

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2011 AT THE MONTEBELLO COMMUNITY CENTER. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 8:09 P.M. FOLLOWED BY THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE.

Present:	Jeffrey Oppenheim	Mayor
	Lance N. Millman	Deputy Mayor
	Stacy Caridi	Trustee
	Marc Citrin	Trustee
	Steven A. Sorrillo	Trustee

Others Present:	Warren Berbit	Village Attorney
-----------------	---------------	------------------

Recording Secretary, Debra Mastroeni, Village Clerk/Treasurer

Mayor's Report:

Mayor Oppenheim announced that the Community Garden is up and running; fully planted. It looks magnificent and some gardeners are already harvesting food. This is the first Community Garden on the west side of the county. Participants visited the Village of Nyack to observe its community Garden. The Mayor advised that we already have a waiting list for next year and encouraged anyone else who is interested in obtaining a plot for next year to contact Village Hall.

Mayor Oppenheim mentioned that the summer newsletter went out a few weeks ago and it is also available on the Village's website.

The Mayor announced that the County has opened the bids for the Mayer Drive Bridge work and they should be awarding the bid within the next couple of weeks.

The Village Board previously authorized a consultant to work with the Village Attorney on the Noise Law. The consultant will be making a site visit in the upcoming weeks.

Mayor Oppenheim noted that Charnwood Drive has been completely paved. In addition, the RC Sewer Department has hired a private contractor to make repairs around the sewer manholes throughout the Village.

The Mayor announced that the bicycle rack and pet disposal system have been installed at the Kathryn Gorman Ponds Park. The Mayor encouraged everyone to get out and enjoy the park, it really is lovely.

As of today, the Montebello Community Center is being powered by a 6,000 watt solar panel system. During the day when electricity is not being utilized at the Center the system will turn the meter backwards, so at night when meetings are in progress that stored electricity will be utilized. Mayor Oppenheim is proud to announce our Village

may be the only municipality in the County and maybe even New York State to have 100% of their power supported by solar energy.

Keeping with the green theme, the Village will be the first site in Rockland County to receive a Charging Station for electric cars. Through the Charge Point America Program, a charging station is provided at no cost to the municipality through a grant from the federal government. The municipality has to pay for installation of the charging station. An electric vehicle would plug into our charging station, swipe their credit card and the Village will be paid a fee for the electricity it sells.

Mayor Oppenheim advised the Board members that he would like to move up the August meeting date as he will be out of town for the regularly scheduled meeting date.

Parks Commission Business: No one from Parks was present.

Public Comment:

Joan Roth - 6 Kevin Drive – noted that she has brought up same issue at the last 3 Board meetings regarding water problems on Kevin Drive. She does not agree with the reason given and wants the Board to help the 15 families on Kevin Drive and investigate the water running from Coe Farm Road. They want this matter resolved. Enormous bug and animal problems; chipmunks making holes under foundations and in our back yards.

Mayor Oppenheim offered to meet with Mrs. Roth on site to view the water problems.

Barbara Marden - 4 Kevin Drive – has lived in her home for 31 years and stated that she has spent \$28,000 re-landscaping her property because of standing pools of water. About 4 years ago she personally took steps to remedy the water on her property; she installed additional landscaping, paver walkway and drains in her driveway. She also noted the animals are horrendous in her yard with more than 20 holes burrowed in her backyard. She invited Mayor Oppenheim to visit her property.

Fredi Shpetner - 1 Kevin Drive - spoke about ongoing zoning violations at 547 Haverstraw Road, particularly the barn that was converted to a storage shed that looks like a house with a front door, windows, and utility lines going in. Last year a utility line went in, recently another utility line was being installed; maybe he was successful in putting in the sewer line. She stated that the Building Inspector and the police were there and saw the kitchen, bathroom and 200 amp electric panel.

Property owner clearly has two homes on one single family lot. Ms. Shpetner wanted to know how the Village plans to proceed with clearing this matter up of a second house being utilized on this property.

Mayor Oppenheim noted that the facts support her comments and responded that the property owner was in court yesterday and in fact received an adjournment to next month. He reiterated that we are working towards everything having to be removed and the building reverting back to its storage only status.

Louella Gottlieb - 8 Kevin Drive – has lived there since 1970, never had problems until Coe Farm was built. She has had to install two huge tanks (drywells) in her backyard to handle the water problems. She has spent a tremendous amount of money trying to resolve this.

The next agenda item was a Public Hearing to consider a Petition for installation of speed humps on Orchard Street, between Lake Road and Route 202.

The Village Clerk/Treasurer read the legal notice into the record:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that a Public Hearing will be held by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Montebello on Wednesday, July 20, 2011 at 8:00 p.m. local time, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard at the Montebello Community Center, 350 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, NY 10901, to consider the installation of a speed hump or speed humps on Orchard Street, between Lake Road and Route 202 (Wayne Avenue), as more particularly set forth in Petitions submitted on May 19, 2011 and June 3, 2011, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Resolution No. 06-101, as modified by Board action taken on Resolution No. 10-058, as adopted May 19, 2010, as directed in this matter by the Village Board upon adoption of Resolution No. 11-075.

All members of the public and all interested parties are invited to attend and participate. The petitions will be available for inspection and review at the Village Clerk's Office during normal working hours, Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The Village Attorney confirmed with the Village Clerk/Treasurer that the legal notice was posted on July 8, 2011, mailed to the residents of Orchard Street, Memorial Drive and a resident on Lake Road, on July 8, 2011, and published on July 10, 2011, meeting the legal notification requirements. Copies of the Petitions were made available for the Board of Trustees and the public.

Attorney Berbit noted for the record the documents received: two petitions dated May 19, 2011 and June 3, 2011, the legal notice and affidavits, letter from the Village Engineer dated July 2, 2011, and memorandum from Planning Consultant, Robert Geneslaw dated July 18, 2011.

The Village Attorney requested that the Village Clerk/Treasurer read the Village Engineer's letter and the Village Planner's memo into the record:

Dear Mayor and Trustees:

A petition has been submitted by residents for a request to install speed humps along Orchard Street. Orchard Street is a two way street with access points from Route 202 and Lake Road. Orchard Street has a length of 0.23 miles or 1,215 feet.

