THREE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED SIXTIETH

REGULAR AGENDA MEETING

Rutherford Hall
Village Hall
August 9, 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, August 9, 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 Clerk Conkling and Assistant to the Village Manager Ringel.

* * * * * * * *

The minutes of the Board of Trustees Regular Meeting of Tuesday, July 26, 2016 were approved on a motion entered by Trustee Veron, seconded by Trustee Samwick, and carried unanimously.

* * * * * * * *

Bills & Payroll

Trustee Pekarek reported that she had audited the Abstract of Claims dated August 9, 2016 in the amount of $469,323.88 which includes $17,236.66 in Library Claims previously audited by a Trustee of the Library Board which were found to be in order and she moved that such payment be ratified.

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

RESOLVED, that the Abstract of Claims dated August 9, 2016 in the amount of $469,323.88 is hereby approved.

Trustee Pekarek further reported that she had examined the payment of bills made in advance of a Board of Trustees audit totaling $265,196.99 which were found to be in order and she moved that such payments be ratified.

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

RESOLVED, that payment of claims made in advance of a Board of Trustees audit totaling $265,196.99 is hereby ratified.

* * * * * * * *

Mayor's Comments

Mayor Mark stated that he had two topics to talk about this evening – Revaluation and Mrs. Finger's recusal and resignation.

"**Revaluation 2016**: Among the many and varied comments that have been made as part of the current criticism of the 2016 revaluation, are comments supportive of the Tyler Technologies 2014 Village-wide revaluation. In the case of those comments, hindsight is less than 20/20. Let's go back to May 2014 -- to the point in time when the results of the Tyler revaluation were first issued. For this purpose, I have left off the names of the commenters and have left out certain identifying information since my purpose is simply to illustrate the reaction at the time and not to single any residents out. However, the minutes are on the Village web site for those who care to look them up.

From the minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting held May 13, 2014:

"The revaluation process that was instituted for fairness and was promised to be fair and transparent has been the exact opposite and they seek the help of the Board in resolving this issue."

"His taxes have doubled on property … no one from Tyler visited the property and no one looked into the nature of the property. *** He also proposed a one -year delay until all information is released to the citizens who have paid for this study to be done."

"He did not have a specific criticism in terms of the numbers; however, he is really confused about the process."

From the minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting held May 27, 2014:

"In his opinion, the substance of the model formula is 'goofy', noting that he [has a] statistics background. It puts a very high value on a relatively obscure element known as the rate adjustment percentage."

My point is simply that it is not uncommon for revaluations to provoke the sort of responses elicited in 2014 and this year. Not only do we have dissatisfaction in the Village, but our next door neighbors in Greenburgh have voiced similar dissatisfaction with a revaluation in their town that Tyler Technologies just completed.

Of course, this is not to be dismissive of the criticisms expressed with regard to the 2016 revaluation. The Board expects residents to let them know what they think. We listen hard to the comments made at Village Board meetings and read the emails and other correspondence we receive. We take all comments seriously.

In point of fact, it was at least in part due to the prior Board listening to resident complaints about the 2014 revaluation that the 2016 revaluation was done. The prior Board had a good faith belief that a comprehensive parcel specific revaluation of all Scarsdale properties would better address the residents' concerns and moving forward with a Village-wide revaluation was advisable. That view was passed on to this Board and the process continued.

The fact that some residents are as upset and angry as they are about the 2016 revaluation is clearly troubling to this Board. However, as has been noted previously, there is a legal framework – the grievance process – by which residents can seek redress for what they believe are over valuations of their homes. And that process is proceeding for those who availed themselves of it.

We also understand that while the grievance process addresses overvaluations, it does not address or correct for properties that may be undervalued. That same asymmetry exists after every revaluation – including of course the 2014 revaluation. The manner by which that issue can be addressed is to do another revaluation.

We have listened to resident comments over the past two months and read Mr. Berg's letter of complaint posted on Scarsdale 10583.com two weeks ago. While we take the criticisms made seriously, none of them offer any alternatives to the ones we already know to the issues being raised. It is easy and dramatic to suggest that the 2016 revaluation should simply be tossed out. However, that suggestion does not include a practical alternative of what to do if it is discarded. To reinstate the 2015 assessment roll – if that were legally possible – would ignore new construction and renovations that took place between the referenced dates for the 2015 assessment roll and the 2016 assessment roll. Nor would it take into account changes in the market during the intervening period. Likewise, doing a new revaluation on some expedited basis – even if that were possible prior to the September 15, 2016 deadline for posting a final assessment roll – would seem to risk replicating the sort of situation in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. Berg asserts that this Board has not initiated an independent review of the 2016 revaluation because it is somehow afraid that it might reveal fatal flaws in the process. Even if that were the case, the means for addressing the issue that would present are those which have already been mentioned -- the grievance process and another Village-wide revaluation. The Board already knows those mechanisms exist so if the purpose of doing an investigation would be to find means of addressing flaws in the 2016 revaluation, we already know what those mechanisms are.

On the particular subject of whether a further revaluation should be done -- that is something that may be considered. However, if anything can be learned from the present circumstances, pursuing that course should be done in a thoughtful, deliberate manner. A framework could be set up, perhaps an Ad Hoc Committee on Revaluation appointed by the Board -- to do so. The Committee would consist of interested and informed residents (some of whom may be in Rutherford Hall this evening) and Village staff who could work together to come up with a proposed course of action to recommend to the Board. However, that process should be given enough time to be thought through. Simply pressing ahead with a further revaluation on some rushed basis would seem to risk putting us in a position similar to the one we are in now.

This Board, the Village staff and residents are looking forward to Mr. Ryan's appearance at a public meeting next week. He has been sent a list of topics to be covered in his presentation based on questions raised by residents, the Board and the Staff. We are interested in what he has to say. We are also prepared for the possibility that his presentation may not answer all of our questions – or answer them to our satisfaction. Even if that proves to be the case, however, the available practical remedies in terms of assessed property values remain substantially the same as already noted – the pending grievance process and the possibility of another Village-wide revaluation.

We have heard and read what residents had to say on the subject of the 2016 revaluation. The purpose of the meeting on August 17th is to hear what Mr. Ryan and the Village Assessor have to say. Public comments will not be solicited. We will ask members of the public who attend the meeting to write any questions they have on cards that will be made available and will be passed up to the Board. We will review the questions and put them to Mr. Ryan if they have not already been addressed. This procedure was followed in similar circumstances in 2014 and proved to be best for conveying information in an orderly fashion. The meeting will continue as long as necessary and as long as it is being productive. For those who may be out of town, the meeting will be streamed live on Scarsdale Public TV and will also be recorded and re-run on the public access channel.

In closing, I wish to thank resident Jane Curley for stepping up and joining the Assessment Review Board. Her presence brings the Board to full strength and better enables it to process the grievances on its docket. Thanks also to Dorothy Finger for acting in the best interest of the community by stepping down from the Board. Mrs. Finger has been a Village resident for over 40 years and has served as a volunteer in many capacities – including as a Village Trustee. We thank her for her years of dedicated service to the Village.

Assessment Review Board Matters: We have read the postings on Scarsdale 10583.com pertaining to Dorothy Finger's recusal from Assessment Review Board matters this grievance season. We also read the *Inquirer* story on this topic last Friday. The following is offered in response to the comments posted.

In June 2016, when this Board became aware of the extreme unhappiness of certain residents with the results of the 2016 revaluation, among a number of things it considered was the possibility of a large number of grievance filings. In looking at the membership of the Board of Assessment Review, Mrs. Finger's membership was of course noted. That observation triggered a discussion at publicly noticed meeting of the Board's Personnel Committee with respect to a different topic -- its consideration of the homestead tax option earlier in the year. Residents may recall that as part of that matter, Mr. Berg argued that Trustee Carl Finger should have recused himself from the Board vote on that proposal because either he or his law firm represent condominium owners in Westchester, although Trustee Finger did not represent condominium owners in Scarsdale at that time, and might represent condominium owners in the future. Mr. Berg's position was that because Trustee Finger might appear to support his clients by voting down adoption of the homestead tax option, there was an appearance of an impropriety although no actual conflict existed. Following up on Mr. Berg's suggestion, the question was referred to the Village Board of Ethics for an advisory opinion that could serve as future guidance to the Board on conflict or appearance issues. The Board of Ethics did not find any conflict on Trustee Finger's part, but said that in the future, recusal in such circumstances would be consistent with "the spirit" of the Village's Code of Ethics.

