

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

VILLAGE OF GREENPORT

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK

- - - - -

VILLAGE OF GREENPORT

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

WORK SESSION MEETING

- - - - -x

Third Street Fire Station

February 20, 2025

6:00 p.m.

B E F O R E:

KEVIN STUESSI ~ MAYOR

MARY BESS PHILLIPS~ DEPUTY MAYOR/TRUSTEE

PATRICK BRENNAN ~ TRUSTEE

LILY DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON ~ TRUSTEE

JULIA ROBINS ~ TRUSTEE

CANDACE HALL ~ VILLAGE CLERK

BRIAN STOLAR, ESQ. ~ VILLAGE ATTORNEY

All other interested parties

MAYOR STUESSI: I'd like to
make a motion to open the
February 20th, Work Session of the
Greenport Board of Trustees. Is
there a second?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Second.

MAYOR STUESSI: All in favor?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Aye.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Aye.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Motion
carries. Please stand for the
Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon the Pledge of
Allegiance was recited.)

MAYOR STUESSI: If you could
stay standing for just a second.
I want to recognize Mr. Sam
Strickland, a member of our fire
department, who did an exemplary
job the other day. I know the
Chief is going to speak about it

in a moment, but he saved the life
of a one-year older and really
amazing work on behalf of the fire
department who obviously worked --

(Applause.)

MAYOR STUESSI: Please be
seated.

First up, Chief Albie with the
fire department report, please.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Thank
you, Mayor. It always springs
back at me.

Okay, good evening, Mayor and
Village Board. My name is Chief
Albie de Kerillis of the Greenport
Fire Department and welcome
Greenport residents and concerned
citizens.

First of all, I would like to
thank the Mayor and the Village
Board for attending our 180th
Washington Birthday Celebration.
It was very well attended, very
well received. Former Chief Marty

Flatley was the Grand Marshal.

And I asked him during the line of the march how he looked so good after 180 years. He never -- I think he was pulling his gun out.

(Laughter.)

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: In any case, the reason why we're here, as far as I'm concerned, as far as a chief and as far as being an EMT for 33 years myself personally and going out on thousands of rescues, I first want to say that on February 8th, the Greenport Rescue Squad got activated to a one-year old infant, CPR in process, given by the Southold Police Department, dispatchers for CPR instructions on the phone.

Upon arrival with the squad, First Lieutenant Sam Strickland entered the household, was given the infant, did three chest compressions and two back blows.

After that, the infant started crying, which if anybody knows in the medical field, when an infant cries, that is a great sign.

Infant and the family are doing very well. It is called a CPR save. It will be noted in the County, State, and across the board. First Lieutenant Sam, please stand up and we want to thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: At the Board of Wardens meeting last night, the Greenport Fire Department Board of Wardens welcome Remmy Drescoski (phonetic) to the Greenport Fire Department Standard Hose Company Number 4.

The Board of Wardens approved a budget modification moving \$20,000 from Line 200, which is a equipment line, to Line 415, which is maintenance, transportation, and

equipment.

And the Board of Wardens
inquired to a request for a PO for
a Stryker stretcher to accommodate
our new ambulance, which is due
for delivery April -- end of April,
mid May is what they're saying
from the Proliner. And that
amount is roughly \$39,000. That
is all I have, Mayor and Board. I
thank you very much.

MAYOR STUESSI: A couple of
other things before you leave. I
know the bids are coming in this
week --

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Tomorrow.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- on our
fire boats.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: We are
expecting some number close a
million, slightly under that.
We've got a half a million dollar
pending grants from the State.

We're going to need to fund the delta for that. The Board will be having a discussion here a bit later on it. The State requires us to be able to prove if we're going to have funding in place for it, even if we're going down different avenues.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Understood.

MAYOR STUESSI: We're going to be discussing bonding for that remainder to make sure it's there next year for it.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Now, Mayor, could I ask you, after the bids open, what's the proper notification, as far as, does the chiefs get alerted to the potential --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, we'll let you know the results after.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Okay, after the process is done?

MAYOR STUESSI: Absolutely.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: And then as I let you and the other chiefs know, in addition to the Board yesterday, it looks like we've got some good potential to potentially look at getting funding for ambulance pickups reimbursed through insurance. We're pursuing that. I know that is, obviously, the largest number of calls your department gets.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: We do.

MAYOR STUESSI: You guys had a record year last year. This past month, January, was a record January.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: We're on pace for 1,400 calls.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yep. It is just unbelievable what these guys are doing.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Yeah.

MAYOR STUESSI: We did the largest budget increase last year

to the fire department, I think,
that's been done in easily a
decade. We are going to be
looking at things very closely
and, obviously, we need to make
sure that you guys are protected
because you're out there doing
God's work. Thank you, again,
Sam, and Chief.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Thank you
so very much, Mayor. Thank you
very much, Village Board.

MAYOR STUESSI: Appreciate it.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I just want
to add. I just want to
congratulate you on another
successful Washington Day Celebration.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Thank you.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I know many
of your members and your
colleagues put a lot of time and
effort and we much appreciate it.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: And we
thank you very much for your

attendance and your dedication to
the community as well. Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: By the way,
that Flatley family was really
loud in the quite zone as a matter
of fact.

(Laughter.)

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Thank you
very much, Mayor. Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: All right,
thank you.

CHIEF DE KERILLIS: Appreciate it.

MAYOR STUESSI: Next up we
have the North Fork Environmental
Council with a presentation for
the Village Board and community.

MS. MURRAY: It will just
take a minute to set up. Thank
you, Candace. Hi, everyone. Good
evening. My name Ann Murray. I'm
the Southold Land Use Coordinator
for the North Fork Environmental
Council.

MAYOR STUESSI: Anne, if you

could just please state your
address for the record as well.

MS. MURRAY: My address?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

MS. MURRAY: Okay. I live in
East Marion at 300 Southern
Boulevard. And while we're
waiting, I'm just going to talk a
little bit about why we're here.

Today we're here to talk about a
Litter Critter possibly for
Mitchell Park in Greenport. We're
going to find out what a Litter
Critter is, why we're talking
about it, where would it be, what
would it look like, and how it
will function.

Okay. So I don't know if any
of you folks have been to Iron
Pier Beach in Riverhead, but
there's one up there and you'll
see photos of one shortly, if we
can get started here. Okay.

Okay, power outage today?

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: No, it just needs a minute. We have to let it load.

MS. MURRAY: Yeah, that was pretty awful that power outage. Scary. We have power. Bravo. Thank you. This is why I hate tech. Sometimes we need it. Thank you, Candace.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Here you go.

MS. MURRAY: Okay. Let's go to Page 3. Yep. So what -- Greenport Litter Critter. What is a Litter Critter? A Litter Critter is a large piece of art that looks really interesting.

It's usually in a high traffic area and it helps keep bottles and cans out of the water and off the street and hopefully out of the incinerators and landfills.

It encourages kids and adults alike to deposit their bottles and

cans into a charming piece of art in on the street or even in the garbage. Litter Critters add a fun focal point in town and they encourage and are a good reminder to recycle whenever possible.

Litters Critter can be seen around the world -- can you go to the next slide -- and even on the North Fork at Iron Pier Beach in Greenport.

Here are some nice examples. And if you go to the next slide, I believe you'll see the one in Greenport -- I mean, in Jamesport. There should be two slides of that one.

Okay. So for Greenport, why are we talking about a Litter Critter? So inspired by the success of the one that we have at Iron Pier Beach in Riverhead, the North Fork Environmental Council has raised money to put three additional Litter Critters on the North Fork

if you count Riverhead.

One is going to be in Downtown Riverhead. They'll be a second one at the intersection of Main and Griffing Avenue that has already been approved. And the other one we're hoping to put in Southold possibly at Silversmith Park. That's currently in development right now. And one in Greenport, which is why we're here.

Over the past few months we've worked with Mayor Stuessi and Village Board Trustee Lily Dougherty-Johnson to create a plan for a Litter Critter. Next slide, please.

So the Greenport Litter Critter would be, we hope, in Mitchell Park. After walking around, we found a great location near the carousel. You can see here, it's kind of central, but not in the way of other things going on

there; like you have the great
farmers market in the summertime.

So what would the Greenport
Litter Critter look like? I'd
like to introduce Clayton Orehek
who is the artist who's going to
be creating it. Come on up,
Clayton. He's going to discuss
his concept for it a little bit.

MR. OREHEK: Okay. Well, I'm
not a public speaker so --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why don't
you raise the mic a little?

MR. OREHEK: Is that --

CHAIRMAN FARLEY: If you
could just restate your name and
address for the record, please?

MR. OREHEK: First name is
Clayton Orehek -- first and last
name, Clayton Orehek; 1431 Roanoke
Avenue, Riverhead.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you for
being here tonight.

MR. OREHEK: Thank you. So I

was approached through the Town of Riverhead to do a concept of a Litter Critter that has been seen, you know, as said, around the world, who wanted to make one for Iron Pier. That's been very successful, had hundreds -- many hundreds of bottles and cans that were not left on the beach to go into the waterways.

The one that we discussed for Greenport, we kicked around a few ideas and came up with a seahorse. I'm not -- I guess I can just go to the page.

MS. MURRAY: Yes, go to the next page.

MR. OREHEK: Part of this will be to have a QR barcode on the signage to a landing page that will provide information, not only about our project, also about seahorses, which are indigenous to this area.

It will be approximately six feet tall. It can be a little bit more; it's not really an issue. Typical profile, so people easily readily recognize the image. The framework, at this point, I believe I'll be doing a stainless steel rod frame. They'll be an opening where -- the male seahorse has pouch, kind of like a kangaroo where it incubates the eggs and the baby seahorses, the fry they call it, this would be where people deposit the bottles. The whole piece will actually pivot. I don't know if there's an image.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It didn't come through.

MR. OREHEK: Okay.

MS. MURRAY: Oh, my goodness.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
It is in the Board's packet.

MR. OREHEK: The whole piece

will pivot at about half way up so that it can be emptied. It will be secured into the ground with four by four CCA posts, pressure treated wood, as well as cement foundations for each one of those posts. It would be a horizontal bar that'll go across. It will literally just to pivot to empty.

At the -- on the tail, they'll also be an additional post in the ground so that it can be secured so people can't flip it, you know, that aren't supposed to. It will be easily unlocked by the Town or whoever is emptying it. So do you not have these images.

MS. MURRAY: Yeah, it didn't go through.

MR. OREHEK: Okay.

MS. MURRAY: So this is -- it's kind of tiny, folks, but the Board has this. It's a seahorse image. You can see the top view

of it and there's the center where the cans and bottles can be deposited.

MR. OREHEK: I'll design it to hold approximately 250 bottles and cans. It's, of course, going to be dependant on the shape and size of the bottles. So I hope it'll be at least as successful as the Iron Pier.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Clayton. So hopefully, as we said, this will keep a lot of this garbage, you know, off the streets of the Village of Greenport and, you know, the grass in Mitchell Park.

And as needed, the Village would be emptying the Litter Critter and taking the contents to the transfer station. They can also be recycled and the Village could get whatever moneys from that or whatever and use it as they see fit. So are there any questions

from the Board on this?

MAYOR STUESSI: So I'm only going to remark relative to the potential location. The location was identified. It's a little hard to tell because it's not on the map, but it's over in the raised area right over by the stairs going up to the boardwalk just off the carousel.

It's an area where it does not typically have events in there, but it's close enough to all of the events -- I think you just leaned up against the lights.

MS. MURRAY: Oh.

(Laughter.)

MAYOR STUESSI: It's --

MS. MURRAY: Another power outage. Oh, my God. Oh, gosh. Anyway, yes, it's a great location and it doesn't interfere with anything. It's on that small patch of grass that's just a

little bit east of the carousel.

MAYOR STUESSI: What I was going to finish with is: If the Board is agreeable towards looking and proceeding, I'm going to ask Lily to talk because she's the one who sort of worked with you guys initially on the idea, we would need to do a very quick study.

It does appear with the long -- the long ago plans, that this is an area where we can get the right amount of depth in order to anchor it properly, which is important.

MS. MURRAY: Correct, right.

MAYOR STUESSI: Lily, would you like to speak on this and then we can open it up to any Board questions?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

Sure. I mean, I just -- it's mostly the North Fork Environmental Council came to us with this idea.

We helped them, sort of, pick like

a critter that would work. And the spot, Kevin mostly picked the spot that would work. I think it's a great idea. Anything that helps people at least put things in some kind of receptacle and raise awareness to recycle.

Also I love the seahorse. I know that we partly picked the seahorse for Rick because it had come up at another meeting that he really likes seahorses and I think the Osinski's --

MS. MURRAY: Right.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: -- had mentioned having one, seeing one in their oyster farm. So anything that educates people about like environmental awareness and protecting our water I think is a great idea.

MS. MURRAY: And as Clayton mentioned, the QR code, you know, you can put all kinds of information

in there. We do want to include a lot of information about recycling to educate people.

MAYOR STUESSI: You're working on one with the Town as well right now, correct?

MS. MURRAY: Yes, we are. Southold Town, we're hoping will approve one as well, but we'll see. We're still working on it. It may take a little longer.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Is the location you mentioned in Southold by the gazebo; is that the park?

MS. MURRAY: Yes. We're considering Silversmith's Park, but we may end up putting it in a different location. It depends on what the Town Board decides. It's really their decision as this is yours.

But we'd really like to give this to the Village of Greenport

and, you know, help the recycling effort here, which is a subject for a whole other meeting. But I think both Southold Town and Greenport could do a lot more on recycling and I wish we could figure out a quick solution to it, but there really isn't any.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I know that they had also reached out to the BID and the Friends of Mitchell Park and the Civic Group and that they were all pretty much --

MS. MURRAY: Right. Yeah, we're looking for support from the other groups.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: -- supportive, but the meetings hadn't all happened at the same -- like the right time for official words.

MS. MURRAY: Right.

MAYOR STUESSI: Julia, any questions or comments?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah, I love the concept. You know, I totally support what you're doing.

MS. MURRAY: Great.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I do have one question.

MS. MURRAY: Sure.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: It's open on all sides, correct? It's like a wire thing? It's not an enclosed thing?

MS. MURRAY: It's lined -- Clayton can answer this a little better, but if you're concerned about people sliding in other bits of garbage?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: No, no, not at all. Actually my concern is kids are going to be throwing sweet drinks in there and I'm concerned about bees being attracted to the area.

MS. MURRAY: Okay.

MR. OREHEK: Well, one thing

they'll be -- I really couldn't draw it in because it would really obscure the armature, but they'll be a mesh around the outside so that things will be retained. We haven't had really a bee or, you know, yellow jacket issue at the one in Iron Pier.

Is it possible there's going to be some? Yes, but it's going to be the same thing as in a trash receptacle, you know? So you throw the can or bottle in the garbage pail and you have a couple of bees or yellow jackets or you're throwing them in here.

As far as people throwing other things in, I have to say, at the Iron Pier location, people have been very respectful. You know, with the correct -- with the signage that's on there, as well as the example that it's bottles and cans. They never empty it

completely, so people are like oh,
this isn't garbage, it's bottles
and cans. It's been very receptive.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: That was my
only thing. I love the message.
Great idea. I support it.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you. Questions?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Anne, thank
you for presenting.

MS. MURRAY: You're welcome.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: How long
have the other ones been installed
in Riverhead and Jamesport?

MS. MURRAY: Iron Pier Beach
was installed last spring was it?

MR. OREHEK: It was about a
year ago, a little less than a
year ago.

MS. MURRAY: Okay.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Any lessons
learned from those installations,
things that you are going to do
differently or...

MR. OREHEK: I mean, as far

as effectiveness of it, no.

MS. MURRAY: Actually one of our Board members who's the Riverhead representative, I asked her that question and she said they've actually seen a ton of less garbage on the beach since this went in. Like they don't find the bottles and cans anymore that they used to and I think it's really had an effect there.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I have a question for Trustee Lily or the Mayor. Who's responsible for emptying it?

MAYOR STUESSI: It would be combination between parks and the road crew on maintenance and trash.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Have they seen this?

MAYOR STUESSI: We're going to be walking through it again. If there's alignment towards looking at it, we want to, you

know, make sure that the site works for it and then we'll develop a plan for it.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay, thank you.

MS. MURRAY: In Riverhead, the Parks and Recreation Department empties it as well.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: You're welcome. Anybody else?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: It is a great concept. I like the seahorse. I have had the same concerns as Trustee Robins and Trustee Brennan have already expressed. Especially since I have children that yellow jackets cause a lot of issues with bites.

MS. MURRAY: Oh, okay.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: So that's the reason why there is the possibility, especially in the summertime here. Mitchell Park is

much different than a beach front.

MS. MURRAY: Of course.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: But those are some of the things that are concerning to be honest with you, is that it remains for recyclable and doesn't become a catchall or other type of garbage.

MS. MURRAY: Well, we thought of that also. And when we walked around Mitchell Park looking for a location, we noticed that there are quite a few garbage receptacles there for just all garbage.

So we kind of think that that's a situation on Iron Pier Beach as well. So as long as you have those around, people are not really going to throw garbage just willy-nilly into this beautiful sculpture if they see it's got recyclables in it. Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: But as with all the trash, it's something we

have to maintain and look at.