Orchard Street is a through street and is used as a cut-through between Route 202 and the Thruway and Airmont Road via Montebello Road. The roadway also services the local

residents along Orchard Street. The properties along Orchard Street are generally smaller sized lots where 29 properties are adjacent to the subject street.

Some increase in traffic has been realized since the Mayer Drive Bridge has been blocked resulting in a detour through Orchard Street.

The Village has recently (since 2007) installed speed humps along other heavily traveled through streets such as Mayer Drive, Oxford Drive and Lety Lane. The speed humps have resulted in calming traffic within these areas with minimal/none negative impacts.

The length of the roadway can accommodate one (1) speed hump approximately midway without causing significant issues as related to emergency vehicle access or maintenance. We suggest that if the process is approved by the governing body to install a speed hump, we review specific locations to install the speed hump in the most advantageous location.

It is noted that due to property size the speed hump location may be closer to front doors or driveways due to the limited distances. We further recommend an consistent with prior installations we mark out the locations in paint so that the public could view the proposed location and offer comment if applicable. Speed humps constructed require proper signage and striping consistent with recommendations of the FHA Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Signed, Martin K. Spence, PE.

Memorandum from Robert Geneslaw dated July18, 2011:

We have reviewed the SEQRA regulations and find that there are two related examples of street and traffic improvements considered to be Type II actions, not subject to environmental review. These are:

>Repairing of existing highways not involving the addition of new travel lanes (617.5 (c) (4))

>Installation of traffic control devices on existing streets, roads and highways (617.5 (c) (16))

It is our opinion that the installation of speed humps can be considered to be generally similar to the examples above and are Type II actions.

If the Village Board agrees, this memo should be referenced in any approval action.

Mayor Oppenheim gave a brief history of the speed hump resolution that was adopted back in 2006. The Board placed the petition process for speed humps in the hands of the residents. Speed and traffic represents a real hazard, there have been several deaths in the last couple years in the Montebello area, and this is a continuing problem that needs governmental intervention. The reason speed humps are a good solution is that it is better

than the alternative, it is impossible to have police on the streets at all times and it is illegal to place stop signs at various intervals to use for traffic control. Back in 2006 the Board looked at various options that were at their disposal, speed humps are not bumps, they go up about 3 inches, whereas a hump is 6 inches. It is possible to drive over a hump going 10-15 miles per hour without really being disturbed, but if you are speeding excessively (over 30 miles per hr) you will be disrupted, so people are forced to slow down and traffic is calmed.

There are certain engineering problems where humps can not be placed on streets, such as curves or a steep slope, or a road that is heavily traveled by emergency vehicles. Those would be legitimate reasons humps would not be placed. Before the Board holds a public hearing, the Engineer is requested to review the feasibility. The petition must contain signatures of at least 75% of the affected residents on the proposed street and on abutting streets that would have no other means of egress.

The roads in the Pines that have speed humps have been transformed. Residents are out walking, jogging, pushing baby strollers. There is a positive, beneficial effect.

At 8:39 p.m. Deputy Mayor Millman made a motion to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Trustee Sorrillo. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Kari Caballero - 8A Orchard Street – noted that her and her son were the ones that started the petition and have been putting signs out for years to alert vehicles to children playing. She and her neighbors park their cars on the street to try and slow traffic down. Neighbors trying to exit their driveways have been hit by oncoming cars, there are dead animals all over the street, because they are cutting through to go to Route 202 or Montebello Road, it's a straight road so they just gun it. They really feel that having the speed hump will at least slow them down. I won't even let my children walk my dog down the block. The amount of traffic has increased tremendously since the Mayer Drive Bridge closed.

Trustee Sorrillo asked if the problem was the same before the Mayer Drive Bridge closed.

Ms. Caballero responded, "yes", people were always speeding but the amount of cars has increased.

Tom Crowley - 15 Orchard Street - happy to hear this appears feasible; he is 100% in favor and has signed the petition. People drive real fast and only slow down before the stop sign. Getting in and out of the driveway has been a real problem. There are a lot of joggers that use the street, a lot of pedestrian traffic, I am happy to hear the program for speed humps has proven effective in other places. I look forward to it.

John McIntosh - 24 Orchard Street – stated that he is against speed humps. He is a mechanic and has seen the damage these speed humps have done to car's suspension. They are destroyed in a year. He believes the problem would be better served if there

was more of a police presence on the street. He also believes the speed limit signs should be lowered so that they are more visible. He reiterated the need for more of a police presence in the neighborhood to issue speeding tickets and notes that he might see a police car once or twice a month.

Mayor Oppenheim noted that he misstated that 100% of the residents signed the petition; Mr. McIntosh did not sign the petition. He stands corrected.

Deputy Mayor Millman advised that the Village of Suffern put speed bumps on Memorial by the ball fields and that that is not the same as the hump that the Village would be putting in.

Mr. McIntosh asked how they are installed into the ground.

Deputy Mayor Millman asked Mr. McIntosh if he has gone on any of the roads in the Village that presently have speed humps.

Mr. McIntosh responded that he has been on Mayer Drive, and had to slow down to almost a full stop. Being a mechanic for many years, I have seen one put in Suffern on Lonergan Drive, 6 months after they put them in over there, every one of my customers needed front end suspension work. We do need to slow down cars but not with this. Most of the speeders are late at night. I have never had any trouble getting out of my driveway.

William Smith - 1 Lake Road – lives on the corner of Lake Road and Orchard.-I get the full picture because I live at the 3-way stop of Lake Road and Montebello and the one way stop at Orchard and Memorial. I hear screeching brakes daily, it's crazy. Everyday I hear someone coming down Orchard towards Lake. Every day, near accidents on the corner of Orchard and Memorial. Motorcycles, mostly people from out of the area. I do see police, the other day there was a town motorcycle cop pulling someone over directly in front of my house. I see joggers all the time, I see people walking their dogs. The street is dangerous and I am certainly in favor of the speed humps. I noticed 2 speed bumps in Suffern, I don't like those things, but I do see a very important reason for them. I think the intersections of Lake, Memorial, Orchard and Montebello should be patrolled more; there are a lot of people driving fast and running the signs. We are waiting for an accident. I regularly witnesses vehicles running the stop signs at the intersection of Lake, Montebello, Orchard and Memorial.

