

Board Meeting

May 15, 2007

The Board Meeting of the Board of Trustees met in the Municipal Building, 14 Baker Street, Patchogue, New York on May 15, 2007.

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Pontieri with Trustees Crean, Dean, Hilton, Krieger, McGiff, Treasurer Krawczyk, Attorney Snead and Village Clerk Seal present. Trustee Devlin was not present.

The flag salute was made.

Mayor Pontieri read the safety message

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved the Board Meeting minutes of April 23, 2007.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Dean, seconded by Trustee Crean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved the Special Board Meeting minutes of May 4, 2007.

Treasurer Krawczyk presented bills for the period ending May 14, 2007 totaling \$420,532.42.

General Fund	\$224,707.52
Trust & Agency Fund	\$7,107.08
Capital Projects	\$314,181.52
Sewer Fund	\$28,604.86
BID Fund	\$14,744.14
Housing/Code Fund	\$2,554.47
Community Development Fund	\$5,589.67
General Bills	\$49,018.37
Total	\$420,532.42

Upon a motion made by Trustee Krieger, seconded by Trustee Crean and unanimously carried, the Board accepted the bills as presented.

Mayor Pontieri stated: on the Town of Brookhaven expenditure of \$44,830.15, if you look back over the last several months this is a very high one. The month of April was free dumping and we opened for the four weekends where we normally open just for the two weekends. That is the reason that it is that high; that will not be the normal number that we will run. And as a notice for the public, there is a payment of \$38,250.00 going to Beacon Wireless. At the DPW yard on Waverly Avenue there is a cell tower, and under the former administration with Mayor Ed Ihne a deal was negotiated for that tower which served the Village very well. We received \$50,000 per year for rental on the property that it is on—lease of property. We had further negotiations with the company that had put the tower up, Beacon Wireless, and they purchased the remainder of the lease. The lease was a 30 year lease at about \$50,000 a year; to the tune of about 1.5 million over 30 years. They purchased the remainder of the lease from us for \$765,000, minus the \$38,000. We have received over the last five years with the lease \$50,000 a year which amounts to \$250,000 and now we got \$765,000 (minus the \$38,000); so basically, what we have made on the tower is one million dollars in five years instead of 1.5 million over the 30 years. So, as far as the return to the Village and the ability to do some infrastructure improvements and to take care of some things such as putting new filters at the pool and the Halycon Manor, etc. The deal that former Mayor Ihne put together has become very advantageous to us at this point and time. It was a deal that was well constructed and we should say thank you to Mayor Ihne for doing that; it was well done.

Treasurer Krawczyk stated: I believe there were five year options. So I don't believe it was guaranteed for thirty years. You don't know with technology where that is going. I think by getting the money up front, we got a very good deal.

As for the monies for Bove Industries, that is for construction of North Ocean Avenue up to this point and time.

Treasurer Krawczyk stated: you have before you our cash balances as of April 30<sup>th</sup> for the Board's information.

Mayor Pontieri stated: over the course of the past three or four days, I have gotten a number of e-mails, a few from residents and many, many from outside the community that are not involved, about the possibility of a dog park here within the Village. It is an issue that has come up the last few weeks. It is not something that we have budgeted at this time, that we have been specifically about to put up the space. It is something this Board will review. We have 29 acres of parkland, so it is something that we must look at very closely from both the financial position—do we have the funding to do the things that have to be done if we put something like that up, do we have the space as would be appropriate, and how do we go about doing it. I have about forty e-mails which I will be forwarding to all of the Board members. At that point and time we will sit with Trustee Devlin and Ms. Lewis from Central Avenue. We will take a look at it and see if we are capable and able to do it in the Village. I cannot give you an answer tonight and I would not even begin to—on issues like liability, where do we get the funding to do it, where should we do it, what properties are available. In no way am I saying that we are not going to do it; but I am not going to say yes we can do it until we take a closer look at it. It is public land and we have to be sure that it is used by the greatest number of people within the Village of Patchogue first and then how do we manage it from a health and safety prospective—cleanup and the safety of both the people in the community and the people whose dogs are there. I think we need to fence it; how do we fund that part of it. You can't just fence it using the \$25,000 and \$30,000 that it would cost to do it, and not put benches in there and amenities. There is a whole fiscal and financial piece of it that, as I thought about it, that we really need to look at it closely. Give us a little bit of time to look at it and we will be in contact with you. This municipality as a government controls 2.2 square miles and how we use it and manage it has to be something that is done for the greater good of the community.

