Impact agrees to furnish public liability insurance in a form and amount satisfactory to the Village Attorney, naming the Village of Scarsdale as an additional insured against any and all claims, damages, or causes of action resulting from the use of Village owned streets and land; and

WHEREAS, the Village special events staff team has discussed the proposed Braking Aids Ride and finds that one special duty police officer will be required at the intersection of Crossway and Weaver Street due to traffic conditions present at this location, such costs associated with this support to be reimbursed by Global Impact at a rate of $99/hour; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that Global Impact, a Section 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization, is hereby authorized to utilize Village of Scarsdale streets as delineated on the attached route map, including temporary use of the Village right-of-way to post route markers in conjunction with the Braking Aids Ride, to traverse the Village of Scarsdale between 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. on Sunday, September 25, 2016, conditioned on the timely receipt of a certificate of public liability insurance naming the Village of Scarsdale as an additional insured; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is authorized to execute the Village Event Permit form and accompanying Terms and Conditions in substantially the same form as attached hereto and made a part hereof.

****

Other Committee Reports

None.

****

Liaison Reports

Trustee Pekarek reported that she was asked by a fifth grader at Fox Meadow to be interviewed as part of his fifth grade research project called the "Capstone" project. Jason Lowe was the student she worked with and he was an extremely engaging, thoughtful and bright young man. His project was "How Scarsdale Interacts with the Environment" and he was quite knowledgeable about storm water mitigation, our tree laws, how we control our geese population, how we protect and enhance our wetlands among other things. He was also joined by six other members of the sixth grade class who pursued research projects on a variety of Village programs – the Fire Department, the Police Department, the sanitary sewer system, dealing with geese, the Boniface Tower and the Tree Law. Each of the students worked with many Village personnel and she stated that she is sure that they enjoyed working with the students as much as she did.

****

Trustee Veron reported that she attended a very productive discussion of the Advisory Council on Youth. They are formulating their priorities for the upcoming fall and noted that they are considering stress and mental health as well as cyber related issues and building community to bridge the generations. They will identify the topic at their meeting in September.

****

Written Communications

Village Clerk Conking stated that thirty-three (33) communications have been received since the last meeting. All communications can be viewed on the Village's website, www.scarsdale.com under the Board of Trustees or Village Clerk section.

Fifteen (15) emails & letters regarding the 2016 Revaluation were received from the following:

- Ann Bohjalian, 15 Greenacres Avenue
- Doug Metz, Scarsdale Agency, Inc.
- James Allocco, Ross Road
- Jane Curley, 7 Hamilton Road
- Susan & Joe Levine, Ardmore Road
- Dennis Meehan, 5 Barry Road
- Linda & Andrew Mantis, 43 Montrose Road
- Mary & Allan Shapiro, 12 Ferncliff Road
- Richard Gast, 163 Johnson Road
- Robert Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road
- Rocco & Sheila Alfano, 170 Clarence Road
- Michael Levine, 54 Walworth Avenue
- Debrah Dweck, Carthage Road
- Josh Frankel, Black Birch Lane
- E. Bernstein, Larch Lane
- Anne Schager

Four (4) emails regarding Grass Clipping pickups was received from the following:

- Andrew Edelman
- Lou Mancini
- Timothy Foley
- William Sinister

Three (3) communications regarding the proposed Library Renovations were received from the following:

- Carol Mehler
- Monroe Gleidman, 11 Overlook Road
- Susan Levine, Ardmore Road

Additional Correspondence was received as follows:

- An email from Josh Frankel, Black Birch Lane, with regard to road conditions on a portion of Saxon Woods Road. A response from Deputy Village Manager Cole is attached.
- An email from ML Perlman thanking the Village for work done on Autenreith and Woodland Roads.
- An email from Joan Weissman, 3 Kingston Road regarding tree care.
- An email from Doug Ulene regarding the Christie Place Parking Permit lottery.
- A letter from Alexandra McCausland concerning the need to recycle.
- An email from Michelle Sterling regarding an update on the Food Scrap Composting Pilot Program.
- A letter from Aidan Strovink regarding the School Summer recess.
- A letter from Susan Levine, 11 Ardmore Road concerning side yard setback requirements.
- A letter from Richard and Marianne Cantor, 11 Innes Road regarding Heathcote School student pickup traffic issues.

****

There being no further business to come before the Board, Trustee Finger moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:08 P.M., seconded by Trustee Veron and carried by a unanimous vote.

_____

Donna M. Conkling
Village Clerk

PUBLIC HEARING

Village of Scarsdale

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Public Hearing is scheduled by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale on Tuesday, June 28, 2016 at 8:00 p.m. in Rutherford Hall in Village Hall to consider two (2) proposed local laws to Amend Chapter 179 of the Scarsdale Village Code, entitled Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and Chapter 243 entitled Recycling.

Donna M. Conkling
Village Clerk

06/15/2016

RESOLUTION RE: **CALLING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON A LOCAL LAW TO AMEND CHAPTER 179 OF THE SCARSDALE VILLAGE CODE, ENTITLED GARBAGE, RUBBISH AND REFUSE, AND CHAPTER 243 OF THE SCARSDALE VILLAGE CODE, ENTITLED RECYCLING**

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing is hereby scheduled by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale to be held in Rutherford Hall in Village Hall on Tuesday, June 28, 2016, at 8:00 p.m. to consider two (2) proposed local laws to amend Chapter 179 of the Scarsdale Village Code, entitled Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and Chapter 243 entitled Recycling; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk is hereby directed to publish notice of said hearing pursuant to Village Law.

Submitted by: Village Manager
Date: June 7, 2016
For: June 14, 2016

CERTIFICATION
THE ABOVE RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF SCARSDALE ON
6-14-2016
DONNA M. CONKLING
VILLAGE CLERK

INTRODUCTORY LOCAL LAW # __ OF 2016
A LOCAL LAW AMENDING CHAPTER 179 OF THE SCARSDALE VILLAGE CODE ENTITLED GARBAGE, RUBBISH AND REFUSE

BE IT ENACTED by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale as follows:

§ 179-2 Definitions.

As used in this chapter, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated:

ALUMINUM CANS
Containers fabricated of aluminum and commonly used for soda, beer or other beverages.

BIODEGRADABLE
Bags or material capable of decaying through the action of living organisms.

BULKY METALS
Stoves, refrigerators, dishwashers, dryers, washing machines, air-conditioning units, boilers, freezers, water tanks, lawn mowers, metal duct work, aluminum siding, metal window and door frames and other large metal appliances. This term excludes items defined as Construction and Demolition debris in this chapter.

BULKY WASTE
Beds, mattresses, chairs, tables, wood, windows, linoleum, magazines, books, colored or corrugated paper products and other large items not otherwise defined. This term excludes items defined as Construction and Demolition debris in this chapter.

CORRUGATED CARDBOARD
Non-wax coated corrugated cardboard containers and boxes.

COMMINGLED
The mixing together of the following recyclables: glass bottles, plastic bottles, metal and aluminum cans, gable top containers, and other like materials should they be deemed a recyclable product in the future.

CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS
Concrete, masonry, wood, plaster, aluminum or other siding material, wire, asphalt, ceramics, tiles, Sheetrock, stones, bricks, clay pipe, concrete pipe and any other by-product of a new construction activity, renovation or rebuilding or other modification to a house, appurtenances and grounds.

COUNTY LAW

Such laws and regulations adopted by Westchester County which create regulations regarding source separation and recycling.

GABLE TOP CONTAINERS

Containers including polycoated and paper board like Tetra Paks or aseptic and gable top cartons, including all milk, cream, and milk substitute beverage containers.

GLASS BOTTLES

Transparent or translucent jars, bottles and containers which are primarily used for packaging and bottling of various products. ~~but only those glass bottles that are green, amber or clear in color.~~

METAL CANS

Containers fabricated primarily of metal, including aluminum cans.

MUNICIPALLY COLLECTED SOLID WASTE

Household waste and other waste materials routinely produced in a household and used household items that are municipally collected whether by public employees or contractors working for the municipality. This material does not include other materials defined as bulky metals, bulky wastes, construction and demolition debris, ~~glass bottles~~, commingled recyclables, ~~newsprint~~ and yard organics.

~~**NEWSPRINT**~~

~~The common, inexpensive machine finished paper made chiefly from wood pulp used for newspapers. This term excludes glossy newspaper inserts, books and magazines, as well as other paper products.~~

PAPER BAGS

A biodegradable bag used for carrying various products and materials that are distributed or sold by grocery and department stores.

PAPER/CARDBOARD

Newspapers, glossy inserts, phone books, magazines, junk mail, brown paper bags, and corrugated and grey cardboard boxes. This term excludes waxed cardboard, including gable top containers, plastic and Styrofoam packing materials, cardboard with any trace of food, paperbacks or hardcover books.

PLASTIC BOTTLES/CONTAINERS

Containers made from plastic that are used for carrying or storing various products or liquids and that are marked with the recycling logo and identifying numbers (1-7).

RECYCLABLES

Glass bottles, metal and aluminum cans, ~~newsprint~~, paper/cardboard, gable top containers, yard organics, plastic bottles and containers, and bulky metals as defined in this ~~section~~ chapter.

YARD ORGANICS

Grass clippings, leaves, branches and other like organic garden materials. Excluded are tree trunks, root systems, tree stumps, logs, main branches and other large growing vegetation.

§ 179-3. Preparation of wastes for collection.

Every person in possession of or responsible for premises used for residential purposes shall prepare and segregate all material intended for collection by the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works as follows:

A. Municipally collected solid waste shall be placed in watertight metal or plastic containers, having a capacity not to exceed 30 gallons, with tight-fitting metal or plastic covers. The weight of any such containers and its contents shall not exceed ~~70~~ 50 pounds. No portion of any such container shall be located below the surrounding grade level or in any enclosure. ~~except as specifically permitted by the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works.~~

B. Material which is not self-contained shall be placed in suitable containers so as to prevent scattering or, if too large to be placed in containers, shall be bundled and securely tied. The bundles shall not exceed five feet in length, and neither a container and its contents nor a bundle shall weigh in excess of ~~70~~ 50 pounds.

C. Paper/Cardboard ~~Newsprint~~ intended for separate collection shall be separated from other municipally collected solid waste and shall be compactly and securely tied with rope or cord in bundles not exceeding 30 pounds in weight and 12 inches by 18 inches by 10 inches in dimensions or placed in paper bags. Collection shall be made in accordance with rules promulgated by the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works. ~~Newsprint~~ Paper used to wrap solid waste and contaminated ~~newsprint~~ paper shall not be included in such bundles and shall be disposed of with household waste.

D. Glass bottles may be separated from other municipally collected solid waste ~~and further separated by the colors green, amber and clear~~ and, if cleaned of contents with caps removed, may be delivered to the Village Recycling Center and placed in containers marked for ~~the various colors of glass~~ commingled recycling.

E. Aluminum cans may be separated from other municipally collected solid waste and, if cleaned of contents, may be delivered to the Village Recycling Center and placed in containers marked for ~~the cans~~ commingled recycling.

F. All plastics (not styrofoam) and gable top containers may be separated from other municipally collected solid waste and may be delivered to the Village Recycling Center and placed in containers marked for ~~plastics~~ commingled recycling.

G. Yard organics shall be separated from other municipally collected solid waste. Leaves, ~~grass clippings~~ and other mulch-like organic materials shall be placed in ~~plastic or~~ biodegradable paper bags for collection in accordance with rules promulgated by the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works. Yard organics, excluding grass clippings, shall be placed at the curb readily accessible to a village refuse collection truck. If yard organics are not placed at the curb, the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works must be called prior to ~~5~~3:00 p.m. two days preceding the scheduled collection.

(1) Fall leaves for the village leaf collection program must be raked to the area between the curb or pavement edge and property line for collection by Department of Public Works crews. Bagged leaves will be collected with yard organics.

(2) Branches not exceeding three inches in diameter shall be securely tied in bundles no longer than five feet in length, 18 inches in diameter and not exceeding 50 pounds in weight for collection with yard organics.

(3) Grass clippings will not be collected curbside by the Village. Residents can bring up to 200 pounds per day of their grass clippings, either loose or in biodegradable paper bags, to the Village Recycling Center at no charge. Contractors disposing of yard organic material at the Village Recycling Center are subject to paying the applicable fees as established by resolution of the Board of Trustees and identified in the annual Village-Wide Fees and Charges Schedule.

H. Placement of bulky metal and bulky waste for collection shall be at the curb readily accessible to a village refuse collection truck. ~~If~~ Village vehicles ~~are required to~~ may not enter private property for collection of this material. ~~the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works must be advised by telephone of the material to be collected and its location prior to 5~~3:00 p.m. ~~two days prior to the scheduled collection.~~

§ 179-4 Placement and collection procedures.

All material intended for collection by the Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works shall be placed where it will be readily accessible for collection as follows:

A. Solid waste garbage shall be kept in a single location at the residence. ~~or in a garage (doors in an open or up position).~~

B. Other material shall be placed at the curb readily accessible to a village refuse collection vehicle. ~~If village vehicles are required to enter private property for the collection of material, such entry will be at the sole risk of the property owner.~~

C. ~~Newspaper~~ Paper/cardboard shall be placed at the curb~~side only~~ readily accessible to a Village refuse collection vehicle.

D. There will be no collection from residences where snow and ice have not been cleared from access pathways or driveways.

E. No material shall be placed at the street for collection prior to the day preceding the scheduled collection except yard organics, which excludes the collection of grass clippings.

F. Normal collection procedures may be changed if they conflict with scheduled holidays or in case of emergencies or other extenuating circumstances. Such changes ~~will~~ may be included in the annual sanitation/recycling calendar mailed to all residents, published in the ~~local~~ official Village newspaper and/or posted on the Village's website.

§ 179-5 Authorization required to collect.

A. From the time of placement of garbage and other waste for collection, such material shall be municipal property. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to collect, pick up or cause to be collected or picked up any such material without the express written authorization of the Village of Scarsdale. Each such collection or pickup shall constitute a separate violation.

B. Nothing herein shall prevent any person from making arrangements for the private collection of materials, provided that such materials to be collected privately shall not be placed at the curb immediately preceding the day for municipal collection of such materials.

§ 179-6 Limitations on collections and acceptable wastes.

A. The Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works shall not accept at its transfer site or pick up any construction and demolition debris, wood over three inches in diameter or over five feet long; tree stumps; tree trunks; firewood; railroad ties; telephone poles; discarded debris, such as lumber, concrete, plaster, dirt, rock, brick, asphalt or large wooden crates or boxes; stones or quantities of sod; flammable or highly combustible matter, such as cleaning establishment wastes or other industrial wastes found to contain varnish, paint, thinners or other dangerous materials; sawdust; explosives; ammunition; oil drums, either full or empty, cans or barrels containing combustible liquids; rubber tires of any size; rubber wastes; battery cases; tar paper roofing; tar cans; any large metal products or abandoned machinery; dead animals; or any hazardous waste as defined by Article 27 of the Environmental Conservation Law and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

B. The Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works shall not pick up from any one dwelling unit during any collection more than:

(1) Three thirty-gallon containers. Each container shall not exceed 50 pounds in weight.

(2) Four bundles of branches.

(3) Six bags of leaves.~~, except by special arrangements.~~

C. The Sanitation Division of the Department of Public Works shall not pick up any material classified as toxic waste by 6 NYCRR 366, the identification and listing of hazardous wastes pursuant to Article 27, Title 9, of the Environmental Conservation Law or any ensuing legislation more restrictive than currently in force.

§ 179-7 Fees. [1]

Except as provided in Subsection B, any person transporting material to the ~~village disposal site~~ Village Recycling Center for the purpose of dumping shall be charged a fee as established by resolution of the Board of Trustees and indicated in the annual Village-Wide Fees and Charges Schedule; provided, however, that village residents may deliver and dump up to 200 pounds per day at no cost. A schedule of fees shall be posted at ~~the Sanitation Division of~~ the Department of Public Works Sanitation Division office.

~~[1]~~
~~*Editor's Note: The fee resolution is available and on file in the office of the Village Clerk.*~~

§ 179-8 Wastes originating outside of village.

No person shall transport to and/or attempt to dump at the ~~village disposal site~~ Village Recycling Center any waste material originating outside the village.