Jill Goldstein - 1 Canterbury Lane – discussed closing of Canterbury Lane where they closed Canterbury off from Viola. aside from the fact that you discuss beautification very often, that was the furthestest thing from beautification. She can't believe that the intended purpose would be for garbage trucks and lawn trucks and delivery trucks to be backing down Canterbury Lane because they can't maneuver the circle. She can't see how that is safe for anybody. Across the street at 2 Canterbury we have a severally disables autistic child who does not respond to her name let alone anything else and I have three children. I will agree the street is quieter except our children are very much in danger because for

some reason the offset was put so far up on Canterbury that trucks, even if you took those 10 feet, can not make the U-turn, because you need a wider space. She watches the garbage trucks back down the street every Monday. She has had to pull into driveways to avoid getting hit by lawn trucks. She reiterates that she can't guess that this was the intended purpose and has been told by people further down the street who have lived there 15 years that when this was originally done, originally proposed, trucks could come in and make U-turns, then the fire department got involved and it changed, and she has not tested this, but believes the mileage is shorter from Tallman to go around, because by the time a fireman gets out and unlocks the gate it has to take longer.

At this time, Mayor Oppenheim informs Ms. Goldstein that this is a public hearing to consider speed humps on Orchard Street and public comment is limited to that matter. There is a separate public comment period to address other matters.

Deputy Mayor Millman asked the residents in attendance if they felt one hump would be sufficient and make a difference.

Ms. Caballero responded that she would like two, but felt one would be worth the effort and would make a difference.

The Mayor asked her if she knew approximately how many children lived on the street.

She responded, 8-10 children.

Mayor Oppenheim thanked Justin Caballero for going out and collecting the signatures on the petitions and applauded his initiative.

Trustee Caridi feels a speed hump is very important in this area, not only is Orchard Street a cut-through now that the bridge is closed on Mayer Drive, but you can not make a left onto Route 202 from Lake Road, so that traffic is diverted through Orchard. People try and avoid the pool traffic on Memorial Drive so they use Orchard Street. Also, when there is heavy rain, Memorial Drive gets flooded out in the Village of Suffern and the road is impassable, Orchard Street is the only way out to Route 202.

No one else wishing to comment, at 8:55 p.m. Deputy Mayor Millman made a motion to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Trustee Caridi. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-081

Village of Montebello

Title: Orchard Street Speed Humps

WHEREAS, as more particularly described in Resolution No. 11-075 adopted June 15, 2011, the Village Board was the recipient of a Speed Hump Application for Orchard Street on May 19, 2011 and an additional petition on June 3, 2011, and, decided to hold a Public Hearing, but only after receipt of a report of the Village Engineer

advising whether the installation of Speed Humps was justified and appropriate in the interest of public safety, said Hearing to be held no sooner than ten (10) days after receipt of said report and the giving of notice by posting, and by mailing to all households on Orchard Street, as well as the households on Memorial Drive and Haverstraw Road that may be impacted; and

WHEREAS, the Village Attorney reported that due notice had been given upon questioning the Village Clerk and ascertaining that a report had been received from the Village Engineer as dated and received on July 8, 2011, and that the following Notice was posted at the Village Hall on July 8, 2011 and mailed to all of the aforementioned households on July 8, 2011, and was published on July 10, 2011:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that a Public Hearing will be held by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Montebello on Wednesday, July 20, 2011 at 8:00 p.m. local time, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard at the Montebello Community Center, 350 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, NY 10901, to consider the installation of a speed hump or speed humps on Orchard Street, between Lake Road and Route 202 (Wayne Avenue), as more particularly set forth in Petitions submitted on May 19, 2011 and June 3, 2011, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Resolution No. 06-101, as modified by Board action taken on Resolution No. 10-058, as adopted May 19, 2010, as directed in this matter by the Village Board upon adoption of Resolution No. 11-075.

All members of the public and all interested parties are invited to attend and participate. The petitions will be available for inspection and review at the Village Clerk's Office during normal working hours, Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the Village Engineer reported having studied the matter as per his aforementioned report which was read into the Record, and per his testimony, recommended the installation of one speed hump on Orchard Street; and

WHEREAS, the Village Planner, Robert Geneslaw, in his memorandum dated July 18, 2011, reported that the installation of Speed Humps is a Type II Action under SEQRA, thus not necessitating environmental review; and

WHEREAS, the Public Hearing was opened at 8:39 p.m., and the following gave testimony thereat:

1. Kari Caballaro-8A Orchard Street
2. Tom Crowley-15 Orchard Street
3. John McIntosh-24 Orchard Street
4. William Smith-1 Lake Road ; and

WHEREAS, no one else wishing to be heard, the Village Board closed the Public Hearing at 8:55 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board deliberated in public, finding that based upon the petitions, and testimony of the neighbors and the Village Engineer, that the installation of one speed hump would promote safety in the subject area, but that worthy points were also made about the need to minimize the visual impact on homeowners, thus finding that the Village Engineer should take into account property lines and sight lines from the homes in placing the hump and associated signage, the final determination by the Village Engineer to await consideration of the neighborhood reaction to same.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that, according to the foregoing Findings, said consolidated Applications be and are granted to the extent of, and according to the condition that placement of the speed hump and associated signage pay particular attention to property lines, and sight lines from the affected homes, and that the design be made available for neighborhood reaction at least 15 days, after which reaction the Village Engineer shall take same into account before finalizing the location, sound engineering and safety remaining the primary factors to be considered.

Motion: Trustee Sorrillo

Second: Trustee Caridi

Discussion:

Deputy Mayor Millman stated there is speeding all over the Village, and unfortunately humps cannot go on every street, he thinks the concept of the hump has worked; after a period of time if they are not working, residents have the option of taking the hump away, at their expense. He thinks the Police should be contacted and asked to patrol the area more. He is in favor of the humps.

Trustee Sorrillo is concerned about a single hump being installed, he feels vehicles will speed up to it, go over it and speed off again. He would like to see two humps installed but understands the opinion of the Village Engineer.

Trustee Caridi fully supports the petition and has empathy for residents with children that live there. She also feels that Orchard Street has always been a cut-through road, not only since the Mayer Drive Bridge closed.

Trustee Citrin noted that he has driven across the speed humps on Oxford Drive with numerous different vehicles and has never had a problem slowing down or feeling a "jarring" impact at any time with the suspension on his vehicles. He is in favor of this petition.