Village Clerk Seal read: Notice is hereby given that a Public Hearing will be held on Tuesday, May 15, 2007 at 7:30 .m. in the Municipal Building, 14 Baker Street, Patchogue, New York, by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Patchogue, to consider a request by the Architectural Review Board to designate property located at 178 East Main Street as a landmark as per Village Code Chapter 93-73 in accordance with Article 21 of Village Law. At said Public Hearing any person interested will be given the opportunity to be heard.

Trustee Crean stated: In early March, I received a letter from the ARB with I handed out to the Board in which they were recommending that a property at 178 East Main Street be designated as a landmark. It is within the downtown Business District and it is one of the last residential structures (just east of the Post Office on the south side of Main Street). The house was constructed back in 1910; it was Madam Guire's house. She purchased it back in 1931 and used it as a beauty dress shop. It is one of the last of its kind on Main Street. It is Village Historian Han Henke's wishes as well as the ARB to designate that property as a landmark within a historic district. It would require the currently property owner, Reuvan Shenharvy, that if there was any sort of alternatives, renovations or any sort of work that needs to be done to the property—any sort of exterior alterations, construction or demolition, he would need to obtain a certificate from the ARB of

appropriateness. It creates a layer of protection to try and preserve that building and try and preserve the historic nature of it. If Mr. Shenharvy would like to take this opportunity to share his thoughts I would appreciate it.

Mr. Shenharvy stated: I would want to find out what would happen to it as far as a commercial goes---can there be any kind of commercial business in there or would you limit it to certain businesses.

Trustee Crean stated there would be certain businesses that just wouldn't make sense to put into that building. Not only the physical structure itself would limit it to only certain uses, but our own zoning and building code would. It's D-3 business.

Village Attorney Snead stated: you would be able to do those things allowed in the business zone. You would be able to make application to the Zoning Board for a use change if you wanted to.....

Mr. Shenharvy stated: for example, if I wanted to build something in the back to match the existing.

Trustee Crean stated: you would need to present your plans and designs to the ARB and they would need to issue you a Certificate of Appropriateness—that it doesn't change the culture of the building. You would need to work with those boards to get their approval first before you were to go ahead and make any major alterations or extensions to the property.

Mr. Shenharvy asked: is that a long process if it is going to be a historical landmark.

Village Attorney Snead stated: once the property is landmarked, the requirement would be to anyone who owns it would have to come before the ARB, have the plans approved before they went forward to the Building Department before they got a building permit. One of the things the ARB will be considering is the factors provided in for 93-75. Basically, it means look at the property, look at the area around it, look at what you are proposing and make sure it is consistent with the history and the architectural style of the house. They don't want you putting a box structure on a Victorian home.

Mayor Pontieri stated: as long as it stays within the historical integrity of the time. I think what Attorney Snead is saying is that if you wanted to extend the back of the building and you proposed a three story cinder block building and painted it white and then said to us from the street this extension in back of the building would stay within the lines of the building so that the architectural integrity that you see from the street—let's say you wanted to do a restaurant and you wanted to build a kitchen in the back, how that is designed to keep in some sense within the lines of the building and the architectural and structural integrity of the building would become important. That is what they would look for you to do. They wouldn't necessarily say no you can't because that defeats the purpose of growth and economic development. But the other side is, they are not going to let you come off the side of the building with something that looks more like the Burlington Coat Factory than the building that you are in. That process just follows the process that we normally follow--the same feeling of the time, so that it would look like the building that is there.

Mr. Shenharvy stated: so if you are going to build out the back and come out the side, you must make it look like the front.

Upon the recommendation of the ARB Board, Trustee Crean made a motion, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, to designate the property at 178 East Main Street as a Historic Landmark.

Trustee Crean stated: it does state that a sign designating "Historic Site" should be posted.

