

VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 21, 2011

A Regular Meeting was held by the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, June 21, 2011 at 7:37 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: Mayor Peter Swiderski, Trustee Jeremiah Quinlan, Trustee Meg Walker, Trustee Nicola Armacost, Village Manager Francis A. Frobel, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Clerk Susan Maggiotto.

ABSENT: Trustee Bruce Jennings.

CITIZENS: Sixteen (16).

Mayor Swiderski: Trustee Jennings had a last-minute medical emergency. He is fine but, under orders of doctor, at home.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On MOTION of Trustee Armacost, SECONDED by Trustee Walker with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Executive Session of June 7, 2011 and the Minutes of the Public Hearing of June 9, 2011 were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF WARRANTS

On MOTION of Trustee Armacost, SECONDED by Trustee Walker with a voice vote of all in favor, the following Warrants were approved:

Multi-Fund No. 5-2011-12 \$263,388.24

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Gonder, 153 James Street: I just wanted to discuss your budget again. Three, four weeks ago, you would not give Trustee Armacost 24 or 48 hours. Four of you voted for the budget, 4.18 percent. The year before, it was 4 ½ percent. You thought your budget process was good this year. It was terrible. You chased Faith Evans, one of your Democrats that lived in this village for a long time, out of the village. Even though her politics were different than mine, she always fought for things that she believed in, even in the school. And she was at a lot of meetings, always giving her comments. Not only the seniors you are chasing out, but you are chasing out young people. You talk about affordable housing? You need 300 or 400 units of affordable housing in this village to keep some of the seniors and some of the young people.

Your 2000 plan, when they took the census, said the average income was \$111,000 or so. I do not know what it is for 2010, but some people just cannot afford the high things that you have. Even the *Enterprise* editor and Faith Evans' letter reminds us the river towns remain a pricey place to live, even for residents with deep roots in this area. Officials need to keep in mind, and continue to cut costs because of the recession. I think some of you people have been in your positions too long. Maybe you should only serve three two-year terms. Need some young blood and some different points of view. I hope Governor Cuomo gets his 2 percent cap through. I know he is going to have problems, but you are killing a lot of us.

Roger Scheiber, 104 Overlook Road: I have a prepared statement I would like to read. I would have preferred to use the Village e-mail to counter the information that was sent out from the PTSA subcommittee against the property tax cap. I felt that an opinion of another side should be offered through the e-mail, but I have not been offered that opportunity.

"New Yorkers have long been some of the highest real estate property taxes in the country, with homeowners' taxes in most of the state ranging from 30 percent to 178 percent above the national average as a percentage of property values. Between 1999 and 2009, property tax levies outside New York City increased by 5.4 percent, more than double the average of inflation of 2.6 percent. School taxes grew the fastest, an average of 6.3 percent." I am going to be talking about school taxes because the issue is school taxes that was brought up in the e-mail. "Property taxes in New York kept going up even as property values, personal incomes, and consumer prices were going down. Keeping a campaign promise, and expanding on a proposal first introduced by his predecessors, Governor Cuomo is pushing to cap school district and local government property taxes in all areas of the state, except New York City. Passed in the state Senate with strong bipartisan support, its fate will ultimately be decided in the state assembly.

"Learning from the mistakes from the 1977-78 California Proposition 13, the proposed New York cap is modeled on Proposition 2 ½, a property tax limitation adopted in 1980 by the voters of Massachusetts. Under Proposition 2 ½, the states and local tax burden in Massachusetts has decreased, without harming public services. In fact, despite the constraints imposed on school spending by Prop 2 1/2, public schools in Massachusetts generally rank among the best in the country. While the Massachusetts limit is 2 ½ percent, Cuomo's proposed tax cap would be 2 percent, or the rate of inflation, whichever is less. Counties, cities, towns, and villages could exceed the tax cap in a given year if a two-thirds majority of their governing body approved. A tougher restriction

would apply to school districts. Cuomo's bill would eliminate annual voter referendums of proposed school district budget, replacing them with votes on proposed tax levies. A supermajority of at least 60 percent of the voters of the school district referendum would be required to approve a tax increase exceeding the cap. An increase below the cap would still require the approval of at least a simple majority of voters. If a district's tax hike failed to win approval after two referendums, the tax levy would revert to the previous year's level, a zero percent increase. Opponents of the tax, mainly teachers, unions, and their allies, frequently contend that limits on taxes will have a devastating impact in the wake of state aid cuts. But they offer no alternatives other than policies that would drive taxes even higher on both the state and local levels. These opponents claim the cap would erode democracy by making it more difficult to raise taxes above the cap. However, Cuomo's proposal would be more democratic than New York's current system, which allows school districts to impose state-mandated minimum budgets and the tax hikes necessary to pay for them without voter approval.

"Local school financing in New York now effectively rests on the baseline assumption of a 4 percent contingency spending growth. This issue, an annual budget referendum, is the extent to which districts will be allowed to spend above the minimal level. The tax cap would shift the focus from spending to taxes, focusing school officials to budget on the assumption there can be no increase in the district tax levy without voter approval. Local government, and school officials, understandably are worried about the possible consequences of the tax cap. Faced with a combination of shrinking state aid and mounting costs, especially for employee benefits and pensions, they fear they will have no choice but to cut essential public services. Thanks to state laws and mandates, many of these costs are difficult for local officials to control in the short term. The answer, however, is not to pass rising costs to property owners, adding an already overwhelming tax burden. The cap will bring intense added pressure on state officials to stop ignoring the local consequences of state mandates they impose on local governments, especially those affecting and shaping employee compensation.

"Local governments and schools have fought these mandates for decades without success because lawmakers knew that the cost could ultimately be passed to the local taxpayers. School districts and other local governments must be given greater flexibility to manage their expenses, especially personnel costs which account for third quarters of their operating budget. Reform needs to begin with the Triborough Provision of the Taylor Law,

which guarantees continuing pay increase, even in the absence of a contract and with repeal of the provision effectively disallowing changes in retiree benefits unless the same change is negotiated with current employees. As former governor, David Patterson, put it when he introduced New York's first property tax limitation bill in 2008, 'All of us understand that the cap is a blunt instrument, but it is needed to force hard choices and to address the fact that New York's local tax burden is the highest in the nation.'

"School taxes account for 61 percent of all property taxes levied in New York as of 2008, and for 59 percent of the average residential property tax bill. But school taxes are more than half the average residential bill in 42 out of the 58 countries outside of New York City. Heavy property tax burdens strain household budgets and drive up the cost of doing business throughout New York. In downstate suburbs, high tax bills put home ownership further out of the reach of many young families. In less-affluent upstate communities, high tax rates undermine property values and feed a viscous cycle of disinvestment in urban real estate.

The adoption of a property tax cap would be a departure from physical tradition in New York. In fact, as noted above, the state's constitutional tax caps on counties, cities, and villages date way back to the 19th century. More recently, just 2 years before Governor Pataki proposed a levy cap in the original 1997 STAR Bill, a cap on all property taxes in the state was proposed by assembly speaker, Sheldon Silver, and passed by the lower house of the legislature. Governor Cuomo's proposal for a broad and tight cap on property tax levies, allowing for override only by supermajority votes, offers a promising way to contribute New York tax and spending burden.

Common criticisms of the tax simply do not stand up to its scrutiny. In Massachusetts, Proposition 2 ½ restrained growth in tax burdens without compromising essential services. Far from eroding local control, Cuomo's cap would give taxpayers new power to check the growth of school taxes. Having taken the first step towards greater control of property taxes, the governor and tax cap supporters in the state Senate must avoid agreeing to exceptions or exclusions that would reduce such a cap to a mere symbol. For example, teachers' pension costs alone are projected to rise by the equivalent of 3 ½ percent of the school tax levy over the next 5 years. And data from the state Conference of Mayors indicates that the city's and villages' levies would have to increase by more than 8 percent a year just to keep pace with projected increases in pensions and benefits for municipal employees.

"Imitating New Jersey and increasing these fastest-rising employee compensation costs from New York cap would be tantamount to imposing no cap at all. County, municipal, and school officials have argued persuasively that they need relief from state mandates to manage expenses within a tight property tax cap. But in putting the cap in first, Governor Cuomo and the senate have kept their priorities in the right order. The tax cap is an essential catalyst for the changes in state mandates that local government and school districts have fruitlessly seeking for decades. In passing the cap, state officials will also have to stop passing the buck for generous pension benefits and collective bargaining rules tilted against the interests of the taxpayer. The tax cap will have a twofold effect. It will instill greater fiscal discipline in local government and schools, and will put tremendous added pressure on the governor and the legislature to finally get serious about mandate relief."

44:11 RETIREMENT PLAN SECTION 384-f FOR POLICE OFFICERS

Village Manager Frobel: I first brought this to the Board's attention a number of weeks ago. It was on the agenda last meeting, with the intent of trying to generate some additional information. We wrote to the State Comptroller's office trying to get a figure as to future cost. The initial cost is the \$430 but we were concerned what our cost could be 25 years into the future. They are unable to generate that number. It depends on the number of men that may continue to work beyond 25 years, their average salary at the time, and the rate of return for the plan. We have had some very good years for the plan. Lately, it has been in financial difficulty. But there were years where we made no contribution at all.

There are some unknowns. What we do know is that it is an opportunity for us to capitalize on the experience of a young police officer; a police officer who is coming on today; two of them have expressed interest in continuing beyond the 25 years or at least having this option available. I think it holds great value to the organization to retain employees after 25 years of service, and this is one option that we would like to extend to them. The Chief can answer any questions about that longevity theory of mine.

Police Chief Bloomer: A couple of issues were raised at the last meeting that I would like to speak on. Somebody on the Board mentioned do we want our police officers to stay beyond 25 years. Maybe because I am the only one that is here beyond 25 years in my department, I said that sounds like a question I can answer. We recently lost two of our senior officers, Detective Sergeant Palumbo and Sergeant White, and they had a combined 65 years experience. Although they have been replaced aptly by Officer Bottiglieri and Officer

Pacheco, it will take several years to train them and get them back to a position, and then train the officers that have replaced Sergeant White and Sergeant Palumbo.

