

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
REGULAR MEETING  
JANUARY 20, 2004**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, January 20, 2004 at 8:10 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

**PRESENT:** Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr., Trustee Michael Holdstein, Trustee Bruce Jennings, Trustee Marjorie Apel, Trustee Peter Swiderski, Village Attorney Brian Murphy, and Deputy Village Manager Susan Maggiotto.

**CITIZENS:** Fifteen (15).

**Mayor Kinnally:** The reason the Village Manager is absent this evening is that he slipped earlier today, and fell and hurt his back and his leg.

**DISCUSSION** - Fenwick Road Drainage Project

**Mayor Kinnally:** We have had a number of evenings with the neighbors and with Cliff Gold, where we have gone through any number of iterations of this project. We have a draft report, and this evening is to solicit comments so we can go back to Mr. Gold and get clarifications or whatever else we need. The Board is not going to take any action this evening. May I have a motion for an executive session with environmental counsel following this meeting to get guidance for our comments for the PRAP for OU-2.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board scheduled an Executive Session immediately following the Regular Meeting to discuss Board comments for the PRAP for OU-2.

**Mayor Kinnally:** Anyone wishing to speak, please come up and give your name and address for the record.

**Walter Haubold, 31 Fenwick Road:** I did not realize that you were soliciting more comments. Can you tell us where we are in the process?

**Mayor Kinnally:** We have a draft of the various alternatives that Mr. Gold went through; we will go back to Mr. Gold to give him the comments, and then we will be back with him to start our deliberations.

**Tom Kadala, 25 Branford Avenue:** I have a presentation and a handout. I found a discrepancy. The report on page 12 shows the CFS rates. These are the cubic feet per

second rates in each area. I took one, Fenwick Road. I wanted to bring it to a level that we can all understand. Not everybody speaks in terms of cubic feet per second. The Hazen-Sawyer report, which was in 1985, came out with an estimate of 322 cubic feet per second. That transfers to a flow at 25 miles an hour. That is the Village speed limit. And that was calculated on the basis of a 36-inch pipe. Then CG Engineering came along and said, That is overstated. The real number is 197 cubic feet per second. That translates to about 15 miles an hour. The first message it gave me was that for about 15, 19 years we have been relying on the Hazen-Sawyer report on figures that were grotesquely inaccurate, at the rate of 25 miles an hour. Now, I am going to give you an idea of what it means for water to flow at 25 miles an hour.

**Mayor Kinnally:** I do not see it on page 12.

**Mr. Kadala:** This is from the Internet.

**Trustee Swiderski:** Page 7.

**Mr. Kadala:** He mentions in the report 88,400 gallons per minute. But this is like water flowing, again, back to the 15 miles per hour, which is also very, very fast for water. So fast that I have turned to Mother Nature, who is never wrong, and what Mr. Gold told us in one of his meetings, this is referencing from him and is also common knowledge, that grass erosion begins at about two miles per hour. So what this is telling us is that over the period of time Mother Nature has said we have never had any erosion because there never has been any erosion in that area. Not to the point of 15 miles per hour. That is a torrent. There would be uplifting of earth, there would be vestiges of grass being torn out. People would have to have fill-in dirt just to maintain their creek area if it were going at 15 miles per hour. So what has happened is that the true figure, I put it at 5 miles per hour and just raised it by 150% to say that that would probably be the realistic peak. That is probably the peak that the engineers who placed the 18-inch and 36-inch pipes that are presently there were calculating.

My concern is that when you look at the different plans that Mr. Gold has laid out, all of it is contingent upon the speed and rate of flow of water. If that number were reduced, then many of his pipes would be much smaller or eliminated. If that number was larger, it would obviously be bigger. So that number is critical in the analysis, and understanding that number, and Mr. Gold is calculating on the basis of water going at 15 miles per hour when, in the time I have been here and in looking at my property, there has never been an event that has rendered that.