They worked very hard on putting this together. We just got this drawing on it. So, you know, we'll be reviewing it closely if the Board is supportive and can make a very quick determination on whether we think it's --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: No, as I said --

MAYOR STUESSI: -- workable in that location.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: As I said, I think it's a great concept, but we all know within the Village of Greenport, our own garbage receptacles receive garbage that's not by those visiting the park to honest with you.

MS. MURRAY: Gotcha.

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, so that's an important point is the hole is sized to only accommodate bottles and cans, not pizza boxes

and bags from your apartment.

MS. MURRAY: Yeah, it definitely won't fit in the -- it won't fit in the Critter.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: That said, you know, anything smaller somebody can chuck garbage in, we'd have to deal with it. Thank you, Anne.

MS. MURRAY: You're welcome.

MAYOR STUESSI: Appreciate it.

(Applause.)

MAYOR STUESSI: The next item on the list is a Public Meeting to receive comments on the following State Liquor Authority application:

This is an application for Main Street Young, LLC doing business as Pip's Cafe and Provisions at 218 Main Street, Greenport.

This is, of course, the relatively new coffee bar and cafe that took the place of D'Latte.

We would like for the applicant to

come up to the podium, please.

And, Candace, maybe we can get
whomever from the BID to go ahead
and get themselves set up for next
over there.

MR. PERROS: Hi.

THE COURT: Hello, welcome.

MR. PERROS: Thank you.

Alexander Perros. I live at 19215
Soundview in Southold, but I'm
here as one of the owners at Pip's
Cafe in Greenport.

MAYOR STUESSI: So if you
could tell us about how you
currently operate and what your
plans are with the beer and wine
license that you are seeking
approval for from the State Liquor
Authority. We're purely advisory,
of course. Ultimately it is up to
the State.

MR. PERROS: Understood.

Thank you for having me. We
operate Pip's Cafe. It's a local

bakery and cafe. Right now we're open six days a week. As we get in the busier months, we'll be open seven days a week. We're open for breakfast and lunch. As we get into the busier months, we just want to be open for a few more hours into the late afternoon and early evening.

Honestly this is -- it's quite simple. We simply want to serve some beer and wine where people can -- you know, if it's a late snack or something like that.

It's just important for us to find ways to kind of continue to support our business so that we can stay open year round, support the local community, give people a place to come hang out. It's really just an expansion of what we currently do to be honest.

MAYOR STUESSI: Julia, do you have any questions?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I have no objection at all. I mean, that's basically what the D'Latte did before, served the same stuff.

MR. PERROS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: And you make an unbelievable pistachio cream doughnut.

(Laughter.)

MR. PERROS: It's not me. It's Corinne, but thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Patrick?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I don't have any questions, but thank you for being here, Mr. Perros.

MR. PERROS: Okay, thank you.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: The only question I had was that it was for a different type of license than I expected. I expected it to be more for beer and wine.

MR. PERROS: It is for beer and wine. Yeah, this was -- I had an e-mail exchange with the Mayor

where --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Oh,
okay. I didn't realize it had
changed.

MR. PERROS: No, no. It was
always beer and wine.

MAYOR STUESSI: No, it's
always been beer and wine.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Oh,
it's always been beer and wine?

MAYOR STUESSI: If you want
to speak to the category, I think
it's important.

MR. PERROS: Yeah, I think
it's a little hullabaloo. So the
SLA requires applicants to either
select restaurant or bar/tavern.
For whatever reason, those are the
only two destinations that they
offer.

A restaurant has to have a full
menu and full service and entrees
and a chef. That's not what we
have there. So our only option

was to choose bar/tavern.

Obviously we're not converting to a bar. We are, as you've seen, I mean, all the investment we've made, we are a bakery and cafe. So it was merely a function of that, but we're only asking to sell beer and wine.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: As I said, that just kind of caught my attention.

MR. PERROS: No, I know. Mine too, I know.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: My only question is -- and I apologize if this was on the application -- was how late you might stay open. I know you said evening, but...

MR. PERROS: Yeah, honestly, we haven't determined it yet. I don't see this happening -- expanding more past, you know,

5:00, 6:00 in the evening. This is not -- we're not trying to stay open later and do a dinner service or after dinner. It's really just, you know, capturing just some more daylight hours to be honest.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

Got you, thank you.

MR. PERROS: Sure.

MAYOR STUESSI: I don't have any questions. I think you guys run a great business over there. And Julia can have her pistachio and I'll have the salted oatmeal or salted chocolate chip cookie myself. Any other questions of the Board? Is everybody supportive?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I'd like to hear from the public.

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there anybody from the public that would like to speak on this? Thank you.

MR. PERROS: Thank you.

MR. BOLANOS: Good evening.

Alex Bolanos, 9395 Main Road, East Marion, New York 11939. I just have a question. Basically, how long have you guys been operating there open?

MAYOR STUESSI: We're not going to do back and forth.

MR. BOLANOS: Just my question is just if they had an inspection since they've been open for business by the Village?

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there anybody else from the public that would like to speak this evening?

MR. BOLANOS: You're not going to answer it? I asked a question.

MR. PERROS: Sure, I'm happy to answer it.

MR. BOLANOS: I mean that's the respectful thing to do.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: No,

this -- it has nothing to do --

MAYOR STUESSI: You don't
need to come back. Thank you.

MR. BOLANOS: No answer?

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there
anybody else from the public that
would like to speak?

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: Can we
please get an answer to that
question, please? When was it
last inspected?

MR. BOLANOS: Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Can't answer
that publicly here tonight.
You're welcome to --

MR. BOLANOS: You can't
answer that publically? Wow.

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there
anybody else that would like to
speak?

(No response.)

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay. Any
other comments from the Board?

(No response.)

MAYOR STUESSI: All right.

We'll move on to the next item,
which is the Greenport BID and
their efforts to put together some
code changes for us to consider
for loading zones. Are you
speaking, Nancy, or Ryan?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I
think I am.

MAYOR STUESSI: Are you? Okay.

MR. FARRELL: Do you want me
to help you with the slides or --

MS. KOURIS: I can do it.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: You
do the slide and I'll do the
talking. That will be easier.

The Greenport BID Board of --
the Greenport Business District
Board has been talking about the
traffic issues in Downtown
Greenport for the last couple of
months. There was some discussion
about dealing with loading zones.

It came to my attention and was

asked to help them in trying to
get a discussion going as to how
to improve some of the issues in
the summertime when we do have
tractor -- not tractor trailers,
but we have deliveries coming and
roads are blocked and traffic.
And the BID community wants to try
to take something and make it a
positive instead of the negative
that happens every year.

So back in 2021, the Village of
Greenport had suggested some
activity of changing some loading
zones, but at the time, for some
reason, there was a glitch with
paperwork and the Secretary of
State never acknowledged the
change that the Village Board
passed back in 2021.

So part of the suggestion is to
take what we originally had
discussed -- maybe if you want to
keep on going to the next one.

Some of the areas that we had originally discussed were in the back of Adams Street, particularly the section around IGA because there is issues with trying -- safety for vehicles trying to get from Adams Street and making turns on to Front Street especially if there's trucks there.

And since that road originally used to be a one-way road and was changed to a two-way street when the Mitchell Park development was done, there has been a lot of -- a lot of -- of confusion in the back and a lot of issues of safety of trying to get out on to First Street.

So part of it is to remove the area that's right next to IGA and across the street where Colonial Drugstore has one spot, and to move it onto the other side of the street where it will be elongated so that it's a little bit easier

for the traffic to flow through on both sides.

The other thing in our code, originally years ago when the IGA was the original A&P building, all of those spots that are now the 15 and 30 minutes parking spots behind IGA, that was designated as a loading zone. That will be taking that out of the code as well.

The next one.

Some of the other things was to turn -- and these are suggestions, this is not what's in the actual code changes -- but they discussed with how to deal with some of the safety issues and for pedestrians, as well as for vehicles.

One of the them was to go back and try to change Adams Street back to a one-way street. That was -- if that would -- in their feelings, it's worth taking a look at. It might make it a little bit

easier for the traffic patterns.

So that was one of the suggestions.

Another suggestion is dealing with crosswalk and probable -- and to increase in, again, parking around the IGA around Mr. Roberts and Downtown. They feel that because our population, especially in the wintertime, is more of an older population and they need to get easy access to IGA, and to Colonial Drugstore, and to some of the other spots downtown, they want, like, for us, as a Village Board, to take a little bit more at the handicap spaces. I just realized you all don't have copies of this.

Go ahead, next one.

The other suggestion is to deal with timed loading zones. Another suggestion was to take look at the Adams Street parking lots that are across from the arcade and on the

other side where there are parking spaces that won't be metered at some point or used to be the metered parking spaces, they used to have them as a timed loading zone to get the traffic off of Front Street.

The business community feels that trying to have delivery trucks on Front Street is really an inconvenience for everybody. It's dangerous. So they're looking towards moving it away from Front Street.

This is also taking away -- this is a description of taking away old loading zones and adding new ones.

The next slide.

There also is the usual problem of the corner of Front and Main. There's been some discussion about maybe putting a stop sign there. What I did, in helping them do some research, was there was some

traffic studies done for some previous Planning Board applications. So they had a timed period of July 7th and July -- I mean July 8th and July 9th.

And as you can see, by the time that they got through the totals of the two days, there was almost 2,400 cars that passed through that for making turns. That's a lot of vehicles. It's a lot more than on horse and buggy days when our roads were created.

So that's part of it, is to look at that and perhaps ask the Village Board to take a little more of a step in incorporating with New York DOT, inquire if there's anything we can do to take an opportunity. We're going to have traffic no matter what we do; we're going to continue to have traffic. So we need to kind of start thinking progressively.

If for some reason -- there's also a suggestion over the years to make Front Street a one-way street. If you make it a one-way street, you have parking on both sides, which would take care of some of our parking issues. It also would slow the traffic down because you have vehicles on both sides of the road. So that's another suggestion that's been taking place.

This is another one, as we're moving some of the already existing loading zones that aren't working. One of them is in front on Main Street in front of the Crazy Beans. When that happens, we have trucks there you can't see to go around the corner.

There is a proposal to elongate the loading zone on East Front Street. And then the Lesion Hall area or Third Street, we all know

that currently the ferry project is being worked on. There's going to come a point when we have to make a decision how to deal with the tractor trailers or the delivery trucks. I'm not certain how many of you have been there when there's been a truck doing a delivery, the ferry is unloading, and there's one lane and you can't move and then you have a stoplight.

So that's another thing that I'm sure that we, as a Village, need to work with the DOT. Once the North Ferry project is done, it may change the dynamics there, but it may not. So that's part of that.

And then we're talking about loading zones on South Street and Third Street. There's a proposal for elongating the one that's the Hummels (phonetic). Although I think it's already -- I think that one is staying the same. That was

an original one in the code.

Is there another one after that?

One suggestion that has come up, because we have a issue with Texaco Alley with the deliveries. And there's an issue and a discussion being -- this is all down near the marina office. Part of it was perhaps making timed loading zones on the parking spaces that are next to the Dime Bank. That would get them off of Front Street.

We have a problem now where we have trucks that are unloading in front of the new yoga place, blocking up traffic. The stoplight has become an issue. So that's a suggestion. Please remember these are all suggestions. The only thing that's being changed now are the ones that were originally thought about back in 2021, and that

really is simplifying some of the misconception as to what was what.

Okay, that's for Central Avenue. That's over behind -- that's behind Golden's Furniture. That one will be going through. That is the -- we will be giving that a bigger loading zone, so that perhaps some of the traffic that is coming, deliveries on North Main, North Main Street, will be able to go down and have a spot to go, because the one that's there now is kind of small.

Okay, this is the area that there needs to be a lot of discussion. The business community is not all in accordance as to some suggestions on it, but there is an issue here and we do need to work on it in the future.

This is a -- this is a topic that was brought up. Because I'm sure many of you know that the

Claudio property, the roundabout that's at the end of Main Street, or East Main Street, is actually Claudio's property, it's not the Villages. It's a turnabout that has been allowed to be used for years, but I think at this point, given that there's a lot of changes going on within the Village, it's time for the Village to discuss some type of a negotiated right-of-way so that we can maintain having that turn around. I think now is the time to discuss that stuff and put it into effect.

I think that's the last one.

Okay, this is the old code where everything is being crossed off except for the one at the hummel (phonetic).

And then this is describing the new ones. And that's -- it's been a very lively discussion. I've been very impressed with the

members of the committee, which are Ryan Farrell, who put our PowerPoint together, thank you very much; Nancy Kouris of Blue Duck; Kim Loper; and Linda Kessler. They are the BID members that have been on the committee. They've put a lot of thought into this.

Part of the meeting is to discuss, in partnership with Shouthold Town PD, to help us work on doing the traffic congestion. And we'll be having a meeting of the Town Board and the Village on the schedule for March 20th. So hopefully this is a topic that we can discuss.

Part of this is being proactive; part of this is looking that we have an issue. We can't let it stand. It's not going to change. We've become a destination. We need not only our own residents

comfortable to be able to travel down the street, but we need to make the tourist's area safe as well. And if there is anything else, that's pretty much the presentation. Okay?

MAYOR STUESSI: Was somebody from the BID going to speak in regards to this so the Board can ask any questions?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Ryan can, yeah.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you, Mary Bess.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: You're welcome. We will get you copies of this and the stuff added late yesterday.

MR. FARRELL: Hi, my name is Ryan Farrell, 417 Main Street.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you. So, obviously, this has been a discussion with the BID for many, many months now and there's some

timing sensitivity on this as we've discussed with the advocacy meetings and the BID monthly board meetings.

In order for the Village Board to be able to move something forward, we're going to need to have something that the BID feels comfortable with recommending to the Village Board and then we will, of course, have to hold a public hearing for the benefit of the public and the rest of the Board.

The timing sensitivity is such that we're going to need something here relatively quickly within a matter of weeks in order to get a public hearing scheduled, go through that, and then ultimately get approval on any potential code changes so that we're ready for summertime.

MR. FARRELL: 100 percent.

MAYOR STUESSI: As the BID is aware, there are spots that are also identified on there --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. The Village attorney has something to say.

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay. Let me just finish.

So there's a number of spots that trucks currently park in for businesses that don't have loading zones. And then, of course, there are other recommendations for them.

Brian, were you going to say something?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR:
Just with regard to the public hearing, if you are going to be changing any loading zones, you do not need to have a public hearing. That can be done by resolution.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes. So I understand that, but I think for benefit of the public, we would

want to get public comments --

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: Of course.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- on it.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: Of course.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- whether the Board agrees. It would be important to me to make sure that we have some level of public comment on it.

Julia?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Actually I watched the presentation yesterday, and you did a great job by the way. You, Mary Bess, everybody that's been working on it, I compliment you on the your work.

There are definitely some discussions that need to happen. We're coming up very quickly on a very busy season again. I certainly understand the urgency here, you know? But I do think

that you got a good basis of
something to work with here.

I was involved in the original
loading zones that we moved over
by the IGA, things like that. But
I think it's a good basis to
start. I'm looking forward to it
and I'm willing to work on it with
the rest of the Board.

MR. FARRELL: Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Patrick?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, thank
you. I appreciate that -- I
appreciate the BID's input on this
because as a trustee, it'll help
us -- it'll help me to make an
informed decision about further
changes with this.

I'm a little unclear though
about -- I think there's two
different things going on here.
We're going to finalize some
changes that were already approved
by the Board?

MAYOR STUESSI: Well -- go ahead, Mary Bess.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: And then we're going to contemplate others?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: The presentation is showing two different visions. One is dealing with the short term at the moment of taking the original document that was supposed to have been finalized to the Secretary of State back in 2021, and we're just taking -- the group decided that in order to get something done for the summer was to take the suggestions that we made that were never implemented. Especially to get it done before the roads are painted or lines or signage needs to be done. That's my understanding.

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, but there's a number of suggestions that is are new beyond what the

Board decided in 2021, right?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: No,
no, we didn't put those in. The
only one that was new was Texaco
Alley.

MAYOR STUESSI: Isn't the one
by the IGA different than what was
recommended?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: No.

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I think it
makes sense to have two tracks for
this. So to proceed to finish
this filing with the State on the
original plans, while we
simultaneously discuss other
changes and have a public hearing
if you like so that -- so we don't
run out of time.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Right,
that was the goal of it. We
decided that as we started talking
with the group, there were a lot
of different thoughts, a lot of

different ideas, and we did -- the Mayor had asked that we get something focused.

MAYOR STUESSI: Was that you?

MR. FARRELL: Not me.

(Laughter.)

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: To get something focused -- to get something focused so that we could get something on the books for this coming tourist season, okay? Texaco Alley is one that -- which is down by the Mitchell Marina office -- is one that was a situation where they couldn't come to any general consensus on it. So instead of holding anything up, we decided to move forward with the suggestions of what -- which is in the paperwork that I sent everyone on the Board the other day. So that was pretty much it. We're doing two tracks. Actually it could be three tracks if you

want because if we're really talking about the Downtown Business District, you know, there may be -- that's talking with the New York State DOT, downtown revitalizations perhaps.

There's just a point that the business community understands that the Village residents would like to be able to traverse over their streets and not feel unsafe.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Makes sense.

MAYOR STUESSI: Lily?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I think it all makes sense, especially doing multiple tracks. I think one, like, BID communicating to the businesses is going to be a really important part, which I know -- I mean, I know you guys do and are working on. I'm just saying, if there are changes, letting the businesses know, so that then they can let

delivery trucks know and that will
be a big --

MR. FARRELL: Yeah, I think
the BID does recognize the urgency
that we have to work with. I
think some of the other members
did become aware of that this week
when they realized how quickly
this was all moving.