§ 179-9 Use of public waste receptacles.

No business owner, operator or employee shall place in a public waste receptacle maintained by the village any waste material that originates from a residence or the operation of a place of business.

§ 179-10 Authority of Manager.

The Village Manager shall have the authority, ~~subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees~~, to further limit or waive the above restrictions on the quantities and types of wastes collected and to adopt regulations, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, relating to garbage and bulky waste which, when adopted and approved, shall have the same status as the provisions of this chapter.

§ 179-11 Penalties for offenses.

Any person committing an offense against any provision of this chapter shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a violation pursuant to the Penal Law of the State of New York, punishable by a fine not exceeding $250 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 15 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment. The continuation of an offense against the provisions of this chapter shall constitute, for each day the offense is continued, a separate and distinct offense hereunder.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This Local Law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.

Underline means addition.
~~Strikethrough means delete.~~

INTRODUCTORY LOCAL LAW # __ OF 2016
A LOCAL LAW AMENDING CHAPTER 243 OF THE SCARSDALE VILLAGE CODE ENTITLED RECYCLING

BE IT ENACTED by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale as follows:

§ 243-1 Findings.

This chapter is adopted pursuant to General Municipal Law § 120-aa. Consideration has been given to existing source separation, recycling and other resource recovery activities in the region, to the adequacy of markets for separated materials and to any additional effort and expense to be incurred by residents in meeting these separation requirements.

§ 243-2 Definitions.

Unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms when used in this chapter shall have the following meanings:

ALUMINUM CANS
Containers fabricated primarily of aluminum and commonly used for soda, beer or other beverages.

BIODEGRADABLE
Bags or material capable of decaying through the action of living organisms.

BULKY METALS
Stoves, refrigerators, dishwashers, dryers, washing machines, air-conditioning units, boilers, freezers, water tanks, lawn mowers, aluminum siding, metal window and door frames and other like large metal appliances. This term excludes items defined as Construction and Demolition debris in this chapter.

CORRUGATED CARDBOARD
Non-wax coated corrugated cardboard containers and boxes.

COMMINGLED
The mixing together of the following recyclables: glass bottles, plastic bottles, ~~tin cans~~ metal and aluminum cans, gable top containers, and other like materials should they be deemed a recyclable product in the future..

CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS
Concrete, masonry, wood, plaster, aluminum or other siding material, wire, asphalt, ceramics, tiles, sheetrock, stones, bricks, clay pipe, concrete pipe and any other by-product of a new construction activity, renovation or rebuilding or other modification to a house, appurtenances and grounds.

COUNTY LAW

Such laws and regulations adopted by Westchester County which create regulations regarding source separation and recycling.

GABLE TOP CONTAINERS

Containers including polycoated and paper board like Tetra Paks or aseptic and gable top cartons, including all milk, cream, and milk substitute beverage containers.

GLASS BOTTLES

Transparent or translucent jars, bottles and containers which are primarily used for packaging and bottling of various products.~~matters,~~, ~~but only those glass bottles that are green, amber or flint (clear) in color.~~

METAL CANS

Containers fabricated primarily of metal, ~~but not~~ including aluminum cans.

MUNICIPALLY COLLECTED SOLID WASTE

Household waste and other waste materials routinely produced in a household and used household items that are municipally collected whether by public employees or contractors working for the municipality. This material does not include other materials defined as bulky metals, bulky waste, construction and demolition debris, commingled recyclables, ~~newsprint~~ and yard organics.

~~**NEWSPRINT**~~

~~Machine-finished paper made chiefly from wood pulp used for newspapers. This term includes glossy newspaper inserts.~~

~~**BROWN**~~ **PAPER BAGS**

~~As distributed by grocery and department stores.~~ A biodegradable bag used for carrying various products and materials that are distributed or sold by grocery and department stores.

PAPER/CARDBOARD

Newspapers, glossy inserts, phone books, magazines, junk mail, paper bags, and corrugated and grey cardboard boxes. This term excludes waxed cardboard, including gable top containers, plastic and Styrofoam packing materials, cardboard with any trace of food, paperbacks or hardcover books.

PLASTIC BOTTLES

~~The c~~Containers made from plastic that are used for carrying or storing beverages or liquids and that are marked with the recycling logo and identifying numbers (1-7).

PRIVATELY COLLECTED SOLID WASTE

Commercial waste and other waste materials routinely produced in offices, retail, restaurants or other commercial establishments that are collected by a private carter.

RECYCLABLES

Glass bottles, metal and aluminum cans, ~~newsprint~~, paper/cardboard, gable top containers, yard organics, plastic bottles and containers and bulky metals as defined in this chapter.

YARD ORGANICS

Grass clippings, ~~L~~leaves, branches and other like organic garden materials. Excluded are tree trunks, root systems, tree stumps, logs, main branches and other large growing vegetation. ~~It does not include grass clippings, tree stumps or logs.~~

§ 243-3 Establishment of program.

There is hereby established a program for the collection of paper, glass bottles, aluminum ~~cans,~~ and metal cans, yard organics (excluding grass clippings), plastic bottles, gable top containers and bulky metals for the purpose of recycling. The program shall be under the direction of the Village Manager, who shall be authorized ~~from time to time~~ to establish and promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

§ 243-4 Source separation required.

All persons who are owners, tenants or occupants of any commercial, residential or industrial building, shall separate out from municipally or privately collected solid waste left for collection, all paper, glass bottles, aluminum ~~cans,~~ and metal cans, plastic bottles, gable top containers, bulky metals and yard organics, excluding grass clippings. Separation will be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, county law and those rules and regulations promulgated by the Village Manager.

§243-5 Grass clippings

Grass clippings will not be collected curbside by the Village. Residents can bring their grass clippings either loose or in biodegradable paper bags, up to 200 pounds per day, to the Village Recycling Center at no charge. Contractors will be charged to tip any yard organic material subject to the fees as established by the Board of Trustees in the annual fees and charges schedule.

§ 243-~~5~~6 Scavenging restricted.

A. Once recyclables have been placed at the curb for municipal collection, such recyclables shall be municipal property. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to collect, pick up or cause to be collected or picked up any recyclable at the curb without the express written authorization of the Village of Scarsdale. Each such unauthorized collection shall constitute a separate violation.

B. Nothing herein shall prevent any person from making arrangements for the private collection of recyclables; provided that recyclables to be privately collected shall not be placed curbside on or immediately preceding the day for municipal collection of such recyclables.

§ 243-~~6~~7 Penalties for offenses.

A. The Village of Scarsdale or any private carter shall not collect any solid waste or recyclable which has not been separated and secured pursuant to the provisions of this county law or the rules and regulations so promulgated.

B. A violation of this chapter, other than § **243-5A**, shall constitute an offense punishable upon conviction thereof by a fine not exceeding $25 for the first offense and $50 for each offense thereafter.

C. A violation of § **243-5A** shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable upon conviction thereof by not more than six months' imprisonment or a fine not exceeding $250, or both.

§ 243-~~7~~8 Construal of provisions.

To the extent that the provisions of this chapter are inconsistent with or different from the provisions of Chapter **179**, the provisions of this chapter shall control.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This Local Law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.

Underline means addition.
~~Strikethrough means delete.~~

PUBLIC HEARING

Village of Scarsdale

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Public Hearing is scheduled by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale on Tuesday, June 28, 2016 at 8:00 p.m. in Rutherford Hall in Village Hall to consider a proposed local law to Amend Chapter 256 of the Scarsdale Village Code entitled Streets, Sidewalks, and Public Places.

Donna M. Conkling
Village Clerk

06/15/2016

RESOLUTION RE: **CALLING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON A LOCAL LAW TO AMEND CHAPTER 256 OF THE SCARSDALE VILLAGE CODE ENTITLED STREETS, SIDEWALKS AND PUBLIC PLACES**

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing is hereby scheduled by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale to be held in Rutherford Hall in Village Hall on Tuesday, June 28, 2016 at 8:00 p.m. to consider a proposed local law to amend Chapter 256 of the Scarsdale Village Code entitled Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk is hereby directed to publish notice of said hearing pursuant to Village Law.

Submitted by: Village Manager
Date: June 7, 2016
For: June 14, 2016

CERTIFICATION
THE ABOVE RESOLUTION WAS
ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE VILLAGE OF SCARSDALE ON
06-14-2016
DONNA M. CONKLING
VILLAGE CLERK

INTRODUCTORY LOCAL LAW # __ OF 2016
A LOCAL LAW AMENDING CHAPTER 256 OF THE SCARSDALE VILLAGE CODE ENTITLED STREETS, SIDEWALKS AND PUBLIC PLACES

BE IT ENACTED by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale as follows:

Article I. Obstructions, Poles, Wires and Rubbish

§ 256-1. Permit required to obstruct.

[Amended 6-28-1966[1]]
No person shall obstruct any street, sidewalk, public easement or other public place without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer and complying with such regulations affecting obstructions as the Village Engineer may prescribe. No owner or lessee of any premises in the Village shall permit any goods, wares or merchandise owned or controlled by him to be kept, stored, displayed or sold on or directly above any sidewalk adjoining such premises. No owner or lessee of any premises in the Village shall permit any refuse or waste from such premises to be kept or stored on or directly above any sidewalk adjoining such premises without first securing a written permit from the Village Manager and complying with such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed in such written permit.
[1]
Editor's Note: Amended at time of adoption of Code (see Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. I).

§ 256-2. Poles and wires.

No person shall, without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer, erect or cause to be erected or change the location of any telephone, telegraph or electric light or electric transmission pole in or string any wires or construct any conduit over or upon any public street, sidewalk, park or other public place.
[1]
Editor's Note: Amended at time of adoption of Code (see Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. I).

§ 256-3. Rubbish and obstruction of public places and watercourses.

No person shall throw or cause to be thrown in any street, park or other public place or in any public drain, ditch or watercourse any rubbish or other solid matter or cause any obstruction or injury to any such drain, ditch or watercourse or divert or stop the flow thereof.

Article II. Openings

§ 256-4. Permit required; fees and deposits to be paid.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980[1]]
No person shall open or cause to be opened the surface pavement or soil in any portion of the public right-of-way, public easement, park or other public place, without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer. Prior to the issuance of a permit, the applicant shall pay the fees and deposits fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees.

[1]
Editor's Note: Amended at time of adoption of Code (see Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. I).

§ 256-5. Responsibility for repairs and restoration.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980[1]]
In the case of openings for sewers, drains, water, gas, telephone or other public utility purposes, the applicant for the permit is responsible for the temporary repair of the opening within the public right-of-way, public easement, park or other public place and must pay the fees and deposits fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees. In such case, the Village Engineer, in his discretion, at the time of issuing the permit, may authorize the applicant for the permit to do all the work required for permanent restoration of any opening within ~~type of~~ said public right-of-way, public easement, park or other public place and pay the fees and deposits fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees. In the event that the Village Engineer does not authorize the applicant for such permit to do any of the work required for the permanent restoration of the opening within the public right-of-way, public easement, park or other public place, the regular fees fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees for this purpose shall apply.

[1]
Editor's Note: Amended at time of adoption of Code (see Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. I).

§ 256-6. Multiple neighboring openings.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980; 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989]
In case two or more neighboring openings are made at one time, the Village Engineer may allow the same under one permit, charging therefor only one fee for issuing the permit but separate fees for the restoration and inspections.

§ 256-7. Replacement of concrete slabs.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980]
Whenever a concrete slab is cut or broken, the area to be replaced shall include a full slab.

§ 256-8. Replacement of curbing.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980]
Any curbing removed by any person shall be reset or replaced. Any person failing to restore curbing to its original condition shall be required to pay an additional fee as fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees. Any person constructing a new or substantially improved home may be required to install, replace or re-set granite curbing along the edge of pavement adjacent to the entire property, as directed by the Village Engineer.

§ 256-9. Additional fees for macadam and concrete sidewalks.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980]
In the case of openings made in macadam or concrete sidewalks, a fee as fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees in addition to any other required fee shall apply.[1]

[1]
Editor's Note: Current fees are available and on file in the office of the Village Clerk.

§ 256-10. Limits on multiple openings.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980]
In no case shall permits be granted to anyone other than a public service corporation for more than five openings to be made simultaneously.

§ 256-11. Fees and deposits.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980; 2-8-2000 by L.L. No. 2-2000]
The following fees and deposits for restoration shall be fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees pursuant to this section:

A.
In the cases of openings in cinder or dirt roadways:

(1)
For permit.

(2)
For restoration.

(3)
Inspection.

B.
In the cases of openings in macadam or similarly paved roadways:

(1)
For permit.

(2)
For restoration.

(3)
Inspection.

C.
In the cases of openings in concrete roadways or roadways with a concrete base:

(1)
For permit.

(2)
For restoration.

(3)
Inspection.

D.
In case openings exceeding four square yards in area are made in the traveled or paved portion of roadways, additional fees for repairs shall be paid for areas in excess of four square yards, at a rate fixed by resolution of the Board of Trustees:
(1)
In cinder or dirt roadways.

(2)
In macadam or similarly paved roadways.

(3)
In concrete roadways or roadways with a concrete base.

E.
In the case of openings in macadam sidewalks.

F.
In the case of openings in concrete sidewalks.

G.
For failure to restore curbing to its original condition.

H.
In the case of connections made to the Village sanitary sewer system.

I.
In the case of connections made to the Village storm sewer system.
[1]
Editor's Note: Current fees are available and on file in the office of the Village Clerk.

§ 256-12. Insurance.

[Amended 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989; 3-9-2004 by L.L. No. 1-2004]
A.
For street openings, sidewalk openings or any excavation in a public place totaling 500 square feet or less, no permit shall be issued for any such opening until the person desiring to make such opening or the person for whom it is to be made shall furnish to the Village insurance, evidenced by a certificate of insurance naming the Village as additional insured, in form satisfactory to the Village Attorney, with limits for personal injury of not less than $1,000,000 for any one person and not less than $3,000,000 for any one accident and not less than $100,000 for any one accident and $500,000 in the aggregate for property damage, insuring the Village, its officers, employees and agents against any liability for personal injury or property damage, directly or indirectly resulting from or arising out of the granting of any such permit or any such opening or the method and manner of doing any work permitted or required by any such permit or under this article or any negligent act or omission in connection therewith on the part of the permittee, his employees or agents, provided that a public service corporation may, at its option, file an undertaking, in form satisfactory to the Village Attorney, to indemnify and save harmless the Village, its officers, employees and agents from any such liability, covering all openings made by it.

B.
For street openings, sidewalk openings or any excavation in a public place greater than 500 square feet, no permit shall be issued for any such opening until the person desiring to make such an opening or the person for whom it is to be made shall furnish to the Village a separate Owners and

Contractors Protection Policy, in form satisfactory to the Village Attorney, with limits for personal injury of not less than $1,000,000 for any one person and not less than $3,000,000 for any one accident and not less than $100,000 for any one accident and $500,000 in the aggregate for property damage, insuring the Village, its officers, employees and agents against any liability for personal injury or property damage, directly or indirectly resulting from or arising out of the granting of any such permit or any such opening or the method and manner of doing any work permitted or required by any such permit or under this article or any negligent act or omission in connection therewith on the part of the permittee, his employees or agents, provided that a public service corporation may, at its option, file an undertaking, in form satisfactory to the Village Attorney, to indemnify and save harmless the Village, its officers, employees and agents from any such liability, covering all openings made by it.

§ 256-13. Compliance required; requirements.

[Amended 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989]
The person to whom the permit is issued shall see that the requirements contained in this article are observed.

A.
Any excavation, other than for paving, within the right-of-way shall be made by hand and not by power-driven equipment, unless by special permission of the Village Engineer.

B.
All excavations shall be by open cut, unless by special permission of the Village Engineer.

C.
All trenches shall be backfilled using K-~~K~~Crete 50 in the traveled way or under sidewalks; trenches outside the traveled way shall be backfilled with K-~~K~~Crete 50 or with soil tamped in layers not exceeding 12 inches in depth.

D.
All work done under any permit issued hereunder, whether directly by the permittee or by others to whom the work is ~~sublet~~ contracted to, shall conform to the requirements of the Village Engineer and shall be under full supervision of the permittee, who shall be solely responsible for the ~~character of the~~ work done.