**Trustee Holdstein:** This flow that Hazen-Sawyer reported to CG, this was the flow down Fenwick. Is that correct?

**Mr. Kadala:** Yes.

**Trustee Holdstein:** This is the flow down Fenwick, which is down a concrete street. You make reference to the potential for grass and other land to be eroded, but this water flow is not going over grass. When it makes a right turn at the Chettih property, water then begins to go over land surfaces other than concrete or asphalt. So saying that we have not seen erosion, which Mr. Chettih has said he has had over his property, I do not think that Cliff or Hazen is saying that the speed when it makes the right turn and goes over that wall and starts going down the Chettih property through to the Ratzenberger property is flowing as fast as these numbers. I think they are talking about just down Fenwick. You say you have not seen the grass erosion to the magnitude that you say this would cause, but it is going over asphalt so we would not really have that comparison.

**Mr. Kadala:** I understand. Once the water begins to flow at a certain pace, it does not slow down because it took a turn. The energy level is still there. It is going to continue at the same rate. It is not going to say, I am going over grass now, I am going to slow down. If it is going at 15 miles an hour, it might slow down to 13 miles an hour.

**Trustee Holdstein:** But if it hits the laking effect at the center of the street, where we have talked about the ponding, and then it starts to flow over that wall, I assume at that point it is losing a lot of speed.

**Mr. Kadala:** Right, but you still have a drop of a 2-1/2 foot slope, which is from the top down to the bottom. It does not matter if it goes a little fast at the beginning and a little slower in between; overall, there is a 2-1/2 foot drop. So it does not matter how it gets there, it is going to have to unload that amount of energy from the top down to the lower end of Branford. It will go up, it will go down, at the end it is the same amount.

**Trustee Holdstein:** To the lower end of Branford?

**Mr. Kadala:** That is correct. In other words, from the level of Dan Rile down to the lower part of Branford is a 2-1/2 foot slope. So it does not matter. Just like a handicapped ramp, it does not matter if you go up the steps or if you go all the way around. You still get to the same place, and still expend the same amount of energy to get there. If it is coming down to Fenwick and it takes a right and it turns down, it is now going to follow from Fenwick all the way down through Branford. I am saying that Mother Nature has said there has never been

any erosion. I agree, Chettih has experienced some erosion, but over a long period of time. Not to the magnitude of 15 miles per hour, by no means.

**Trustee Holdstein:** I am not an engineer, but it seems to me that if you take the ponding water at Fenwick and you then disperse it, as some of the plans are, by taking it in a couple of different routes, then the power of that water, whether it is at 25 miles an hour or 15 miles an hour, slows down, or gets diluted, or gets spread out.

**Mr. Kadala:** There is no question, it loses its energy at that point. But we are looking now from Fenwick all the way down to Branford, all the way down to Ashley. That is a straight line. So there is no turn of any kind. There is no ponding of any kind. It is rushing at whatever speed it is supposed to be. What I am referring to is that Mother Nature has been telling us all along that the most that we have ever experienced could be 5 miles per hour. You would see mass erosion. You would see grass roots flying up in the air. You would have basically rocks. You would have pitted areas that would have to be filled in. None of this has ever occurred. So my feeling is that his numbers are extremely overextended at this point, at the rate that he has them, by a factor of 300%. That is huge.

**Mayor Kinnally:** We will pass it along. He is not here to defend this. But all we want to do is collect the data, give it to him, to get the best explanation from him. Maybe he can talk to Trustee Walrath.

**Trustee Holdstein:** You are working from the bottom up. Can you explain to me your two miles per hour and your Mother Nature scenario?

**Mr. Kadala:** This figure of two miles per hour was given to us by Mr. Gold at one of his meetings, and it is also common knowledge. If water is rushing over grass at two miles per hour, the kind of grass that is in Branford and our area, it will uproot it. So one of his concerns in his design, and that is why it came up in the discussion, was we cannot have the water flowing too fast because if we do it will uproot the grass at two miles per hour. What I am saying here is, maybe he said that over a period of 20 minutes or 30 minutes, whatever. So even if it was five miles an hour you would notice some kind of erosion of sorts. But the numbers we have been given, the 25 miles an hour, for example, were grossly exaggerating the situation to the point that the water was going at the Village speed, so to speak, for a vehicle. It did not make any sense at all. It cannot even reach those speeds. So whoever came up with those numbers...