So the next steps now for us are
going to be to reach out to our
members and collecting as many
recommendations and summarizing
them as best as we can. We also
do want to make sure that we're
being very receptive to the
public, to the Village, and making
sure there's a grand compromise as
best we can manage.

Nancy, do you have anything you
want to add?

MS. KOURIS: Yeah, I just
want to if you don't mind --

MR. FARRELL: Sure. Thank

you, everyone.

MS. KOURIS: No, don't go away. Don't go anywhere. Nancy Kouris, Blue Duck Bakery and president of the Business Improvement District.

What we did come to consensus, the Board did and everything, is, as Mary Bess said, we need to move forward with something. So we'd like the trustees to vote in the documentation from the -- from the year 2021.

It needs -- it starts as a starting point. With the Business District, the residents, this is a really long work in progress, but we need something to base it on. So we really need you guys to push that one through, the 2021 code changes.

And our intention, of course, is to reach out to our business members, residential members, and

make it as comfortable for everyone to coincide, live together, during the busy months and even during the slower months.

Some of those traffic issues, Front and Main, Adams Street and Third -- I get confused between First and Third, but anyway are very dangerous because the back of the bakery is actually on Adams Street. And I have a tendency to come down and want to make that left into that -- into Adams Street and, let me tell you, sometimes there's a garbage truck and another truck there and it's not happening.

So these are really important changes for the Village and Ryan has done a wonderful, wonderful job in getting that out and I really do thank the rest of my subcommittee, Linda Kessler and Kim Loper also, and Mary Bess for

helping us. It was very, very,
very, very helpful.

MAYOR STUESSI: Did anybody
else have any comments further
before I speak?

(Audience member indicating.)

MAYOR STUESSI: We're not
taking public comment now on this.

So my concern would be -- as I
understand, this has only been
reviewed by the BID Board, a
limited number of people. Was
there a time being scheduled to
review it with other business
members as well before you come to
us with a final proposal?

MR. FARRELL: Oh, 100
percent. We do recognize we do
need to reach out to full
membership of the BID and get
everyone involved and aware of
what's going on. So this is our
very first steps to consolidate
information, again, get the ball

rolling. But, yeah, definitely a work in progress, but we do understand the urgency that this has to happen sooner rather than later.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, I just think it's important to get input from the other business. And then I know Julia had the Wayfinding and Pedestrian Committee, it would be good for you and maybe somebody else from the committee to review it carefully as well.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Agreed.

MAYOR STUESSI: I haven't seen it in print. I was participating in the Zoom the other day. It did appear to me that we were missing loading zones on Carpenter Street servicing all of the Waterfront Commercial businesses over there and behind your hotel as well. Was there anything on there or did I miss it

or do we need --

MR. FARRELL: No, those were not in the 2021 proposal, but we do recognize that we do have suggestions that we need to try to work in or move forward on.

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there anything -- I mean, there's nothing that prevents us -- we're not tied to the 2021 proposal?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: No, no. The Village Board can -- especially if we're going out to Village -- to public comment, we can add something along Carpenter Street. It was a little bit -- it kind of was no general consensus on anything when we were having the discussions. I think it was a matter of that the desire was to get this started and then we would come back with some other suggestions.

And since Brian is telling me that we can do it by resolution,

which I wasn't aware of --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: -- we could move a little bit quicker each -- you know, in trying to get it done. I do know that I haven't really heard of too many issues because most of the loading, I believe, for Carpenter Street, is done early in the morning or it's not during busy time.

My one concern is not shutting off access to the shipyard, which is on East Front Street. That's my biggest concern because that's the only way to get into the shipyard. But I do know that it was a discussion, but I -- it really didn't gel to get to this moment, that's all.

We can try and make it gel in a hurry, but, you know, if that's going to happen, they're going to be giving out some type of

information to the rest of the BID District, we could include that in if that's, you know...

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, I just -- I think if we're going to look at making these changes, we should do it as best as we possibly can as a Board, together with the BID. And so I hate to see us leave out some locations that might make sense on Carpenter.

I know there's a lot sensitivity with the residents over there. And, you know, where trucks should or should not be would seem, to me, that we ought to take care of it for that area as well.

Any thoughts on that, Patrick or Julia?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: No. Actually, I was just wondering, is it possible that the Board can attend a BID Meeting and we can have a joint discussion on Zoom or

something like that; is that a possibility?

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, we would need to publically notice it if there's a quorum of it.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right.

MAYOR STUESSI: But I think, at this point, the best course would be for BID, together with Mary Bess, to go back to the larger BID and then come back to us. And then I'll leave it to everybody else. What's your opinion on holding a public hearing for the general public, which I think would be important to have residents opine on this as well before we vote?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah, we're told it doesn't have to be -- by the attorney, it doesn't have to be a public hearing, correct?

MAYOR STUESSI: Right.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Just

comments from the public, that's fine.

MAYOR STUESSI: I understand it doesn't, but I'm just suggesting that I think we should give the public a chance, and residents, to opine on what we might be doing for loading zones, etcetera in the Downtown District.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Absolutely. I definitely think we need to hear from the public on it, yep.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: That could be handled at a public comment, correct?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Without having to follow the notification requirements of --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, we wouldn't have to file notification.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I'm just concerned about the time.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah. I'd

want to make sure we noticed it
and, you know, we reached out, as
the BID did as well, to make sure
there's as much comment as possible.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: The
only thing we could do is, between
now and maybe Monday, maybe we
could have a Zoom meeting of the
committee and take a look at
Carpenter Street and maybe be able
to do, via e-mail if you're all
comfortable with it, some
suggestions along Carpenter Street
and see if you're comfortable with
what we come up with.

That is an option to expedite
the process if that is comfortable
with all of you. That has to be
up to you to go along with that.
You know, I don't think it would
be very difficult to create what
you're looking for.

MAYOR STUESSI: And when are
you looking to hold the wider

comment from the Business District members?

MR. FARRELL: I think Nancy can speak on that further, but as of yesterday, we were talking about how to collect -- how to best collect the information from our community via either a social media or an Instagram forward blast, but also a job form sent out to people in our newsletter.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I think that the goal, and I think this is something that I'm seeing with the BID Board, in the past has always been this tension between the Business District and the community, the Residential District.

The BID Board has taken the attitude that they're part of the community, they want to be part of the community, they want to communicate with the community,

they want to get their input,
whether it's from just a resident
or somebody that really is outside
of the Village and comes in here
all the time.

We are a Village, we're a
community, and that's the way we
should be. That's the attitude
they're taking and especially with
this is, you know -- that's why
the ideas of thinking down on the
second track that we were talking
about is really going and looking
into the future as to what the
Village is going to look like, okay?

MAYOR STUESSI: Any other
comments from anybody?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, I
haven't really focused on this.
This has not been on my radar. I
do trust that the work that the
prior Board did in setting up the
recommendations is good and valid
and I don't want to blow that up.

I mean, I would like to see --
like I said, I'd like to see both
things happening so they don't run
out of time. But I definitely
have to look into it more. This
is really kind of new to me. I
was under the impression it was a
done deal.

MAYOR STUESSI: No, no. It
was never approved back in 2021
and put in place.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Well,
it was approved by the Board, but
what happened is the paperwork
from A to Z never made it.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Understood.

MAYOR STUESSI: Wonderful.
You guys did a great job and we'll
look forward to reviewing it.
And, Candace, I'd ask if you could
attach to the minutes or even with
the agenda, their presentation
today so the public can see what
they've done thus far. Thank you

so much.

MR. FARRELL: Great. You're very welcome.

MAYOR STUESSI: Next item on the agenda is a public hearing to discuss and take action on local law 2 of 2025 to amend the code of the Village of Greenport in relation to the imposition of fees by the Board of Trustees by resolution.

This was something that was done earlier this year, but there was a procedural issue and so we are opening the public hearing again on it. May I have a second?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Second.

MAYOR STUESSI: All in favor?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Aye.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Aye.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: All right.

The public hearing is open. Is

there anybody that would like to
speak on this item?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN FARLEY: Okay. Is
there a motion from the Board on
this?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I'll
make a motion to close the hearing.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Second.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I'll second
that.

MAYOR STUESSI: I think you
were louder, but I heard Lily.
We'll record you as the second.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: All in favor?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Aye.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Aye.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Motion carries.

Next item up is actually two

public hearings that were combined, sometime ago, into one. I'm going to list both of them and they remain open from the prior meeting.

It's a public hearing regarding the proposed local law amending the zoning map to reclassify certain property designated on the Suffolk County Tax Map as 1001-004-08-28 from R-2 One- and Two-family Residence District to CR Commercial District. The public hearing remained open from the January 2, 2025, Regular Session Meeting.

And the public hearing regarding the proposed local law amending the zoning map to reclassify certain property designated on the Suffolk County Tax Map as 1001-004-08, part of 29, from R-2 One- and Two-family Residence District to CR Retail Commercial

District. The public hearing remained open from the Regular Session Meeting.

I'm going to invite the applicant to come up to the podium if there's somebody here to speak on it? I understand there was an update. Or if you're not -- if your counsel is not here, maybe Village Counsel -- you are here.

MS. HUBBARD: I'm here.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Do you need a second on that?

MAYOR STUESSI: No, we're already open.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.

MS. HUBBARD: Hi, I'm Jackie Hubbard from Twomey, Latham, Shea, Dubin, and Quartararo in Riverhead. I'm here on behalf of the applicant. I have provided a letter today and a map, as requested. Brian and I had spoken

last week about this. We thought it was best appropriate just to supply the map and from that -- from what our engineers have calculated, because the more restrictive district is the Residential in this setting and that that portion is the larger portion for the property, that portion of the code, that we've been discussing doesn't apply in our opinion. And I believe Brian had agreed with me on that as well. So that's what I put in that letter and passed to you just for your review. Beyond that, that was the only update, as I believe you've been waiting for that map from us.

MAYOR STUESSI: Correct.

Brian, do you have anything to add to that?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: No.

The reference is to Village Code

Section 150-5D, as in David. And that would provide where if, in this instance, the commercial portion of the split zone was greater than the residential portion, then there wouldn't necessarily need to be a zone change as they would be permitted to use the residential portion as a CR use.

Here that's not the case. So if you are to make a change -- if it was the case, you wouldn't necessarily need to make this change. If it -- now being that they do not get the benefit of being able to use it for a CR, you can consider whether to approve this change.

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay.

Is there anybody else from the public that would like to speak on this item tonight?

Yes, Mr. Saldino.

MR. SALADINO: John Saldino,
6th Street. I spoke in previous
public hearings on this topic. In
the interest of full disclosure to
the public, I'm a member of the
Zoning Board of Appeals. I'm not
here tonight as that. And I only
want to comment -- I don't know
the Tax Map Number -- about the
lot north of --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: That's 28,
the vacant lot?

MR. SALADINO: The vacant lot.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: 28.

MR. SALADINO: So my comments
are -- and I read the Planning
Board's report. I don't agree
with it. Three of the members,
their opinion was that by granting
the code change, it would allow
safer passage for emergency
vehicles on 4th Avenue because it
would prevent people from parking
on 4th Avenue if they had a place

to park for the new hotel parking lot. Anybody that's driven down 4th Avenue knows that they park there already, I mean, both sides of the street.

The other comment was that since there was -- since it's a vacant lot and it's been a vacant lot for a while, nobody has taken the time to develop the lot, so it's really not an issue if it becomes a parking lot since nobody developed it as residential housing.

My comments are the same as last time. We don't know what the owners mindset was. Was it going to be an annuity for his grandchild, he didn't want to live next door to a house, he didn't want the property developed, he wanted a buffer? We don't know what the owners motivation by not developing the property was.

So to say, well, since there's

no house there now, you know,
they'll probably be no house there
in the future, to me, is hokum.
Every word out of every Trustees'
mouth, including the Mayor's,
usually revolves around some kind
of housing. To take a viable
piece of residential property off
the -- out of consideration to
turn it into a parking lot, I
think, is shortsighted.

Right now the property doesn't
meet the width of a conforming lot
in the Village, but our code does
say that a house can be built
there, without a variance by the
way. It could be built
as-of-right. Our code also
says -- but it would be limited to
a one-family house.

But our code also goes on to say
that as soon as that one-family
house is done, the owner can,
as-of-right, again, put a

two-family house. So now we're talking about two dwelling units. The Village Board -- I apologize -- the Village Board, and I think some people are in favor of it, is considering accessory dwelling units. Now we're talking about three dwelling units on the property.

It was suggested -- it was suggested by the Planning Board that the property to the south, the Greenport Hotel, if they planned on going through with their expansion -- and, again, I don't want to get into that application. I haven't seen the application. I expect it might come in from front of the Zoning Board. I don't want to have to recuse myself. So, Brian, if I step over a line, you know, like raise your hand. I don't want to have to recuse myself by making

inappropriate comments about the
Greenporter Hotel.

It was suggested by the Planning
Board that if that application
went through, they would have to
find alternative parking. There
is alternative parking in the
Commercial Retail District within
200 feet of the hotel that they
could certainly buy and develop
into parking. So I don't see that
as being the extreme need that
some people are claiming that they
need this property to provide
parking for their expansion.

We can't -- we can't -- we can't
talk about housing and say how
much we need it, and every one of
ya's have, and then take a lot off
the Residential District's rolls.
The BID's in favor of this. Of
course they would be. I mean --
and that's their job, to promote
the Business District.

But I'm just not seeing -- a friend of mine told me the other day, John, it's one lot. What's the big deal? It's one lot. Lily says, it's a start. It's a start. You know, and just because it's one lot doesn't mean it should be discounted as -- well, you know, there might be three people that some day get to live on that lot.

So I would urge you to do whatever you want with the property to the south, do whatever you want with the residential mixed with the CR on that piece of property to the south. But as far as this code change, I think it would be shortsighted of this Board -- sorry. It would be shortsighted by this Board to actually enact this code change. So thank you. Thanks for listening.

MAYOR STUESSI: My apologies.

I am helping them to monitor the

electrical situation. We're trying to get an update on why the lights are flashing as well. Ordinarily I wouldn't have my phone out.

MR. SALADINO: I didn't notice the lights flashing.

MAYOR STUESSI: No problem. Anybody else from the public like to speak on this?

Hello, Randy.

MS. WADE: Hello. Randy Wade, 6th Street. I do think it's a good idea to have a buffer between the Greenporter's wall and the -- what is an office building, but I guess it has more the form of a residential. I -- it's the timing.

I feel like more site plan review, can they go up three stories, can they only go up two and a half stories, should the third floor have ten-foot setback

so it doesn't overpower the other places? There are so many decisions before, you know, that question arises as to should a change happen there.

So I wish they would go forward and buy the property and then figure out if they could do something with it, no matter what the decision of the Planning Board and the ZBA are. And once that's all firmed up, then come back and ask for a code change. But at this point, there are too many open issues.

The idea that there has to be a public benefit, John is right, there should be housing and the planning department proposed that there be housing within the Village somewhere for eight units, but I kind of feel like then it just means that one business is taking housing away from other

people. And I'd really like to see a day where if a business is going to do an expansion, they include affordable housing, not necessarily for their employees, but for the community. And so somehow that's a negotiation that would have to happen at the Planning Board level.

So I hope that can go forward and I hope they go out on a limb and buy the property entrusting that we all want that wonderful business to be successful. Thanks.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

Is there anybody --

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: Captain Robert H. Lehmann; 335 3rd Street, Greenport, New York. It would be would be a disaster if we let a residential piece of property go commercial. I have three children who are born here. I have three children who love Greenport, as I.

But I'm a newcomer, I only came here in '67. So a newbie according to my fire department. Some of my men have been here for 350 years. But I have the deepest respect for Greenport that no one would ever know. To let this go tragic.

I have a 31-year old son that couldn't afford an apartment. Couldn't afford \$2,400 for an apartment if you sneezed, you blew out a window it was so small. So he had to move back home. Of course we accepted him, but boy he sure does hate it because he cannot do what he wants. What 31-year old child can?

I think as many parcels of property that are residential, somehow, Habitat for Humidity or someone can build a home for our children of Greenport so they don't have to leave Greenport and

move to Idaho or Nebraska, because
it's a hell of a drive for me to
go visit him. Thank you very much.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BOLANOS: For the record,
Alex Bolanos; 9395 Main Road, East
Marion, New York 11939. I would
just like to say, and the
attorney's here, he can confirm
it, we do -- I know little about
the code and there is a section in
there that says about small lots.
Small lots just pertains to this
situation where a small lot can be
developed as long as it's vacant,
which this is.

And it's just kind of
hypocritical that they push for
affordable housing then they want
to convert and lose a possible
family, you know, two-family house
for a commercial, for gain. Thank
you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

Is there anybody else that would like to speak this evening?

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: Captain Robert H. Lehmann, 535 3rd Street. Just further advice for the Village Board. I'm in the process now of obtaining 533 3rd Street. It's with the attorney general of New York State. It was fraudulently purchased by an individual or a group of individuals and now it's in the Courts and I was lucky enough to be able to pay the second half of last year's taxes as per owner's request.