While this Board is always sensitive to conflict or appearance issues, suffice it to say, the exercise it went through in connection with the homestead tax option at the prompting of Mr. Berg served to heighten further the Board's sensitivity to such issues. The Board did not believe an actual conflict existed with respect to Mrs. Finger sitting as a member of the Assessment Review Board. Rather, the Board considered whether there might be an appearance issue in having Mrs. Finger serve on the Assessment Review Board. The focus was on whether it might appear that her consideration of grievances might be influenced by the fact that her son was serving on the Village Board and might – in certain scenarios -- be put in a position, along with other Board members, of defending the 2016 revaluation. The issue was not whether Mrs. Finger could exercise her independent judgment, but rather whether some residents might feel her judgment could be colored by her relationship to Trustee Finger. It was solely an appearance issue. Therefore, while the request that Mrs. Finger recuse herself and ultimately resign was not made at Mr. Berg's request, it was most definitely prompted by the education the Board received at Mr. Berg's urging on conflict of interest or appearance issues.

In terms of not explaining this background to residents at an earlier time, we asked Mrs. Finger if we might do so and she expressed a preference to state her position herself. We honored that request and she has stated her views. If it was an error not to inform the community of this background earlier, the error was mine.

As previously noted, once a volunteer was found to fill Mrs. Finger's seat on the Assessment Review Board, Mrs. Finger resigned her seat and the Assessment Review Board is now fully staffed. We thank the members of the Assessment Review Board for their

dedication and the extraordinary effort they are making to process grievances in a timely fashion."

Mayor Mark stated that other members of the Board would like to speak at this time.

Trustee Veron gave the following statement:

"Tonight, I would like to address all of you, those who have written or spoken to us, as well as those who are observers in the revaluation discussion. I strongly believe you have every right to seek answers to your questions. Having spent 18 years of my time in Scarsdale on the other side of this dais, I completely understand your passion and know how it feels to want to make progress.

We appreciate your commitment to sharing your views and expertise with the board. We value your collective wisdom. You bring talents to bear on this analysis that are enormously beneficial to the town. We are listening attentively, but, please do not mistake a deliberate process for inaction. We have been working diligently throughout the summer, and we owe it to you to communicate the steps we've taken.

Let's start at the beginning - my beginning, too. The decision to conduct a second revaluation in 2016 on the heels of the 2014 initial revaluation was made by a previous board, largely in response to issues raised by a different group of citizens who complained vehemently of flaws in the original revaluation. Mr. Ryan was engaged, and in early June of this year, the tentative assessment role was released. This board had no prior viewing of the data. We are elected officials and should not and do not have any involvement in the completion of the assessment role. It would be inappropriate.

Along with you, we examined the results and had many questions of our own. We compiled lists for both the Village Assessor and for Mr. Ryan. We, too, wanted to understand the underlying methodology. We asked many of the same questions that the community asked: why were so many sales eliminated from the sample, how were the construction grade determinations made, what is the rationale behind the neighborhood coefficients, what is the explanation for the wide swings in property values in certain cases, among many others. We also had questions about the contract and the assessment process as a whole.

Yet, in the first several weeks, we saw that our priority had to be the grievance process as the deadline was fast approaching. We understood that the Assessor's Department needed to devote its full resources toward supporting citizens who wished to grieve. For those who felt their properties were over-assessed, the grievance process was the most immediate path toward remedying the situation.

But our work did not cease. We researched revaluations in other communities, read about challenges in neighboring municipalities, and called town officials in other areas. We met with residents and with Village staff. We pored through your comments and analyses.

And as soon as the Assessment Department had completed recording the grievances, we asked that they direct their energies toward addressing the overarching questions. We requested they post answers on the website and brief us on their progress. We insisted that Mr. Ryan return to Scarsdale and that our Village Assessor address your concerns in a public forum. We scheduled that meeting immediately upon confirmation, and Mr. Ryan and Ms. Albanese will appear on August 17th.

I realize that many of you want immediate action, but please understand that this is a process that takes time, and some actions you call for, we simply cannot take. Our board does not have the authority just to discard an assessment role. But what we can do and what is our duty is to examine the process. We need to identify the problems so we do not repeat them.

We all desire a fair outcome and a stable assessment role. And every one on this board is committed to that goal.

Thank you for listening."

Trustee Callaghan spoke next, stating that he would like to comment further on the issue of Dorothy Finger stepping aside as a member from the Town Board of Assessment Review. He stated that he has "known her and her family for most of her adult life in Scarsdale. When you take a public servant, and I use that term public servant more seriously than a volunteer because she has given of herself selflessly to this community and to the County at large and so has her family. And it really makes me mad when I see a person of this estimable character having to step aside. They are few and far between in this community. People come to these meetings, they stamp their feet and they raise their voices but they don't get in the game. She got all in the game. It is unfortunate that due to the shenanigans surrounding the revaluation through no fault of herself, she chose to step aside. That took courage, a lot of courage. Thank you for listening to me."

Trustee Stern stated that he would like to add to Trustee Callaghan's comments, stating that "Dorothy Finger is an unusual woman in her service to this Village. She has been intimately involved with many things going on, giving selflessly of herself. It is interesting and no coincidence that one of her sons is on the Board of Trustees. It's not a fix, it's just a dedication to public service of this whole family. I feel terrible about what happened; I'm not going to comment on what happened but it happened. Things like this happen; it's very unfortunate. I think we lost a very, very dedicated public servant. That is what the unfortunate thing about this is. She was a person who wanted to continue serving the Village selflessly. We should honor her for her past service and hope that we learn a lesson from this. The lesson should be we shouldn't rush to judgment, we shouldn't jump

and say things about people that may or may not be true and without verification, and make assumptions. I think it's a horrible tragedy in a way; thank God it's not a tragedy of loss of life but it's a tragedy of loss of reputation, loss of what she did in the past, of just the focus on what happened recently. I think that it is a terrible thing that has happened in this Village.

The second thing about the reval – I expressed the angst of the Board and I was attacked for that. First of all, everyone in this room probably knows that people feel certain things and no one has the right to tell you how you feel. It may appear that way, but no one has the right to do that. This whole Board, and the Village staff, and everyone involved in this thing, I think feel the frustration, the anger, and I use the word angst again of all the residents, and we ourselves, except for maybe the Village Manager and the people who work for the Village. We have the same issues as residents of the Village. I just want to say that the Village Board of Trustees has been working extremely hard to try to get some answers although frankly, it's been attacked. I don't mind the attacks; I know from a legal standpoint what we can do and that is what kind of governs what we've said and how you feel we've been conservative in what we've said and not jump to conclusions. But we are investigating this thing to the ends of the earth and we hope to come to some conclusions about it and we also want the public to share in that investigation. We welcome criticism, we welcome contributions, constructive contributions, not attacks. If you want to attack us, that's okay too. We are very strong. We know what we are doing, we know where we stand, we know what we can and can't do legally and we know what we can and cannot say. In that context, I would encourage everyone in the Village to come down when questions can be asked of the person who did the reval and I hope the people are satisfied with the ability to ask these questions. We hope that we will learn by whatever mistakes we made and if we made mistakes and we will go forward in the future to benefit the whole Village. Thank you very much."

Trustee Pekarek stated, "I would like to make three points tonight.

First, we listen to all of our citizens in Scarsdale and if they do not come to the Board of Trustee meetings, they write letters and email and they make phone calls, they talk to us at neighborhood association meetings and they bump into us in the grocery store, in a restaurant, on the street and they share their thoughts.

Now, because you have said something and we have heard it does not mean that we always decide to move in your suggested way. There are a lot of points of view out there and we weigh all of them.

So, please know that because you have stated something and we don't move in that direction, or we don't do so immediately, doesn't mean we haven't heard you.

Second, as it regards the revaluation. We moved ahead with the exercise because we thought it was the right thing to do and we thought it would tweak the earlier Tyler valuation, which was good but not perfect.

Well, there were a lot of reasons we moved ahead, which you all have heard. There were, to my knowledge, no nefarious thoughts or actions by anyone involved in this current valuation.

We, I, was quite disappointed and surprised by the initial results. And we continue to be concerned about the outcome.

Please know that your comments and concerns weigh heavily on us. We continue to ask questions and we do look for continuing input to understand just what happened. And when we do this again, we will do it differently. We will continue our research and get answers to determine next steps. And we do appreciate your sincere interest, time, energy and the knowledge you have voluntarily devoted to responding to the revaluation results. Please know that we, the Mayor and Trustees and the Village staff, have also invested time and energy into this and we all have had sleepless nights, as I am sure many of you have had as well.

Third, contrary to many of the comments that have been made by several of our most upstanding citizens, this is not political. There was no hidden agenda nor bias towards anyone in this valuation exercise, and we are trying to understand the intricacies of this valuation model.

But based on several comments that have been made and the attitude represented by several of our citizens, I am personally appalled. We all here, the Mayor and the Board of Trustees, the Village staff, those present this evening, and all of you who live here, we love Scarsdale. We love what it means, we love what it stands for, this is our home, it is where we all have raised, or are raising, families, and where many of us want to stay for many years.