Experience is a hard thing to quantify, but I would ask you this question. Mayor, if your son was ill and needed to go to a doctor would you take him to the experienced doctor that had 20 or 25 years of experience, or would you take him to the guy that has been working for a couple of weeks? If one of your children had to hire an attorney and their future was on the line, would you take them to the attorney who has been working for 25 or 30 years and has dealt with all of the cases that could possibly come up, or would you take them to somebody who just passed the bar? Experience is a tough thing to measure. In our department, it is invaluable. Especially in a small town it is invaluable because we see the same people every day, we see the same types of calls at the same houses every day, and you develop a rapport with the public. Sometimes an experienced officer is much more able to calm a situation than an inexperienced officer would be.

I do not think you can measure that salary-wise. I would not know how to start to do that. With all the talk of pensions being the hot-button topic, it is an issue everywhere. I understand that. If the state was looking to save money they would not keep somebody here five extra years. You are paying them five extra years of salary, and their pension therefore will be higher based on that. But having said that, with all the perks that we have -- I have heard person upon person come up and outline those perks once the budget started -- I do not have a viable list to hire from. If somebody retired from my department there is no list. There are not a lot of people that view it as such a great opportunity that they are taking this test and passing the test, and are ready, willing, and able to be hired. We have no list as of now. The next test will not be until December, 2012, which means the next list will not be available until August, 2013. We can hire a transfer; there are other ways to hire an officer. But in my experience, the local guy, somebody who grew up here, somebody who has a connection to this village, is much more valuable than hiring somebody from out of town.

Changing the retirement system from 20 to 25 years is a huge change in whether people will want to work at this job or not. Certainly, I am not crying poverty, but there are only two officers in our entire department that have houses in this village. They are not making a lot of money. They are making money, but I am here 27 years and I do not have a house here. I have a co-op. I am very concerned that by moving it from 20 to 25 years, which has been done, that bell has been rung, it is going to limit who is interested in this position. And I want to be able to choose from a list that has many options and many great officers to choose from. I think this perk after 25 years, if somebody stays that long, may offset in some ways the hardship of staying the extra five years. And it is a hardship. If you are not promoted here, that means you go around the clock every third week. You work holidays, you work weekends. I am not crying. That is what you signed up for. You knew that that was the job

when you came. But the rules have changed, the retirement is different. It is five more years. I think the $1/66^{\text{th}}$ per year after 25 is something worthwhile.

Mayor Swiderski: What is the $1/66^{\text{th}}$ in reference to?

Village Manager Frobel: Their final average salary. They take an average of the last three years, and beyond 25 years they get 1.66 percent of that times the number of years they worked. If they worked two years, two times that, five years, et cetera. So if you left here at, say, a final average year's salary of \$86,000 that represents about \$1,500 a year additional pension that you would be accruing times the number of years that you worked. Up to age 62 is the maximum they can work. If they are chief of police, they can work until they are 65. So there is a cap on the number of years they can work, even beyond the 25.

Police Chief Bloomer: It does not affect any of the current officers, other than the two that were just hired and then any prospective. We already have these two. They are locked in so I am not so worried about them. But I am concerned with, going forward, what kind of list we are going to have, who we are going to attract to this job.

Trustee Armacost: Do we have to decide this today? It would be very useful to get the data that no one can get before we decide. If it is not affecting anyone right now, anyone we have hired, and it is not going to affect anyone until 2013, I am not clear why we are rushing to do this without that data.

Village Manager Frobel: I think the variable is the entrance fee. The \$430 today is only guaranteed for one year. If anything, that is the urgency. We agree with you. These men are looking at 25 years. We could conceivably have joined this, I guess, after 20 years of their service, make that decision at that time. They have one year to join 384-f after the Village opts into it.

Trustee Armacost: But what is the urgency of today?

Hastings Police Officer Pavone: I have been the PBA representative for over four years. With that waiting, next month it will be 12 years I have been a police officer. Within the last three years, New York State has changed the New York State Police and Fire retirement system twice. I started in Tier 2. That provides for a 20-year retirement. In 2008-2009 they switched to a Tier 3. It is the same thing: a 25-year retirement, plus payment into your pension. They decreased all the death benefits for Tier 3 members. So through lobbying and legislation, all the police units came up with Tier 5, which offers the 25-year with the same death benefits as we have in Tier 2. My point is that the retirement system is changing so much, if we wait on this New York State could, and I am sure they are trying as we speak,

next or the year after, possibly get rid of that 384-f. Or if we wait two years it may not be on the table anymore for the officers to get into.

Trustee Armacost: But I am not talking about waiting two years. These are calculations that you can extrapolate so you have a better sense of the ultimate cost burden. So like waiting a month so that someone can do those calculations. If the state comptroller will not do it, then we have a finance team here that should be able to put some kind of...

Village Manager Frobelt: I cannot. Part of the variable is the likelihood of the numbers working beyond 25 years, what the wages will be 25 years in the future, the rate of return the plan will realize. There were some very good years and, right now, there are some difficult years in terms of their investment strategies. I have had two conversations with the staff, I put it in writing. I quoted exactly in my report her comments. I am at a loss.

Mayor Swiderski: Are they saying they cannot release it now, or is it that we have not done a full year's cycle under the new plan? Tell me what happens when they released the numbers. Did they release it by tier, so that when they do the annual release of numbers in November or whenever it is they will give us the different numbers by tier?

Village Manager Frobelt: We will get an estimate in December. It is just one raw number. We have the group divided into two plans but I am not sure if it is broken into the two individual plans. I cannot recall.

Mayor Swiderski: And the lump sum, it is not a rate. It is a sum, right?

Village Manager Frobelt: It is a sum.

Mayor Swiderski: And when we get the final number, is that a sum again, or is there any rate factor in it?

Village Manager Frobelt: It is a raw number. I do not believe it is broken into the two different classes, under the two different plans. It is one number we get.

Mayor Swiderski: Actuarial calculations can be a monster, but there has got to be a factor.

Trustee Armacost: There has to be. Otherwise, it is completely unacceptable. There is no rationale behind the payment. That is what makes it scary for you guys, as well, if you feel that that is what is happening. There has to be a way to make the calculation understandable. If we are making choices now that are going to have implications in 25 years, we need to know what they are at the end of the day. Otherwise it is irresponsible

Trustee Walker: There would have to be some assumptions: this calculation is based on an assumption that we are going to have to kick something into the pension, or this calculation is going to be based on the assumption that the pay increase is going to be salary increase and it is going to be X. But there are an endless number of assumptions that you would have to make, and it might be too big a range to even be useful to us. I am picturing how you would do the calculations. I do not understand actuarials.

Village Manager Frobel: It is a complicated science. That is why I went back, at the Board's request, to press them, and that is the answer I got: that they are unwilling or unable to give us that accurate estimate. I agree. That is something you would want to know. What would this cost us 25 years in the future? I am at a loss.

Trustee Walker: Based on where we are right now; based on the salary increases we have seen over the last 10 years, based on the way the pension fund has been performing over the last 10 years. Based on these assumptions, then what it is going to look like.

Trustee Armacost: You can do averages of performance. That is how people calculate things. They do averages. You take a period of time, whatever you decide is the reasonable period whether it is 10 years or 15 years or 25 years, and you average that out. And then that gives you a sense. But to make a decision without having even tried to do that makes me uncomfortable. There are too many decisions we are making where the data is not solid enough, for me at least, to make those decisions. Maybe I am asking for something that is too difficult to give, but we should at least try.

Trustee Walker: Who is going to make those calculations?

Trustee Armacost: If you have the data, you have to decide what the time period you are dealing with is. Is it five years, is it 10 years, is it 15 years, is it 25 years? If we are projecting 25 years into the future, then you want to look back on averages for the past 25 years, and then you see what has been the average increase. We have got people here who have done this for other things, and they can tell you what the average increase is and what that would look like at the end of the day. Then you can see more or less what is at stake.

Mayor Swiderski: I do not think it is even that complicated. It is an issue of the marginal difference between the two plans. I do not think we have to guess anything more than that. There needs to be an indication if this plan is one percent more a year. I am not looking for a 25-year analysis. Backward-looking will not do much good here because this has all sorts of assumptions that have to be baked into the equation about how many employees will take up on this plan, how long they will stay beyond 25. All those are only manifest in whatever a

differential extra is, and we do not know what that is. If it is one percent, it might be a shrug. If it is 10 percent it might not be. Without a sense of that, there is uncertainty as you say.

Trustee Armacost: Having missed the last meeting, trying to understand what was said, and maybe there were nuances when I am reading that I am missing, it feels like an emotional decision as opposed to a fact-based decision. That is not a great way to make decisions.

Trustee Quinlan: We can be sure that it is going to cost the Village more money. The question is do we want to commit to that. But I am trying to understand the concept, and maybe one of the officers can help me. So we used to have you could retire in 20 years. Now they are making you, depending on when you were hired, retire in 25 years. You are 20 years, and these young officers will be 25.

Officer Pavone: Twenty-five years, yes.

Trustee Quinlan: So after 25 years you get a pension.

Officer Pavone: That is right.

Trustee Quinlan: And what are we voting for tonight? That if they work longer than 25 years they will get a higher pension?

Officer Pavone: Every year after your 25th year you are going to get 1.66 percent of your final average salary. When you talk final average salary, again, the system is changing so much. Final average salary used to be one year for Tier 1. When Tier 2 came up in 1973, the final average salary consists, and it still does to this day, of your three final years' average salary. So 1.66 percent of your final average salary.

Trustee Quinlan: So if you work one year, you get 1.66 percent of your final average salary. If you work two, you get twice. If you work five, you get five times 1.66 percent. That is all subject to change, right?

Officer Pavone: Yes. Again, I cannot foresee that. But the way it has been the last three years, last meeting Village Manager Frobel said it: it is very confusing. I am trying to keep up with it myself, but there have been two tier changes in the last three years; there have been two article changes. So it is constantly changing.

Trustee Quinlan: Would you be happy if you could retire in 25 years, or are you happy that you can retire in 20 years? Do you personally consider it a benefit for you that you are in the 20 year plan, or would you rather be in the 25 year plan?

Officer Pavone: I do not think I can answer that right now. The benefit for officers before this new tier came on was the job attraction of 20 years. We are working around the clock. Holidays, when you are with your families we are working. Weekends we are working. Again, like Chief Bloomer said, we knew what we were getting into when we started so I am not trying to pull any punches here. And yes, it is one of the attractions and one of the benefits of being a police officer. Making it 25 years, again, it is just an incentive for the officers. Some people cannot handle the shift work after 20 years, some people can. It affects everybody differently. But if you are an officer that likes the job, and you have stayed 25 years and you feel like staying longer, it is an incentive.

