

Minutes of the **VILLAGE BOARD MEETING** of the Board of Trustees of the Village/Town of Mount Kisco held on Monday, October 22, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Frank J. DiMicco Board Room, Village Hall, 104 Main Street, Mount Kisco, New York.

Present: Mayor Gina Picinich  
Deputy Mayor Jean Farber  
Trustee Isidoro Albanese  
Trustee Peter Grunthal  
Trustee Karen Schleimer

Also Present: Whitney Singleton, Village Attorney

Absent: Edward Brancati, Village Manager

Mayor Picinich opened the Village Board Meeting and asked everyone to rise for the pledge of allegiance. She asked everyone to please remain standing for a moment and for everyone to consider that all of us who sit at this Board table are very grateful for all of those in our community who are using their voice to share with us what they believe to be the needs of our community. We greatly appreciate how engaged people are in all that is going on in our community and we thank you.

Continuation of a Public Hearing to discuss a proposed Solar Energy Law

Mayor Picinich stated that we have received feedback from our Planning Board and that feedback was incorporated into the most recent document that was published on-line on Friday. There were a few changes mostly making sure that in removing Tier 2 and trying to incorporate them in Tier 1 we were not just getting rid of Tier 2 and absorbing it into Tier 1. The recommendation from the Planning Board was that all solar panels on structure must serve as a roof to be incorporated into to Tier 1 and the panels themselves should not exceed the total square footage on 750 sq.ft.

Village Attorney Singleton replied in addition to that, by virtue of it being an accessory structure, it cannot be between the house and the street and it cannot be in a required side yard.

Mr. Brian Liebman read the following statement into the record.

I would like to take a minute and cut through some of the rhetoric that has been thrown around these past few weeks. One of the major selling points for the Oakwood project from those who advocate for it has been that if a solar farm were to be constructed in the cemetery then it would have direct ecological benefit because along with the solar panels Oakwood would be able to include a pollinator garden on their property which they do not currently have.

The term Pollinators, as far as I am aware, is a term referring to long grasses and wildflowers. They are wonderful no doubt, but it's nothing particularly exotic, and if Oakwood or anyone in the town is interested in allowing for pollinators all they have to do is to stop mowing sections of their grass as often or as short or perhaps not at all, and if they want to cultivate certain flowers like we have on the Peninsula a simple application of some seed should suffice.

The Town's new No-Mow zones which I complimented last week and am continuously impressed by, are a great example of what happens when select grassy areas are left to grow without interference. So, I see absolutely no reason why the installation of a solar farm has anything to do with Oakwood or anyone else starting a pollinator garden.

I also have two technical points I'd like to bring up with the current revisions to the law.

The first is that the definition of Tier III solar energy systems is very general and non-specific. In fact, I think it's fair to call it a "catch-all definition." As defined it is:

Tier 3 Solar Energy Systems are systems that are not included in the list for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Solar Energy Systems, or any Tier 1 or 2 system that does not comply with the applicable regulations.

I can't anticipate the future, but this definition seems to open the door for many potential loopholes in future proposals as solar designs and technology trends change. I think a more rigorous and constructive definition would be far more secure.

Secondly, for those who have advocated that Mount Kisco should try and steer solar development onto parking lot canopies, if this is something the board sees as something desirable then it would also make sense that a "tier type" could be specifically defined and regulated for that application.

Please do not take these points as indication that I'm in any way in favor of this law being passed, but if you are determined to pass it I do think it could be improved on these two aspects. Thank you.

