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(The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.)

MAYOR HUBBARD: Call the meeting to order. Pledge to the flag.

(All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance)

MAYOR HUBBARD: Thank you. Okay. We'll start off with Chief Wayne Miller from the Fire Department with his report.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Good evening

CHIEF MILLER: Good evening, everybody.

Okay. So just a few things here.

The parking lot in the back, they brought it up last night at the Wardens meeting. It's turned into like a mud pit back there.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

CHIEF MILLER: So they were wondering if we could get, I don't know, some kind of stone or something put in there, or something to firm it up a little bit.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Uh-huh.

CHIEF MILLER: It's turning into a little bit of a mess. So there were some complaints about that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yup.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Is that because of drainage from the concrete work in the front
there? Is that a new condition or was it a preexisting condition?

CHIEF MILLER: No. This is something new, because they put the pools in the back.

So where that was dug up --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

CHIEF MILLER: They just filled -- when they filled it back in, it's just --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right, got it.

CHIEF MILLER: -- basically dirt, so it's creating a problem.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah. They're supposed to be shoring up around the aprons and everywhere, all the other stuff. It's supposed to be shored up. Unfortunately, we're not going to be able to get it paved because of the weather conditions and all. But either Corazzini or --

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- when the -- get DL, the cement contractor who's going to put something in and -- you know, and roll it and compact it, so that even if they have to plow the parking lot and everything, they don't
start tearing everything up --

CHIEF MILLER: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- when stuff goes on for
the winter.

CHIEF MILLER: And so -- and that's done.
That's not -- I heard a rumor that there was
talk about tearing that back up, the -- where
the pools got put in.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Who said that?

CHIEF MILLER: I don't know. That was
just -- I won't elaborate on it, but it was
just something that I heard. So, you know,
okay, fine.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, you could ask
whoever said it, find out and let me know.

CHIEF MILLER: All right. All right.

No.

MAYOR HUBBARD: We have no plans of
tearing it back up.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay, great.

MAYOR HUBBARD: We already got the bill
and it's paid, it's already paid for.

CHIEF MILLER: Yeah, okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So if they got something
else going on, they really should let us know.
CHIEF MILLER: Well, you know how rumors start flying around.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, yeah.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Speaking of rumors, in reading the report, I see here that there's some discussion on another truck.
CHIEF MILLER: Yes. Standard Hose is looking for a new pumper.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh, okay. Have they checked with the Village Treasurer yet on everything or --
CHIEF MILLER: We haven't voted to buy it yet.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh, okay.
CHIEF MILLER: We're still looking at it for a few more prices, possibly. That got discussed last night also, so.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. As I said, I saw it here and I was kind of like, "Oh, okay, um, um." I haven't heard anything, and I'm assuming nobody else heard anything, so that's the only reason why I'm asking.
CHIEF MILLER: Yeah. We're not. You know, we're close, but we're not in the final stages yet, so.
The other thing, too, the cement pad in
the back, we spoke about that. Are they going
to -- are they done doing cement work for this
year or was that --

MR. PALLAS: We're not yet --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Go ahead.

MR. PALLAS: No, we're not sure on that
yet. I'm still working with them. They think
that it might be best to wait.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: So if they do that, it's
only going to tear up more of the parking lot
when they go and put it in. So rather than do
that and have additional stone that we have to
put in --

CHIEF MILLER: Right.

MR. PALLAS: -- just leave it until the
spring, do that in the spring and then do the
paving all at once.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay. And also Station 2,
we talked about the concrete inside the
building. And Derryl said something, they were
going to do that during the winter, because
it's indoors.

MR. PALLAS: I'll double-check on that.
CHIEF MILLER: So we need to know if that's going to happen so we can make arrangements for that.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Did they find anything when they were cutting that out, Paul, that we had talked about?

MR. PALLAS: I don't think so. It would -- I didn't hear anything, so I'm assuming. I told them if they did find something, to let me know. So I haven't heard, so I'm assuming they didn't.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: And they didn't find any problem, so.

CHIEF MILLER: All right. So the next thing was we were talking about redoing the floor bays, the floors in the truck bays. So it looks like it's going to be quite a bit of money to do that. The cheapest bid that I've got so far was around $73,000. Now I'm not sure if that includes prevailing wage or not, so that may raise the cost. But I had three quotes. One was 73,000, one was 150, and another guy was 123, and that's to do all three
buildings.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: What exactly are you doing to the floors?

CHIEF MILLER: They're going to come in here, they're going to grind up, grind up these floors out here, and they're going to put a new coating in there and seal the floors.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Oh, seal it and all?

CHIEF MILLER: Yeah, so -- and they were going to do that in all three buildings, plus the bathrooms also in this one.

MR. BRANDT: That has to go through formal bidding, though.

CHIEF MILLER: No, I know that. I'm just bringing it up and letting you know that that's a possibility of what might be coming up, yeah. No, don't worry, I'm on that. Also the cars --

MR. PALLAS: On the floor, there's a -- we're doing -- sounds very similar to what we're doing in the basement in the power plant, which is being done under a County contract. I can get you the information --

CHIEF MILLER: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: -- and you can contact the guy and see if it even qualifies for it.
CHIEF MILLER: Okay. Yeah, that would be great, appreciate that.

The two cars, do you guys want those or -- I understand they went out, nobody bid on them and --

MR. PALLAS: Yeah, we're taking -- we're definitely taking one.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: I'm not sure about the second one yet.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Is that the -- is that the resolution to rescind?

CLERK PIRILLO: Yes, yes. Yes, it is.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay. So we're voting -- do you want us to vote to rescind the surplus declaration?

MR. BRANDT: Surplus, yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Right.

CLERK PIRILLO: We declared it as surplus and not for use for general municipal purposes. So we are rescinding it to undeclare it, if you will.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And then we're --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So we can use it for municipal purposes.

CHIEF MILLER: And the last thing I have is the LOSAP. They voted to keep it the same.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

CHIEF MILLER: No changes. But, also, within the next few months, they're looking to increase the amount of years to 40 years, just for retention. There's a lot of guys that are -- a lot of younger guys that are at 30 years already, so they're talking about making it 40 now, so.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

CHIEF MILLER: Whatever. So Jimmy, the secretary is going to work with Penflex to try to get something together so that we can present it to you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Just to kind of explain that to everybody, when we started the program, we started it with a 20-year program in 1993, that went to 2008. In 2008, there was a referendum to vote on it to change -- to add the 10 years --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- to make it 30 years.

State Law allows for 40 years. So we're -- at
2018, we're at the maximum again. So anybody who has their points will max out at 30 years. To do the program, original program, some of the departments did it with 40 years right to start, but it increased the cost a lot. And this way it's been amortized over the past 20 years doing it, or 25 years, with a five-year buy-back on the original program. So now we're hitting the point now at the end of 2018, members that are still active and making all their points will max out after 30 years.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Gotcha.

MAYOR HUBBARD: And so this would just go and match what the State Law is, which is what everybody else has. But it would have to be a referendum again.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure.

MAYOR HUBBARD: That's how we did it in 2008, and the same thing is coming up in 2019.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Mayor, will we be having a representative from our LOSAP company come and give us an investment discussion?

MAYOR HUBBARD: We can. I mean --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: We haven't -- I don't think we really had it for a while, have we?
MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, that's fine.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I know we get the information, but I think it would be interesting to re -- I'd like to reeducate myself, especially if they're going to the 40 years, because it is part of our budget and we do have to keep watching it.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Oh, we could do that. Also, we're going to need to know what the projected cost of --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- this, of setting up the referendum, when we're going to schedule a vote, what it's going to add to the Fire Department budget and the Village budget, what the cost is going to be adding the 10 years.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Last time I believe it added about $30,000 per year onto it, because everything -- nobody starts collecting that all at once. It just increases -- you have to put -- start putting money away now for future years for it.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: All right. Well, I --

MAYOR HUBBARD: But it wasn't a huge
amount of money that had changed. But we have
to see what it is in this day and age.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I think it just would
be an educational -- for us, as Trustees. I
think it's been a while, so okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. No, that's fine.

CHIEF MILLER: All right. That's all I
have.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Just have, you
know, Jimmy get in contact with me and we can
sit down and, you know, we could talk with
Robert where the numbers, where it all falls.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: And then try to pick a
time, because it has to go -- you have to do a
referendum on that.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay. So like --

MAYOR HUBBARD: You have to do a public
vote.

CHIEF MILLER: -- what kind of time frame
are we -- if we really want to proceed with
this, what kind of time frame are we looking
at? Like March, is that when it would happen
or --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, it really depends
on Penflex, how long it's going to take them to
put the stuff together to decide what to do and
to schedule the vote.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Ideally, you would try to
schedule the vote in the summertime when
everybody is here.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: You know, but how much --
they need a vote by a certain amount of time to
notify the State that we're expanding the
program and to put everything in place for the
following budget year.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay, sounds good.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So, if we had the numbers
more sooner, because our budget year starts in
June, so --

MR. BRANDT: And I'm starting to work on
the budget next month, actually.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. So just, you
know, to place-hold what the possible cost
would be, depending on if it passes the
referendum and everything else. So the
beginning of January we could probably sit
together, you know, Robert, Jimmy, you and
myself and just sit there and talk about it, go
over the time frame with somebody from Penflex
and figure out what to do.

CHIEF MILLER: Okay, sounds good.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.
CHIEF MILLER: Anything else?
MAYOR HUBBARD: Anything else for the
Chief?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: No, sir.
MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. Thank you,
and have a Merry Christmas.

CHIEF MILLER: You, too. Merry
Christmas, Happy New Year.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Merry Christmas.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Merry Christmas.
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Merry Christmas.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you. Merry
Christmas.

CHIEF MILLER: Stay safe.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. We've got a couple
of items for discussion.

The wetlands permit application of
Stephen Bull, 24 Beach Road, we had left that
open last month. There was a lot of questions
after the public hearing and all. Did the
Board have any questions or --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Do you have anything to add?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah. I'll be honest with you, I sent around an email earlier with some questions to the Village Attorney. And I'll be real honest with you, I'm leaning towards asking us to just table this discussion until our Building Department has had an opportunity to actually check into some of the issues that were brought up between both the applicant and some other public members.

You know, it was brought to our attention that we have a group of sheds down there that have no permits. That kind of needs to be discovered, whether they're legal or not legal to begin with.

And the other question was brought to our attention on easements and right-of-ways, and I have a big question. Does this create access for Village residents to get down to Sandy Beach? So I think we have a lot of questions to ask, and I'm leaning towards asking that it be tabled until we find out some of this
information. That's my thoughts.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Uh-huh. Anybody else on the Board?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And if I may add onto that, the -- there's a big question of title, whether -- you know, Mr. Tasker brought up the issue of the title and the right-of-way. But, you know, there's -- someone has to go research and figure out if the title -- if that went with the title. I don't know very much about title, but someone -- I just don't -- I have 4,000 questions and no answers. If -- I'm very curious, also, if John Saladino's testimony, he was reading from the -- you're going to correct me later --

MS. MOORE: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: -- about it actually was, John, but the -- he was reading advice from the organization that sets the standards for these -- for wetlands construction, I guess. I'm sorry I'm butchering this.

But my point is that if I need -- Joe, I need our legal team to tell us if, in fact, this is all below the floodplain and, therefore, none of it, there should ever --
never be any construction. If that's the case, then I don't even know why we're discussing it. But I need -- you know, I need legal help right now, because I don't know anything about this stuff.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So I -- since last meeting, I received two emails from two different Trustees, one of which was you, and saying that they had questions. I contacted both Trustees and spoke to them on the phone and said that -- I was asked to be prepared for tonight to answer any questions that anybody has.

I've researched this extensively, I'm prepared to answer. I feel that I have a pretty thorough knowledge at this point of several of the key points that were raised the last time, and I'm prepared to answer any questions either tonight, or I could communicate in a memorandum, a memo, a confidential attorney/client memo, whatever -- whatever you prefer. If you have questions tonight, I'm happy to proceed, I'm feeling prepared.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: So is that area below
the floodplain, and can there be no
construction there?

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So I don't -- I
haven't seen the flood map, but it's my
understanding that it is below -- it is in the
floodplain. There can be construction there,
but you need to get permits. So there is
permits involved, one of which is from the
Village, and that's the application that we
have before us. There was a discussion
about --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. Those are DEC
and Army Corps?

MR. PROKOP: DEC.

MR. PALLAS: Just DEC.

MR. PROKOP: I don't think the Army Corps
is involved.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah, just DEC.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: The Army Corps,
because there's no -- there's not --

MR. PALLAS: Correct.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: No.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: So there was a question the
last time about whether FEMA -- what the FEMA
regulations are that affect this, and the type of construction of whether or not it had to be raised. There's actually -- I actually found two conflicting FEMA regulations, one -- when I've gone through all this with Mr. Pallas, one of the FEMA regulations that I was able to find precludes new construction or substantial reconstruction without raising the structure above the flood -- above the Base Flood Elevation.

In New York State, if it's a habitable premises at all, so you have to go freeboard plus two, but I think for the shed, it would be the Base Flood Elevation.

However, there's also another regulation that says that, repeats that, but says that if you're able -- for an accessory building that's not going to be habit -- used for habitation, if you can make the building completely water tight, you're able to not raise it. So I think that that -- that's pretty much exactly the language. I can circulate it. But it's not -- it's not just the base of the structure, it looks to me to be pretty much the entire structure would have to be water tight and be
able to not be susceptible to flooding damage
and --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: That's the International Building Code?

MR. PROKOP: No, that's FEMA, FEMA regulations.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: FEMA, okay.

MR. PROKOP: Federal regulations, right.
And I have those regulations, I can circulate them. I have a copy with me tonight. I can also circulate them to you, if you'd like.

The other thing -- one of the other things that was brought up, I just wanted to clarify, if I could, is that there's -- there are two easements across the -- two easements that go from one end of Sandy Beach to the other, and it was a little confusing the way that it was discussed. To me it was, I don't know if it was to anybody else, but it definitely was to me. But the first one is that there was a 30-foot easement, but that -- the original easement, but that's a privately held right-of-way, it's not -- it's not a public right-of-way. So the 30-foot easement is a common right-of-way among the property
owners of Sandy Beach. It is not a public
right-of-way to the Village or anybody else.

Adjoining that right-of-way, however,
there's a 20-foot easement that we have --
evidence was recorded, was dedicated to the
Village and then was recorded. That 20-foot
easement is a public easement in favor -- in
favor of the Village. But it's -- when Trustee
Phillips was asking about providing -- or, I'm
sorry, whoever asked that question. I'm sorry
if I'm identifying the wrong Trustee. Whoever
asked that question about providing access for
the Village down to the end of Sandy Beach,
that -- it would be over that 20-foot easement,
not over the 20, plus the 30. The 30 is a
private easement.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: The private easement
is -- that's the road that's there, right?

MR. PROKOP: That's the road that's
there, that's 30 feet.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And this is on the
other side of that?

MR. PROKOP: Adjoining the road.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Adjoining that.

MR. PROKOP: Yes.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS:  And is or is not the shed inside the 20-foot easement?

MR. PROKOP:  Okay. So we have -- so that's a good question. We have -- there is a survey that was part of the record, a piece of the survey, and that survey shows the shed being within the 20-foot easement, which is the easement that belongs to the Village. Now, however, the -- one of the things about this is that the language to these easements themselves is very -- is very confusing. And, actually, the easement says that, "Provided, however, until such time as the land shall be improved as a Village street by said Village" -- "successors in interest shall have the right to improve said land at our own expense and to" -- but -- and to use it as a road.

So I think that the intention was that it could be improved by the owners of Sandy Beach, if they wanted to, this 20-foot strip, and use it as a road, but probably not put anything in the easement that would obstruct it or diminish its use as a public right-of-way or road.

So --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS:  Wait a minute, I'm a
little confused here. The property owners down there on the 20-foot easement could put a road in, but --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Has to be available to the public.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Has to be available to the public.

MR. PROKOP: Has to be available to the public, right. They couldn't do anything that could block it.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Block it, that's what I meant.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: So, technically speaking, today I'm not allowed to go drive on the current, quote, unquote, road unless I am a member of the association?

MR. PROKOP: Correct.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay. But I should be able -- if they pave it, I can then drive down there, or can I just go walking down there now as a Village resident, or as a member of the public?

MR. PROKOP: I think you could probably -- I think you could -- my initial review -- my
initial response would be that you could probably walk down there as a resident. It says the Village -- until such time as the Village shall improve it as a road that the property owners can have the right to improve it and use it as their road, but that doesn't preclude any other use by the public. So it really is a public easement, I mean, subject to a more formal opinion and review, but that's my initial review of this.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: So this -- that isn't a wetlands permit issue at all, then.

MR. PROKOP: Right. It's not a wetlands -- it's different from the wetlands permit issue.

Now there is, as we were told last time, there is litigation that's pending involving this. One of the things about the property is it's also -- there's also a private covenant limiting building on the property, but the -- which is one of the contentions, basically the contention of the lawsuit, but that is not a Village concern. That's a private covenant, not a Village concern. And I don't think there's any advantage at this point to the
Village becoming involved in that lawsuit.

MAYOR HUBBARD: No. Okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So let me just get this clear in my head so I understand it. The lawsuit is dealing between the written covenant that's in the deeds that says that they can't build, correct?

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. So for us, with the application before us, then we're not really in a position, until that lawsuit is settled, to approve anything, because we could approve it and then the court could say it needs to be torn down, correct?

MR. PROKOP: Well, that's -- yes. I mean, there's no clear right -- at this point, there's no clear right to build it, for it to be there, both from a private aspect and also from the Village aspect.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: The outcome of the lawsuit would either be structure has to come down, or a structure gets to stay, it's your own property?

MR. PROKOP: Well, that's -- there's two steps. That's step one, but step two is what
about the Village easement. So the --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: That lawsuit's not about the Village easement.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, the lawsuit's not about -- the lawsuit's about the building.

MR. PROKOP: Right. So if Mr. Bull was to succeed in the lawsuit, he would still have to come to the Village and convince the Village that we should allow the shed in the Village easement.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And then after that, ask us for a wetlands permit.

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And the DEC.

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Is there a DEC permit now?

MR. PROKOP: I don't know.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No.

MR. PALLAS: The DEC -- there's a letter in the file from the DEC that we confirmed, essentially says that he should have gotten --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Approvals.

MR. PALLAS: -- a permit, but they're letting it go for -- under this -- for this
"don't ever do it again" kind of thing, is how it was described to me.

MR. PROKOP: There was one other question that was raised about a building permit. Reviewing the Building Code, the International Building Code, and also the New York State supplement, there's differing language, which Mr. Pallas and I are trying to resolve as far as the minimum, the minimum square footage, which requires a building permit. But I think in either case, that this shed is probably under the minimum square footage to require a building permit, meaning it probably -- it did -- it did require a -- it does require a wetlands permit because it is a structure, but it probably -- I haven't measured it, but the comments that I received is that it probably did not receive that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right, 10-by-10, so it's 100 square feet.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Even if it was 130, 150,
depending whatever it was, it's still 100
square feet, so it's still below any minimum
threshold for needing a normal building permit.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: There's a lot of
questions.

MAYOR HUBBARD: No, there is.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I'll throw another one
on there, but I would want to ask the
applicants, maybe they're not prepared to
answer, but, you know, would they work with us?
Would they move it? Would they -- you know, do
we have options there? So that's a discussion.
I don't know how or when we have that, but, you
know, if -- because if it is on Village
property, that's a tough one, but --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Well, I mean, do
you want to hear a comment? I know the
applicant is here, they would like to comment.

MS. MOORE: We're all here.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah, if they're here.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well, I think they
should comment, but I think --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yes, okay.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, I was trying to get
through the questions that they had first --

MS. MOORE: No, good, that's fine, that's fine.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- so they could discuss it so is there.

MS. MOORE: Good, good, okay. Good, because I'm glad you discussed certain basic things. It looks thick, but it's actually the very simple first page, and then it attaches the flood ordinance, because there are two specific exemptions. So let me give that to you. Hopefully, I have enough, so pardon me. The Clerk should have this. So I'm going to give each of you, and I have one for you, also.