**Trustee Holdstein:** So you created a Mother Nature scenario by doubling the two miles an hour and then working out the math that way.

**Mr. Kadala:** I said at two miles an hour there would be signs of erosion. And I said just for easy figuring, because I am trying to make a point here. I am not scientifically doing this. I said five miles an hour, to compare against the 15, to compare against the 25. Just to get a concept across.

**Mr. Jackson, 2 Ashley Road:** I have a question for Mr. Gold. On plan C they are talking about a 42-inch storm drain at Fenwick, coming down Fenwick, and water was getting dumped from Branford and then going all the way to Farragut Avenue to the end of my property. They are proposing a 42-inch coming down from Fenwick. The water now leaves, it goes under Farragut Avenue and into a 32-inch pipe. So my concern would be, the water on both sides of Ashley Road, does it start pooling? Does it start rising more so than before they put in a 46-inch pipe up on Fenwick? What is the result? Does it go up Ashley Road? Before we used a larger pipe. Will the condition be worse?

**Vince Boccumini, 28 Fenwick Road:** This gentleman here is an engineer. I am not an engineer, but I know a little bit about drainage. My question is, if water is not flowing, why does the catch basin pop off at the end of my driveway at least a half a dozen times? There has to be some reason for the water flow.

**Mayor Kinnally:** I believe he has answered that in the past, but certainly we will get that information from him. It has something to do with the size of the pipe and the amount of flow going down that pipe.

**Mr. Boccumini:** It does not affect us too much. My front yard floods, but I know the Chettihs and the Haubolds, they have a lot of water. But this catch basin keeps popping off. We have called many times. I have replaced it myself.

**Patricia Romer:** I am from Steppingstones. First I want to talk about the study in terms of some contradictions on documentation of the flooding on Fenwick Road. At one place in the study it says that it ponds to 30 inches deep. In another place it says it ponds to 18 to 24 inches deep. In another place it says it ponds exceeding 24 inches in Fenwick. In some places it says it subsides very quickly. Those page references are 2 and 5, and Appendix D. There is a document dated November 19, 2002 that says that the ponding is 18 inches to 24 inches. I was on that walk along Fenwick that day with Mr. Gold and a neighbor of mine, Mr. Ellis, at 24 Nepperhan, and many others from Fenwick. There was no observable

ponding in front of Mr. Chettih's wall or on Fenwick at that time. That does not mean it does not happen, but it does mean that the evidence here is contradictory and anecdotal. My question to Mr. Gold would be, would it be possible for him to statistically measure the ponding on Fenwick during a 2-year storm, and then predict the depth of ponding that would occur during a 10-year storm or a 25-year storm.

I have another question. In the report, CG states that it is designing pipes for a 10-year storm and culverts for a 25-year storm. But it also states that the open channel receiving the water from this culvert is inadequate for even a 2-year storm. The references to the pipe and culvert sizes are page 11 in your text, and references to the channel sizes south of Branford to Ashley are pages 5, 9, and 12. Repeatedly, Mr. Gold warns against the removal of the wall on Mr. Chettih's property vis-a-vis plan D because it will "increase water discharge downstream and worsen the downstream conditions." What is the actual speed in cubic feet per second of the water flowing out of the culvert under Branford onto Mr. Kadala's property currently for a 10-year storm and a 25-year storm, and what would it be for plan A, C, and D for a 10-year storm and a 25-year storm? How would that speed affect erosion and flooding in the channel through Mr. Kadala's, Ms. Gross's, and Mr. Localio's properties? Would it eventually necessitate re-piping under Ashley?

There are references and maps and price lists to a swale on Farragut Avenue. I am concerned that water from this swale might stream down Farragut Avenue, as water from a swale across Branford now encourages flow down to Fenwick. My question would be, where on Farragut Avenue would this swale be, and what additional water management is planned for Farragut Avenue, or the undeveloped Village property that is not mentioned in plans A, C, or D? What new problems, if any, might be expected along Farragut Avenue as a result of this swale?