Trustee Quinlan: Let us say everybody we hire decides that 25 years is enough. Most people would probably agree that they could do it for 25 years. Will we be paying into the pension for the next 25 years, despite the fact that no police officer decides to work the 26th year?

Officer Pavone: Again, we would have to work on those numbers to get those numbers realistic.

Trustee Quinlan: Will we be paying more? I am not looking for a number. I do not care if it is \$1 or \$100.

Officer Pavone: The only information that I have right now is there is a one-time fee to adopt this plan. I believe that the reason that they are not giving Mr. Frobel these numbers is because, again, they are unwilling or they will not give us those numbers unless we adopt this plan. I do not have any more information as far as the yearly cost.

Trustee Quinlan: All right. But, Fran, maybe you can answer. Can we assume that it will cost more every year?

Village Manager Frobel: Yes.

Trustee Quinlan: So it is going to cost the Village more every year no matter what the police officers do.

Officer Pavone: That would be a fair assumption.

Trustee Armacost: You need to know what the implications are before you adopt something like that. I think you do not just say yes. I think it is a very good question.

Trustee Quinlan: I have to decide whether I am going to burden the Village and the taxpayers in the future with more money to pay into a pension plan when I am not sure any of the officers are going to want to work after 25 years. The feeling I get from you, and maybe the other officers I know, is that they are probably going to retire the minute they are able to.

Officer Pavone: You do not know that.

Trustee Quinlan: I do not know that, but I am guessing.

Officer Pavone: I think that is an unfair assumption.

Trustee Quinlan: I would guess they would. Most people I know will retire. If they work for the government or for a village or for unions, they usually will retire the minute they hit the maximum years and a maximum amount that they are going to get.

Officer Pavone: I think that is an unfair assumption. I think that is impossible to foresee.

Trustee Quinlan: Maybe it is.

Mayor Swiderski: But the maximum amount here grows. So there is an incentive. That is the point of the plan.

Trustee Quinlan: So the point of the plan is that the incentive would be that they would make more money. I am willing to do it because I think police officers are great, I think they work hard. Niki is right that it is an emotional issue. But we have to be one of the only people in government that are discussing increasing pensions on June 21 of 2011. Everybody else is reducing pensions or cutting pensions or making more contribution into pension plans and to health plans. And we are now discussing increasing pensions?

Officer Pavone: Twenty-five years down the road, yes, you are.

Trustee Quinlan: Yes, but I have to worry about that because I will not be here.

Officer Pavone: Right. And I worry about it, too. To your point, Officer Pacheco is 21 years old. So in 25 years, my guess is that he will not retire. He will be 45 years old. So I would make a safe assumption that he would still be here. Officer Bottiglieri is 26 years old, so in 25 years he will be 51. I would doubt he would be retiring at that age, too. So I do not think you would be putting money into a system. The other points that you raise are valid:

the point about are we going to be paying into something that nobody is going to cash in on. I think they will both be here at 25 years. I think that is probably a safe assumption.

Trustee Armacost: But it is not down the line in the sense that you have to pay now in order for it to be recouped down the line. So it is a decision that affects people. As soon as we make the decision it has an effect. Part of the dilemma that we have is we do not know how much money it is going to be even on a yearly basis. My only concern is just lack of data to make a sensible decision. That is really my problem.

Officer Pavone: That is the problem that we have all had with this. My only point is that these officers will be very young in 25 years and I would doubt that they would leave.

Trustee Walker: But are there not two questions? One is how much we are going to pay after they hit their 25-year mark. That is hard. We do not know how many officers there will be or what their salary will be then. But can we answer the question: what we are going to have to be paying over the next few years into this fund?

Mayor Swiderski: That is arguably the only interesting question. The pension is determined on a per-year basis. What the payout is down the road is truly immaterial to us. It is what do we have to part with, as a village. From a financial perspective, that is the only decision.

Trustee Walker: And maybe it is really minimal, but we do not know.

Trustee Armacost: But this is the part I find impossible, that we cannot be told what that is going to be, and be able to make a decision. If we know it is two police officers and we know what they are paid, surely it is not that difficult to calculate.

Trustee Quinlan: It is not just two officers. It is all the officers that are being hired that are young in the system.

Trustee Armacost: But there are not any others. There are only two.

Trustee Quinlan: No, in Hastings there are. But in other villages there might be, and they are all part of the union. But I do agree with you. I mean, if this is \$100 a year I would say yes, let us do it.

Trustee Armacost: Of course, but if it is \$30,000 a year.

Trustee Quinlan: But if it is \$10,000 a year, it might not be worth it. Maybe the union, or the people, are not giving us a figure because they do not want us to know.

Mayor Swiderski: I do not think they know yet. This is a new plan.

Trustee Armacost: Then why do we have to decide today? Why do we not wait until they know? Maybe they will know in August, maybe they will know in September, maybe they will know in October. The data may end up being extremely persuasive, in which case you will have everyone voting in favor. But if the data is disturbing, then we will be happy we did not vote today. I do not want to have regrets about something like that.

Trustee Walker: I think we are all clear that it is not the amount that is going to be paid out after 25 years. It is the amount we have to pay out in the next 25 years over time. And what is it next year? Maybe it is nothing, or maybe it increases gradually over time. How do they calculate that? Or are we just paying after they hit 25?

Trustee Quinlan: I want to thank you for answering my questions because now, at least, I understand what the situation is. There are just too many variables: how many, will people want to work longer? I have a lot of friends that are New York City firemen and they retired the minute they could because they could not stand the shift work, they could not stand the danger, they could not stand this, they could not stand that. They are out playing golf, calling me up, saying let us play golf on Tuesday down at Pelham Bay. And they have been retired since they have been 50 and they are happy.

Trustee Armacost: Who is the decision-maker on the amount of money? Is it the state comptroller's office, or is it someone else?

Village Manager Frobel: The state comptroller's office is the agency responsible for administering the state pension plan, and they are the ones that do the actuarial studies. They are the ones that, each year, mail out an invoice to the member communities, telling them based on your salaries, here is your contribution into this plan to keep it solvent.

Trustee Armacost: But can we, instead of voting on this, say that we would like to write an official letter? I will work with you, if you like, to draft the letter. You can draft it, and we can work together, to ask for this data.

Village Manager Frobel: I did. That is what I said at the beginning of my comments. I wrote the letter because I wanted it writing, based on our conversation at the last meeting. Spoke to a woman on two occasions. She wrote back, called right away, saying we do not have that information to give you. I pressed her, saying, the Board needs to know because to make a decision we need to know what it will cost us on an annual basis. As I indicated in my written report, exact quote from her conversation and I saved the tape from the call, too

many variables to make that kind of calculation. And that is where we sit. I told her then we are going to have a hard time, in all probability, signing on for this plan. And that seems to be where we are this evening.

Trustee Quinlan: Let's say we decide to opt in, and it is \$1,000 in year one. Will that \$1,000 be held for these two young gentlemen for when they retire, or will it be used to pay the pensions of people that are retiring tomorrow?

Mayor Swiderski: It all goes into the same, and is not a personal savings account. It is a pension fund.

Officer Pavone: Mr. Frobel has been terrific with this whole thing. New York State, when you get to a certain point in requesting numbers and adopting more tiers and the benefits that they have to offer, they will not deal with me, or even Chief Bloomer for that matter. They do go through Mr. Frobel, and whatever you need we would be willing to work more closely with you as long as we need.

Trustee Walker: Could your union help?

Officer Pavone: Again, we have called the state concerning Officer Bottiglieri and Officer Pacheco. And when you get to a certain point as far as projections, numbers, they want to hear through Mr. Frobel.

Trustee Quinlan: And what is the time limit that we have to decide this? You said a year from when?

Village Manager Frobel: The price to join was guaranteed for one year, the \$430. But you will be able to opt in as long as this plan is offered. As the police officer mentioned, it is changing constantly. Two years from now, this opportunity may not exist. It may still be; it may be for 20 years.

Trustee Quinlan: So we can opt in for \$430 per officer?

Village Manager Frobel: No, the total.

Trustee Quinlan: For one year. When does that one year start, and when does it end?

Village Manager Frobel: I think in the letter it said March 31, 2012.

Mayor Swiderski: And at that point, only officers hired past a certain day are eligible. If we do not do this now, and wait for preliminary numbers to come out of the state, will those officers have lost the opportunity to sign up for this? Or are they put into the other pension plan? How does this work for them?

Village Manager Frobel: They are already in another plan. They are in the 384. These officers have one year from the date the Village opts into the plan to join this plan.

Trustee Armacost: So we have until March, and that gives them a year after March to decide if they want to join. So I feel like we have a little more time.

Mayor Swiderski: I think that is the clear outcome of this discussion. I do not think we have to move any further.

Trustee Armacost: Fran, I am willing to help on this and work with whoever. If we can be persuasive, the comptroller was quite helpful to me when I was asking questions the other day. Which does not mean the comptroller will be helpful this time, but sometimes having a different person ask questions is good.

Mayor Swiderski: Well, it is also an actuarial cycle. And when they issued the new numbers, at that point they have to have something in hand.

Trustee Quinlan: I do not want this to get lost in the shuffle and I do not want to wait until March because if it is not much money I am all for it. I think it is a good thing if everybody likes it and they want to do it. We can have more experience, and we can have people longer on the job. And 45 is very young to retire. My guess is, Niki, I do not think we are ever going to get a number out of these people. They obviously do not want to give it to us. So we will have to decide without the number, but I do not want to let it go.

Village Manager Frobel: I will not lose track of it.

Mayor Swiderski: I would argue it is whatever point that we have some actuarial numbers issued for the year is probably when they run their calculations. And at that time, we are more likely to get something than not. It is worth waiting for that point.

**48:11 AUTHORIZATION OF CERTIORARI SETTLEMENT – ERISSA REALTY,
1-3-5 MAIN STREET**

Village Manager Frobel: At the last meeting you heard from special counsel who handles these tax certiorari matters for you. It involves property on Main Street, five retail stores, a

few residential apartments above it. After consultation with the attorney, he believes this is one that should be settled by the Village.