Ms. McIntosh stated the speed limit is 30 miles an hour on Orchard Street, which is a residential street; the limit is the same on Hemion Road, which is not residential. She wondered if there was anyway the speed limit could be reduced on Orchard.

Attorney Berbit responded, under State Law the lowest speed limit is 30 miles per hour on Village streets.

Mayor Oppenheim stated that Orchard Street is the most densely populated street in Montebello, and he feels that the residents are most deserving of speed humps. The Village Engineer will mark out the location on the roadway; he will try to place it in a location to not hinder someone backing out of their driveway. Residents will have enough time to contact the Village if they feel the hump is placed in a problematic area.

Deputy Mayor Millman hopes the speed hump slows traffic, but cautioned that it does not mean children should play in the street, everyone should be extremely careful.

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-082

Village of Montebello

Title: Setting Speed Hump and Authorizing Installation

WHEREAS, by a Resolution previously adopted this evening, after a Public Hearing, and at which SEQRA was duly considered, the Board authorized the installation of one speed hump on Orchard Street, subject to a final design by the Village Engineer, marking same in the field including signage for same, and allowing the community at least 15 days to react, and giving any such reaction due consideration before final placement by the Village Engineer; and

WHEREAS, the Village Engineer reports that installation of said speed hump can be accomplished under Tilcon's master contract with the Town of Ramapo, and with signage and striping also supplied under the contract, at a total cost not to exceed \$5,000.00, per the written estimate of the Village Engineer, a true copy of which shall be appended to the Minutes hereof.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that, in the interest of public safety, one speed hump shall be installed, as more particularly described above and in the attached documents, and that a sum not to exceed \$5,000.00 be and hereby is authorized to be expended to Tilcon for the installation of same, for the installation of appropriate signage and striping as per the direction and design of the Village Engineer, per the Tilcon proposal, precise location to be determined by the Village Engineer after marking the intended locations, and considering the community reaction.

Motion: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second: Trustee Sorrillo

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

The next agenda item was a presentation by Joseph Macula, Manager of External Affairs with United Water and Sameat Mester, the Project Manager and C.E Engineer for the Haverstraw Water Supply Project. The presentation focused on United Water's proposed solutions for providing a sustainable water supply to Rockland County by treating the Hudson River water for consumption. Water that is produced by the pilot plant is of the same or higher quality than drinking water currently consumed by Rockland County residents according to their engineering study.

A question and answer session ensued after the presentation and ended with Mayor Oppenheim thanking Mr. Macula and Mr. Mester for their presentation.

Resolution: 11-083

Village of Montebello

Title: Approval of Minutes

BE IT RESOLVED, the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of May 18, 2011 be and are hereby approved.

Motion: Trustee Sorrillo

Abstain: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second: Trustee Caridi

Upon vote, the Resolution carried.

Resolution: 11-084

Village of Montebello

Title: Approval of Minutes

BE IT RESOLVED, the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of June 15, 2011 be and are hereby approved.

Motion: Trustee Caridi

Second: Deputy Mayor Millman

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

The next Resolution was a Fee Reduction Request for Wehman/Bambace, 1 & 3 Lake Road. The Board felt they needed additional information on this matter and tabled the Resolution for the August meeting.

Mayor Oppenheim gave a brief explanation of the next resolution with regard to the National Water Main Co. which was awarded the contract by the R.C. Sewer District #1 to repair manholes and replace pavement around manholes in the Village. This company requested a waiver of the road opening fees in the amount of \$4750.00 because they claim the work does not require what would normally be considered an excavation, that

there will not be any disturbed soil. The Village Clerk surveyed a number of other Village's that have received the same request and most are not charging a road opening fee. The Mayor spoke to the Village Engineer who stated that the company is in fact providing an improvement to the Village's infrastructure and that waiving the fee may be appropriate and customary. The Village will incur engineering fees from inspections of this work. None of the 19 manholes that are being repaired are on any newly paved streets.

Trustee Citrin does not understand the logic behind waiving the fee. The Deputy Mayor would like to know if there was an amount of money for fee reimbursement in their contract when it was awarded from the Sewer District. Attorney Berbit has not reviewed this contract; the road opening application was made by the National Water Main Cleaning Company, not R.C. Sewer District #1.

Resolution: 11-085

Village of Montebello

Title: Fee Reduction: Road Opening Requests for National Water Main Cleaning Co.

WHEREAS, the Village is in receipt of an undated letter and attached specifications from National Water Main Company indicating that it has been awarded a contract by the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 (RCSD No. 1) to repair manholes and replace pavement around same for a maximum area of 5 foot by 5 foot around the covers at 24 locations claimed to be within the village as specified in said notice letter; and

WHEREAS, in her memorandum dated June 22, 2011, the Village Clerk responded requesting a Certificate of Insurance naming the Village; a \$5,000.00 satisfactory completion bond; road opening fees in the amount of \$4,750.00; and, reported that Grist Mill Court is an undedicated road, requiring permission from the developer and 4 other roads are not within the Village, and, as a consequence, that approval is needed from the Village Engineer for 19 of the roadways in the listing; and

WHEREAS, a road opening permit application dated June 16, 2011, was received by the Village on that date, with Rider prepared and attached by Village Engineer on June 21, 2011, setting forth conditions to the issuance of the permit, and a mark-up of the road list, indicating that 19 of the openings are on Village roads, plus 2 are on non-dedicated streets; and

WHEREAS, given that such work is for the RCSD No.1, the applicant has requested that road opening fees be waived as, apparently, is the procedure with other municipalities, but the Village Engineer reports his estimate that monitoring the work will necessitate about \$600.00 of his time; and

WHEREAS, all documents mentioned are understood to form a part hereof, true copies of which shall be appended to the Minutes hereof.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that said road opening permit shall be granted, the conditions set forth in the Rider by the Village Engineer to be attached to and to form a part thereof, and that the road opening fee in the amount of \$4,750.00 waived, except for \$600.00 to reimburse the cost to the Village of the Village Engineer.

Motion: Trustee Caridi

Second: Trustee Sorrillo

Roll Call vote:	Trustee Citrin	Nay
	Trustee Caridi	Aye
	Deputy Mayor Millman	Aye
	Trustee Sorrillo	Aye
	Mayor Oppenheim	Aye

The Resolution carried 4 to 1.