Repeatedly, Mr. Gold emphasizes the importance of maintenance for drainage pipe culverts and inlets and says how it must be emphasized. At least monthly, and after storms, Mr. Gold says, there must be inspection and cleaning to insure full capacity for the next storm. My question is, if plan D were implemented except for removing Mr. Chettih's wall, could the cleaning of culverts and pipes from Fenwick to Steppingstones increase flow enough to relieve Fenwick without excessively eroding and flooding downstream properties? What would it cost the Village to implement plan D minus the removal of the wall, and plus the above-described maintenance to all drainage facilities?

Jane Gross, who cannot be here tonight because she has to work, asked me if I would read this statement to the Board. She says:

I've said this many times at these meetings, and in direct communication to Mr. Hess and the Board, but I still cannot believe that we are considering spending \$500,000 in taxpayer money on a complicated engineering solution to a problem that may be solved by simply cleaning the culverts on a regular schedule. Each time I complain about water approaching my house and Richard Localio's, only to recede as soon as one or the other of us goes out in the rain to unclog the culvert, I am assured that more regular cleanings will be scheduled. I work at home overlooking the brook, and can tell you that the only time anyone cleans that culvert is the day after I complain, and sometimes not then. Our organization has asked for laws of how often these culverts are cleaned, and I can only assume the laws don't exist, or that they prove my point and the Board would rather I not know that. This entire controversy was sparked by two feuding neighbors on Fenwick who have yet to document their water problem to most of our satisfaction. The people most often flooded, Mr. Localio and me, are telling you that cleaning the culverts would make a huge difference. You have yet to make a serious attempt to do this. I wonder how the Village residents who are not here and not directly impacted by the drainage problem will feel when learn that this board has chosen to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars rather than pull some soda bottles, Frisbees, tree limbs, and other trash from a few culverts. What's the hurry? Clean the culverts on a regular schedule for awhile, document your efforts, and then come back and tell the results. Thank you.

**David Walrath, 100 Edgars Lane:** There have been some valuable comments here, and I am looking forward to hearing responses to them. I would like to put in the record, before it is forwarded, we should check Jane Gross if she is talking about the bar screen in front of the culvert or the culvert itself. I have heard it talked about, the problems with that screen which is there to prevent larger things from going into the culvert. I do not know about any of the other culverts. I wanted to clarify Tom Kadala's presentation. Where does the 36-inch pipe come from now?

**Mr. Kadala:** When you look at 197 cubic feet per second, you are looking at a cube. There are 197 of them. You stack them all up, you have perhaps 15 feet this way, 12 feet high. That would be 197 cubic feet per second moving along. So if I had a tube that large, that would be the proper size so that I would have that one cubic foot per second speed. I am not going to do that, because that would be an enormous pipe. So I am going to squeeze that down to a 4 foot or a 3 foot, and I am also looking at a 3 foot space because it is equivalent to the current space now with just the drains available on the open drain.

**Mr. Walrath:** Except that the open drain, when it gets full it spreads out in people's yards and you get ponding.

**Mr. Kadala:** No, I understand. But when you look at a 36-inch pipe, I was doing this to demonstrate an issue. The key issue here is not the precision of the numbers. The key issue here is to say that for 15 or 19 years we were all hung up on a Hazen & Sawyer report that was grossly inaccurate, and CG Engineering even came in and said, Oh, this is totally off by 150% or so. I am coming in and saying it is 300% based on my basis.

**Mr. Walrath:** That is a meaningless number that it is 300% over.

**Mayor Kinnally:** Let us just say there is a difference of opinion. Cliff recognized that there were differences between people.