E.
The Village of Scarsdale reserves the right to hire a third party inspection service/inspector to oversee the opening and restoration of any work performed in the public right-of-way, public easement, park or other public place. All fees associated with this service shall be paid by the applicant prior to the issuance of any permit by the Village Engineer.

F.
At the request of the Village Engineer, the applicant must supply a detailed maintenance and protection of traffic (MPT) plan, as per New York State DOT standards, showing the area of proposed work, all signage to be installed, detour routes, location of traffic control personnel, proposed lane closures, or any other requirement specified by the Village Engineer. The use of Scarsdale Police Department personnel may be required for additional traffic control. The expense for such personnel usage shall be paid by the applicant. After the Village Engineer approves the MPT plan, the applicant must submit the approved MPT plan to all Village emergency service departments and agencies.

§ 256-14. Temporary repairs.

[Added 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980; amended 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989]
The permittee is responsible for the temporary repair of the trench. Temporary trench repair is to consist of two inches of asphalt concrete placed on top of the K-KCrete backfill and level with the existing road surface.

§ 256-15. Time limit for work; closing trench for noncompliance.

[Amended 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989]
The Village Engineer may prescribe the time when the work shall be done and the length of time that any trench or other excavation may remain open. He may cause any such trench or opening to be filled up or closed at the expense of the person to whom the permit is issued in case of noncompliance with the terms of such permit or other conditions prescribed at any time by the Village Engineer.

§ 256-16. Permanent trench repair.

Temporary trenches shall be widened a minimum of one foot beyond the original cut or any crack developed from the adjacent pavement settling because of the excavation. ~~The base course of road pavement shall consist of New York State Department of Transportation asphaltic concrete Type 1A to a depth equal to the existing base course (four inches minimum); top course of pavements shall consist of 2 1/2 inches of New York State Department of Transportation asphaltic concrete Type 7F in two lifts.~~ Asphalt thickness and materials shall conform to the standard construction details maintained by the Village Engineer. All final pavement restoration limits shall follow the guidelines depicted in the "Minimum Pavement Restoration Limits" diagram as adopted by the Board of Trustees, and amended from time to time. The "Minimum Pavement Restoration Limits" diagram shall be maintained by the Village Engineer. The edges of ~~the~~ all trenches shall receive a liberal application of asphaltic emulsion to seal edges.
[1]
*Editor's Note: Added at time of adoption of Code (see Ch. **1**, General Provisions, Art. **I**).*

§ 256-17. Protection around opening.

The person to whom the permit is issued shall maintain sufficient guards, barricades, lights or watchmen to protect persons and property against injury and damage by reason of any such opening.

Article III. Drainage

[Amended at time of adoption of Code[1]]
[1]
*Editor's Note: See Ch. **1**, General Provisions, Art. **I**.*

§ 256-18. Connection to public stormwater drainage system.

No person shall connect any drain designed to conduct storm-, surface or subsurface water with any part of the public stormwater drainage system until the plans thereof drawn to scale shall have been filed with and approved by the Village Engineer and his written permit issued therefor. No person shall backfill any trench in which such drain is laid or constructed until the Plumbing Inspector shall have inspected the same and issued his written approval thereof.

§ 256-19. Drainage onto streets and sidewalks.

Except in case of temporary emergency, no person shall cause or permit any water or other liquid to be pumped or forced to run from or out of any building or premises upon or across any sidewalk or curbstone or into any street without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer.

Article IV. Culverts and Gutters

[Amended at time of adoption of Code[1]]

[1]
*Editor's Note: See Ch. **1**, General Provisions, Art. **I**.*

§ 256-20. Culverts.

No person shall construct, alter, repair or remove any culvert along or near to the line of the gutter of any public street without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer and complying with such specifications as the Village Engineer may prescribe. In case any such culvert under any private entrance shall become broken or damaged or insufficient properly to carry off the water flowing thereto, the owner of the premises for which such private entrance is provided shall, upon demand of the Village Engineer, forthwith reconstruct the same in accordance with such specifications as the Village Engineer may prescribe.

§ 256-21. Interference with gutters.

No person shall obstruct, or construct any structure interfering or tending to interfere with the free and open operation of, any gutter of any public street without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer and complying with such specifications as the Village Engineer may prescribe.

Article V. Sidewalks

§ 256-22. Snow and ice removal.

A.
The owner, lessee, tenant, occupant or other person having charge of any building or lot abutting upon any paved sidewalk shall keep the sidewalk adjacent to such building or lot free and clear of snow and ice; provided, however, that failure to clear snow or ice from a sidewalk within a period of four hours, not including the time between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., after the snow ceases to fall or the ice to form shall not be deemed a violation of this section. In case the snow or ice on the sidewalk shall be frozen so hard that it cannot be removed without injury to the pavement, such person shall, as soon thereafter as the weather shall permit, remove the same and, in the meantime, cause the sidewalk adjacent to such building or lot to be strewed with ashes, sand, sawdust or similar material.

B.
No act of the Village in removing snow or ice from any such sidewalk shall affect the obligation imposed by this section on such person.

§ 256-23. Curb cuts.

[Amended 5-13-1980 by L.L. No. 1-1980; 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989; 9-22-1992 by L.L. No. 7-1992; 3-9-2004 by L.L. No. 1-2004]
No person shall lower any curb or change the grade of any sidewalk for the purpose of providing vehicular access across such curb or sidewalk without first securing a written permit from the Village Engineer and complying with the following requirements:
A.
Application shall be made, in writing, by the owner of record of the abutting premises to the Village Engineer. Such application shall set forth the points at which such vehicular access shall begin and end in relation to curb- and property lines and the materials of which it shall be constructed.

B.
The Village Engineer shall not grant a permit to lower any curb or change the grade of any sidewalk for the purpose of providing vehicular access across such curb or sidewalk when, in his opinion, the actual or intended use of such vehicular access would endanger pedestrians or traffic.

C.
Prior to the granting of any such permit, the Village Engineer shall charge a fee and shall exact a cash deposit per linear foot of the width of the proposed curb cut, which deposit shall be refunded upon completion of the curb cut to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer. The Village Engineer shall charge a fee for the inspection of the completed curb cut and may make such rules for the proper care and cleaning of such curb cut as he deems advisable. All fees pursuant to this section shall be fixed upon resolution of the Board of Trustees.

D.
No such permit shall be issued until the applicant shall furnish the Village insurance, in a form satisfactory to the Village Attorney, with limits of not less than $1,000,000 for any one person and not less than $3,000,000 for any one accident for personal injury and not less than $100,000 for any one accident and $500,000 in the aggregate for property damage, insuring the Village, its officers, employees and agents against any liability or personal injury or property damage, directly or

indirectly resulting from or arising out of the granting of any such permit or the making of such curb cut or the method and manner of doing any work permitted or required by any such permit or under this section or any negligent act or omission in connection therewith on the part of the permittee, his employees or agents.

E.
Every such curb cut shall be constructed under the supervision and subject to the direction of the Village Engineer and on condition that, upon failure to comply with the terms of the permit, the Village Engineer may revoke the permit and cause the curb and sidewalk to be restored to their original condition at the expense of the owner of record of the abutting premises.

F.
Should the use of the curb cut, in the opinion of the Village Engineer, be or become dangerous to pedestrians or traffic, the Village Engineer shall mail a written notice to the owner of record of the abutting premises to discontinue use of such curb cut and to restore such curb and sidewalk to the original condition within 10 days of the mailing of the notice, and such owner shall comply with such notice within 10 days. If such owner shall fail to so comply with such notice, the Village Engineer may revoke the permit and cause the curb and sidewalk to be restored to their original condition at the expense of the owner of record of the premises.

G.
In case any part of a curb cut shall not be paved, repaved or repaired according to reasonable requirements of the Village Engineer, the Village Engineer shall mail a written notice to the owner of the abutting premises directing that the same be so paved, repaved or repaired, as the case may be. Such owner shall comply with such notice within 10 days. If said owner fails to comply with such notice, the Village Engineer may cause the curb cut to be paved, repaved or repaired, as the case may be, at the expense of such owner.

H.
The owner of a lot may appeal from any decision of the Village Engineer. The appellant shall apply to the Planning Board within 60 days after the decision to deny a curb cut permit, with an information copy to the Village Engineer. This appeal shall include a statement of guaranty that all expenses for any required opinion obtained from an independent consulting traffic engineer shall be paid by the appellant and shall be accompanied by a fee as set by resolution of the Board of Trustees.

I.
The Planning Board may grant a waiver from the decision of the Village Engineer. In making its decisions, the Planning Board must find that the result will, in its judgment, not be in conflict with the public health, welfare and, in particular, with considerations of traffic safety and may attach appropriate conditions and safeguards to such waiver.

J.
The Village Engineer is authorized to promulgate standards and guidelines for the construction and maintenance of driveways. Such standards and guidelines shall be filed with the Board of Trustees upon promulgation.

Article VI. Street Numbers

[Added 3-14-1989 by L.L. No. 6-1989]

§ 256-24. Purpose.

The purpose of this article shall be to require the clear display of house numbers from public streets for all properties that contain principal buildings within the Village in order to assist the general public or the authorities in identifying any property in case of an emergency, as well as for the welfare of the general public in conducting its normal affairs.

§ 256-25. Applicability.

This article shall apply to all properties within the Village that contain a principal building thereon, whether or not said building is occupied. Such premises shall bear and display at least one set of house numbers, which shall be assigned by the Village Engineer. Buildings facing two or more public roadways shall be required to display auxiliary numbers, if necessary, to pass the visibility test (as hereinafter set forth) when viewed from those points in the center line of the public roadway opposite those points where regularly used pedestrian or vehicular passageways enter the public roadway.

§ 256-26. Specifications and requirements.

A.
In order to comply with this article, house numbers shall be Arabic in design, shall have a minimum height of two inches and shall be mounted in a secure fashion to the building's front wall or to a porch or other fixed appurtenance in front of the building in the general vicinity of the main entryway or main path of travel which leads to the main entrance from a public street or otherwise separately and securely mounted upon the face of a wall or upon a post in the front yard of the premises.

B.
Auxiliary numbers shall be mounted at a height between four feet and 10 feet above the adjacent grade or exterior landing directly beneath but never higher than 15 feet above the adjoining grade. They shall be sufficiently legible as to contrasting background, arrangement, spacing, size and uniformity of integers so that the numbers may be read with ease during the daylight hours by a person possessing at least 20/40 vision as he views the numbers from the center line of the facing street and at an elevation of five feet above the finished surface thereof.

C.
The numbers shall be so placed that trees, shrubs or other obstructions do not block the line of the numbers from the center of the street to any appreciable degree.

§ 256-27. Existing numbers.

Existing numbers used on premises which essentially comply with numbers officially assigned by the Village Engineer, at least to the extent that such number or numbers are in logical sequence with number or numbers assigned to properties on either side which are located on the same side of the street, shall be considered as bearing the correct number or numbers for the purposes of this article.

§ 256-28. Existing installations.

Existing installations which essentially meet the requirements and/or spirit of this article, including numbers presently on or attached to a mailbox, shall be deemed to be in compliance without further alteration.

§ 256-29. Failure to comply.

The absence of house numbers or the insecure fastening or absence of any integer thereof or the use of any number out of logical sequence for the street toward which it faces or the failure of a number to meet the elevation requirement or the visibility requirements shall be considered as a violation of this article. Failure on the part of the property owner to comply with the provisions of this Article within a period of 15 days from the date of issuance of a notice of violation shall be sufficient cause for the Village Engineer to proceed with carrying out the provisions of this article and assess any costs incurred to the property owner concerned, with a minimum charge of $25 for each property in violation.

§ 256-30. Assignment of numbers.

The final authority for determining and assigning the number or numbers to be used upon any particular property shall be the Village Engineer of the Village of Scarsdale, such authority being delegated to the Village Engineer by the Board of Trustees pursuant to § 4-412 of the Village Law.

Article VII. Penalties

[Added at time of adoption of Code[1]]
[1]
Editor's Note: See Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. I.

§ 256-31. Penalties for offenses.

Unless otherwise provided, any person committing an offense against any provision of this chapter shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a violation pursuant to the Penal Law of the State of New York, punishable by a fine not exceeding $250 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 15 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment The continuation of an offense against the provisions of this chapter shall constitute for each day the offense is continued, a separate and distinct offense hereunder.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This Local Law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.

Underline means addition.
~~Strikethrough means delete.~~

RESOLUTION RE: ADOPTION OF VILLAGE OF SCARSDALE MINIMUM PAVEMENT RESTORATION LIMITS

WHEREAS, the Village Board of Trustees is desirous of maintaining a well-functioning, aesthetically pleasing road network and is committed to preserving its life cycle; and

WHEREAS, construction activity associated with home construction and renovation, utility upgrades and repairs, and other similar work involves roadway excavation, leading to accelerated roadway deterioration and significantly increased road maintenance costs if such disruptions are not properly restored; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale recognizes it is prudent to require proper restoration of its roadways; and

WHEREAS, the establishment of minimum pavement restoration standards is necessary to ensure the adequate restoration of all Village roadways in a uniform manner that safeguards Village roadway infrastructure investments; and

WHEREAS, the Village Engineer has proposed industry accepted best practice pavement restoration standards and limits for proper renovation of the Village's road network following the completion of construction activities impacting roadway integrity; and

WHEREAS, the restoration requirements depicted on the "Minimum Pavement Restoration Limits" diagram attached hereto are sufficient to protect our significant local investments into maintaining quality roads; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that pursuant to Chapter 256-16 of the Scarsdale Village Code, the "Minimum Pavement Restoration Limits" diagram dated June 20, 2016, attached hereto is hereby adopted by the Village Board.

Submitted by: Village Manager
Date: June 24, 2016
For: June 28, 2016

RESOLUTION RE: APPOINTMENT OF FIRE CHIEF

WHEREAS, Thomas Cain is retiring from the Scarsdale Fire Department effective July 17, 2016, after nearly thirty-two years of distinguished service, ten and one half years of which he served as the Fire Chief; and

WHEREAS, to assist in the selection of Chief Cain's successor, an interview panel consisting of elected and former elected officials, senior Village staff, and a career fire service professional was assembled to evaluate and interview the four candidates who applied for the position; and

WHEREAS, the candidates were examined thoroughly by the members of the interview panel in areas of firematics, organizational theory, management style, public budgeting, leadership abilities, and professionalism; and

WHEREAS, on June 2, 2016, the panel filed the report attached hereto, naming two finalists for consideration by the Mayor and Village Manager; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and the Village Manager reviewed the background and experience of the finalists, having then interviewed both on June 13, 2016; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that pursuant to §4-400(1)(c)(i) of the New York State Village Law and §A318-4(A) of the Scarsdale Village Code, Captain James Seymour is hereby appointed to the position of Fire Chief for the Village of Scarsdale commencing on July 18, 2016, with the compensation to be determined by the Village Manager.

Submitted by: Mayor Jonathan Mark
Date: June 24, 2016
For: June 28, 2016

RESOLUTION RE: APPOINTMENT TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS

WHEREAS, the Advisory Council on Human Relations was organized on January 24, 1978, to advise and assist the Village Board of Trustees in fostering mutual respect and understanding among all individuals in the community; and

WHEREAS, the constitution of the Advisory Council on Human Relations provides for a total of up to twelve (12) members serving staggered two-year terms, with the current Council consisting of nine members, allowing for additional appointments; and

WHEREAS, Michelle Sullivan Lichtenberg, 91 Greenacres Avenue, has expressed an interest in serving on the Council on Human Relations; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board's Personnel Committee convened on June 14, 2016, to discuss this matter and voted to recommend to the Full Board that Michelle Sullivan Lichtenberg be appointed to the Advisory Council on Human Relations for a term ending April 2, 2018; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that Michelle Sullivan Lichtenberg, 91 Greenacres is hereby appointed to serve as a member of the Advisory Council on Human Relations for a term ending April 2, 2018, or until such time as a successor is appointed.