So when the State decides who owns the property, the person who paid the last taxes, which is I, will own the property. But what I plan to do with the property is have two Greenport families live in that; kids or middle age, I

don't care, but first priority would be Greenport and to sustain the house. Whatever the mortgage is, whatever the electric and the water is, we divide it in two and they take care of it.

I don't want to make a dollar profit on that property, and taxes, of course, too. That's my way of helping my Greenport, which I love from the bottom of my heart. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there anybody else that would like to speak on this item tonight?

(No response.)

MAYOR STUESSI: No? Is there a motion from the Board?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Are we talking about both here?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes. They were open together, so we need to close them.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Are
you looking for a motion to close?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.
I'll put a motion on to close both
public hearings.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I'll second
that.

MAYOR STUESSI: All in favor?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Aye.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Aye.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Motion
carries. We will discuss this
later this evening.

Candace, Village Clerks's
Report. Thank you.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Thank
you. I'm going to start my report
with several announcements and
just discussion topics. Sorry, my
mic a little weird over here. I

hope you can hear me.

So the Village of Greenport
Annual Tax Sale will be March 12,
2025. I apologize I did not put
the time for the tax sale on
here --

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

You want a mic?

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: No, it's
okay, I can hold it.

-- but it is noted on the
website, so I'll correct that
discrepancy for next week.

The Village of Greenport General
Election is March 18, 2025 here in
this very room. There will be two
voter registration days held at
Village Hall. So the first one is
March 6, 2025 from 8:30 to
5:00 p.m. at Village Hall. The
second one is Saturday, March 8th
from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The clerk's office is really
excited. We're hosting our third

student intern from Peconic Community School. Each intern -- this is a program that Peconic Community School already had in place. And when I began working at Village Hall, they reached out and we host interns whenever we're selected by the interns.

These interns are in the 8th grade, the 7th or 8th grade. They're quite fascinating students. So they conduct their own self-guided research project while they're at Village Hall.

So our current intern, she has decided to research the history of businesses within the Village. She's interviewed several business owners. I believe the president of the BID as well, historians, former mayors, and leaders in our community. She will be sharing her information hopefully. She has goals to share with the

Suffolk Times and I'll, of course, share it to the best of my ability as well. We're really excited to see what she produces at the end of this project.

And next up here, so the clerk's office team, we've been working really diligently since August of 2023 to get our records in order at Village Hall. As I've noted in prior meetings, we've gotten rid of about 300 boxes worth of just trash for lack of a better way to describe it. There's old documents that were stored there that we are not required to keep and they no longer serve a purpose. So far we've gotten out, like I said, about 300 boxes.

The next steep in this process and obviously aside from just, you know, functionality within Village Hall, the purpose is, ultimately, once we're done purging and

organizing, we'll digitize many of the Village records. That, of course, is a long term project, probably a few years out. We're in the process of applying for the New York State Archives Local Government Records Management Improvement Grant Fund. That's a lot of words. LGRMIF is what the grant is noted as.

We are seeking \$150,000 in this grant cycle, which is the maximum offered. The Village is -- because we have a housing authority within the Village of Greenport, those are recognized by the State archives as two different entities. So we are able to seek \$75,000 for both to do this work.

So Phase 1 is for Village Hall to organize, purge, and then ultimately digitize our records. This Phase 1 will take a few

months. There will be a company that comes. They will work in Village Hall to get all of this work done. This will also include custom cabinetry and everything will be categorized for easy access in the end of this.

Phase 2 of this project is a few years out as well. Phase 2 we're going to focus on the remaining Village buildings.

So that's -- I definitely have to thank the clerk's team. It's a combined effort. Jeanmarie has done tremendous work with getting us, you know, to where we are and it's been a wonderful effort with the four of us.

Next up I have resolutions or proposed resolutions for next week.

Resolution to schedule a public hearing at the March 27th, Regular Session Meeting to discuss

Chapter 103, which is rental properties.

The Kalmar Nyckel has reached out to the Village of Greenport. This is another tall ship. They came here last year. The Village of Greenport is hoping to host -- is that me or someone else?

-- the Kalmar Nyckel from July 20th -- on or about July 20th or 21st is their anticipated arrival, through August 4th. They will offer free deck tours to students on the weekend while they're here in the Village.

Next up is the request to publish bids. So these will be two separate -- they're listed as one with two bullets under, but it will be two separate resolutions. The first one is for Mitchell Park for a wave attenuator on the east pier. Did I pronounce that correctly?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Okay.

Visitors docket replacement is the second bid that we are hoping to publish or get approval to publish for next month.

Next up I have public assembly applications that we received.

So the first one is a public assembly application received from Helen Swiskey to host a celebration of life and a memorial bench dedication in honor of William Swiskey. They're looking to hold this memorial at 5th Street Beach on May 10th. The rain date is May 17th, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

The next public assembly application was received from Brandi Hopkins on behalf of Greenport High School for the Class of 2025 to host the Annual Graduation Parade on June 21st

with the typical parade lineup that they've done for the few years that this has been taking place in the Village.

Next up is a public assembly application received from the Greenport BID to host the Annual Egg Roll on Saturday, April 19th in Mitchell Park. The event will place 10:30 a.m. to noon. The BID is requesting a waiver of the application fee for their event.

And then finally is a public assembly application received from a Chandra Grant on behalf of the LGBT Network of Long Island to host the, I believe, it's the Third Annual Pride Parade and Festival on June 22nd from noon 5:00 p.m.

The parade portion of the event, the lineup will start on Broad Street, head down Main Street, again, for the typical parade

route where they will end on Front Street. The festival portion of the event will take place on Mitchell Park with setup beginning as early as 7:00 a.m. This applicant is requesting a waiver of the alcohol prohibition for the duration of the festival.

Finally, I have legal notices listed here that have gone out over the last month and then contracts signed by the Mayor. It's just one contract for the month of February or from January to February. Are there any questions?

MAYOR STUESSI: Anyone for Candace?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yes, I have a question. On the last public assembly application for Chandra Grant, LGBT, is this, more or less, the same as the prior year or is there anything new here? Is

the alcohol prohibition, was that something last year as well?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yes.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Yeah.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: And I have a question on your Announcement Number 5, you're talking about the records management work and you're describing Phase 1 and Phase 2 as it relates to the grant and I know you've done a lot of work on this already. So what was Phase 0? What did you already accomplish that you're now continuing?

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Phase 0 is what you see when you walk into Village Hall. There are no longer walls of boxes in the main office. So a lot of those records, they have either been purged or put down in the basement. The State archives, they actually offer a free program. So all of the boxes that have left Village Hall, I've

set up with a contact at the New York State Archives. They come out, they pickup the boxes free of charge, so none of this has cost the Village any additional money.

General organizing, setting new best practices. So we -- you know, there was a list. The boxes were somewhat numbered in Village Hall, at least some of them in the basement, but that list included these 300 boxes that are no longer at Village Hall. So, obviously, it was too difficult to, you know, edit that list. I don't know -- I can't really ensure it's accuracy either.

The records never stop generating at Village Hall. So it's an incredibly -- it's an ongoing task. It's always going to be ongoing, so setting best practices, to answer your question, is one of the items that

we've done. Just working directly with the State archives to set these new best practices. So boxes that are now -- any time a new box is created, there's a label that now has a destruction date on it, which is really important if there is a destruction date. So it helps you to organize what we have.

Obviously the Village has adapted or adopted the policies from the New York State Archives with regard to how we handle the records. So every record that's generated has either an expiration date or a destroy date or it's permanent. So this includes the housing department, some building department records. While that has probably been the least focus here, the building department records, just because of years of -- there's so much. You know,

when new records are generated, I think for easy access, is what it looks like to me, that some of the new permits that have been issued over, I'd say, at least the five years or so, those are separate sometimes from the actual building department folder or the building records, and that's just because of the magnitude of the records.

It's not mismanagement or anything like that. I think it's just an overwhelming task to keep up with. So we tried a little bit with the building records, but not as much as the other general records in Village Hall.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay. Well, thank you. I hope you get the grant.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: I hope so too. We've set ourselves up pretty good, so...

MAYOR STUESSI: We've got

good support from the State.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Yeah.

MAYOR STUESSI: It's
dramatic. And I don't know when
you've recently walked in the
basement, but it's --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Not in a
while.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- dramatically
different. So there's no longer
piles of paper on the floor and
things. Everything is on shelves,
organized, in boxes and very
different.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Yeah,
another thing to note is the
company that will actually do the
work, they write the grant for us,
which is awesome. So I'm in
constant communication with them
to make sure that they have
documentation. We got new
cabinets. The treasurer helped me
look for those, so we have new

cabinetry in some places. A big focus has been the main -- where the clerk's office team sits so that we have quick access to the files that we use most frequently. That's been a huge part of this project.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: That's great, thank you. And one other question. So could you just remind me what time the BID opening is for the fire boat? I may have missed that.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: I did not say it. Sorry about that. It's 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Thank you.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Candace, this is a 100 percent reimbursement grant or is this a split, done, and 50?

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: I'll answer how we received the money and I don't know because I'm not

sure I totally understand that terminology. So the first 50 percent -- if we're awarded the grant, the first 50 percent, that check is generated within -- last year it took about six months, but I've been told that that was the longest that this -- the State archives has released the funds for that first 50 percent.

And next 40 percent we'll have to submit paperwork to get next 40 percent after funds are spent. And then the final 10 percent is disbursed at the end of the project.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: So they have a retainage of 10 percent. That's that what's called is, a retainage.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: I'll --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Do we have to block \$150,000 in a secured fund to verify that we have the money?

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: I'm going to let the treasurer answer that question.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
No. No, we do not.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay, just checking.

MAYOR STUESSI: I'm going to add on one other item to the Clerk Department's effort on recordkeeping, which has been phenomenal, as I said --

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- several times. It's dramatically different than it was just a couple of years ago when the new Board came in. The other thing that's going to be great about this is, with all the work that's been done in the main lobby area, which has been significant. There's a couple of other larger pieces. We've gotten rid of most

of the older file cabinets that
were broken. There's an old safe
there that's going to be removed.

Once that's all done in the next
two months, once you get past the
election, we are going to be
painting the interior of Village
Hall down there.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: And removing
all of that -- I don't dare call
it carpet.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: The 1975
carpet that I can't wait to get
rid of? Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: Whatever it
is. So it's going to look much
more welcoming for people when
they come in and more importantly,
as much as we care about our
villagers, it will be great place
for the staff to work there and
we'll move our way through the
back of it too.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Yes.

Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Any other questions for Candace?

(No response.)

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: No.

MAYOR STUESSI: No? Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: One question for Candace.

MAYOR STUESSI: We're not taking public comment right now.

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: Not public -- just a question.

MAYOR STUESSI: Sir --

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: A question.

MAYOR STUESSI: That would be during the public comment period.

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: May I ask a question for Candace?

MAYOR STUESSI: Not now, sir. We're not taking public comment.

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: If she's going to throw out the deeds, I

have to find the deed. It's very important.

MAYOR STUESSI: You can go to Village Hall tomorrow and they'll be glad -- if you FOIL it, they'll be glad to get you whatever you need.

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: They won't throw it out, will they?

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: No, absolutely not. This is the deed that the Heights Association, the North Ferry, the piece of property they gave to the Village of Greenport for the residents of Greenport to have access to the harbor.

MAYOR STUESSI: Sir --

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: It's a very important deed. Very, very important.

MAYOR STUESSI: Sir --

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: Right in front of Preston's. That's a Village dock. Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you. I would ask the audience to please wait until we have public comment and we'll be taking as many public comments as there are at that time.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: If I may just to -- I think that is a concern for people that I just want to make sure that is clear. So the State archives, there is a retention schedule that we have to follow. So that retention schedule, there are documents that are mandatory for me to keep as permanent records. I do believe deeds are on that list.

And then there's also a separate piece that we've kind of adopted in the clerk's office, if it's historically significant, whether it's on that list or not, we're not going to dispose of those documents. So anything that has been disposed of is, in fact, no

longer necessary for us to keep,
just to be clear.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.
Mr. Treasurer?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I have a
number of resolutions this evening,
as well as some talking points.

My first resolution is to
appropriate the Electric Fund
Reserves to funds Phase 1 of our
LED Streetlight Project. That
will be the design phase, which we
are all very much looking forward
to. The reserves that it will be
pulled from is a savings account
that we have specifically for
projects like this.

My second resolution is to
appropriate General Fund Reserves
to fund the Financial Advisory
Services. Those are related to
the 2025 bonding we did for the
North Ferry. Our friends over at

Munistat will assist us with financial decisions.

My third resolution is to appropriate Electric Funds Reserve to fund the monthly power invoice.

My next -- now my next three resolutions all pertain to an increase in various fees throughout the Village. As I elaborate on each of these fees, the key take away for the increase of all of them; planning, zoning, HPC, building, is simply just due to increase in the cost of doing business. That's goods, services, labor.

To comment on the planning, zoning, and HPC fees, these figures that we're proposing were calculated with the assistance of Mike Noone who deals fees regularly. The increase of fees is entirely due to an increase cost of doing business. This

includes higher costs for posting notices in the newspaper, stenographers, videographers, labor with overtime, and the largest which is the legal expenses.

Some projects going through planning, zoning, or HPC require multiple hearings, meaning that the previously stated expenses can multiply every time.

For the building fees, George in the building department and I collaborated on fees. George has experience work with other municipal building departments and is very familiar with what these fees should look like and we feel that these new fees are suited for our Village. We gathered information from neighboring municipalities and found a middle ground that we both feel reflect fair prices for the Village, as well as the builders.

As mentioned in previous work sessions, it's important to make sure that the building department is self sufficient and it brings in enough revenue to cover building department expenses, which in years past it has not.

The last fees we're looking to introduce are for the electric department, specifically for formal applications to install or upgrade new electric services. Currently there's no formal process for application to physically install new electric services or upgrade existing electrical services.

The Village does have internal documents that are provided to the treasury department to alter the utility bills after an upgrade or an installation, but none on the homeowner or the contract's end -- contractor's end.

The there are two versions for the proposed electric upgrade installation form, one for residential, one for commercial. The Board has been provided with them. The fees were inspired by surrounding municipalities. And we had Doug Jacobs in the electric department determine what questions should be on the applications. He states that the information on them are relevant and no electrical contractor would have any difficulties filling them out.

Moving on. Utility billing is on time.

Talking points: Vehicle for the water department. I mentioned this at previous work sessions as well. The water department has needed a new vehicle for some time. With its age and its recent need for maintenance, it's hard to

justify paying to repair a vehicle considering the condition of it.

I've reached out to Sourcewell, which will allow us to purchase the truck off of government contract to ensure we get lowest possible price. With monthly spending in the water district averaging \$50,000 and with about \$750,000 in water department savings accounts, I believe this new truck won't put any financial strain on the water department.

Significant collections --

MAYOR STUESSI: Before you go there, we did receive the electric department truck yesterday as well.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM: Yes, we did. Yes, Mr. Jacobs was very pleased with it he was telling me.

Significant collections. Property tax collected through January '25; \$1,345,412.66. We

should become whole with that,
which should be approximately
\$1,388,000 after our tax sale held
next month.

Rents collected in January 2025
was \$28,644.66. That number may
look low. We did receive a rent
payment in February that was made
for January, so it's booked to
February. You will see an
increase in the rents collected,
above average, for the month of
February on next month's reporting.
And that concludes my report.

MAYOR STUESSI: Real quickly
if you could speak anecdotally to
bookings for larger boats and
yachts coming in this summer. As
I understand, we're ahead of
schedule right now, which should
be helpfully for funding the much
needed wave wall, which will go in
the main yacht pier and then also
visitors dock boards, which fell

into complete disrepair and was removed.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

Correct, yes. After speaking with Rick in the marina office, as well as just seeing the transactions come through, we are ahead of schedule comparing it to past years for bookings for the marina, so that's good news.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Do we still have electrical issues on the dock?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

I believe we were looking to install new pedestals on the east pier, but I'd have to get more information to give you more detail.

MAYOR STUESSI: So the issue with electrical and the pier was when that upgrade was done -- you'd know better how many years ago that was -- not all of it was upgraded. So the newer, larger

yachts need the higher upgraded electric, otherwise they're having to run independently. So it's really just the southern most spots. And so I know Rick wants to take a look with us -- and this came out of your harbor study as well, maybe you want to talk to it a bit. It's a big issue for a lot of the folks.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, so I did speak about it with Rick. My understanding was that there's not enough pedestals of the proper service type and size. So we're limited to, I think, the end of the pier.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: And if we had the proper pedestals, provided the correct kind of connections and type of electric, we could actually facilitate more rentals, I believe, right?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah. Yeah,
and so interestingly, the grants
team actually literally sent
something yesterday that there's a
new port infrastructure funding
grant that we can apply for that
we're going to be bringing in
front of the Board to take a look
at for a number of different
things. It won't be in time for
the visitors dock and the wave
wall, but this might be a longer
term solution for electric and
some other things as well.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Are
we still -- at one point we bonded
for the upgrade for the east pier.
Are we still paying the electric
portion?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Yes, we are.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: How
far into it are we now?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

I don't have it in front of me,
I'm sorry, but I can provide you
that information.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay,
all right. Maybe that's one of
the options that we could -- if we
can show a benefit to the
community, we can rewrite that
bond and maybe increase it for
some work on the pier, the
electric pedestals. But I don't
know how -- it has to be near the
end.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Do you know what year? Was it --
do you know what year it was?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: 2012,
2013 maybe.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
2013? It was probably for 20 years,
but I can double check for you.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yeah,
if you could.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

Absolutely.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: All
right, thanks.