None of us are happy about the current undertones that this valuation has and is causing. But to make derogatory innuendos and negative personal comments…that is, or should be, below us as citizens of Scarsdale, as Americans, or more plainly stated, beneath us as human beings, and frankly, it takes away from the real issues.

And if character is destiny, shouldn't we be civil towards one another?

We acknowledge that there is a concern about this valuation exercise. And while there is nothing we can do about this immediately, there is so much to learn from this so that when it occurs again, and it will, the future Board of Trustees and the Mayor, and all of you, will be more involved as the Mayor has stated this evening. Thank you."

Trustee Samwick stated "First, I'd like to echo what Trustee Veron said; I think that was right on target as were the other reval comments by Trustee Stern and Pekarek. I do want to go back a little bit and talk about the 2014 reval which to a very large extent we were in a very similar situation to what we are today. The tone and tenor may have been different, but the message was basically the same and it was with, as Trustee Pekarek said, the intention of trying to remedy that revaluation that we went ahead with this revaluation. Obviously looking backward the results were not at all what we hoped, and what we were hoping for was a 'fix', a 'tweak' and it is not what we got.

It makes the goal of having to move forward more complicated because what seemed like the natural approach to fixing this turned out not to be. So I think that putting together as the Mayor suggested a committee and really looking at how we approach this and having community input into that part of the process, I think is critical."

* * * * * * * *

Manager's Comments

Village Manager Pappalardo reported to the Board and community on a few summertime Village departmental activities that are either completed or in the works.

The Recreation Day Camp began on July 5th and came to a close last Friday, August 5th. The camp season overall was successful. The Village provides a number of registration options from the full season five week program through our four age grade camps to a single week for the sport and travel camps. A total of 857 campers enrolled in the 2016 programs representing a year to year reduction in participation of 69 from the 925 participants in 2015. The Recreation Department conducts an annual outreach every year after camp and they will do that again. The Board is aware of the issue that we have had with the lack of a sixth week of camp, and that still is an issue.

Pool attendance and operations during the summer which has been very hot and dry, have been brisk as evidenced by daily admission fees from the Memorial Day opening through last week trending ahead of budget in excess of $8,000 more than realized for the same time period last year. Additionally, total pool pass sales of 2,069 have increased slightly year to year. These numbers include our full week passes, weekday passes, and single use passes. The complex will continue daily operations until September 9th. A few years ago the Village added the extra week after Labor Day. This was a big hit so we continue to do that.

In the Treasurer's Office, the Village's independent auditors have been present at Village Hall this summer conducting their annual audit analysis and have currently provided the Treasurer with some trial balances and adjusting journal entries for most of the Village's funds. A full audit report is expected and financial statements for Fiscal Year 2015/16 by early September, in time for the scheduled September 13th Village Board Finance Committee meeting on this matter. With regards to the General Fund, the initial audit review indicates

favorable General Fund balances between budgeted expenditure savings and revenues in excess of budget. Notable items are certain onetime revenues including the sale of Village property of $643,000; personnel vacancy and overtime management efforts by the Village and the impact of an improved liability insurance experience and resulting premium reductions as well as the workers' compensation insurance premiums and claim reductions based on the institution of certain health and safety programs that the Village has been working on for the last couple of years. We also benefited this year from lower fuel costs and the mild winter of 2015/16. The net result of these efforts is that the Village is in a position to transfer cash to the Capital Budget to fund a number of the projects that are identified for borrowing in the 2016/17 Budget. This is consistent with the established practice of transferring cash to capital from the year end closeout. Additionally we may wish to consider adding to the assigned fund balance for pension expense as the New York State Retirement System has reduced the estimated return on their pension portfolio as well as the discount rate used to estimate future benefits. This may drive up pension expenses in FY2017/18 and beyond.

Regarding capital and public works projects that are underway at this time, the Crane Road gas main replacement project continues. Con Edison is working daily on completing the work on Crane Road from Post Road to Stonehouse Road. They have trenched and installed a new high pressure gas main along the project limits and are expected to complete the work within the next few weeks – hopefully by the end of next week. There will be intermittent road closures while they make the final residential sewer connections to the new gas line. As part of this work and in accordance with our recently adopted local law, Con Edison has agreed to reimburse the Village for 100% of the cost to repave Crane Road curb to curb from Post to Stonehouse Roads. The Village is planning to extend the paving work to Fox Meadow Road through our existing capital budget appropriation.

The recommencement of the Village's contractual road resurfacing operations is scheduled to start again next week. It is hoped to complete this season's work no later than the end of September. The Village is currently out to bid for the next two year paving cycle. The Board should see a resolution for contractual road and curbing services on one of its September agendas. The Village will decide this fall whether to perform another round of road resurfacing or wait until after the winter to reassess the roads and pave again in the spring of 2017.

Concerning the Harcourt Woods stormwater project, this project was the fifth and final segment of the larger South Fox Meadow flood mitigation project and it was completed last month through the replacement of a small pedestrian bridge over the watercourse at Harcourt Road. The work was a result of mutual cooperation between the County of Westchester, relative to funding, the project contractor, and the Village. The Village's Engineering staff designed the bridge and provided construction oversight. The Village provided the steel for the deck which was recycled from the old salt shed roof as well as the steel for the rail posts and brackets, which were all cut to size by our Village crews. The rails were stained by the Highway Department and installed by the Facilities Maintenance crews.

This is a good example of working cooperatively – not only intra-departmentally but also with a contractor and in this case with another governmental agency. You can get a lot done and be very efficient as well. The bridge now includes a seven foot wide sidewalk providing for safe access on this very busy area while improving the aesthetics. The contractor also planted some additional landscaping on site. The Village is receiving a lot of compliments from people who use that area and walk it frequently.

Village Manager Pappalardo reported that the Village is closed out now on the $1.64 million contract on the interest subsidized grant loan with the New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation on the overall South Fox Meadow flood mitigation project, as well as with the County grant agreement which funded $1.45 million of all those stormwater projects as well. By all accounts, the South Fox Meadow flood mitigation project, which included the construction of bio detention basins at George Field Park and Cooper Green, has significantly mitigated flooding along the flood prone South Fox Meadow drainage basin area. It has been at least five years since the project was started; the Village is very proud of it and happy that a difference has been made in the quality of life for a lot of residents along that South Fox Meadow drainage basin area.

Regarding textile recycling, the Village is in the process of renewing the vendor agreement to place a textile bin at the Village Recycling Center. This will be the second year. The Village has received approximately 11 tons or 22,000 pounds of textiles since starting the program in August 2015. Forty-five percent of this material is usable clothing which is exported to underdeveloped countries. The vendor has been responsive and has provided a second weekly pickup when the bin is overloaded. Based on the first years' experience, the Village is considering adding an additional bin in the near future. He stated that the residents have been generous with their old clothes and other textiles and they should continue to bring them. The second bin will probably be out there this year. The Village gets a minimal return – 15 cents per pound which totals approximately $3,000 based on these numbers. The fact that the Village is collecting and recycling these materials and people are getting good use out of it that are needy is the crux of the program.

Village Manager Pappalardo next reported on grasscycling. He stated that after the Board of Trustees voted recently to maintain existing curbside grass collection operations, the Board asked staff to perform additional analysis by identifying homes by address and material quantities where bagged grass clippings are left for collection. Last week Village Sanitation crews began this exercise while also noting the homes where other yard organics were being collected. The Village plans on continuing this analysis for the next four to six weeks as the grass season ends and will resume again in the spring of 2017. The field report data will be organized in a spreadsheet with the contractor's information on file for any particular property linked to this data. Once this quantitative information is compiled, it will make it easier to identify and target homes and contractors not grasscycling in order to advance the Board's objective of further educating residents and their contractors on the environmental and cost benefits of grasscycling.

Village Manager Pappalardo then reported on the Sheldrake Cayuga project. He stated that in March 2016, the Village Board authorized the execution of a grant agreement with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation for a $1,050,000 State water quality improvement program funding to perform water quality and flood mitigation improvements in the Sheldrake River drainage basin that connects with Cayuga Pond. This is another area of the Village that is identified as a flood plain area under the FEMA Flood Zones. The project funding is $1.4 million with the Village required to fund 25% or $350,000 under this grant. The engineering firm was retained in January and they have been working with the staff on the project design which involves desilting of Cayuga Pond to capture additional storage capacity, the installation of a pump station at the pond to proactively drain water to create storage in anticipation of severe rain events, and the installation of a sediment forebay at the mouth of the pond to desilt pollutants from the water prior to settling in the pond. The site is very restricted as the pond and the property surrounding the pond is all private property. As such, the use of private property is essential for this project to move forward. Staff has been working with the neighbors, including Fenway Golf Club, to explain the project and seek temporary construction easements to access the work site. A permanent easement is also required for the installation and continual operation of the pump station. Two evening meetings have been held with the neighbors and meetings have been held with representatives of Fenway Golf Club on three separate occasions and staff has communicated via email on a regular basis with those residents most affected. Unfortunately, the Village has yet to receive any easement agreements and the engineer's final design and construction plans are on hold until the Village works towards securing these. If the Village cannot secure the easement for the placement of the pump station and also the temporary construction easement to place the dredged material in sediment bags to dry, the public right of way will have to be considered. The Village hopes to work through the issues with the resident so that good use can be made of the grant money and help to mitigate flooding in the Sheldrake area which has been problematic over the years.