I apologize. My secretary -- I was not at the office today, so the first Exhibit A is actually just the specific language of the flood ordinance, it's not the building code. I actually copied the building code, so.

So, to start with, just looking at this very simple memorandum, this is 100 foot square -- 100-square-foot storage shed. The first question is does it need a building permit? The answer is no. And correctly stated, there is a specific exception to requiring a building
permit if the structure is less than 200 square feet. So we're 100, we don't need a building permit. So that resolves that one. We are all in agreement on that one. As for the --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Ms. Moore.

MS. MOORE: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Would you mind going up there, because I want to make sure that --

MS. ALLEN: Thank you.

MS. MOORE: Oh, I'm so sorry.

MS. ALLEN: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: -- the people out there can hear you. Yeah. Thank you.

MS. MOORE: No problem. So the first issue that was -- I did in a very simple format, is a building permit required for a 100-square-foot shed. And the answer, and I quoted the section of the State Code, the International Building Code, the reference, and it specifically exempts structures that are under, or 200 square foot or less. So there's no building permit requirement.

The second question is, is a wetland permit required under Chapter 68? That's where I attached the full section of the code, which
apparently there's a discrepancy in publishing,
code publishing, because the law that was
adopted September 25th, 2009 has specific
language, and that's Exhibit A, which in the
word "usage" in definitions says a shed is
specifically exempt from the flood ordinance.
That's why most sheds or accessory structures,
they don't have to comply with the two-foot
freeboard and all of that other thing that you
guys were exchanging conversations.

There's specific language that says that
a shed, as well as -- and the language is
pretty straightforward. Permitting
construction does not include land preparation,
so that's clearing, excavation, that kind of
thing. It makes sense. You don't need a flood
ordinance -- you don't need a flood permit for
that. Or the installation of streets or
walkways, or excavation for a basement,
footings, piers, foundations, or the erection
of temporary forms, or the installation of
accessory buildings such as garages or sheds
not occupied as dwelling unit or not part of
the main dwelling. So if you had an attached
garage, that's treated differently than if it's
a detached garage. In this case, we have 100
foot square -- 100-square-foot shed. So the
Chapter 68, the way it was adopted on September
25th, specifically excludes that.

So now we have what I think we've shown
through this, no building permit, no flood
permit, and that's why nobody in that
neighborhood has a flood permit. And you say,
"Well, do we have violations?" No. It's
because the code says they are not required.

Then we deal with this easement.

MR. PALLAS: Can I just -- can I just
clarify?

MS. MOORE: Sure, go ahead.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah.

MR. PALLAS: Chapter 68 deals with
floodplain development?

MS. MOORE: Yes.

MR. PALLAS: We still have a wetlands
section in our code.

MS. MOORE: Well, the wetland --

MR. PALLAS: That's a separate --

MS. MOORE: But the wetland permit says
you follow the -- whether or not you're in the
floodplain. We've got six --
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No.
MR. PALLAS: No, it doesn't.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No.
MR. PALLAS: It -- what it talks about is the floodplain map.
MS. MOORE: Yes.
MR. PALLAS: And it's the -- and I apologize, I don't remember the exact reference, but it talks about a map with a map number, and that is no -- that map is obsolete. We have -- as a matter of precedent, we have used the Zone A, I think, or X, I forget what the number is --
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Zone X.
MR. PALLAS: -- as the -- as the area that it requires, and this clearly is within that area.
MS. MOORE: Well, here's the problem you have. If you site a section of the law that brings you in as far as why you need a permit, so, if you're -- if the flood ordinance says you don't -- you don't have to have a shed built in accordance with the flood ordinance, but you're bringing it in as a wetland permit to have to get a permit for a shed, there seems
to be an inconsistency in that law in that --
you're looking at, you know, as if you're confused.

MR. PALLAS: I don't -- well, I don't believe --

MS. MOORE: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: I don't think it's an inconsistency. Again, this is --

MS. MOORE: I think that the language may --

MR. PALLAS: I would have to go to both -- I would have to look at both code sections --

MS. MOORE: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: -- of the language to see.

That's --

MS. MOORE: Well, I would ask you to take a look.

MR. PROKOP: Yeah. I think it's important, since you -- you know, if you've pointed out tonight, there's a difference between the adopted language and the published online language, then we need to look at that.

MS. MOORE: Correct.

MR. PALLAS: It won't be the first time that we --
MS. MOORE: Okay. I understand, yes, it's very possible. So --

MR. PROKOP: But thank you. We'll take that under advisement.

MS. MOORE: That's fine. So now we deal with the third issue that was raised, was the easement. There appear -- remember, an easement is just a right. That easement that was -- that was created in '45 was for the purposes of building a road that would take a 30 -- from a 30-foot road to a 50-foot road, because that 30-foot road would have been most likely turned into a -- the -- a public road. So I'm assuming 30 plus the 20 makes it 50 foot, so you meet the State definition of a public road. So, to me, when I read that language, that seemed to be the intention of that easement that was granted, to be able to create a greater -- a larger road.

But let's assume that it was a road that was going to sit parallel to the other. The private beach, Sandy Beach Road next to the 20-foot public easement. Even assuming that, if you start where the 20-foot easement begins down at the end of Sandy Beach, when you come
onto Sandy Beach, you'd have to go through an entire width of wetlands. You have a light post, you have electric lines, you have fences, you have all types of interference before you even get to the Bull property, which is where that little shed sits.

So -- and Mr. and Mrs. -- Mr. Bull, they're prepared to say, "Listen, if you come in and you build a road, we'll move the shed." If you want us to talk about shifting the location of the shed a little bit, so that if somebody wants a public access, they'd have to cross through wetlands and tromp through wetlands to get there, but -- so I'd ask you to go back there. That's my memory of where you'd have to start, at 20 feet, where the 20-foot area is. You only get a clear area of walking path on the Bull property than the Elliot property, so you'd really have to see if there is any common sense to that.

But, nonetheless, if the concern is the public easement, you certainly can't put a car. And this 100-foot shed is not blocking pedestrians, so you can walk from one -- from one side or the other, it's blocking the width
of the shed.

So there -- I think it's an issue that doesn't really exist, if, in fact, there was a problem, and it -- you put in a road, first you'd have major environmental issues on building a road there, so it's never going to happen. It's very typical of a paper road, but we would certainly discuss that. At that point, we'd ask the DEC and get permission to move it, if we had to. I'm sure that that would not be a problem if they have to move it five foot over one way or the other. That's not an issue.

So I do ask you to walk down there. Start at 20 feet from where the road turns to Sandy Beach, move -- go 20 feet back, and then figure out if there's any possible way that you can walk from one end of Sandy Beach parallel to the -- to the private road.

And as far as being able to drive, it's not a public road, but if you're visiting people on Sandy Beach, you have a right to go there, so.

The issue four, which I raise, is the selective enforcement, because this is the only
shed that has ever been prosecuted for being there, so that's just a legal issue that I raise, and -- and --

(Alarm Sounded)

MS. MOORE: Wow, it's noisy. Okay. And just for the record, we're not trying to create any problems, we just feel that this has been led by, you know, one neighbor who has, as you already know, brought a civil action, and having the Village raise issues and have us go through this permitting process makes his civil action moot if you force the shed out. So that certainly makes a very easy argument.

MR. TASKER: What is she even talking about?

MS. MOORE: So what I'm talking about is that --

MR. PROKOP: Could you repeat that? I'm sorry, could you -- could you repeat what you just said?

MS. MOORE: I'm sorry, the public is commenting, so.

MR. PROKOP: I couldn't hear what you just said. Could you repeat?

MS. MOORE: Oh, with the feedback? Yeah.
What I'm saying is that there is a civil case regarding the shed.

MR. PROKOP: Right.

MS. MOORE: Okay? If the Village says, "No, you can't have a shed," well, hasn't that been -- hasn't the civil litigation been resolved? Yes, right? We're not -- the Village says no, we have a violation, we're going to obviously do an Article 78 and argue over it, but it makes his civil case pretty much a done deal and a moot point. That's the -- that's I think what led to this whole process, rather than really the issue of an environmental impact, and whether or not, in fact, is the wetland permit needed or not needed, again, because of the fact that there are really no -- there are no other wetland permits issued in this area. It makes me wonder why suddenly a 100 square foot shed becomes, you know, a wetland permit issue, so.

And that's all. That's a very simple outline, and I attached -- as I said, I attached the code, just so it looks thick, but it's really -- I tried to make it as simple as possible. Thank you.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Well, we have more information, more stuff to read and go through and all. Oh.

MR. TASKER: Excuse me, Mr. Mayor. I'd like to answer the comments to this. First of all, a little more history.

Indeed the 20-foot easement would be extremely difficult to build a road on, let alone even to walk on, as the previous speaker just said. You'ld have to walk through about 800 foot of marshland before you got to the back end of Mr. Bull's property and you get on dry land that you could then walk down to the point. As a matter of fact, there are people who walk up and down the beach road all the time, and you know that happens on every private road there is. There are people who drive on the -- excuse me -- the private paved road all the time. They're out looking and they see "Private Road", "Well, it doesn't affect me," and that's just what happens.

But the fact of the matter is, is that 20-foot easement that the Village owns is in wetlands, and it does not provide access to anyone walking to get to the point. They have...
to walk on the private right-of-way.

The idea of selective enforcement was just raised. As I spoke at the last meeting, every one of the sheds that were cited as being erected without a permit were all erected before there was even a Zoning Code in the Village of Greenport, let alone a requirement for wetlands permits for a building code -- for a building permit, let alone a requirement for a wetlands permit.

And, in fact, in her remarks at the last meeting, at the record at Page 9 -- Page 10, rather, Line 8, the Attorney states that for these sheds, all the sheds that were cited as built without permits, the application process was not required. Indeed, there was no -- as I said, there was no zoning law, there was no wetlands permit law, and there was no DEC restrictions.

More than that, all of those sheds are -- exist -- well, apart from the ones that are in the Town of Southold, which I noted have had no bearing on this at all, all of those sheds are in the zone between the bulkhead and the paved road. The DEC has said very clearly that
that's essentially a free zone as far as they are concerned. The DEC is not concerned about construction between the bulkhead and the paved road, as long as they were in existence before 1977, and indeed they were. They were there in 1944, when I first came to Sandy Beach.

And, as I said, I knew every one of those garages, they were called garages in those days, that existed, that were cited as built without permits. Indeed they were built without permits. There was no permit requirement.

So let's drop that issue as far as setting some kind of a precedent that you should be overlooking. What you now have is an ordinance that prohibits building without a wetlands permit or a floodplain permit, Section 63 or 142. They both come into play here. They cannot be disregarded merely because in -- prior to 1944 some garages were built on Sandy Beach in an area that is now, let's call it a free zone for construction.

In fact, in her testimony at -- whoops, excuse me. At Page 10, talking about the Building -- the New York State Building Code,
Ms. Moore said the Building Department has recommended, and CAC and Mr. Pallas have recommended these anchors. These are the anchors that are supposed to hold the shed down in the case of the great flood. Ms. Moore said, "But it's merely to comply with your flood damage prevention provisions." That's Section 63. She acknowledges that they apply to this construction here in that location.

So the idea to kind of wave it off, that Section 63 is pretty vague, and what are we doing this for, and so forth, you got to read Section 63. I can parse it for you, but I don't think you want me to take the time to do that. But I recommend you read very carefully and parse very carefully Chapter 63 of the Zoning -- of the Village Code.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Do you mean 68?

CLERK PIRILLO: 68.

MR. TASKER: 68. I'm sorry.

CLERK PIRILLO: It does.

MR. TASKER: Oh, yes, 68. Well, you don't have to worry about 63.

MS. MOORE: Good. Thank you.

MR. TASKER: That had nothing to do
with --

MS. MOORE: I thought I missed something.

MR. TASKER: -- with buildings or

anything like that at all. Thank you for

reminding me. In fact, in my notes it says

Section 68 that is applicable for the

table damage.

MR. PROKOP: It was 60 something.

MR. TASKER: I think, talking further

about -- I think these were Mr. Saladino's

remarks, and you can check the record to be

sure, but at Page 18 of the transcript, it was

said that the applicant or his attorney hasn't

mentioned that they haven't -- "It was built,

we understand, without a building permit, but

it was also built without a wetlands permit."

This is at Line 9, Page 18. "The applicant or

his attorney hasn't mentioned that, they

haven't given a reason for that." Indeed, they

haven't. They knew about it. They knew about

the restrictions, they knew about the need for

a wetlands permit, and they went ahead and did

it anyway. If they applied for a wetlands

permit, perhaps the proper scrutiny would have

been applied. He wouldn't have built it
without permission, and the proper standards for building it would have been adhered to. I need to point out that the case law, and, in fact, the Attorney just mentioned this the other night, this case the other night at the ZBA, I think it's the Parkview case, that an erroneously issued permit or an erroneous waiver from the need for a permit creates no property right. You can't get there and say, "Oh, the Building Inspector told me it was okay," even though the proper examination of the statutes, the ordinance and so forth would have shown you clearly that it was not permitted to be done. So ignorance is no excuse in that situation.

Now I want to come back to the -- to the application itself, or the building permit that Mr. Bull completed and that Ms. Moore submitted, and that was -- it said one of the required -- one of the questions on that application process is, "Are there any prior existing restrictive covenants which permit or regulate the use of the subject wetland?" And the applicant indicated falsely, "None". He knew full well of the existence of the
restrictive covenant that prohibited buildings in that area. It was in his deed, it was in his chain of title, and it was also cited in his title report at the time he purchased the property.

So you have to say why is this question raised in the -- in the application form for a wetlands permit? You say what? What is a wetlands permit worried about restrictive covenants for? And the reason has to be this, that it was -- if it was -- you know, that it's meant to have an effect on the Board's decision, because it kind of seems like an out-of-left-field question. Well, the reason is that it has to be there because it recognizes that the Village shouldn't countenance violations of other covenants that are going to come back to haunt them by its action on the permit.

So you've got a couple of things to do with the permit, and she -- it's already been suggested, I think Ms. Phillips already suggested maybe the thing to do is table this thing. You got three choices with this application. You can approve it, you can deny
ir, or you can table it. If you approve it, there's going to be a line out the door for people applying for similar permits, you can guarantee that.

Of the people who agreed that Mr. Bull's shed was not a problem, there were six objectants that he cited, I believe. Two of them are a married couple who live on a property that is, in fact, in the Village of Southold. Two others are neighbors who are quite a ways up the street. The other three are his next door neighbor on either side, Mr. -- let's see. I'll tell you who they are. Yes, P.J. Parson to his east, Elliot to his left. Elliot is the one you have to remember, who's already -- who also built a shed without a wetlands permit, without a DEC permit, and is one of the defendants in the suit that I have brought against them for violating the restrictive covenant. The other one, Raines, is two doors to the left of Mr. Bull's property. And I want to show you some pictures that may elucidate what's going on here, if I may.

CLERK PIRILLO: If you could state your
name and address for the record --

MR. TASKER: I'm sorry.

CLERK PIRILLO: -- if you can do that.

MR. TASKER: Yes, I will.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.

MR. TASKER: If you'll include that in
the record, please. I'm sorry. The Clerk had
just reminded me I didn't state my name when I
spoke, addressed the podium. I'm Arthur
Tasker. I live at 17 Beach Street in
Greenport, in the Village of Greenport. Thank
you.

If you look first at the first picture,
you will see, starting from the left, the first
house that you see is the Raines' house, the
house after that is Mr. Elliot's house, the
next one is Mr. Bull's house, and the next one
is Mr. -- P.J.'s house. I have trouble
remembering his last name as well. I know him
too well as P.J.

But if you look at the next picture, it
shows in greater detail. The next photograph,
it shows a more close-up view. You'll see the
backyards, if you will, of those four parcels.
These are the people who think it's fine to
have a shed there. They are the only places in
the area north of the paved road where it is
possible or feasible, just because of dry land,
to build a shed. So of course they're going to
say they're in favor or don't object to
Mr. Bull's shed.

But that also begs the question, there
are 24 other people that presumably were
canvassed as to whether or not they had an
objection or not, and four people -- three
people, who were neighbors, who have got an ax
to grind, came back and said, "Yeah, it's fine
with me." Two people said, "Well, I don't
know, I can't see it from my house." Another
one from Southold Town said, "I don't care
either." What happened to the other 24
people's responses? Because you can be sure if
any of them thought it was fine or okay or
didn't care, it would have been cited. So the
best you can say is most of them objected, and
that's just as reasonable a conclusion as the
fact that they approved it, because had they
approved it, you would have heard about it from
the applicant. We digress.

They try to pass off the DEC's saying
that, "We don't need" -- that they didn't need a DEC permit, even though the building was already -- already built, as some kind of a, "Well, don't do it again" sort of thing. Let me read to you, and I think that it is attached to the handout that I just gave you, the letter from the DEC, dated June 20, 2017, to Stephen Bull, headlined in bold type, "WARNING LETTER".

"During a recent inspection, Department staff noted a potential violation at 24 Sandy Beach Road, approximately 40 feet from the boundary of a New York State regulated tidal wetland. These are regulated activities within the Department's Tidal Wetland jurisdiction, and, therefore, require a permit from this Department.

Conducting regulated activities without the required permits is a violation of Article 25 of the Environmental Conservation Law. Such violations may be subject to a maximum permit of $20,000 per day per violation."

So the DEC certainly does not require -- regard this as a trivial ho-hum violation of their requirements.

"At this time, the Department is issuing
this warning letter in lieu of further enforcement action against you." That is not saying, "Well, it's okay, just don't do it again."

They went on to say, "We now consider the violation resolved, but you are reminded, however, that any future regulated activity will require the appropriate permits."

So the applicant knew and he did it anyway, because he had made applica - permit application to the DEC at the time he was considering raising his house and rebuilding it. He made an earlier application to the DEC for this same -- for this same shed and knew what the DEC required and did it anyway. So he's lucky he's not faced with $10,000-a-day fines.

MR. PROKOP: I just want to say for the Board, unless somebody disagrees with me that may be familiar with this, typically, what the ZB -- excuse me -- what the DEC does is they issue these -- on your first trip through them, on a violation, they'll issue a warning letter, and they'll identify you as a violator, and they'll remind you that you have this per-day
fine potential. And then the second -- if there's -- if you ever commit another, a second offense, they then claim that you had fair warning, and then they try to pick up the -- assess the per-day fine. So it's typical on a violation -- on a -- your first violation that you'll get one of these warning letters.

MR. TASKER: Thank you for the clarification. So at least at this point we're not looking at $10,000-a-day fines yet.

So I want to modify, and in conclusion, I want to modify my earlier suggestion with regard to what I think the Board's action should be on this. I suggested that they -- that they table this application until the conclusion of the litigation. I said a few moments ago there are three choices that the Board has, to accept the application for a wetlands permit, and as I said, there'll be a line out the door of at least Mr. Elliot and P.J. and Raines, who have got room behind their houses to build that. Everybody else is in wet -- has wetlands only behind their house. They can deny it, which is the appropriate thing to do, not just for the reasons that I've
stated with regard to the litigation and with regard to the easement, but for the fact that they failed to comply with the requirements of Section 142 of the Village Code and Section 68 -- am I right -- 68 of the Village Code for requiring -- requiring a permit application. They didn't even make application for the permit.

Parse that section of the code and you will see that there is a complete ignorance on the part of everyone in the Village Administration, the applicant to comply with article 60 -- with Section 68.