MAYOR STUESSI: Lily, any
other questions for the treasurer?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I
do have two questions about the
electric form. One is just
there's a couple of little typos.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Oh, apologies.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Just before --

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
It will be revised. If it's
approved, we'll revise it.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
And the other thing I just wanted
to bring up is, this is a Board
question, but if we want to
encourage solar, do we want to
perhaps lower those fees or -- I
don't know if those fees are based
on exactly like the meter and the

time it takes to put in the meter.

Just something I thought I'd bring up.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, Doug had based the fees on the amount of work that goes into doing this and, of course, they're much more for commercial projects. That was one the biggest deltas in the Village was the great expense the Village was paying towards the effort of putting together something for a commercial project.

We can set up a separate time to take a look at the solar issue. I know you know we've got some other electrical things we're going to need to take a further look into after what happened today, but that's worth mentioning yeah.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
That's all I have and I can give you my edits.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Sure.

MAYOR STUESSI: Mary Bess,
anything else for Adam?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: When
is the ban due for Mitchell Park
for the bulkhead we took out?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
August 2025, August 1st.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: August 2025?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: 2025.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Correct.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Do we
have any -- you know, is there any
paperwork moving forward on that?

MAYOR STUESSI: As I
mentioned the other day, we're
working on that with Federal
Government and there's an issue
with it now that we believe we'll
have that corrected pretty
quickly, just relative to system.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: To
the Federal Government system or
to the application process?

MAYOR STUESSI: The Federal
Government system.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Oh,
okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: Julia or
Patrick?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I had a
couple of comments. So, Adam, I
sent you comments on the electric
forms and we had a back and forth
and I know you spoke with Doug.
I'm still -- I have more comments
and I'm still not completely
satisfied with the forms. Maybe I
could just come into your office
of that's okay?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Sure.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I don't
want to bother you too much, but I
think I've kind of exhausted the
e-mail back and forth. And then
this is really a question for
Counsel. I had suggested to Adam

that the form, which is really a type of permit, have an insurance requirement on it. And the response I got back from Adam or from Doug was that that's not appropriate. But I know our other permits, like a Wetlands Permit, our code requires that they applicant demonstrate that they have insurance.

So the question for you is should this form require the applicant provide evidence of insurance when they're undertaking work that we're essentially permitting?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: So initially there is a requirement in the Uniform Code that any building permit include proper insurance. That's not what this is. This is something different. So this is ultimately up to the discretion of the Board as to

whether it wants to impose that requirement. Certainly nothing wrong with it and nothing that would preclude you lawfully from imposing a requirement that there been insurance in place.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, so I think this is a case where the Village has some exposure, some risk exposure, because by giving this permit so-to-speak, we're approving this and there are a lot of risks associated with electrical work. So I would recommend that the Board require that it be added to the form. So it would be similar to a building permit or a wetlands permit.

MAYOR STUESSI: Julia, do you have any thoughts?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Patrick, so you are referring to like a contractor providing proof of insurance?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Does that
make sense to you?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: It does make
sense to me.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: You're
talking about the contractor, right,
Patrick? You're not talking about
the homeowner?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: No. It's
going to be whoever the permittee
is, yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Whoever does
the application for the permit.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Now a
homeowner typically is not
required to demonstrate they have
workers' compensation or
disability because they wouldn't,
but they should have liability
insurance if they're undertaking
electrical work and they're on a
permit.

Really their electrician should be the applicant, the person with the license, and they should have no problem demonstrating that they carry appropriate insurance.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Brian, didn't we add in that we wanted to have contractors be licensed? You know, plumbers and electricians need to have a license, correct?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: Correct. That's where -- that's exactly where I'm heading to now to read what we proposed.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I had another question for Adam. When you're talking about the water department and the purchase of a truck and you mentioned the savings account and you said that the purchasing of a truck wouldn't put any strain on the water department's finances. But

previously we spoke about
increases in the cost of our
purchase of water, correct?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

Yes.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So are we
anticipating any financial strain
and does this have anything to do
-- does the savings account have
anything to do with the increased
cost that the Village has in --
because I know we were going to
try to step up our water rates,
but I think there was a limit or
we had decided that we would step
into it over time.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

So the rate study we had completed
basically referenced that we have
too much cash in savings for the
water department. They
recommended a five-year phase in
with a 2 percent increase for the
first two years followed by a

12 percent increase for the
remaining three years.

The rise to the cost of water
will become coming from the
savings as well if we don't update
the rates this year. I do plan to
propose to the Board to increase
the water rates based on that
information, based on the rate
study information and the
presentation I had previously
given.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So
providing the Board approves the
rate increase, you don't see a
strain?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Correct.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Thank you.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: I
have an answer to Trustee Robbins
inquiry. The language that we
proposed was, Number 1, that if
there's going to be any type of

electrical work, it be performed
by either a master electrician or
somebody performing services under
that master electrician, Number 1.

And Number 2, that the Board and
the Village and building department
can require insurance for such work.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay. Thank
you.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Adam,
on this form you have customer and
then you have electrician. And
now I'm hearing that it's -- I'm
assuming there has to be an
electrician underwriter
certificate or something in the
end, isn't there, once work is
completed?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:
Yes, we always require that.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.
So with both names on here it's a
little confusing.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

Well, the customer information is really just so we know the address of where this is taking place.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

The electrician column is a little more specific and it does include the license number of the electrician and contact information from them as well.

MAYOR STUESSI: And then, as Patrick mentioned, he had a few good suggestions on that and I think if you were able to get in in the next several days, you can then talk about it before next week's meeting and the resolutions.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, that's what I would like to do so we can put it to rest.

MAYOR STUESSI: Adam, you can circulate it to the Board ahead of time so everybody can look at it before the resolution next week?

VILLAGE TREASURER BRAUTIGAM:

Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: Any other
questions for Adam?

(No response.)

MAYOR STUESSI: All right.

We've got a lot of folks here on
some good topics. I'm going to go
a little bit out of order. The
first item on the list I'm going
to invite our Historic Board to
come up to the podium just for the
Board to ask any questions. We
closed the public hearing on the
Sandy Beach Historic District.

If you could introduce yourself
briefly, Jane, and I know we have
Joe Corso here as well from Sandy
Beach if you'd like to approach
the podium.

MS. CLAUDIO: Janice Claudio;
First Street, Greenport; the Chair
of the HPC.

MR. CORSO: And Joe Corso,

4 Sandy Beach, Greenport.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

So you guys put a lot of work into it and we appreciate everything, the studies that were done, the recommendations by the Historic Board and also the neighborhood community. We closed the public hearing at the last meeting. I will open it up to the -- we closed the public hearing, as I said. So I will open it up to the Board for discussion or any questions of them.

We would be having a resolution on the agenda for next week to protect Sandy Beach under the historic purview. Julia?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I think that everything you've presented to me answers most of my questions and I do support the Historic District. It will be just within Sandy Beach, correct?

MS. CLAUDIO: Correct.

MR. CORSO: Yes.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay, thank
you.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I had asked
the last time you were here about
whether there was going to be a
map or an exhibit that accompanies
the resolution and I think your
response was that the district has
been identified by tax lots. Have
you thought anymore about that or
have you done anything about
making a map?

MS. CLAUDIO: No. We could
amend the official map for the
peninsula, the 27 lots, the homes
that are on the zoning map and on
the -- you know, we have the two
maps that show the Historic
District in purple if that sparks
a memory. And then, of course,
the zoning map. It would be a
change of those maps.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, so
maybe in a draft format. I just
think it would be helpful to be
abundantly clear on what the --

MAYOR STUESSI: Candace, can
you make a note?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: -- what the
layout is.

MAYOR STUESSI: We can get
that done at Village Hall easily.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: When I
think about the other Historic
District, I think about how it
looks on the map.

MS. CLAUDIO: It would be a
different color, Candace, because
the --

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: I won't
be creating the document.

MAYOR STUESSI: No, we have a
company that does it. I was
asking --

MS. CLAUDIO: Okay, but it
has different characteristics than

the existing Historic District
because it's not a National State
Registered District, it's the
local district.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Okay.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I would I
appreciate that, so thank you.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Can I ask a follow-up on that?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Just so there would be two
different districts?

MS. CLAUDIO: No -- well,
yes, it's going to be done as two
districts, one code, Chapter 76.
But the existing Historic District
also has the advantage of the
State and National Register, which
Sandy Beach, at the moment, does
not have.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So the code
will be amended to refer to the
two different districts distinctly

because they have different requirements or different criteria.

MS. CLAUDIO: They are separate in their periods of significance, but the code itself will apply to the district. Our local law remains the same. So, Brian, am I answering that clearly? Do you --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, it's the same rules that apply for the existing Historic District will now apply for Sandy Beach.

MS. CLAUDIO: For Sandy Beach.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: Correct. It will be subject to the regulations in Chapter 76.

MS. CLAUDIO: The Certificate of Appropriateness, the process of that will now -- we're the -- the local law is one that has the process to it and that is now applied to Sandy Beach or will be.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So I still

-- I'm a little bit on the fence on this project, but I do -- because I'm concerned about the historic merit of the homes. But I do appreciate all the work that you've done it and your board and I appreciate the work that's been done in the community, so I want to be supportive of that.

MS. CLAUDIO: So I think that the Sandy Beach community thought of as a beach colony dating to the early 1900's, the late 1890's, with the scalloped shack roofs is the more appropriate way to think about it. I do think the scalloped shack element is very interesting certainly and unique, but is something that has changed.

But as a beach colony dating from that period, our period of significance for the existing district dates to 1930. There's certainly significance to Sandy

Beach prior to 1930. I think, to me, it's quite clear that it has historical importance.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Well, each time that you've come in here, you've gotten me closer to --

(Laughter.)

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: -- agreeing with you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Better plan on coming back next week.

MR. CORSO: So if we get a map, you're on the other side of the fence, you're on our side?

MAYOR STUESSI: Mary Bess?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Just getting back to the two separate districts and dealing with the code, they'll be some mention of two different districts within the code, you're going have to modify the code a little bit?

MS. CLAUDIO: I honestly don't know the answer to that.

It's not contiguous, which is a historic -- when the State looks at it and the national register, the contiguous nature. Whether -- I think the water separating the districts, it's got to be a new district, but, you know, the district is not defined in Chapter 76.

The exact boundaries of the current 37-year old district are not spelled out, so I don't know the answer to that. I don't think there's that need, but we'll find out because Brian will do it.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

But so as a homeowner going in front, like, would it be -- it's a similar process except you'll be judging it on it's neighboring surrounding houses and how it fits in --

MS. CLAUDIO: It's the compatibility.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

-- versus it's First Street or
somewhere more in town.

MS. CLAUDIO: Yes. The code
lays out a way to look at
applicants and one of them is the
street view and the compatibility
with the neighbors.

MAYOR STUESSI: That's an
issue you deal with now within the
larger Historic District.

MS. CLAUDIO: Correct. That
is the process, yes.

MR. CORSO: And that is
something that we as the
homeowners want. We want to try
and keep the flavor of the beach
and the look. We really don't
want to have somebody come in and
do something out of character
amongst the rest of us. So we're
trying to, you know -- we want
that oversight is really what
we're looking for.

MS. CLAUDIO: Joe came to the Board a while back now, almost a year I would say, with that statement, help us project the character of the beach, to the Historic Board and that's what lead us down this road.

MAYOR STUESSI: Any other questions?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Are we still -- Candace, can you answer us, are we still a certified local government?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes, we are.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Yes.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay, all right. That's been up updated?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yep.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay, because that's important for --

MS. CLAUDIO: It is.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: -- what you're doing to be honest with you.

MS. CLAUDIO: Good job. Yes,
it is.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: What else
would we be if we weren't --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: A
certified local government is
within the Historic Parks and --
it's a special destination. Go
ahead.

MS. CLAUDIO: Well, so I'm
learning about this and actually I
can't put my hands on the actual
code, but I'm working on it and
it's just an added advantage that
Greenport has when comes to grants
and opportunities from -- I'm
talking from a historic
perspective, but it's a good
thing.

It makes us eligible for more
grants at the State level. This
20 percent tax credit that we have
for residential and up to
50 percent for commercial for

those properties within the
Historic District. And you have
to be a certified local government
for that. So it's --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS:

Janice, I was on a Historic Board
when we did that.

MS. CLAUDIO: You told me that.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I'll

go take a look in the box in the
basement and see if I have a copy
of whatever.

MS. CLAUDIO: We've been

looking for about a week. It's
not like we've been exhausted, but
we have been looking for it. And
Fran at SHPO is also --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: No,

as I said, I was involved in it,
so I will take a look. I don't
know what's left in that box
because I've given a lot away over
the years.

MAYOR STUESSI: I just wanted

to thank you both again for all of the effort on this and the others that helped you, Robert Harper in particular, as well as all your neighbors. The history that you guys provided was really incredible. I'm getting to see some of the photos in the house there is as well and walk the neighborhood with you and a number of other folks.

MR. CORWIN: Yeah.

MAYOR STUESSI: You guys have -- you spent a lot of time and energy on this. You're obviously very passionate about it. So I want to thank the Historic Board and Joe and the community. I'm certainly supportive of anybody that wants to preserve our history.

The other thing I wanted to thank you, Janice and Robert, for that amazing presentation that you guys did at the library recently

on tax breaks. As you just mentioned, it's highly advantageous to people, if you are within a Historic District, to get breaks when you're doing construction. And as we all know, the cost of construction has gone up significantly and if you're not within the Historic District, you don't have the ability to take advantage of these tax breaks.

MS. CLAUDIO: Correct.

MAYOR STUESSI: So, very impressive.

MS. CLAUDIO: I just want to compliment Joe and the passion and pride that The people have for Sandy Beach is just, it's wonderful and impressive.

MR. CORWIN: It's generational. It's something that a lot of these homes have been passed down from one generation to the next and you just feel part of

that. You don't want to let --
you know that to go away. You
want to try and keep it the way
it is.

MAYOR STUESSI: Great.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you so
much.

The next item I'm going to go to
is wetlands and CAC. Patrick, you
had this on your list. I know we
had talked about this before.
Would open it up for you to
present to the Board. There's
quite a bit of work. I want to
thank you for all of that. It's
certainly very helpful for
everybody to consider.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay, so --
thank you. So a couple of
meetings back I had questioned
about the CAC and what was the
scope for the purview of the CAC
and we had decide that I would

look into that a little bit.

So I did a little research and I'm sure some of my colleagues know a little more about this than I do, like Trustee Robins and Trustee Phillips, but it turns out that the CAC can be created either by local law, an ordinance, or by resolution. And as far as I can tell, our CAC must have been created by resolution because it doesn't exist in our code. So I don't see any creation of a CAC in our code.

So the State does allow you to create one by resolution, but -- and that's fine. But what I'm missing is what the language of the resolution was or -- you know, what went in -- what were the details that went in to creating it and determining what it should do? And I don't know if anyone remembers creating it.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: That was all tied to the LWRP when it began in the original existence in the 1988, '89 original LWRP. And I thought that that was actually part of the setting up for the code that is dealing with the waterfront consistency, which is those draft -- or the policies that we have to follow 1 through 44. I thought that was what set it up.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, so that's correct. That's my understanding as well. So our code in the coastal consistency review chapter or section, the wetlands section, they both reference the CAC. So they both describe a role for the CAC, like the CAC needs to review this or whatever. I just couldn't find anything on the CAC itself.

So, Brian, this is a question

for you, does it matter to us whether this was created by resolution or ordinance? Is one stronger than the other? Do we care?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: No. If you can do it either way, you can do it either way. You just need to establish what they can and can't do.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, right. So unless we can find the record of the resolution, I think we need to reestablish what it is the CAC does. And so I had provided the Board with a little memo from the State about how to create a CAC and what a CAC could do. And then I just looked a little bit at New York State municipal law and it talks about the kind of things that a CAC can do.

In the primary things that it

discusses are the CAC can do research on land area, municipality. They can coordinate activities of unofficial bodies in the municipality. They can prepare maps, texts; distribute books, charts, things like that for the public or the municipality to use. And most importantly, they can create an inventory or a map of the municipalities. It's really about all kinds of open space.

So it's not just about wetland. So the Conservation Advisory Counsel is really tasked with creating inventory of everything within the municipality that might be need conservation attention. That could be open space, woodland, wetlands, shoreline.

Mary Bess?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Well, that was part of the upgrade that

we were doing that hasn't moved for quite a while, was to include Silver Lake, freshwater Silver Lake, some of the wetlands that are within Moores Woods. That was to encompass all of those because that wasn't encompassed in first version of the LWRP. They only concentrated on the saltwater side.

But part of it was dealing -- part of that was to deal with creating, within that LWRP, the grant opportunities or the direction that the Board was going to look towards for us as Silver Lake or dealing with some of the wetlands issues that are within Moores Woods, especially Moores Drain was another one that was some of the topic. Because that -- as the LWRP has these projects named, then this is a basis for pursuing further grant

funding, which is why, you know,
the State has quite a different
set of areas to deal with.

But if you did it within the
LWRP and it's named in the LWRP,
then it gets you a step further
into the grant process or further
into the development of what you
can do.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right.

