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, Village Clerk Conkling and Assistant to the Village Manager Ringel.

* * * * * * * *

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 an 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. He stated that he would like to highlight a couple of the issues with the model. In the Ryan report, they are using a variable for square footage that they say is transformed with a square root transformation. Basically what that means is that if you quadruple the square footage of your house, the value according to Ryan's model, of that improvement will be two times, so it will rise twice the amount of the dollars that you put in. They downloaded all the 220 data points of 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 is 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 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, it's 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 that 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. Mason Lau 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