Trustee Quinlan: I am going to vote in favor of this settlement, but I have a big problem with the process and the way things seem to go in these matters for villages. This case has been pending for 10 years, and it is being settled for \$43,000 and change. I cannot understand how a case that is going to settle for \$43,000 has been pending for 10 years.

Mayor Swiderski: Has it been pending for 10 years, or is it covering 10 years?

Trustee Quinlan: I see 2002.

Mayor Swiderski: Well, there is a difference. They have not been coming every year since 2002.

Trustee Quinlan: They went backwards?

Mayor Swiderski: Yes.

Trustee Quinlan: OK, so when did they file the suit?

Mayor Swiderski: These are typically brought in arrears for years.

Trustee Quinlan: That is a good point, but can you tell me then how I am wrong? Or you are just guessing.

Mayor Swiderski: No, I know over the years that is how these things work. It is always brought in arrears. They tend to do them in several years bundled together into a single settlement.

Trustee Walker: Although there have been some, it seemed to me, that have dragged on for a few years.

Trustee Quinlan: That is a point well-taken but is in dispute. I do not know exactly when it was brought. All I see is 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, et cetera. We will put that aside. It appears to me that the system is set up so that the taxpayer continues to pay and pay and pay on these settlements. So there is some problem here, whether it is with the assessors who are over-assessing. The way I understand the system and I do not have anything to do with these kinds of cases, the assessor assesses the property, and the applicant disputes the assessment and goes to court and gets his own expert to give a lower assessment. And then we have a

higher assessment and we have a lower assessment. Then somehow a compromise is worked out between the higher and lower, and we end up with \$43,000. We keep being told that we had the money to use but now we have to pay it back. We had a line item for certioraris of about \$50,000 for this year and this is going to knock that out by June. If we get hit with more certioraris, we are going to have to borrow money to pay for them. Is that a fair statement?

Village Manager Frobel: We could.

Trustee Quinlan: Or we could go into our savings account.

Village Manager Frobel: Yes.

Trustee Quinlan: It seems like we have to pay, ultimately, so I do not know whether we should have our assessor be more thorough with his assessment, although I do believe in our assessor, or whether maybe on one of these cases, and I have only been doing this for six years but I have never seen a judgment, we should trust our assessor and maybe go to trial instead of settling all these cases. Roll the dice and see what happens. They keep getting settled, and the only people that are making money are the lawyers. The taxpayers are paying the lawyers', not the applicants' fees. We keep getting hit by these. There has got to be a way, and I do not know what it is, to cure this. It does not seem fair. Either our assessor is making a mistake, or the system is built in to have the Village and taxpayers just keep paying and paying and paying.

But this seems to be a fair settlement with what I learned in executive session. I cannot articulate today about this particular case. I am complaining about the system, and the system stinks as far as I can tell. We pay every case that is brought. Some cases go away, very few. The applicant either forgets about it or the lawyer forgets about it. But every time the lawyer calls up in a case, and it is not just our village, I assume it is all villages, it is beyond belief for me.

Trustee Walker: It is unfortunate. We did scrutinize this very carefully in executive session. We understand the reasons behind this, and a lot of it has to do with commercial rents going down, so the value of the property is affected because the rents have been going down. There are a lot of reasons for that, and not just the economic downturn. There is not a lot we can do about it unless we went through a revaluation process. That is the alternative.

Trustee Quinlan: I was against revaluation as little as a couple months ago. But after looking at these numbers, and thinking about it, I think that a revaluation would be a good idea. It would take a lot of guts to do it, but we cannot keep paying these certs.

Trustee Walker: Our special counsel told us that even the towns that have gone through revaluation are dealing with certioraris.

Trustee Quinlan: They are because it all depends on how accurate the revaluation is.

Trustee Armacost: Also, those counsels have a stake in the system as it is currently set up. So I think we should take that perhaps with a grain of salt.

Mayor Swiderski: The issue of revaluation is fraught, as they say. What we had been offered more than a year ago was a presentation by the town assessor on the revaluation process. We should have taken her up on it. Maybe it is worth understanding the context and the logic around it. A reassessment costs big money and it has some disruptive effects on a village. I do not know how much it affects this. I understand where certioraris come from. They reflect a break in the value between residential property and commercial property over time. It is enormously frustrating and expensive, but it is not anything we suffer unduly here. It is across the board, especially in markets where residential real estate has climbed quickly, you suffer through. I am not sure whether a reval would address it or not, but I would want to hear and understand.

Trustee Armacost: I remember when that conversation was raised. I said that there is no harm in having the person come and make the presentation. At least we would be better informed, as opposed to making decisions based on not a lot of facts, again.

Mayor Swiderski: Let us do that, in the early fall, when there is potentially a public to listen. There is talk about it being done at a county or a town level, and it is one of these things where the larger the pool the less the expense. It is worth understanding the reasoning on both sides. This is arcane and worthy of careful attention.

Trustee Armacost: The tax cap issue may mark it a different kind of a conversation this time around than the last time.

Mayor Swiderski: I never considered what the interaction would be, but you are right.

On MOTION of Trustee Quinlan, SECONDED by Trustee Armacost the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

WHEREAS, petitions having been filed by the property owner, below challenging real property tax assessments on the Village's assessment roll with respect to the following parcels:

Property Owner	Address Description	Year(s)
ERISSA REALTY	1-3-5 Main Street Tax I.D. No: Sheet 10, Sec. 11, Block 627, Lot 24	2002-2011

WHEREAS, petitioner's court challenge is now pending in Supreme Court Westchester County; and

WHEREAS, the Village and the property owner have reached a mutually agreeable resolution with regard to the assessments at issue in the Court challenges; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, Counsel to the Village Attorney is authorized to execute a settlement on behalf of the Village for assessments for no less than the following:

Years	Current AV	Reduced AV	AV Reduction
2002	75,000	69,200	5,800
2003	75,000	60,525	14,475
2004	75,000	57,190	17,810
2005	75,000	50,835	24,165
2006	75,000	52,215	22,785
2007	75,000	48,780	26,220
2008	75,000	45,730	29,270
2009	75,000	48,915	26,085
2010	75,000	44,385	30,615
2010	75,000	50,680	24,320

The refund of Village taxes amounts to \$43,831.78±.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Bruce Jennings	Absent	
Trustee Jeremiah Quinlan	X	
Trustee Meg Walker	X	
Trustee Nicola Armacost	X	
Mayor Peter Swiderski	X	

**49:11 NEGATIVE DECLARATION – ADOPTION OF PROPOSED
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Mayor Swiderski: This is a step in the process of approving a comprehensive plan, where you declare whether that plan requires an Environmental Impact Statement, or not. We are the lead agency. We used a form at the workshop run two weeks ago where you step through an Environmental Assessment Form, and check off whether a particular impact is likely to occur because of what is in the comprehensive plan. Having stepped through that document in detail, the Board came to the conclusion that we would issue something called a negative declaration, which means that the Comprehensive Plan, at least at the level of detail provided, will not have a negative impact on the environment. This resolution formalizes that. Once we vote for this, at the next meeting we would accept the comprehensive plan as the Village Comprehensive Plan. So it is the next and final step before that acceptance.

On MOTION of Trustee Armacost, SECONDED by Trustee Walker the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has reviewed the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson Comprehensive Plan and has held two public hearings on the final version of the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees reviewed the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) Full Environmental Assessment Form for the Comprehensive Plan at a public hearing on June 9, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees thoroughly analyzed the relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the Comprehensive Plan would have a significant adverse impact on the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees determined that the Comprehensive Plan would have no significant adverse impacts on the environment, but rather would have only positive impacts on the environment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: that, for the reasons detailed in the attached notice, the Board of Trustees hereby issues a Negative Declaration under SEQRA.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Bruce Jennings	Absent	
Trustee Jeremiah Quinlan	X	
Trustee Meg Walker	X	
Trustee Nicola Armacost	X	
Mayor Peter Swiderski	X	

50:11 NEW YORK STATE SNOW AND ICE AGREEMENT AMENDMENT

Village Manager Frobel: Every year we enter into those IMAs, both with the county and with the state. In that resolution they give you an estimate as to the reimbursement. Now that the winter is over, they revised that number upward to reflect our expenses to provide that service for snow and ice removal.

On MOTION of Trustee Armacost, SECONDED by Trustee Quinlan the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

RESOLVED: that the Mayor and Board of Trustees authorize the Village Manager to sign Amendment B to change the estimated expenditure for the New York State Snow and Ice Agreement 2010-11 snow season from \$9,932.80 to \$13,923.56.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Bruce Jennings	Absent	
Trustee Jeremiah Quinlan	X	
Trustee Meg Walker	X	
Trustee Nicola Armacost	X	
Mayor Peter Swiderski	X	

VILLAGE MANAGER'S REPORT

Village Manager Frobel: I wanted to publicly acknowledge the fine work of our men in the Parks and Recreation and DPW. They have been helping with our step reconstruction. You may have noticed it outside the building. We started last fall. They worked right up to the bitter cold weather, but once snow arrived they had to stop. They are back. A tremendous savings to the Village. We had gotten bids to do the work, and it is costing about 25 percent of what it would have cost us. I do want to draw the Board's attention to that workmanship.

Trustee Armacost: On the note of praising the DPW I walk along Cliff Street quite regularly with my dog, and they have done a major reconstruction around a drain there which looks incredibly lovely.

Village Manager Frobel: Thank you. Four or five catchbasins have been totally reconstructed over the last several days, so they are doing a lot of good work.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS

1. Safety Council Recommendations: Alternate Side Parking Zone on William Street; Taxi Only Parking on Main Street near A&P; Crosswalks on Broadway at Flower, Minturn, Warburton, and Fraser.

Police Chief Bloomer: All of these recommendations have come before the Safety Council and have been approved.

Several years ago we created some new parking spaces on Main Street in front of the taxi office and in front of the nail place. Those spaces were designed to help the nail salon and also the Community Center so that people who were coming to the Community Center would have a place to park. There is a new business there where the church was, the Purple Crayon. There are several businesses in the area. It has been a bone of contention because I do not think we get the full advantage of those meters. The taxi office is there, and the taxi guys pull up and they run in to get their next call, and they come back out or they run in to go to the bathroom and come back out. Even if they are using the meters, those spaces are blocked off from the businesses that are there and from the Community Center. If people are going to one of the programs, particularly the elderly, those meters are taken. I have met regularly with Mr. O'Reilly, who is from Rivertowns Taxi, and he is here tonight. I am trying to come up with a solution that would please everyone.