Village Clerk Seal read: Notice is hereby given that a Public Hearing will be held on Tuesday, May 15, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building, 14 Baker Street, Patchogue, New York, by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Patchogue to amend Chapter 563 of the Village Code regarding definitions and word usage. At said Public hearing any person interested will be given the opportunity to be heard.

Deputy Mayor McGiff stated: one of the ongoing problems that Building & Housing Department has encountered within the Code is some of the definitions. Some residents have become more crafty in their efforts to overcrowd certain houses and definitions of kitchens has been stretched to the limit, anything else you can think of, e. g. yards, driveways, parking areas. You will notice a lot of houses in the Village and it looks like the whole front yard has been turned into a parking lot. In an effort to combat that, the Bldg. Dept. led by Mr. Sarich have sat down and addressed this problem—made the code more specific.

Peter Sarich, 14 Baker Street, Patchogue stated: over the course of the last several years we have encountered several problems that were either not clearly addressed in the current Village code, State code, kind of subject to interpretation on our part and on the part of the public. Over the course of the last or four weeks, Carol Giglio, Bldg. & Housing Coordinator, and myself and Paul Feuer our Prosecuting Attorney have gotten together along with Deputy Mayor McGiff to address some of these issues and come up with solutions to these problems that we are having so that we can better serve the public by enforcing the Village codes and certain issues and also assisting in the prosecution of those we charge with violating those codes. There are four proposed changes to the definitions and associated moving around certain things that I would like to go over with you and ask that you consider amending our Village code to include these. The first one that we would like to change it called "kitchen definitions update." When our personnel go into a building and we find that an illegal conversion has been made and there is a kitchen in place, we issue the summons, take them to court, and upon conviction we go back to make certain that the kitchen has been removed. Some other municipalities have accepted just the removal of a stove from an illegal apartment or an illegal kitchen and have been satisfied with that and they sign off on that as no longer a kitchen. What remains is kitchen sinks, kitchen cabinets, dishwashers, everything else remains. And chances are that stove remains in the garage only until we leave. The definition that we currently have is a space of 60 sq.ft. or more in floor area with a minimum of 5 feet used for cooking or preparation of food. That's the definition that we deal with. It goes further to define a kitchen as such a same type of space, but less than 60 sq. ft. What we are asking is to change the definition of a kitchen to any assembly of cabinets, appliances, countertops and plumbing used in connection with the storage, preparation or cooking of food. By making the definition a part of an assembly or grouping of things we can include the kitchen cabinets, the countertops, the sinks and the plumbing leading to all of that and we can clearly order that all that plumbing and all the appurtenances be removed completely and that the space be returned back to what it was. What this allows our inspectors to do is to really get a better guarantee that this isn't going to reoccur. The reason we need this is after someone has been convicted of violating our code, to make it clear as to what extent they have to revert it back to what it was. Sometimes now they just cap the gas line right there or the drain; that could easily be reverted back. When we

issue a plumbing permit it covers water and gas, so we kept it generic so that it could cover any type of plumbing.

Attorney Snead stated .....I would suggest that we hold this hearing for the next meeting.

Mr. Sarich stated: the other issues are destruction of lawn area. Also, Paul Feuer asked we make it a chargeable offense to make an illegal conversion of a space—currently that law is only in the definition section. It is not in a chargeable section. Under the definition of “conventional bedroom” there is a phrase that says a room may not be converted into a conventional bedroom without the permission of the building inspector. That is a very useful tool to us, but it is more useful if it has a separate code so that when we bring someone to court, we are not using the definition section. If one of our inspectors see there are more bedrooms than allowed, they will check the file/records and find out how many bedrooms is supposed to be there. The Village Clerk has those records. The other section has to do with maximum occupancy and dwelling units. Our code addresses a dwelling unit as a group of one or more bedroom spaces. There are additional factors in there that qualify it as a dwelling unit, but what it doesn’t do is address the overcrowding of an individual room. Sometimes we go into three bedrooms and they have an occupancy of six people total. Sometimes we will see one bedroom that by its square footage should hold only two people and will have four people in it. We want to be sure that the dwelling unit, as a whole, is not overcrowded. What we want to do is address if we ever find an area where bunk beds have been stacked up military style and they are renting bed space out. We haven’t had that problem similar to other areas outside the Village, but we want to be prepared if we encounter something like that.