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, we're
required to add all that in in our
new update and the State just
changed the law on freshwater
wetlands as well.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Right.

MAYOR STUESSI: And so the
encroachment of any building has
to be even further away than it
used to be in December of last
year before the change. That will
be part of our update.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. I
know that LWRP Committee

Chairperson Williams has identified that the Silver Lake area in particular is really lacking and that has to be developed and researched and brought into the --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah. It's not even really the policy, it's the State's going to require when we meet with them on it.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. The other thing that the New York State suggests is that the CAC keep accurate records, meetings, and they file like an annual report with this Board.

Now there's also an opportunity that this Board can give them specific responsibilities. So we can designate -- and maybe this is already done with the original resolution. We can say, we want you to review every wetlands application for the Board or to

advise the Board or we want you to do coastal consistency review or something like that. So absent the language of the resolution, I think we need to kind of nail this down.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah. I don't think there's any reason to look back at this point. Let's just put in what we need to and put it to the Board for resolution.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. And the State goes on --

MAYOR STUESSI: I think everything that's current that you provided from the State is applicable.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. I think so. The State also goes on to specify how many members should be on the Board. They have a suggestion or a recommendation that you include at least two members that are younger people.

I provided this Board with a

copy the Town of Southold's Conservation Advisory Counsel and they also -- on the Southold website they also indicate the terms, when they expire, and they have a mission statement for their CAC. So we should do something similar like that so it's clear to the public what the purpose of the CAC is.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I'll be honest with you, Patrick, I think it started out that way.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: But I think over the years, because I remember that there was under -- when David Abatelli was our Village administrator, there was a form that was actually filled out and there was a membership of maybe four or five different people that were on it. And since then, with change of administration,

it was more -- it wasn't as important -- it wasn't as important to the previous Village administrator as it was to those who were used to the waterfront to be gentle about that.

So it kind of got -- it got shortened down, and I'll be honest with you, there were several people on it that are no longer able to be on it and I think the history is that got lost.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, yeah. I understand that. I think it's time to give them a boost and support them --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, absolutely.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: -- dust it off and refresh it. Our own code only mentions the CAC in the Chapter 142 wetlands saying that the CAC should file a report with the Village Board. It's pretty

limited. And then -- yeah,
there's a stipulation about the
amount of time that the CAC has to
review wetlands applications.

And I know that's what they've
been doing firsthand. But I would
suggest that we tighten that up.
And maybe expand the membership of
the Board so we have more of a
continuity so the --

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, one of
the things we're getting ready to
do as well is sending out
confirmations to people that are
on Boards whose terms might be
coming up to see if they're
interested in staying on or not.

And then also sending something
out publically for those who might
be interested in joining some of
the boards. And this would be
ideal to add on there and set a
new number and establish it.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay. Now

this gets into codes. Well,
actually no because this was done
by resolution, so it doesn't
actually require a code change.
We could do another resolution if
necessary to update this?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Well,
I think -- my curiosity is, I
mean, you and the Mayor are
cochair on the LWRP. So where are
we at with that? I know that this
small group has been working on
doing the rewriting. And I know I
have a copy of all the -- which I
think outdated now -- with the
local drafted policies that were
supposed to put into that
waterfront consistency. So where
are we at with that --

MAYOR STUESSI: So Patrick
was finalizing the Harbor Front
Plan and he's done a bunch of work
on that. And we just need to
schedule a meeting with the State,

which would be with the Harbor Committee headed by Patrick. And we need Suzie back who's traveling right now. She's out west. So I'm hopeful we're able to schedule this in the next 45 days, but I'll be able to let you know here quickly.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Because there's been some questions about flooding and properties that, you know, are flood levels are a little bit different than they used to be. And I'm just not sure where we're at with that progress in the LWRP. I know that Gene Cooper has provided me some information. So that's why I'm asking where we're at with that. Because that is also as important as reviewing plans. We need to --

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, so flooding is a different subject and that we're going to have on our joint meeting with the Town on

March 20th. Because there's some mapping that's going on on GAS with, you know, a lot of these zones that are flooding that didn't in the past. And then the other thing I'm hopeful that we'll be ready for on that March 20th event is USGS has been doing significant survey work on the ground water intrusion, everything that we're seeing come up out of the ground, which has increased significantly. And we're hopeful they might be ready in time to present as part of that meeting too, and we're going to want to pool all of this new data in.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: So will a representative from the Department of State that deals with LWRP, will they be coming down to do any update for us or any presentation as to what's new in the laws?

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, so that's what we're looking to schedule when Suzie is back together with the smaller group and we can hopefully do something larger as well at the same time.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay. Are we planning on applying to some of the grant money that -- well, it may not be there anymore, but in order to finish this project?

MAYOR STUESSI: No. They're anticipating that there will be more. That grant funding will likely be opening up in May or June.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: The first one is going to be that port one we just talked about.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Right.

MAYOR STUESSI: Patrick, what else?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Well,
that's all I have on CAC. Does
the Board have any direction for
me, what to do next? Do you want
me to -- it's not that complicated
and the State guidelines are
pretty clear.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, I'm
very much supportive of you taking
what you've already done and, you
know, working to get it -- put
aside a resolution for us to
reform the committee with, you
know, X number of people. You
know, some -- I don't want to use
the word diversity anymore, but
some of the State qualifications
and --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- do that.
Anybody else? Are you supportive
of that?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Would it
include a mission statement, like

what the --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I don't think I would write the mission statement. I think that would be one of the first tasks for the newly constituted board.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Okay.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: There's some good information here from the Hudson River Estuary Program Conservation Advisory Council. They kind of tell you how to set up a board and everything.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Well, actually they give you the guidelines to set things up. I mean, it's pretty self explanatory.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I'll be honest with you, Patrick, I didn't get through all of what you were suggesting because I was dealing with the bids. So I'd

kind of like to have a little bit
of an opportunity where you and I
have a discussion about it maybe.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: That's fine
with me. I'm happy to do that.
Let's move on. So I also did a
little work on the waterfront
consistency review. This is a
chapter of our local code,
Chapter 139, and the waterfront
consistency review is supposed to
be undertaken every time there's
an action approving, funding,
taking any action. And the
purpose of the waterfront
consistency review is to make sure
that the action or activity is
consistent with the LWRP.

So this is really important
because it's waterfront
consistency that ties the LWRP to
the Village. It makes it -- it
binds. It binds -- in my view, it
binds the goals of the LWRP into

this Board's decision making.

So now a lot of actions are exempt from waterfront consistency review. So all Type II actions are exempt, but someone has to make a determination early in the process whether this is going to be exempt or not. And if it's not exempt, so if it's like a Type I action, it has to go through a consistency review and someone is supposed to make a determination to see that the action, or the policy, or the funding, or the expenditure is consistent with the LWRP. Now this would be last officially adopted LWRP. So it would 1988 or '98?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: 1992 was the last one.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: '92? Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: There was the original and then there was an update.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: And there's a form. So there's a CAF and I think Trustee Phillips mentioned this at the last meeting that it used to be done. I think its kind of fallen by the wayside.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yeah, the previous Village administrator did away with it.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I'm sorry, what does CAF stand for?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: It's a coastal advisory form.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: Coastal assessment form.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Coastal assessment form. So it's another acronym, but it's part of the waterfront consistency review. So it makes an assessment to see if it's consistent with LWRP.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: It's just questions and guidelines.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah. Now

things can happen that are not --
things can still be allowed that
are not consistent with the LWRP
if there's extenuating
circumstances or if the Board
decides that it's --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: It's
a guideline.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: It's
a guideline. It's the same way
for projects that are mentioned in
the LWRP are not necessarily going
to move forward, but it's kind of
like a comprehensive plan of the
waterfront.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. And
there's a written determination
required. There's a timeline of
30 days. So it's much like the
CAC. There's some specific items.
So that's all on that. And then
the next piece I put -- brought to
your attention was our wetlands

code.

So I was concerned that our wetlands permit application was missing some important data. And so I reviewed the code and I was pleased to see that the wetlands code is very specific.

So there's a lot in the code. Now I understand the entire code can't be replicated on the form, but there are some important pieces in here that our current application doesn't really cover.

For example, our wetlands permit application requires a site plan and an indicator map, but the code on the wetlands requires a survey by a certified land surveyor. And so that's different. So I'm not sure that all of the applications that have been coming in front of us were done by land surveyor.

They may have been done by a permit expediter or contractor or

something like that.

So I think we should maybe edit the checklist on wetlands permit application to be -- so the language matches the code more closely.

And our wetlands application also requires a notarized affidavit. I'm not sure if there's a form for this. Candace is not here. But if there isn't, that form should be developed because it's part of the code.

And then in the code, much like I mentioned about the electric forms before, the code requires that the applicant demonstrate evidence of insurance and that's not on the permit checklist, so --

MAYOR STUESSI: Candace should definitely add that too.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Exactly. So it's kind of some minor edits to the permit application. I suggest we do that so it more

closely matches the code.

And then the other thing I wanted to point out is in our wetlands code in Section 142-7 we have all the fees listed there. So does that still need to be edited out because we have a new fee schedule?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yes.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So is that a code revision, Mary Bess, that we need to undertake?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: That's the only way I know how to get it out of the code.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Because we were in the process of implementing the new fee schedule.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: The new fee schedule, yeah.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So for clarity, this needs to be --

MAYOR STUESSI: Pull it out

and put it on the fee schedule.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: It is part of the law that you're considering.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So the law --

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: What we did was we went through -- and hopefully we got them all -- went through the entire code, found everything that had a specific fee and made modifications to the code to incorporate the authority of the Board to adopt those fees by resolution rather than have a set fee as in the code.

So for instance, 142-7, do you have it in front of you now?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yes.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: The new law that you're considering would read: The fee for a wetland permit application, any other applications required by this chapter, and any required hearing

notice shall be an amount determined, from time to time, by resolution of the Board of Trustees. The applicant is separately responsible for payment to the Village of all consulting and professional fees incurred by the Village in reviewing the application.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay, so that's fine. So that will actually effect 142-7?

DEFENSE ATTY one: Correct.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay. Very good. Our code also discusses the length of terms of wetlands board members. I guess we should check if we're doing that. That's really it. So I'd be happy to take this another step further and write up the specific recommendations on the permit application form.

MAYOR STUESSI: Please. Everybody else in agreement on this?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yeah.

Patrick, I do believe, and you'd probably have to look at some of the older property files or wetlands permit files, but I do -- this form that's here was updated a couple of years ago. There may be a form, an older form, that might give you some guidance as to what was on the application. Just because I remember having to see them in some of some of -- some wetlands permits that were issued before.

As I said, that's an updated form that was done a couple of years ago. So it probably was going under the guises that everything was being done and reviewed by the DEC and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the New York State Department of State. Those applications were all reviewed before we finally saw the end product.

So that may be why the application got kind of shortened. Because I am not sure, with the DEC permits, I believe you had to get a survey or at least I think I had to get one. So I'm not sure. Those are some of the things, I think, that are already in some of those packages.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay. Well, I can take a look at that. I think I'm honestly more interested in making sure the form matches the code.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Looking at old files is more your thing.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I know. I like the old files, okay, but I see that some of the permits that come in from DEC, that that stuff may already be available in it.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Okay,
that's what I'm trying to say in a
long way.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I understand.
I can look at that. Thank you.
That's all I have on that.

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay. So in
regards to wetlands, we had tabled
a couple of wetlands resolutions
in our last meeting and we were
going to discuss them today in
advance of, you know, putting them
off for a resolution. I know a
number of you went and looked at
the sites. Who wants to take the
lead on the conversation on this?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Well,
I'll take --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Are we
doing that now?

MAYOR STUESSI: Pardon me?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: We're going
to discuss those applications now?

MAYOR STUESSI: I think we

need to discuss them in Work Session
so we can get a resolution set.

VILLAGE CLERK HALL: Excuse
me. Our stenographer needs a few
minutes if we could. I'm sorry to
just jump in.

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay, let's
take five-minute break, everybody.

(At this time a brief recess
was taken.)

MAYOR STUESSI: All right, so
we'll go back to the wetlands
permits. Patrick, would you like
to start off?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: No.

MAYOR STUESSI: No?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So which --

MAYOR STUESSI: Mary Bess?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Which
application are we speaking about
first?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: How
about we do Mrs. Curran's application?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: So there was some discussion in the last meeting about potentially making some potential modifications to approval.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right, right, right.

MAYOR STUESSI: We can discuss if there's anything anybody wants to do and then we can ask that the Village Clerk and Counsel draft and just send to the Board in advance of next week so we can get it on the agenda and hopefully vote to move these folks' projects forward.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Well, I guess probably I'll put it out first since she happens to be my neighbor, for full disclosure. The property doesn't -- it doesn't -- it's not capable of having a pump-out station there. In a portable one, given -- and

I'm sure you all went down and took a look at it -- the ramping that's there, trying to take something up and down is almost -- and there are ten boats that are -- there's ten vessels.

My feeling is -- and I know that Mrs. Kearns has put into her lease that there's no dump -- no dumping, whatever you want to call it, no using your bilge overboard and that there's -- that they are supposed to be using the Greenport pump-out boat in order to do that.

I would like to see that put into the resolution, that she has her tenants -- there's ten boats there or how many -- I think it only accommodates ten. That this resolution says that she's making a good faith effort to have them use the Greenport pump-out boat and that, you know, whenever possible to keep from anybody

throwing overboard. That's what I'm looking for.

It's a piece of property, when it was originally configured, it's a rough -- it's a rough -- it's floating docks. We all saw it. And when the tide goes down, it goes down really low in there. I mean today I could like across to Sterling Harbor and see the bottom of their bulkhead. Didn't see any holes, but I could see the bottom of the bulkhead. So that's how low the water gets into the creek. So that's my suggestion.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So you're suggestion is in keeping with the CAC's recommendation. I think they said, more or less, the same, right? That they wanted the tenants to be informed about the pump-out and to post signage or something.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: But I would like it in a resolution so in the future if she ever comes back for another application, at least in this determination it says this is what we did. Because written determinations haven't been done on wetland permits in a long time and that, I think, needs to be done and it needs to be in that determination.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right, right. And we have a prior member of the CAC had spoken to us about -- he's emphasized the need to specifically reference these recommendations so that they're embedded in the determination, which is -- it doesn't really matter to me how we do it, whether we reference the CAC or if you provide the specific language. I am very much in favor or I was in favor of trying to require these

pump-outs to the extent possible
and wherever feasible.

And I'm a little concerned that
I don't feel like we have a -- or
I don't have a good guideline of
what project is the right size
project to require this.

MAYOR STUESSI: The threshold?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Kind of a
threshold, right. Or like in this
case, this is a smaller marina and
there's an argument to be made,
maybe this is too much of a
burden.

And then we have another
application before us where it's a
much larger marina, but the
application is only for a small
part of it that's in the Village,
right? So the Safe Harbor
application for example. So how
do we compare and how do we know
which is the right size project to
require this pump-out?

I did speak to some people who have operating marinas in our areas that have pump-outs and they explained to me some of the challenges of using them. One being that where the pump is located can produce an odor. That's problematic for the people using the facility.

And another is that it's difficult to maneuver some of the larger boats up into the area where they would have access to the pump-out and they really prefer to use the portable, the boat pump-out, the Village marina pump-out. And their customers are in the habit of doing that and they do that. And so this one operator I was speaking to finds that they're using their fixed pump-out station less and less.

So I think we need to kind of revisit the pump-out thing and

decide how we would apply that
and, you know, where and when. So
I guess I've kind of like softened
my approach to these particular
applications. It seems like it's
problematic. As much as I think
it's important really to protect
water quality that everyone
pumping out and no one is
discharging waste, which is the
law. I mean, you can't do that.

So we just need to make sure
that the boaters are informed, the
landlords are doing what they can
do promote proper handling of
waste, and whatever we can do as
the Village to facilitate, you
know, providing the mobile
pump-out boat.

MAYOR STUESSI: Julia?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yeah, I
mean, I agree with Mary Bess. I
think that that's a very small
marina down there. I think it is

ten boats, right? It did go down to ten as well.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yeah.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: And that the pump-out solution -- the pump-out boat, is the appropriate solution. And I think it should be in the resolution that that's what's required.

And I think they have to be on a case-by-case basis. I think every resolution may be different. And, you know, I'm not, you know, not getting away from too much restriction and stuff like that, but, you know, we can let common sense dictate here in this situation, you know?

It's a very small marina and, you know, this is, obviously, the most reasonable way to service it. So I think that's the language we should have in the resolution.

MAYOR STUESSI: Lily?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I have two thoughts and these aren't really that specific to this application. But one is this goes back to the LWRP update. Like because we're kind of, you know, basing this on a former LWRP update, which was probably a good idea at the time and maybe it still is, but I think that --

MAYOR STUESSI: It's not only that, our code says you have to be connected to the sewer.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Okay. Well, right. So then -- but we're not -- so we just haven't been like obeying that basically or haven't been...

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I think that's it's a matter of --

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Or didn't -- wasn't before, so we're sort of just keep saying it's fine people aren't?