Mr. Robert Rosenthal (Guard Hill Manor) one of the first things that I noticed in this law is that if a solar panel is in a protected area and if you redefine what purposes are allowed in that protected area for certain use then it would be permissible to be used. I think it is important to keep in context what really a protected area would be in a conservation area or a preservation area. I do think it's important that we do define what are permitted uses in order for us to use the areas, but also to not expand so much so that every time that we want to have something put in a preservation district that the purpose for preservation district disappears because we just have hundreds of definitions of permitted uses. The other thing I'd like to bring up is that there are a lot of different designs right now for solar panels and solar panel systems. It's all up in the air and depending on what technology ends up being the predominate type of systems that people might use could really determine the characteristics that are going to be permissible and I don't think that has been determined yet. I know that there are a number of companies on the west coast that are developing systems and they are not necessarily compatible with the east coast systems. So it could end up being down the road you try to implement something that might not be compatible. I think there needs to be some clarification regarding how these private systems integrate into the main grid. With the understanding that the power that is coming from a central source can then be sold to people, at some point it is going to have to connect to the main grid. So even though it is a private system and it is going to be handled through the purchaser and the supplier. It should be important to keep into account that it is not going to effect anyone else's power and that there is a system set in place so that the State and local authorities have the proper participation and making sure that there are not issues with anyone else's power who are not participating in the private purchase of electricity. Those were the main things that I saw as an issue, just making sure that we clarify what is going to be private in nature, where the line between what people are currently using if they are using Con Ed or if they are getting public utility. Where the line is, where the participation is so that we understand that we are not going to have a compromised electrical grid because we want to start using private companies to get less expensive power. We just want to make sure that everyone's power supply is going to be safe. Thank you.

Ms. Shona Noronha stated the last time I spoke I presented three (3) very important points which I see are not reflected in these changes. I also took a very close look at one of the documents that was presented on solar energy and I was kind of surprised that some of the comments that were put in or the changes that were made were rather confusing. So I want to raise three points again to make it short and simple. The first one is that we need a really clear definition of Tier 1, 2, and 3. I know that you all had decided to abandon Tier 2, but I think it's very important because if Tier 1 is roof top and end at 750 sq. ft. then we need another Tier to take care of more than 750 sq. ft. Because, as you know from the numerous emails you've received, there is the possibility of commercial enterprises putting a canopy over their parking and using the canopy as a top for solar panels and that might well exceed 750 sq. ft. So I'm recommending that like in the previous version, the NYSERDA version, there was a Tier 2 for anything in the 1,000 square foot range I would say let's be a little more specific and cover from 750 upwards on roof or structured installations.

Trustee Grunthal replied I believe the 750 sq. ft. applies to accessory structures not the main structure.

Ms. Noronha replied ok so that has to be expanded because there will be some that fall beyond 750 sq. ft.

Mayor Picinich replied that roof top does not have a size limit, accessory structures have a size limit and that is 750 sq. ft. anything beyond that would then go to Tier 3 because that would need to go through planning and a special permit process.

Ms. Noronha replied I'm suggesting that the original language put in by NY State has some significance because a commercial outfit may have their roof top structure of 750 feet, but may want to put on top of their parking lot, which may be more than 750 feet which would be considered an accessory structure in order to make that happen.

Mayor Picinich replied again that is why that would go to a Tier 3.

Ms. Noronha replied we have to be really specific in a Tier 3 that we don't just mean ground mounted that we also mean structure mounted. This is nowhere in the language of the revised version.

Mayor Picinich replied I believe what it says is anything that is not Tier 1 and defined in Tier 1 would be considered Tier 3.

Ms. Noronha replied that may be the case, but if you read all of the sub-sections which refer to the removal of trees, etc. it really is a carry over. You have taken legacy from the Tier 3 language, brought it into the new document, and left out the word "ground

mounted" because you wanted to incorporate. That is fine I am just saying it is not clear and it needs further clarification.