**Mr. Kadala:** Sure, no. The purpose of 36-inch, if you did the calculations, if you were to ask me how did you come up this number, I have an area to show you. If you had a pipe that was 15 by 12, that is a huge pipe. But it really is not realistic. I have to squeeze all those boxes, imagine all those boxes, into now either a 4 foot pipe or a 3 foot pipe. If you were shoving these cubes through this pipe, how far would it go? And that gives me the speed. If the pipe is really small, it is going to have to go much further so, obviously, the speed would be much greater. I just used an average of 36-inch pipe. I could use 48-inch, it does not change the numbers by very much. But the point is made that if you look at two miles per hour, that is way down at the bottom and that is where erosion actually takes place. Mother Nature has told us we have never had a problem. What is in existence right now has been working pretty well. I am giving credit to the engineers that designed prior to this. The point about cleaning the culverts is important.

**Mr. Walrath:** Clifford said when he made his presentation to you that he and I had some difference. I think I was looking for something between his alternative 4, and I think it finally wound up as a staging of alternative 3. It is my hope that he, perhaps, can explore that a little further. He has always said that he did not want to apply greater flows downstream and that has been the criteria. A fairly small retention basin forms behind the wall on Fenwick Road. A larger one in Dan Rile Park. How much larger it needs to be is the question that has not been answered. He told me it would take a more detailed survey. I do not think it is a lot of money nor a lot of time, but the surveys he has are not sufficient to define that difference. If you want to look at things in between alternative 3 and 4, it might get down to a more reasonable cost. You might get a project that would answer the problems on Fenwick and protect the people downstream, the two immediately impacted: the Chettih



and Ratzenberger properties. Because they are down low. The other properties down below, until you get down to there almost everybody is up high enough. So what you have is ponding in side yards. But there is a real problem with the Chettih and the Ratzenberger property. You are going to have to look at what happens to those two properties whatever size project you take. At some point the projects that Mr. Gold worked with were designed for 10-year flow. Beyond the 10-year flow, it is going to overflow, come down Fenwick, and come right down through the same area that it does now. Tom Kadala picked some numbers out of the air. He did not say what frequency they were, and he is talking cramming a large flow with a small frequency into a small pipe and saying why have we not seen problems like this. There is a very obvious answer. The system has not worked like that.

**Mayor Kinnally:** Because it has not been in the pipe.

**Mr. Walrath:** When the culverts cannot take any more, it flows up and over the road and gets from the Ratzenberger's yard over the top of the low point on Branford.

**Trustee Apel:** I am looking forward the answer to those questions also. I still want to understand the ponding effect in Dan Rile Park, and the necessity for doing that. If there is something between 3 and 4, or C and D, or whatever we want to call that, do we need to have the retention pond at all? Can we do the other parts first as a minimum? Or can we just do the curbing? What is the real minimum? Can we do this in such stages that you do the curbing first, and then work on a couple of pipes, and then clean out the culverts, and see how that works? Then, if that does not work, you go to the next stage? I know in his plan he was pretty clear he wanted that retention pond. But I want to know if we can divert water along the road a different way by putting up the curbs and cleaning out the culverts before we start doing the other things.

**Mr. Walrath:** I am going to volunteer to answer that. It is a question of the size of the retention pond. His first two alternatives, there was a high dam to get enough head to direct flow through a pipe and get it down past anybody's property. The question I want him to answer would be, how large do you need to make the retention pond so that the flow that goes downstream is no greater than...

**Trustee Apel:** A trickle?

**Mr. Walrath:** Provide a detention pond that is bigger, but not a lot bigger, than what is presently detained behind the wall at Fenwick Road. That is the thing I want to have explored. It does not need to be a retention pond with an 8-foot dam. It needs to be, perhaps

could even be, excavated. The size of the pond is the question: how big do you make it? And if you can do with a smaller one, I would like to see the calculations on that.

**Trustee Swiderski:** I second Marge's question. If there is a plan that I have an interest in, it is D. And even there, I am curious to know the amount of flow that plan itself would likely reduce. I am exactly interested in what Marge is interested in, which is can D be an interim first step to see what happens? Clean the culverts, do the minimum, and observe. Document any problems after that has been done.