So I would suggest this: Rather than adjourn this hearing, they should -- this Board should deny the permit based on all of those reasons and let the dust settle on the litigation. If at the conclusion of the litigation the applicant thinks that he's got a reason to suspect that the Village might give him a wetlands permit, let him apply again. This is not his first trip through abandoned wetlands permits, I can assure you, and I think that the Clerk can fill you in on the details of those. There have been at least three, to
MR. PROKOP: What is the status of the litigation?
MR. TASKER: Are there any questions?
MR. PROKOP: Yes. What is -- excuse me. Can I ask a question?
MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, go ahead.
MR. PROKOP: What is the status of the litigation?
MR. TASKER: Status of the litigation is this: Both defendants have moved to dismiss on the grounds that the complaint was improperly stated. Those motions are sub judice right now in Supreme Court. There is a preliminary hearing to be held some time in January with respect to that. But there has been no, shall we say, challenge to the -- to the substance of the conclusion of the complaint at this point.
You know, I see these attacks on me and my approach to this, I see this as an attempt to discredit me in front of this Board, when it's really an attempt to try and salvage a faltering defense to my litigation. Thank you.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Mr. Mayor, are we having the -- it sounds like we're having the
hearing now.

MR. TASKER: The hearing is open.

CLERK PIRILLO: The hearing is still open.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: But can I just ask to the folks out there through you, can we focus on the wetlands permit? I don't think anyone here needs to talk about someone's private litigation. And I'll just be very frank. It has nothing to -- that has nothing to do with how I would think about voting on this. To me, this is a wetlands permit issue in the Village, and it's about the Village and its residents, and, you know, good luck to everybody with your lawsuits. Is that okay if we ask folks to stick to that?

MAYOR HUBBARD: That's fine. I think we're only going to have one more comment on it, and then we're going to move on to our regular business. Go ahead, Mr. Bull.

MR. BULL: Stephen Bull, 24 Beach Street, also known as 24 Sandy Beach Road, Village of Greenport.

I think I have to state and correct the statements, the erroneous statements that were
made by my neighbor, and who is pursuing me and court, who now has me on the ropes in Southold Court because of his influence on the Building Department.

He states that ignorance is no excuse, and yet, by Tasker's own record of lack of compliance to the Village in 2006, he ignored the building code of the Village of Greenport, hired a builder and started to raise his cottage on Sandy Beach, his cottage, you know, which is now winterized, he doesn't live there, he lives on the old folks home, and add a second floor.

Tasker's cottage is an inhabited structure, my shed is not. And although he was required to get a Village Code, both a wetlands and a building permit, he did not, he started construction. Neighbors called the Building Department. They came, they inspected the property, and they told Tasker to stop construction, which he did in order to avoid a Stop Work Order.

Tasker knew he had to get these permits. He -- I guess he was ignorant beforehand, but he started construction without permits. He
got his wetlands permit, he got his building
permit, and then he was allowed to continue his
construction. But two years later, Tasker
wanted a C of O, because he hadn't had the
building inspected. So he goes back, and the
C of O is expired. He gets another C of O, and
then he has it inspected. But when the
building is inspected, it hasn't been raised to
the FEMA regulated level. But he got his
C of O. How did that happen?

   Anyway, Mayor Hubbard and Trustees of the
Village of Greenport, Arthur Tasker and John
Saladino's misrepresentations have filled your
ears with untruths, smoke and mirror
statements, and the public -- at the public
hearing on November 27th, and then tonight,
with regards to my wetlands permit for a shed
at 24 Beach Street.

   Although I am requesting a wetlands
permit for my shed, I don't believe I need one.
My shed is an uninhabited structure. The shed
is sitting on uplands, in total compliance with
the rules and regulations of the Village of
Greenport, and does not require either a
building permit, nor a wetlands permit.
In the New York State Building Standards and Codes, now known as 2015 International Residential Code, Second Printing, as adopted by New York State, and adopted by the Village of Greenport, Chapter 1, Scope and Administration, Part 1, Scope and Application, Section R, 105-2, Work Exempt From a Permit, a shed does not need a building permit, as long as it is a one-story detached accessory structure, and provided that the floor area does not equal or exceed 200 square feet.

That's in the code.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: That's a building permit, right?

MR. BULL: That a building permit is not needed --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Right

MR. BULL: -- when a shed is under two -- when it's temporary and under 200 square feet. My shed is built to this adopted code and does not need a building permit.

With regard to a wetlands permit in the law of Chapter 68 for Floodplains Development, it only applies to habitable construction.

That was what happened with Tasker in 2006.
You know, he violated that, because he had a habitable construction he was doing and he didn't get a permit. This is an uninhabited structure, it's a shed.

In addition to a shed built in uplands, it does not require wetlands -- wetlands permit, according to the rules adopted June 23rd, 2016 for sheds under 144 square feet, and Chapter 65-4, Page 15.

According to the Building Department files, three other sheds have been recently erected in the Sandy Beach area without a wetlands permit. This is not what Tasker has just told you. Tasker has told you that there are -- all of the buildings that were cited that I included in the original wetlands permit application were garages built in the '40s. Well, I did include a few of those, but three of those structures are sheds of modern construction. You can go there tonight, you can go there tomorrow in daylight, it's perhaps a little bit better, and you will find these modern sheds there that were subject to the wetlands permit, if the wetlands permit is indeed an issue, subject to the building code,
if the building code was an issue, but it's not.

And there's a lot of other sheds, I would presume, that are in the floodplain of Greenport that have never been required to provide a wetlands permit. This is clearly an action that's focused on me by my neighbor.

John Saladino incorrectly states that the DEC does not differentiate between wetlands and uplands. The DEC states that the wetland are clearly demarked by the lack of marine plant above the high water mark. This is something that you've all seen when you go down to the beach or you're by the water. You'll see that the plants that are nourished by the saltwater stop at the edge of the beach. Then there's a little area, and then you get into this other area which is called the uplands. That's where the grasses begin.

These areas above the high water mark are called uplands. The DEC has jurisdiction over the upland areas that adjoin the wetlands. The DEC says that my shed built on uplands is not an issue for them. The DEC gave me consent to the construction of the shed on my property.
uplands, because no part of my shed --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, no, no

MR. BULL: -- touches the wetlands. That's very clear. There's no part of the shed that is actually in the water. This is the concern of the DEC, and you'll see this on some of the highway, as you go to Orient Point, that some of the older structures were built with pilings into the wetlands. And so that's what is the concern of the DEC, not the structure that was built in the area which is now defined as the uplands.

When I received this letter that has been presented to you, which is the DEC warning letter, that was after a conversation that I had with the DEC in which they said, "You should never have done this, you should have gotten a permit first." I didn't know that I should have. "And so by doing this, we're going to issue you this warning letter, because we've sent our people out there to inspect the area, and what you have done would be something that we would give you if you had asked us for a permit, but you didn't. We inspected it, we're giving you this warning letter, don't do
this again." I accept their reprimand. I will not ever do that again.

John Saladino made statements, said that moderate wave action, if you look in the -- you know, the record from the November 27th meeting, John Saladino's statements said that moderate wave action goes through the middle of my house. Guess what, it's true, but the shed is 200 feet away. The action -- the wave action does not occur in the area of the shed, because that's north of the house. The wave actions stop at that point.

John Saladino is trying to confuse the Trustees with his own misunderstanding and lack of information on the terms of this argument. My shed is not in a wave zone. The DEC has approved the shed as an uninhabited structure built on wetlands. By Village Code, the shed does not need a wetlands permit, nor a building permit. The Trustees are skating on thin ice if they should choose selective enforcement.

Let me say again, there's no moderate wave action in the area of the shed. John Saladino is confusing you. The shed is on upland, it's not on wetlands. It's just a
shed. It's not covered by Chapter 68, Floodplain Development Code, where Saladino rambles on in his last remarks and does not give you the specific code. Let me give you this code to you now. This is the whole section of Section 68.4.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. How long is this section? I mean, we just --

MR. BULL: It's going to be --

MAYOR HUBBARD: I mean, we've got a lot of other -- we've got a lot of other business to take care of.

MR. BULL: It's going to be short. It's going to be short.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. I just -- if you can, wrap it up, Mr. Bull.

MR. BULL: Quote, "permitted construction of streets, or walkways, or excavation, or for a basement, footings, piers or foundations, or the erection of temporary forms, or the installation of accessory buildings such as garages or sheds, are" -- "that are not occupied as dwelling units or not a part of the main building are excluded from Section 68."

I guess I'm going to have to put this
page to one side and let's get down to the
remarks of my primary -- my neighbor, who
has -- and I'll go back to John Saladino if he
wants further -- to make further remarks later
on -- in replying, rebuttal to him.

But let me address the four arguments
that Tasker has presented one at a time, the
first being that I built the shed knowing I was
in violation of the covenant agreed on in 1945.
This is an obsession of Tasker, I think we've
heard that tonight, but one that has recently
been conveniently taken up.

Tasker lied when he said at the last
Trust meeting -- Trustee's meeting, as well as
in his Supreme Court complaint, that my
neighbor, Paul Elliot, put his shed up just a
year ago. Elliot installed his shed in April
2014, three-and-a-half years ago. Tasker did
not object to that shed until 2017. He had
three years to register a complaint or
litigation with Mr. Elliot with regards to a
breach of covenant. I presume, because
Elliot's shed was standing without objection,
that mine would as well.

I did not falsify my application by
stating there was no covenant on my property. There is no covenant restriction on the construction of a shed, there is only Tasker's belief that there is. As you know with lawyers, you can be sued for anything by them in civil court.

Do not take -- let Tasker's misstatements about covenants and about his litigation on covenants cause you to believe there is a covenant that restricts the construction of a shed. Tasker had the opportunity to file a suit against my neighbor, Paul Elliot, years ago, but he did not do so. This selective enforcement and Tasker's tyrannical pursuit is counter to the good will of Greenport. Tasker knowingly allowed Bull to build his shed in order to harass him and trick him into a lawsuit.

MR. BULL: Tasker is now trying his legal case before the Trustees in order to save you money.

On Tasker's second point, I did not trespass on Village property. A portion of the shed may or may not sit on a 62-year-old easement of the Village of Greenport for a road
that will never be constructed. If this road were to be constructed at great cost by the Village, with huge environmental damage, and lengthy permits required by the DEC, the Army Corps of Engineers and others, then, after receiving proper notification, I'll move my shed two feet, or whatever else is required.

Tasker's third point is that the shed is in violation of Chapter 142 concerning wetlands, floodplains and drainage. My construction of a shed does not violate any terms of the prohibited acts of Chapter 142, Section 4. Tasker, like Saladino, is targeting me and my shed for selective enforcement.

I have not looked at every property within the vast FEMA established floodplains in Greenport to discover all the other sheds which have been built or installed that do not have wetland permits, but surely there are many. I have checked with -- in the Village files on the three that are standing within spitting distance of my shed and they do not have wetland permits.

I was forced to file for a wetlands permit as a step to resolve the civil
litigation that was -- currently that was
brought to me via the efforts of Tasker --
Tasker through the Village Department and
action that is currently on hold in the Town of
Southold Court. This shed is still an
uninhabited structure approved by the Federal
and State level, that is FEMA and DEC.

Tasker's claim of devious activity on my
part to construct a shed is false and
misleading. My sons and I built the shed when
we had the time and the money. I never
promised not to build a shed. Tasker also made
here claim -- hearsay claims about my knowledge
of the code. I only knew that the code said
the construction of a shed in Greenport did not
require a permit. Earlier dealings with the
DEC assured me that a shed was not on a
wetlands site.

With his fourth point, Tasker proposes
the shed does not meet the requirements of
Chapter 68, Floodplain Development, which
Tasker misstates as flood damage protection,
small point. This law only applies to
habitable construction, Chapter 68, to
habitable construction, not uninhabited
construction.

Tasker has not read the 2009 amendment to Chapter 68, which states that an uninhabited structure such as a shed or a garage are not covered under Chapter 68. I've already read you every word of this section of the code once. I've saved you having to read it to you twice. My shed clearly meets the definition of Chapter 68-4, since the shed is not occupied. It's not a structure covered by Chapter 68. I repeat, the shed is an uninhabited structure not covered under Chapter 68. Tasker should read the chapter himself and apologize to the Trustees for wasting their time.

I reiterate, there's no reason why Tasker should have to rule -- that the Trustees should have to rule on this at all. A shed in Greenport was built to the code, that was built to this code does not need a building permit. A shed built on uplands does not require a wetlands permit.

Mayor Hubbard and the Village Trustees, ask yourselves, if you selectively target my shed and arbitrarily require that I get a wetlands permit that the DEC says is not
necessary, then Tasker and Saladino are going
to require the Trustees and Mayor to go after
all the many, many other sheds in Greenport
that are built on the FEMA floodplains. Thank
you.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Joe, we're hearing a
lot about Chapter 68. Wetlands permits are
Chapter 142, right?

CLERK PIRILLO: Yes. Yes, they are.

MR. PROKOP: That's correct.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. We're not going to
keep going back and forth all night on this.
Mr. Saladino wanted to speak. Arthur, you were
already up there for 20 minutes before.

MR. TASKER: George, I need -- I need 30
seconds.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Just Mr. Saladino was up
next, he was standing there.

MR. TASKER: All right. I need a minute
of your time, I will keep it to that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. But, I mean, we
have a lot of other business. We're not going
to keep going around and round in circles on
this.
MR. TASKER: No.

MAYOR HUBBARD: I mean, everybody made their points, we got it. We're going to take information and -- go ahead, Mr. Saladino.

MR. SALADINO: John Saladino, Sixth Street. Have I confused you yet? Anybody confused by that yet? No?

MAYOR HUBBARD: No.

MR. SALADINO: Then I'll go forward. To suggest that that building doesn't need a wetlands permit is like -- for some reason, Mr. Bull, in his mind, he thinks that I think that I have this vendetta against him, or something, and I have a letter to prove it. The truth of the matter is if I gave him any thought at all, perhaps I would, you know, after hearing what he just said, and after reading this letter that he wrote.

We heard a lot tonight about Chapter 68, he quoted from it very passionately. What he forgot to quote was that the International Fire and Building Code was upgraded in 2015. It was upgraded in 2009, there was amendment. We adopted, our Chapter 65 adopted the 2015 edition of the International Fire and Building
Code as the construction standards in this village.

The International Fire and Building Code says everything that he said, but it also goes on to say in Appendix G, which is the floodplain portion of it, that garages and sheds are subject to certain construction standards, and they yield -- they -- the word, I don't want to say cede or -- they defer to the American Society of Civil Engineers to set those construction standards, and the construction standards are what I read to you before. There's a copy here. I could read it to you again, that the building does, in fact, have to be elevated, it can't be built on the ground.

A lot of stuff was said here that in my opinion -- and I expressed no opinion at that last meeting. I read verbatim from the International Fire and Building Code, and I read verbatim from the American Society of Civil Engineers, their floodplain handbook. I didn't make it up. Actually, there's a copy here. Arthur maybe gave it to you, maybe he didn't, I don't know, but it's easy enough to
check. I mean, it's -- I got it offline, I
mean, it's easy enough to check.

My advice and counsel as a member of the
CAC doesn't -- that's all we do is advise.
That's all we do is tell you, express to you
what we know about a certain situation in a
certain area. To suggest that if you grant
this permit you're going to have to violate
every other shed in the Village, we know that's
not the reality in the situation in Greenport.
We know that -- I mean, you can't throw a
baseball without hitting some kind of building
violation in Greenport. And the only time it
comes before the Village Board -- if Mr. Bull
is suggesting that he's going to make the
complaint about each and every illegal shed in
Greenport, then it would be possible, then it
would wind up in front of you or in front of
the Building Department. But if he's not
saying that, I know I'm not going to do it.

So if we -- if we take Chapter 68, which
the applicant's attorney, her opinion is it's
deficient. Her opinion is, is what from what
she read, what the real code says is different
than what's printed in our code book. Let's
take Chapter 68 out of it. Let's just -- let's just deal with the International Fire and Building Code, Chapter 65. It sets standards to build a building, even a shed. It tells you how you have to build it, how you have to construct it.

So to say that our code, or the first paragraph of the International Building Code that he read, you got to go a little deeper. You have to go -- you have to read past -- you have to go to the second sentence. You have to read past what suits you and read what actually applies to the situation, and Appendix G of the International Fire and Building Code chapter, the 2015 edition addresses just that.

So, I mean, a lot of stuff has been said here tonight that erroneous, my opinion, but I told you guys last month that it wasn't my opinion. I've been on the CAC for a while. We kind of know where the wetlands is, we kind of know where the upland portion is. I don't know what Mr. Bull's qualifications are. I don't know. I mean, all I've heard from him is opinion, you know.

So I don't have any comment about the
lawsuit. The lawsuit is the lawsuit. You know, Arthur, that's the path he chose to take.

    I don't think the application should be tabled, I think the application should be rejected. The building should be moved or it should be made to be compliant, it should be raised. Those are your choices. And like I said last time, I know this was a little harsh. We can continue to go down the "Good Ol' Boy" Greenport paradigm, that road, and just give forgiveness, or we can start to do the right thing.

    They just had two instances up-Island a little bit, I think it was Aquebogue or Jamesport. The guy overstepped his bounds a little bit on the bluff, put a staircase in, wasn't supposed to. He got an $80,000 fine, and they made him rip the staircase out. Finally, somebody is taking it serious. It's about time that we took it serious.

    Nothing that I've said to you can't be checked by anybody here. Everything I said to you, I don't have a reason to baloney-skin you guys, I don't. I don't have a vendetta against Mr. Bull, even though in his letter he accuses
me of that, of bullying, of harassing, of
intimidating. I don't have a recollection of
that. You know, perhaps -- and he goes -- and
he says in his letter, it's been reported to me
that I was harassing Village employees. I'm
not an attorney, but if I was harassing a
Village employee, I would think that employee
perhaps would have been better off writing the
letter than her advocate.

As far as -- I guess I said something
funny. As far as previous dealings with
Mr. Bull, as a member of the CAC, we did, we
did, we had previous dealings with him. He
wanted to raise a building. We didn't force
him to withdraw his wetlands permit, he chose
to withdraw his wetlands permit.

The only -- the only comments the CAC had
about raising his building were that we had a
problem with the sanitary system. And what we
told him was, is if you can get the Suffolk
County Department of Health Services to write
off on this, we would have no problem giving
you a wetlands permit to raise the building.
It would be impossible for him to get the
Suffolk County Department of Health Services to
write off on that sanitary system.

But the reason -- and he's forgetting to mention also that the Building Inspector refused to grant a permit for that building because of the condition that the building was in to raise the building, locust post, as ledger boards, as rim joist and stuff. She was afraid the building would collapse if they tried to move it. So we had nothing to do with that. Our interest was only the sanitary system.

So -- and as far as the wave action, the whole zone is Zone AE. If you know about floodplains and stuff, they give you where the moderate wave action is. I mean, the FEMA map tells you that you can't build below the Base Flood Elevation. I mean, it's -- your own attorney told me, the only -- told you, the only way you could do it is if you completely waterproof the building. And a shed or a structure in our code includes tanks, so those, of course, would be waterproof. But that's not what's listed in the handbook for floodplain from the Civil Engineers. They set the standard.
I think, as a municipality, if the -- if our code says we follow the International Fire and Building -- and we only passed that three months ago, by the way. So if our code says we follow the International Fire and Building Code, and the International Fire and Building Code, Appendix G, Chapter 801, says that you -- that the standard for construction in a floodplain is the American Society of Civil Engineers, and they say that this is the way to build the building, as a municipality, I don't know how you don't abide by that.

I apologize for taking up a lot of time.

Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Thank you.

MR. SALADINO: Thanks for listening.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Mr. Mayor, can we get a copy of that somehow? That's sort of what I'm asking. The documentation that -- let me express my frustration. This is a serious matter. These people have an application before us and they deserve their day in court.

I'm getting paper dropped on me, 40 pages, right as somebody comes to a meeting.

So I think your intentions are good, but, I
mean, I think everybody in the planet has my
email address, we're all on the website. If
people would send -- send us the documentation
that supports your case by email, so we can
review it and take a look at it and make a
thoughtful decision, so we can give you, you
know, the --

MR. SALADINO: Trustee Roberts, I did
send that information to the Village.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: To me?

MR. SALADINO: I sent that information.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Did I miss it? If I
did, I apologize.

MR. SALADINO: I didn't think -- I didn't
think I had to send it to you personally. I
sent the information --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thanks.