Ms. Noronha stated one of my points last time, and I am sorry to raise it again, is that Tier 3 is such an important decision that has to be made and I had suggested that Tier 3 be voted upon by our elected Village Board. The reason for that was dual, one we voted for you therefore we expect that you will do the right thing for our community. It also reflects our conversation and the gift that we share of collaboration and therefore I think the cost here could change the nature of what our Village looks like right now. I think that is the reason that Tier 3 applications after the Board has received information from the CAC, the Planning Board, the Building Department, and whatever other boards you want to name to be the ones who vote on it. This time I am suggesting that the vote be a super majority. That is four (4) out of the five (5) of you would have to be in favor of the application because I feel every strongly about how Tier 3 is going to change the nature of our Village. The second reason for requesting you to put this in is because it will take the weight off of so many of our expert volunteers here in this group who serve on the other committees and the perception that they are doing something selfishly would be lifted from them. I want such wonderful people who serve our community to be received and recognized for the efforts they have made. I have another point with regards to the silent residents of our Village and those are the trees. I know that at the last meeting one of the people vested in a project mentioned that a tree mitigation plan was a little round about in the previous version. I took a close look at this recent version and I saw that you have included pollinator gardens as mitigation for trees. I am requesting you all to imagine that there are five (5) green spaces in our town which were identified previously and if each of those places had to remove 200 trees in total 1,000 trees would be gone, I don't think five (5) pollinator gardens are going to be the right substitute for 1,000 trees. I want you to remember that there is more than the life of animals, birds, and insects, it is human lives that will be changed because of how the wind blows and other conditions. How rain falls on the trees and what trees do to prevent problems. I want you to reconsider the mitigation plan because we do not want pollinator gardens to take care of the trees that will be removed. I want to see somewhere in the law that trees are going to be planted for every tree that is taken away. The third point, is a point that somebody at the last public hearing mentioned, and that was that the companies involved in providing the service should have insurance to cover any health hazard that takes place due to large, industrial-scale solar farms and I request you think about it and include it in your next version. I hope we will have a chance to review another version before it goes up for vote and I hope you will bear in mind these three (3) important points that I think are my points, but I think are also the points of others as well. Thank you very much.

Mr. John Rhodes, Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Council thanked the Board of Trustees for all of their hard work on this matter. I sat in on one of your work sessions, which was almost four (4) hours long, and I realize that you are really trying to do the right thing here and trying to cover all of the points. It is a very complicated matter and I do appreciate you digging in to all of the details and spending those hours. I did notice that you have included some of the comments made by the CAC from the last meeting such as the coverage limits for the PD and CD zone and that was very important. That was one of the things that we noticed could kind of explode the size of these installations if it wasn't put right and I really appreciate that.

Mr. Rhodes presented the following points that were discussed at the last CAC meeting and if I'm going to interject any of my own opinions, I'll try to identify those as being my own and not those of the consensus of the CAC.

The CAC supports very strongly any well thought out plan to increase the use of alternative energy in our town and believe that portions of this law regarding roof top solar are a big step in the right direction. Larger facilities can obviously create much greater challenges in terms of environmental impacts. We want to ensure that everything possible is being considered in the creation of this law to avoid or effectively remediate any adverse unintended consequences. Because when you get something that is this complicated, and also involves new technology, there are always some sort of unintended consequences. We want to minimize those and we want to be able to think in terms of creating a law that is going to box in those unintended consequences. That is why the combining of the larger rooftop with the ground based industrial-scale solar was important to me as they really have to be separate. It's really a totally different type of animal and in terms of how you are going to define it in the law. In this latest draft there are things in the tier qualifications that obviously don't apply to rooftop or garage installations. I think the criteria for them and the qualifications and the screening criteria that the Planning Board or anybody else is going to have to apply to them are going to be very different and they should be clearly differentiated. I thought at the Work Session Meeting when the Board was talking about the larger rooftop and garage type installations like the ones at Manhattan Village College that those some way would be included in Tier 1 because they were the same type of animal even though they were larger and even though they would require possible construction approval and engineering studies. Still, it was a different type of animal from the ground based one because the environmental concerns are totally different and the criteria for approval are totally different. So that confused me and I read it several times and I said all