Mayor Pontieri asked: doesn’t there have to be some flexibility in that? There may be a bedroom of a size that may not conform to some of those. One of Dr. Esposito’s houses, the bedroom based upon the square footage there should be one person there; based upon the living arrangement there was a husband and wife.

Mr. Sarich stated: there are certain pre-existing rights that go with every dwelling. There are certain ceilings heights—the second part of the old part of my house would never pass ceiling height, egress windows, but the new addition does. When we know that someone is doing something for profit and are cramming people in there, we want to have the tool at our disposal to really cite them. We have to be more and more specific when we go to court. Everything that we do is subject to challenge. We have been winning a lot and we want to continue to do so and this would help us continue winning.

Attorney Snead stated: I am looking at the maximum requirement and it is pretty specific as to how many people can be in a room with a certain square footage; why do we need any more than that?

Mr. Sarich stated: because it says further down that a dwelling unit is the entire unit.

Attorney Snead stated: a house is a dwelling unit. So that house has three bedrooms and in those bedrooms and in each of those bedrooms you have certain square feet in each room, a maximum occupancy for each room. As I read this, you have a dwelling unit that has a number of rooms of a certain square footage, if we find more individuals in any one of those rooms that violates this requirement, it doesn’t matter how many people are in the house.

Mr. Sarich stated: apparently there has been some question about cases that we brought to court concerning the occupancy of the entire dwelling unit. And there has been some question as to exactly what the occupancy of each individual room was.

Attorney Snead stated: it is actually the very first sentence and not the description. It says the “the maximum number of occupants permitted in any unit.” So it strikes me is that all we need to do is take out that particular sentence.

Mr. Sarich stated: or add an additional sentence that just says “no individual room” because the argument has been this has four bedrooms with an occupancy of eight people. There were six in one bedroom, one bedroom was vacant, and two in the other, and they said they are not overcrowded.

Deputy Mayor McGiff stated: or you will get a lot of situations where there is a family with two children in one bedroom and a couple of single people renting out the other rooms. So as a dwelling itself, they are within the law but the individual rooms they are not. That’s a situation we are seeing a lot of now. I think the family unit in today’s society is so differently defined.

Mr. Sarich stated: whenever the issue of children has come up, infant children sharing a room with their parents, you would expect that they would do that, but when the children get to be 7, 8, 9, 10 years old, usually it is a rental situation in that case. Eventually the family outgrows the room. We certainly look at every case that comes before us. This is really to help us with that blatant attempt to maximize the space by renting out as much space out that they can possibly can.

Deputy Mayor McGiff stated: one of the things that we do is ask each person in that house what they pay, not that it is applicable, but just so that we know this landlord is making a certain amount of money. My mother is one of twelve kids that grew up in a three bedroom house. There are situations like that; that’s not we are talking about here.

Attorney Snead stated: the code defines only two types of units--rooming units and dwelling units. So if you change that first sentence to state if any rooming or dwelling unit, the maximum number of individuals permitted in any one room shall be determined as follows.

Peter Sarich stated: clearly all these are suggestions. I am sure all these need to be tweaked.

Trustee Dean asked: is anybody familiar with any other municipalities with similar legislation, groundbreaking in it approach? Does the town or other villages have something on their books?

Deputy Mayor McGiff stated: I think Lynbrook and places that have been getting aggressive have similar statues.

Peter Sarich stated: I belong to a Chief Buildings Inspectors Organization for all the towns in Suffolk County. I proposed that question to them in a group e-mail and tried to get some answers back.

Mayor Pontieri stated: I appreciate your time with this and the work that your department does with the direction of Deputy Mayor McGiff. It is probably the most important thing we do right now. The quality of life of the entire Village is sometimes predicated on the little day to day things that you guys do. I really do appreciate it.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Krieger, and unanimously carried the Board held the hearing open until May 29<sup>th</sup>...