There is a very similar project at Crane-Berkley. This is another pond and open watercourse desilting project being done in conjunction with the Crane Berkley Homeowners Association. As the Village stormwater system empties into this area, the Board established a special improvement district in January through which the homeowners association and the Village will share the expense of the improvement work. The Board awarded the construction contract this spring and the contractor has begun to mobilize on site and is currently installing the appropriate safety and erosion control measures prior to beginning the desilting operations. The Village has been in frequent communication with the association representatives to keep them informed. The work will continue through the summer and fall.

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that replacement of the salt shed at the Public Works site at 25 Ramsey Road is well underway. Demolition of the old shed is complete and the new foundation and site work is in progress. The Village Board awarded a $123,000 contract in June for a shed vendor to furnish and install a fabric salt shed structure on the

foundations being set. The $250,000 project is being managed in-house to save on engineering consulting expenses. The project is expected to be completed this fall with the shed ready for use this winter.

Regarding the Popham Road Firehouse renovation, the final contract bid documents for the $3.5 million structural improvement project will be completed this week. The Village will be advertising for bids on Friday, August 12th. The bids will be due back on September 13th and the Village hopes to have a contract award before the Board for the second meeting in September or the first week in October and start construction in the fall. The project duration is anticipated to be one year.

Village Manager Pappalardo reported that the Village Board is taken out annually for a bus tour and one of the locations they were taken to is the Freightway site, which is a 2.38 acre site. The Village Planner spoke about the development potential of this area. The dilemma here is that the Village is faced with the possibility in the very near future of multi-million dollar improvements that need to be made to the Freightway Garage, a structure built in 1973. The Board expressed a desire to investigate the site for a potential public/private partnership similar to the arrangement for the Christie Place development. As such, the Village Planner and Assistant Village Manager have met independently with a handful of developers to discuss their ideas for this site. The Planner explained the current zoning and that any project of significance would likely require a zone change to allow for additional density. She referred them to the Village Comprehensive Plan and necessity to maintain roughly 700 parking spaces that are essential to the commuters. All of the developers have expressed interest in a mixed use transit oriented development that would accommodate the Village's interest – parking, retail and perhaps some cultural use and empty nester and millennial housing options. One of the developers noted that many of their units at the Ritz-Carlton in White Plains have been sold to downsizing Scarsdale residents. So there seems to be a need for this type of housing.

* * * * * * *

Public Comment

Robert Berg, 32 Tisdale Road, read from his statement regarding the 2016 revaluation which was submitted as written correspondence to the Village Clerk to be made part of the record. He stated that he is a member on the Town Board of Assessment Review (BAR), meeting again this evening for the 11th time. He believes that the BAR has decided approximately 650 cases so far. He stated that the BAR is an independent Board and that the Mayor and the Board have no right to interfere in the makeup of the BAR once constituted or in its activities. He stated that he is very disturbed about three incidences where the Mayor and the Village Board have interfered with the BAR's independence, the most important once being the recusal and subsequent resignation of member Dorothy Finger. The second incident was that the Mayor, on his own, telling the community that on Grievance Day, that the BAR would be accepting appraisals and any additional

documentation supporting grievances until September 1st. That was news to the BAR members. This was for the BAR to decide, not for the Mayor to mandate. Finally, Mr. Berg stated that he read in the Inquirer that the Mayor said that 'I will recuse myself from any grievances where a taxpayer so requests'. The Mayor had no right or power to say this. He stated he evaluates any request for his recusal on their own merits.

Mayor Mark responded to Mr. Berg's comments, stating that as to Mrs. Finger, he believed he expressed himself at the start of the meeting. Regarding the September 1st point that Mr. Berg noted, Mayor Mark stated that it was something that he repeated at a recent meeting which was a statement that had been made much earlier in a public meeting. It was a repetition of something that had been said much earlier. Lastly, what was reported in the Inquirer about Mr. Berg's own recusal was simply a statement that he had observed, personally, sitting at a meeting of the Board of Assessment Review. A resident appearing before that Board requesting Mr. Berg to recuse himself, and he without any hesitation recused himself. The Mayor stated that all he did was report that to the newspaper that he observed that and based his conclusion that he might do similarly on what he had personally seen him do. It was not meddling, not telling the Board what to do – Mr. Berg decides what he wants to do but the Mayor reported on what he saw.

Trustee Stern stated that he found it curious that Mr. Berg invited the Mayor and the Board to attend the Board of Assessment Review meeting. The Board has made it a point not to go to the Board of Architectural Review meeting because they have some executive power over the decisions of that Board.

Mr. Berg stated that the Board of Trustees has no executive power over the Board of Assessment Review. He stated that he wanted the Mayor and the Board of Trustees to see what people were suffering from this revaluation.

Philip Mehler, 45 Birchall Drive, stated that he has been a resident for 45 years and that he appreciates the comments and hard work the Board has done on this issue. He stated that the Board needs to do something meaningful about this problem. Many people on fixed incomes cannot afford these taxes. The higher taxes have destroyed the market for the higher priced homes. The homes are not moving; they have been on the market for 2-3 years. In two years his own home has gone up in assessment by 30%. Regarding financial management, he noted that the taxes have gone up 3% a year. He questioned why they have to go up 3% every year. He suggested that the Village use some of the money in the reserve account, and also stated that the Village doesn't need a Triple A rating. He stated that he also doesn't know where all the money is going, adding that Scarsdale has the worst roads and the highest taxes in Westchester.

In response to a complaint by Mr. Mehler about the number of Village staff, Mayor Mark responded that the Village staff has hardly grown over the recent 5 years and only approximately 1.5% of the increase in the Village budget is directly attributable to Village operations.

Village Manager Pappalardo informed Mr. Mehler that he would be happy to sit down with him and take him through the budget. He noted that Mr. Mehler is asking good questions and again stated that if he would like to meet he should call the Village Manager's office to make an appointment.

After a question by Mr. Mehler about the Homestead Tax Option and the status of that issue surrounding the Christie Place condominiums, Mayor Mark explained by giving him a brief summary including the Board's decision to not adopt the Homestead Tax Option.

Josh Frankel, Black Birch Lane, read from a prepared statement which was submitted to the Village Clerk and made part of the record. He stated that he favored the 2014 Tyler revaluation. He noted that he had spoken at the June 14th and June 27th Board meetings; he spoke regarding the Ryan revaluation and detailed the clear shift in the tax burden among the residential zones as well as noting that the Tyler revaluation had been mostly reversed. He stated that he asked two questions – the derivation of Mr. Ryan's land value table and why Mr. Ryan's sales base used 220 sales, only 58% of the 379 recorded in the State of New York Office of Real Property Services database for the period he used. He noted that he had submitted a FOIL request on June 27th to examine the reasons for the invalidations of 159 missing sales and to date he has not received the requested documentation. He stated that it is no longer possible to accept this revaluation as legitimate; it is not acceptable for the Board to continue to point to the grievance process as the solution to this problem. The Board should explore what legal recourse it has against Mr. Ryan and rescind the Tentative Roll immediately.

Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez, Fox Meadow Road, discussed the missing sales information in connection with the 2016 revaluation. She went over the contract and the requirements set forth in same that Mr. Ryan was obligated to fulfill. The preliminary report does not contain any explanation of how the model was designed, if data were validated or if any fact testing was done. Ms. Rodriguez stated that no references were received for Mr. Ryan. She stated that Assessor Albanese has ignored her questions. She read and discussed the emails she received through a FOIL request between Assessor Albanese and Mr. Ryan.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez stated that the Board needs to invalidate the 2016 Revaluation because the terms of the contract were not fulfilled. She asked the Mayor and Board to exercise their fiduciary duty and bring legal course against Mr. Ryan.