of these things don't apply to the larger rooftop solar. One place where that really tweaked me a little bit, before we had been talking about basically for the Tier 3 ground based solar only being in PD and CD and there are a few possible properties in town for that. All of those properties are in the PD and CD zones. So it really doesn't make sense to have Tier 3 Solar in terms of avoiding future unintended consequences and other things that could happen with land speculation and different Boards. You could be in a situation where somebody could aggregate things in a hospital zone or in a commercial zone and it is allowed under the law. All of those zones that are not really practically suitable for large ground based solar should be removed from Tier 3. But now when we are lumping the larger roof type systems into Tier 3 then it becomes kind of confused. It should be a separate classification and specification for the larger rooftop solar, especially if we are thinking and as many people have already speculated, that some of the new super markets going in might have covered parking lots and put solar there. That's really a different type of animal from the ground based solar, which requires very stringent and careful environmental look to make sure that it is doing what we want. This looks like there were some very good things in this revised draft, but unfortunately, we only had the weekend to review it. Hopefully, we will be able to take a closer look at this and any other revisions that you are going to make at your work session meeting and be able to give you some final comments and recommendations on that. We have a lot of expertise available to us and we would like to make sure that you have the benefit of that expertise. With regards to the setbacks and borders. In the original PD zoning which was made in collaboration with the people at Oakwood and the other cemeteries because there is lots of language in there that refers to and reflects the needs and concerns of the cemetery. The offsets in the rear of those properties (cemetery or golf courses), basically, in the existing law says that the setback in the rear for any sort of construction should be a minimum of 50 feet. I know that in the original and in the current draft the setback in PD is set at 25 feet and that concerns me. Why is it being done and in many cases it's really not going to be enough. The specific recommendation of the CAC was that it be maintained at 50 feet because right now there is an important wild life corridor in the back of that property along the tracks there, which is the only connection between the two (2) largest wet lands in all of Mount Kisco. If you look at the maps that have been prepared by Westchester Land Trust that area is shown as a connector, which is very important because when you have large wooded or wetland areas the connections between them are very important to maintain diversity and wildlife. There is no logical explanation as to why it couldn't be maintained at 50 feet. There might be some additional costs to the developer because they would have to move that solar farm 25 feet or more up to the east and that would involve relocating the cart path. There are some tradeoffs for what we are trying to do. The purpose of the PD areas is basically to preserve nature resources and scenic beauty for the continued maintenance of the quality of the environment. I don't know what fits that definition more than a wildlife corridor linking the two (2) largest wetlands in the town. I think that's really important for you to consider. I'm sure because the Village is making modifications in the PD area to the advantage of private land owners and that I don't think it's a burden to require that those original reasons for the PD zoning, the continued maintenance and the quality of the environment be included. This is a wildlife corridor and any private landowner can simply put a sign there saying no hiking allowed and no hiking would be allowed. All environmental organizations agree that these connectors and wildlife corridors are really essential to maintain the environment in our town. We are asking you to maintain that 50 foot buffer, which is in the law right now in terms of the rear borders of PD zone. We are looking forward to seeing a revised version of the solar law that will hopefully have a clearer definition in terms of Tier 3 between the ground based and larger based facility. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Robert Liebman read the following statement into the record.

The current controversy in Mount Kisco over the siting of a solar farm in Oakwood Cemetery and a law that would allow solar farms to be located on properties zoned as Preservation District or Conservation Development District and several other zones is sort of a microcosm of what has occurred in many parts of New York State where the siting of solar farms on farmland has created controversy. In response to this controversy over siting solar farms on farmland NYSERDA announced this past spring that companies that kept renewable energy projects off farmland would be rewarded by receiving bonus points that would move their projects higher on the list of projects seeking approval. This action was supported by environmental organizations such as Clearwater and The Nature Conservancy. In effect, the action by NYSERDA encourages the siting of solar projects on landfills and other brownfield sites and on parking lot canopies and rooftops. This action by NYSERDA should be used for guidance in drafting a solar energy law for Mount Kisco. Our solar energy law still requires considerable revision to direct solar panels to be placed on rooftops, brownfields, and parking lot canopies rather than in green areas of the village. The law should certainly not allow solar farms to be built in Preservation Districts or Conservation Development Districts. As the law stands now, solar farms could be constructed in two cemeteries, on the grounds of a golf course, and on a forested property that borders Route 172 and Sarles Street and two other properties zoned CD. The law should exclude solar farms from these types of properties, which include a significant portion of Mount Kisco's green open space and undeveloped land. The Village Board should

follow the lead of NYSERDA when it comes to siting solar and revise this law to protect all green space in the village.