Public Comment:

Mayor Oppenheim explained that Canterbury Lane was closed last year after more than a decade of talking about its closure. The Mayor went on to say that the decision preceded all of the current Board members. The closure was initiated by an agreement with the people who lived on Canterbury at the time and Mayor Ellsworth and the Board of Trustees at that time, in cooperation with the developer of the Pines in a proposal when they put in Lety Lane which was going to have a good line of sight and access, they felt that Canterbury was going to ultimately be closed at Viola Road. This was the plan, which took 20 years to get done, primarily because the Village did not get dedication of Lety Lane until the developer offered it, and that did not happen until a couple of years ago, therefore the Village could not close Canterbury until the dedication of Lety Lane was accepted by the Village Board. In the process, the Village had two public hearings in which everyone who lived on Canterbury was invited to attend and speak their mind about the closure; everybody was heard. We also heard from County Emergency Services, the Fire Department, the School District, everyone had a chance to speak their mind, not once, but a couple of times. The unanimous opinion the Board heard, and that was reflected in the record, was that everybody wanted it closed. Emergency Services didn't want it closed completely, they wanted a crash gate that they could open in the event of an emergency and in the event of snow fall, so they could open it up and plow, and get through. The deal that was stated on the record at that time was that if it was closed a barrier would be put in. The Engineer at the time designed and showed everyone what it was going to look like. It was not the most aesthetic looking, but it is what is permitted for Emergency Services and their requirements. This was the deal the entire time.

The Mayor went on to say that he understands the problem Mr. Weinger (1 Canterbury) and Mrs. Selchick (2 Canterbury) are having. The problem is the end of the road is not a big enough cul-de-sac for vehicles to do a turnaround, particularly trucks. They are going

primarily on her property because she has a circular driveway, turning around there, and that places her child in danger.

Mayor Oppenheim explained that he had the Engineer go out, Martin Spence, he looked at it, studied it, and talked to everybody, and actually, with a paint can, drew out a possible solution for the problem. The possible solution would be to make a bigger cul-de-sac to pave it out in a bigger circle which would require taking part of the lawn, a little piece of Mr. Weinger's and a little piece of Ann Selchick's front lawn but within the Village's right-of-way. That would create a larger cul-de-sac that would allow almost all of these vehicles to turnaround, maybe not the biggest truck, but almost all of the vehicles would be able to then turnaround without going onto private property.

The Mayor also noted that he understands that Mr. Weinger has particular issues regarding his children getting to the school bus. The school bus stops on the Viola side of the crash gate; that is mandated by the school district, not the Village. Your children have to get to the school bus so they walk around the gate and the pathway may have snow on it, it may be wet and in those circumstances the children are going through the gate, which is obviously not what the gate was intended to do. You have a concern and want the Village to put pavement around the side of the gate so there would be a path for the children, to make it safer for them. I asked our attorney to look at this along with Martin Spence and a letter was mailed to both Mr. Weinger and to Mrs. Selchick making the following offer: that the Village, at our expense, expand the size of the cul-de-sac, so vehicles would not go on your property, and make an effort to try and make a walkway or path to the side for the children to walk around the gate to be maintained by the residents. The letter was mailed out about two weeks ago and we have not heard back from you.

Jill Goldstein - 1 Canterbury Lane - moved in 3-4 years ago so she was unaware of the history of the closure. She only made it to one meeting and was totally unaware of everything going on. She was told by some of her neighbors that when this was first initiated, they did bring trucks up to do turnarounds, and they were planning on making it wide enough to do turnarounds. You would like to take 8 feet from Selchicks property and 2 feet from ours, which although this seems like a lot there is still a straight thing where the fence is and it does not give the trucks enough room to make the turn, and I understand that maybe the children at the end of the block, the other end of the block, are very happy, I just do not see how big trucks backing down the street can possibly be safe for anyone, because trust me, those trucks are big. We feel that if you time the fire department response from Tallman, if they were to come around to Canterbury instead of cutting through the Pines, by the time they get out to unlock the lock it would be the same difference as if they came through the Pines. To put the offset further back towards Viola gives those trucks a bigger area to turn, right now, even the newspaper man is using our driveway, there are holes in the driveway, and our neighbor has holes in her driveway from trucks that have taken out pieces of pavement. Our lawns have been ruined by people driving all over them. Ms. Goldstein acknowledged that the Mayor was very responsive to her complaints.

Mr. Weinger - 1 Canterbury Lane - One of the things that is talked about a lot is the opening, I am a fireman in Suffern so I am used to pre-planning and emergencies and things like that, and I know there is a lot of discussion from Emergency Services and what they wanted, but even with the way it is now I do not think their intention with what they really wanted is what really ended up happening, because they wanted a way they could pull their tractor trailer up on that part and be clear of Viola in order to unlock the gate, but I don't think there is enough room there for them to do that anyway. He really feels that if the gate was moved closer to Viola, then the circle you guys want to make will actually be big enough. I kind of reject the fact that 2 feet from us and 8 feet from them will make enough room, because the trucks that are causing the most trouble are the tractor trailer trucks that have a truck against them, the ones that the landscapers use, you see them all around. The trucks are getting longer and longer and longer, because they have a trailer behind a dump truck, or a trailer behind another type of truck, and in order for them to make a circle they have a limited radius, because once the two corners touch that's it, they can't, and they are very hard to back up and turn around, so I kind of reject the fact that the Engineer says large trucks will make that turn, I don't think that any trucks that are getting stuck there now, which are the landscaper trucks would make that turn, just from looking at it, but I could be wrong. I am not an engineer, but I have seen a lot of trucks turn around and they have trouble making it through our neighbors driveway and that is much bigger than what you guys are talking about, so that is one thing.

The other thing is, when you guys voted to close, finally close it, because another vote, I think the previous mayor was there and I think one of the trustee suggested that we shouldn't close it permanently we should close it temporarily because what happens if there is a problem? They said maybe it should be closed for a year and then revisited.

(Ms. Goldstein interjected) "Which is why we waited until now, we wanted to give it a full year".

Mayor Oppenheim does not wish to debate this all night and suggests Mr. Weinger craft a letter of response to the Village Board putting forth his proposal to remediate this problem and it will be shared with the Village Engineer for his review.

Mr. Weinger asked who from Emergency Services asked for this kind of barrier gate, was it Tallman or other Emergency Services?