**Trustee Jennings:** I agree with what has been said. I do not have any specific question for Mr. Gold at this point. It is not so much in between C and D as an alternative to D that I would like to explore further. If the scenario Peter just described may work, then it seems prudent to do as little as possible and see if we have fixed the problem.

**Mayor Kinnally:** We could phase it in.

**Trustee Jennings:** Phase it in. On the other hand, if that is not expected to work, for some engineering reason, I would like to explore a less expensive way of slowing water down. And the ponding in the park is the way to slow the water down. Mr. Gold himself has remarked on occasion that it might be done without such extensive piping and excavation, as alternative C suggests. Therefore, I was somewhat disappointed to find that alternative D has nothing in the park at all. That is what I am looking for. I am looking for a more minimal approach. Doing something in the park, but not as much as C envisions or would cost.

**Nick Fiebach, 36 Fenwick Road:** I am concerned about some of the comments from the Board about seeking to do the minimum and observing because it sounds like the crux of this is a probability game. That is, there are 2-year storms, 10-year storms, and 25-year storms. It is hard to know whether, over a period of observation after doing the minimal, you will have done enough to cover the next storm that comes after the observation period. So I think the comments about wanting to know from the consultant more definitively what the scenarios are for 2-year, 20-year, and 25-year storms, to the best that an expert can tell us, will be very, very important.

**Mayor Kinnally:** We will notify the public when we have a public meeting to discuss additional information from Mr. Gold and then begin our deliberations. The Board has decided nothing at this point. We have not decided to do nothing; we have not decided to do the minimum; we have not decided to spend \$400,000 or \$500,000. Whatever decision is made will be made with due deliberation in public of the various options and alternatives.

**APPROVAL OF WARRANTS**

On MOTION of Trustee Apel, SECONDED by Trustee Jennings with a voice vote of all in favor, the following Warrant was approved:

Multi-Fund No. 45-2003-04 \$179,695.21

**6:04 SALARY APPROPRIATIONS**

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** This is a requirement from the state retirement system as they are processing the retirement of the police chief. The budget appropriation of these funds was not satisfactory to them. They want to see a resolution, so this is an after-the-fact resolution of something that we had already acted on.

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

**RESOLVED:** that the Mayor and Board of Trustees approved and appropriated funds in the annual budget for the following salaries:

	<u>2002-03</u> <u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>2003-04</u> <u>Fiscal Year</u>
Village Manager/Treasurer	\$161,061	\$168,311
Police Chief	133,560	100,000*
Superintendent of Public Works	84,500	88,300
Deputy Village Manager/Village Clerk	73,700	77,000
Superintendent of Parks and Recreation	72,400	75,700
Director of Youth Services	65,300	68,250
Building Inspector	54,300	46,000*

\*New Personnel

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

**AYE**

**NAY**

Trustee Michael Holdstein

X

Trustee Bruce Jennings

X

Trustee Marjorie Apel

X

Trustee Peter Swiderski	X
Mayor Wm. Lee Kinnally, Jr.	X

## **VILLAGE MANAGER'S REPORT**

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** Since I was assigned this meeting just a few hours ago, I did not come up with too much to say. But Neil would want me to remind the Board that we are beginning our budget process. Our department head budget requests are due this Friday. So if you have any budget requests or suggestions, as soon as you can get them to Neil I know he would appreciate it.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS**

### **1. Update on the Waterfront**

**Mayor Kinnally:** We are going to be meeting with counsel immediately following this meeting to discuss counsel's advice to us concerning comments on the PRAP for OU-2. I am going to be making inquiry of ARCO when the money is coming under the consent decree. It should be coming soon.

### **2. Chemka Pool Renovations**

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** What we are looking for tonight is guidance from the Board on what the change orders ought to be so that we can prepare them for the next meeting. You are not voting tonight on anything, but simply trying to decide which way we want to go on these recommendations.

**Mayor Kinnally:** First item is the general change order, \$896.08 net deduct.

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** That was presented at the last meeting. It was all the pluses and the minuses as they looked at the project. The bottom line would be a deduct of \$896. Total adds were about \$15,000 and total deducts were about \$16,000. These are recommended by Neil and Ray Gomes.