MR. SALADINO: -- to the Building -- to
the Department. If the Building Department
didn't get the information to you --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Fair enough. So I'm
just saying, because I started this whole thing
off asking Joe if he can --

MR. PROKOP: I'll get it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: -- respond to that --
MR. PROKOP: If you think it's relevant, I'll get it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And so we can read that, read all the documentation, because otherwise it's really hard to -- people talking at a meeting, it's hard to parse it all out, you know what I mean?

MR. PROKOP: Any of the regulations that have been discussed tonight, including the ones that I mentioned, that were mentioned by the applicant, I will circulate to the Board.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Please do.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: With a -- with a summary, a

summarization.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: A summarization would be great.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Go ahead, briefly, Mr. Tasker.

MR. TASKER: I need one minute, Mr. Mayor, and thank you very much. By the way, I only dropped two photographs on you tonight, so that probably wasn't too much of a
burden.

When I decided to raise my house and add -- on Sandy Beach and add another bedroom in late 2006, I engaged the firm of Bruce Anderson. I forget the name of his firm. They're consultants who deal with getting building permits and so forth, and they shepherded me through that process into the early part of 2007, at which point they had completed their work. But then I was informed, to my surprise, that I was required to get a wetlands permit before I could commence construction. At no time prior to this, as Mr. Bull alleges, was there any construction of any sort done on my property.

In early 2007, perhaps around March, there was a wetlands permit application and hearing, at which time the wetlands permit was granted. Some time shortly thereafter, a building permit was granted and the construction started. It started in about April when the house-movers, I've forgotten which ones they were, came over and raised the house. That was the first speck of construction that was done that I had planned.
The work was completed in the latter part of 2007, perhaps around September or October, as it strung through the summer. And in February, when I realized that I had a building permit that was about to expire, and I had not yet been issued a Certificate of Occupancy, I contacted the Building Inspector, told her of my plight, and she said, "Come in, we'll get you a building permit issued, because the work is completed and you're in compliance." And that is -- not a building permit, a Certificate of Occupancy, and that is the Certificate of Occupancy that I received. All of those are documentary evidence, which I will provide to you to add to this. Mr. Bull is lying. That is a complete fabrication.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's enough.

MR. TASKER: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right.

CLERK PIRILLO: That's enough.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's enough.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. We're going to take and get the information from the Village Attorney, all these other chapters and codes, and everything else. We'll review that and we
will have a discussion on this next month.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So do you offer your --

you want to offer a motion?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: You want me to offer a

motion?

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm offering a motion
to table the application for Stephen Bull to
our next work session.

MAYOR HUBBARD: In January.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: In January.

CLERK PIRILLO: The 18th of January.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Second. So that would
mean that there's no hearing next week.

CLERK PIRILLO: Are we closing the

hearing? Or you're going --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, we left it --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: We left it open.

MAYOR HUBBARD: We left it open last
time.

CLERK PIRILLO: You're going to keep it

open?

MAYOR HUBBARD: We'll continue to leave

it open.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah.

CLERK PIRILLO: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: So are you going to take comments next week?

MAYOR HUBBARD: No. It will not be on the agenda.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Just because we have two other hearings and -- okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: It will not be on the agenda to have comments on that.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: We had the public hearing. We're keeping it open to go, and everybody has time to read. The pictures, the other stuff that Mr. Saladino quoted, and everything else, we'll review all that and we will discuss that at the January work session.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So I had made a motion, so --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I seconded it.

MR. TASKER: Mr. Mayor, excuse me.

CLERK PIRILLO: He seconded. Okay.

MR. TASKER: You will accept written documents?
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Could we finish the vote first?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Excuse us.

MR. TASKER: If you're going to -- to one extent, you're closing the hearing, and I just told you that I will provide you --

MR. PROKOP: He didn't say he was closing the hearing.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: He didn't say he was closing the hearing.

MR. TASKER: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: I did not say I was closing the hearing.

MS. ALLEN: They're not closing the hearing, Arthur.

CLERK PIRILLO: They're not closing the hearing.

MR. TASKER: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: I did not say that, Mr. Tasker.

MR. TASKER: I'm trying to understand what you said, that's all.

MAYOR HUBBARD: I said we are not going to be taking comments at our regular meeting next week. We're keeping the public hearing
open until the January work session, which is
the motion that Trustee Phillips made and
Trustee Roberts seconded.

MR. TASKER: Thank you for the
clarification.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay, you're welcome.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'll call -- I would
call the vote. Aye.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yup.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: That's his job.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well, whatever. Let's
get it done.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay, yeah. All in favor
of Trustee Phillips' motion?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Aye.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Aye.

Opposed?

(No Response)

MAYOR HUBBARD: Motion carried. We'll
discuss this again at the January work session.

Okay. Board Discussion: Proposed
amendment to Section 9 and Section 18,
Multi-Family Dwelling, of Chapter 150 Zoning of the Village of Greenport Code. We had -- the latest version of this was from --

MR. PROKOP: It was from -- it was dated October, but I think it was actually from August.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: So there haven't been any changes.

MAYOR HUBBARD: That's what I -- that's what I was asking, the latest copy that --

MR. PALLAS: I believe that's correct.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- she had and all that.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: And if I could just -- just so people aren't -- you know, you don't have to devote a lot of time to trying to figure out where -- I have provided red line copies. But I'll just mention to you that the proposed change is -- right now, we have residential use as a conditional use in the --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: WC.

MR. PROKOP: In WC, and the proposal is to -- but prohibited, except for --
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: No. No, not WC.

MR. PALLAS: Not WC.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I'm sorry, I'll shut up.

MR. PROKOP: In the commercial -- in the first Commercial District, which is in 150-9. And the proposal is to move residential use as a conditional use through the other two districts, which are in 150-10 and 150-11. So, basically, throughout the Commercial Districts that exist in the Village, residential use would be allowed as a conditional use, and --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Up to three units.

MR. PROKOP: Up to three units, right.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: More than that would require a variance.

MR. PROKOP: Yes. So that's the basic.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Mayor Hubbard, as I did -- as I told you at the last couple of meetings, I always was under the impression that the multi-family definition or zone was a stand-alone because of a certain piece of property that was developed within the Village of Greenport, okay?

So I'm going back and looking through
Lakeside's Building Department files. The -- back in 1983, there is an actual Zoning Board resolution that is stating that multi-family is not a use in R-1 and R-2 District, that they had to get a zoning amendment to do the multi-family. So I'm a little -- I always believe that it should be left alone. I'm not comfortable. I'll be honest with you, I'm not comfortable with the -- changing the multi-family the way this is written now. I'll be honest with you, I'm not, okay?

I think that it was meant to be stand-alone. I think we have some history to go back and look into, because in looking in the old code book back in 1983, is that when it was, '70 -- whenever the code book was.

MR. PALLAS: The original building --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: The original one.

MR. PALLAS: It was '71.

CLERK PIRILLO: '71.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: '71. There were several amendments to the multi-family within that code book, which I think created the single stand-alone for that purpose. So I'm -- I'm just --
MAYOR HUBBARD:  Everything has been
updated through -- the new version of eCode and
all has anything that's been updated and
changed, that's what we're going by, is the
current stuff.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS:  Well, that's what I'm
saying, is it was --

MAYOR HUBBARD:  Right.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS:  It was -- somewhere
along the line, it was developed as being a
stand -- it was developed -- the code, the ZBA
amendment was done in 1983.  So that's what
established the multi -- the multi-family.  And
it states here that the reason that they had to
have the zoning amendment was because the
property down there was zoned one-family and
two-family.

MAYOR HUBBARD:  Right.  Well, this is not
changing R-1 and R-2.  This is --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS:  And they said they're
putting --

TRUSTEE ROBINS:  This is in commercial,
isn't it?

MR. PROKOP:  No, it's confirmed -- what
it -- what it is doing is it's confirming
basically what you just said, that multi-family
is for R-1 and R-2. This is something -- this
is something else.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: What is something
else?

MR. PROKOP: It's allowing residential
use as a commercial use -- excuse me --
residential use as a conditional use in all the
Commercial Districts up to three units.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh. Then you'll have
to send me, because I keep reading different
changes.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: And so --

MR. PROKOP: I'll send this to the Board.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Which is another issue
I have with some stuff here, so that's all
right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. I believe we
had -- that's what we were given at the last
regular meeting.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Everybody got a copy of
that.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: That's my understanding of it, yes.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Not to be --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. Well, I mean, read it and everything, I mean --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: If not everybody's prepared, then we shouldn't discuss it.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's right.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Otherwise, we can discuss it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: All right. So your concern was related -- was because you thought it was something different.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That was part of it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But we've had so many versions of this multi-family --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- document that --

and I'm getting very confused, and as far as every time we turn around, we have a new one. We don't have them red-lined. We don't know -- you know, it's great to have the date on the top, but every time we start to have a public
hearing, sometimes we don't get the code
changes until right before the meeting, the
work session, so.

MR. PROKOP: The code changes haven't
changed since August or October.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm not -- I'm not
prepared. I'm not prepared to discuss it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I just don't have any
other scenario in my professional life where I
can't find the document, and I don't get the
information until two minutes before the
meeting, and it's just very frustrating. And
if someone -- you know, and when a law gets
dropped in front of me at the public meeting,
where we're not even talking about that law, I
share Trustee Phillips' confusion sometimes. I
think I know where we are on this one, and you
just summarized it, which I appreciate, but
it's -- we need a better system.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: What does this cost --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well, I thought the
original -- the original purpose for asking for
this multi-family was because the Building
Inspector did an interpretation with -- with
the ZBA, and there was -- needed to be a
clarification about multi-family in R-1 and R-2 Districts. Was that -- you know, where did this multi-family fit? Is that not what the original purpose of this whole discussion was?

    MAYOR HUBBARD: Because it's in two different spots in the code, it's in two different sections. One section says one thing, and I forget the actual number. Go ahead.

    MR. PALLAS: Yeah. The 150-9 has a reference to multi -- it refers back to the 150-18 for existing -- existing dwellings or existing buildings, which is in the R-1 and R-2. The one -- 150-18 is -- stands alone and doesn't say where it applies, that -- so there was -- we felt that there was a need to bring that all together, and that was what the -- this was attempting to do, and we thought we were going down the right track.

    MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

    TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I support this.

    TRUSTEE ROBINS: I'm just as confused as everybody else, by the way. I agree, you know, Paul, that what, you know, you put together, and that was the intent, was to clarify the law
and bring both of them together, okay? But I always saw it basically as a clarification for potential development of apartments in the Commercial District, nothing to do with the residential area.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Right.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: That's the way I saw it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Up to three.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Up to three, and whether, you know, we want to do that or not. You know, that's -- then we can discuss that, but, you know, clarify the law.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But I thought we had had some applications that were dealing with the residential areas that wanted to do more than three or four apartments, you know, on a property. Did we not have some of that discussion before?

MR. PALLAS: There are -- I think there are some discussions about potentially doing that, but they've -- there's nothing pending right now on -- for any of those currently. There were two -- again, there were two -- the initial, the initial question was what zones does the 150-18 apply. That was
the initial question. As we start going through it, obviously, we uncover other things that need clarification or discussion, and that's where -- that's how this developed over time. As opposed to, you know, just trying to fix one little thing, it opened up other things, so.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So you're now telling me that you believe that the multi-family belongs in Zone R-1 and R-2?

MR. PALLAS: No, I don't --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No. I mean, that's -- that -- I mean, so that was never -- that is a clear -- it is clear to you that multi-family fits in within the R-1 and R-2 areas?

MR. PALLAS: No, I didn't say that.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: All right. Well --

MR. PALLAS: I didn't -- I didn't mean to imply that. The -- all I was asking for is clarification as to where one-eight -- the initial discussion, from our perspective, staff's perspective, is what zones does the one -- because it never says in the 150-18 where it -- where it applies. That was the initial discussion. And then it developed into this
other discussion about, well, should we apply it multi-family, some form of multi-family codes within the Commercial District. So it was -- it was -- so the attempt was, and I haven't read it in a while, and I apologize, I don't remember the specifics, but the attempt was to try to pull it all together. That was the attempt, or the idea, not the attempt. I believe we --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So your intent was to pull it all together with all the zones, R-1, R-2 and Commercial?

MR. PALLAS: To clarify all the multi-family --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: And this is only dealing with Commercial?

MR. PROKOP: No, it doesn't.

MR. PALLAS: No.

MR. PROKOP: It doesn't. It says -- it says that one -- it was also intended to say that 150-18 only applies to R-1 and R-2.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. I mean --

MR. PROKOP: Well, I think it --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Why don't we -- can you
take the version that you have now, send one
email to all the Trustees, all the Board
Members of the version of what it is? Can
everybody just review that, look at it, and
come back with comments, and let's -- I mean,
this has been here, we've been talking about
this for a year, and every month it's on there
and we keep going around on it, and I want to
just wrap it up so we don't have to keep having
the same discussion. I would like to just
bring it a head and just get it -- drop it off
the schedule and we don't have it on there
until we come up with something better, or
bring it to a head and let's just review it,
and vote on it, and make changes, and vote it
up or down.

It's just, you know, each month when
we're working on the agenda, we get the same
items, and I'm just trying to get them
completed, similar to like the rental law that
we had on there, and we finally, you know,
talked about it for a couple of years. I just
want to get these things done. Either we're
going to take action or we're not, and let's
just move it forward and be done with it.
That's --

MR. PALLAS: Yeah. If I may, it might be helpful, when that gets sent out, and I can work with the Village Attorney on this, to come up with just maybe, you know, a half page of bullet points as to what the intent of what --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That would be extremely helpful.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: -- of what the --

MAYOR HUBBARD: The intention of what you're trying to do and where you're changing whatever it is.

MR. PALLAS: Of what we're trying to do, so you can see --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right.

MR. PALLAS: You can see what the intent is in light of what the code change looks like to --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: -- try to pull it into one spot.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. I just want to bring it to a head and just -- you know, just get it taken care of, okay? So we'll send that
out so everybody knows. I did check the dates on it of what they were, when the changes were made, looking at them, and one was August, and the October one went out. The last one was given out in November, but it's the same one, there was no changes and no comments on it. So it's just the same version's been sitting there for some time and I just want to wrap it up.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: It's operated several times.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So we'll get version, it will be sent around tomorrow, and that's the current version that we're going to discuss next, so everybody knows exactly what it is, okay?

CLERK PIRILLO: And when is that discussion, Mr. Mayor?

MAYOR HUBBARD: What's that?

CLERK PIRILLO: When will that take place? Is that the January as well?

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yes, that will be at the January, yes.

CLERK PIRILLO: Okay. Thank you.
MAYOR HUBBARD: So we have it. Anybody has any suggestions, we could get it, then we could put it out and have an official public hearing, because we've had changes back and forth, and try to just wrap it up.

The next one was Chapter 118, the subdivision merger of land. I know we talked about that last month. I talked to Joe earlier today. We talked about just putting wording in. Instead of changing the whole code, wording just saying that it refers to the Zoning Board. And I know you had issues, you weren't around --

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- today. Yeah, I didn't have a chance to talk to you. But I think that's what we kind of came up with. Instead of revamping the whole code, just put in the provision that if this needs to be reviewed, you want to merge the lands, it goes to the Zoning Board, and let them do it, instead of being done administratively by one person in the Building Department.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So I have --
MAYOR HUBBARD: That was the intention that we --

MR. PROKOP: Right. So I have a -- I have a comment.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Sure.

MR. PROKOP: And I did -- I did look at this, as you had asked me to. What the answer -- the answer to this is that when we created the subdivision -- we did not have subdivision procedures prior to the adoption of 118. One -- subdivision approval by the Village was required under New York State Law, but we did not have our own Village procedure. So what we did was we adopted 118 to give us subdivision procedures for when people wanted to do subdivisions, and we added at the end the section about mergers.

The issue is the ZBA only has jurisdiction over Chapter 150, which is the zoning code. The ZBA does not have jurisdiction over any other part of our code. So what I -- what I'm thinking about this, what I recommend we do is we take the merger language, with the revision that you want, and put that in 150. I can fit that into Chapter
150. So the merger -- the merger provisions are actually in our Zoning Code, and the subdivision --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And each zone -- I'm sorry. So each zone would have a merger provision?

MR. PROKOP: No. There'll just be whatever we're up to, 150-48, or whatever.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Oh, okay, yeah.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

MR. PROKOP: So that the two or three little lines about subdivision that are causing such a big problem, I'm going to take them -- excuse me -- about mergers, I'm going to take them out of the subdivision procedure law and put them in the zoning law, and that gives the ZBA jurisdiction over that. So then if people would want to do a merger, then they would go to the ZBA.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Exactly.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I like that.

MR. PROKOP: And that will -- that will take care of that. And then the 118 will be stand-alone subdivision procedures only, and we won't have anymore of this --
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Confusion.

MR. PROKOP: Yeah, confusion.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. Well, that was the intention of everybody. Instead of having the Building Department, one Building Inspector saying this is good or bad --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- put it back before a Board of five people living in the Village and have them decide.

MR. PROKOP: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So if you could work on that and get that around to us all, so we could try to do that for next month, and then that will take that one --

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- off the list also.

All right. Thank you.

All right. We're going to move on to regular monthly reports. The Village Administrator. But we're also, instead of doing the Treasurer, between the Village Clerk has a lot of stuff in common with the Village Administrator, so we're going to do those two together. And, Robert, you're going to have to
wait a little bit longer and we'll do yours afterwards.

MR. BRANDT: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right? Well, just do knows.

MR. PALLAS: Okay. Good evening, everybody. I'll start with my resolutions. I have a few hires in winter for the Ice Rink, and probably joint hires for the Carousel as well.

We have two training, resolutions for training for Doug Rocco for the Electric Department. That's North -- Northeast Public Power Association training. He's going into his second, second year of four years. We got the -- he did very well in his first year, which is good, and he needs to continue to become a First Class Lineman, continuing that training.

I have a proposal from Susan Stohr. I discussed this last month, I believe, regarding the Governor's Office of Storm Recovery Grant that's up to -- it's currently at a million dollars, potentially up to five million. I would ask that if I could have some
administrative support for that using Susan Stohr. She was instrumental in getting us a grant in the first place. I've worked with her for quite a number of years. I think it would be very beneficial for -- would be beneficial for me, to be perfectly honest, to help me, to assist me in the administration of that grant. So that's my second proposal, yeah, second big resolution.

The next resolution has to do with the same grant. I had sent around a draft -- I'm not quite sure what you call it -- amendment to the grant paperwork that would just allow me to sign off on changes to the grant documents that don't involve funding to streamline the process. This was actually requested by the Governor's Office of Storm Recovery. They prefer to do it that way.

They're very interested in keeping this grant streamlined, which is completely different from most -- most other grants that we get. So I would recommend that we go with that, too.

Again, what you have, what I had sent around was just the -- a draft that needs to be
worked on a little bit, but I'd like to get it at least conceptually approved, and then I can work with the Village Attorney on making sure that every -- all the I's are dotted and T's are crossed before we send, send that out.

The next one, an add-on resolution for Haugland Energy as look to -- looking to use the old scavenger waste site to do staging for the PSEG project. Negotiated a price between starting as soon as tomorrow, if possible, but I don't know if that's logistically possible, through the end of April, for $15,000. Obviously, it would have to have insurance, you know, and pay us up front and all, sign a contract. Joe has drafted a contract for it already. So we're in -- as far as that goes, we're in very good shape.

And I'd ask because they are looking to start tomorrow. Like I said, I don't know if that's actually doable for them tomorrow, but they might start as early as next week. So I'd ask if we could possibly vote on that resolution tonight.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Joe.

MR. PROKOP: I think they need to give us
-- they need to -- before they go in the site, I think they need to have -- give us a check for $15,000, and they also need to give us the actual insurance.

MR. PALLAS: Correct. I've spoken with them regarding that there. They have assured me that they would. And I've told them flat out, well, that's -- you know, I will have to have it in my hand before.

MR. PROKOP: And then the agreement, the agreement is ready to go, basically.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.