Submitted by: Village Manager
Date: June 24, 2016
For: June 28, 2016

RESOLUTION RE: APPOINTMENTS TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

WHEREAS, the Advisory Council on People With Disabilities was created by resolution of the Village Board in 1984 with the purpose of assisting the Board in certain matters and issues to advance the interests of Village residents with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, the constitution of the Advisory Council on People with Disabilities provides for a total of seven to nine members serving two-year terms, with the current council consisting of five members, allowing for additional appointments; and

WHEREAS, Marjorie A. Meiman, 13 Wakefield Road, and Ronny Hersch, 32 Benedict Road, are interested in serving on the Advisory Council on People with Disabilities for a two-year term ending April 2, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board's Personnel Committee convened on June 14, 2016, to discuss this matter and voted to recommend to the Full Board that Marjorie A. Meiman and Ronny Hersch be appointed to the Advisory Council on Human Relations for a term ending April 2, 2018; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that Marjorie A Meiman, 13 Wakefield Road, and Ronny Hersch, 32 Benedict Road, are hereby appointed to serve as members of the Advisory Council on People with Disabilities for a term ending April 2, 2018, or until such time as a successor is appointed.

Submitted by: Village Manager
Date: June 24, 2016
For: June 28, 2016

RESOLUTION RE: **AWARDING VM CONTRACT # 1202 – FURNISH AND INSTALL NEW 60' X 120' FULL SPAN FABRIC SALT SHED STRUCTURE**

WHEREAS, as part of the Village's snow and ice removal program, an average of 3,000 tons of salt is used per year, all of which must be stored and protected from the elements at our 25 Ramsey Road facility, ready for safe and efficient access when needed; and

WHEREAS, the existing "lean-to" type shelter is functionally obsolete, in that its storage capacity is only approximately 1,000 tons, is operationally cumbersome, in that its bay-style segmentation leads to excessive time and effort to store and remove salt piles, and is structurally unsound, as evidenced by concrete delamination, rusted steel rebar reinforcement, and rotting timbers; and

WHEREAS, in order to address the structural and operational deficiencies of the existing aged structure, it is necessary to replace it with a cost-effective, modern, large span, lightweight metal enclosure featuring a fabric cover and providing a slightly larger footprint to facilitate increased storage and elimination of problematic dividing walls, resulting in improved operational efficiency and enhanced storage capacity; and

WHEREAS, on April 26, 2016, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution to transfer $250,000 in unassigned General Fund Balance to the Capital Fund for design and construction of a new salt shed and associated site work, with said preparatory demolition and site work already underway; and

WHEREAS, the Village Manager reports that he publicly advertised for the receipt of bids on June 3, 2016, through VM Contract # 1202 - Furnish and Install New 60' X 120' Full Span Fabric Salt Shed Structure; and

WHEREAS, on the bid opening date of June 14, 2016, four bids were received, with the lowest responsible lump sum bid of $123,380 submitted by Structures Unlimited, LLC, a company qualified to provide the required materials and install the full span fabric salt shed; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is hereby authorized to execute VM Contract #1202 - Furnish and Install New 60' X 120' Full Span Fabric Salt Shed Structure with Structures Unlimited, LLC. C4640 State Highway 97, Stratford, WI 54484 at the total lump sum cost of $123,380; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the $123,380 cost to Furnish and Install a New 60' X 120' Full Span Fabric Salt Shed Structure be charged to the Capital Budget Account H-5197-963 2016-112-Pub Bldg – DPW Salt Shed; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to undertake all administrative acts required pursuant to the terms of the contract.

Submitted by: Village Manager
Date: June 24, 2016
For: June 28, 2016

From: Farley Baker <farleysb@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 9, 2016 9:05 PM
To: Mayor
Subject: Revaluation

Dear Mayor Mark,

An increase of 41% - that's the change in value of my property as a result of the current revaluation.

I live in Edgewood, at the southeast corner of Grand Boulevard and Johnson Road. To provide some context, there are 398 houses in the area bordered by Grand Boulevard on the north, on the west by Post Road, by Eastchester to the south, and by New Rochelle to the east. This is an area of generally smaller houses on smaller lots.

At 1,087 square feet, with two bedrooms / two baths, my home is the second smallest of the 398 houses in this area. As a point of reference, and also because it affects the value of my home, the smallest house in this area (and likely in all of Scarsdale), is right next to mine - it is 965 square feet. By right next to mine, I mean just that - it sets on my property line - no setback - and is just ten feet from my house. But this is fine - it was this way when I bought my house, and this condition, combined with my home's small size, with a driveway onto busy Grand Boulevard, and a Bee-Line bus stop on my corner, made this property affordable for me.

I bought my home in 1992 for $220,000 dollars. At the time, in this same area, there was nothing under $300,000, and prices were generally in the $350,000 to $400,000 - with a handful even more. Until this revaluation, my home was valued at about two-thirds of the majority of other larger houses in this part of Edgewood.

Now, due to the 41% increase, my property is valued the same as, if not more than, many larger houses in my area.

While there are numerous examples of this, I'll present just one as it clearly illustrates the lack of logic - a comparison of my corner property to the corner property located diagonally across the intersection. In the current revaluation, that property's value did not change. While both houses are well maintained, and have the same lot size, this other house is 77% larger, has more bedrooms / baths, does not have a driveway onto Grand Boulevard, or a bus stop, or another house right on its property line. Prior to the current revaluation, my property was valued at 71% of this other house - to me this was logical. So why is my house now the same value? If my home and this other house were for sale at the same price (as current valuations indicate they should be) - which do you think would be purchased faster?

I have looked at the new valuations of many of the 398 houses in my area and also in the Village, and in my opinion, there are so many inconsistencies and errors among properties that this current revaluation must be set aside. Many errors are obvious, and point to incompetence or lack of diligence by the consultant. This revaluation seems to have been done with a broad brush - lacking consideration of property specific conditions that affect both land and building values. In some ways, this approach reminds me of the Li.Saltzman / Andrew Dolkart study done on historic properties in 2012.

I should not have to spend time and money to correct this injustice. Please share this email with the Trustees and Village Manager.

Regards,

Farley Baker
182 Johnson Road

From: Mayor
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 7:39 PM
To: Janis Klavins
Subject: Re: Assessor mistake

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Klavins-- The process for addressing the issue you raise is to file a grievance with the Village Assessor's office . This year grievances must be filed no later than Tuesday, June 21, 2016. The grievance form and related instructions can be found on the Village web site at http://www.scarsdale.com by clicking on the Village Assessor heading on the left of the web page and then on the links to the form and the instructions. The links to the form and to the instructions are below for your reference.

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524_fill_in.pdf

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524ins.pdf

Note that so long as the grievance form is filed timely (by the deadline date), it need not be (but certainly can be) accompanied by such supporting materials as you wish to submit. Such materials, an appraisal for example, may be filed later, but the grievance form itself must be filed by June 21st.

If you have questions about the grievance process you may call the Assessor's office at: 914.722.1133

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: Janis Klavins <jvklavins@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 4:29 PM
To: Mayor
Subject: Assessor mistake

Dear Mayor Mark,

Our lawyer advised us to write to you and the Village Manager about a grievance and a complaint.

We just found out when we received the 2016 Residential valuation detail sheet that the assessor had
made a mistake by listing 4 full bathrooms in our home. We only have 3!
We overpaid the tax last year. It seems we will overpay again this year.
The assessor reduced the bathroom count for next year.
We feel that we should not have to pay for the assessment mistake!
We are asking for adjustments for last year and this year.
We hope you can help resolve this matter.
Thank you very much,

Ilga and Janis Klavins
5 Broadmoor Rd.
Scarsdale, NY 10583
(914) 472-2116

From: Mayor
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2016 9:46 AM
To: janec.curley@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Assessment

Dear Ms. Curley -- This acknowledges receipt of your email. As is the case each year, residents who wish to grieve their assessments may do so by making a grievance filing on or prior to the deadline date. This year that date is Thursday, June 21, 2016. The grievance form and related instructions can be found on the Village web site at: http://www.scarsdale.com/Home/Departments/VillageAssessor.aspx

Note that so long as the grievance form is filed timely (by the deadline date), it need not be (but certainly can be) accompanied by such supporting materials as the resident wishes to submit. Such materials, an appraisal for example, may be filed later, but the grievance form itself must be filed by June 21st.

If you have questions about the grievance process you may call the Assessor's office at: 914.722.1133

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: janec.curley@gmail.com <janec.curley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2016 9:19 AM
To: Mayor
Subject: Assessment

I live at 7 Hamilton. The assessed value of my home went from 920,000 to 1,200,000.

I purchased the property in 2012 for 880,000 in an arm's length, brokered transaction. The property had been on the market for quite some time, but nobody wanted it because the home is in tear down condition, has an extremely awkward layout, minimal attic space accessible only through a bedroom, no garage, and a half basement with < 6' headroom. The other half of the basement is a gross dirt crawl space.

I don't think a home with no garage has ever sold for over a million dollars in Scarsdale. All of the value of my property is in the land. The property across the street sold last year for 1,250,000 and the house was torn down. That house was on two lots! The combined acreage is larger then my property, and my property is absolutely not sub-dividable. I was a licensed real estate appraiser prior to grad school and I am very confident my assessment is completely off base.

Beyond my own property, I am confused as to how this debacle ever got so far. I work for a bank in model risk management. My job is to assess the validity of the mathematical methodologies, assumptions, inputs, and implementation of the quantitative financial models used by the bank. There is absolutely NO WAY you can model single family home values using such a tiny sample set of sales for model development. Additionally, single family homes are probably the most complex financial asset there is. I would be very surprised to see house values successfully modeled. Has this been done before? Did Ryan provide any evidence that this approach would work? Did any consultants advise on retaining Ryan for this project? What are you doing to get that money back?

Finally, regardless of the inequity of the assessments, this debacle has reduced the aggregate value of real estate in Scarsdale. Everyone has some intuitive sense of risk when they purchase property, or any asset. In town like Scarsdale, political risk in not a significant factor. That just changed. Real estate in Scarsdale just because a much riskier investment. And that means it is worth less. Why would I buy a house in a mismanaged town when I could purchase in Bronxville?

What are you going to do to help Scarsdale property owners who are not former appraisers and experts in financial modeling grieve their taxes? Because people should not have to give way thousands to professionals to help them right a wrong that is entirely the town's fault.

Jane Curley

Donna Conkling

From: Mike <atlorenz@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 6:26 PM
To: Clerk's Department
Subject: Rescind the Ryan Report

Please cancel or void or rescind the 2016 Ryan Property Tax Assessment results

Laura Kunkin
9 Continental Rd

Sent from my iPad

Donna Conkling

From: Lou Mancini <lou@jdevents.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 9:46 PM
To: Mayor; Clerk's Department
Subject: Tax Reval 2016

Mayor

Please share with the entire BOT and Village Administration my concern and frustration with the 2016 reval efforts.

Highlights:
Many questions
Very few answers
$245K spent in 2016 for a drive by reval that has undone $1M plus evaluation that actually had interior inspections and rated properties properly and MOST importantly allowed for dialogue and corrections prior to posting the prelim.
BOT was put on notice of the concerns and failed to address them
Lots of examples of errors and frustration

VOID the 2016 reval and lets set the stage to get it right down the road with some validation.

The majority of resident do not mind paying their fair share if it is right, explainable and supportable.

This reval does not meet the criteria above.

It is your job to fix it since you started it.

There will be no winners with this. Grievances will not fix it. Lawsuits will only cost more money to taxpayers. Doing nothing will only incense the taxpayers more.

Fix it!

Thanks,

Lou Mancini
40 Carman Rd
914 645 7728

From: Shapiro, Allan <AShapiro@rossbar.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Manager's Department; Mayor
Cc: Assessor's Department
Subject: Property Assessment

Jonathon and Stephen
Greetings
Trust all is well
Mary and I wish to contest our assessments.
However, I could not find the complaint form on-line The notice of tentative assessment directed me to a NYS site... but I could find the complaint form on the NY site. This site is very obscure.
Why is it not on the Village web site?
I prefer an electronic copy to fill out.
Also, having been a Scarsdale resident for 35 + years, it is becoming increasing hard financially to stay in the Village which we love and where I have served on multiple village boards and community/institution boards.
The Village is remised in not dealing with this issue of impact on Senior Citizens.
I would be happy to serve on a committee to explore alternative options that could provide some form of relief from this annual (bi-annual), fiscally burdensome, increased taxation on senior citizens.

Mary and Allan Shapiro
12 Ferncliff Road
Scarsdale, NY 10583

914-723-6846 (Home)
914-645-9105 (Cell)

From: Mayor
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:03 PM
To: mbemore@aol.com
Cc: Nanette Albanese
Subject: Re: Reval questions

Dear Ms. Evans -- Your questions are better directed to the office of the Village Assessor (cc'd). However, if you believe the assessed value of your property is too high, you should file a grievance. Below are links to the Complaint Form and the instructions for filing a grievance which you can use for accessing those documents. For your reference, they can be found by clicking on the "Village Assessor" heading on the left hand column of the Village web site and then on the headings for each document

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524_fill_in.pdf

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524ins.pdf

This year the filing deadline is Tuesday, June 21, 2016.

Note that so long as the grievance form is filed timely (by the deadline date), it need not be (but certainly can be) accompanied by such supporting materials as you wish to submit. Such materials, an appraisal for example, may be filed later, but the grievance form itself must be filed by June 21st.

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: mbemore@aol.com <mbemore@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 11:45 PM
To: Mayor
Subject: Reval questions

Dear Mayor Mark and Village Trustees,

I was unable to attend last night's Board meeting but did record it in anticipation of learning answers to several questions I have about the most recent revaluation. Today I watched the recording of the meeting and note that you were not yet in position to answer my questions, many of which were also raised by other residents. Thus, I hope you might be able to address the questions listed below as soon as possible so that I, and perhaps other residents, can better understand this second revaluation process.

With much appreciation,

Mary Beth Evans
16 Edgewood Road

1. What explains the differences in assessments that resulted from the first and the second property revaluations?

- If the purpose of the second revaluation was to correct for some "outliers" resulting from the first revaluation, why did so many properties either increase or decrease so significantly in value over so short a time period?

- Can you please provide a side-by-side comparison of how Tyler Technologies and Ryan Associates' determined land and house values, including each formula's assigned numeric values for particular characteristics?

- And can you please provide specific examples from across Scarsdale to show how the Ryan Associates' formula has resulted in fairer and more uniform assessments than Tyler Technologies' formula?

- Greenburgh, Ossining and other Westchester towns also used Tyler Technologies for their recent reassessments. Were the problems in the application of the Tyler model to Scarsdale unique to Scarsdale?

2. What was the rationale for and the result of using a neighborhood multiplier system to calculate land values in the recent Ryan Associates' revaluation in which Edgewood, Greenacres and Quaker Ridge were each assigned a multiplier of 1.10; Heathcote a multiplier of 1.15; and Fox Meadow a multiplier of 1.30?

- What was the justification for defining "neighborhood" according to elementary school, as opposed to, say, zoning area? And how were numeric values and incremental differences determined for each neighborhood?

- What specific neighborhood characteristic accounts for the application the same 1.15 multiplier to a 4-acre Heathcote Road property and a 0.17-acre Heathcote Road property?

- Why is a 0.16–acre Lee Road property in Fox Meadow of greater "neighborhood" value than a 0.16-acre Lee Road property in Edgewood?

- What makes a 2-acre Zone AA1 property in Heathcote deserving of a 1.15 "neighborhood" multiplier that is just 0.05 more than the 1.10 "neighborhood" multiplier assigned to a 5,000 square foot Zone A5 property in Edgewood?

- Can you please provide evidence that the Ryan reval neighborhood multiplier system contributed to fairer and more uniform assessments in 2016?

From: Mayor
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 4:56 PM
To: Mayra Rodriguez Valladares; Manager's Department; Attorney's Office; Clerk's Department; Nanette Albanese; Patrick McEvily
Subject: Re: Monday Meeting 2016 Revaluation

Dear Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez - I understand that the staff is working on responses to your letter. Whether they will be done by the time of the meeting is uncertain but it is in the works.

The limited purpose of the meeting is for the Board to get an update on the grievance process. A representative from the Assessor's office is expected to be present to give that update, though not the Village Assessor who I understand will be out on a long-planned vacation. Mr. Ryan is not being invited to the meeting as that is not its purpose.