The Village Clerk/Treasurer responded, it was Tallman and also the ambulance corps, there were several.

Attorney Berbit noted that it actually was Emergency Services that drove the change. Originally, with the former administration, the plan was to make it a permanent circle, without access to Viola in any form. Emergency Services opposed this, suggesting the alternate approach for the crash gate and setting the gate in enough so larger trucks could pull off Viola Road.

The Mayor stated that because Viola is a County road, they had to be included in this too. That is part of the reason it took 20 years.

Mayor Oppenheim reminded Mr. Weinger that he visited his property when he moved in and spent a lot of time discussing this. The Village paved part of his driveway to accommodate him for this at the Village's expense. The Village has been there trying to work with him 100%.

Ms. Goldstein said they realize the Village has been there trying to work with them, when this was originally proposed and everyone saw that the trucks could make the "U-turn", that changed dramatically from the time it actually took place to the execution.

Mayor Oppenheim asked that they put it in writing and we will move forward from there.

Mr. Weinger and Ms. Goldstein expressed their appreciation to the Mayor.

Resolution: 11-086

Village of Montebello

Title: Revised Fee Schedule-Violation Searches

WHEREAS, the Building Inspector reports that Village's Fee schedule should differentiate between Commercial and Residential violation search fees, as is done in other municipalities, such as Airmont whose schedule was shared as exempletive, because to perform such for commercial properties is much more complex and time consuming, thus justifying that a graduated fee schedule be adopted; and

WHEREAS, such appearing fair and reasonable, and will more accurately reflect the cost to the Village in time in performing such searches.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, effective immediately, that the Village's Fee Schedule be amended as follows, the revised schedule to be attached hereto as a part hereof:

Building Inspector fees.

Violation searches:

-For a residential property: \$175.

-For nonresidential property.

Occupancy Group A (A = Assembly).

Capacity of Facility (persons)	Fee
1 to 50	\$175
51 to 100	\$200

10	
1	
to 300	\$250
301 or greater	\$2 per person

Occupancy Groups B, E, F, H, I, M, U (B=Business; E=Educational;

F=Factory; H=High Hazard; I=Institutional; M=Mercantile; U=Utility and Misc.)

Area of Facility (square feet)	Fee
1 to 5,000	\$175
5,001 to 10,000	\$200
10,001 to 25,000	\$500
25,001 to 50,000	\$750
50,001 to 75,000	\$1,000
75,000 or greater	\$1,500

Occupancy Group R

R-1 = Transient Occupancy (i.e., hotels and motels).

Number of Rooms	Fee
Up to 10	\$175
Each additional over 10	\$10

R-2 = Permanent Occupancy (i.e., townhomes).

Number of Living Units	Fee
Three-unit cluster (each)	\$175
Each additional unit (public part inspection only)	\$20

R-3 = Fewer than three dwelling units: \$200.

R-4 = Residential Care/Assisted Living Facilities (more than five but fewer than 16 occupants, excluding staff).

Number of Beds	Fee
Up to 10	\$200
Each additional over 10	\$10

I = Institutional (i.e., nursing home with more than 16 occupants),

Number of Beds	Fee
First 100	\$175
Each additional over 100	\$10

Reinspection violation search:

For first such reinspection of a residential property: \$75; and

For each subsequent reinspection of a residential property within one year of the first inspection: \$75

For first such reinspection of a nonresidential property: \$125; and

For each subsequent reinspection of a nonresidential property within one year of the first inspection: \$125.

Motion: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second: Trustee Caridi

Discussion on the amount of time it takes for a building inspector to inspect a large commercial building versus a residential dwelling. The proposed fees represent what other neighboring municipalities are charging for their inspector's time.

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-087

Village of Montebello

Title: Amending Resolution No. 11-076 ~ June Abstract

WHEREAS, the invoice for Scenery Solutions in the amount of \$6,396.86 was included in the June Abstract as a General Fund expense and should have been listed as a Parks and Recreation Account expense; and

WHEREAS, deductions were made to the invoices for March and April for the Town of Ramapo highway service, and the deductions were not reflected in the total amount due, therefore, the total amount due to the Town of Ramapo to be reduced from \$39,125.41 to \$38,938.30.

BE IT RESOLVED, that Resolution No. 11-076, entitled Approval of Abstract and Schedule of Claims, dated June 15, 2011 be and hereby is amended to reflect a change in the total amount of claims from \$128,030.31 to \$121,446.34.

Motion: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second: Trustee Caridi

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-088

Village of Montebello

Title: Schedule Property Maintenance Hearing for 2 Tanchak Court

WHEREAS, despite the issuance of a notice of violation and violation notices, Building Inspector reports in his memorandum dated July 14, 2011 that the premises located at 2 Tanchak Court, Section 40.20, Block 1 and Lot 13.1, record owner Michael Campanella, remains in a non-maintained condition, representing a nuisance and a possible hazard to health and safety, and an eyesore; and

WHEREAS, it is reported that said conditions have persisted for some time prior to June 6, 2011, when a Notice of Violation was posted, in that it appears the owner has not maintained his property, the grass being unmowed, and the property having become overgrown, and such cannot be tolerated; and

WHEREAS, such condition appearing to violate §132-17 of the Village Code and §302.4 of the New York State Property Maintenance Code; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Building Inspector recommend that a hearing be held pursuant to §132-17 of the Village Code, to determine whether the Village Board shall order that the conditions be corrected at Village expense and direction, the cost of same to be charged and assessed, to constitute a lien and charge on the property on which it is levied until paid or otherwise satisfied and discharged, and shall be collected in the same manner and at the same time as other Village charges.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that a hearing be held pursuant to §132-17 of the Village Code for the above purposes on August 11, 2011, beginning at 8:00 pm, local time, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, and that due notice thereof be given to the record owner and to the public as required by the Village Code.

Motion: Trustee Sorrillo

Second: Trustee Caridi

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Title: Approval of Agreement with Coulomb Technologies re: Electric Vehicle Charging Station.