In my interpretation of what has transpired, the Village Board has made a fundamental error in drafting this solar energy law. Rather than starting out with the aim of protecting green spaces from the installation of solar panels the Village Board started out with the aim of passing a law to allow a solar farm to be sited in Oakwood Cemetery which is zoned as a Preservation District. To accomplish this, the law has been written to allow solar farms in areas zoned as Preservation Districts and other districts including Conservation Development Districts. So rather than protecting green spaces, the law opens up green spaces to solar developers who want to construct solar farms.

Mount Kisco has very limited brownfield areas for solar, but has an abundance of rooftops and parking lots which could be used. The flat roofs of apartment buildings and commercial buildings would seem to be particularly suitable for solar power. Parking lot canopies with solar panels could be constructed on both parking lots owned by the Village and on commercial parking lots. These canopies cannot only provide electricity from solar panels, but also keep cars cooler on sunny days in the summer which makes getting into the cars more pleasant and reduces the need for air conditioning in cars and therefore saves energy. The solar canopies also reduce the heating of the parking lot surface by solar radiation and thereby help reduce the heat island effect. An example of parking lot canopies with solar panels is a project in a General Electric parking lot in the Schenectady area. This solar project contains 6,800 solar panels, almost twice the number that the Oakwood Cemetery solar farm would have. What better place for solar than a parking lot. There is no loss of parking spaces and there are additional benefits as noted above. There are no tradeoffs, nothing to mitigate, only benefits.

Locating solar farms in cemeteries, on golf courses, and on undeveloped forested land in Mount Kisco makes little sense and is unnecessary. A good solar energy law would not allow solar farms to be constructed in these locations. A good solar energy law would be aimed to direct solar panel installation exclusively to rooftops, brownfields, and parking lot canopies. This should be the aim of our solar energy law. To write a good solar energy law I would recommend attending a workshop being held at Pace University law school on the morning of November 16, 2018. The workshop which is titled Managing Solar in Your Community--Resources and Assistance for Local Governments which will be aimed at helping communities prepare for larger scale solar installations such as we are dealing with here. The workshop will feature case studies with Westchester County municipalities and a presentation from NYSERDA dealing with everything from permitting and zoning to NYSERDA's new Municipal Solar Procurement Toolkit. This is a very timely workshop from the perspective of Mount Kisco and it would be wise not to pass any solar energy law until after this workshop takes place. Thank you.

Mr. Mark Farrell (Oakwood Cemetery) my comments are very limited. In addition to the language of the proposed zoning changes specifically addressing district regulations for Preservation District 110.6B 2 C 3 having to do with the setback. The setback is 25 feet which I'm not taking issue with, but fencing has been included as improvements to be kept 25 feet from the property line and I don't understand why that is. That just moves everything in. As I understand it the arias and panels need to be a certain distance from the fence, so if we cannot have the fence on the property line then the entire project shifts which will impact more property if it's to stay the same size. I think the size as it is proposed may be the minimum size to make it viable. I don't know why the fence is being proposed and that it must stay 25 feet off of the property line. Is there a reason for that, I can't address the reason for that if I don't know it. So I'm just suggesting that the fence should be allowed to be on the property line, like people can do with fencing. We have fences on property lines throughout this entire Village.

Trustee Grunthal replied perhaps that was something that wasn't thought about and it didn't cross anybody's mind in the drafting and that's something that we can take a look at.

Mr. Farrell stated in response to a statement that was made earlier this evening. It was suggested that Oakwood Cemetery participated in the drafting of the Preservation District Zoning language, which came about in the 1980's. I was not involved in Oakwood then, but several of our Trustees were, no one has ever suggested on our side that it was a product of a collaborative effort and I think evidence of it not being a collaborative effort if you go back about 10 years and the history of litigation and applications. It was not something that we sought or helped to draft. Thank you.

There were no other comments from the public.