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried, the Board set a Public Hearing to be held on May 29, 2007, to address the amend definitions of Sections 55 and 56.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Dean, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, the Board rescheduled Public Hearing to amend various provisions of Chapter 93 Article 7 of the Village code regarding commercial signage and illumination to be held on May 29<sup>th</sup>.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Crean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request for the Village Clerk to receive and collect the 2007/2008 Village tax roll in the amount of \$7,269,952.21 without penalty until July 2, 2007.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Crean, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request to remove from the 2007/08 tax roll, account #2667 in the amount of \$1,334.96 for Village owned property located at 48 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mayor Pontieri stated: that is a piece of property that the County which had been taken on take lien, turned over to the Village, and we will be renovating that house for sale as an affordable house under the Affordable Housing Program. This will be the 4<sup>th</sup> house. On South Ocean Ave., just past Park Street, the second house in that has cedar shakes, was a home picked up under tax sale that the County turned over to us 4-5 years ago and under Mayor Ihne, that house was renovated also to the condition that it is in now and we will do the same with this one also. In both of the other cases it was done as affordable homes for young couples. This is just a way for us to continue that.

Marian Russo stated: we have received notification from the County that we should be receiving a release of funds in the next few weeks and once we get that we can begin the project. I would estimate by the end of July or beginning of August, we should get that work started. It will be a lottery, the same procedure that we did for the houses on Wiggins and Ocean. It has the same requirements as was done at Copper Beech—the income limits at 80%.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Dean, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request to add to the 2007/2008 tax roll account #3092 in the amount of \$1,152.08 for property owned by Ram Associates located at 111 West Avenue.

Mayor Pontieri stated: that is the train parking lot just south of Claire Rose. That was a Village parking lot. With the expansion of the sewer plant which will happen sometime next January or February, we swapped with Clare Rose that property and they gave us the property on South Street which is contiguous to the sewer plant so that by doing that we didn't have to spend any of that money for property to be able to expand the plant to go from its current size of 500,000 to 1.2 million.

Mayor Pontieri stated: one of the things you have heard a little bit about tonight which Sr. Bldg. Inspector Sarich has been talking about is a General Code. It is what I am going to ask Village Clerk Seal to talk a little about because it is what she has been involved in. Our Code book is thick and much of what is in there is outdated; there are sections of the Code that we don't address and use anymore. We are contracting with General Code to do a re-codification of the code--to go through and clean it up, thereby making it more usable.

Village Clerk Seal stated: I met with the representatives of General Code on another matter and they happened to bring this up. I found in my term here as Village Clerk that there are times when looking for something in the code it is not the easiest read. They brought this proposal to us which I gave to the Mayor and it is before you tonight. What they are proposing to do is go completely through, chapter by chapter, and make recommendations to the Board—if there are redundancies, clean it up, and then the Board would sit with the Village Attorney and go through it and decide what maybe needs to be tweaked, what needs to be left out, redundancies that may need to be consolidated, and what they will do then will completely do that and with the recommendation of the Board do bring the entire code up to today's standards. They are explaining that we have 202 supplements right now in our code; that is the most on Long Island from what I've understood. We have it for thirty something years and have never re-codified in all that time. I know that the Village Attorney as well as the efforts of Bldgs. and Housing (of course, those which are most pertinent as to what is going on now). This would allow the entire code to be look at and be re-codified. It would be in a much friendlier way of understanding. It would be a different format and a different size. They are proposing 40 code books, as well as putting it on line, updating the E-code with editorial analysis, proofreading, formatting and indexing for a price not to exceed \$15,000. That would be 40 new books; currently there are 37 in distribution. This would completely rejuvenate and make the code much more readable.

Mayor Pontieri stated: there are sections of the code which are now superseded by NYS cost and that we still have in our book that needs to be cleaned up or taken out. I think it is \$15,000 well spent. It will be a great advantage to us within the court system as Peter indicated today.

Attorney Snead stated: when they make recommendations of things that need to be changed, I would review, Peter would review sections of it and then make recommendations to the Board of which to adopt or not adopt. Anything we would then change would have to be done at a Public Hearing, but obviously, it would be the entire document. The document would be on file at the Village Clerk.