MR. PROKOP: As far as I'm concerned.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Was there a retainer on there in case they don't --

MR. PROKOP: I put in a bond -- I think I put in a bond amount, if I'm not -- if I'm not mistaken. Instead of a deposit, I put a bond amount where we --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Where we could add that. I also included damage to -- so damage to the site, but I don't know how you feel about this. I also put in that they would be
responsible for any damage to Moores Lane, because they're going to be putting -- moving heavy equipment in and out of that site.

MR. PALLAS: I certainly think that's reasonable. I don't -- I don't anticipate it's not. It's really they're storing conduit, primarily, and bucket trucks. So it's not anything substantial, but I think it's a good idea to include those protections.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right, yeah. Retainer, whatever you want to call it, just in case they knock the fence down, whatever.

MR. PALLAS: Yes.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So there's money. They don't just say, "Yeah, it will be just like it was before."

MR. PALLAS: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So we have something. You know, so --

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- 2500, $5,000, whatever. You know, they're bringing in, you know, gravel, fill, whatever, that they clean the place up, and everything else, back to where it was.
MR. PALLAS: Yup, yup.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So the 15,000-plus, you know, security deposit, whatever you want to call it.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Security.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah, exactly, yup.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: I'm fine with it.

CLERK PIRILLO: So we have a resolution approving the agreement between the Village of Greenport and Haugland Energy, LLC for the temporary use by Haugland Energy, LLC of the Village of Greenport property, and authorizing Mayor Hubbard to sign the agreement between the Haugland Energy, LLC and the Village of Greenport.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So moved.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: So moved.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So moved.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Second.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. I have a motion and second. All in favor?

TRUSTEE MARTILLOTA: Aye.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Aye.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Aye.

Opposed?

(No Response)

MAYOR HUBBARD: Motion carried. So you tell -- you know, bring down the paperwork and anything everything else that needs, you know --

MR. PALLAS: Sure. We'll contact him in the morning.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- and I'll sign it.

Yes.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.

MR. PALLAS: Thank you. Thank you. And thanks, Joe, for getting that done quickly.

MR. PROKOP: I'll need a diagram of the site to attach.

MR. PALLAS: What?

MR. PROKOP: We need a diagram of the site to attach to the agreement. Somebody has to do it.

MR. PALLAS: Yes, yes.

MR. PROKOP: Please.

MR. PALLAS: Sure. I can have Derryl do that.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Paul, you had another one you needed to have a resolution on?

MR. PALLAS: I don't think so.

CLERK PIRILLO: No. Trustee Martilotta does.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh, okay.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: All right.

CLERK PIRILLO: We'll -- we're going to get to that --

MR. PALLAS: We'll get to that.

CLERK PIRILLO: -- at my part.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: All right. Does Susan -- this you don't need?

MR. PALLAS: I don't need that this week, no. No, that --

CLERK PIRILLO: That he doesn't need tonight.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh, okay.

MR. PALLAS: No, no.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: All right.

MR. PALLAS: No, I'm fine with that.

Okay. Moving on to Department Reports, to the Road Barn first. Just a couple of
highlights.

The -- they did -- the Road Crew did continue to assist with the finishing up of the road paving project, which turned out very well. They really did a great job in staying ahead of the contract and working with the contractor, so I just want to mention that.

They also worked to get the Ice Rink set up. They -- we -- because we had done some redoing of some of the concrete in the -- in Mitchell Park, they had to reinstall anchors, and it's actually been beneficial. The walls have never been sturdier. So they did a really good job of anchoring, anchoring the walls. And I just want to make sure everybody's aware that they did extra work this year to get that set up.

Moving on to the Sewer Department, just a couple of highlights there. Basin No. 2 is taken out of service and cleaned, and for starting the concrete ceiling and maintenance of Basin No. 2. And they also did some work on the -- on road paving project for manhole risers and things like that. So virtually every department was involved in that, in that
project.

Moving on to the Electric Department. Cooling tower project is almost -- at this writing was almost complete, it's virtually complete. We intend to begin some testing next week on that project.

I do also want to thank them for all the Christmas lights that they had put up. They did a -- again, we added a significant number of lights and really turned out very well. We've actually got even ideas now for doing more next year, so that's good. I think everything turned out really well with that.

Moving on to the Building Department, again, just a couple of highlights. The Historic Preservation Commission on December 4th held a workshop, which was very well attended. I didn't -- I didn't have a chance to go, but I understand it was quite -- quite a good project that they did on that.

I've also added this month, as I had been trying to do every month, Fire Marshal report. It's a little extensive, because we added -- we were going back to the beginning, so there's a lot in there. From this point forward, it will
only be the individual months that will be added. I just wanted to play catchup with that.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Paul, on Building, you are working on a new -- a replacement for use evaluations, right?

MR. PALLAS: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: Yes, but we should -- we had hoped to get it into the report, and we had some --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Right.

MR. PROKOP: We went back and forth. We -- it didn't make it into the report, and I'm sorry, there have been changes.

The first thing is that it's not going to be called "use evaluation". A use evaluation is gone, that term is gone. My preference is that we don't use it anymore. It's now called -- it's basically Fire Marshal Review, it's a Fire Marshal Review provision. And we've gotten it now to a point where it's very simple, it's just two sections. And I think it will be ready to be -- I mean, it's been done, we just have to get it around. So I guess it will go out, got out tomorrow, probably.
MR. PALLAS: Next week.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Great.

MR. PROKOP: Next week? Next week, okay.

MR. PALLAS: Next week.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And are use evaluations still happening?

MR. PROKOP: It's not the same.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: But are there still some before the Planning Board, or are there none and we're done?

MR. PALLAS: We have maybe one or two, but they're simple. There's nobody is -- nobody is in a rush for them, so we're still -- because we don't have the new code, we can't really just change it in midstream.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: But there's no urgency at the moment for any pending applications.

MR. PROKOP: But there's defined triggering events and they go -- the triggering event goes to the Fire Marshal for review.

That's --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Great.

MR. PROKOP: It doesn't go to the Planning Board.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So the anticipated date of receiving this document is next week?

MR. PALLAS: By the end of next week we will have it, we will have it out.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. So that we can discuss it at January's work session?

MR. PALLAS: Yeah, yes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay. I don't want to throw a monkey in the works -- sorry, a wrench in the works at the end, but I think we got to -- we have to at some point consider this phenomenon of pop-ups. I don't know if it's in this law or somewhere else, but --

MR. PALLAS: We are in the process of --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: You're looking into it?

MR. PALLAS: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay, great.

MR. PALLAS: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. Because, you know, as somebody who has put a couple of applications before our Planning Board for use evaluations, including one in which I had to draw a picture of a square room where I sit on the phone all day, it's -- I think that we need...
to -- we need to consider this in our code, because, otherwise, everyone would just -- I mean, I could have just made a pop-up office in a former flower shop.

CLERK PIRILLO: We worked with Code Enforcement. We had a recent situation with a pop-up, and worked with the Attorney, Fire Marshal, Code Enforcement to make sure that a Notice of Violation was sent. And we know that there is potential for another pop-up. We don't know the location. But we are using the code, and we made sure that the violation

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Great, yeah.

CLERK PIRILLO: -- was sent in a timely manner.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: But I think pop-ups are not necessarily a bad thing, as long as they're considered. So I'd love to hear --

CLERK PIRILLO: That particular one was not --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Well, I don't know what the details. But, yeah, if there's -- you know, maybe people have to get a pop-up, whatever, approval and then they can do certain things, I don't know.
MR. PALLAS: There is actually existing code. As part of this, investigating this with the -- our Fire Marshal, when I asked him to look into it, sent me a draft of the violation, and cited a section of code that I had never seen. So there actually is a section of code that it does cover this kind of thing. It may need some nuance changes, but I don't -- I don't believe so. It's really up to these companies to do the right thing. I think through this process, through this -- I don't want to talk about the violations too much, but --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

MR. PALLAS: -- I think we're on top of it --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.

MR. PALLAS: -- is my -- is the answer.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. I'll wait until -- I'll wait until we see the violation, because I would like to know, is it -- are these pop-ups just dealing with events? Because, you know, you have pop-up restaurant -- you know, pop-up dinners within restaurants, that's been coming around as well.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Well, one of the things that --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So how are you -- you know, how are you defining pop-up?

MR. PALLAS: Yeah. If they're doing it in a restaurant and it's -- if it is a -- if it is, in fact, a restaurant, I don't know that there is a violation there.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: All right. But so --

MR. PALLAS: So the concert -- this one, this one in particular happened to be a concert, and the code is specific about that kind of thing.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, I understand that.

MR. PALLAS: It's really events as opposed to restaurants.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. But you also have artist studios that deal with pop-up situations, and that's why I'm asking you if you're dealing with it being an event or --

CLERK PIRILLO: They're all case specific.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: No, it would be -- it would be case specific.
CLERK PIRILLO: Each one is specific.

MR. PALLAS: I mean, if it were -- in the hypothetical, if you're talking about a -- an art studio that had a pop-up dinner and they were cooking there, that's clearly not allowed, and we would -- we would investigate it, and assuming it's not allowed, we would violate it.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. All right. Because sometimes music is art. So, anyway, that's why I'm asking.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah. And a case specific would be relevant here, too, because, I mean, I think part of the pitch, from what I read about this thing, was that it was -- it was secret. You know, I mean, they were under the radar. I mean, so they didn't want to tell us or anybody else, I guess, about it, you know, or thought they didn't need to do it. So, I mean, those are the kind of things that bothered me about it, you know.

MR. PALLAS: Understood, yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay, yeah.

MR. PALLAS: All right. Moving on to the Recreation Department, I already mentioned about the Ice Rink. We did actually open --
been open twice, I think, correct?

CLERK PIRILLO: Three times.

MR. PALLAS: Three times, three days.

Weather hasn't been super cooperative, but we
were able to open today.

MAYOR HUBBARD: It will be next week.

(Laughter)

MR. PALLAS: That's what I saw. Assuming
all -- it doesn't all melt away over the
weekend, but hopefully we hold enough ice to
reopen next week.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Try Christmas night.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah. Skate School, again,
all related to the Ice Rink. Skate School
registration is coming in. The ice hockey
schedules are all set, and the contracts, I
believe, are done.

CLERK PIRILLO: They are.

MR. PALLAS: Moving on to the Rec. Center
itself, the Center is decorated. We had the
holiday party on December 14th, which was --
went very well.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes, it did.

MR. PALLAS: There's a note here from the
Rec. Center. The staff and students would like
to extend their gratitude to all sponsors that
gave generous donations. The donations were
used to purchase holiday gifts. And I just
want to say a special thanks to Sylvia for
coordinating all of those donations.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And didn't Trustee
Phillips wrap a bunch of gifts, too?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes, Elf Phillips did
wrap a bunch of gifts.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you. It was a
great job.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you. If I may take
a moment of gratitude, I think the timing is
good timing. I have a list of our helpers.

Phil Carlucci and Phillip Ross Industries, DL
Concrete, Jim Olinkiewicz, Dave Murray, BST,
D&B Engineers, Peconic Landing, McMann Price,
the Cutchogue Lyons Club, John and Maritza
Winkler, Paul and Betty Pallas, Doug and Mary
Moore, Southold Historical Society, HANFRA,
Educational Solutions Consulting, David Corwin,
Bob Fager and Teresa Taylor, Flynn Stenography,
Heather Walker, Kathy Berezny, Debbie Boyle,
Margo DeVito, Christine Kelly, David Corwin, Trustee Phillips, who donated her time for wrapping, and Mr. Mayor and Mrs. Hubbard.

So I would just like to thank everyone, because without all of us, that couldn't happen. As we all know, that's near and dear to my heart, so thank you very much.

Just one additional moment of gratitude for the Friends of Mitchell Park, who also this past Sunday, the 17th, gave us a free day of Carousels, Carousel rides for children. So thank you to the Friends of Mitchell Park as well.

MR. PALLAS: And Sylvia concluded my report.

(Laughter)

CLERK PIRILLO: Okay. All right. Concluding with a moment of gratitude, that's nice. On to the Clerk's Report.

To begin with, resolutions to be added. We recently went out to bid for the removal of trees, and the removal and grinding of tree stumps, and the pruning of trees. We hereby request that we reject all bids as submitted and go out to rebid.
There was some confusion amongst vendors regarding which trees were to be removed, which were to be pruned. So we feel that in order to make the process as equitable as possible, it would be best to renegotiate the list with the Tree Committee and with our crews and go out to rebid. Also, considering the fact that the timing is not crucial, that would be our suggestion.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Just make sure we have one person go and tag them this time and we know -- I don't -- the last time, not picking on John Quinlan, but he's colorblind. And so I said, "What's a yellow ribbon compared to the green ribbon?" He said, "I didn't use yellow." I said, "Yes, you did." So --

(Laughter)

MAYOR HUBBARD: So that's why I'm trying to figure out blue ribbon, yellow ribbon, you know, and he -- so we need to just clarify that. So that I asked -- I asked at the Tree Committee, "What's the yellow ones mean?" "No, I didn't use yellow, I used all green." I said, "No, you didn't." So, and --

CLERK PIRILLO: Point taken.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. And then we have one of the vendors that was bidding on it mark some trees themself and marked the wrong trees. So we just need to clarify the whole thing.

And if we have -- have Derryl and Doug go and put the ribbons on, or something, just to make sure that it's all clean and neat, and we do it properly this time. Well, we did it properly, but just, you know, all of a sudden, somebody marked other trees, and stuff like that, so we just need to correct that.

CLERK PIRILLO: Yeah. There were the proverbial too many hands in the soup.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, so --

CLERK PIRILLO: Point taken.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.

Continuing on with bids, we -- I also request a resolution accepting the bid as submitted by Russell Reid, and that is for the provision of liquid sludge hauling services. They were the sole bidder, and they are a responsible bidder in our past experience. They have quoted us a price of $196 per thousand gallons.
Trustee Martilotta has requested that we also have a resolution to be voted on this evening, which is regarding an Intermunicipal Agreement between the Village and the School. And this Intermunicipal Agreement is for time during the break. Trustee, would you like to explain that?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure. I sent this all out to you guys in an email, I believe. And just to make sure everybody knows what we're talking about, an agreement between the School and the Village, where we would be able to open up the gymnasium, the two gymnasiums in Greenport School. The smaller one would be for the elementary kids, the larger one would be for the high school age kids. The Greenport School would be providing two teachers, one teacher for each one of those gymnasiums. We would be providing, I believe, it was six staff, Mr. Pallas.

MR. PALLAS: Correct.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: For that three-hour block, so three in each. We're looking to have, you know, basketball games, board games. We've laid out a whole bunch of things for the
We had a meeting with myself, Mr. Tsaveras, who's the Principal of the Elementary School, Ms. DeVito, and a couple of teachers that will be there as well, just so we could plan it all out. We think we have all things covered from first aid kits out to all the things that will keep young boys and girls really busy, and hopefully make them tired on a 20 degree day the day after Christmas.

We're also hoping that if this is successful, this is something we can do again in the future. As we know, in the winter, there's not an awful lot to do for a seven-year-old kid when it's 20 degrees outside, so we're really hoping that this will be something really positive.

I know I'm super excited about it myself. I'm hoping that this would lead to us being able to do some more things for kids over the breaks. And if we could vote for it, I'd love that.

The reason I ask for the vote -- well, I got this to you as soon as I could. You would be shocked at how long it takes to open up the
gym at the high school for 12 hours. I mean, it was pretty amazing. But the reason I ask for the signature now is, obviously, we're not meeting again before -- before Christmas. So by having the Mayor execute this now, then we could do the -- we could cover the days. I believe it was the 26th through the 29th, if I'm not mistaken.

CLERK PIRILLO: Yes, yes.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: It's four days, right?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Four days, yes, ma'am.

CLERK PIRILLO: Yes.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: And that's what we're looking for. It should be a really great program. Ms. DeVito is really excited about it, so is the Principal. It seems like it would be a great thing.

CLERK PIRILLO: So to that end, we have a resolution approving the Intermunicipal Agreement between the Village of Greenport and the Greenport Union Free School District for a joint program from 12 to 3 p.m. on December 26th, 2017 through December 29th, 2017 at the Greenport School, and authorizing Mayor Hubbard
to sign the Intermunicipal Agreement between
the Village of Greenport and the Greenport
Union Free School District.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So moved.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Second.
MAYOR HUBBARD: All in favor?
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Aye.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Aye.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Aye.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Aye.

Opposed?

(No Response)

MAYOR HUBBARD: Motion carried.
CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Good thing, because the
fliers went out to the kids two days ago.
(Laughter)

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: And it's in the
Suffolk Times today.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.
CLERK PIRILLO: Here it is.
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I know, I know. My
son brought one home. Oh, man, they're looking
for us now.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I was kind of laughing when I saw it early this morning.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I said, "Isn't this the thing we were talking about?"

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I saw it.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I said, "Oh, my goodness."

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: It was kind of funny. I read it early this morning on that first cup of coffee, you know.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I know.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

CLERK PIRILLO: Okay. Progress on --

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Awesome. Thank you.

CLERK PIRILLO: -- new business. A piece of new business is that we are searching for a Building Inspector. So the way to do that is to canvas the Civil Service list. We have already begun the process. Letters have gone out to those on the list. Responses are due back on the 11th of January. And it is our hope that at the January regular meeting, we will have an appointment for the Board to vote on to fill the current spot.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: And this will be an
actual Building Inspector description, not this --

CLERK PIRILLO: This is a Building Inspector.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- Village Director of Development --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- correct?

CLERK PIRILLO: There is --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: We're going to end the position.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, no. I'm reading that, that's why I'm asking.

MR. PALLAS: Yes, yes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's why I'm asking.

CLERK PIRILLO: We're abolishing --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: We're abolishing it.

CLERK PIRILLO: We're abolishing the title.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

CLERK PIRILLO: And her title, as a matter of fact, is aged in any case, according to Civil Service.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

CLERK PIRILLO: We have -- Paul and I did
an extensive review of titles on the Suffolk County Civil Service list, and the title of Building Inspector is the one we feel best suits the needs.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. That -- yeah, because -- yeah.

MR. PALLAS: Yeah, I do -- and, also, I do want to thank the Clerk's Office on this, because it was -- normally, getting this stuff done through Civil Service takes much longer than this. A lot of effort was put in to making sure that we are -- that we get a Building Inspector as fast as possible. So I just want to thank --

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.

MR. PALLAS: -- the Clerk's Office for that.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you. Old Business.

Good news on old business. The scanning project has -- scanning project is underway. And our Clerk to the Boards, Kristina, is spearheading the project, has met with my deputy and Southold Town, and progress has been made. We expect to buy a scanner next month, and the scanner that we're buying is one that
is a larger size, so that it can handle some of
our aged documents properly and also our larger
documents.

We have a timeline for the project that
is very thorough. It goes from the step of
consolidating and compiling files, to scanning
those files, to going online with those files.
We've already created in the electronic system
categories for Building Department, for Sewer
Districts, for property files, for Fire
Marshal. We have any variety of categories and
indexes already labeled and stamped, if you
will, which is what they call this.

Work has already begun. There was a
meeting held today with the head of this,
Kristina. And I want to thank her on behalf of
Paul and myself, because she's already expended
quite a bit of effort in getting this project
moving, and we feel it's going to come to
fruition sooner than expected.

We are hoping to implement -- we have a
monthly goal that we're looking for, which
would be about 50 files per month to be scanned
into the system. If we do better than that, of
course, we'll be happy and go faster. The
first thing, which is the organization of files
and consolidation of files, color coded for
paper files, and otherwise, will start
happening already next week. It's already been
done preliminarily yesterday and today, but the
big emphasis and big push will start next week.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Awesome.

CLERK PIRILLO: There is a system in
place already, as I mentioned about the color
coding, for Planning, Planning information to
be in read folders, ZBA green, HPC blue,
vio/ilations in orange, so that this way anyone
that goes into the file can easily retrieve
required paperwork. So we're happy to report
that.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Awesome. Thank you.

CLERK PIRILLO: You're welcome.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's off my to-do
list.