Mayor Picinich stated that we had received the draft on Friday and I know that there were more things for us to discuss. I don't think we can consider this a final draft. I think we have to meet again as a Board. I'd like for us to identify a date right now for a work session because we certainly cannot close a public hearing until we have a final draft. So I would like to propose meeting next Tuesday, October 30<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 pm for a work session meeting. All Board members were available to meet for the work session meeting.

Mayor Picinich proposed that the Village Board of Trustees review what we currently have and which we've had since the end of last week. I'd like for all of the Trustees to send an email to all of us and include Mr. Brancati and Mr. Singleton and we can have a conversation in email so that we can have a solid draft to work from. I'd like to recommend that we get these in to Mr. Singleton in the next day or two please.

Village Attorney Singleton stated perhaps it would be better to re-circulate clean versions of this so that you can review them and I'll incorporate the comments that were made at tonight's meeting.

Trustee Schleimer asked that Village Planner Jan Johannessen also be asked to join this meeting.

Village Attorney Singleton stated that he would like to make a few comments in response to a couple of things that were stated this evening for clarification. We did not change definitions, those are the definitions that came from the State and we did not change what is and what is not a Tier 1 or Tier 3 System. We simply inserted the numbers that were left blank by the State. That was the form that was put out by NYSERDA. The only thing that we have done is we've taken away ground mounted systems in residential districts and anything that is not on a roof top, that's in a commercial district is going to go to the Planning Board for their review of a site plan. So if there is a parking lot that's going to have carport tops that's going to be reviewed with a public hearing by the Planning Board to make sure that there is no adverse impacts on adjoining properties. Any Tier 3 system is going to go to the Planning Board. My recommendation to the Mayor was that Town Board's are getting away from issuing special use permits because they are too political in that fashion, people are always looking for assistance, people are always looking to twist somebody's arm. It could lead to the appearance of impropriety or preference and you select the Planning Board to review your planning applications and it was my recommendation to the Mayor that it remain with the Planning Board so that it does not become political, because this Board is a political Board, and the Planning Board is not.

Mayor Picinich stated that this public hearing will remain open. We will continue to take comments with reference to this proposed solar energy law, the draft as it exists is currently on line.

**1. Communications:**

- a. Email from Chandreyee Mitra Grants Manager for JCY Westchester re: Westchester County CDBG applications.

Ms. Mitra, Grants Manager for JCY-Westchester Community Partners, a division of the Family Service Society of Yonkers notified the Board of Trustees and discussed their application for funding for a Westchester County CDBG grant to offer Reading Buddies After School program in the Bedford Central School District. The possibility of Reading Buddies After School being offered in nearby Bedford Hills schools besides the elementary schools in Mount Kisco was discussed. JCY-Westchester Community Partners also informed the Board of their volunteer mentor outreach efforts. The Board suggested flyers be put up in the local Library. Ms. Mitra noted that if the JCY-Westchester Community Partners received the CDBG it would be the district's decision as to which particular school they feel would benefit the most from this service.

- b. Letter from the Mount Kisco Chamber of Commerce re: Annual Village Tree Lighting Ceremony request.

The following motion was offered by Deputy Mayor Farber and seconded by Trustee Schleimer authorizing the Chamber of Commerce to hold their Annual Village Tree Lighting Ceremony on November 30, 2018 at 6:00 pm; all in favor.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

- c. Letter from Jerome Linser of the Mt. Kisco Hebrew Congregation re: Menorah Lighting request.

The following motion was offered by Deputy Mayor Farber and seconded by Trustee Grunthal authorizing the Mount Kisco Hebrew Congregation to hold their annual Menorah Lighting Ceremony on December 2, 2018 at 6:00 pm; all in favor.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye

**2. Petitions: None.****3. Board, Committee and Commission Reports:****a. Beautification Committee Presentation – Residential Garden Contest and Flower Basket Award.**

Mrs. Joan Stewart, Chairperson of the Mount Kisco Beautification Committee announced the Winners of the 2018 Residential Garden Contest.