It has always struck me that the space that borders the A&P on Main Street is underutilized. There is a whole bunch of space there. It is wide, wider than a normal street, and it is not taken advantage of. For a village like us, which values parking and needs parking spaces, it has always struck me that we could take advantage of that. So my proposal that came as a result of many meetings with the Safety Council and with Mr. O'Reilly is to create a taxi-only zone on that part, which would encompass three spaces. If you look at the top picture, I have four cars parked there so that you could see that it could comfortably fit four. But we are looking for three. Legally, they have to be 22 feet apiece. So that would take up 66 feet. In front of the first car would be a distance of 50 feet coming back from the bus stop. Behind the last car would be a distance of 98 feet to the corner where the sidewalk juts back out. It is a good distance.

The next picture is a picture of four parked cars. The final picture shows the view t as you exit the A&P to show that it is not obstructed. Even with cars parked there, it clearly gives you a good view. One of the Safety Council members mentioned this seems like a great use of space that we are not using, and I view it that way. The Fire Chief and the Commissioner of Public Works are members of the Safety Council and have approved this and do not view it as a problem. Since 8 o'clock this morning we have had three cars parked there to show that it would work. There was not an issue today with traffic, with views from the A&P, with those cars getting hit. So it seems like win-win. We would create these three spaces that would say "Taxi Only." Mr. O'Reilly has assured me that his cars will then use those spaces and not park in the metered spaces I have assured him that if that does not happen they will receive tickets regularly and I will have a ticket book in my car which will be easy enough to fill out. He is here if you have any questions for him. He came in support of this.

Sean O'Reilly, Rivertowns Taxi: We talked about four spaces originally and there is enough room there but the Safety Council said three, which would be great and would definitely give us a lot more flexibility on Main Street. We use four spaces behind the fire department. I try to keep the personal cars back there so people can park in the front. But it is real tight over there with everything. So yes, this will be great if it could happen.

Trustee Armacost: I think it is a great idea.

Mayor Swiderski: Are they going to be individually demarcated for three cars?

Police Chief Bloomer: I think we would individually mark them 22 feet apiece. The great thing about this is, other than that there is no expense here. We do not have to put in meters, we do not have to dig holes. If for some reason six months from now we said this was a terrible idea it is just a matter of blacking out the spaces.

Trustee Quinlan: I just want to say that I walked down to the meeting tonight. You could see that there was no problem. I walked right by it. Was this your idea?

Police Chief Bloomer: Yes.

Trustee Quinlan: Thank you for adding that idea. The Safety Council are a great committee, and they approved it. And I walked by it, and it looks great.

Trustee Armacost: I think it is fantastic. I have one suggestion which is there should be a very high fine for anyone who parks in the taxi spots that are not taxis. You could add that to the fine list.

Trustee Walker: Sean, are the taxis going to be there all the time?

Mr. O'Reilly: The taxis, when they are working, no, they will not be there. But there are a lot of times where we have nine or 10 cars and three are sitting around. So they are on Main Street.

Trustee Walker: But I mean 24 hours a day, all week long they are going to be there?

Mr. O'Reilly: No.

Trustee Walker: I have often wondered why we do not have parking on that spot, and I always wanted to talk to you about it, so I applaud you bringing that up, and this seems like a really good use of this location. But I wonder if we could be even more flexible if there is a possibility for using it for other purposes when the taxis are not there. I guess it is the opposite of what Niki proposed because she is looking for revenues. But I am looking for more parking spaces perhaps for merchants. Now that probably will not work out because you will need them probably the same times that the merchants would need them, most likely. And right now, this seems like the best use because it is clearing the area where merchants could use them.

Village Manager Frobel: That was our original proposal. We had proposed parking in that stretch for merchants. It was going to be part of our business zone, and that was rejected by the Board.

Trustee Walker: By us? I did not reject it.

Trustee Armacost: Which of us? Were we all present?

Mayor Swiderski: Chief, right now are the meters being fed by the taxis?

Police Chief Bloomer: I think they are pretty good about it. Do I think it is 100 percent? No. I think they are pretty good about it because they run in, they run out. There is not always a meter person around, so are there times that they are not? I am sure there are. But even when they feed the meters, it is so inconsequential the amount, a nickel while they run inside and Sean gives them the next call. But it is the same time that somebody would be looking to use that space.

Mayor Swiderski: Right. So we are likely to get an increase in revenue from the meters.

Police Chief Bloomer: Yes, and we can measure that. Last note, the bank is very much in favor of this. I met with the bank manager, and they are very much in favor of it.

Trustee Walker: But do we put a sign up, then, saying Taxis Only?

Police Chief Bloomer: I spoke to Marianne Stecich before even bringing this to the Safety Council, and she told me that there would be no reason we cannot, as long as you pass the law, make that a taxi parking only.

Trustee Walker: And if ever Rivertowns Taxi leaves that location we could make it into something else, put meters in.

Police Chief Bloomer: Originally why you voted it down, I believe, was that I had asked for eight spaces, not three. We may see that three work, and then we may be able to move to five at some point. But I would start with this.

Trustee Walker: The other reason to have parked cars at that spot is, I think it will slow the traffic down coming down Main Street.

Police Chief Bloomer: That definitely happened today.

The next one is crosswalks by the temple. The first one is Minturn at Broadway, the second one is Flower at Broadway, and the third one is also Flower at Broadway. These are on each end of the temple. This request originally came to the Safety Council from members of the temple for students crossing at these intersections. The sidewalk is on the west side of the street. There is no sidewalk on the east side. There are no crosswalks at either one of those intersections which border the temple. We had New York State DOT come down and look at this intersection. They told us, in essence, that our sidewalks are functioning as non-painted crosswalks. If you will notice, and is why I took the pictures, at the bottom of each sidewalk a cutout, which tells the public that this is where you are supposed to cross. New York State DOT gave us the green light and the Safety Council gave it the green light to put crosswalks at each intersection.

Trustee Armacost: Is that just, again, simply painting it?

Police Chief Bloomer: It involves painting, but there are line and notification requirements that New York State DOT and Commissioner Gunther went over. He knows exactly what signs have to be posted to tell you that there is a crosswalk coming up, or to tell you that it is right here. So there are other requirements besides just the paint, but Mr. Gunther is well aware of it.

Trustee Armacost: And do you have like an estimate of what the cost of those other requirements are? Is it minimal?

Mayor Swiderski: The paint and restriping we pay for. The signs are free.

Police Chief Bloomer: Also, as a requirement of our approval the temple is going to build a path across their property which will go behind the tree in the first picture and come out on Minturn so that their kids are not walking on Broadway in order to get to the intersection. That was our concern, and they are going to do that once it is approved here.

Trustee Walker: When we met with DOT about Broadway we also asked them about restriping that area so that it is one lane northbound instead of two lanes northbound. They said that was fine with them if we want to do that, and it would make these crosswalks even safer in their opinion. So that is something we should address. We do not need to address it tonight.

Trustee Armacost: That seems very sensible to me.

Trustee Quinlan: I am in favor.

Michael Milici, 11 Floral Avenue: Having crosswalks was something topical in our area for awhile. People had mentioned it because we need something to keep the cars slowing down. Cars tend to go about 40 miles an hour there, in spite of the speed limit. The visual effect of a crosswalk would give a little more influence to the pedestrians. I see, especially that there are more kids living in our neighborhood now, that it is more essential having that there.

Jill Shellow, 21 Flower Avenue: I also support the crosswalks on both Flower and at Minturn. I cross that intersection every morning and every evening, and it is a scramble to see whether I can get across fast enough. There is a bus stop on the northern side where Flower crosses Broadway. Even that bus is coming in at a relatively high speed. Not only for our children on Flower, but the children who are in Hastings Gardens. I was to speak on behalf of the temple separately. Rob Baron, the president of the temple, had meant to be here this evening but it is his birthday so I agreed that I would come. The temple has agreed to put in that pathway so that the students who are coming and going have a safe access to that crosswalk. When the time comes that you want to talk about narrowing that stretch of Broadway down to one lane, we will be back here and we will encourage you to do so.

Police Chief Bloomer: While we were investigating the last two crosswalks, Mr. Parker took us down to the intersection of Warburton and Broadway. Where 615 Broadway is there

is a new pediatrician's office, either going in there or by this time it may have already gone in. That doctor, and New York State DOT, felt there should be a crosswalk across Warburton Avenue from Wagner Park to 615 Broadway. Again, we have those curb cuts that would indicate that is where you wanted walkers to go, but we do not have the crosswalk. So the first page would show the length of the crosswalk north to south. The second page shows you the view from Wagner Park over to 615. While we were looking at that intersection, Mr. Parker also said that we are remiss if we do not add a crosswalk across Fraser Place. If you notice, there is a curbcut. We are inviting people to cross Broadway at Fraser Place, which we do not want them to do. We want them to cross Fraser, and to your right there is a crosswalk that would go to 615. So his recommendation, and then the Safety Council's recommendation, was to add a crosswalk there, as well.

Trustee Armacost: That is very sensible. That is a very dangerous area, and there are lots of kids in that Fraser-Elm area. That is just filled with kids, too, who are walking to and from school along that way so I think it would be very helpful.

Mayor Swiderski: It is a no-brainer.

Trustee Walker: Absolutely. Chief, you know there is no sidewalk and no crosswalk at Elm. Do you find people crossing Broadway at Elm? Or do they somehow walk, but there is no sidewalk to get down to Fraser Place? How do they cross now?

Police Chief Bloomer: I do not recall that ever being an issue. I cannot say I have looked into it greatly. The only time I notice it is a problem is when we have the Fireman's Carnival. I notice a lot of people cross at Elm.

Trustee Walker: Some way for the kids to walk down to Fraser, a sidewalk. But it is tough.

Ms. Shellow: I can tell you, having lived briefly on Elm, that I regularly crossed without a crosswalk there. It makes better sense to channel the children and everybody else with painted and striped areas, rather than encouraging them to walk along the street, because there is no safe option where there is a sidewalk on neither side of the street.