CLERK PIRILLO: Any questions? I believe
that concludes my report.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Thank you.

CLERK PIRILLO: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Village Treasurer.

MR. BRANDT: Good evening, everyone.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Hi.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Good evening.

MR. BRANDT: Okay. I have a couple of budget amendments I want to pass to you. The first one is for a new postage machine in the Clerk's Office. It is used for all departments. However, it's a capital purchase and I'd like to record it in the General Fund as such. The cost options were to purchase it outright or to rent it over the course of five years. The difference was $6900 to purchase it, versus 18,000 to rent it. I think it was a no-brainer.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: No-brainer, yeah.

MR. BRANDT: So I'm recommending that we purchase that machine, and I need to get funding in place for that.

Carousel door repair, you're going to have to help me with what they did on this particular repair. This is the -- this is the robust repair to the doors, so this should be --

MR. PALLAS: Yeah. This -- yes. This is basically the conversion of three, three of the doors from electric to manual, which we have
found that is a much better method of, and very
little maintenance required on the doors to do
that.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: So you eliminated those
overhead motors completely?
MR. PALLAS: Completely, yes.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah? Okay.
MR. BRANDT: Okay. And the last budget
amendment is to appropriate funds for the
additional -- the add-ons to the paving
project. We added some concrete work around
this building, in fact. The additional funding
needed is $298,000, bring the project to 1.2.
MR. PROKOP: So you want -- you wanted a
motion? It would be a resolution to amend the
contract to accept the change.
MR. BRANDT: We are going to -- we are
going to -- no, we don't have to amend the
contract based on the wording on the original,
it was by volume.
MR. PROKOP: Okay.
MR. BRANDT: Okay. We are going to be
presenting, or I'll be presenting the Board an
amending resolution for the bonding, because we
want to encompass the whole project, the grant
money, as well as this. So Bond Counsel has recommended that we do it the way we did. We just put the resolution forth for the bonding, and once the project is completed, we can encompass the whole project.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: So this is going to be included in the original bond of 800,000 that we voted on --

MR. BRANDT: Correct. We're just going to itemize now. On top of the 800 that we borrowed, we have 125,000 spent that we're expecting grant money for, and then the additional reserves we're using.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: So --

MR. PROKOP: What was the term of the bond? I'm sorry, excuse me.

MR. BRANDT: Fifteen years.

MR. PROKOP: So do we have to go through another estoppel period?

MR. BRANDT: No, no, no.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, no, no.

MR. PALLAS: No.

MR. BRANDT: This is just an amending of the original --
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Amendment to the same bond.

MR. BRANDT: Correct.

MR. PALLAS: Yes.

MR. BRANDT: This is an amendment to the original resolution.

MR. PALLAS: Just to clarify, we're not adding anything, any dollars to the bond.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Dollars? Okay.

MR. PALLAS: It's just language.

MR. BRANDT: Yeah, the bond is not changing, it's --

MR. PALLAS: The bond is not changing.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: But, but we are going into the Capital Fund.

MR. BRANDT: I'm sorry?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: We are pulling money out of the reserves.

MR. BRANDT: Yeah, to --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: A hundred and twenty-five.

MR. BRANDT: Right.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: Right. But we're not -- we're not changing the bonding, the borrowing.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: And that's what --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: What happened?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I believe, if I'm understanding it correctly, is the 125,000 that we have coming in the form of a reimbursement to us needs to be actually documented someplace within the bond; is that what it was?

MR. BRANDT: Right. Bond Counsel recommended that we itemize these things, so this way the money that we outlaid toward the 125, we outlaid would be -- we would be able to reimburse ourselves for the --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Ourselves back.

MR. BRANDT: -- the grant money we're expecting separate from that. If we didn't do that, then we would have to fund the repayment of the bonding with that money. It was just a cleaner way to do it. Since we knew it was going to be an open-ended project, we didn't want to lock ourselves in and then we would have to go through the whole process again. Again, the bonding is not changing, it's just the reserves that we've used for the rest of the project.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: So they went over budget, okay.

MR. BRANDT: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, some was additional stuff we came across as we were doing the project, stuff that was not included in the original price. Originally, we did not plan on like the drains here in front of the building. The drains got put in, because the water ran down. Actually, we're trying to settle a lawsuit right now where somebody slipped and fell on the apron last year because of ice.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I remember that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So we put drains in the front on each corner and one in the back, so now everything that comes off the roof goes in the gutters and it's going underground into a drain, which was something that came up after we had started the project.

Just a couple of other things. The pavement project was estimated to come down Main Street and stop at Crazy Beans. It wasn't to go down to the end of road, because that's where the State road starts and our turn road begins. And just being down there with Paul
and Derryl and looking at it, it would look really silly for this overall project to be done and not pave that little section going down there.

Some of the money that we're going to be using is we got reimbursed from the project last year of $115,000 from CHIPS, that we're taking that out of reserve. That's one of the, you know, reimbursement for making ADA compliant sidewalks and repairs. We're going to use that money to pay for part of it, and then we're going to submit again to get reimbursed additionally for this repair. So that should cover the additional cost and put everything back into the Reserve Account.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Oh, so we're expecting this to essentially be like a revenue neutral thing?

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: All right. All right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So but that's where the money is coming --

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: My heart sank when I
first looked at that. I said, "Oh, my God."

(Laughter)

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, no, no, no. It's revenue neutral. No.

MAYOR HUBBARD: We said 400,000 last year, we got back 115. We spent 800,000 this year. I'm hoping to get that, too, with what we already got back in, and 125 from the State. And we're really at the same thing with the additional cost. We got additional work done, but we're getting reimbursed for it.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Okay. I feel much better.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: And the 125, if I understand it, is if we didn't do this, it would have to go towards paying the debt on the bond, instead it being recycled back into our budget to be able to do some of those things.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: Yeah. We have to -- we have to flag that and itemize that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: And you have to do the work first to get the money.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.
MR. PALLAS: Right.

MR. BRANDT: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: It wasn't an upfront grant which they -- supposedly, it was going to be, but then it wasn't, so we had to do the work first and then get reimbursed for it, so.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: And I think it documentates everything a little bit better for everybody so we know where the money is going, so, yeah.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure.

MR. BRANDT: Thanks, George.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.


Sector 3 is about to be processed for the actual bills. The readings are complete there. All monthly reports have been submitted on time.

Community Development: Although there's been some activity rotating out some vouchers, we still have five families searching for housing. It's the ongoing problem we have at this point.
Significant collections: We're one point--one million for the tax levy. Rents stable at 70,000 for the month.

Any other questions on my report?

MAYOR HUBBARD: No. No, it's good.

MR. BRANDT: Easy. Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Thank you.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.

MR. BRANDT: Thank you. Have a good holiday, everyone.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: You, too.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Thank you.


MR. PROKOP: We -- I prepared the deeds and transfer documents for the two properties to go to Habitat for Humanity. I forwarded them to Habitat a few weeks -- two weeks ago. There was no comment back. I need -- I basically requested some information from them, and then we can execute the deeds, at least get it rolling. I sent another email, got no comment.

So what I've now asked them to do is actually set a closing date, so we can get a
date that we can actually sit down and just
transfer, complete the transfer, rather than
going back with emails, and I hope that could
take place as soon as next week.

The Hampton Jitney agreement is done. I
think we got the first check in from them.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: If I'm not mistaken,
something we worked on.

I have an agreement and a policy that
I've circulated, I prepared for the Village a
while ago and I circulated. I haven't received
any comments back. I think, if I'm going to
send around the most recent versions of the
Local Laws for you, maybe I'll send around
these two documents also, so we can get -- see
if there's any comments.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Now what were the two
documents?

MR. PROKOP: It was --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Dock, Railroad Dock
policy, right?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes.
MR. PROKOP: Railroad Dock policy and the North Ferry maintenance.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Oh, gotcha.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: All right.

MR. PROKOP: The Local Laws, I did a -- the Local Law for the Fire Marshal review, I had mentioned, we'll get that out. I also prepared a Local Law for the 11 timed parking, new parking spaces at the IGA parking lot, and a Local Law for leaf blowers, the leaf blower regulations.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Lawnmowers?

MR. PALLAS: Leaf blowers.

MR. PROKOP: Leaf blowers.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But it includes lawn mowers in the code, proposed code.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Because the draft I -- I never thought we were talking about lawn -- I mean, I thought were talking leaf blowers, but --

MR. PROKOP: It's leaf blowers.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: -- the draft has lawn mowers in it.

MR. PROKOP: It does?
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes, it does.
MR. PROKOP: Okay. I'll take a -- I'm sorry, I'll take a look at that.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Because that -- and we've got a hearing in seven days.
MR. PROKOP: Yeah. So the -- I'll get it to you.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: For banning lawnmowers, I mean.
The 11-spot parking thing, thank you. When I read it, it looks -- I don't see where it says add 11 spots. You have sort of preamble language that says -- and maybe this is the way it's supposed to be. It says add 11 new parking spots, and then it says -- refers to the southeast corner of the lot. Is that --
MR. PROKOP: That's how we do it in our code, right?
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.
MR. PROKOP: So in our code, in our code, we have a section of the code under 132, I think it's 132-54 or something --
MR. PALLAS: Yeah.
MR. PROKOP: -- that lists all the -- lists all the timed parking spaces in the
Village, so --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Right.

MR. PROKOP: So we added it to that list.

So that by adding 11 spaces to that list, we create -- we create 11 parking spaces.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Got it, okay.

MR. PROKOP: Eleven timed parking spaces.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. We're taking -- you're changing the time on -- you're changing -- we're not adding 11 new parking spaces, we're just changing the time limits on existing 11 parking spaces, correct?

MR. PALLAS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Adding a time limit.

MR. PALLAS: Correct, yes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's what I'm -- that's --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

MR. PALLAS: Yes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: It's not -- it's not plus 11 in the Village, it's 11 -- it's 11 --

MR. PALLAS: Right.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But that's not what I heard --
BOT Work Session 12/21/17

1 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Eleven new 30-minute, yeah.
2 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- but that's okay.
3 MR. PROKOP: Yeah. And I took a
4 recommendation for the legislation that was --
5 that was given to the Village. And I'll check
6 that comment that you made for the leaf --
7 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: On the leaf blowers?
8 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: On the lawnmowers?
9 MR. PROKOP: The leaf blowers.
10 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh, the lawnmowers?
11 Yeah, it's definitely in there.
12 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: It says lawnmower.
13 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: It says lawnmowers.
14 MR. PROKOP: Also lawnmowers, okay.
15 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.
16 MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, I had phone calls
17 on that same topic and all. And really, the
18 whole idea was just to get the discussion
19 started. But to have a public hearing, you
20 need that something that you're proposing with
21 what things you're going to discuss. So one,
22 we went from one extreme to the other, to hours
23 that you can cut your grass, and that was a --
24 that's the law that was actually from the city
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MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, that's what they have in theirs. And it was just, okay, well, the person that submitted it, "Well, this is what we want," so we put the whole thing in. And then she called me and said, "Well, that's not what I want," "But that's what you had given us." And we used it as a mock law that somebody else had, so we weren't reinventing the wheel, we did what somebody else had. So that's where the confusion on that all came from. But we're going to have the public hearing, everyone will come, whatever, we'll just listen to what people say, and then we'll come up with something that we might propose as legislation.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: And we can put input in on this parking law ourselves at that public hearing as well, you know?

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: We're talking about lawnmowers?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, not that, the
TRUSTEE ROBINS: No, not about the lawnmowers, about the parking at the IGA.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, that's already been noticed.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I know.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Oh.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I'm just saying, but it doesn't -- it's not necessarily -- it's written right now for 30 minutes. I happen to disagree with that, so I want to have my comments as well.

MR. PROKOP: Right, but we'll discuss it at the public hearing.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. I mean, are you going to do it -- usually, you have -- you have our discussion at the following work session, right?

MAYOR HUBBARD: Correct.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: The following work session.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah, the following.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay, good.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Usually we get all the information and then we have discussion.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: We listen at the hearing.
MAYOR HUBBARD: But, I mean, when -- you're welcome -- when the public is talking, you're welcome to say something, if you want it -- if you feel dead set against something, it's better to say it then, when we have the public hearing, so we could modify it, instead of if we want to try to get it done --
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.
MAYOR HUBBARD: -- in a timely fashion. If you have something to say, bring it up at that point.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah, I'll play it by ear, depending on the comments that are made.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, okay.
MR. PROKOP: And I'm sorry, I know it's late, but I have two things that I need to discuss in Executive Session, just very, very quick, but I have to -- they're timely and it has to be discussed tonight. I'm sorry.
MAYOR HUBBARD: That's fine. Any other questions for Joe?
TRUSTEE MARTILLOTA: No, sir.

MR. PROKOP: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. Thank you.

Okay Report of Committees: Audit

Committee met this month. We basically talked about the audit, which we got that back. Robert, did you get a date from Bill Freitag yet?

MR. BRANDT: No, but he said that he would accommodate us for January.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: He said whatever -- I'm not sure if he's going to make the work session or the Board meeting.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: But he said January he was -- that he had that open for us.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. It would be better at the regular meeting than the work session --

MR. BRANDT: Obviously.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- because you never know. One topic on a work session could take a while, so --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: You don't say.

(Laughter)
MAYOR HUBBARD: That was the recommendation that they had. We also did review policies and procedures, how it worked with the Marina, and minor adjustments on that for next year.

So that's all we had on the committees. Mayor and Trustees. We'll start with Trustee Robins.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Report on the BID meeting from the 14th, so it was last week. They were tallying up the ballots of two-week online voting that took place. So they did elect some of the existing officers, and also added two new officers to the Board. Sharon Sailor and John O'Brien, I believe, are the two new Board Members who are coming on board.

There -- I have a copy of a website report from Yvonne Lieblein. You know, they devised a strategy to have what they're calling a Digital Campaign Manager and a Web Master work in coordination to help promote the BID. So Yvonne has had meetings with Katharine Schroeder and Bill Robins, who are the new members who are going to be working on that. Actually, Katharine's been working with BID for
a number of years.

December focuses on organization and access, and they're going to be developing an electronic information kit for the members to, you know, understand how to promote their businesses, and also to initiate better communication between the members of the Board. And they're also going to develop their social media strategy and create a database for -- beginning January 2018.

The travel show that takes place in New York City is going to be from January 26th to 28th. I believe Yvonne will be there, and maybe somebody else. They do a lot of promotional stuff about the Village there.

SOBO, their Sidewalk Beautification Committee, obviously, they were -- they helped to work with the Village on the Christmas Parade and decorations, and they are grateful for all the great things that were done by the Village. And that was a fantastic -- I think it was a fantastic event, the Christmas Parade, and the lights. And it was, you know, a great idea, George, to kind of switch that to an evening and --
MAYOR HUBBARD: Yup, it was a fun day.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah, good idea.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: -- I think it was really fantastic.
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I think it was great.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: You know, it couldn't have been better.
They are trying to figure out how to coordinate the rain garden plantings with the planters that we have on the street right now, you know, so that they kind of have similar type of plants. Dave Abatelli is the one that usually works on the planters. I think you'll notice around town there's some little signs that local businesses can sponsor a planter now.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I saw that, yeah.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: You saw those, yeah. So that will continue.
The other thing that they were talking about is to kind of come up with a clean sidewalks initiative to stress businesses to keep their sidewalks clean. Certainly, identified businesses that tend to be the worst
offenders, but the idea is to kind of keep up a pressure campaign to, you know, really urge businesses that, you know, you've got to have some pride in your Village. And so, you know, hopefully, that will be effective this year.

They -- I suggested to the Pride Committee that they promote themselves by purchasing one of the ads at our Ice Rink, so I think they're going to probably do that.

Other issues that we'll be discussing in the next coming months are parking and signage. Delivery truck parking is a huge problem. The businesses are aware of it. You know, trucks coming in on Front Street and parking, pulling up on sidewalks, and, you know, creating dangerous situations where emergency vehicles can't get through. So they're certainly aware of that.

The -- I don't know if the businesses can do this or not, but the need for restaurants to provide cigarette receptacles. Cigarette butts are a terrible nuisance on the sidewalks, I mean, we see them everywhere. People have to go outside to smoke, so businesses should be encouraged to provide, you know, receptacles so
that people can get rid of their cigarettes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: It would be nice if Eastern Long Island Hospital would provide more than just one for their employees, so.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Oh, well, that's -- yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Because it's all over the place.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: They approved the -- to work with us on this lighting grant that has been pending for quite a while, so they're committing $9100 from their budget this year to -- and that's going to be a lighting project that's going to take place, I guess, on Adams Street.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: In the back parking area.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes, that's where it was originally intended.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah. So finally moving forward with that. And I think Rich Vandenburg sent a letter of support to you, George, on that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yes, he did.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Also told them to remind the businesses, please, no parking during snow storms. You know, let the shops know to warn their customers, you know, don't have your cars on the street if there's any kind of snow happening.

The -- they brought in a -- there was a presentation by a guy who's promoting a Norwegian Viking ship called the Draken Harald Harfagre. Anyhow, it's the only Viking ship that's in existence right now. I guess it crossed the Atlantic, and they -- I don't know why they came to make their presentation to the BID. I think the idea was that if they ask, if they come to the Village to ask to do this, that this would be a BID-funded project and not a -- something that they would be asking the Village for, so that's why, because I asked. I said, "Why? Why are" -- "Why is it coming here first?" And that was the response, was that we'd like this to be -- if we're interested in it, you know, that the BID would try and do their own fundraising for it and just -- and come to the Village for dock space and things like that.
So it was a very preliminary thing. I don't know. You know, this was through Rich Vandenburg, they reached out to him. I believe it was former Mayor David Nyce who made the connection, they reached out to him. So just putting it out there. That's all I really can report on. And the guy made a very nice presentation and --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. But, I mean, if they're going to do anything with Village property, they need to -- you know, the BID doesn't run the Village.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: That's what I said.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Just before they go and start getting too far involved in it, they need to come and see if there's space available, and when it is, and what's going on and all.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Check.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So just make sure they know that.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I got it.
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1       MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay, that's fine.
2       TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.
3       TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Vikings are coming,
4       I like it.
5       TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Lock up your kids.
6       (Laughter)
7       TRUSTEE ROBINS: The Carousel Committee.
8       Okay. So the committee met on the 5th. So
9       they've received a $15,000 grant from the
10      Friends of Mitchell Park to work on the next
11      project, which are these inter-scenic panels.
12      And the grant is a 12-month grant, but they're
13      giving them an option of a six-month extension,
14      just in case there were any delays. There are
15      votes and things along the way that have to
16      take place in the Board. So, you know, they
17      have up to 18 months to get this done. But
18      they have developed a timeline for the project.
19      It will be just a year going into, I guess, May
20      of 2018.
21      There are technical aspects of the
22      project, but, basically, it's going to follow
23      the same pattern as the rounding boards were.
24      They'll select four artists, and there'll be
25      select -- there'll be 14 paintings. Paintings
are going to be assigned. People won't -- artists are not going to have a choice. You know, it's going to be a random drawing of the paintings that will be assigned, and they're going to have a time limit on when they have to get those paintings in. And they'll have a penalty for the late work, you know, to the remuneration they're getting if they don't get it in on time. So I guess, yeah, that timeline will be they'll have 30 days from submission to a rough sketch to complete the painting.

And then, you know, there's just been a discussion. They're going over a dozen -- a couple of dozen photos of old paintings and things like that in the Village to decide what to do.

I had a little information here that Paul Pallas and I had put together on the Mobi-Mats project, which I brought up last year. I understand that, you know, in this current grant proposal, there could be funding for handicapped access. So he, Paul -- we took a look at the sketch. Mayor would like, you know, to -- you to reconsider, you know, the location and how to get those mats into the
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Do they actually go in the water, the mats? Is that what they do?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Well, if you look at their website, you can see them actually going in the water, but my concern is that how do we deal with tides, you know?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Well, that's --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I mean, they'd be in the water --

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Well, that's -- I was thinking, yeah, maybe not in the water.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: -- and then the tide backs out and they're not in the water, so --

MR. PALLAS: I have reviewed this, but -- I know they, on the various websites, show them appearing to go into the water. I don't think they actually are constructed to go in water.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right.