1st Place tie: Barbara Cutri, Croton Avenue  
Sky Albert, Tripp Street

2<sup>nd</sup> Place: Jose Alvarez, Forest Drive

Honorable Mentions:

Mr. and Mrs. Buegler, Ward Avenue

Mr. and Mrs. Pieragostini, Woodland Street

200 Diplomat Drive Corporation

Mrs. Stewart announced the winner of the 2018 Flower Basket Award is Suburban Floors located at 232 Lexington Avenue.

Mayor Picinich thanked the Beautification Committee for facilitating all of this and to all of the award winners. Thank you so much for contributing to the beauty of our community, we greatly appreciate the contributions that have been made.

Trustee Albanese presented the following video showing all of the areas in the Village that have recently been adopted and beautified by volunteers in our community. Trustee Albanese stated next year we will be adopting seven (7) additional places in the Village to beautify along with adding benches donated by people that will be placed throughout town for people to sit on.



**Mount Kisco beautification**

<https://vimeo.com/297123615>

**b. Finance Committee Meeting update.**

Mayor Picinich reviewed what had been discussed at the last Finance Committee meeting. Our Treasurer Robert Wheeling reported on our interest earnings to date. The total interest earned as of 10/4/18 is \$71,000 and we were budgeted at \$27,000 so we have substantially exceeded budget favorably by \$44,000 already. A lot of that was due to the investment that we made in NYCLASS. Also based upon having the leverage by investing in NYCLASS we had negotiating power to go back to the banks and renegotiate some of our rates with them. Right now, we are in a very good position with reference to interest and that is additional interest that wasn't planned.

Mayor Picinich stated we also had a conversation about garbage trucks (large vs. small). We need to be making some purchases because some of our trucks are very old. The notion was if we get smaller trucks that will only pickup in the Village and then we are able to transfer that garbage to some larger transporter or carter and they could remove it out of the Village for us. The first look at the numbers actually showed that it would not be a cost savings, but in fact actually cost us money. Because we would need to pay for the carting and also pay for someone to be on site managing the transfer of the garbage. The Finance Committee stated there may be some other solutions for garbage and how we handle different types of trucks that we could be looking at to improve the effectiveness and efficiency. One of the members of the Finance Committee came up with a variety of models and different variables, so this conversation is going to continue. At first blush, it appeared that it was not cost effective; we are going to go at it again and continue the conversation.

Mayor Picinich reported that the Finance Committee also reviewed the water projects. This was the spreadsheet that had already been approved by the Village Board, it was the \$20 million dollars over 20 years financing. Bottom line everyone agreed it was a solid model and that we should move forward. This Board already approved the \$10.5 million to cover the projects that are now happening on Mountain Avenue and North Bedford Road.

Mayor Picinich reported that Capital Projects were reviewed and over the next 15 to 20 year financing, we have about \$19 million in capital projects. Included in that projection were funds for the Firehouses, Streetscape Improvements, Police/Court Facility, Fox Center, Library, Village Hall, and Memorial Pool. Those projects when done over a 15 and 20 year financing period actually is at a deficit in years 2026-27; 2027-28. I want to qualify a deficit, we always maintain 25% of operating in accordance with our Finance Policy and that won't go below that. But if we took all of this money out over three different blocks of time, we would actually have to borrow from that 25% in each of these two (2) year periods. The Committee wants to go back and look at other ways to either increase or modify the revenue or reduce the cost of the projects. The Finance Committee is not prepared to make any recommendations at this point in time. There are things that we know we have to do first and foremost such as the work on the Fire Houses and the Library.

Trustee Grunthal stated that the 25% in operating fund balance is precisely for those situations where we need a little more money and reducing the percentage to perhaps 20% is still considered a very satisfactory amount in our fund balance. So I don't think we should get too alarmed if we go below 25% for just two years.

Mayor Picinich stated that's a good point. The committee wanted to sit down and review the numbers again. Also this assumes that the Village is paying full boat for everything with these round estimates. We are generally very good at getting grants, so these numbers could be changed and modified.