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: Mayra Rodriguez Valladares <mrvassoc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 1:29 PM
To: Mayor; Manager's Department; Attorney's Office; Clerk's Department; Nanette Albanese; Patrick McEvily
Subject: Monday Meeting 2016 Revaluation

Good afternoon,

We see that there is a meeting on Monday at 8pm. Would you kindly be responding to the questions we sent you last week at that meeting? Will the village assessor and JF Ryan Associates be present to answer questions from residents?

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,
Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez

Good afternoon,

Please see our letter about the 2016 revaluation and the Tuesday June 14th village meeting.

http://bit.ly/1UlJCG0

Please include this in your website as a public record. Please confirm receipt of our correspondence.

Best regards,
Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez

From: Mayor
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 6:02 PM
To: Michael Seymour
Cc: proscars@aol.com; Marilyn Seymour
Subject: Re: Recent Revaluation

Dear Mr. Seymour - -This acknowledges receipt of your email. The Assessor's office is making every effort to respond to inquires such as yours. However, the volume of such requests is such that it is taking longer than one would hope for them to get back to residents making such inquiries. It is my hope that they can respond to you as soon as practicable.

Very truly yours, Jon Mrk

From: Michael Seymour <orioles4@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 5:40 PM
To: Mayor
Cc: proscars@aol.com; Marilyn Seymour
Subject: Recent Revaluation

Dear Mr. Mayor,

I was unable to attend the Village Board meeting last night to make myself heard on this subject, so I am forwarding a copy of my recent email to the Assessor, which to date is unanswered. I need to understand how my valuation could go down almost 15% in two years. I'm not complaining about a likely reduction in taxes. I'm complaining about a flawed process that values my property at $1,475,000 when a recent professional appraisal valued it at $1,860,000. I am about to put my house on the market after living here almost 50 years, because I can't afford to live here any more. Needless to say, the value of my property is a very important issue for me today. The revaluation should be set aside while the experts try again.

Michael Seymour
85 Greenacres Ave.
914-262-9176 (cell)

Dear Ms. Albanese,

To reiterate, I'm trying to find out what happened and why it happened. You certainly can tell me this.

For me, as apparently for many, the recent rerevaluation is a disaster. You have dramatically altered the perceived value of my property, lowering it by a quarter of a million dollars, to $1,475,000! And are unwilling/unable to give me an explanation of how and why this could happen even though I personally came to your office to try to get some answers, then followed up with email. Yes, I should be happy that the taxes will go down. But I'm not. If we were able to stay in this home we love and have lived in for 40 years but can no longer afford, I would be. Adding to my confusion about what has been done to us, I have a professional appraisal of the property, conducted on May 11, 2016, that values the property at $1,860,000. This appraisal is based both on the sale of comparables, and on the cost approach. This is almost $500,000 more than the new Village valuation. I need to know why, and how this could happen. It directly affects my and my wife's future.

Michael Seymour
85 Greenacres Ave.
914-262-9176

Donna Conkling

From: Mike <mikekunkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 6:24 PM
To: Clerk's Department
Subject: 2016 Revaluation

Please rescind the Ryan Tax Assestment

YOU GOT US INTO THIS MESS YOU CAN GET US OUT

REALLY VERY WRONG ON SO MANY LEVELS

MIKE KUNKIN
9 Continental Rd

Sent from my iPad

From: Min Lucy Luo <lum2006@med.cornell.edu>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:46 PM
To: Assessor's Department; Mayor
Cc: Min Lucy Luo; zimingzou@yahoo.com; Min Lucy Luo
Subject: apply an appointment for June 21 assessment review and complain to the new assessment system

Dear Scarsdale Mayor and Assessors,

This is the owner for 36 Carman Road, Min (Lucy) Luo and Ziming (Eddy) Zou. We are highly upset and disappointed with the new 2016 tentative assessment for our house and neighbors. We are applying an appeal appointment for the coming board assessment review meeting. The official grievance form will be submitted to the village office on 6/17/16.

Scarsdale's reputation is based on its high quality school system, neighborhood and nice village manage. In the past 100 years, several generations worked very hard to build up this high reputation for our fabulous village. Base on the past two times' house assessment increase, we afraid that our village might add another title as "property tax sucker". We totally understand and support a reasonable tax charge system, which is the base for a good village and school system. But overcharged property tax system can destroy our village's reputation and scare out further potential house buyers. How can we have a stable village tax income source, if all our on-market houses can't sell out? Some villages in Connecticut/NJ are suffering from their high tax policy. Hope Scarsdale won't be the next one.

Thank you for all your hard works to keep our village nice!

Best

Lucy (212-810-6293, the owner of 36 Carman Road)

This letter was sent to Scarsdale10583 by Nickolai Baturin and Brice and Mayra Kirkendall-Rodríguez:

We attended the June 14th Scarsdale Village meeting to present our qualitative and quantitative analysis to you, as our elected officials, and to our fellow Scarsdalians. We provided evidence that there are numerous flaws in J.F. Ryan's model. Additionally, we explained that the model governance was very weak, because the Village awarded JF Ryan a contract without requiring him to compete with any other firm, no one in the Village confirmed and documented J.F. Ryan's credentials, Ryan's data and assumptions were not validated by anyone who is quantitatively qualified, no quantitative professional audited the whole process and model, and the whole process and model inputs were not made transparent to Scarsdale residents until after the revaluation had been completed. Weak model governance means that the model is neither robust nor credible. Hence, this model is invalid for the purpose for which it was designed, which was to determine the value of Scarsdalians' homes. Using this model will push many people out of Scarsdale which will adversely impact both the village and school administration's budgets.

At the village meeting, we had opportunity to hear from other citizens with impeccable quantitative expertise. For example, Neel Daniels, who has a background in statistics and who conducts independent validation of models that are used by banks, explained that when validating a model, it is important to ascertain that the outcomes are reasonable. He concurred with our analysis that Ryan's model needed to have been tested to see if it would predict the value of homes and that the Ryan model should have been validated and audited independently. Also, David Han, explained in the meeting that in his analysis he found that the 'Ryan model is calibrated with the data from July 2014 and Sept. 2015 and the assessor claims the model has a very good goodness-of-fit, which is clearly an in-sample result but the out-of-sample tells a different story. The assessor used construction grade to manipulate the assessed value to match transaction price! The model calibration is inappropriate.'

Another resident, Kai Tang, whose background is in research and development as an engineer in semiconductor development for over a decade, explained that 'Ryan's assessment doesn't pass the sanity or the smell check.' Mr. Tang is correct. The changes were massive in Ryan's revaluation in comparison to Tyler's. 1 in 5 homes had a total assed value change of over 20%. The changes in house AVs were even more extreme; 25% of house AVs went up more than 18% and another 25% went down more than 31%, while 25% of land AVs went up more than 24%.

We cannot emphasize enough that history is littered with cases where weak model governance and invalidated models have had dire financial and economic consequences. For example, flawed and invalidated residential and commercial real estate models were one of the main causes of the 2007-2008 financial crisis, which negative effects are still being felt across many parts of the U5 and globally. More recently, a congressional inquiry determined that one of the reasons that JPMorgan lost over $7

billion dollars in 2012-2013, in what is known as the 'Whale Scandal' was improper model usage and changing from one model to another, when derivatives traders did not like the results of the first model.

The exchange between the mayor and village attorney and the citizenry on Tuesday has left us with even more questions than when we first started reverse engineering the Ryan model on June 1st.

We pose the following questions and respectfully request a public answer, since transparency is a cornerstone of democracy.

1. Who is the village official or officials who selected JF Ryan to be the monitor for the Tyler revaluation and when?

2. What metrics were used to select Ryan to be a monitor? What does a monitor do? Who in the Village ascertained that he performed well?

3. Who decided and why that a new revaluation should be conducted?

4. What village official selected Ryan to conduct the 2016 revaluation? On what basis was the decision made and where is that documented? Did anyone ask for referrals or recommendations attesting to Ryan's expertise either as an appraiser or as a modeler and was that documented?

5. Did Ryan disclose all inputs and assumption to village officials before he embarked on the revaluation process? If so, where is this documented?

6. Thus far, we have not found evidence that J.F. Ryan has modeling qualifications. Did the village verify that Ryan has modeling expertise? If so where is that documented? Did village officials ascertain where he has used models before and who validated them? Was Scarsdale the first time he used his flawed model largely based on a drive by methodology?

7. Through our research thus far, we have found, that Ryan appraised residential and commercial properties in New Canaan, Stamford, and Sherman, Connecticut. In those appraisals, he conducted on site visits. Why did Scarsdale officials not require onsite visits be part of the Ryan model?

8. What fiduciary duty do you have to the Scarsdale citizenry in respect to conducting revaluations?

9. Have you given consideration to the very important remarks that resident Robert Berg stated at the village meeting, 'The Ryan revaluation calls into serious question whether the time has come to replace our non-partisan system of uncontested elections for Village office with something else, where voters have a choice, and where candidates have to let the voters know their positions on important issues in town – like another revaluation or historic preservation?'

10. Have you taken into account that using Ryan's flawed model will hurt the Scarsdale School Administration's capital plans and budgets, which in turn will anger even more residents?

It is important for Scarsdale village officials to establish a standard of how often it will conduct revaluations and utilizing what methodology. If village officials are going to be changing models randomly, this will perpetually be another example of weak model governance. If you change models, you will need to establish and document why a model is going to be changed, what are the differences in the model, and what are the limitations of the new model. Moreover, because you will have different methodologies, any comparison that you make of how property values have changed or any predictions of how they may change in the future would be invalid. Citizens, the village, and the Scarsdale school administration will not be able to create valid forecasts of what taxes might be to different methodologies. For the sake of Scarsdalians, the Scarsdale school administration's budget, and our village's reputation, we urge the honorable mayor and trustees to invalidate Ryan's voodoo valuation.

From: Real Estate Professional <realestateprofessional99@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 10:33 AM
To: Mayor
Subject: A question please.

Dear Mayor Marks,

#18 Lack of transparency for Ryan 2016-06-22 13:59
However, the village has shown no transparency as to how this reval was done and who physically drove by to make these evaluations of the properties. For all we know, it could have been done by Mr. Ryan's two rookie sons, who he lists as his "Directors" Shane Ryan age 22 and Christopher Ryan age 25, as listed below in another posting. In that case, clearly we would not want to trust our properties worth to two young inexperienced people such as that. It's long overdue for the Mayor and Trustees need to come clean and start some kind of informative dialogue as to Mr.s Ryan's evaluation practices. If not, a New York State inquiry is needed!

Quoting Michael Levine analysis:
Encourage everyone to read his comparative analysis of the Tyler and Ryan revaluations that is posted on the village site. He's a professional statistician. Notably, it's not a damning indictment of Ryan.

It will be very hard for the Board to rescind this revaluation if the experts cannot conclusively show that it is inferior to Tyler

From: Mayor
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 12:02 PM
To: robertbergesq@aol.com; Steve Pappalardo
Cc: boardofed@scarsdaleschools.org
Subject: Re: An Invitation to Attend the Continuation of the Grievance Day Board of Assessment Review Hearings on Thursday, June 23, 2016

Dear Mr. Berg – This acknowledges receipt of your email. On June 23, 2016, I attended portions of both the morning and evening meetings of the Board of Assessment Review to observe the proceedings, as you suggested. What I saw over the course of more than four hours was an orderly process conducted in a professional and civil manner. The residents who appeared were given an opportunity to state their case, their written materials were received and Village staff made numerous trips to the copy machine to make required copies of submitted materials when residents failed to bring them. The BAR members (including you), the Village Assessor, the Deputy Village Assessor and the BAR's attorneys all treated those appearing with respect. It was a demonstration of Village volunteers and professional staff working well with our residents. It was as it should have been. You and the other resident members of the BAR are to be thanked for your service.

At the Village Board meeting on June 14, 2016, the Board listened to residents who were aggrieved by the 2016 revaluation. As a result of that meeting, emails received from residents and the number of grievances that have been filed, the Village Board is keenly aware of the sentiment of many who perceive that the revaluation produced unfair results for them.

What I perceive from my visit to the BAR are the aggrieved property owners pursuing their remedies as the applicable rules and regulations allow and as they properly should. The fact that 1,030 grievances were filed last Tuesday, while disappointing, is hardly surprising. After the 2014 revaluation, 950 grievances representing approximately 16% of the parcels in the Village were filed. That many filings were made despite the fact that in 2014 residents had had an opportunity to discuss their reassessments informally with Tyler Technologies, and resolve certain matters prior to the 2014 tentative reassessment roll being filed. This year -- when there was no informal review process – the number of grievances filed represents approximately 17% of the parcels in the Village. When measured by number of grievances filed, 2016 is not significantly dissimilar from 2014.

What troubles me is your apparent desire to inject further emotion into what is already an emotional set of circumstances for many. To call upon the Board of Education to proceed in some fashion against the Village Board -- as you did in the Board of Education meeting earlier this week -- serves no constructive purpose. You also ignore the fact that the vast majority of residents in effect accepted their 2016 revaluation results by virtue of not filing grievances. Setting neighbors against neighbors is not appropriate.

You ask why residents of Fox Meadow would vote in favor of a bond issue to fund the Greenacres School project in light of the multiplier ascribed to Fox Meadow. One would like to think that they would do so because as residents of the Village they share a fundamental common interest in the Village that all residents share. They would also do so, because someday, there may be a bond issue for a Fox Meadow school project that hopefully would get support from residents of Greenacres and the other neighborhoods. They would do so, for the same reasons that residents voted in favor of School District bond issues over the years. They would do so because we are a community and what improves the quality of life in one area of the Village, improves the quality of life in the Village as a whole. Raising speculative doomsday scenarios serves little function other than to foster a divisive environment.

The law provides a remedy to those aggrieved. Aggrieved residents are pursuing that remedy. The members of the Board of Assessment Review, including you, have generously given of their time to schedule two additional meetings so that all residents who wish to be heard as part of their grievance process can be heard. For that we thank the BAR.

My present view of what should happen going forward is what is already happening. The BAR should give due consideration to the grievances filed, make adjustments as they deem appropriate which residents can then accept or appeal further through the courts. We ask those residents to maintain their focus on that process. We also ask that residents not succumb to your inflammatory rhetoric urging the divisive tactics suggested during your recent appearance before the Board of Education and in your email. Your approach serves only to foster ill-will among community members and gives no recognition to the large silent majority of property owners who have in effect accepted the 2016 revaluation.

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: robertbergesq@aol.com <robertbergesq@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 5:22 PM
To: Mayor; Steve Pappalardo
Cc: boardofed@scarsdaleschools.org
Subject: An Invitation to Attend the Continuation of the Grievance Day Board of Assessment Review Hearings on Thursday, June 23, 2016

Dear Mayor Mark and Trustees of the Village of Scarsdale:

I speak as a private citizen, and not in my official capacity as a member of the independent Town of Scarsdale Board of Assessment Review.

As you know, from the outset, I opposed the second townwide revaluation in two years, and particularly, the awarding of a no-bid contract to JF Ryan to implement a drive-by revaluation employing a totally new and untested model. When it became crystal clear to me at the April 26, 2016 Board of Trustees meeting that the Ryan train wreck was just around the bend, I begged you to pull the plug while there was still time, and to revert to the time- and grievance-tested Tyler Technologies 2014 revaluation numbers, as adjusted after two years of grievances. My pleas went unheeded, and on June 1, 2016, the Ryan valuations became the tentative assessment roll which establishes the presumptively legal valuations of every property in Scarsdale, subject to adjustment by the BAR if a grievance has been timely filed.

Property owners in Scarsdale have responded to the new Ryan valuations en masse. Besides the public outcry in the press and during the 2 1/2 hour long public comment period at the Board of Trustee's June 14, 2016 meeting, over 1,000 Scarsdale property owners have filed property tax grievances against their new Ryan-generated valuations. This unprecedented number of grievances, representing an astonishing 17% of all Scarsdale properties, comes about because of the seismic shifts in valuations generated by Ryan's new valuation model compared to the Tyler model just two years ago.

Thus, I invite, and indeed, I implore you to come and observe tomorrow's Board of Assessment Review ("BAR") public hearing, which is the continuation of the Grievance Day hearing, beginning at 8 am in Rutherford Hall. On Grievance Day, the BAR heard as many grievants as it could -- about 70 or 80. But because of the huge number of property owners who want to speak at the BAR hearings, the BAR must hold another two days of public hearings, at least, to accommodate this demand.