Mayor Pontieri stated: what we would probably do for those things related to the Planning Board and the ARB, they would come in and meet with those boards and review those recommendations with those Boards so that we would get recommendation from those individuals Boards back based upon what changes that they are looking to make. The same thing when you are looking at the building code or housing code; they would sit with the building and/or housing inspectors at different times to talk about those recommendations. Before those recommendations would come back to us, I would look for the individual Boards and departments to have their input. And then we as a Board would meet with them and discuss. Then those Trustees, McGiff and Devlin, who work with specific Boards, would then be meeting with them also concurrently to advise us as to what pieces.

Village Clerk Seal stated: General Code advised us to put together such a team as the Mayor is talking about. They will give us suggestions and then it is up to the Board to decide if they want it changed or not. It's actually about a year process. The submission of a manuscript analysis is within 240 days of the authorization to proceed. Once it is submitted by us as far as our changes, it is about 60 days after that.

Trustee Dean stated: we are working on storm water legislation which I don't think fits into any of existing slots so just make them aware. This is a fairly lengthy addition to the code.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Hilton, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request to hire General Code to do a complete re-codification of the Village Code at a cost not to exceed \$15,000 which includes 40 new Code books and updated E-Code.

Mayor Pontieri stated: we have a request by the owners of 37 Jennings whose property because a recommendation of the Zoning Board back in 1977 put certain covenants on the property, one of them was in regards to an age restriction. I would like to send this back to the Zoning Board of Appeals and have them make a recommendation as to whether we should or should not lift the covenant.

Barbara and Jim Templeton, 37 Jennings Avenue, stated: we own the building and are in contract and it has become a bank issue. If the covenant is not lifted, the building will become un-sellable. It has really caused us a severe hardship. There are not a lot of 62 year olds around that have the kind of money that is required to rent the apartments. It is a legal 5 and it is a two story. The buyer's bank has taken an issue and will not give him the mortgage until this covenant is reversed. It precludes a tremendous amount of rental population and it makes it very difficult to keep the place filled. We purchased the building three years ago and also acquired two tenants that did not fit the age requirement, one of which who is 53 and has been there 11 years. We had a personal mortgage with the seller and, therefore, did not involve a bank back then; it wasn't an issue. The buyer's bank that extended him twice, leaves us at a critical point right now. They felt it was age discriminatory and also thought it would complicate him getting tenants in, thereby he could not make his mortgage payments. The bank extended it until June 7<sup>th</sup>.

No B.I.D. report.

No Chamber of Commerce report.

Trustee Krieger stated: right now the Theatre is giving a dance recital for the next month. I want to thank Code Officers for their work on the weekends. We have gotten a lot of compliments from merchants as well as the Theatre. I also want to thank Alex Russo who volunteered his services when I couldn't make it down there. Alex is a volunteer at the Theatre and it is just another example of how the people at the Theatre express their feelings about the Theatre and the Village of Patchogue. They do a great job.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Krieger, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request to purchase two additional video cameras from Electronix Systems for the outside rear area of the Patchogue Theatre at a cost not to exceed \$5,500.

Trustee Krieger stated: this is for additional security behind the Theatre. We want people to come into the Village to park in the back and use the alleyways into Main Street. We want them to be secure back there. Those cameras will be monitored in the Theatre for evenings when there are events in the Theatre for people to feel safer in and out.

Trustee Crean stated: the Annual Meeting for the B.I.D. will be held June 5<sup>th</sup> at 4 p.m. where they will elect certain Directors and talk in detail about adopted budget. It is earmarked \$30,000 and nearly 20% of their budget for the next five years will be going towards the dredging of the river. Hopefully, it will appease some of the riverfront property owners who asked, "What do I get from the B.I.D.?" It's a direct correlation to the success of the marinas of the river that funding will go towards dredging.

Trustee Crean stated: I would like to thank the Village Clerk and assistants for a Village mapping project, City Map Project. They are going out and getting advertisements from downtown and riverfront businesses to fund and pay for a map of the Greater Patchogue area. It is not just the Village, but the entire Patchogue area. It will note points of interests, ferry terminals, train station. It's a revision of one that was drafted a couple of years ago in which there were quite a number of errors that needed to be corrected. And it will also include a number of new streets within our Village from Copper Beech and Bay Village.