MR. PALLAS: So I don't -- it's not whether I can do it or not, it's they're not designed to do that.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right, right. You know, one other thing I did think about these Mobi-Mats is not just exclusively for use by
people who are in wheelchairs and handicapped. I mean, it's also, you know, people with strollers, you know, and things like that.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: You know, so, I mean, they show that on their website as well, you know, so it's a -- I mean, I think the concept's good.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Great.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I'm sure that we can, hopefully, work something out at Fifth Street, you know, that will, you know, accommodate them. Paul has an estimate here of about $6,000, I think, for two mats, was it, Paul, and --

MR. PALLAS: I forget, but I believe so.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah, I think it was for two mats.

MR. PALLAS: But that was to get us to basically this distance that's shown here.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah. And I know when we first brought this project up, I did receive an offer from a local family that was interested in contributing $1,000 to the project. So, you know, that would be some seed
money certainly to get started.

So that's my report. Thank you very

much, and Merry Christmas to everybody.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. Thank you.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Could we -- if we're
going to do this, we may want to think about
accessible parking down there, handicapped
parking spots that fit, because right now we
don't have any, there's no -- just a thought.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: All right? If we're
going to have this, right --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: If we're going to have a
handicapped thing, that of course it would --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: -- put a couple of
spots.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Sure.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Absolutely would be
appropriate.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Just a thought.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Once we know where
they're going to go.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Thank you. Trustee
Phillips.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Treasurer Brandt and Trustee Roberts and I recently have been discussing a lot about CDBG funding and grants, and we had a meeting two weeks ago, was it?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: (Nodded yes).

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. Where we had a conference call with Suffolk County CDBG with a variety of questions in relationship to community development opportunities.

This discussion started, because in looking at our Treasurer's report, under the Small City Rehab Savings line item, back in 2011, the balance was 10,519. As of November of 2017, the balance is now up to $152,000, which has come in from the repayment of mortgages that were part of the original Small Cities Grant Program that had been established years ago.

In our discussions, we're finding that there's a lot of areas to look at, and that this money could go back into the community in a variety of ways, and either be repaid back to the Village to make it a continuous fund, or something.
So what we're asking is that the -- if it's the pleasure of the Mayor and the rest of the Board Members, if we could just kind of continue our research into the possibilities of what this funding can be used for, and come back with a report in the January work session to talk about the CDBG grants as well, because we'll be having a public hearing --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Next week.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- next week, which will be the first process of applying for any of the Community Development Grants. We have to have the public hearing or public meeting, whatever the title is. So that's one item that we're asking, is if everyone is supportive in us continuing to come back with some ideas next month.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay? The other thing is Village Clerk Pirillo sent around to all of you on December 18th the discussion points from the Marine Debris Reduction meeting that was held at the Schoolhouse on 11/30. This program actually was not a Village of Greenport program. It started as a joint venture between
the Town of Southold, Greenport School. And part of it was people were contacted to be participants where we had owners of four local restaurants that participated in this reduction of plastic that would not go into the marine -- marine trash on the beaches, or whatever.

Megan Byers updated me the other day that two actions have come out of that meeting. One of them is that the Product Stewardship Institute, which is what their organization is, has applied to NOAA for a K through 12 educational grant that Greenport School students would be involved in, along with, you know, hopefully, mutually working with the Village of Greenport on some of our road ends and beach ends dealing with trash.

And the other one is North Fork Environmental Council Board is supportive of an idea that came out of this called the Trash-Free Waters Certification Program, which has certain levels of rewards to local restaurants, which is what they're going to focus on, in trying to reduce the trash and plastic with into -- into the marine debris.

So part of the -- part of the discussion,
and it was a rather lively discussion, it was interesting to see the different viewpoints. But our waterfront is a major economic generator for our Downtown Business District. So I have given Megan Byers the contact information to the Business Improvement District Board, and Julia and I have -- I've networked with her to discuss and think about some participating items, because some of their focus was to ask municipalities to make code changes in dealing with plastic waste.

We have a fair amount of restaurants in the Village of Greenport. I think that they would take more ownership if they're actually participating in writing or coming up with some changes. So they're going to start in January on that. So I'm just assuming that at some point, the BID will be connecting with me and going from there. Okay?

I have also noticed that there's been some activity with the Town of Southold in reference to the Bay to Sound Trails. I noticed that they just received a new funding round. They also have just recently gone back to the original -- the original grant that they
had, which dealt with the walkways with the
wood -- the purchasing wood, and whatever. So
they've -- they're starting to move forward on
that. And I'm just wondering if they have
contacted you, Mayor, in reference to updating
us. I know I've asked for all the information,
but I didn't get a chance to read it, okay?

But the new grant is extending the area a
little bit, so, I -- you know, it's dealing
with around Silver Lake on some of the cleanup.
So I think that we need to be part of the
process here, or have a little more
communication going on. So that's -- that's
the one thing.

The Transportation Commission has been
talking about a lot of the congestion of the
roadways during the pumpkin season, or actually
the whole tourist season. So they requested
that the Liaison to the Transportation,
Councilman Ruland, approach the Town Supervisor
to create a meeting of the minds between the
municipalities, and that's something that will
be coming, a letter will be coming directly to
the Town of Shelter Island, the Town of
Southold, Village of Greenport, and the Town of
Riverhead to discuss Sound Avenue. That's part of the project. And they want to go from the actual municipalities, and then start reaching out to the business communities and start trying to create some type of solution to deal with Sound Avenue, because it's a historic highway, they cannot widen it. That's the problem, they can't touch it, they have to leave it alone.

And the only thing that I'm going to request, because I -- it's been a long -- it's been a long evening, is I would like that when we start -- before we actually set a date for public hearings, I think it would be easier for all of us if we discussed the potential code changes before we set the dates. I find that sometimes we're chasing up to catch up. And as we discovered this evening, I'm not usually pretty confused on a lot of stuff, but the multi-family one has confused me with all the changes. So I just think that before we set the hearing date, we should actually have the proposed code written for us to review first. That's my suggestion. I don't know how everybody else feels about that.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. As the topic comes up and schedule a public hearing, like the leaf blower thing, just to bring up, we don't have anything. You know, we can keep it open-ended and try to do it at that point, but most people in the public want to know, well, what are you actually proposing.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: So --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I would rather -- you know, I would rather we had the opportunity to review it, or at least get it on paper, so that we know what we're talking about as well, because that -- I -- yes. The lady, she told me that, you know, that's not what she intended with the lawnmowers. But by, you know, giving us that document, that, you know, there was no notations, no nothing on it, it was just this is what we want.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right, okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So it's caused a great amount of frustration.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: And I'm not sure how -- I'm not sure how we have a public hearing on a law that just one person gave us. I mean, I'm
assuming there's some sort of process. But I think what you said is that you just want to put it out there for feedback, so I guess that's what we're going to get.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah. Well, it was.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah, we'll see.

MAYOR HUBBARD: One proposal that they had was very -- it banned leaf blowers for the summertime, Memorial Day to Labor Day. And when I saw that, I was like we're definitely -- we're not going to do that, because, basically, what you're saying, we don't want to bother the tourists while they're here, and to heck with everybody that lives here year-round. So then it's like let's go back and look at what other stuff was submitted with the package, and that draft law was in part of the package, and that's when that came out. And then it was like, all right, we had already changed the public hearing notice once, so I wasn't going to change it again. So it was really let's just have the discussion and see where we want to go with any of it.

So the first version that went out, the first public hearing to me was unacceptable, I
don't see how we could even possibly do that. It was just, you know, just a summertime ban, and that makes us really look like we're just catering to people that are renting for the summer, and I was not comfortable with that. So I said let's get the different version, and that's when that came out of the package. And then it went out, because we were trying to meet the time constraints, and I did not see that. When I read it myself, I'm like, all right, I could never cut my own grass, then.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Because I work six days a week, and everything else.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right, but --

MAYOR HUBBARD: And I could never cut my grass on a Sunday, or I had to do it at, you know, one o'clock on a Sunday in the middle of July, which --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I guess what I'm trying to say politely is I would like to get this stuff sooner than later.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, yeah. I mean, all it really does is it would sit there and you would add an extra month to the process.
Something that comes up work session, we'd have the Village Administrator and the Village Attorney try to draft something to bring back to the next work session for us to review, and then we would schedule a public hearing. We would just add a month into the process, but we would have it all first to hash it out. That's -- normally we said we're going to schedule a public hearing. We'll put something together as we're working towards it, but this way we'll just do it -- it just -- it adds a month. But it's something that's not really time-sensitive, and then at least the whole Boards knows what we're putting a public hearing out on so we don't have this kind of thing.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: That was just a brief explanation of what happened with this one --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah. No, no, no, no. I wasn't --

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- and why it got out there. And we were just trying to meet the time constraint, because we said we're having this and we've got to get something out there.
And open-ended public hearings are very hard without a definition of what we're going to propose, because then people don't really know if they're for or against it, because they don't know what's there. So that's why we tried to put a draft out first, but this one didn't work out so well. Well, we'll have the public hearing and we'll see what people have to say.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. Thank you.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm done.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay. Thanks.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Go ahead, Trustee Roberts.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you. I want to reiterate the idea of putting the events together for the tree lighting was just -- was just really great, so thanks for that. It was great, great time with the family.

I did not put in my report, but the -- we approved back in September or August to do a fundraiser at the Ice Rink, the Ice Fest. So we're targeting January 20th at -- with a
weather date of January 27th, the following
Saturday, so that the weather pattern, if it's
warm that day, could hopefully clear out the
next week.

We've got basically about just 45 minutes
of program planned at 4 o'clock in the
afternoon, and then at 5, the Hockey Club's
-going to have a game. We're going to be
collecting sponsorships. We're going to
have -- you know, people are going to be able
to kind of give out free hot cocoa and stuff in
the park.

And the -- I've gotten the -- they're
called the Figure Skating -- the Figure Skating
Troop of Harlem, or something like that. It's
a group of -- it's a club in Harlem of figure
skaters and they perform all over the New York
area. And we're working on funding, but I
think we'll find it somewhere, for them to get
on the Jitney and come out, do their
performance. It's like 20 girls from the City
who are going to come perform.

And I know we've got a former figure
skater. One of the owners of American Beech is
going to do a little routine. I'm going to get
Trustee Martilotta to join my speed skating relay race team. And we're going to have like Greenport celebrity racing. It's going to be fun on ice skates. Anyway, the 20th, 4 o'clock.

And the Clerk has been really helpful, and we're working on details, and going to try to just raise some money for the rink, and everyone's been great.

I also don't have my report, because someone -- the folks who came last month and talked about, you know, trying to find ideas for residential parking for people who live above the businesses downtown came and saw me later in the week, and they said they wanted to go -- you know, they saw what happened with leaf blowers, and they said, well, there might be some people who want to sign a petition.

So today Rachel came by and gave me seventy -- looks like 75 signatures of people who -- you know, I think they're seeing that -- what I suggested to them is don't just ask for parking because you don't want to walk with your bags. Don't just -- but, you know, let's try to fit this into a plan here so that it
becomes part of -- and so what they -- they walked with a petition, which I suggested, that if we add the 25 or 20 spots over on Fourth Street, you know, that -- if the railroad let's us develop that property and add all-day tour -- you know, essentially tourist parking spots, could we find 20 to 25 spots that could be stickered for people who live in the downtown district.

And it's no more than just could we work out a plan. There are no specifics of how to do that. So these folks asked me to bring this here for you, so I just got it today. I wanted to give it to the Clerk, and you can scan it and send it around. But I was surprised at how many people were interested in this. So, you know, I think a bustling downtown is good for the economy, and it's good for everything going on around here.

So if we can help some of those folks out, you know -- it's really, as I understand from talking to them, it's not about I want to park close to my house, because, I mean, if you live in an apartment, you can't be guaranteed you're always going to live close to your...
house, I did it for many years. But it's about -- and I know this from the days when I -- when I have to drive to work in the summer, if I have to go to a meeting or go to something, run an errand in the middle of the day, you know, I got to cruise around for parking, which is, you know, again, that's part of renting an office in the Downtown District. However, if we could find that -- and my idea would be find a few spots here, a few spots here, so that we keep the number of all-day parking spots the same. We find more parking first, and then we take some of the spots we've got and make them for our residents. That's the concept, and we'll distribute it, and I guess talk about it later.

Another great idea from last month's meeting -- it's great when people come and share ideas, I think. I think it's just -- it's government in action, and I like listening to that stuff. But somebody came and talked about a 25 mile-an-hour speed limit, and I did a little research on this. I can't find a reason not to do this. You know, as someone who walks around with a little kid all the
time, I don't see how it hurts anything. But, you know, there are other people here who are maybe better experts on traffic than me, but, you know, I would love to see us look into this. And as I understand it, you need an action of the Assembly to -- or, sorry -- of the State Legislature to go either below 25 or -- sorry -- to go to 25 or to go to 20 miles an hour. So I don't know if we need to go all that route, but, you know, I just want to put it out there to see if anybody else thought that was an interesting idea.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I think it's a great idea. I've got to tell you, I try and cross the street with little kids, and I live a little over by Fifth Street, crossing there to get to the other side, the people come flying through there. And there's a crosswalk, which is generally pretty ignored, you know. And anything that will slow them down I would 100% be in favor of, to say nothing of the fact that there's a school right there. You know, there's a lot of kids walking downtown at lunch. And, like you said, I don't really -- I can't really think of where you're going.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. We can control Village roads, but to change the State road, you know, and all, that has to go through the State, and we'd have to have a discussion with them about them switching that and what their process is for that, you know, so.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: So you're generally supportive and we can look into it?

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah, 25. I mean, you know, in the downtown area 30 is too fast. You know, the section going out of town, people getting up there, I know some of the complaints came up on that end. They said it couldn't be enforced, but there are signs along there, 30 miles an hour. We could do a section of the downtown once you get out of there.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Come to Sixth and Fifth Street in the summer, it's like IndyCar Raceway sometimes, people flying up and down the road to the beach, so --

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well, you mean, on our own road?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. On our road, yeah.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Oh. Well, I mean we can control that already.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: We can make it Village-wide speed limit.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: You're talking about on the north -- I mean, the Main --
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: On the Main Road over there.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: On Front Street.
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: On Front Street and Main Street.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Front Street and Main Street, right.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Front Street and Main Street, yeah.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: We're talking about you enter the Village of Greenport, it says 25 miles an hour. That's what these folks are talking about, and like, again, I don't see a reason not to do that. But --
MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. Well, there's two separate actions you need. You need one to do it on a Village roads, you need one to do it on the State roads.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: You can't just --
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Can we confirm that?
I'm not -- are you guys all sure of that?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: The State, the State road, okay, this came up at the Transportation Commission, because someone from the Village of Greenport wrote in and was referred back to the Village. But the comment was, and it came out of Chief Flatley, is that you have to petition the State to change the State speed limit.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: It's not our speed limit, it's the State.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Is that the one we just paved and painted?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah. Well, yeah, yeah. We have to maintain it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Did we get permission from the State? Oh, we have to maintain it, but to change --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: We have to maintain it, but to change the speed --

MAYOR HUBBARD: They gave us $125,000 to help pay for it.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Oh, there you go, all right.

MAYOR HUBBARD: You know, so --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. But to change speed, we have to go ask them. That's what Sag Harbor is doing at the present moment.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Got it, okay.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay. You have to -- it's -- you know, they pick and choose what they want to enforce on it. I mean, let's be realistic, you know.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: If we could look into.

MAYOR HUBBARD: But, you know, like on First Street, when people were going really fast on First Street, the way the Village did that was put stop signs in and slowed the people down by stop signs. The same on Fifth Street and everything else. Instead of just a straight run, Fifth Avenue over here, they put the stop sign in to get them, people to be more in compliance. And people zoom up faster and brake faster, but, you know -- but to do a Village-wide, you could do Village-wide, but it's not going to pertain to their roads --
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Understood, okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: -- because they had their jurisdiction on it, you know.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Well, so Bridget, who brought this, has, I guess, been networking with -- she claims that Thiele and Palumbo are ready to support this, if the Village wants it, and run it up the flag pole with the State Legislature.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Well, Paul can review it, find out what the procedure is, what we need to do.

MR. PALLAS: (Nodded yes).

MAYOR HUBBARD: Do we need a public hearing first before we petition to it, or could we just send a letter requesting, and he'll find out some information and get back to us on it.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thanks, appreciate it.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: The Village, I mean, right in front of the school isn't even in the Village.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: No, it's not.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. That's a school
zone.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I mean, so that would have to be the State, to do it.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Right in front of it.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Right. It would start at Saint Agnes Church.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yes.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: It would start somewhere on Sixth.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: But, I mean, even there, because I'm always -- people come flying, and I'm like the road ends in 300 yards, where are you going?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: What's happening on Main Street is once -- either they're coming out of the hospital and they're in a hurry to go home, for the employees, or once people get past Steamboat Corner or past Holy Trinity Church, what I've noticed is everybody -- it's a straight path, they're headed to the North Road. All of a sudden, it doesn't become 30 miles an hour anymore, it starts to become 40 or 45, and that's --

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Well, we got that
nicely paved smooth road over there.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: You know what I mean?

(Laughter)

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But the other suggestion that had been made was that -- and if you do the 25, is to post signs coming from -- coming into Greenport from the North Road and the Main Road, Front Street, is that the speed limit's -- you know, 30 mile per hour speed limit signs. You know, to just point-blank -- you know, a big sign that says these streets are 30 miles per hour, so.

But there's a lot of options. I have no problem seeing it slow down. The hospital staff has got lead feet, and it's getting worse by the minute, so that's okay.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. Then we'd have to -- we'd have to coordinate with the Chief, you know, and just ask that he --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Right.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: -- right, enforce it, or give Greg one of those laser guns. Okay.

Thank you.
He's not a Village resident, but a North Fork resident has been trying to make a donation to us, and he's a friend of a friend, so he's been coming to me. So I'm just -- I'm putting this into the report. He wants to donate something called an etree from this company Sologic Renewable Energy Systems. And it's a nice thing when someone calls up and says, "I want to give the Village something," and I honor that it's -- and it ain't cheap.

So this is somebody who wants to donate one of those -- one of these things, and I just thought I'd put it out to you all. If -- because I think -- I think Paul would go probably spend a bunch of time on it if -- it requires some research. So if the Board was really interested in having one of these things, then -- and it's -- basically, it uses solar, and you plug your phone or device, or whatever, into it, and it uses the solar to charge the device. That's about as much as I know about it.

There are technical things that have to be looked into. But if we wanted to pursue accepting a donation of one of these things,
then I think then Paul would do some research.
And so I just -- so I come to you and say if you're interested. And if not, then the gentleman said, "If you guys are not interested, that's cool, I'll move on." So I think, you know, out of fairness to the guy who's trying to make a donation, we should just let him know if we're interested or not, and then, you know, we should find time for Paul to look into it, or have Derryl look into it or something.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Does it necessarily -- I mean, is he pursuing that it needs to be in one of our parks?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: That's his proposal. But I think if we went -- if we came back and said we'd like it here or there, I think he --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's what I'm asking.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. He wants to give it to the Village, and if we said we think this is the spot, then he can decide. I mean, you know, he's trying to do something philanthropic, it's a nice thing. So he's been emailing me for six months about it.
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1 MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah. I'm just trying to
2 think of a place that it would be useful and
3 that you could put it. I mean, you know, it's
4 not the prettiest thing, and you don't want to
5 put it right in the center of Mitchell Park, or
6 whatever, you know.
7 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: No.
8 MAYOR HUBBARD: But I'm just trying to
9 think where it would be useful.
10 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Maybe over by the
11 Jitney bus stop.
12 TRUSTEE ROBINS: I think it's ugly. I
13 would say no. That's my opinion.
14 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I can't think of
15 anywhere where it would fit in that it
16 wouldn't --
17 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. I mean, it's
18 fine that --
19 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Plus the fact it needs
20 to be convenient for anyone who wants to use
21 the charging station --
22 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.
23 TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- which is for mobile
24 devices, correct?
25 TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah. I have a hard
time envisioning where it would fit.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah, I do, too. To be honest with you, I really do have a hard time.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah. Because, I mean, you put it at, you know, the ball field, it's not going be that big. You put it by the ball field, but it's not going to get used that much. It's got to be a place that it's going to be use, but it doesn't really fit the decor of the places that we have.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: It does not.