You and the trustees need to understand why so many property owners are outraged and, in many cases, traumatized by the Ryan valuations. You need to hear from elderly homeowners who have lived in our Village for four or five decades or more whose property values have suddenly, and inexplicably risen by 25% or 40%, and who fear that they will be unable to live out their lives in their beloved village.

You should hear the anguish many homeowners express about having to struggle to pay for an appraisal or to hire an attorney or property tax service to fight the Ryan valuations that appear to many to be random, or biased, or simply incomprehensible.

The direct economic cost to residents of this botched revaluation is staggering. Assume that the 1,000 grievants obtain independent appraisals to support their grievances and those appraisals cost $400 each. That's $400,000 our residents must spend to challenge the flawed $250,000 Ryan revaluation. But the direct costs are actually greater. Many residents will use property tax services to handle their grievances. These services charge a fee generally of about 50% of any tax savings achieved. So if a resident faces a $20,000 increase in property taxes on account of a new Ryan assessment, and the resident's property tax service reverses the increase, the resident must pay a $10,000 fee to the service to correct the Village's mistake (and that fee is due before the tax reduction even goes into effect).

Mr. Mayor, you and the Board of Trustees have become the BFFs (best friends forever) of every property tax service and every real estate appraiser in the lower Hudson Valley. And that's no compliment!

Extraordinary direct out of pocket cost to our residents is just one disastrous outcome of the Ryan revaluation. Many properties, once again in the estate areas, have seen their valuations go down considerably following the Ryan revaluation. In large part, the Ryan revaluation reverses the results of the Tyler revaluation in the estate areas. And many of the owners of those properties grieved their Tyler valuations and had them reduced over the past two years. So, to the extent that Ryan's model now underassesses these properties, these properties will remain underasssessed until the next townwide property revaluation, shifting their tax savings onto the backs of the rest of Scarsdale's property owners.

But perhaps even more damaging is our residents' loss of confidence in the Village government. Who was minding the store? And the damage extends to the School District as well. The School District is planning on bonding $100 million or more in critical infrastructure upgrades to our 100 year old building stock over the next decade or so. Those bonds require voter support. But that support will not materialize if voters believe (rightly) that Scarsdale's property assessment roll is inequitable (which I certainly believe is the case thanks to Mr. Ryan). For example, can you imagine Fox Meadow residents clamoring to support a bond referendum to build or renovate the Greenacres school (estimated cost at $40 to $52 million) when the Fox Meadow residents are now paying a 1.3 neighborhood multiplier under the Ryan model-- the highest in Scarsdale -- for the privilege of funding a Greenacres-only project? I sure can't.

Scarsdale residents underwent a difficult revaluation in 2014. But at least that process was conducted by the nationwide leader in mass appraisals in a transparent process that allowed residents to correct their data cards and then to meet informally with Tyler personnel to address(and correct, if appropriate) their preliminary valuations several months before they became fixed as the tentative assessment roll. Although about 1300 property tax grievances were filed against the Tyler revaluation numbers over the following two years, virtually all have been resolved by this year, and our property assessment roll was in terrific shape -- and most residents accepted this roll as fundamentally fair.

But lulled by the Ryan Siren's (the mythical Greek siren, that is) song that "One good revaluation deserves another," Mayor Steves and his Boards and (you and your Boards) drove the ship right up onto the rocks. The economic damage to residents is acute; the emotional damage is palpable. Please come tomorrow to the BAR's reconvened hearing to hear from the residents to whom you owe the highest fiduciary duties. The next move is up to you. Thank you.

Robert J. Berg, Esq.
Law Office of Robert J. Berg
Robert J. Berg PLLC
32 Tisdale Road
Scarsdale, New York 10583
(914) 722-0579
(914) 522-9455 (cell)

From: Mayor
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:10 PM
To: rocco170@verizon.net
Subject: Re: Comments to the 2016 Scarsdale Property Revaluation

Dear Mr. and Mrs Alfano-- Correction: the filing deadline is Tuesday, June 21, 2016. Not Thursday. Apologies for the confusion.

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: Mayor
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 8:11 PM
To: rocco170@verizon.net
Subject: Re: Comments to the 2016 Scarsdale Property Revaluation

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Alfano -- This will acknowledge receipt of your email. It is noted it is not the role of the Village Board to "approve" or "disapprove" the results of the revaluation. The Village assessment roll is a matter under the authority of the Village Assessor. While I sympathize with residents such as you and your wife who have experienced an increase in the assessed value of their properties, the recourse for residents who wish to contest their valuation is to file a grievance.

Below are links to the Complaint Form and the instructions for filing a grievance which you can use for accessing those documents. For your reference, they can be found by clicking on the "Village Assessor" heading on the left hand column of the Village web site and then on the headings for each document.

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524_fill_in.pdf

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524ins.pdf?

This year the filing deadline is Thursday, June 21, 2016.

Note that so long as the grievance form is filed timely (by the deadline date), it need not be (but certainly can be) accompanied by such supporting materials as you wish to submit. Such materials, an appraisal for example, may be filed later, but the grievance form itself must be filed by June 21st.

If you have questions about the grievance process or if you wish to talk to the Village Assessor about your assessment you may call the Assessor's office at: 914.722.1133.

If you wish to read more about the 2016 assessment process a report on the 2016 prepared by J.F. Ryan is posted on the Village web site. The link to the report is below.

http://www.scarsdale.com/Portals/0/Assessor/Scarsdale%20Revaluation%20Report%202016%20Assessment%20Roll.pdf

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: rocco170@verizon.net <rocco170@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 7:34 PM
To: Mayor
Subject: Comments to the 2016 Scarsdale Property Revaluation

Dear Mayor Mark and the Scarsdale Village Board of Trustees,

My wife and I live at 170 Clarence Road. We purchased our home in 1970 and have enjoyed living in the community for almost 47 years. Our house is a two floor colonial, built in 1938 and measures approximately 1600 square feet in living space.

The municipal services in Scarsdale are excellent, the school system is outstanding and generally the atmosphere in the Village at large is very welcoming. Our two adult children were educated in Scarsdale from Kindergarten through the 12th grade and they both have very positive reflections on their time as students in Scarsdale.

Because we enjoy Scarsdale to such a great extent, following our children's graduation in 1987 and 1989 respectively, my wife and I decided to remain here. We are both retired New York City public school teachers who taught high school students at various New York City public schools in the Bronx. We retired in 1996 and 2001 .

Following the 2013 revaluation administered by Tyler, we received a significant increase to the assessed value of our home and property. Because we were so disappointed to be assigned such an (in our opinion, unreasonable and substantial) increase, we filed a formal grievance. Ultimately our assessed value was reduced by $100,000. Following the conclusion of this unpleasant episode, we assumed that the matter had been resolved at least for the foreseeable future.

However, we were again extremely upset to receive the recent 2016 assessment from the Village Assessor's Office which we understand was prepared by an outside company, J.F. Ryan Associates.

We understand that you and trustees serve the Village as volunteers and my wife and I both sincerely appreciate all of your collective time and efforts on behalf of all Scarsdale residents to make Scarsdale such a special and unique place to live. As noted above, we are retired public school teachers and we both receive a fixed income on an annual basis which makes the recent reassessment particularly upsetting – especially in light of the dramatic increase in our assessment following the Tyler revaluation. In the 2016 assessment, our property value was increased by $200,000.

We recognize that there had not been an all-inclusive, Village wide appraisal of properties in Scarsdale for at least a thirty or more year period and that one of the reasons for the 2013-2014 revaluation was to correct the inequities in the relatively low assessments many large property owners in Scarsdale enjoyed for many years - all at the expense and subsidization of the more numerous and smaller sized homes and properties throughout the Village of Scarsdale.

The 2016 assessment was, to my knowledge, not publicized to the extent of the Tyler revaluation. In fact, I recently received a press release concerning some minor changes in the types of recycling accepted by the Sanitation Department, while I did not receive any press releases concerning the 2016 reassessment. In addition, there was to my knowledge no in-person site visit to my house and property by any employee of J.F. Ryan Associates.

Although not a property tax specialist or a statistician, I am nevertheless left perplexed as to results of the 2016 reassessment. I have made on-line inquires of several other properties not only in my own neighborhood but throughout Scarsdale. The significance of the assignment of values to the land at many addresses appears to diminish or overshadow the values assigned to the residences or "structures." For example, my house has one and a half bathrooms while other, significantly larger and newer homes on smaller sized lots with a greater number of bathrooms and bedrooms, does not appear to not factor into the overall assessment to the extent of the land value. Moreover, one very confusing aspect also concerns the presumptive use of the home's proportionate and corresponding infrastructure services (*e.g.,* greater water and sewer usage for larger homes). It appears logical to assign a larger value to a larger home that uses more municipal services than a smaller home. However, to a layman such as myself, this fact does not really appear to be factored into the new assessment.

Without asking for a reason for the general lack of publicity in connection with the second revaluation, please let me respectfully suggest that before the new assessment is approved by the Board, you and the other Board members fully analyze the obvious disparate results of this second revaluation on <u>all</u> property owners in the Village. Moreover, my wife and I merely ask that all of the Board members dispassionately review the overall findings of the 2016 revaluation, and in the event that evidence is provided that establishes a bias in favor of the larger homes by comparison to the smaller sized homes, that you and the other Board members have the courage to admit the 2016 revaluation should either be substantially corrected or voided entirely.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rocco and Sheila Alfano

170 Clarence Road

Donna Conkling

From: Bal1998 <bal1998@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 2:21 PM
To: Clerk's Department
Subject: To The Mayor and the Board of Trustees

Dear Mayor Mark and Trustees:

This note is to express my Agreement with the Proposal to Invalidate the recent Ryan Village-Wide Assessment in Scarsdale..
and to Revert to the 2014 Tyler Reval and its numbers.. for our Taxes..going forward.

As was mentioned at the June 14 Meeting..grievances over the 2014 Reval have already been dealt with.. which would be a positive factor in considering this action.

Thanks very much for listening.

Susan Levine
Ardmore Road

From: Mayor
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 1:58 PM
To: Wuhong Zhang; Nanette Albanese
Cc: Assessor's Department; Robert Cole
Subject: Re: Please correct land value/traffic(parkway) multiplier (0.7)

Dear Wuhong Zhang -- This acknowledges receipt of your email. As it appears you believe the assessed value of your property is too high, you should follow the grievance process. Below are links to the Complaint Form and the instructions for filing a grievance which you can use for accessing those documents. For your reference, they can be found by clicking on the "Village Assessor" heading on the left hand column of the Village web site and then on the headings for each document

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524_fill_in.pdf

https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/current_forms/orpts/rp524ins.pdf

This year the filing deadline is Tuesday, June 21, 2016.

Note that so long as the grievance form is filed timely (by the deadline date), it need not be (but certainly can be) accompanied by such supporting materials as you wish to submit. Such materials, an appraisal for example, may be filed later, but the grievance form itself must be filed by June 21st.

Very truly yours, Jon Mark

From: Wuhong Zhang <wzhang11365@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 11:12 PM
To: Nanette Albanese
Cc: Mayor; Assessor's Department; Robert Cole
Subject: Please correct land value/traffic(parkway) multiplier (0.7)

Dear assessors,

I am Wuhong Zhang, home owner of 19 Kent road. I moved into the neighborhood in August, 2011. For the past four years I am living here, the assessed value of my house has increased by $500,000.00, or 56% of the initial purchase price. Why?? I am shocked by the way the home property is being assessed. Why the land value of the property is assessed at $1.1 million? Especially since the house's back yard is next to noisy Bronx River Parkway!!

When deciding a house property value, the most important factor is the LOCATION, LOCATION, LOCATION! My house's backyard is next to Bronx River Parkway(please see the map I attached below). It's very very noisy, I have to close all windows all year long to fall to sleep. How could the land value of my house is same as the house across the street which has much less noise impact of the Bronx River Parkway?

More importantly both Kent Road and Parkfield Road in fox meadow are in the same geographic location which is backed up with Bronx River Parkway, why are the similar houses on the Parkfield road used multiplier 0.7 (for Traffic parkway) to calculate property land value, but our house in Kent road is using multiplier 0.9(for Traffic medium/heavy)? This is a very clear flawed calculation!! and it is NOT fair! We are requesting to correct this faulty calculation so that our house value is based on 0.7 multiplier to match the similar houses value on Parkfield road.

The Village of Scarsdale Assessor's Office released a public notice which indicated it would correct any errors on the 2016 Residential Valuation Detail Sheet.
I also went and spoke to Mr. Robert Cole(cc'ed on this email) who suggested me to talk to assessor in regarding to this matter.

I went to the assessor's office three times, but the assessors refused to see me. I left all of the evidences to the clerk to get an answer about the traffic multiplier. On Monday I went to the assessor's office again and was told by the clerk, according to the assessor, in order to change to Traffic Multiplier to 0.7, my driveway have to open up to Parkway? really?? If this is the case, why houses on the Parkfield using 0.7 multiplier and none of them have driveway open up to the Bronx River Parkway! If this is the fact, then I want a public statement from J.F. Ryan to clearly define their standard of Traffic Parkway.

I look forward to hear from you soon ! Please see attached maps and Ryan model multiplier.

Regards,
Wuhong Zhang

Petition to Void 2016 Scarsdale Tentative AV

About this petition

If you believe the Scarsdale Village should void the 2016 Revaluation, because it is based on a flawed model and opaque process, please sign this petition. Please leave your name and address in the comment section and share with your neighbors.

Thank you!

Signatures

1. Name: Brice Kirkendall-Rodriguez on 2016-06-05 01:22:52
Comments: 19 Fox Meadow Road. We wish our home had appreciated 36% in value in the last five years but neighboring homes almost twice our size aren't even selling for our new evaluation amount. Clearly the new model did not test assumptions using outlier results. FAIL!

---

2. Name: Nickolay Baturin on 2016-06-05 02:12:57
Comments:

---

3. Name: Judy and Michael Kerr on 2016-06-05 15:02:37
Comments: 15 Fox Meadow Rd

---

4. Name: Ellen Eikamp on 2016-06-05 17:12:50
Comments:

---

5. Name: Karl on 2016-06-05 17:58:30
Comments:

---

6. Name: Jian Wang on 2016-06-05 18:32:50
Comments:

---

7. Name: Jun Xie on 2016-06-05 18:33:39
Comments: Completely ignoring the purchase price (mkt price), and giving big house owner too much benefit.

---

8. Name: ashley tang on 2016-06-05 19:10:45
Comments:

---

9. Name: Angela varlotta on 2016-06-05 19:36:12
Comments:

---

10. Name: Nancy Fann-Im on 2016-06-05 20:22:02
Comments:

---

11. Name: Xin liu on 2016-06-05 20:52:26
Comments:

---

12. Name: David Benderson on 2016-06-05 21:13:34
Comments:

---

13. Name: Linda Lagana on 2016-06-05 21:19:11

Comments:

---

14. Name: Sherry Zhao on 2016-06-05 21:39:27
Comments:

---

15. Name: Chaohong Gu on 2016-06-05 21:41:37
Comments: Most basic information of my property is incorrect.

---

16. Name: Lauren Yang-guo on 2016-06-05 21:54:52
Comments: My house has been unfairly assessed.

---

17. Name: Xiaoqing zhang on 2016-06-05 22:26:25
Comments:

---

18. Name: Jingmiao Gao on 2016-06-05 22:53:48
Comments:

---

19. Name: Christina deCastro on 2016-06-05 23:23:30
Comments:

---

20. Name: Susan Douglass on 2016-06-06 00:00:48
Comments: Our assessment went up by more than $500,000 -- and the only change was a repair in the driveway from damage caused by a car explosion/fire there. The process was completely unfair and arbitrary.

---

21. Name: Mel Cates on 2016-06-06 01:52:17
Comments:

---

22. Name: Kai Tang on 2016-06-06 02:41:53
Comments:

---

23. Name: Beth klein on 2016-06-06 03:26:33
Comments:

---

24. Name: Lucyna Shefter on 2016-06-06 04:23:39
Comments:

---

25. Name: Daniel Shefter on 2016-06-06 05:00:30
Comments: 21 Fox Meadow Rd

---

26. Name: Michael Iver on 2016-06-06 10:47:14
Comments: How could my assessment increase 26% for a single-car garage 1900 sq-ft

split built in 1959 with everything original; kitchen and bathrooms?