Trustee Hilton stated: I would like to report that we have started the removal of the asbestos roof at the Halycon Manor, future home of Recreation. It is going very well. The pump house pool project has been held up by the Suffolk County Health Department who has withheld their approval. Some problems that resulted in 1954 where the discharge of the pool goes into the Bay and we are giving them a timetable of when we will fix that. In today's pools the discharge goes into a holding tank and is slowly fed back into the system; the way we have it now, it just goes back into the Bay. In the long run, it will save money because we will not be using as much chlorine and water, but at this point, this was something that was in Phase II of the fixing of the pool which is the pool structure itself. Right now we were just looking to bring the pump house to date. We need to give them an engineering plan for the reconstruction of the pool.

Trustee Hilton stated: right now I would like to put on hold request to hire Crystal Pizzolla as dock security.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Hilton, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried the Board approved request for Tutor Time of East Patchogue to use Shorefront Park for field days, July 6<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> and August 10<sup>th</sup>.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Hilton, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request for the Greater Patchogue Chamber of Commerce to hold their annual Carnival Days Sidewalk Sales on July 5, 6 and 7. They are also asking for security, Code.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Hilton, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request for Long Island Head Start to hold their 2<sup>nd</sup> annual end of the year celebration on June 15<sup>th</sup> with a rain date of June 18<sup>th</sup>. They are asking to have Church Street closed down west of the parking lot, as the group of our children is 3 to 4 years old. Request for tent has been denied.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request to re-appoint Brian Egan as Special Prosecutor.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried the Board approved request for raises for part-time Village employees effective 6/1/07 as per list submitted.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Crean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request for the Van Guard Hose Company #1 to hold their annual Pot O'Gold Raffle with amplified music on June 10<sup>th</sup> from noon to 6 p.m. at Firemen's Park

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Crean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request for an outdoor/live music permit for the Tiki Bar/Club House located at the West Bank Marina on the Patchogue River. It is

currently zoned E-Industrial and is within the proposed Waterfront Development zone. Mr. Bruemmer assures us that he is going to end the music earlier than 11 p.m. as is mandated in the Village code.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Hilton, and unanimously carried, the Board set a Public Hearing on May 29, 2007, to consider amending Village Code Chapter 48-4 with regard to fire prevention fees and permits.

Upon a motion made by Deputy Mayor McGiff, seconded by Trustee Dean, and unanimously carried, the Board approved request by Pentecostal Church Refuge of Salvation, Inc. to have outside church services in their parking lot on Railroad Avenue on July 20, 21 and 22, between 7-10 pm on Friday and Saturday, and 5-9 pm on Sunday.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Dean, seconded by Trustee Hilton, and unanimously carried, the Board approved a change order for 14 Baker Street Construction Project of \$96,791 to bury lines, subject to architect's approval. We are going to have to move light poles on east side of building; it is an OSHA requirement and not something that we foresaw. The choice was between moving the poles and burying the lines; we have opted to burying the lines which makes more sense. We have to bury the electric lines, Verizon lines, fiberoptic lines, there is electrician costs for the installation of conduit with all the lines to run through, all the splicing that has to go on once it is back inside the building, so it is a substantial cost, but this will clean up our services. About \$40,000 might be reimbursable through the Caithness money. It's not all that bad, once we get that back. There was \$25,000 already budgeted for that work order.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Dean, seconded by Trustee Hilton, and unanimously carried the Board authorized the Mayor to enter into a contract between the Village and the Hess Corp. for the use of the Hess property for the spoils/dewatering site for the dredging portions of the Patchogue River.

Mayor Pontieri stated: the expectation for the North Ocean Avenue project is that it should be completed by late June, the latest by July 1. They will be pouring sidewalks over the next couple of days. And probably on the 28<sup>th</sup> of this month, they will tear up the road bed for repaving and light poles will be going up at that time also. It has been a lot of inconvenience to a lot of store owners and residents, but unfortunately, that is a part of reconstruction.

Public to be Heard: None

Upon a motion made by Trustee Crean, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff, and unanimously carried, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:10 p.m.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Crean, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff and unanimously carried, the Board returned from Executive Session at 10 p.m. No action was taken.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Crean, seconded by Deputy Mayor McGiff and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.