Police Chief Bloomer: This last request was generated from a member of the public. He had a lot of lengthy issues, but the one that I am addressing is number three on page two of his e-mail. He is a resident of William Street, and his complaint is that cars park for an extended period of time on William Street. You have the bar there, you have the gas station there, and cars park on William Street on the right side, which is allowed, for an extended period of time without moving. While we do have the 14-day law, by which we can mark

tires and get people to move, that means that the car is there for a period of time before the resident notices that it has been there for a period of time, and then they call, and then you add on the 14 days to that.

I believe his complaint is valid. We have frequently responded to cars that have been left for an extended period of time on this street. So his request was that the south side of William Street be made an alternate side one morning per week for an hour or two hours, which would require all the cars to have to get off of that side. It would not only serve to get the cars off of it, but they could then clean it. Also, we would see if cars were being left there or were abandoned. Commissioner Gunther and I have gone up to the site several times. He has either a Monday or Thursday morning, which would coincide with some other street cleaning times in that area. And it would be an hour, 9 to 10, 10 to 11. It seems like a solution for this complaint. We would then get cars off of this area, and the street would be clean. So the Safety Council looked at it, and approved it as well.

Trustee Walker: And there are not too many driveways on the north side to make it difficult for people to move over?

Police Chief Bloomer: No, they would have to get their car entirely off William Street. There are a lot of driveways. So they would either have to, for that hour, put them up on Aqueduct Lane or down on Warburton Avenue.

Trustee Armacost: It looks like about 10 cars that are affected.

Police Chief Bloomer: We looked at it three days, and I think there were probably about eight.

Trustee Armacost: So is your theory that people are storing cars on this street?

Police Chief Bloomer: Yes, I think so.

Trustee Armacost: Then that is a way of testing that, certainly.

Trustee Quinlan: And why do you think they are storing them on the street?

Police Chief Bloomer: Because there are no restrictions. On Warburton Avenue, you have to move it on one side one day, on one side the other day. There are no restrictions on this street until somebody notices that it has been there for a long period of time. It can sit for an extended period.

Trustee Quinlan: The only thing that concerns me is that if residents are parked there they are going to have to move their car.

Trustee Armacost: But they do anyway. All the people on the south side of Washington have to move their cars.

Police Chief Bloomer: Your point is right that they will have to move it once a week for an hour. But the benefit to them is that it certainly opens up more spaces on the street, and their street can be cleaned.

Trustee Quinlan: Yes, that is if the street cleaner is working. What bothers me is, if you were saying that you wanted to do this on my street I would be totally against it because I do not want to have to move my car. We all park in our driveways and on the street. Could we make every street that way? Why pick out this particular one street?

Trustee Armacost: The south side of Washington has exactly that rule.

Trustee Walker: Both sides.

Trustee Quinlan: Pinecrest does not have a rule. Division does not have a rule.

Police Chief Bloomer: Right. We could list a whole bunch of streets if you want. But the point here is that the bar is there and the gas station is there, and I do not think Pinecrest has a gas station, I do not think they have the bar, I do not think the same issues take place on every street as they do here. Also, on your street you do not have other streets surrounding you that require cars to move. So, for example, people that live on Farragut would not put their car on Hillside because they are required to move it on Farragut once a week. Or people that live on School Street would not put their car on Hillside because they are required to move their car off Hillside.

Trustee Quinlan: So you think people on Warburton are moving their cars up there and just leaving them.

Police Chief Bloomer: Correct.

Trustee Walker: There have also been a lot of cars outside Hastings being stored. I have not noticed them so much on this street, but there were a lot of white vans the Aqueduct parking lot for weeks, maybe even months, until the police cracked down on them. So when they can store their cars in certain areas, people do it, and they come from out of town to do it.

Police Chief Bloomer: Yes.

Trustee Quinlan: People park on our street and walk down to the train and go to Paris, France. There are cars parked on my street for weeks. But the difference is, we report them. We say anybody know who that car is? No. Let us call the police and get rid of it. Fourteen days it is here, good-bye. When someone reports a car that has been there for two weeks the police respond immediately.

Police Chief Bloomer: But like I said, it will take them two weeks or more to notice it, and then it is two weeks on top of that before it can be removed.

Trustee Armacost: Can I ask a question about unintended consequences? Let's say we pass this and they cannot park on this street. So where are they going to go? Are they going to move one street over? Is it going to create the same problem on the next street?

Police Chief Bloomer: I think the cars will move to Warburton Avenue, and they cannot stay for longer than a week there because each side has alternate side parking. This will only be for one hour. I think when the residents that live there come home from work that night they are going to take their car from wherever they put it and put it back on William Street. People that are storing it, will they find another place? Is that what you are asking me? Probably.

Trustee Armacost: Well, it is not so much that. Obviously they will find another place. I am just wondering if they are going to create a problem, which is not a reason not to do it. I am just trying to anticipate where the next storage zone is going to be.

Police Chief Bloomer: Good point. It is probably as Trustee Walker just said going to be Aqueduct Lane, which is happening now. That is what I would guess. To your point, Trustee Quinlan, I think the residents may not like this. This was one resident's request. We looked at it, it did not seem like it would be onerous on the residents for an hour. But you have to, as I understand the process, make this a public hearing now, correct?

Trustee Walker: Can we notify the people who live on the street directly? Put fliers out.

Trustee Armacost: I have one suggestion. When we vote on this, can we separate these out? I would not want to have the other crosswalks affected by the people who do not like this one.

Trustee Quinlan: I am totally in favor of all the crosswalks. We need many, many crosswalks, and they are a safety feature, and they are necessary in this village, and I wish more people would adhere to the state law and stop when someone is in a crosswalk, which they do not do. But this is a whole different kettle of fish. I have some problems with this. Let us say someone has two cars. Most households do. You park in the street, and this is within walking distance that you go take the train to work. And now you have to move your car between 9 and 10 o'clock a.m. when you are at work.

Trustee Armacost: I understand what you are saying, but people have to do that on the street over. The issue here is the people who leave it and go to work in Kabul for six months. It is when you have dumped your car on the street, that is what you are trying to deal with.

Police Chief Bloomer: Correct.

Trustee Quinlan: I think that happens on a lot of streets in Hastings.

Police Chief Bloomer: Probably. But that is what the resident was complaining about.

Mayor Swiderski: We have to have a public hearing, so all we are doing is cueing up a public hearing.

Trustee Walker: Yes. So can we ask Mr. Irwin to invite his neighbors to come to the public hearing, at least, so that we hear from other people?

Trustee Quinlan: The other thing is, I do not see that many people in John's bar. I do not understand it. Every time I walk by it is like there is one person in there sipping a beer at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Police Chief Bloomer: Do you walk by at 3 o'clock in the morning? There are people there.

Trustee Armacost: Well, you may not want to open up space for them.

Trustee Quinlan: I do not care. Well, that is good to know. I do not walk by at 3 o'clock in the morning. I am asleep unless there is too much music playing from some other place and keeping me up.

Mayor Swiderski: So cue this up for a public hearing?

Trustee Walker: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: You do not need a local law on the crosswalk, but you are going to need local laws on the no parking. We will be in touch.

2. Financial Report – Fiscal Year End Summary

Village Manager Frobel: I presented the Board with a memorandum last week summarizing where I think we are going to be at the end of this year we just closed. Obviously, all subject to the auditors' findings, but I think it is a valuable summary. This is the start of what I will do periodically. I am not going to rely on just the written report that I have given to the Board in the past. I am not going to read the report, but I will respond to any questions and touch upon some of the key points.

We took a close look at the year end. We believe that the revenues exceeded the budget. Revenues exceeded what we anticipated revenues to come in at by about \$402,588. This, of course, was due largely to that one-time building permit. We think revenues will reach \$13,031,472.

As I have mentioned in the past, there will be an adjustment for the FEMA grant. As noted, we received a grant of \$60,000. We had thought it would be higher than that, so there will be a resulting adjustment by the auditors of the FEMA grant. So that will bring your revenues for the year ending on May 31 to \$12,991,472.

Expenditures came in under budget. We expect expenditures will end up at \$12,278,145, resulting in a growth of \$713,327. If all this comes to pass, I would suspect the auditors will be taking of that about \$501,751, and we will be setting it up in that fund balance reserved, not available for appropriation. That will essentially establish the collateral for those funds that we know are out of balance. So what you have successfully done is, you have paid that down or you have set that aside as collateral, and you will have what I think will be the fund balance, unreserved, undesignated, \$211,576. That will truly be the amount of money available to you for other purposes, not designated.

On the bottom of page two I gave a recap. The designated fund balance will be the \$861,970, the undesignated, as I just noted, giving you, really, a fund balance of about \$1.1 million. So I think we did pretty well in the year end. We have got some growth there. A lot of it was due to expenditures that came in lower than we expected. Our revenues, without the benefit of that one-time building permit, would have experienced difficulty, but thankfully the expenditures came in lower than anticipated.

As I noted in my narrative, this still assumes that the new auditors are going to credit the sales tax for last year. We have not received that yet. And also as noted in the narrative, we

have not yet received the drug awareness grant that we typically get from, I think, the county. So if those things come to pass, this is where I think we will be at the end of the year.

The printout for where we are in the current year we will be giving to you periodically. Obviously, there are no trends that are starting to emerge only 21, 22 days into the year. I did mention at the last meeting the difficulty with that garbage truck. It needs a front end replacement, and that was about \$4,500. And as noted tonight, that tax certiorari certainly put a damper on our available funds for claims and judgments. We are, as I mentioned in my narrative, watching the tax levy cap, anticipating that passage.

The audit specs are out. We have had quite a bit of interest. We mailed it out to seven firms, unsolicited. I have had several conversations with auditing firms that are interested in submitting proposals. Those are due early July. I did send an addendum out, correction in the specifications. I did not pick this up exactly, but we wanted the first year report completed by the end of September. Obviously, that would be impossible because by the time we hire a firm it will probably be August, and there is just no way they can do the audit in 30 or 45 days. So minor point. That was pointed out to me by one of the bidders. I have also prepared a guideline for your use for the interviews of the auditing firms. I only offer it as a model. I will be giving that to you probably this week.