WHEREAS, in furtherance of the "Green" orientation of the Village, and given the diminishing availability of the Charging Point America (CPA") Program, funded in part under the terms of Grant Number DE-EE0003391 from the U.S. Department of Energy ("the Grant") as part of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act ("ARRA"), the Mayor has negotiated with Coulomb Technologies and, subject to Village Board approval, the Village has been awarded one Coulomb Technologies Inc. ("CTI") electric vehicle charging station; and

WHEREAS, to effectuate same, the Village must enter into the following interrelated agreements, which enable it to have installed and to operate an electric vehicle charging station, at no initial cost to the Village, other than local electrical installation cost estimated up to \$3,000.00:

1. Station Award Agreement
2. Limited Product Warranty
3. Master Services Subscription Agreement ;and

WHEREAS, the Mayor further explained that having such a charging station is good for the environment, saving on emission and fossil fuel, and promotes the use of fully electric vehicles, and also has the potential of generating income to the Village, and that the associated federal legislation promotes that municipalities become charging stations as a matter of public policy; and

WHEREAS, the Village Attorney has reviewed the "Agreements and Warranty" and has suggested various changes to same, except since he recognizes that the content of these agreements may not be subject to easy negotiation due to the federal funding aspect of the program, and given that the requested changes have not been received to date, except for the choice of law and the place for dispute resolution language states that his suggestions do not rise to a recommendation against the agreements, which he recommends be revised.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the associated grant be accepted as is, and entering into the aforesaid agreements, subject to, final form as to dispute Resolution being acceptable to the Village Attorney; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the remainder of the NYSEDA Grant received from the solar panels at the Montebello Community Center in the amount of \$57,000 of which \$55,762 was used for that purpose, the balance of \$1,238 to be applied

towards the charging station installation cost, which the Village may do as reported by the Village Clerk who explained the issue.

Motion: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second Trustee Caridi

The cost for the charging station has not been fully determined, but it should not be nearly as much as \$3,000.00. There were residual monies left from the NYSERDA Grant received for the installation of the solar panels at the Community Center which will be used for the charging station.

Trustee Citrin asked if there are electric trucks on the market as of yet. Mayor Oppenheim responded that Mitsubishi was coming out with one. Trustee Citrin thought it would be a great idea to have at least one electric vehicle owned by the Village.

Trustee Sorrillo has a concern that because this station will be the ONLY charging station in this area, that they will come to Montebello. Mayor Oppenheim stated that most people that have electric cars have the charging station at their homes as well.

The Village's station will be primarily used for people that are "passing thru".

The station will be given to the Village for no charge until January 2014, after that point a \$300 a year subscription fee will be charged, after that time the Village can disconnect the station.

Trustee Citrin asked if the Village earns any income from this. Mayor Oppenheim responded, "yes", the Village can set the rate that will be charged, there are a number of different ways the fee can be assessed.

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-090

Village of Montebello

Title: Fine Structure for Violation of Park Rules

WHEREAS, the Parks Commission by virtue of a Resolution adopted July 7, 2011, referenced as if set forth hereinafter, a true copy of which shall be appended to the Minutes hereof, requested that the Village Board consider amending the Village Code to the extent necessary to effectuate establishing an initial fine structure of \$500 per offense pertaining to violation of the Kathryn Gorman Ponds Park Rules; and

WHEREAS, the Commission views this as necessary given noted violations of the Rules already occurring since the recent opening of the Park, in order to protect Village Property and to safeguard lawful users of the Park; and

WHEREAS, such would also have universal application to other Village property, such as the environs of the Village Hall.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Village Attorney, with the assistance of General Code and the Planner as he deems necessary, is authorized to study the Village Code for the above purpose, and to prepare a draft proposed amendment to same for review by the Village Board no later than the September 21, 2011 Regular Meeting of same.

Motion: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second: Trustee Citrin

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-091

Village of Montebello

Title: Parks Commission-Outdoor Movie Night

BE IT RESOLVED, as requested by the Parks Commission that authority is hereby granted to enter into a contract with Superior Audio Visual in the sum of approximately \$1,200 to conduct an outdoor movie night on or about October 1, 2011, and that said sum be authorized to be expended therefore, a true copy of said contract to be appended to the Minutes hereof as a part hereto.

Motion: Trustee Sorrillo

Second: Trustee Caridi

Trustee Citrin felt that there are a lot of movie theaters in the County, the Town conducts a movie night, but there is no reason that the Village should sponsor a movie night. He was very disappointed at the turn out of the Camp-Out and feels that October may be the wrong time of year for this sort of event.

Trustee Sorrillo and Trustee Caridi concurred with Trustee Citrin's comments.

Deputy Mayor Millman mentioned that because the village is conducting a Noise Study at this time, there could be potential sound concerns from the movie night that could possibly go beyond our property and onto adjacent properties.

Roll Call vote:	Trustee Sorrillo	Nay
	Trustee Caridi	Nay
	Deputy Mayor Millman	Nay
	Trustee Citrin	Nay
	Mayor Oppenheim	Nay

Upon vote, the Resolution failed.

Resolution: 11-092

Village of Montebello

Title: Setting Revised Income Levels for Indian Rock Affordable Housing

BE IT RESOLVED, that moderate income levels pertaining to qualifying for the Village's affordable housing program, for the period April 15, 2011 to April 14, 2012, be set according to the attached, as a part hereof, Memorandum of the Village Planner dated July 8, 2011, and associated chart.

Motion: Deputy Mayor Millman

Second: Trustee Sorrillo

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-093

Village of Montebello

Title: Approval of Abstract & Schedule of Claims

BE IT RESOLVED, the Abstract and Schedule of Claims dated July 20, 2011, and totaling \$ 148,015.66 are hereby approved and the claims listed thereon shall be paid.