---

27. Name: Carol Silverman on 2016-06-06 12:11:40
Comments:

---

28. Name: Fang Lu on 2016-06-06 12:17:07
Comments: 143 White Rd, Scarsdale.
My house has been assessed unfairly.

---

29. Name: Debbie Donahoe on 2016-06-06 14:19:17
Comments:

---

30. Name: Anna Scappaticci on 2016-06-06 15:24:34
Comments:

---

31. Name: Arezo Hariri on 2016-06-06 15:50:01
Comments: Homes around me with more bedrooms, larger lot size and SF are assessed at a lower price. How is this possible?

---

32. Name: Joshua Fisher on 2016-06-06 15:56:48
Comments: 10 Fox Meadow.
W/ recent sales below my PPSQFT, its hard to understand how the valuation was realized. Additionally, its hard to understand how the town was able to update information on my home w/o actually visiting (e.g. sqft, bathroom conditions, etc.)

---

33. Name: Michael Wolloch on 2016-06-06 16:59:33
Comments:

---

34. Name: Robyn Adams on 2016-06-06 17:25:41
Comments: 1 Mayflower Road
My taxes are nearly doubled from last year when Tyler Technologies made their assessment. Tyler Technologies actually visited my home. The new assessor did not. Something is obviously wrong with their methodology.

---

35. Name: Minnan Zhao on 2016-06-06 17:32:08
Comments:

---

36. Name: Debbie Singer on 2016-06-06 17:40:19
Comments:

---

37. Name: Brett Jordan on 2016-06-06 17:45:40
Comments:

---

38. Name: Michael Lang on 2016-06-06 17:57:49
Comments:

---

39. Name: James Allocco on 2016-06-06 18:25:42
Comments: In a town with low housing turnover and large differences in fair market value even between houses on the same/adjacent streets, a reval that relies too heavily on sales data will lead to many inaccuracies. At minimum, large swings up or down in valuations from 2014 could have triggered an in-home visit for a real appraisal to verify results.

---

40. Name: Rose Marinaccio on 2016-06-06 19:50:56
Comments: 110 Fox Meadow Road

---

41. Name: Randy Scheiner on 2016-06-06 19:54:50
Comments:

---

42. Name: Julie Tang on 2016-06-06 22:18:43
Comments: 2016 Reval is supposed to correct the mistakes from 2014 reassessment. But it caused more mistakes on many houses, especially the smaller houses.

---

43. Name: Alok and Amita Ajmera on 2016-06-06 23:59:07
Comments:

---

44. Name: HOWARD GOODMAN on 2016-06-07 01:02:07
Comments: colonial acres

my assessed value went up over 45% from when Tyler Technologies performed their assessment. which is extraordinary....how can anyone in scarsdale accept that level of increase without considering moving out of scarsdale

---

45. Name: Matthew Yazdi on 2016-06-07 01:21:48
Comments: 1 Olmsted Road

---

46. Name: Ran Liu on 2016-06-07 01:53:16
Comments: We are on 4 Kathy lane.
the model used for assessment of 2015 is completely flawed. We can't tolerate anymore wasting our tax money on something completely nonsense.

---

47. Name: Yanjun Li on 2016-06-07 01:55:44
Comments:

---

48. Name: Jinwei Wu on 2016-06-07 01:58:44
Comments:

---

49. Name: Xiaoxia Zhang on 2016-06-07 02:19:04
Comments: 168 Johnson Rd. Between two assessments,the building information for my home changed: Grade went up from C 100% to C+ 110%; Overall condition went up from 4 to 6. No body did any improvement since 2010. How come the grade of the home getting better by itself? By the completed flawed magic model used in this assessment?!

---

50. Name: Landa LaMotta on 2016-06-07 03:22:26
Comments: Revaluations and revaluations... the processes are opaque and duplicitous...

---

51. Name: Ann Bohjalian on 2016-06-07 03:42:48
Comments:

---

52. Name: zhaohui Han on 2016-06-07 03:46:12
Comments:

---

53. Name: Zhen Zuo on 2016-06-07 09:57:11
Comments:

---

54. Name: Nathalie Daniel on 2016-06-07 10:12:54
Comments: Thanks Mayra for starting this!

---

55. Name: Zhaohui Han on 2016-06-07 11:45:59
Comments:

---

56. Name: Steve Capellini on 2016-06-07 13:33:14
Comments: 27 Ross Road
Scarsdale, NY 10583

---

57. Name: Jan Flanzer on 2016-06-07 13:51:59
Comments:

---

58. Name: Gabriel Streche on 2016-06-07 14:25:44
Comments: The model error on this new reval is so large! Trying to match any of the assessments to sale prices is just pure fiction. A 'simpler' Ryan model that was sold by the Village is so off from reality!

---

59. Name: Kelly Shang on 2016-06-07 15:20:30
Comments:

---

60. Name: Michael Wolloch on 2016-06-07 19:40:02
Comments:

---

61. Name: Melissa Sepe Chepuru on 2016-06-07 21:38:28

Comments: The lack of transparency is as disturbing as is the apparent randomness of the calculations. Glad to hear people are gathering around this issue together.

---

62. Name: Elizabeth Detmer on 2016-06-08 00:58:03
Comments:

---

63. Name: Katharine Miao on 2016-06-08 01:38:55
Comments:

---

64. Name: Mike Kunkin on 2016-06-08 01:54:09
Comments: Something is very wrong with this Revaluation
Why should my taxes go up 50% since last revaluation and my property go up $350K in one year

---

65. Name: Candace Capellini on 2016-06-08 11:41:38
Comments:

---

66. Name: Susan Levine on 2016-06-08 13:04:22
Comments: This new Reval raised my Assessment 15% to a Level at which my house would never sell. A huge tax increase for us..as Seniors. The "Model" used by Ryan was a mistake.

---

67. Name: Laura Kunkin on 2016-06-08 13:15:35
Comments:

---

68. Name: Hiromi Kawabata on 2016-06-08 17:18:03
Comments: Our assessment went up almost 40% from the first one done by Tyler

---

69. Name: Sam Dunn on 2016-06-08 18:26:12
Comments:

---

70. Name: Anthony Amoriello on 2016-06-08 20:09:16
Comments:

---

71. Name: Chris Amoriello on 2016-06-08 20:15:18
Comments:

---

72. Name: Zhuojuan Zhang on 2016-06-08 22:45:05
Comments:

---

73. Name: Lew Leone on 2016-06-09 00:02:45
Comments: 8 South Woods Lane Home built in 1927. Nothing changed since the last reval. Increased $129k over 10%. Defies logic.

74. Name: Dino Venuto on 2016-06-09 04:49:02
Comments: Reval is flawed
Vacant lot over 2x the size of lot on same block valued $25,000 more. Many,many inequities.

75. Name: sherry Berkowitz on 2016-06-09 13:36:00
Comments:

76. Name: Wuhong Zhang on 2016-06-09 14:43:00
Comments:

77. Name: Stuart Silver on 2016-06-09 14:56:54
Comments: The 2016 Reval was unecessary
and needs to be rescinded!

78. Name: Ray Dotoratos on 2016-06-10 05:20:17
Comments:

79. Name: Jean Dotoratos on 2016-06-10 05:33:48
Comments: The FMV of my house increased $50,000 as a result of the previous reassessment and now due to the 2016 reassessment increased $275,000 on top of the $50,000 one just recently done. I have not made any improvements to my property since the previous reassessment. I'm a senior resident of Scarsdale for 50 years living on a small fixed income. I'm signing this petition to void the 2016 Scarsdale Tentative AV. This grossly overly inflated absurd increase to me and my neighbors with comparable increases while other properties similar to mine decreased by excess $150,000 and more for no logical reason is not fair nor just to me or other residents in our community.

80. Name: Hiromi Dotoratos on 2016-06-10 05:39:07
Comments:

81. Name: Robert Berg on 2016-06-10 14:23:49
Comments: This debacle was entirely predictable and avoidable. The Village Board and Mayor wouldn't listen to me, Bob Harrison, and others who begged them not to go forward with this unnecessary and messed up reval. Look at the angst created and the money wasted.

82. Name: Jill Krutick on 2016-06-10 15:58:25
Comments: Time for a do over.

83. Name: Kelly Karapetyan on 2016-06-10 17:14:54
Comments:

84. Name: Michael J Raposa on 2016-06-11 11:02:31
Comments:

---

85. Name: Robert Kobayashi on 2016-06-11 15:50:32
Comments:

---

86. Name: Sheila Stempler on 2016-06-11 20:23:01
Comments: This new assessment is an outrageous increase and you are forcing seniors and long time residents out of their homes.
Shame on you!

---

87. Name: Tama Seife on 2016-06-11 21:25:53
Comments: The reval seems to concentrate the assessment increase on lot size. The unintended (or intended) consequence is to promote mcmansions using every inch of empty space.

---

88. Name: Irene Weitzenberg on 2016-06-11 22:05:11
Comments: If you are on a fixed income you are being taxed out of your home.

---

89. Name: Mahesh Vennam on 2016-06-11 23:23:02
Comments: Review unfair home values

---

90. Name: Bob Harrison on 2016-06-11 23:32:25
Comments: Scarsdale residents need to show up at the Village Board meeting on Tuesday, June 14 at 8 PM , Get your friends to come. Sign the petition to void the Reval, send a protest email to the mayor@scarsdale.com, and to the entire Board at clerk@scarsdale.com , file your grievance with the assessor by
Tuesday, June 21.

---

91. Name: Terri Harrison on 2016-06-11 23:36:17
Comments: Void the 2016 Reval !!!

---

92. Name: Julie Zhu on 2016-06-12 02:53:08
Comments:

---

93. Name: LI Liu on 2016-06-12 03:00:34
Comments: 73 Hampton rd I

---

94. Name: Laurie Disick on 2016-06-12 13:20:52
Comments:

---

95. Name: Josh Frankel on 2016-06-12 13:28:56
Comments: This reval was presented as a way to correct "outliers," to "refine and correct" (Mayor Mark's words) residual issues from the Tyler reval. Instead, it used a wholly

different model and, not surprisingly, produced a totally different outcome. This is totally unacceptable, and the "tentative" roll should not become permanent.

---

96. Name: Aparna Vennam on 2016-06-12 21:07:19
Comments:

---

97. Name: Cristina Marinaccio on 2016-06-12 21:45:24
Comments: Recal the reval!

---

98. Name: Xiaofang Wei on 2016-06-12 23:01:46
Comments:

---

99. Name: Hui liu on 2016-06-13 00:29:10
Comments:

---

100. Name: zhengyu huang on 2016-06-13 00:29:36
Comments: We bought our house last year and got assessed way above the sale price. I don't even see our house on the list of the sale comp list. Not sure what kind of model they are using

---

101. Name: wentian fu on 2016-06-13 00:37:44
Comments:

---

102. Name: Lori Fedio on 2016-06-13 01:42:11
Comments:

---

103. Name: CheongSack Hoong on 2016-06-13 01:58:59
Comments:

---

104. Name: Ping Wei on 2016-06-13 02:05:51
Comments:

---

105. Name: Jing Li on 2016-06-13 02:40:57
Comments:

---

106. Name: Min Luo on 2016-06-13 03:22:14
Comments:

---

107. Name: Bernice Galef on 2016-06-13 12:34:02
Comments:

---

108. Name: Eitan Kashanian on 2016-06-13 14:06:08

Comments:

---

109. Name: Tony Luo on 2016-06-13 16:16:11
Comments:

---

110. Name: Gary Levy on 2016-06-14 00:44:46
Comments:

---

111. Name: Stephen Marchiony on 2016-06-14 02:10:08
Comments: In 2014, our house was finally valued properly.....less than two years later it was assessed over 22% higher--based on a completely different model.

---

112. Name: Anna Demina on 2016-06-14 02:18:51
Comments: I believe the new Scarsdale valuation is unfair

---

113. Name: Michele Braun on 2016-06-14 13:40:58
Comments: 14 Wakefield Road
Scarsdale, NY 10583

---

114. Name: Teresa Blume on 2016-06-14 13:57:54
Comments: Teresa Blume 135 Saxon Woods Road

---

115. Name: Michael Seymour on 2016-06-14 15:13:09
Comments:

---

116. Name: neil doppelt on 2016-06-14 15:14:29
Comments:

---

117. Name: Felix DiMartino on 2016-06-14 21:28:23
Comments: The town board should take notice of the unusually high number of homes for sale, with many not selling unless the homeowner is willing to accept a low offer from a potential buyer. This at a time when homes in neighboring towns, like Larchmont, are selling quickly, often at asking price. The growing frustration of watching the unreasonable rise of Scarsdale taxes ,the wasting of countless hours and money to fund inaccurate revals, plans to stop leaf collection, and grass clipping pickup has created the perception that the Scarsdale we once new is rapidly disappearing. Seems the governing body is on a mission to do "less with more". I wonder, if instead of raising taxes while eliminating services, we had an independent auditor-review to determine if the town is most effectively utilizing our tax dollars.

---

118. Name: Jen Premisler on 2016-06-15 00:12:58
Comments: The assessments are in appropriate and transfer the tax burden from the most expensive homes with the most land to the least expensive homes with the least land. A $5 mil house on an acre should be assessed proportionately to a $750k house

on .2 acres, not disproportionately.

---

119. Name: Robert Neidig on 2016-06-15 15:06:31
Comments:

---

120. Name: Sharon Stern on 2016-06-15 17:10:09
Comments:

---

121. Name: Ron Tesoro on 2016-06-15 17:59:02
Comments: Don't let high taxes destroy our village. Void the reval and demand a review of the Ryan model.

---

122. Name: Victor Ghiozzi on 2016-06-16 00:50:35
Comments:

---

123. Name: Greg Kourakos on 2016-06-16 18:52:41
Comments:

If you believe the Scarsdale Village should void the 2016 Revaluation, because it is based on a flawed model and opaque process, please sign this petition. Please leave your name and address in the comment section and share with your neighbors.