Michael Kerr, 15 Fox Meadow Road, stated that he has heard a lot about the tone of the people in the audience and he wished the Board could see their own faces and understand what they are projecting and perhaps the Board would understand the tone of the residents. The whole tone would be different if the Board had not 'circled their wagons'. He stated that his taxes have been increased 50% as a result of the Ryan reval which is only three years after he purchased the house. He also noted that no one seems to have looked

into Mr. Ryan's background before he was hired and mentioned that Ryan and his sons did the drive by revaluations. Why are there five employees in the Assessor's office and Ryan and his sons go out and do the revaluation? The results were so off from what was expected. The Board has done nothing, the residents have done all the work and they should be applauded by the Board.

Trustee Stern stated that he would like to state that Mr. Ryan's sons had nothing to do with the revaluation and did not drive around the Village. That is a fallacy that has been perpetrated throughout the Village.

Mr. Kerr expressed his displeasure with the procedure of writing questions down for Mr. Ryan to answer at the meeting to be held on Wednesday, August 17th. He can't ask a question or ask for clarification?

Mayor Mark stated that the idea for the meeting on the 17th is to let Mr. Ryan say whatever he is going to say; the thought is that by doing it in that fashion, everyone on the Board, everyone who attends and watches on the public television channel will hear what he has to say. Once he finishes, everyone will have a reaction to it. The Board has sent him topics to be addressed that were based on the questions that the residents had and the Board and staff had. It is up to him to do so and to respond.

Barbara Wabeck, 11 Windmill Lane, stated that she and her husband bought their house in 1972 and it was valued at $15,000. She stated that her Tyler revaluation preliminary estimate for her home was $1,331,000 and she was shocked. Then the Tentative estimate was $1,125,000. It arrived with a document with comparable homes. With the Tyler revaluation, she had the time to hire a lawyer to grieve the taxes. The assessment was lowered to $925,000 at that time. The Ryan revaluation has raised the assessment $200,000 again, bringing the total assessment to $1,125,000. Unfortunately her husband passed away on June 2nd and the Ryan revaluation result came in the mail around June 10th. She was unaware of the grievance deadline of June 21st. She went to fill out the forms on June 27th and was told of the deadline at that time. Despite her description of the circumstances, she was told to come back with the forms in January. New York State does not provide an exception that would allow a municipality to review and adjudicate a grievance after the statutory deadline has passed. Since Ryan had no observer, why didn't the Assessor apprise Ryan of the Court's decision to lower Tyler's assessment which Ryan as the observer signed off on? There was too little time for people who had personal problems to grieve in a timely manner.

Alex Mazer, 47 Church Lane, stated that he is a senior at Scarsdale High School. He stated that he has been disturbed with the way the revaluation has been handled from the start, and a clearly flawed methodology was used. The previous method used by Tyler Technologies was more accurate and fair. He stated that dissent regarding the proposed 2016 revaluation from residents was ignored by the Board. The government does not represent the community. He stated that he was personally surprised that such a

disorganized revaluation could have taken place in Scarsdale. No one is against making sure home values are accurate; however, this revaluation was poorly executed. Looking forward to the meeting scheduled for August 17th with Mr. Ryan when a more detailed breakdown of the revaluation is expected, a more structured path forward can be set in place by the community and the Board.

Howard Weitz, 29 Lawrence Road, stated that he would like to address what the Board of Trustees can or cannot do legally. If a contract is voided, then the application of whatever regulatory authority is moot because there is no performance under the contract. In his opinion, whatever application of the New York State Tax law would otherwise apply if the Ryan contract had been performed property, does not apply here. If the Board deems it appropriate to void that contract, he didn't think the Board would have to worry about what the tax law is. It's as though the contract never existed. He also stated that the Board should not be concerned about what other residents might do in terms of litigation if they void the contract.

Robert Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road, stated that he has been the volunteer Youth Director for the Scarsdale Youth Tennis League for 32 years and they just completed their 32nd year last Thursday night. He thanked the Recreation Department for their help.

Mr. Harrison stated that the Board should tell Mr. Ryan he should come in early September for a meeting, not during the month of August when so many people are on vacation.

Mayor Mark stated that the Board is hoping that Mr. Ryan honors what he has told the Board in that he is going to be at the scheduled meeting on August 17th which will be streamed live so people can watch.

Mr. Harrison questioned the number of sales that were used in the revaluation. He cited numbers that he found in the MLS system, comparing to those used by Mr. Ryan. He noted that of the 338 sales in the MLS system, there were 81 sales under $1 million or 24%. That is where this community has been stressed by the low-end homes going up anywhere from 20-50% more. Were these sales thrown out or included? Included in the 220 sales that Mr. Ryan used for his model, 39 of those sales are under $1 million, or 17%, well under the 24% of the MLS. He felt that this is a significant difference.

Mr. Harrison stated that based on the facts and the emails, the Board should be suing J.F. Ryan for the $240,000 no bid contract for a breach of contract, malfeasance or whatever other legal terms are possible. He stated that he hoped Mr. Ryan would have answers for the residents at the August 17th meeting.

Michael Levine, Walworth Avenue, stated that he appreciated Mr. Frankel's analysis and others' analyses regarding the missing sales. He did his own analysis generously looking at what could be considered invalid regarding the missing sales data to put into the sales

base. That left approximately 140-150 unexplained. He felt that half of the missing sales were easily explained and were explained in the Inquirer by Mr. Ryan himself. Mr. Ryan had stated that any sale not reflected in the report was either reported as invalid or considered an outlier, often times as a result of changes made after the date of sale. That would mean that the property was improved after the date of sale – changes were made to the property. There is an easy solution that Tyler Technologies used – for properties sold there are two sets of property records. One is in the sales file, and one in the production file which reflects the inventory of the taxable status. The sales file allows the inventory to be frozen so that the attributes used as a comparable are reflective of the status of the property at the time of sale. Mr. Levine stated that this is basic practice and he didn't know why this basic technique of keeping track of the sales as they existed at the point of sale and using them in the modeling wasn't done. There is no indication that it was done. Mr. Levine stated that in his opinion, Mr. Ryan discarded some 68 perfectly good sales that could have been used in the model.

Mr. Levine added that he believed the Board has been acting in good faith this entire way and it is just a difficult and hard thing to get a handle on. He hoped everyone could get to a good resolution.

Nick Baturin, 23 Fox Meadow Road, shared recent analysis done on the revaluation. He stated that he looked at the official 220 sales in the sample. In doing the analysis, they found that the small houses are assessed at approximately 96-97% off the sales price. Those are homes with values under $1.3 million. On the other hand, the larger homes with higher values of $1.3 million are assessed on the average of 92-93%. There is a downward sloping curve if you were to look at this ratio of assessed value to sales versus the magnitude of the assessed value. He stated that he calls this a fundamental unfairness in this revaluation.

Mr. Baturin stated that they reached out to a support person of NCSS software that is supposedly the software that was used by Mr. Ryan. This person called this a vertical inequity. This software is made to analyze revaluations. Ideally this vertical inequity is evaluated and removed. Adjustments should be made to the model to remove the non-uniformity. The software generates a report that indicates the bias ratio and when they used this software it comes out that there is a very significant bias in the data.

When they analyzed recent sales data using this software, they found more severe bias in that small homes are overvalued and the larger homes are even more undervalued. The fundamental unfairness is manifested even more strongly in recent data.

Rob Parlato, 1 Sherbrooke Road, stated that the Heathcote Association has asked through their attorneys for them to have their FOIL answers and questioned when they would receive them. Village Attorney Esannason advised Mr. Parlato that that the FOIL from Huff & Wilkes was fulfilled on July 29, 2016.

Mr. Parlato stated that all the models that everyone is talking about is absurd. It should only be comps and sales. He stated that he has been in real estate for over 53 years and has bought many properties in Scarsdale and Westchester. When he purchases a property he used comps, not models. This is a created manipulation of property values. The land values are higher than the home values. He suggested that the Board hire an outside attorney to come and investigate the 2014 revaluation and the 2016 revaluation. The Board shouldn't be conversing about this issue. He noted that he was so impressed with this Board of Trustees during the discussion of the proposed local law on gravel being considered an impervious surface. The Board saw the real reason why the law was being proposed and stopped it. He stated that the Board should take the pressure off themselves on this issue and find out what happened through an investigation led by an attorney. It is not fair for people like the Board that give their time to go through this angst. He felt it would satisfy everyone in the room this evening if an investigation were done on that level.

Steve Rakoff, Morris Lane, stated that this is a billion dollars lost for this Town and losing the ranking as the premier community in all of Westchester. In April of this year at the Committee of the Whole meeting, everyone was flabbergasted at Mr. Ryan's inability to answer straightforward questions. He noted that at that time the Mayor was very strong in making it a point for Mr. Ryan to answer the questions. He expressed his concerns about the scheduled August 17th meeting, noting that he doesn't expect anything other than an alibi. He also noted that in some of the questions and emails that were brought up, the truth should be found out and if that leads to a change in regime in the Assessor's office that would be appropriate.