Capital projects, I have had a staff meeting on that. The department heads are preparing their capital budgets. I will have individual meetings with them next week as we begin to prepare that. And also noted, I have given you a copy of a fund balance policy. I think it strengthens the fund balance policy you already have. I would like to see you adopt that. I think it would be a wise thing to do. It specifies the different reserve and unreserved categories, and it really spells out what your intent is, I think, to keep 10 percent available in a fund balance.

So as I noted, I am going to give these to you periodically. I will also be available for questions. Again, not going to rely on just the narrative, but rather try to strengthen what we have been presenting to you since we have been here.

Trustee Armacost: During the budget process, which is not that long ago, it is like a month ago, you had speculated that without the money that we received from the one-time special building permit that there would be revenue of about \$100,000. I am curious to know what happened to \$75,000?

Village Manager Frobel: Well, we ended the year, we think, around \$713,000.

Trustee Armacost: No. This was not including the fund balance which we already have, which you have added in. You were talking just in terms of revenues over expenses at the

end of the year. You had said at that point that you speculated it would be about \$100,000, based on savings related to various things: income that was projected to come in, as well as savings related to money unspent on compensation to various workers, et cetera. And so I am just curious to know why it is only \$24,000 and not \$100,000.

Village Manager Frobels: Where are you reading from?

Trustee Armacost: Here. It is \$24,000.

Village Manager Frobels: Oh, revenues realized. That is true. As I noted from the beginning, we just about made revenues. Our problem had been, as identified, some of the difficulties in the amounts that we did not receive. If it was not for the one-time building permit, then we would have had a difficult time meeting our revenues.

Trustee Armacost: But I am just trying to understand why, a month ago, you thought it was going to be \$75,000 more.

Mayor Swiderski: That was the net amount.

Village Manager Frobels: The net amount, the difference between the revenues realized and the expenditures. The net amount I had closer to \$80,000.

Mayor Swiderski: It was \$83,000.

Trustee Armacost: It was \$83,000, and then we worked out that there was an additional \$20,000 which you had not accounted for in your calculations. And now the net amount is \$24,000.

Village Manager Frobels: No. I thought your question was going to be how did I miss the mark in returning more money than anticipated. The answer to that was going to be I am not sure the auditors are going to credit the \$145,000 grant; I am not sure of that. And I'm not sure they're going to allow the sales tax we have not realized yet to be credited to last year.

Trustee Armacost: But have you included that, or not?

Village Manager Frobels: Yes, I did.

Trustee Armacost: So you have included that as income already.

Village Manager Frobels: Yes.

Trustee Armacost: And there is only \$25,000 of surplus with that included.

Village Manager Frobels: No. When all this occurs, I think the net growth will be \$713,000.

Trustee Armacost: No, it was not net, Peter. The \$100,000 he was referring to at that time was not including this. This was not discussing the fund balance. This was just surplus of revenue at the end of the year. That is what we were discussing at that point.

Mayor Swiderski: Over-expenses.

Trustee Armacost: Over-expenses: \$100,000, and it is now \$25,000.

Village Manager Frobels: No. Now the difference between revenues we have realized and expenditures that we incurred is \$715,000. That is the growth. That is the difference.

Trustee Armacost: That is including the building fee, and it is also including the money we already had in the reserve fund.

Village Manager Frobels: No, it is not.

Trustee Armacost: So you are saying that there is an additional amount on top of that.

Village Manager Frobels: Yes.

Trustee Armacost: So what is that amount?

Village Manager Frobels: I expect the difference between the revenues we realized, when adjusted for the FEMA grants and the expenditures, growth will be about \$713,000. And the reason for that is the one-time building permit and the fact that I am counting on receiving the \$145,000 grant for the drug education and the sales tax that we have not yet realized.

Trustee Armacost: But that was already included in revenue before. So I am not sure.

Village Manager Frobels: Let me go back and give you those exhibits that I gave you that evening, and I think I can demonstrate that although we have missed the mark we have ended up greater to the good than I thought. It is closer to what I had projected it would be when we did this in April.

Trustee Quinlan: On page two, financial results, it says, the scenario identifies a negative balances in the pool, library, and capital fund in the amount of \$861,970, adjusted by the auditors last year by \$360,219, resulting in the amount still to be secured by surplus of \$501,751. So do we know why? I am happy, but my first question is, why was it adjusted by the auditors last year to be reduced, from \$861,970 to \$360, 219? Do we know?

Mayor Swiderski: They applied our fund balance.

Trustee Quinlan: All right, so they applied the fund balance, resulting in the amount still to be secured by the surplus of \$501,751. Now, you mentioned in your verbal report that, and my question is, are we going to wipe out these negative balances? But you also use the word "collateral" for them. I would like it explained to me, are we going to wipe them out, including total \$420,000? So we had \$300,000 in our fund balance, and now we have \$420,000. So are we going to wipe them out, or are we going to save them in the designated fund balance as collateral?

Village Manager Frobel: As I understand it, and you will work with the new auditors as to how they want to classify it, it would be the fund balance, but designated for the specific use.

Trustee Quinlan: Can we not decide to wipe it out? I mean, we already decided. Everybody knows how I feel, that we should have never borrowed money from ourselves to pay for these things.

Mayor Swiderski: That is what the designation does. And whether you choose to apply it, in the end, to wipe it out is a Board decision.

Trustee Armacost: Which will depend on what information we get from Moody's. That is part of the reason why we do not want to make that decision, because our rating potentially goes up or down depending on the way that they view the fund balance.

Trustee Quinlan: But if we designated.

Trustee Armacost: We do not have a choice. It is designated.

Trustee Quinlan: So are we doing that, or not?

Trustee Armacost: It is done.

Trustee Quinlan: So we designated it. So why do we not just wipe it out? We cannot use it for anything else, can we?

Trustee Armacost: We cannot use it for anything else, but if our fund balance looks bigger potentially we do not know. There is a policy issue on this with Moody's; our auditors have given us two different pieces of information that contradict each other on how Moody's will view this. What we do not know is what Moody's opinion is, which I think is the most important opinion.

Trustee Quinlan: I try to simplify things. But Moody's are going to look at it and say, you either wiped it out or you designated it. But who cares? It is there. Let us call a spade a spade.

Trustee Armacost: But we have been given different information about how Moody's will view that.

Mayor Swiderski: We need to hear that.

Trustee Quinlan: OK. Well, you can see why I ask the question, because it is not clear.

Trustee Armacost: Exactly, it is very unclear.

Trustee Quinlan: My opinion is, I want to wipe it out. But there might be three other people that do not want to wipe it out. But we have designated it anyway, so we cannot do anything about it anyway. It is like a shadow game.

Mayor Swiderski: Yes.

Trustee Armacost: It is like a shadow game.

Trustee Quinlan: Mirrors and shadows. It is designated, but we cannot use it. But we got to use it, but we cannot use it.

Trustee Walker: How are we getting this information?

Village Manager Frobel: It came out, in large part, with the exit interview with the auditing firm. They advised us as to how they were treating what we thought was your fund balance undesignated, and applied it.

Trustee Walker: But in terms of getting the Moody's view on this, how do we do that?

Village Manager Frobel: I think wait until the opportunity arises, until they have a monitoring call.

Trustee Quinlan: But do they not do that just every couple of years?

Village Manager Frobel: It varies. Yes, it can be every year. It can be until we do some bond anticipation notes, or until we do some serial bond issuance.

Trustee Armacost: And we should get the opinion of several other financial advisors who we have access to. We should ask all the auditors that we are interviewing what their opinions are, and see how many different opinions we get.

Trustee Quinlan: As long as we designated that we cannot spend it on other stuff that we feel like.

Trustee Armacost: Exactly, it does not exist to be spent.

Mayor Swiderski: The new GASB forces that transparency on what is designated and not by its categories.

3. Upcoming Grant Opportunities

Village Manager Frobel: We are proceeding. I had that conference call today with Malcolm Pirnie and Mathews Nielsen and the DEC. I think the landscape architects came away with a clearer understanding of the expectations. Malcolm Pirnie was helpful in filling in any gaps. I think, on balance, we are going to be able to recommend to the Board probably at your next meeting the retention of a landscape architectural firm to assist us in it, provided we can reach the right numbers.

Trustee Walker: Right. It was all about the numbers.

Village Manager Frobel: That is the wild card. But from what I heard in this conversation today, I think they should be able to do it.

Trustee Walker: So there were not any surprises in what the DEC is looking for in the closure report that exceeded what they had put into the scope of work.

Village Manager Frobel: No. I go back to that letter from the DEC, which clearly spelled out the expectations. I think it helped Kim, the landscape architect, to hear first-hand from the DEC what is required, and I do not think it is as burdensome as perhaps she envisioned. Also as part of this grant we are working on, not only the quarry as a design element -- actually, we are hoping for construction of it from this grant -- but we are looking at

Riverview Park for a combination dog park and regular park. Meg, do you want to fill that in? You are more active in the neighborhood efforts.

Trustee Walker: A neighborhood group is forming, pulling in the dog park advocates and also people from the neighborhood who would like to have other activities going on besides just a dog park, possibly a picnic area, a tot lot, maybe a little area for kids to ride tricycles and to skate in the area that was a basketball court. I have attended their meetings, and they are working on a scheme that we can price out and come up with numbers to bring to the Board to figure out how much we could go after in this grant: how much in-kind services we are going to get from the Village, how much the community is going to raise because they would like to do some fund-raising, and then that means how much the Village would have to contribute to match the parks grant that we want to go after. I think it is an exciting concept. It is something that will probably be built in phases. It is not going to happen overnight. So they will come up with something modest for this grant, understanding that our means are modest at this point. But they will have some longer-term ideas that they would like to carry out. The group will come, probably at our next meeting, to talk about that.

4. Waterfront Update

Trustee Quinlan: I have no report. The DEC meeting last Wednesday was very helpful and informational. I would suggest everyone, if they could not come to the meeting, to catch it on WHoH. I learned a lot even though I have heard it many, many times.

51:11 APPROVAL OF REVISED PLAN FOR RIDGE STREET EXTENSION

Village Attorney Stecich: About a year ago the Board approved the extension of Ridge Street with some parking and no-parking requirements, and approved a license agreement. But what was still outstanding on the license agreement was Exhibit A, which is what you have here. The applicant came back with the Exhibit A, and I was comparing it to the Exhibit A that the Board had looked at to make sure that things were on it, like we had a removable bollard that the Board did not want there, and you wanted some no-parking signs and whatever. All this stuff was on there.