**Mayor Kinnally:** The next item is the painting of the light poles. It is one of the things that I have raised; without the painting they would be standard aluminum.

**Trustee Apel:** And with painting, they are going to be...

**Mayor Kinnally:** Well, whatever color we want them to be. Something that would blend into the background.

**Trustee Holdstein:** What do we know about the painting: how long it will last, what the overall maintenance will be? Do they have to be repainted? Will it last five years, 10 years?

**Mayor Kinnally:** There is a standard warranty on it. And this is a factory installation, is it not? Let us assume for our discussion that this is not a regular maintenance item. Do we want to paint these things for another \$15,000? When we first discussed the poles, there was great concern on the part of the Board that these things would be somehow intrusive. We were trying to make them as disappearing as possible, and we were trying to soften the impact there and from a distance.

**Trustee Apel:** If it is going to do that, we should spend the money and do it, especially since it is going to be done at the factory. If it enhances it, and makes it disappear or makes it appear to be smaller, then it might be helpful so they would not stand out. They are fairly large to begin with.

**Trustee Holdstein:** When we are looking to add \$15,000 to paint the poles, which I would be in favor of, I am trying to understand where that is coming from, in terms of what we bonded and what we have spent so far. Do we have surpluses? Is this overage? Where is this money going to come from for this and some of the other items we have to take about?

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** This report shows you what is available from the budget and what is still available from the bond: \$207,000.

**Trustee Holdstein:** If we max out the bond at \$1.9-million.

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** Right. Less \$45,000, and then with all these changes, depending on whether you choose the cheaper or more expensive turnaround, it would leave a balance in that \$1.9 million of either \$113,000 or \$101,000.

**Trustee Holdstein:** I just wanted to understand where the money was coming from. Having understood that, I would vote in support of painting the poles.

**Trustee Jennings:** I also would support spending the extra \$15,000 in order to achieve the aesthetic and environmental effects that we are after. It makes a lot of sense to me that the poles will blend into the background of the trees and the surrounding area more if they are

painted than if we purchase them in aluminum. But I have not seen it. I have only seen Irvington, and they do not have the background of the trees. I would like somebody who has seen these painted poles to reassure me that the painting will, in fact, will make quite a difference in terms of how it blends into the background. I would hate to throw \$15,000 at something that really would not have that much impact on your vision. I would rather spend extra money making the parking lot better. It makes sense to me, but I want to be reassured by somebody who has seen it and is an expert in it.

**Trustee Swiderski:** I agree. When you are at the pool, the poles are right there in front of you, and I do not know if the aesthetic effect is much. I think it is rather for people walking up to the woods, people coming down from the woods. It minimizes the visual impact. My concern is, for the \$15,000, I want that paint job to last 15 or 20 years. I do not want to be repainting them in two or three years' time. I would like to hear what the warranty is.

**Trustee Holdstein:** I, too, would like to see that assurance. It occurs to me that lifeguard chairs, ladders in and out of the pool, and perhaps even the diving board structure are all aluminum. So from the standpoint of blending in, when you think about some of the other aluminum or metal-looking objects around that pool, maybe the aluminum blends in better. I am not sure, so I would certainly want to second what Bruce is saying. When you are standing there and everything else are all aluminum poles and these things are brown, maybe it will look worse rather than better.

**Mayor Kinnally:** We also have to get a color chart.

**Trustee Holdstein:** Yes, and some advice from those same experts as to which would be the best choice if we go that route.

**Mayor Kinnally:** Painting of the bathhouse. Using an outside contractor.

**Trustee Swiderski:** Absolutely. People would be disappointed if we do not.

**Trustee Jennings:** Yes. A fresh coat of paint makes things look a lot better.

**Trustee Holdstein:** Peter put it the best.

**Trustee Apel:** For sure.

**Mayor Kinnally:** Shade shelters.

**Trustee Holdstein:** Can I get some help on what this is?

**Mayor Kinnally:** Shade for people who are sitting underneath them.

**Trustee Holdstein:** We have had them there before?

**Mayor Kinnally:** Yes.

**Trustee Holdstein:** We were not able to salvage the old ones?

**Mayor Kinnally:** I am sure they were not thrown away, but I do not know.

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** Well, it was in the bid, and we can take it out of the bid and obtain it more cheaply ourselves.