Motion: Trustee Sorrillo

Second: Deputy Mayor Millman

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Resolution: 11-094

Village of Montebello

Title: Ratify Stipulation Agreement Sakhrani/Perfect Cut

WHEREAS, Perfect Cut Tree Service, Inc.'s (Licensee) license to cut and remove trees in the Village was suspended pursuant to Chapter 176 due to the allegation that Licensee removed trees at 3 Lety Lane, Sakhrani being the landowners, greatly in excess of the permit, and also unlawfully removed trees in the Village's conservation easement; and

WHEREAS, the landowners were similarly noticed and charged, including also with replanting in the conservation easement; and

WHEREAS, the Licensee posted a \$5,000.00 bond in conjunction with commencing an appeal to the Village Board, which enabled it to continue working; and

WHEREAS, the Assistant Village Attorney, Ira Emanuel, negotiated with the Licensee and the landowners to resolve all issues, resulting in a Stipulation dated July 9, 2011, as executed by all parties, referenced as if fully set forth herein, a true copy of which shall be appended to the Minutes hereof, and the issue of re-vegetation (Remediation Plan) has been approved by the Planning Board on July 12, 2011, PB-10 of 2011, (copy attached); and

WHEREAS, the Village Attorney recused himself for the deliberation and negotiations process because, circumstantially, the Licensee was in the midst of doing tree removal work on his property pursuant to a Village Permit when the violations on the Sahkrani property occurred; and

WHEREAS, as more particularly set forth in the Stipulation, the salient details are as follows:

1. Admission by Licensee and Owners.
2. Acceptance of joint and several liability.
3. Licensee forfeits the \$5,000 paid to the Village.
4. Licensee and Owner to jointly pay another \$7,000 to the Village (28 trees excessively removed at \$250 per tree), \$2,000 of which is to be returned upon satisfactory completion of all terms including re-planting, but which shall escheat to Village if terms not satisfactorily completed.
5. Tree Remediation Plan, as approved by the Planning Board, to be completed as determined by the Village Engineer no later than 8/31/2011, including removal of trees planted in the Conservation Easement, except for those regarded to be planted per the Remediation Plan, the cost of same to be paid as noted.
6. Payment of all professional fees incurred by Village in this matter; and

WHEREAS, as the appeal of the license revocation is made to the Village Board, and the Village Board has exclusive jurisdiction over the Village's Conservation Easements, the Stipulation is presented to the Village Board for review and possible ratification.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon the finding that said Stipulation comprehensively and fairly addresses the harm perpetuated by the Licensee and Owners, and is recommended by the Assistant Village Attorney, Village Engineer, and was approved by the Planning Board, that such is hereby accepted and ratified by the Village Board, and the License of the Licensee restored, conditioned upon successful and satisfactory completion of all terms of the Stipulation including timely effectuating the Tree Remediation Plan, but should such not occur, then all sums paid to the Village shall

be considered as forfeit, the License revocation considered as back in effect, and both the Licensee and Owners shall remain subject to prosecution for violation of Village Code 176, as well as trespassing upon and violating the Village's property interest in the Conservation Easement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Licensee be warned that should another violation of Chapter 176 occur, the Village Board will not be inclined to agree to a Stipulation which restores the Licensee's license, irrespective the terms.

Motion: Trustee Sorrillo

Second: Deputy Mayor Millman

Upon vote, the Resolution carried unanimously.

Trustee Citrin thanked Assistant Attorney Ira Emanuel for negotiating this deal.

The next agenda item was a review of the application submitted for Ramapo Valley Soccer Club.

Mayor Oppenheim recused himself from discussion on this application as he owns property in the vicinity of this proposal.

Village Attorney, Warren Berbit summarized that Mr. John Martin from the Ramapo Valley Soccer Club has submitted for the second time before the Board a proposal to build a year round multi-purpose recreational facility on two side by side lots located on Rella Blvd. Village Attorney Berbit pointed out that with the size of the agenda tonight, he was very swamped with preparation, therefore he was unable to have a lengthy dialogue with the Soccer Club's Attorney, Mr. Klein. He did however briefly speak with the Village Planner who stated there is "Commercial Recreation" as a special permit use listed under the LO zone, the property in question is listed in the LO-C zone.

The Applicant is requesting the "LO" zone special permit use to be included in the "LO-C" zone. Mr. Berbit points out that in discussion with the Village Planner, if this change were made it would include the MaryDell and Weg properties, unless some type of bulk restrictions were introduced. It would be considered a Type I action under SEQRA and would require that a full Environmental Impact Statement be prepared.

Attorney Berbit suggested that bulk limitations be added to the special permit uses and that they specifically list the uses to prevent potential use changes in the future. He is currently seeking a better definition for commercial recreation.

He went on to say that the Village Board would declare itself lead agency and then would authorize the application to be forwarded to other agencies for their review and comments.

Trustee Citrin stated that the revisions/additions that were made to the proposed plan from the initial informal application that was submitted in March 2011 are dramatic.

Members are confused with the direction in which the application is going, Mr. Berbit explained the steps.

Attorney for the applicant, Michael Klein gave a brief overview of the applicant's proposed plan and stated his client wishes to engage in discussion with the professionals at CDRC, and, after recommendation from the Planning Board they would like to come back to the Village Board to continue discussions about the desirability and feasibility of this commercial recreational use.

It is recommended that the Members of CDRC perform an informal, careful and thorough review of the application at the request of the Board of Trustees and respond back to the Board no later than October 1, 2011 with a detailed response to assist the Board with its deliberations. A consensus favored this approach.

The next agenda item was a discussion on the computer system quotes that have been received.

Board members were not satisfied with the quote that was received from the sole-proprietor, Coulter's Computer Consulting. They felt that Delaney Computer Services, Inc. was high in their monthly service costs. The Village is not happy with the service of Atlantic Tomorrows Office, who is currently the Village's computer company. Another presentation this evening added another quote to consider.

Trustee Caridi suggested a company that recently completed a large job with the school district; she will have the company contact Debra Mastroeni in Village Hall to at least give a quote.

The matter was tabled to acquire an additional quote and to further review the quotes received.

Public Comment:

William Smith - 1 Lake Road – lives across the street from the Montebello Road bridge, he has concerns with this bridge because of the increased use of it with the Mayer Drive bridge closed. The bridge is 75 years old, built in 1936 and he has an engineering background, licensed architect and looked at the bridge and it's concrete, the main structure is concrete over corrugated pipe which is over steel beam. He noted that there is a lot of rust on the girders. He checked the bridge out on-line, through the NYS website, that rates all the NYS bridges in the State, it does not rate like its going to fall down tomorrow, but he thinks someone needs to look at it, the town, the village has to be proactive about this bridge. The Village needs to take a close look at it and put a plan in

action because he sees trucks going over it, it is not designed for the size of the trucks that you see going over it.

At 11:15 p.m. Trustee Sorrillo made a motion to enter Executive Session to discuss litigation matters, seconded by Trustee Caridi. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

At 11:20 p.m. Deputy Mayor Millman made a motion to exit Executive Session, seconded by Trustee Citrin. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Deputy Mayor Millman made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Trustee Citrin. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:21 p.m.