MAYOR HUBBARD: You know, so.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I will give the gentleman your regrets and thank him.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay, good.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: That's fine.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Awesome. I just want to make a plug for -- you know, I want to make a plug for open container enforcement. I think -- I think you intend to get on this next year, so we don't have to talk about it too
much. But, you know, I'm sitting there
listening to the kids singing at the tree
lighting, and, you know, I've got like a couple
of people. And, you know, I'm no -- I'm no
Puritan, right, but here we are in the park at
this great kids ceremony for the tree, you
know, and we got people kind of -- you got a
guy smoking a cigar, a couple of people having
drinks in the park. And I just think we can --
I think it seems to me that it's gotten past a
point now where we need to really get -- we
need to really get aggressive on this open
container stuff.

I think we should probably -- I want to
-- I think Chatty's right about Monday Night
Dances. I think we need to -- we need to start
saying things to people, and, you know, we need
to just sort of let people know, like that's
there -- we have 15 places where you can go get
a drink, and here in this park is not one of
them. So --

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I was -- I've been
thinking about it, because I've -- you know, I
feel the same way you do. And Dances in the
Park, I think it would be great to see the
local restaurants start participating -- you
know, have a discussion with the local
restaurants to encourage the participants in
Dances in the Park to visit them either before
or after the concert, you know, with some type
of promotional, or whatever. That not only
would help Dances in the Park, but also would
be good for them as well. That's just an idea,
I'm throwing it out, okay?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I know one that does
that. But, yeah, it's -- I think -- I think we
probably need to do some messaging, and we can
talk with Diane about it when she MC's the
concert. But I'm less concerned about that.
It's just that I think -- you know, and we even
had it during our -- we had the Unity Vigil in
September, and some guy walked by yelling at
us, carrying beers around.

It's just, you know, I think the Maritime
Festival has -- I'm hearing a lot from folks
downtown that it's just gotten to be a little
much. And other, other outdoor festivals
don't -- they do things that they -- there are
different strategies for doing this, but they
have more kind of containment, I think, with
it. I think if you're serving outside, you
have to contain your own little -- your own
little, you know, beer garden, and I think
that's actually what is -- what you're supposed
to do in general, under State Law. I'm not
sure of that.

So I just want us to think about this as
we head into next summer. But, you know,
there's a time and a place for everything, and
the sidewalk is not really the place to be --
you know, that's why we have 15 drinking
establishments in this town.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm assuming that the
Maritime Museum will start bringing us their
mass assembly permit for next year soon. They
usually do early in the season, you know,
January, February, March.

MR. PALLAS: That's correct, yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Would it behoove us to
have Paul reach out to them and kind of say
that we have had this discussion, have had some
issues brought to our attention from last
year's Maritime Festival, and that maybe they
need to be talking to us now about how to deal
with it? I'm just throwing the idea out.
MR. PALLAS: I mean, if that's what you all want, I have no problem doing that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah. Just that we had numerous complaints, and it's getting to be more just a drunken party, you know, so.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah. I think that we need to reach out to them and say that, you know, we are -- we are -- you know, we work with them, and I think we take the good with the bad, and they should take the good with the bad as well. And it needs to be brought to their attention before they start planning something that we all of a sudden start to have conversations that are more of butting heads instead of actually being a cooperative --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Work together.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- work together, a group of people.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure. What are their -- what are their ideas?

MAYOR HUBBARD: It worked with the food court with other suggestions, bringing back a more nautical theme and everything else. Just something ahead of time, that, you know, we need to cut back on what we're doing and
restrict what's going on with the other stuff, so it's just not a free-for-all everywhere.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well, I think we also need to understand the liquor law licenses a little bit better ourselves before we approve the public assembly permit, because I do know on Sunday you're not supposed to be drinking beer at 9 o'clock or serving beer -- I mean, serving beer at 9 o'clock. You could drink it, that's if you buy it. But I think that -- I think it's noontime, is it not?

MS. ALLEN: It always has been.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: I think they may have gotten rid of that law. But I know that for our place, the -- I think our resolution said 11 a.m. You know, I had some -- I'm out there setting up at our place and I got some guy at 9:30 going, "Hey, can I have a beer?" I'm like wow.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah. No. Well, I walked down and someone was being served beer at 9 o'clock in the morning as --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: -- young ones are
going -- never mind.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Anyway, I just think we need to have the conversation now, not later, okay?

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thanks. That's why I'm bringing it up.

And have we gotten anywhere with the railroad on the extra parking over on Fourth?

MR. PALLAS: I've spoken with them. I do have to get -- they are looking for a formal letter. I've started working on it.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Great.

MR. PALLAS: I will get it out next week.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Okay. Thanks. Merry Christmas.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Thank you.

Trustee Martilotta.

TRUSTEE MARTILLOTTA: They got me before.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Yeah, he already went.

TRUSTEE MARTILLOTTA: Yeah.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Very good.

TRUSTEE MARTILLOTTA: All you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yup. I really don't have anything special. It's been a busy month. The
past three weeks I've had something every day, between tree lightings, parties, menorah lightings. I just want to thank everybody that participated and came and enjoyed all these events. Everything was really nice. People were well behaved. I think everybody had a really good time.

A lot of work went into -- on all kinds of people's -- efforts went into that. And I think, you know, the Village looks good. It's been a good holiday season so far. And I just thank everybody that's been participating, and wish everybody a Merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah and Happy New Year.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: You, too.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Do you want to take a break before we go?

MS. BRAATEN: Well, it depends how many people.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Well, we got a few.

MS. BRAATEN: Okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD: I mean, it's 10 o'clock. So you want to --

MS. BRAATEN: Yeah, just five.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. We'll take a
five-minute break, and then we'll have the
public address the Board, and we'll move on.
(Recess: 10:00 p.m. - 10:08 p.m.)
MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. We'll open it
back up to the public to address the Board.
MS. RUDDER: Where would you like me?
MAYOR HUBBARD: Come up to the podium,
your name and address.
MS. ALLEN: I'm just going to be real
quick.
MS. RUDDER: Okay.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay.
MS. ALLEN: Chatty Allen, Third Street.
I wasn't really going to even bring this up, I
wrote it in my votes, but since Trustee Roberts
brought it up with the petition, I just have
one question for the Mayor and the Village
Board.
When did it become the Village's
responsibility to provide parking for tenants?
I'm not for that at all. I don't feel the
Village needs to provide -- when you rent an
apartment, you know if you have parking or not.
I think trying to give out residential stickers
is opening a can of worms you don't want to touch.

As for reducing speed, I'm all for that. The other day I went on a class trip and they were amazed that I had four different vehicles between Greenport and Port Jeff fly past on double lines with all kinds of traffic. You can reduce the speed, which is great, and most people will abide, but the ones that are already flying, you know, you pray that they're going to follow the right thing.

And just my final thing. When I went on my field trip on Tuesday, the Elementary Principal came with the class, and we were talking about opening the school over vacation. I think that's a wonderful idea, so thank you to everyone. And I thanked him as well. He seems very excited about this, and is really hoping that, you know, this is going to be something that works.

And, hopefully, in a few months, we'll be back skating again for the kids in the wintertime.

So thank you. Have a nice Christmas.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.
MS. RUDDER: I'm going to pass those around.

My name is Penelope Rudder, I live on Second Street. And my handwriting is miserable, but that's my Gmail at the bottom. It's pennyrudder@gmail. I forgot to put that on.

Before I start, I want to thank you, Mayor Hubbard, and thank you, Sylvia, for something on -- that's not on this, what I'm going to talk about, but you did help me so much with laminating the posters that I put up at the movie theater panels. Thank you so much. Those are now weatherproofed, and the children's art is just beautiful. So thank you very much.

This is a project that I learned about actually at its inception. I hope it would be something that really appeals to you. If it does, we'll be the first Free Little Pantry in the State of New York. This is going to be a model, actually, that should be very simple for us to do, because you've already done the Free Little Libraries.

And what bothers me a lot is that phrase
"mind the gap". And I think that there's a lot of hidden hunger in any community. People don't tell you when they're hungry. Instead, they kind of go to bed tired and they go to bed hungry. And I think there are a lot of children that this affects, there's a lot of aging population this affects.

And this is a project that the units are very similar to the size of the Free Little Libraries. I have the plans, I have the cost. I can get them underwritten, so I'm not asking for money. This is on Village property, so Sylvia, when I presented this to her, I came in one day very excited. She said, "Well, you need to go to the Board and ask for permission to put it up in the Village." So that's why I'm here. So, really, that's what I'm asking for, is just the use of the property to get these established.

I will maintain them. I will oversee all the inventory of them. The food donations are covered by the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Act, so that's covered.

But what I want to address, really, is the need that I feel is important for a
community, and that's something that goes --
that has gone on here tonight, is just 24-hour
neighborliness. This is not something we need
another agency for, we need our neighbors for.
We need to recognize that, you know, a lot of
the things that are done so well like CAST and
the different food pantries, they have hours
and they close down, hunger doesn't. And this
way it's just like the Little Free Libraries.
You can drop a book, you can take a book. You
can drop off some food, you can take some food.
You can be anonymous.

   Everybody falls through the cracks
sometimes and they need help, and it's our
responsibility as neighbors to help be
accountable for making our communities
sustainable.

   So I hope that you'll look at this and be
as excited about it as I am. They're all over
the United States, even internationally. So
I'd like for Greenport, because we're so
walkable, we are so generous in so many other
ways in this whole issue of hunger and
addressing the very basic needs. Like we
talked about affordable housing, affordable
food is paramount for all of our residents. So I hope that you'll look at this and kind of help me get it started, at least with your enthusiasm. I've got everything in place, except for the little spot on Village property that I need to put these on, and I'm asking for three to start, so.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Where?

MS. RUDDER: Where? Well, I don't know where, because you guys have to decide. They have to be, hopefully, near a trash can, obviously, because I don't want a lot of litter, and very well lit. So I think it would involve -- I don't know anything about permits. And, boy, I'm going to stay out of the permit business after -- after that discussion earlier. That's for you guys to decide.

(Laughter)

I'm going to do the inventory. This is going to be teamwork, this is going to be shared, this is going to be a mutually dependent project, believe me. So I want to just have that be very clear. You're going to decide that and we can go from there.

So it's whatever it's -- this is
teamwork, and it's helping all of our citizens, young and old, hopefully cover this area in whenever they needed to go grab some food and help them out.

So thank you very much. Have a joyous Christmas. Please tell me what I need to do next.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay
MS. RUDDER: Thank you.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Thank you.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Thank you.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Thank you.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Anybody else wish to address the Board?
MR. DINIZIO: You know, there's an old saying I used to say when I was on the Zoning Board. You don't know who your friends are until you apply for a permit. I'm going to tell you.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Jim, just your name for the transcript.
MR. DINIZIO: Jim Dinizio, 39 Sound Road, Greenport. I'm not in the Incorporated Village. I am a Councilman for Southold Town, so I'm trying to attend these meetings to just
get a flavor for, you know, where we -- how we can work together and what we can do.

The Bay to Sound thing is just something that certainly we can work on, where we got some money for that. And I think you just need to express your needs concerning that. It's a small part of what we're doing.

I know that some of the stuff we got the money for is for taking down the silo at the Sill Farm, which, if anybody's been down there, if you ever want to go down there, it's just a beautiful spot. I mean, it's really going to be, you know, magnificent to be able to walk from there to the Sound, and hopefully to Silver Lake some day. Probably a good hour walk, I would imagine. So, you know, I'll try to help you with that, get in touch with the civic.

And so that, as you know, we had a company come or a developer come and, you know, propose an affordable housing development up on North Road, something that's been in the works for a better part of a year-and-a-half, trying to find the right people. These people are experienced. They're experienced here in the
town in that they helped out with the Mattituck at the Cottages. They do nice work, I suppose.

There's a lot of work that needs to be done, especially by the Town leaders. Time is money with these things. If we can clear up all of the assumptions and get down to brass tacks on just exactly what this gentleman is proposing, what he expects, and what the Town expects of him, you know, maybe we can get it out of this thing by the time frame 2018.

You know, it's pretty ambitious, quite honestly.

I've been on Facebook all day, I know Mary Bess the same thing, just trying to explain to people what's going on.

So we had a meeting that night, it was announced. We had a Village resident come and she asked about the sewer hookups. Now we're not in charge of sewer hookups, that's you guys. She was concerned that this company would be asking for a break in the sewer hookups.

So the next meeting that we had was the day after at Peconic School, and so I asked the gentleman. He said he asked and you said no.
So good for you guys, okay?

(Laughter)

MR. DINIZIO: So that clears that one thing up.

Her concern also was that we would be building in Moore's Lane, you know, basically, you know, gutting Moore's Woods. It's a 17-acre plot, and seven acres of that is going to be used. So you have to compromise sometimes. You know, 10 acres for seven, probably not a bad deal, you know? Hopefully, the wetlands thing will all work out.

And then, you know, as far as affordable housing is concerned, there's just one other thing I got to say. What the Village and the Town do affects not just the Village and the Town. In this instance, it's going to affect the school district in a pretty large way, considering the size of our school.

I've asked for some stuff from the school. I need to know how -- you know, how much to capacity are, what their capacity is, so we can kind of figure out. I've asked the developer, he says maybe 20 new -- 20 new kids will go in there. I don't know. You know what
I mean? We have to work those things out. You
guys are the leaders and we are, too.

You know, we need to pull people's feet
to the fire on this and get the right
information out, so that, like I said, time is
money, without wasting months of this
gentleman's time, the developer's time, the
owner of the land's time. Either we get a
decision to him or not.

The perfect example is the sports complex
in Sports East. The guy went on for years, you
know, and then got an answer that, you know,
wasn't what he -- what he expected. So I'm
kind of just asking you for your cooperation on
that.

Last meeting we had at the Town lasted
five hours, but Doug was there. Marathon,
okay? It's about wineries and businesses, and
basically businesses in residential zones.
We're going to hash that out. It's going to
work. We voted it down. Like you said, you
were talking about wanting to go over your
resolutions first, and, you know, that's what
happened that night. Basically, it was a law
that was proposed. It was a compromise, and it
didn't quite work out for them. We voted it
down right then and there. That's what you
have to do, you have to put it out, just like
you guys want to do.

Sometimes reading it and adding that
extra month wouldn't even help you, it would
just add the extra month, because you know
right away at the hearing how it's going to go,
because you have to listen to the people, it's
not necessarily your decision.

But, in any case, I voted against another
law that would have allowed residential uses as
a principal use in business zones, very similar
to what you were discussing. My reason for
that is that, unlike Greenport, which is just
saturated, and you're looking for places to
put, we have to solve, in my opinion, solve our
problem of affordable housing, or housing in
general, in the areas in which we have or we're
taking it from.

We're purchasing land, okay? We've
purchased basically 2500 houses, if you look at
it as two-acre zoning, and took that off the
market, and we didn't do anything to replace
that. We didn't do anything for the people
that we displaced from that. We're talking about our kids and our grandkids. So, hence, the affordable housing, we're going to try to do that. It's in the right zone. So, you know, my vote for that was it's -- you know, planning is something that we need to do long term. We need to commit to commercial zones, and we need to commit to our residential zones. So, you know, I just wanted to make that clear.

And other things that, again, the same thing, it still hurts our school districts, you know, with STRs. You know, they're taking houses away from our kids, you know, like musical chairs, and they're sitting in the chair while everybody else is going around until the music stops. So just take into consideration that.

I think the elephant in the room in this whole affordable housing thing is going to be the school district, and we need to solve that problem. We need to help them, guide them. If the people in Southold Town are serious about affordable housing, then, God darn it, they better step up this time, because this is probably the last time it's going to happen,
because after this, you know, I don't know where it goes. If doesn't go in Greenport, which I consider the City of Southhold Town, you have it, you have the sewer, you have the water, you had the electric. If we had annexed it, we -- they would have had all of that, less expensive than what they -- what we can get it now. But, you know, if we can get 50 houses, we can put them in there, and we don't overtax our school district, then it's a win for everybody.

So thank you for listening to me tonight, and I appreciate your help. Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Anybody else wish to address the Board? Okay. At this time, I'll call --

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Corwin.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Mr. Corwin.
MAYOR HUBBARD: What's that?
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Mr. Corwin.
TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Mr. Corwin wants to talk.
MAYOR HUBBARD: Oh, did he? Okay.
MR. CORWIN: My name is David Corwin.

C-O-R-W-I-N.

What is the status of the Village of
Greenport versus Genesystems Electric -- or Engineering and the million dollar transformer that had the wrong specifications?

MR. PROKOP: There's a -- there are two lawsuits pending. One is the -- there's a lawsuit, which is Green -- which is the Village versus Genesys, and that's the one that we've discussed for a long time now. That case is pending in the court. We have been meeting with the Genesys attorney to see if we can possibly resolve it before we move to a trial, basically.

And there's a companion lawsuit where Genesys is suing the Village. The basis of the lawsuit is they claim that we owe them money on contracts, balances due that they claim are -- exists on contracts. And, also, there's a claim that we interfered with a contract where they were trying to sell the company, and that's the second lawsuit. And that's in the same status, that it's pending in Supreme Court in Suffolk County, and that we have been meeting with Genesys, their attorney to attempt a resolution.

MR. CORWIN: So this is the first time
I'm hearing about this, and I'm assuming everybody else, that Genesys is suing the Village of Greenport; am I mistaken about that?

MR. PROKOP: No. They started --

MR. CORWIN: It was never discussed at a work session.

MR. PROKOP: They started it -- started out as a counterclaim. And the -- in the original lawsuit, their answer was a counterclaim. They dropped the counterclaim and they brought in a second lawsuit.

MR. CORWIN: So it's still going back and forth. My concern is somehow this thing is just going to disappear and die, because you never bring it up at these meetings and let us know what's going on.

MR. PROKOP: I could give you a summary, a summary statement of what's going on. I'm happy to do that, if the Board wants me to do it at every meeting, but I --

MR. CORWIN: Well, I'd like to ask the Board that you ask the Attorney to do that. I mean, it's a legitimate thing.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Yeah. That's going to be -- one of the discussions we're going to
have tonight in Executive Session is about progress that's made on that. A lot of it is all stuff that can't be discussed because it's an ongoing lawsuit, but we'll get you some kind of synopsis for it.

MR. CORWIN: Well, if you're going to have an Executive Session, you're going to tell us what it's about before you go into Executive Session, correct?

MAYOR HUBBARD: That's right, yes.

MR. CORWIN: All right. Well, I would like to be brought up to date every month. If you could, I would appreciate that.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Sure.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you.

MR. PROKOP: I could give a status update every month, I'd be happy to do that. The only thing, I just can't discuss strategy, or, you know, things like that.

MR. CORWIN: I understand that.

MR. PROKOP: But I would be happy to give you an update every month.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PROKOP: There has been a lot of work
in both lawsuits. As I said, we -- you know, resolving it -- initial litigation, and also an attempt to resolve it, and that's pretty much the status now.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Okay. Anybody else wish to address the Board?

(No Response)

MAYOR HUBBARD: All right. I'll offer a motion at 10:29 to go to an Executive Session to talk about pending litigation.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Second.

MAYOR HUBBARD: All in favor?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Aye.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBERTS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR HUBBARD: Aye.

Opposed?

(No Response)

MAYOR HUBBARD: Motion carried. We're in Executive Session. Thank you all for coming, and Merry Christmas.

(The meeting was adjourned to Executive Session at 10:29 p.m.)
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