MAYOR STUESSI: That's what
we're discussing right now.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Right. Well, okay. I mean, I
guess I have a hard time then, if
we're saying the code says it,
which I didn't think the code did.
I thought it was just the LWRP,
but --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I don't
think we have a code that requires.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: It's
part of the LWRP, I believe.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: It
was part of the --

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Right. So what I was going to go
back to is that we need to look at
that as a whole soon. And I do
think -- and this was actually a
suggestion that Dave Bergan made
when I went and visited the
marina, was that making our code

similar to the Southold code where expansion of marinas does then trigger, like, you to have to pick up to -- you have to have -- like, you know, so it's not this -- it's more clear and it's not just us making determinations on a case by case basis so much.

Which, again, I mean, it's not going to be a perfect system, but it makes sense to me that we would be doing what Southold does. But that's a code change, so it's not --

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, and as it relates to the updating of the LWRP. I would hope Patrick has a recommendation for the Board, which we would then bring to the community to provide an update.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Yeah.

MAYOR STUESSI: -- with the harbor.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: This is where that coastal consistency

review comes into play here.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Because
it's what brings the LWRP into the
requirements of this Board. Yeah,
so I think that's a good point,
Lily, about the expansion thing,
but new questions jump to mind,
like what's an expansion?

And what we're seeing with some
of our applicants is they're
reconfiguring the marinas to meet
customers needs or whatever their
business needs are, larger boats,
fewer boats. I don't even really
even know what -- is that an
intensification use or is it --

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Or
maybe it's not an expansion, but
maybe we actually have to look at
what our code should be and then
have a code and then follow it and
have a little less of this.

Because, again, I want to be fair.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yes.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

You know, like I don't want to have approved a wetlands permit before -- I guess the other thing that came to mind too was just making sure that then our Village pump-out boat is really like available, you know, is like there meeting that need.

MAYOR STUESSI: It is and we work with the Town if there's ever any days where they're not and the Town comes over as well. They work very closely.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Is there any cost for these private marina operators or the vessel to use our Village pump-out?

MAYOR STUESSI: No. We expend the labor and then there's a reimbursement from the State on it.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: It's part of it, yeah.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay.

MAYOR STUESSI: They're not paying.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: But we're being fully reimbursed?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So we couldn't ask them to pay.

MAYOR STUESSI: No.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: That would be like double --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Double dipping.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay. My point is we need to be compensated because it's an important service that we're providing. If we're not going to be requiring these pump-outs in every instance, then the Village is taking up the burden of transferring --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, it would seem in any updates we do, we may want to put something in that in the event the Village

isn't reimbursed, that we should get some sort of compensation for it. Because, you know, we're going to be running into some State budget issues here soon, State and Federal, so we don't know where we'll be in a year.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: How would you claw that back?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah -- no, no, I just mean if, you know, when we do the updates, say, in the event that the State doesn't reimburse, the Village has right to charge.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Oh, I see, like going forward?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah. Not going backwards.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: But I think we need to realize, right now we have two applications in front of us. And what we're trying to now do is go down the

path of talking in the future.

And I think we need to kind of get back to making a decision on the two that we have now. And then we can be --

MAYOR STUESSI: Well, so it sounds like there was general consensus from the three of you on moving forward that application without the requirement of doing the sewage connection, but stipulating in there that they needed to utilize the Village pump-out.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Correct.

MAYOR STUESSI: I'm -- while I understand the situation, I'm with Lily. I'd like to be seeing us do as much as we can to get people to hook up to the system along the water to make sure it's going to be taken care of.

Would somebody like to address the other one? We have a majority

on that, so we'll add that to --

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Well, hold
on a second. Hold on a second.
Expand on that. So what would you
like to see with the Kearns' marina?

MAYOR STUESSI: No, no. I'm
saying I have conflict with this.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah, yeah.

MAYOR STUESSI: So, yeah, I
think this is something we need to
address on an ongoing basis moving
forward. I mean, to your point,
what is the threshold? Is it five
boats or ten boats? What size?
What capacity? So it gives me
agita is what I'm saying.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: And I
think we're at the time now that
we need to take that topic the
next step forward. We have two
applications that we do need to
make a decision on.

And I agree with you, I have
agita about it too, but I also

live under a different set of rules with a bigger boat. So, you know, it's just we need to -- we need to, for the applicants, we need to move on because the time clock is ticking for them.

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay. So we'll move that one forward with the stipulations in it. Who would like to talk about the other one?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Okay. I'd like to take about Safe Harbor. The way I see the Safe Harbor application is that they want to decrease the number of smaller boats and increase the slip size for the much larger boats.

I see that as a situation where smaller boats are more likely to -- not illegally discharge, but, you know -- well, maybe yes. To be honest with you, less inclined whereas the large boats that would be like 100 feet or

more than you're talking about for these slips, they're self contained. They're not going to be doing anything in the harbor. I mean, maybe they'll do something out in the open sea or something like that, but they're not discharging into our wetlands.

So I don't see it as a problem and I would support this application on wetlands permit based on that.

MAYOR STUESSI: Any comments from anybody else?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I kind of feel the same way Julia does. I'll be honest with you, the dynamics have changed in the recreational boating industry. Most of the smaller boats are now being trailered because the slips are too expensive. And I never really, in all honesty, have seen any issues coming from Safe Harbor

because the way the current runs,
it would be in front of my house
to be honest with you.

So I understand that, you know,
they're doing their best to be
cautious. They have issues with
-- other issues with environmental
problems at the moment that need
to be discussed at some later
date, but I'm in favor of
approving the application.

MAYOR STUESSI: Lily?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I
mean, I think it's the similar
question. And even though they're
much larger and it's only --
they're making small changes. But
I do think like in terms of the
pump-out like we can't have a
cesspool and right now we can't
hook up to our sewer, and even if
we could, it would be a very long,
complicated, expensive process.

So, practically, I think it is

kind of the same issue. I think,
I don't know if we wanted
something similar with the Kearns
application of just saying -- I
mean, I think they do this anyway,
but saying to use the Village or
their pump-out boat. And beyond
that, I'm not sure what,
practically, we can really do
except perhaps change the code in
the future and change the LWRP.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes, have a
further conversation down the road.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: But I would
agree, we should add the
stipulation of using the pump-out
service of their own. And only in
the event that they, for some
reason, have an emergency and
can't provide their own, which
they do, obviously, they would
lean on us because we have to do
that.

My hope is that we get them connected to the sewer. That's another conversation altogether. I think between where we're going to be going with some sewer grants as part of downtown revitalization and a number of other things and possibly even this port grant, that might fold into it all, but that's a discussion for another night or we will be here until two in the morning. So we will move that one forward with a resolution with that stipulation for next week.

Before we move over to Greenporter Hotel, Patrick, you had said there was something you wanted -- a proclamation you wanted to read for a firefighter.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. So I've been asked by Bob Hamilton who's a member of the Star Hose Company Number 3 to read a

proclamation and it's very brief.

I'd like to do that right now.

I'm going to stand for this:

Whereas, George Matthias gave his life as a volunteer fireman in the Village of Greenport on August 20, 1972. He was directing traffic at a car fire in order to keep his fellow firefighters safe.

Mr. Matthias joined the Greenport Fire Department on January 21st, 1921. He was a member of Star Hose Company 3 and a member of the Fire Police Squad.

So this is a proclamation that the fire department is preparing and they would like to have it displayed here in the fire department and I want to give a special shout out to Bernie Purcell of the Eagles Company because he put a lot of effort into getting the recognition for George Matthias' sacrifice.

This happened a while ago; this was in 1972. And through Bernie's efforts and others, the Matthias family is finally getting recognition on the event and the ultimate sacrifice.

(Applause.)

MAYOR STUESSI: So the next item -- and, again, we're going to be tabling items until our next meeting that we'd like to discuss as a Board -- is the public hearing in regards to the Greenporter Hotel.

Again, there were two public hearings. We need to have a Board discussion related to what we've heard over the course of the public hearings.

With that, I will turn it over to Mary Bess as chair of the Code Committee to speak first on this.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: On the Greenporter?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Oh, okay. Well, I'll be -- a little background history. When I was going to college commuting back and forth to Suffolk Community, I worked for Jack Levin in his office. There were nights that I spent from 3 to 11 in the Greenporter.

I have been part of the Levin family for a long time. And in talking to Jack Levin over the many years, he always discussed how business, which we had great long conversations, is that he always bought that back lot so that if ever they expanded or if the girls and the boys or family decided to expand the Greenporter, that lot would become part of the property.

So I, in all honesty, do not have a problem with changing the

both of the codes to commercial retail -- no -- yeah, to commercial retail. I think that -- I understand the housing. It's a topic that this Village has talked about for a long time, but I do know that if there had been any intent of selling it for residential use, it would have been sold a long ago for that. It was kept for a single purpose.

I do know at one point at the closing for the previous owner, she thought the lot came with it and got pulled out, which I'm sure was part of the business model of whatever the -- Rachel and Ellen were thinking at the time.

But I feel that it would be better to have that all in one piece, all contained. It may help improve some of the issues along 4th Avenue. We need to deal with the Suffolk County bus that comes

down there.

I just looked that there's -- if
and when the final plans get
before the Planning Board, the
Planning Board has the foresight
to look at the whole picture and
not just -- not just focusing on
the size of the building or the
this or whatever. So I, at this
point, I'm in favor of changing
the two codes.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: The two --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS:

Zones, excuse me.

MAYOR STUESSI: Patrick?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So I want
to talk about Lot 29 first. So
Lot 29 is the one that's split
zoned, correct? Right? That's
the lot that's --

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Yes.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: That they're
parking on.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah.

Well, the building is on it.

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah,

building and parking.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: The

building is on it. So I'm sure

you all recall that I was

concerned about whether we should

be making a code change when the

code already has a provision for

how to deal with lots that are

split zoned.

So some people have described

this as like a cleanup, but we

have a cleanup provision in our

code that says when a parcel is by

bisected by two zones, there's a

way to determine how you can look

at that.

And so the applicant's attorney,

Attorney Hubbard I think that was,

spoke earlier about this matter.

I had asked that the applicant

provide a survey demonstrating for

this Board, how Lot 29 is actually currently divided between R-2 and CR. So I appreciate that they did provide a survey and a letter here.

The survey indicates that Lot 29 is about 6,600 square feet with the R-2 zoning, which is the more restrictive zone, occupying the 3,400 square feet, and the CR zoning occupying 3,200 square feet. So the portion of the lot in R-2 is slightly larger. It's over the 50 percent threshold. Meaning that they cannot -- by our current code, they cannot expand the use of the CR into the entire lot.

So they don't have the availability -- what they're demonstrating is that Section 150-D does not allow them to use the lot entirely for CR and therefore they are requesting this change.

So I get that. That's what I

wanted to hear. I wanted to hear that this is required and not just something that we are voluntarily doing unnecessarily. I will point out that the attorney's letter says that the surveyor had to use some approximations to determine the lot size. And there's only a 200-square foot difference between the R-2 and CR in this calculation. So it's very close to being split almost 50/50.

In my own research into the size of this lot, I was able to determine that the lot, in some records, is undersized by a couple hundred feet or oversized by a couple hundred feet. So it's within the swing of --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: -- or I'd say the error of margin. I don't think it really matters. It's that close. It's that close.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't believe that number is accurate.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I don't understand entirely why the surveyor wasn't able to come up with a more definitive determination, why it had to be approximated. They tried to explain that in the letter here, but I think it's --

MAYOR STUESSI: There's a heck of a lot of stakes out there. They were out there for a number of days. If you drive by, they're still there.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yeah. So when I researched the Suffolk County tax records, they come up with different lot sizes and depending on where you looked, sometimes the lot was larger and sometimes smaller. So I guess that's what they're dealing with.

So I -- because the lot is currently being used and because

the building already occupies a portion of that lot, I think I'm in favor of removing the split zoning on this lot, that this Board could agree to change the zone in this particular lot into the CR.

Now I feel differently about Lot 28. So lot 28 is the vacant lot that is directly north of 29. And I think the -- our Planning Board did a great job in kind of laying the groundwork or the foundation for our discussion.

So the Board produced a very lengthy report here. And I just -- you know, I just need to say that I really value our Planning Board. So Chairperson Hammes is always professional, always thorough, always thoughtful. She runs a very tight ship, but the other members do a great job as well and that's the

board members of Walton, Talerman, Creedon and Buchanan. So I respect their work. I disagree with their determination and their conclusions.

So this memo dated January 27th that they prepared, I guess I would describe it as being very nuanced and I think a reasonable person could take the same assumptions and come out with the opposite conclusion, which I have.

So they, in their memo, they go to great lengths to explain that they are -- they have a limited amount of good guidance on this matter. Because they're referring to -- they're looking for information and guidance from a comprehensive plan.

As you all recall, back in the spring they had asked this Board to provide them more guidance on other matters, comprehensive

planning, parking. So they point out that the LWRP, which serves as our comprehensive plan, is out of date. They point out that they have not been given the requested guidance, that this Board has not given them what they've asked for in terms of guidance. And they've sort of established that they don't have a lot to go on in making this determination.

But then they go into great detail about -- so they're trying to answer the criteria for which they need to review this application and they support their determination by referencing the LWRP, which they went to great pains to say is not good enough.

So I said earlier it's a very thoughtful and nuanced report, but it's a little bit tortured in my mind. It's saying two things at once. And the conclusion -- I'm

paraphrasing here -- is that at the end, the Planning Board says, we really don't have good information and it's really up to the trustees to make this determination.

And when I look at the assumptions that are baked into their memo, for example, they discuss Lot 29 not being buildable or marketable. We had a member of the public here mention this earlier. So Lot 29 --

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

28, I think.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I'm sorry,

Lot 28. Thank you. Lot 28 is the vacant lot and that's an 8,600 square-foot lot. It's not small by Village standards. The way it's substandard is it's lot -- it's street frontage.

So it's only 47 feet wide where we would normally require 60 feet.

In my mind, the fact that it has a

narrow street frontage is not a significant defect. Getting an area variance for street frontage is arguably one the easiest to get. It's not something the owner created. It's has to do with how the maps were drawn in the Village.

And even at 47 feet, we have 25 combined side yard setback. That leaves 22 feet with which to build a house. 22 feet is consistent with other houses in the neighborhood. It's about the same size as the house next door to the north. So on an 8,000-square foot lot zoned R-2, we allow 35 percent lot coverage. That's a lot of lot coverage.

I don't have the numbers in front of me right now, but you could build an accessory structure. You could build a house, a two-family house with

three stories, two stories above grade -- or even a one-family one house, two stories above grade, one story below grade. You could build a house 2,400-square feet at least.

Even with our new more restrictive lot coverage requirements for driveways and paving, there's a lot of lot coverage area to work with. So I don't really see this lot as being defective or unbuildable.

I agree with some of the public said earlier that we don't really know the motivations for why this lot was not developed. There's numerous reasons why someone may not bring a lot to market and I don't agree with the assumption that this is not buildable because it was never built on before.

I am concerned about reducing residential inventory. So one of

the things that we've heard from prior administrations over the years was that it's so difficult to build affordable housing because there's nothing available in the Village. This wasn't previously available, but is a lot and it is buildable in my view.

So I'm very reluctant to see this lot lost into the CR District. I think it's important that we maintain our residential inventory. And I understand there's no guarantee that this would be affordable, right? We don't know how it's going to be developed and who would choose to buy it and build there, but it is still available for housing nonetheless. And I think it would be one, two, and possibly three units if this ADU thing ever catches on.

The other concern I have is that

this idea that the hotel needs to be bigger or a bigger hotel somehow equates to a more vibrant downtown. I'm not really buying that. No one has convincingly made the argument that we need to have a bigger hotel to make a vibrant downtown. In fact, we might need more smaller hotels. So in my mind, bigger doesn't equate to vibrancy in this case.

I think what the applicant is asking for is a really an extraordinary accommodation. And I asked our Counsel this before, but correct me or you could confirm, the current hotel is not currently in compliance with parking, correct?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: The number of spaces do not conform to the current requirement for parking onsite.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Okay, and

the proposed application, as proposed, or what's been put forward to the Planning Board, will also not, even though the hotel is going to be larger, it also does not comply; is that correct?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR:

Additional spaces are provided, but not sufficient to bring it into compliance with the code, correct.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right. So

I have a problem accommodating this applicant for a hotel that's not in compliance that wants to expand into a larger hotel and still not be in compliance. I think that's asking a lot of this Board to make a zone change.

I also feel like this is clearly an instance of spot zoning. I know in the Planning Board's memo they made the argument that this

is not spot zoning, but the memo itself and the Planning Board's letter from last June or July clearly established that this is spot zoning because they emphasized the fact that the comprehensive plan is not adequate, the parking studies haven't been done, this Board has not provide enough guidance of payment in lieu of parking.

Clearly to change the code would not withstand -- in my mind, would not withstand the test of whether it's spot zoning. This is making a zone change specifically for this application and there's no way to demonstrate that this provides a public good or a public benefit.

I think the requirement is that it provides some public benefit. The fact that it provides a benefit to the applicant is not a

disqualifier, correct, Brian?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: No.

The fact that it provides a benefit to the applicant relates to the spot zoning aspect of it. Public benefit is not a consideration other than in that respect.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: So I just don't see how you can make an argument that this is not spot zoning. It doesn't meet the test. The document that the Planning Board referred to, James Coon, Government Technical Series on Zoning and Comprehensive Planning, this comes up often. Their definition here, it says:

Spot zoning refers to the rezoning of a parcel of land to a use category different from the surrounding area, usually to benefit a single owner or a single development interest. Size of the parcel is relative, but not

determinative. Illegal spot zoning occurs when the change is other than part of a well-considered and comprehensive plan calculated to serve the general welfare of the community.