Brice Kirkendall-Rodriguez, Fox Meadow Road, stated that through their FOIL request, they found the software that Mr. Ryan used, and they used it themselves. It is now clear that he did not use his own software correctly. The software did indicate that there was a problem and Mr. Ryan ignored it. He hoped that the Board picked up on that. He stated that his wife did incredible detailing of emails that suggest a closer than comfortable relationship with a vendor before there was a contract yet it was presented that there were no other qualified candidates for a no-bid contract which was probably an erroneous statement. He noted that there is probably evidence of contractual problems with this revaluation. He felt that the Board has a number of ways to save themselves from a continued and protracted battle here and there is a way out of this. The Board should invalidate the contract and extricate themselves from a spiraling circumstance that has a community at odds with the Board.

Mr. Kirkendall-Rodriguez stated that the format for the meeting of August 17th is rather restrictive as there are those residents that would like to ask direct questions. It has been indicated that the Board will be giving Mr. Ryan prepared questions that he will answer and that he will answer questions on cards submitted by the residents. He asked if it was possible to see a list of questions that the Board intends to ask him before this meeting.

Mayor Mark responded that it will be possible to see the prepared questions in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Kirkendall-Rodriguez reiterated the desire that the residents have to direct questions to him.

Mayor Mark stated that it was the Board's decision to have questions prepared and written down – this was driven by the goal of having an orderly way of getting Mr. Ryan to present whatever it is he has to present.

Trustee Pekarek stated that the audience will have the opportunity to ask questions written on a card.

Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez, Fox Meadow Road, stated that she didn't think she should be treated like a child – the residents are the ones paying for this and she respectfully requested that the residents be able to ask questions. She reiterated that she would like to have a list of the questions the Board is going to ask Mr. Ryan before the meeting. She stated that the residents deserve the right to ask the questions directly.

Mayor Mark responded that he understands Ms. Kirdendall-Rodriguez's request; as he indicated in his opening remarks there was a similar situation in 2014 and the Board that faced the results of that revaluation. The Board used this procedure of written questions to get an orderly set of responses. He stated that it is not a matter of treating people like children; that is not the point of this at all. The Board does want to hear Mr. Ryan and if they get into a situation where there is a dialogue between him and a resident it is going to spiral into a series of questions and they will not get a coherent set of responses from him. Mayor Mark stated that he would like to give Mr. Ryan a chance so that everyone can evaluate what we do with what we hear.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez stated that this never would have happened if Mr. Ryan had been answering the questions all along. He has had these questions for two months and should have answered them a long time ago. She asked why Ms. Albanese has not returned phone calls or answered questions, noting that if she had, she would have more faith in this process.

Village Manager Pappalardo stated that Ms. Albanese will be available on August 17th to answer questions and noted that she has been very responsive in completing the FOIL requests regarding the revaluation that have been received. There are 18 very voluminous requests that require much time to fulfill. The fulfillment of these FOIL requests have been made a priority and due to this, time has been lost on other critical projects.

Ms. Kirkendall-Rodriguez stated that she really wanted to know who did the drive-bys; who was the staff on premises from Ryan doing the work and asked if the Assessor vetted these people on his staff.

Robert Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road, stated that it was in the newspaper that a FOIL request submitted by Josh Frankel could not be satisfied until after the meeting on August 19the and asked if this was still the case.

Village Attorney Esannason responded that yes, this was still the case.

Mr. Harrison stated that he would also like to know who did the drive by appraisals for Ryan Associates. He also asked if he could submit his questions via email to clerk@scarsdale.com before the meeting of August 17th.

Mayor Mark responded that residents could send their questions to the Clerk's email address as noted. Mayor Mark also stated that staff submitted a list of topics that includes questions received from residents, and topics and subparts to those with questions from the Board.

Mr. Parlato interjected, noting that his FOIL request as mentioned earlier, was in fact fulfilled.

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

* * * * * * * *

Finance Committee

Upon motion entered by Trustee Samwick , and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution regarding Appropriation of Insurance Reimbursement was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, the Scarsdale Police Department utilizes seven marked vehicles to perform preventative patrol and respond to emergency calls for service, as well as for other Police Department operations including traffic and parking enforcement around the schools; and

WHEREAS, one of these necessary patrol vehicles, a 2015 Ford Police Interceptor Sedan (SPD#8), was damaged beyond repair in a motor vehicle accident that occurred in April 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Village recently received an insurance claim reimbursement in the amount of $22,714.32 for this vehicle, which is critical to maintaining adequate operational fleet size, and it is anticipated that the combination of the insurance reimbursement and salvage of undamaged equipment will allow SPD#8 to be replaced with a

comparable vehicle, with any shortage to be covered through SPD's operating budget; and

WHEREAS, it is now necessary for the Village Board to appropriate said reimbursement to the Capital Fund for the purpose of purchasing a new police vehicle; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board of Trustees herein appropriates the insurance reimbursement of $22,714.32 from the FY 2016/17 General Fund Revenue Account identified below to the appropriate Capital Fund Project Account as follows:

Amount:	**From**:	**To**:
$22,714.32	A-1000-022 2680-01 (Insurance Recoveries)	H-3197-962 2017-031 (Police-Vehicles);

and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 2016/17 Capital Budget be amended to reflect these additional funds.

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 Veron, the following resolution regarding Acceptance of a Gift for the Scarsdale Public Library Addition and Renovation Project was approved by the vote indicated below:

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, in accordance with a Village Board request at a March 07, 2016, Committee of the Whole meeting, the Library Board and Architect value engineered the schematic design plans, reducing the total project cost to $17,900,000, as identified in Option A-1 (attached), which the Architect presented at the July 19, 2016, Committee of the Whole meeting; and

WHEREAS, The Friends of the Scarsdale Library has offered to donate the gift of $10,000 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 $10,000 from the Friends of the Scarsdale Library 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 $10,000 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 the Friends of the Scarsdale Library, for their generosity and commitment to the Scarsdale Public Library and Community.

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 Acceptance of a Gift to the Scarsdale Public Library was approved by a unanimous vote:

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; and

WHEREAS, the Henry Laird Smith Foundation, as directed by Jeannette Sloan Warner, wishes to make an unrestricted $1,000 donation to the Scarsdale Public Library; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board of Trustees hereby accepts the unrestricted gift of $1,000 to be used toward Scarsdale Public Library general operating expenses and extends its thanks and appreciation to the Henry Laird Smith Foundation and Jeannette Sloan Warner for this generous gift to the community; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Treasurer is herein directed to deposit said gift of $1,000 in the Scarsdale Public Library Budget Account TE-91-.22 – "Miscellaneous Gifts."

* * * * * * * *

Law Committee

Mayor Mark noted that before the next resolution is read regarding an authorization to execute an agreement with the Scarsdale Teen Center, he is going to recuse himself from discussing this item or voting on it because his wife, B.K. Munguia is the President of the Scarsdale Teen Center.

Upon motion entered by Trustee Finger, and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution regarding Authorization to Execute an Agreement with the Scarsdale Teen Center was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, the Village of Scarsdale (Village) and the Scarsdale Union Free School District (District) have provided financial support to The Scarsdale Teen Center, Inc., for its operation since 1998-1999 and are desirous of continuing to fund a recreational and social program for community youth; and

WHEREAS, the term of the renewal agreement is for one (1) year, commencing September 1, 2016, and terminating August 31, 2017, pursuant to which the Village will provide $87,500 in annual funding to the Teen Center, payable in two equal installments of $43,750 on September 15, 2016, and March 15, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education represents that the District will provide an additional amount of $65,000 in program support during the term of the Agreement and, consistent with past practice, deposit said funding with the Village for subsequent disbursement to the Teen Center; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board, in conjunction with the Board of Education, will continue to evaluate future funding of the Teen Center, with any such funding commitments to be linked to program performance and the Teen Center's ability to increase revenues and operate on a more self-sustaining basis; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board of Trustees herein approves $87,500 in 2016-2017 funding to The Scarsdale Teen Center, Inc., as appropriated in the adopted Village Fiscal Year 2016-2017 General Fund Budget, and recognizes the Scarsdale Board of Education's commitment to fund an additional amount of $65,000 from the District's Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to execute the Agreement between the Village of Scarsdale and the Scarsdale Teen Center, Inc., in substantially the same form as attached hereto; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to undertake administrative acts that may be required pursuant to the terms of the Agreement.

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

After Trustee Callaghan voted Nay on the above resolution, he explained that he is voting in this manner the Teen Center has been underutilized and overfunded for several years. The Center had shortfalls and in the red in 2013 - $32,180; 2014 - $10,960; 2015 - $52,200; 2016 - $42,700. He noted that listed in their budget proposal they had noted only 1500 people participated in the activities of the Teen Center and 500 of those came from four grammar schools for their moving up ceremony – this represented 1/3 of the attendance. He stated that he visited the Teen Center last year three days in a row and found no one in attendance and on the Friday evening the door was locked and lights out. The Village has put in $1,575,000 over 18 years. The Village could use the $87,000 each year for 18 years to help balance the budget.