**Trustee Apel:** So we save a lot of money. I think it was very good.

**Trustee Holdstein:** I do not think, in the scheme of things, it is a huge amount of money. But I would like to know what happened to the other ones.

**Mayor Kinnally:** If we do have the other ones, Neil has got to explain it to us. But lest us assume for our discussion that we do not have them.

**Trustee Holdstein:** I am okay with it.

**Trustee Apel:** I think it is fine.

**Trustee Jennings:** Yes.

**Trustee Swiderski:** It is a recurring complaint. Absolutely.

**Mayor Kinnally:** Plastic lockers?

**Trustee Apel:** Yes. I think it is important. They took out the metal ones which were all rusted, and this is supposed to last longer and not have that kind of a problem. It is an important purchase.

**Trustee Holdstein:** Yes.

**Trustee Jennings:** Yes.

**Trustee Swiderski:** Absolutely.

**Mayor Kinnally:** The bus turnaround.

**Trustee Apel:** Is the bus turnaround also supposed to be used as a drop-off?

**Deputy Village Manager Maggiotto:** It is not meant to be a drop-off in the turnaround. It would facilitate people dropping off near the pool.

**Trustee Apel:** Dropping off, and then getting around. Okay.

**Mayor Kinnally:** It is more for circulation than anything else.

**Trustee Apel:** The circular turnaround versus the other one is a much better concept. The other thing would block traffic because you have to back in and then back out. That would defeat the purpose. Was this in the original diagram we had a long time ago, the original set of diagrams for the pool? Was this the original place they were going to have that circular?

**Mayor Kinnally:** I do not think it was in the original plans.

**Trustee Apel:** There was something circular, but I do not know whether it was circular and dropping off. The reason I say that is multi-purpose. There is sort of a multi-purpose thing that I am thinking of. If there was a way to drop kids off for school to Hillside, it would meet that purpose, too. But that is during winter, not in the summer. So people can come up, drop their kids off there, and then go down. So they can drop them off in the back as another alternative to going up to the front of the school.

**Mayor Kinnally:** They can do that now. They drop them off, and then they continue through the parking lot and come right back out.

**Trustee Apel:** But would they not stop the traffic, though, if they are just going up?

**Mayor Kinnally:** No. Because they are beyond the road at that point. Where they are dropping the kids off, it is really into the parking area. The path is north of the end of the curbing that goes around the pool.



**Trustee Holdstein:** I think, unfortunately, the less expensive option does not seem to be efficient. With the extra \$10,000 you are gaining something that is far more efficient. I have to go with the circular drive.

**Trustee Jennings:** I agree. The circular option is well worth the added cost. I only wish that we could capture a few extra parking spaces along with this road improvement. But looking at this diagram, if only it was wide enough to allow angle parking off this circle we could get several spaces there. The one Achille's heel I see with this renovation plan is that we are not having a net addition of parking spaces, and yet we are making the facility a lot more desirable, a lot more attractive. Hopefully, it will be more heavily used. The result is that people will have to park on School Street or on Hillside, or at Hillside parking lot.

**Trustee Swiderski:** The circular driveway is the only choice. My only concern is that I thought that particular area was heavily sloped, or at least far from flat, and I wonder if the cost is accurate or not. But it is the only choice. The other one is an accident waiting to happen.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mayor Kinnally:** There is no public.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

On MOTION of Trustee Holdstein, SECONDED by Trustee Apel with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board scheduled an Executive Session after meeting with counsel immediately following the Regular Meeting to discuss personnel.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

On MOTION of Trustee Jennings, SECONDED by Trustee Swiderski with a voice vote of all in favor, Mayor Kinnally adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:20 p.m.