So I don't know how we could argue that this change is part of a well-considered and comprehensive plan. This Board, in order to satisfy that, would have had to do more work.

For example, we could have discussed creating a parking overlay zone, right, for the entire commercial retail area. But we haven't really got into any detail on that. We could have discussed how this would impact other commercial properties or set a precedent. I don't think we've really done the work on that.

So in my mind, this doesn't really meet the test. I don't

know how this proposed change can be well-considered as part of the comprehensive plan.

MAYOR STUESSI: Julia?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I don't know how I can top Patrick. I mean, you know, the dissertation on this. But as you all know, I'm very much in favor of affordable housing and housing in general. But I will say that I don't think that the solution the housing problem is based on one lot in the Village, okay? We have no way of controlling what that lot will be developed if somebody does build a house on it.

I mean, I do real estate. I know that's the motive is to try and get as much money as you can for anything that you build in the Village. As much as I certainly appreciate the need for our first responders and everybody in this

Village who needs housing, I don't know if we're going to achieve that by -- this would be a moral victory, I guess.

That said, I can look at another side of this and that is that we're going to be discussing short-term rentals, I believe, next week. You know, we're going to resume the discussions on that.

And, you know, short-term rentals provide housing for guests and visitors. Hotels don't. In fact, I believe there was an article just in Newsday today about the lack of hotels on Long Island for tourism and stuff like that.

So, you know, I thought -- you know, I came at that I think at some point because we've been discussing this for many sessions now, about the fact that this could serve a need, you know, to, you know, provide housing and not,

you know, tourist housing basically and not be something that would be detrimental to the community.

As far as the Planning Board decision is concerned, and I watched that whole hearing actually when they came to the decision. I kind of -- you gave such an in-depth analysis of it, Trustee Brennan, that, you know, I don't think that they're decision was cavalier and, you know, not without thought, you know?

I listened to each one of them give their reasons and I read the report. I read the attorney's report it on today, which I think he basically said that it would be appropriate for us to make this determination.

So I'm going to probably say that I would support it. I agree with Mary Bess, you know, that the

people that own that property, you know, haven't ever done anything there before and I don't see that it's going to make a difference in the affordable housing situation.

I mean, personally, I think that the only way that we're really going to build more housing is to partner with the Town where the land is and where we can accommodate them with our sewer. I think that the Mayor has outlined a couple of projects for the future that may be more viable.

But, you know, you want to talk about spot zoning, well, this is a spot situation where I don't think that this is going to contribute to the housing situation in Greenport. Like I said, I think it would be a moral victory. I think it's right in one sense, but I don't see that, you know, I can

deny a code change. That's how I feel.

MAYOR STUESSI: Lily?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I pretty much agree with Patrick and most of the public comments and e-mails that we've gotten. I'm okay with changing the zone of Lot 29. It's already built on. It's already been used as that, but I don't -- I understand where everyone's coming from and I don't think anyone thinks the Planning Board was cavalier and there's good arguments on many sides.

But where I come down is that it's residential housing and we need housing. Yeah, I don't have that much more to say about it. I mean, I could.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: I watched the Planning Board as well and listened to every one of the members that made comments. They

were looking at the project as a whole. They were looking that as within their planning guidelines, that they have to do what's best for the community.

This -- if it were to -- you know, they're looking at how to deal with congestion in the streets, how to make it a safe, secure place, how to promote a quality of life for everyone in the area. We do not have a house on that lot right now, but there are other houses that perhaps would benefit from some changes of getting the congestion off of 4th Avenue.

I feel strongly that we also have to look at the betterment of the community as a whole in each area and that's what the Planning Board does. I listened to each one of them. They had a lot of thought in their decisions. And

I, to be honest with you, felt very confident in the decision they made and that's the reason why I would follow through.

They're the ones that are a different arm of our government. They look at things differently than we do and I can tell, just by the discussion and the way they make their comments, they spent a long time discussing it and coming to a true decision in their own minds. So that's all I really have to say.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I would just add to that I attended that meeting and I totally agree with what your sense of the meeting was. It was thoughtful and deliberative and professional, as I prefaced my comments. I have no doubt that they're doing good work and doing their best work. I just don't agree with their conclusions.

It's not a comment on their ability or a criticism of their process at all. Like I said, I think a reasonable person to look at the same data and come to a 180 different conclusion.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I also think you can look at public benefit in a lot of different ways. I mean, you could make the argument that we need more hotels and tourists, but you could also make the argument that you need more year-round locals living here for the vibrant downtown.

So I think it just, it depends. I understand what everyone is saying about like the benefit of the community, but we're making different determinations on that. Like where I come down, the benefit of the community is much more for housing than it is for --

MAYOR STUESSI: And do you

equate all housing, whether it's
affordable or a \$1.5 million house?

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I
mean, I think any addition to
housing is going to create more
likelihood that there's more
affordable housing. Would I love
it to be affordable? Do I
understand that's not -- we can't
really make that determination? I
understand that. I still think
housing -- people need housing,
period. They need affordable
housing, but they also just need
housing.

And I'm not sure that parking
for hotel rooms for tourists who a
lot of money is better than -- you
know, it's still a house. And
maybe it frees up some other house
or some other housing for someone
else that is a little bit more
affordable.

So, no, I don't equate it

exactly. But I don't think -- I don't think it weighs out to me. It doesn't make sense to me to say let's give parking to a hotel instead of having residential housing.

I also do think that if we do this here, why -- there's many other parts of the Village that the same thing -- we could say the same thing and I don't think that's a -- that's not the vision that I see for the Village.

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: But the vision that we all approved when we changed the codes, any new construction of a hotel or motel has got to jump through major hoops. So what is here, already existing in the Business District, is probably going to be it until such time another Board decides to change the code. I think that that needs to be a consideration.

I'll be honest with you.

I respect Chairman Hammes' input into this. I feel that the frustrations that the Planning Board feels towards us as a Village Board not making decisions on things has clouded this decision a little bit in that we're putting in things here that are saying, okay, Village Board, we need this input.

Well, we asked them to give their honest opinion as to how they felt about this project. And I don't think that we really want to -- if the Planning Board decides to give them any exceptions or any increase or however they're going to work for it, putting out further intensification of activities out into 4th Avenue on Main Street into the back roads or however you want to put it. I think we have

to look at it as something that's just as important.

Housing? Yes. I happen to agree with Trustee Robins. We've been discussing this for years. Our original goal with housing was to just deal with the fact of looking downtown to create going up. But we do need the Town of Southold to increase any type of housing. And that's where we should be concentrating on that topic.

But what I'm disappointed in this here is that I think a little bit of the Planning Board's frustration with us, as a Village Board, has come out in some of this long, very well thought out position paper from the Planning Board, but I still feel strongly that they were supporting it. And that's -- we have a lot of work to do, but we keep going around in

circles on a lot of topics and
it's just time we get down to take
care of it.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you. I
have given it a lot of thought. I
also appreciate all of the
commentary tonight, from Trustee
Brennan in particular, and some of
the things Lily said.

As everybody in the public know,
I would lay down in the street if
I thought we could do something to
create some affordable housing in
any way, shape, or form. I don't
see that happening with this
particular parcel. The average
price of an empty lot in the
Village is \$350,000. You buy that
lot, you build a house on it,
you're going to be paying easily
\$500 a square foot. You're well
over a million dollars and even
more than that. And when that
happens, that's going to actually

drive up the prices of every other house in the Village, which is going to create an even bigger problem as part of it.

That being said, ultimately I rely on our Planning Board for guidance on things like this. They have made the recommendation to support it. I support the Planning Board. It doesn't mean the hotel is happening as proposed. The Planning Board is ultimately going to make a decision on that.

There's a number of different issues relative to ingress and egress. The fire department brought up a number of issues over there as well that need to be considered as part of it. So I think all of that needs to be taken into account.

And I think the other thing is the Board needs to look

holistically at a balance between residential and short stay visitor life and we are prepared to enter into -- and we've had many, many discussions on short-term rentals and have a new code that we are going to be considering next week to further restrict short-term rentals in the neighbors, which I think will end up being a bigger benefit to people who live in the neighbors.

And so maybe there is some balance that needs to be considered with the Business District and look at potentially considering some additional hotel rooms on a site that already exists subject to Planning Board approval, and ultimately they will be deciding factor.

So that's where I am at the moment on this. We can talk about it more next week when we have

resolutions up for a vote. Any other final comments from anybody on it?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: I just have one comment. So there's been a lot of concern about 4th Street with traffic, parking, loading. I think it's important to recognize if this Board can make changes to 4th Street, separate from this hotel application, right?

So we don't need this -- changes on 4th Street to improve traffic or emergency vehicles, or first responder access is not predicated on approving or disapproving.

MAYOR STUESSI: No. I'm hoping we're going to see this in the BID document for -- you know, there's loading or unloading or emergency access over there, like I know there are suggestions in other places as well.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: The point

I'm making is we don't need the hotel project to accomplish what we need to accomplish on 4th Street if they think there's a safety issue there. We could do it --

MAYOR STUESSI: Yeah, but I'm simply saying that my reading of the Planning Board is they believe it needs it to be there for a variety of reasons.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Yes.

MAYOR STUESSI: And I'm supportive of the Planning Board in that. And ultimately they're going to be deciding whether there's 10 rooms, or 15 rooms or zero rooms added to it, but that's under their purview to decide.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Right.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:
Are we going to respond to their letter like they would also like?

MAYOR STUESSI: I think we

should talk further in our next Work Session. We're not going to solve that tonight.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON:

Yeah, no, I wasn't suggesting it tonight, but that has been coming up a lot, so.

MAYOR STUESSI: All right.

We have some other items, obviously, that we're going to table. We have a sewer resolution that will be on for next week for approval of an exemption of the moratorium for a property that is on the Main Road that had applied prior to the Village Board moratorium.

There is one other property, possibly a third, that I know the Village attorney is going to be talking to that attorney on. They may come up in front of the Village, but we can talk about that more next week in advance of

that.

We've got a lot of folks here this evening. We're going to turn it over to public comment in a moment. I would just ask that everybody be respectful. Stand up for your two or three minutes, speak once on whatever subject you want to, and sit down so the next person can come up. And with that, we will turn it over for public comment. Is there anybody that would like to speak?

(Audience member indicating.)

MAYOR STUESSI: Yes, sir, Mr. Rishe?

MR. RISHE: Good evening. Marc Rishe, 315 Sutton Place.

MAYOR STUESSI: My apologize on mispronouncing your last name.

MR. RISHE: That's okay. No one gets it right. So I -- I'm speaking in regards to the sewer moratorium. I am the owner of the

property at 550 Madison Avenue. I have submitted two requests for exemptions to the moratorium and I just want to get clarity from the Board. I know you mentioned something. Will the Board hear my request formally? What is the sort of Board response --

MAYOR STUESSI: We need -- that's what I was just saying. We need your attorney to talk to our attorney before next week. We'll work to set up a meeting right away. And if you meet the basic criteria -- there is some disconnect on that between what she's saying and what we have, you would be added on for a resolution for the Board to considered.

MR. RISHE: Understood, and I guess the question is, if the determination is that it's not added to the resolution, there doesn't seem to be a process

defined for a request for
exemption or is it a blanket
denial? Because I think there's
some sort of -- again, there's
some sort of --

MAYOR STUESSI: We're going
to be discussing the sewer
moratorium a bit more next week
and the status of it and the next
steps.

MR. RISHE: Okay, understood.
Appreciate it.

MAYOR STUESSI: If you fall
outside of that.

MR. RISHE: Okay, appreciate
it. Thank you.

CAPTAIN LEHMANN: Captain
Robert H. Lehmann, 535 3rd Street.
I think if we charge our visitors
any price whatsoever to dump their
sewage, they're definitely going
to dump it out in Gardener's Bay
before they get here. I think
it's a complimentary item. If you

want the larger yachts here to
enjoy themselves, don't charge
them nothing, just complimentary.
Let them spend their money in the
shops for dinner or whatever they
do. That's an item number one.

Item number two is the -- well,
forgive me I did forget that for
the moment. Thank you.

MAYOR STUESSI: Would
somebody like speak next?

MR. BOLANOS: Hello. Alex
Bolanos; 9395 Main Road, East
Marion, New York 11939. Good
afternoon. I want to thank
everybody first for coming here.
Hopefully a lot of people here are
in my support. And hopefully the
truth will come out, given the
opportunity to present my
evidence, which hasn't been
possible for me.

As everybody witnessed here
before, I asked a question. I

wasn't even given the respect of getting an answer. I mean, that's all public information by the way.

I'm going to backtrack a little bit. There was some discussion here about traffic today. Just a question, the signs on Front and on Main are missing. Therefore, people are no longer limited to time limits. It seems to be like we have a problem here in the Village with parking and we're just making it worse.

The other question is, who's going to enforce it? Everything sounds great, but who's going to enforce it? I haven't worked parking in two seasons and that brings me to correct the treasurer. I would like to -- beg to differ what you said. You said that the buildings department doesn't generate enough revenue.

I would like to FOIL how much

revenue the buildings department generated in 2021 with parking summonses. Do you know that off the top of your head?

MAYOR STUESSI: We're not going to do a back and forth.

MR. BOLANOS: Okay. It's between \$70- to \$80,000. That's how much the Village lost in revenue in two years. That's 160,000, okay?

Also during the traffic discussion, there was mention that there was trucks and loading and Adams Street parking. That's why we need this loading. Well, that wouldn't happen if we had enforcement. These cars wouldn't be parked like that when I used to enforce and so we'll keep going with that.

Another thing, we spoke about the pedestals on the dock and I would urge the Village to please

first find out if we have fire suppression. Because I know -- we can look back, there was a lawsuit won for the Village to actually incorporate fire suppression, which to the best of my recollection, there is no fire suppression there. But continue to talk about the pedestals, that's a great idea.

And after that, I would just like to say there's a lot of things wrong in the Village and we're all here because we're concerned. Everybody that knows me knows I've dedicated a lot of time and I work very hard at improving the Village.

And I was out on medical leave. Upon my return back from medical leave, I'm getting kind of pushback. They don't want me back. And they're having a meeting here -- that's why I'm

hoping everybody's here gathered
in my support -- to terminate me.
If that does happen, I would like
an opportunity to defend myself,
because, I'm sorry to say, the
Mayor has confused the work Mayor
with monarch.

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there
anybody else that would like to
speak this evening?

MR. BOLANOS: Oh, one more
thing. We need a moratorium on
the Mayor. I wish I could drop
the mic, but I can't.

MAYOR STUESSI: Is there
anybody else who would like to
speak this evening?

Yes, Margaret.

MS. DE CRUZ: Hi, Margaret
de Cruz, 25 Washington Avenue. I
just want to, once again, say I
wish we didn't turn a parking
lot in -- I mean, that we didn't
turn a lot into a parking lot.

And I have no idea what the controversy is, but I know that he was a good inspector when I needed one and that's all I can say. Thanks.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

Is there anybody else that would like to speak this evening?

Yes, sir.

MR. WHITTLE: Ed Whittle, 164 6th Street and I was just wondering if we can't get potholes fixed on 6th. They're -- the road is in such terrible shape, not to mention that they already started with the paving at the end, but they tore up the whole road through our whole block and it's just sitting there.

And I have another question as, is there any idea when they're going to start up again as far as the paving?

MAYOR STUESSI: The second it gets warm. I'll be glad to come

by your house and share more details with you on their timing.

MR. WHITTLE: Okay, but as far as potholes, can't that be addressed by the work crew?

MAYOR STUESSI: The Village crew has been doing some on the warmer days over the last couple of weeks, but it's been very problematic with the weather when it's too cold.

MR. WHITTLE: Okay. Just out of curiosity, are we on Greenport generators right now or is PSEG?

MAYOR STUESSI: This is PSEG.

MR. WHITTLE: PSEG?

MAYOR STUESSI: Yep.

MR. WHITTLE: And I am sure you guys have to deal with a lot of conflict today concerning the power outage. I'm just glad it's back on and running.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

Anybody else like to speak this

evening?

(No response.)

MAYOR STUESSI: Okay, with that, I'm going to make a motion to go into Executive Section. Is there a second?

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Second.

MAYOR STUESSI: All in favor?

DEPUTY MAYOR PHILLIPS: Aye.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.

MAYOR STUESSI: Aye.

TRUSTEE BRENNAN: Aye.

TRUSTEE DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR:

What's the reason for Executive Session?

MAYOR STUESSI: Oh, I'm sorry. We're going into Executive Section for labor matters, advice of Counsel, and adding on one more of the potential accusation of real property.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY STOLAR: And for labor matters, you're talking

about matters leading to
employment, motion disciplines,
suspensions, dismissal or a
removal of a particular employee.

MAYOR STUESSI: Thank you.

If we can ask the public to
leave. We're going into executive
section now. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the Board of
Trustees Work Session Meeting was
concluded at 9:26 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, REBECCA WOOD, a Shorthand Reporter and
Notary Public in and for the State of New York,
do hereby certify:

THAT the above and foregoing contains a
true and correct transcription of the
proceedings.

I further certify that I am not related,
either by blood or marriage, to any of the
parties in this action; and

THAT I am in no way interested in the
outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand this 5th day of March, 2024.



REBECCA WOOD