Trustee Stern stated that he would like to disagree with Trustee Callaghan; if one looks at what the Teen Center has done in terms of saving teen lives it is worth every penny that is spent. They may have a temporary issue now, but it will not be permanent. We should continue funding the Teen Center.

Trustee Callaghan noted that the Scarsdale Family Counseling Services for Youth, comprised of highly credentialed individuals, is available for teen problems and issues. The bleak financials of the Teen Center is not a temporary issue.

* * * * * * * *

Upon motion entered by Trustee Finger, and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution regarding the New York City Rate Review by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, the Village of Scarsdale has appeals pending before the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) of the Entitlement Rate increases adopted by the New York City Water Board (NYC) for Fiscal Years of 2015 (5.13% increase) and 2016 (9.87% increase), and before the New York Public Service Commission of the excess rates adopted by NYC for Fiscal Years 2014 (5.60% increase), 2015 (3.35% increase) and 2016 (2.97% increase); and

WHEREAS, the Village of Scarsdale also wishes to challenge the entitlement increase of 1.25% and excess water rate increase of 2.1% adopted by NYC for Fiscal Year 2017; and

WHEREAS, the NYSDEC will review the Entitlement Water Rate imposed by NYC if appropriately requested to do so; and

WHEREAS, since the Village receives all of its water from the NYC water system, the Village Manager recommends that the Village of Scarsdale authorize the petition to NYSDEC to review and establish the Entitlement Water Rate to be imposed by NYC for the taking of water from their system; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is hereby directed to authorize the firm of Dichter Law LLC, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022, to submit a petition to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to review and establish the Entitlement Rate to be imposed by New York City for the taking of water from their system; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is hereby authorized and directed to provide proper verification for this request as required by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation in a form that will satisfy the requirements of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

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

* * * * * * * *

Municipal Services Committee

Upon motion entered by Trustee Pekarek , and seconded by Trustee Samwick, the following resolution regarding Intent to Act as Lead Agency for SEQRA Review of the Cayuga Pond Stormwater and Sediment Reduction Water Quality Improvement Project was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, the 2009 Village Wide Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan found that the Sheldrake River Drainage Basin is one of the most complicated, flood-prone drainage basins in the Village; and

WHEREAS, the Village has aggressively pursued grant funding to support both water quality and flood mitigation projects in the Sheldrake River Drainage Basin, and, in 2015, completed several projects within the Sheldrake River sub-drainage basin 3 (SR-3) including infrastructure improvements and sediment removal to enhance both capacity and flow rates; and

WHEREAS, the Village was awarded a $1.4 million Water Quality Improvement Project (WQIP) from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation with a 25% (350,000) local match, a portion of which can be met through in –kind services, to continue these efforts with the Cayuga Pond Stormwater and Sediment Control Project (the Cayuga Pond project); and

WHEREAS, Cayuga Pond, located in the SR-3 critical sub-drainage basin, is also within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100 year flood plain; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Cayuga Pond project has several water quality and flood mitigation components including removing accumulated silt to restore the depth of the pond to its original bottom elevation, constructing a sediment forebay/spill pond to trap sediment and reduce downstream impacts and installing a pump station to manage stormwater flow and provide additional detention capacity; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board of Trustees has considered the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and Chapter 152 of the Village Code; and

WHEREAS, there are three agencies with permitting, funding or approval authority for this project, known as involved agencies pursuant to SEQRA: the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation with funding and permitting authority, the United States Army Corps of Engineers with permitting authority and the Scarsdale Village Board of Trustees with funding and approval authority; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, upon review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form, the Village Board determines the proposed action, as described above, is

an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA, 6 NYCRR 617.2(ak); and be it further

RESOLVED, the Village Board of Trustees hereby declares its intention to act as Lead Agency pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.6 (b) for the purpose of conducting a coordinated environmental review of the Cayuga Pond project and directs staff to transmit the Full Environmental Assessment Form to the involved agencies mentioned above with notification that a Lead Agency must be agreed upon within 30 days of said transmittal.

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 Authorization to Execute Change Order #1 to a Professional Services Agreement for Scarsdale Public Library Subsurface Investigation and Analysis Services was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, Dattner Architects (Dattner), the Village's Architect for the Scarsdale Library Addition and Renovation project, completed the pre-schematic and schematic design phases of the project in September 2015; and

WHEREAS, to design the proposed basement modifications, addition foundations and all other geotechnical aspects of the proposed project, a subsurface investigation, analysis and report with recommendations was necessary; and

WHEREAS, Hage Engineering (Hage), Dattner's structural engineering consultant, prepared the general requirements for the subsurface investigation and analysis based on the schematic design documents prepared by Dattner; and

WHEREAS, the Village solicited proposals for the subsurface investigation and analysis and received the lowest responsible proposal from Richard S.

Kessler, P.E., Consulting Geotechnical Engineer (Kessler), Little Falls, NJ for $41,760; and

WHEREAS, via resolution of May 10, 2016, the Village Board of Trustees authorized the Village Manager to execute a professional services agreement with Richard S. Kessler, P.E., Consulting Geotechnical Engineer (Kessler), 59 Jacobus Avenue, Little Falls, NJ 07424, for $41,760 to provide Geotechnical Engineering Services for the Scarsdale Public Library Addition and Renovation Project subsurface investigation and analysis (attached); and

WHEREAS, the subsurface investigation as outlined in said agreement commenced on June 2, 2016, and after the 3rd of the 15 borings was completed at a cost of $28,912.50, the work was suspended as a result of conditions described in the Kessler Subsurface Investigation and Analysis Report of July 13, 2016 (attached); and

WHEREAS, Kessler, in consultation with Dattner Architects, modified the technical requirements of the subsurface investigation and developed a change order titled "Proposal for Resumption of Subsurface Investigation and Analysis" (attached), totaling $40,915, which represents an additional $28,067.50 in added project cost; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the Village Manager to execute the attached June 21, 2016 proposal identified as Change Order #1 to the aforementioned May 10, 2016 agreement with Richard S. Kessler, P.E., Consulting Geotechnical Engineer, 59 Jacobus Avenue, Little Falls, NJ 07424, to provide additional Geotechnical Engineering Services for the Scarsdale Public Library Addition and Renovation Project subsurface investigation and analysis; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the additional Geotechnical Engineering Services identified in Change Order #1 be funded utilizing the available balances in the Library Capital Campaign Fund, specifically Account # HL-7497-964 2016-074 Library Capital Preliminary Project Services; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to undertake administrative acts that may be required pursuant to the terms of the Change Order #1 proposal.

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 Veron, the following resolution regarding Rejection of Bids for VM Contract #1187 – Rehabilitation of Ardsley Road Water Tank was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, the 750,000 gallon Ardsley Road Water Storage Tank requires an entire roof replacement, interior and exterior painting, and other safety and security upgrades to demonstrate compliance with various State and Federal guidelines; and

WHEREAS, via resolution dated May 26, 2015, attached, the engineering consulting firm of Professional Consulting, Inc., (PCI) was hired to provide the necessary engineering design services, cost estimates, and public bidding services; and

WHEREAS, based on PCI's preliminary cost estimate, the Board of Trustees provided an appropriation of $1,400,000 in the FY 2016/17 Capital Budget for the Ardsley Road Water Tank rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, the Village Manager reports that on June 22, 2016, he publicly advertised for the receipt of bids under VM Contract # 1187 – Rehabilitation of the 750,000 gallon Ardsley Road Water Tank, having sent proposals to fourteen vendors; and

WHEREAS, on the bid opening date of July 21, 2016, one bid was received from Scaturro Bros. Inc./Alpine Paint, 16 Chester Ave, Congers, NY 10920, for a total of $2,750,000, which was nearly double the PCI estimate; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the attached recommendation letter, PCI attributed the lack of bids to prospective bidders experiencing difficulty identifying a specialty roofing contractor required for the project, the higher than expected project cost due to a number of

variables, and, as such, recommended rejecting the bid and further modifying the bid specifications prior to rebidding the project; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends rejecting the sole bid received pursuant to VM #1187 and rebidding the project subject to revisions and reductions to the project scope and review and consideration of the project funding plan; 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 #1187; and it be further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is hereby authorized to reject the bid documents for the Ardsley Road Water Tank Rehabilitation in accordance with the New York State General Municipal Law, and to re-bid the project after adequate review and revisions to the project scope and funding.