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
117	Scott Caplan	1 Black Birch Lane	Scott@Caplan.net
118	Nicholas Nesi	19 Colvin Road	NICKNESI12@GMAIL.COM
119	Noreen Lynn	19 Colvin Rd	Noreen955@gmail.com
120	Norman Bernstein	14 Nakeer Rd	nwbernstein@nwbllc.com
121	Alan Frommer	150 Nelson Rd	FromCo1@aol.com
122	Sandy Greene	150 Nelson Rd.	sygf@aol.com
123	Peter Gordon	30 Penn Blvd.	pgordon@stblaw.com
124	Matt Martin	171 Clarence Road	matthew.martin@pattonvaldes.com
125	Rocco Alfano	170 Clarence Rd.	roco170@verizon.net
126	Sheila Alfano	170 Clarence Rd.	roco170@verizon.net
127	Lynda Malentra	173 Clarence	Lyndawissing@gmail
128	Robert Malentra	173 Clarence	MALENTTB@VERIZON.NET
129	Tama Seife	21 Circle Rd	tkseife@aol.com
130	Jonathan Last	116 Spier Rd	JSLsailing@verizon.net
	Barbara Underhill	40 Brookby Rd	bunderhill@optonline.net

2016 Void Revaluation

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
330			
331			

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
131	Dorothy Levin	11 Overhill Rd	levin.dottie@yahoo.com
132	Duncan Wilson	21 Ridgecrest West	dwilson@scarsdaleschools.org
133	DENNIS MEEHAN	5 BARRY ROAD	DJMREF 43@YAHOO.COM
134	Lee Handler	14 Lebanon RD	leehandler@optonline.net
135	Bernice Gold	15 Roosevelt Pl.	15BGmartin@earthlink.net
136	Ruth Garrity	85 Brambach Rd	patruth@optonline.net
137	Pat Doughty	85 Brambach Rd	patruth@optonline.net
138	Dylan Doughty	85 Brambach Rd	patruth@optonline.net
139	Peter Rubinstein	15 OVERHILL	peter.rubinstein@verizon.net
140	James Tsiropinas	259 Madison Rd	jtsiropinas@gmail.com
141	Douglas Leone	137 Johnson Rd	Douglas@clairedleone.com
142	Marcia Banner	1 Reynal Crossing	mbanner@optonline.net
143	Irena Rubinstein	15 OVERHILL RD	Peter.Rubinstein@verizon.net
144	MATT YAZDI	1 OLMSTED RD	matt@yaztek.com
145	Arezo Hariri	1 olmsted Rd	arezo@Yaztek.com
146	David Han	137 Madison Rd	zhaohui.han@gmail.com
147	Florence Longo	178 Webster	Royallight@aol.com

17

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
148	HARRY MILLER	20 GORHAM ROAD	hmmiller22222@yahoo.com
149	Irene Weitzenberg	236 Rock Creek Lane	IPann@aol.com
150	Sheila Stempler	236 Rock Creek Lane	sir14@aol.com
151	Robert Hecht	328 Heathcote Rd	twostarbob@aol.com
152	JOSEPH KEHOE	12 EDGEWOOD RD	JVKEHOE1@OPTONLINE.NET
153	En Xiang Jiang	19 Kent Road	jiangnyc@gmail.com
154	Grace Shedlin	11 overlook	99liedman@gmail.com
155	Terri Harrison	65 Fox Meadow	
156	BARRY KULA	300 BOULEVARD	KULAM@OPTIMUM.NET
157	MELANEY LAM	7 SYCAMORE ROAD	MELANEYCHAN@GMAIL.COM
158	Barbara Sulcov	27 Lawrence Rd.	SBSULCOV@aol.com
159	Darryl Smith	4 Fox Meadow Rd	darryl.Smith14@verizon.net
160			
161			
162			
163			
164			

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
165	C. DIAS	102 Greenacres Ave	christopherdias@gmail.com
166	Dan Volpi	74 Huntington	DANIEL_VOLPI@YAHOO.COM
167	Elizabeth Stephens	11 Barry Rd	rwb53@optonline.net
168	Dwight Stephens	11 Barry Rd	sds@melitoadolfsen.com
169	E Bernstein	11 Larch Lane	eberns426@yahoo.com
170	Chaohong Gu	14 Jefferson Road	guchaohong@yahoo.com
171	Allen Scholmann	84 Penn Rd.	alschul@gmail.com
172	SUNIL SUBBAKRISHNA	22 LOCKWOOD RD	sunil.subbakrishna@gmail.com
173	GEETHA SUBBAKRISHNA	22 LOCKWOOD RD	geetha.subbakrishna@gmail.com
174			
175	Janna Volpi	74 Huntington	JCVOLPI@GMAIL.COM
176	Bay Dover		
177			
178			
179			
180			
181			

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
182	Ken Cohen	16 Windmill Lane	KCLC16@yahoo.com
183	JAMES LABICK	17 Brookline Rd	James Labick@yahoo.com
184	Lew Leone	2 Eastwood Ln	LewLeone2@Aol.com
185	H. GREEN	172 BREWSTER ROAD	HARRY1GREEN@YAHOO.COM
186	Kathryn Duncan	15 Overlook Rd	Kadduncan@aol.com
187	Toscala Boy	15 Overlook Rd	toscalaboy@yahoo.com
188	Lois Cohen	16 Windmill Lane	KCLC16@yahoo.com
189	Julia Tsuyuki	259 Madison Ave	Julia8259@gmail
190	Rose Flanagan	38 Jefferson RD	flanagan38@msn.com
191	John Flanagan	38 Jefferson Rd	Flanagan38@msn.com
192	Jocelyne Forde	37 JEFFERSON RD	josieforde@hotmail.com
193	GARY MATZKIN	10 GRIFFIN AVE	GARY.MATZKIN@GMAIL
194	RICHARD REUTER	27 DRAKE RD	ORIENTAC@LEYSCHRISTIE.COM
195	NEELSON DANIEL	1109 POST RD. SCARSDALE, NY	Neelson.Daniel@ey.com
196	Steven Sulcov	27 LAWRENCE RD SCARSDALE, NY 10583	SBSulcov@aol.com
197			
198			

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
300			

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
216	Iolo Stern	6 Crosby ct.	idosterni23@gmail.com
217	Jeff Godwin	10 Secor Rd.	jlgwin65@gmail.com
218	Shaun Schuerlein	175 Clarence	shaun.schuerlein@gmail.com
219	[illegible]	29 Lawrence Rd	FRIEDAGW@VERIZON.NET
220	[illegible]	29 Lawrence Rd	HFWEITZ@VERIZON.NET
221	Ellen Neidig	21 Black Birch Ln.	ELPRUN@aol.com
222	[illegible]	182 Johnson Rd	FARLEYSB@gmail.com
223	Ken Forde	37 Jefferson Rd	KFORDE@MSN.COM
224	K Friedman	9 Dickel Rd	friedman914@optonline.net
225	Emma Kulig	300 Boulevard	kulaidoscope@gmail.com
226	DAVID HEIMANN	4 CORALYN RD	DMHEIMANN@AOL.COM
227	JULIE THYSEN	4 CORALYN RD	JTHYSEN@GMAIL.COM
228	JUSTIN KATTAN	176 Webster Rd	justinkatt@yahoo.com
229	RAUL CHAVEZ	63 Church Ln	RAULCHAVEZ@yahoo.com
230	BARRY SILKOWITZ	72 DRAKE RD	BASILKOWITZ@YAHOO.COM
231			
232			

41 Additional Signatures

Share 18

Petition to Void 2016 Scarsdale Tentative AV

67 Signatures Goal: 1,000

0 Shares

67 Signatures

Goal: 1,000

If you believe the Scarsdale Village should void the 2016 Revaluation, because it is based on a flawed model and opaque process, please sign this petition. Please leave your name and address in the comment section and share with your neighbors. We will deliver the petition at the June 14th Village Trustees meeting at the Village Hall at 8:00pm. More information is here, The Scarsdale Revaluation Train Wreck Has Arrived. Thank you!

2 HIGHLIGHTS

June 6

More Actions you can take: 1. Go to June 14th trustee meeting at 8:00pm. it will be at 1001 Post Road, Village Hall, 2nd Floor. 2. Someone is contemplating a Public Integrity... show more

June 4

We are now live!

Is there a cause you really care about? Start a free petition like this one and make a real difference.

START A PETITION

30 COMMENTS

Filter

Susan Levine United States, Hartsdale
Jun 08, 2016

SIGN PETITION

upvote reply show

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
199	[illegible]	[illegible]	Lew Leone [illegible] AOL
200	HENRY	18 WALWORTH	louhenry@optonline.net
201	DAVID HING	28 RIVEN ROAD	djh92@gmail.com
202	[illegible]	114 [illegible]	N/A
203	LINDA MARTOCCI	44 Fayette	lsmartocci@verizon.net
204	Evelyn Boxer	59 Franklin Rd	rex06@aol.com
205	Bonnie Rudin	15 Bradford Rd	bonnierudin15@gmail.com
206	PATRICK Mary FORDE	54 SPRAGUE Rd + 89 Lee Rd	
207	Mary Forde Patrick	89 Lee Rd. Scarsdale	
208	Carole Zeller	74 Carthage Rd. Scarsdale	CZROCK827@aol.com
209	Greg Schwend	49 Barry	kimagreg@gmail.com
210	Paul Diamond	5 Cardet Ct	PAULDIAMOND10@gmail.com
211	[illegible]	10 Carthage Lane	
212	Veronika Thirad	8 WHITE BIRCH LN	VWJHIRAD@YAHOO.COM
213	Dorian Glickenhaus	11 Walworth Ave Scarsdale	Dorion.Glick@gmail.com
214	DR + MRS. P. Moskowitz	30 Herkimer Rd	cardmoskowitz2@yahoo.com
215	Laurence [illegible]	24 Olmsted	

16 signatures

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
~~[illegible]~~	~~[illegible]~~	~~[illegible]~~	~~[illegible]~~
200	Elliot L [illegible]	19 Stratton Rd Scarsdale NY	ELCMD67@[illegible].com
201	Haoyu Tsai	125 Sawyer Wood Rd White Plains, NY	aukler@gmail.com
202	Jean Onofrio	107 Lee Rd Scarsdale NY	
203	ED Rooney	31 JEFFERSON RD SCARSDALE, NY	
204	Jingqing Chen	14 Rochambeau Rd, Scarsdale NY	
205	Jon Melil	[illegible]	
206	Andrew Aulisi	7 Jefferson	andrew.aulisi@gmail.com
207	Karen Smith	2 Windmill Circle Scarsdale NY	KarenRSmith1@gmail
208	HSTAD	8 Fenimore Rd	
209	Brian Stern	5 Gorham Ct	brianstern@gmail.com
210	Gary Naughton	244 MAMARONECK RD	GNAUGHTON@LOEBREALTY.COM
211	Kathleen Naughton	244 Mamaroneck Rd	Kknaughton1002@GMAIL.COM
212	Xuanmin Chen	11 School Ln	xyatny@yahoo.com
213			
214			
215			

13 Signatures

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
~~191~~	~~[illegible]~~	~~[illegible]~~	~~[illegible]~~
200	Julie Duignan	20 Ferncliff Rd.	jl-duignan@yahoo.com
201			
202			
203			
204			
205			
206			
207			
208			
209			
210			
211			
212			
213			
214			
215			

Signature

Number	Name	Address	Email Address
199	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
200	MShenberg	6 Dickel	MShenberg@whitecase.com
201	Alison Shenberg	6 Dickel	hartelegal@aol.com
202	Eyal Barnea	33 Saxon Wood Rd.	ebarnea@yahoo.com
203	Giovanni LaPorta	22 Brooksby Road	JOHNLAPO@HOTMAIL.COM
204	Saurav Pandit	297 Boulevard	saurav.pandit@gmail.com
205	[illegible]	12 Edgewood Rd	JUKEHOE1@OPTONLINE.NET
206	Don Lien	115 Lea Rd	dclien@hotmail.com
207	Jiang, EnXiang	19 Kent Road	jiangnyc@gmail.com
208	BRIAN DUIGNAN	20 Ferncliff Rd	bduigs@hotmail.com
209	JOAN BROCKER	102 POTTER RD.	brocker@optonline.net
210	Brendan O'Keefe	33 Stonehouse Rd	bokmuse@gmail.com
211			
212			
213			
214			
215			

11 Signatures

Donna Conkling

From: malenitb@verizon.net
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 8:48 PM
To: Clerk's Department
Subject: Potential Discontinuation of Grass Clipping Pick-up

Re: Potential Discontinuation of Grass Clipping Pick-up

Dear Mayor Mark and the Board of Trustees,

I am writing in response to the recent Press Release issued by the Deputy Village Manager's office concerning the proposal to exclude grass clippings from the organic yard waste materials eligible for curbside pick-up by the Village's Sanitation staff.

When my schedule permits, I "grass cycle" when mowing my lawn and the effect on our grass is usually good - especially after a good rain. My wife and I practice organic vegetable gardening, we use only organic fertilizer such as milorganite on our lawn, we use no pesticides, and we weed our lawn by hand.

While I appreciate the Village's commitment to encourage residents to practice sustainable gardening and other environmentally friendly practices such as grass mulching and composting, I feel very strongly that all Village residents continue to voluntarily choose between grass mulching or bagging their grass clippings for pick-up for the following reasons:

1. Based on our experiences both grass mulching and bagging our cut grass (we use a grass mulching mower that is also equipped with a bagging feature), we have found that to properly grass mulch, lawns must be mowed on a consistent schedule (e.g., every week in the summer). For many Village residents who cut their own lawns, this can be difficult. Because my wife and I work full time, it is a challenge for us to care for our garden and lawn on a regular, weekly basis. Grass mulching on a lawn that has not been cut in two or more weeks is generally ineffective, aesthetically unpleasing, and tends to suffocate the grass.

2. For residents with small lot sizes, the composting of bagged grass is not really an option because of limited space.

3. I think disputes between neighbors may increase because of the placement of compost piles of mulched grass that will continue to grow in size over time.

4. For our senior neighbors who choose not to grass mulch or compost, if curbside pick-up of grass clippings is discontinued, the physical effort for them to bring bagged grass to the Village Recycling Center will be unduly burdensome.

5. Discontinuing curbside pickup of grass clippings will encourage illegal dumping of grass clippings.

If the Village discontinues curb side pick up of grass clippings, Village residents will no longer have a choice in the matter. Such a decision would be unfair to all residents.

Appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, Robert Malenitza

From: michellesterling1@gmail.com <michellesterling1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Mayor; Jon Mark; Bill Stern; Deb Pekarek; Marc Samwick; Matthew Callaghan; Jane Veron; Carl Finger
Cc: Amy Paulin; Steve Pappalardo; Robert Cole; Benedict Salanitro; Tyler Seifert; rkschulhof@gmail.com
Subject: Food Composting Initiative - significant grant opportunity

Hello Mayor Mark and Village Board of Trustees,

Over the past 2 weeks Ron and I have had 2 important meetings regarding food scrap recycling that we would like to bring everyone up to date with.

Our first meeting was in Albany with Assemblywoman Amy Paulin, her staff attorney and 4 members of the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation. The meeting was set up by Assemblywoman Paulin to help us further our food scrap recycling initiative and specifically to discuss New York State's potential to help with any such program. The meeting was a productive one. In short the State is offering significant grants to municipalities and counties to encourage sustainability initiatives. A food scrap pilot pickup program would fall within the parameters of the grant. We left off that we would explore a potential grant for our town - either alone or in partnership with Westchester County.

Our second meeting was here in White Plains with Assemblywoman Paulin, Westchester County Legislators Francis Corcoran and Catherine Parker (who are the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board's Environmental Committee) and Lou Vitrone of the Westchester County DEF. Like the meeting with the NYSDEC, this meeting was to discuss what the County could offer to help with a food scrap pilot program in Westchester. The legislators were brought up to date regarding our discussions with the DEF to either use their Rocket at the H-MRF for our pilot pickup program or have it lent to us and installed at Secor. We also discussed with them the idea of the County partnering with us to make a joint grant application for the NYS grant. Assemblywoman Paulin felt that a joint application would be strongest. We left off that the Assemblywoman was going to speak with our Village Manager's Office and request exploration of a joint grant application with the County. Lou and his staff at the DEF are also looking into the grant application. FYI the application deadline is July 29.

In our prior email on this topic we requested that the Board of Trustees ask Village management to speak with the County regarding both (1) doing a joint program where the Rocket stays at the H-MRF and we bring our residential food scraps there and (2) obtaining a loan of the County's Rocket for installation in Scarsdale. We still feel strongly that these are both great options that should continue to be pursued for Scarsdale.

There is now, however, an opportunity to obtain significant grant funding from New York State that would not only support the costs of our pilot program, but could help fund the costs of a program once it is out of the pilot phase and open to our entire community.

As the grant is due by July 29, we request an immediate meeting with both Village Management and the Board of Trustee Sustainability Committee to discuss the grant application. That meeting would then fairly quickly need to be followed up by a meeting between us, Village Management and the County DEF. We look forward to hearing back from you on this as soon as possible so that we can take advantage of this significant opportunity that entails both the partnerships and financial savings which would be ideal for Scarsdale.

We appreciate your attention to and support of this initiative.

Best,

Michelle and Ron

From: James Shenwick <jshenwick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 9:45 AM
To: Mayor; Manager's Department
Subject: Scarsdale Motorcycle Parking

Yesterday, I noticed two signs indicating that in the future a permit will be required to park a motorcycle at the villager Scarsdale train station. I respectfully ask why is the policy changing? For over 50 years motorcycle parking has been free at Scarsdale. This year, on average 5 to 6 people park motorcycles or scooters at the Scarsdale train station – a reduction of about 60% from prior years. There are plenty of spots available. I would like to know why Scarsdale is now requiring a permit, and why this change is necessary? I would ask that you rethink this change. I also believe that with the reduced number of people riding motorcycles and scooters and the limited time when one can write a motorcycle or scooter (due to the rain and cold weather) that this change in policy if it was done to generate revenue will produce very little revenue. Again, I would ask that the villager Scarsdale not resurface the motorcycle parking area and that require permits to park. Jim

James Shenwick
Shenwick & Associates
c/o Littman Krooks LLP
655 Third Avenue (42nd & 3rd Ave SE Corner)
20th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10017
(W) 212-541-6224 ext. 119
Cell Phone: 917-363-3391