But I did notice that to the left of the parking area the previous drawing had indicated that that area was going to be Grasscrete and that was taken off the plan. I called Christina to find out why that change was made. I think the person who was putting it in said grass would not grow there, but Christina will explain in more detail. But because that is a fairly substantial change to what the Board had agreed on, I said they needed Board approval.

Trustee Quinlan: What is different in this plan than the plan that we already approved.

Mayor Swiderski: What is bordered by green is gravel instead of Grasscrete.

Village Attorney Stecich: It was not all going to be Grasscrete. The part that said new driveway, I think, was always going to be gravel. But the lower part was going to be Grasscrete and it is now gravel instead of Grasscrete.

Ms. Griffin: It is actually called PermaTurf. I am here for two reasons. One, to talk about that and two, to clarify the signs. We did build the driveway, and we intended to do PermaTURF, which I have used in a number of places.

Mayor Swiderski: Do not use industry terms.

Ms. Griffin: I am sorry. PermaTurf is recycled plastic. It is a honeycomb shape, and it is supposed to keep the root system of the grass below the level of the tires of a car. We have used it before successfully, but there is hardly any sun here and we were afraid it was not going to work. You still have to have a gravel base underneath it, so I would like to ask the Board if they would accept the gravel. I would like to send photographs around so you could take a look at that.

I want to clarify the signs before we have them made. We have one sign that you approved, which we have shown located at the front of this new gravel driveway. I was not clear whether you wanted, in addition to that, a no-parking sign at this part of Ridge Street so that no one goes through this and tries to park. For your information, there are two no-parking signs at the turnaround on each side of the street. Maybe you would like to see it in photographs you can pass around.

Village Attorney Stecich: Christina, now what about the thing that says "parking area?" Is that PermaTurf or gravel?

Ms. Griffin: Gravel.

Village Attorney Stecich: Because even on your new Exhibit A it says PermaTurf.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we are going to have to change that, sorry. You can see the amount of shade. I have tried to take this in the sunniest part of the day, when the western sun is low. There is really so little sun here that I did not think it would work. And yes, I will have to make sure that is changed to gravel. So that is one question.

Mayor Swiderski: Regarding the substitution of a gravel surface, as depicted in the picture before us, versus PermaTurf, the question is, is the Board comfortable with that modification to the plan?

Trustee Walker: Now that we understand that the grass will not grow there, having a pervious surface there is still a good idea. That is what you are achieving with this. That is better than, for example, paving it in asphalt. So it may not be as good as Grasscrete, but it is certainly better than pavement.

Mayor Swiderski: I have no issue.

Trustee Quinlan: So as long as the water can run through and it is not concrete, I am fine.

Mayor Swiderski: Then there are two subsequent questions. The first one is, is the wording on the sign at the entrance to the lot that you showed us OK with the Board.

Village Attorney Stecich: You approved that.

Mayor Swiderski: And we approved it. We are all OK. The second question is, do we want a no-parking sign at the lower pink dot there, an additional no-parking sign. I do not care.

Ms. Griffin: This tells you the most about the signage that is there. This is a turnaround on Ridge, and there are two signs, one on each side, that say no parking. Our new sign that says "All Unauthorized Vehicles Prohibited" would be here. The question is, would we put another no parking sign out here somewhere in the middle maybe of the gravel driveway.

Trustee Armacost: Are you afraid people will park there, or what is the reason?

Mayor Swiderski: Do you want to?

Ms. Griffin: No. I just want clarification.

Village Attorney Stecich: I think it was part of the resolution before. Meg, maybe you remember what the reason was. They were supposed to put up no-parking signs.

Trustee Armacost: Are we trying to avoid putting up a parking sign which we previously said you should put up?

Ms. Griffin: No. When I had a conversation with Marianne on the phone you brought it to my attention that there should be more than one sign. I do not remember putting a no parking sign here, but I would be happy to. I just want to make sure we know.

Trustee Armacost: If we did not ask for it before, I do not particularly feel like we need an extra one if we have already got two.

Mayor Swiderski: We did ask for it?

Village Attorney Stecich: We did ask for it before. That is the point. It was part of the approval before that there be no-parking signs on that spot.

Trustee Armacost: So then let us just do it.

Village Clerk Maggiotto: Why not send it to the Safety Council.

Village Attorney Stecich: That is what I would say: ask the police, whether they think they need to be there, and if so, where.

Mayor Swiderski: I just could not care less.

Trustee Armacost: Exactly.

Trustee Quinlan: I do not care either. I would leave it up to you. If you want to put it up, put it up. If you do not, do not.

Ms. Griffin: We just want to finish it.

Mayor Swiderski: There are three signs on the way in. I do not know what more clarity somebody needs at that point in time. If somebody ignores the entrance spot, and still parks beyond it, it is to your interest to have that car towed, right? At that point?

Village Attorney Stecich: Would it be clear? Does the parking say "No Parking This Side of the Street"? What does it say?

Ms. Griffin: I added this to the plan I just gave you. I did not have this before. It was just going to say "No Parking."

Village Attorney Stecich: But where? How far is there no parking? That is why it has to be clarified, and I would suggest that you clear that up with the police or the Safety Council,

whatever, because this board does not really know that. But there may well need to be a sign to make it clear that you cannot park there.

Mayor Swiderski: Ask the police.

Village Attorney Stecich: So ask the police. And I do not think it has to be part of the license agreement. But you do have to fix this drawing to take off the PermaTURF. And then send me a new one, and then we can let the thing be executed.

Ms. Griffin: Will do.

Trustee Quinlan: I agree with you, Peter. It is micromanaging. You do not seem to care one way or the other either, so what do I care.

Ms. Griffin: I just want to finish it.

Trustee Armacost: Are you not saying that you care that we agree to something, or do you not care either?

Village Attorney Stecich: No. My point is, I do not know where the signs are and what they say. But people were suggesting it is your interest; you would have the cars towed. Yes, but it has to be clear to the cars that they cannot park there. So the signage has to be clear. If there is no parking along that whole strip the signage has to be clear.

Mayor Swiderski: I would argue that sign at the entrance, you are entering a differentiated surface at that point.

Village Attorney Stecich: No. But tenants in that building are authorized. They can get in there, but they are not allowed to park there, right? Are they also not allowed to park there? If it is no parking, it is no parking. So an authorized vehicle is allowed in there, but they are still not allowed to park. So that does not do it.

Ms. Griffin: We have not made the sign yet. It could be one sign that says something other than this. Unless I misunderstood, I thought we were only doing one sign. So that is why I am here; whether you think this is sufficient, or not.

Mayor Swiderski: What is your preference? We clearly do not have a strong opinion. If it will add clarity to your tenants and potential trespassers, then if you think it is unnecessary did you come in with an opinion?

Ms. Griffin: It is a bit of a problem because they will park there even though there are two no-parking signs. I do not know if you need another no-parking sign. Until this gets enforced I think people will continue to ignore it. "Only Authorized Vehicles Permitted," I do not know if anybody would ever think that it means that you could still park from here to there.

Trustee Quinlan: We are talking about the second sign. Do you want that there, or not?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, I know. I am trying to decide. Really, once you get beyond this point do you really need a sign that says no parking?

Trustee Armacost: Can you just have a sign that says "No Parking Beyond This Point?" Does that not make it very clear? This feels like not something we should be discussing in this much detail.

Trustee Quinlan: Do you want a sign there or not, yes or no?

Ms. Griffin: No. I do not really want a sign there. I do not think there is any point because up to this point there should not be any unauthorized vehicles.

Trustee Quinlan: How many times do you want a board to tell you do what you want, and then you do not know what you want? I wish someone would tell me that. What do you want to do? We will give it to you.

Mayor Swiderski: Do you want to have a sign "No Parking Beyond This Point?"

Trustee Armacost: No parking beyond this point makes it very clear that there is no parking beyond this point, and it does not lead to the confusion of authorized or unauthorized. It is up to you. If I were you, I would want "No Parking Beyond This Point," but it is your spot.

Ms. Griffin: I think that is a better sign.

Mayor Swiderski: OK, excellent. Be it resolved.

Trustee Armacost: Which sign is it going to be?

Mayor Swiderski: "No Parking Beyond This Point."

Trustee Quinlan: The authorized vehicle sign is going down, and you are going to put up a sign "No Parking Beyond This Point."

Ms. Griffin: And I will just revise this drawing and give it to Marianne.

Mayor Swiderski: Nobody here cares. We are happy with that.

On MOTION of Trustee Walker, SECONDED by Trustee Armacost the following Resolution was duly adopted upon roll call vote:

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Board of Trustees approved a license agreement on June 1, 2010 between the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson and River Town House LLC for use of the Ridge Street Extension, and

WHEREAS, Appendix A showing improvements to the Ridge Street Extension has been changed to indicate that the area formerly PermaTurf is now gravel and that there is a single parking sign that reads "No Parking Beyond This Point" at the entrance to the Ridge Street Extension , now therefore be it

RESOLVED: that revised Appendix A is approved.

ROLL CALL VOTE	AYE	NAY
Trustee Bruce Jennings	Absent	
Trustee Jeremiah Quinlan	X	
Trustee Meg Walker	X	
Trustee Nicola Armacost	X	
Mayor Peter Swiderski	X	

Trustee Walker: July 8 Friday Night Live is going to Midsummer Magic. We are inviting back Vinnie DePonto, the magician, who was our guest producer last year, last July. He is bringing dozens of magicians. We are thankful also to Verizon for being our sponsor for this event. We are going to use the Boulanger parking lot as the focal point for the event and we are going to close part of Main Street. The merchants on Main Street have been clamoring for us to move Friday Night Live to Main Street. They want the road closed. So we are going to try that out.

On the Comprehensive Plan, I had a couple of little changes to the description of the sidewalks in the Broadway area to help us in the future with grant applications and to correct some mistakes.

Mayor Swiderski: If you can put those into an e-mail out to the Board well before the meeting so that if there is an objection I can hear it. I am going to have Raf post that on the Web site, so we have public notification of the change. It may not be substantial, but it does change words.

ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Trustee Quinlan, SECONDED by Trustee Walker with a voice vote of all in favor, Mayor Swiderski adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:00 p.m.