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

* * * * * * * *

Upon motion entered by Trustee Stern, and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution Awarding VM Contract #1201 – Tree Work was approved by the vote indicated below:

WHEREAS, due to the volume of tree maintenance needs, necessity for assistance during emergencies and off-peak hours, and to protect the health, safety and welfare of the community, the Village requires contract support from a private tree care company; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2016, the Village Manager reports that he publicly advertised for the receipt of bids under VM Contract # 1201 – Tree Work, sent bid proposals via BidNet, and mailed bid proposals to five contractors to provide tree pruning and removal services; and

WHEREAS, the contract includes three separate proposals for pricing – Proposal A – Bucket Truck with Operator, Two Ground Men & Wood Chipper (Daily), Proposal B – Same as "A" for overtime hours, and Proposal C – 100 ft. Crane w/ Operator and Two Ground Men (Hourly); and

WHEREAS, on the bid opening date of Tuesday July 12, 2016, three sealed bids were received with the lowest responsible bid received from Almstead Tree & Shrub Care Company LLC, 58 Beechwood Avenue, New Rochelle, NY 10801, at the following prices: Proposal A – $2,521.00/day, Proposal B – $375.00/hour, Proposal C – $419/hour; and

WHEREAS, the contract term is two years, retroactive to June 1, 2016, through May 31, 2018, with an option to renew for one additional year at a price increase of four percent; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that VM Contract #1201 – Tree Work, is awarded to Almstead Tree & Shrub Care Company LLC, 58 Beechwood Avenue, New Rochelle, NY 10801, for a two year term at the following prices: Proposal A – $2,521.00/day, Proposal B – $375.00/hour, Proposal C – $419/hour, and; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the cost for FY 2016/17 be charged to General Fund Account # A-1490-HWY-SHDTR-400-483-1, for which $80,000 is budgeted, with the work for year two of the contract FY 2017/18 subject to adequate budget appropriations; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is hereby authorized and directed to execute VM Contract # 1201 with Almstead Tree & Shrub Care Company LLC, 58 Beechwood Avenue, New Rochelle, NY 10801; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this contract may be extended by the Village Manager for an additional one-year period subject to the availability of adequate budget appropriations; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to undertake administrative acts as may be required under the terms of the contract.

AYES	NAYS	ABSENT
Trustee Callaghan	None	None
Trustee Finger		

Trustee Pekarek
Trustee Samwick
Trustee Stern
Trustee Veron
Mayor Mark

* * * * * * * *

Upon motion entered by Trustee Stern, and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution regarding the Scarsdale Concours Car Show was approved by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, Scarsdale Concours has requested permission to hold the 13th Annual Scarsdale Concours Car Show in the Village Center on Sunday, October 2, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Scarsdale Concours Car Show requires the temporary closure of several streets in the Village Center (map attached), including Spencer Place, Harwood Court, Boniface Circle, and Chase Road, with the Scarsdale Police Department overseeing the street closures and providing traffic control during the event; and

WHEREAS, the Scarsdale Concours Car Show is an event coordinated by dedicated volunteers, including former Scarsdale High School students and Village residents, and has been successfully held in the Village of Scarsdale for the past twelve years; and

WHEREAS, the event draws over 100 antique car owner participants, hundreds of spectators, dozens of sponsors, involves showcasing vintage and new cars, and generates proceeds which are donated to local service organizations, including the Scarsdale/Edgemont Family Counseling Service, Paulie Strong Foundation, and Scarsdale Police Benevolent Association Warrior and Family Assistance Fund; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Village Board is desirous of accommodating this event and grants permission to hold the 13th Annual Scarsdale Concours in the Village Center on Sunday, October 2, 2016, conditioned on the timely receipt of a certificate of insurance listing the Village of Scarsdale as an additional insured; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Manager is herein authorized to execute the attached Village Event Permit form.

* * * * * * * *

Personnel Committee

Upon motion entered by Trustee Veron , and seconded by Trustee Pekarek, the following resolution regarding a Re-Appointment to the Committee for Historic Preservation was adopted by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, in accordance with Village Code §182-3, the Village Board of Trustees may appoint up to seven members and one alternate to the Committee for Historic Preservation ("CHP") for three year terms; and

WHEREAS, Matthew D. Schwarz was appointed to the CHP for a term expiring on April 4, 2016, or until such time as a successor is appointed; and

WHEREAS, Matthew D. Schwarz has expressed an interest in being re-appointed to the CHP; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that Matthew D. Schwarz, 26 Montrose Road, is herein re-appointed to the Committee for Historic Preservation ("CHP") for a term expiring April 1, 2019, or until such time as a successor is appointed.

* * * * * * * *

Other Committee Reports

Trustee Stern stated that included with the water bills that were just recently sent out to residents, there was an insert entitled "LED Pilot Locations" and a description entitled Village LED Streetlight Pilot Program underway. It is a very user friendly way of looking at this. The Village has taken an extraordinary step in forming a committee, putting in a pilot program, and asking Village residents for their reaction to these LED lights. The map that was sent with the water bills shows where the LED lights are located. He encouraged every single resident to go to the locations and look at these lights and supply their feedback, good or bad.

* * * * * * * *

Liaison Reports

Trustee Callaghan reported on the Parks and Recreation Advisory Council, stating that the Recreation Department is working with the PRC in trying to get more parking spaces at Hyatt Field. Plans have been sent out to the members of the PRC and a meeting will be held in the fall to review this to see what can be done.

Trustee Callaghan next reported that last Friday evening at their evening services, the Westchester Reform Temple gave special recognition to the Emergency Response Agencies in Scarsdale. As Fire Commissioner, he was very pleased to be there. He noted that Rabbi Blake went out of his way to make all the volunteer and paid firefighters feel at home. He included the recognition in the services and in the readings about how important the volunteers are in this community. It was very warmly received and Trustee Callaghan stated that he wanted to make note of it to the Board and have it noted in the record; especially when people go out of their way for volunteers – it is very much appreciated.

* * * * * * * *

Trustee Veron announced that an Ad Hoc Committee on Communications will be formed in connection with the upcoming launch of the Village's new communications platform that Village staff has been working diligently on. The goal of that Committee is threefold: develop strategies to engage residents; solicit feedback; and to ensure that the experience is user-friendly. She encouraged residents to submit their resumes online through the Boards and Councils menu.

* * * * * * * *

Written Communications

Village Clerk Conkling stated that forty-three (43) 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.

Thirty (30) emails & letters regarding the 2016 Revaluation were received from the following:

- Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez, Fox Meadow Road (5)
- Gary Levy
- Howard & Frieda Weitz, 29 Lawrence Road
- Dan Moretti & Mary Beth Evans, 16 Edgewood Road
- C. Jeffrey Stein, 92 Penn Road
- Barry & Emma Kula, 300 Boulevard
- Barbara Wabeck, 11 Windmill Lane
- Liying Tang & Shengquan Peng, 109 Brambach Road
- Avner Reggev, 25 Woodland Place
- Marcus Reidenberg, 39 Greenacres Avenue
- Margaret & Gerry Hill, 5 Jefferson Road
- Robert Malenitza
- Resident, 4 Kathy Lane

- Ray Silverman, 250 Madison Road
- Mike Levine
- Xin Liu, 13 Hampton Road
- Susan Levine, Ardmore Road
- Sheila Stempler
- Sara & David Kober
- Phyllis Stagg-Pilla & Ed Pilla
- Robert Berg, 32 Tisdale Road (2)
- Richard Adelaar, 46 Fenimore Road
- Ellen Bierman, 50 Popham Road, Apt. 4F
- Chenggang Zhou, 3 Ridgecrest North
- Preston Lurie & Sarah Weinshel, 101 Spier Road

Four (4) emails regarding the Library Renovations were received from the following:

- ML Perlman
- Mayra Kirkendall-Rodriguez, Fox Meadow Road
- James Allocco, Ross Road
- Susan Levine, Ardmore Road

Four (4) emails regarding Grasscycling were received from the following:

- Rona Shamoon, 48 Edgewood Road (2)
- Bob Harrison, 65 Fox Meadow Road
- Susan Levine, Ardmore Road

Additional Correspondence was received as follows:

- An email from Roger Neustadt regarding speeding vehicles.
- An email from Carolyn Mehta regarding public right of way deposits.
- An email from Ron Schulof & Michelle Sterling regarding Food Scrap Recycling.
- A letter from Susan & Stephen Samtur in opposition to a proposed pool at 36 Herkimer Road.
- An email from Debra Hyman, 6 Ogden Road regarding potholes on the Fox Meadow Road sidewalk

* * * * * * * *

There being no further business to come before the Board, Trustee Finger moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:40 P.M., seconded by Trustee Samwick and carried by a unanimous vote.

_____

Donna M. Conkling
Village Clerk