**4. Village Manager's Reports:** None.

**5. Board Reports:**

Trustee Grunthal reported that earlier this year the Energy Advisory Panel recommended to this Board that we use electric based equipment for all municipal landscaping and that should be converted as the fossil fuel based equipment wears out and as we replace them that we switch over to electric based equipment. Today the New Castle Sustainability Advisory Board had a demonstration of precisely this kind of equipment in Chappaqua and a number of us from surrounding towns attended that and actually looked at the equipment. We saw a riding mower and small leaf blowers (backpack and handheld). The mower didn't look that different except for a solar panel on top of it. This equipment was very impressive and I have numbers demonstrating the annual costs of a gas mower vs. an electric mower. Two things happen when you switch to electricity you have the equipment that doesn't have the vibrations and the maintenance needs of gasoline powered equipment, therefore the maintenance costs of electric equipment is far lower as is of course the cost of electricity versus the gas that they use. The other point is that the pollution created by these small driven pieces of equipment are extremely high they produce carbon dioxide that is vastly greater than a regular automobile driving many miles. So this is equipment that we should be looking at and considering very seriously as the existing equipment needs to be replaced. The prices are higher than the regular gas driven vehicles, but again you have far lower maintenance costs and you also have the contribution to reducing the amount of pollution. They do require charging stations but they are 110-volt outlets.

Deputy Mayor Farber started by thanking the Mount Kisco Rotary Club for a every elegant evening of fine food, wine, and music this past Thursday evening at the Holiday Inn for their annual Tastes of Northern Westchester, it benefited the Mount Kisco Arts Council. The Arts Council provided the music of Libertine Project plus 40 works of art from local artists in the silent auction. There is actually one piece in particular from local artist Laurie Kimsal that was commissioned by the Arts Council for this very special event. It's an acrylic that reflects the beautiful wild flowers growing along our newest trail provided by the Mount Kisco Historical Society. Anyone who has walked these trails will recognize these wildflowers, it's a beautiful representation of what we see every day on that trail. The good news is that Laurie Kimsal and the Arts Council would like to donate this very special work of art to the Village of Mount Kisco to hang right here in Village Hall. I would like to request that we schedule a formal presentation at our next Village Board meeting to accept this beautiful gift. I will send this formal request to the Village Manager.

The Mount Kisco Historical Society met on Wednesday, October 3<sup>rd</sup> and we actually discussed the damage done at the Kirbyville School House. Several summer storms caused some really severe damage. We finally got an estimate for the work needed which will be covered by insurance and we will also have to keep repairing leaks on the roof at the 55 Maple Avenue building until we can find the final solution.

Columbus Day was celebrated in the Village on Sunday, October 11<sup>th</sup> at noon the Italian American Club conducted a really beautiful ceremony at the statue. Mayor Picinich gave a beautiful and inspirational speech.

The Mount Kisco Fire Department held an open house on Sunday, October 14<sup>th</sup> at the Green Street Fire House. There were fire truck rides for the kids, food, fun and demonstrations on fire safety from 11:00 am to 2:00 pm. One never tires from a ride on a fire truck.

Finally, on Wednesday, October 11<sup>th</sup> there was a thank you party for all of the volunteers of FISH. FISH is an all-volunteer organization and provides rides for seniors who cannot drive themselves to doctors' appointments, pharmacies, or rehabilitation sessions. All it takes to help is just one morning or one afternoon a month to be either a phone volunteer or a driver. Please call Pat Reilly or Joan Stewart for more information. I have been driving for FISH several years now and it is tremendously rewarding to be of help, it is so worthwhile.

Trustee Albanese stated that the community sign has been ordered and it will take about three (3) weeks to make all of the pieces and the total cost is approximately \$9,800.00 compared to \$10,500 or \$12,000. It's going to look beautiful and I can't wait for it to go up.

Trustee Schleimer stated that on Saturday, November 10<sup>th</sup> the Fox Center Craft Sale will be held in the Mount Kisco Public Library at 10:00 am. These are handmade wonderful gifts and projects made by our seniors. A sample of the items for sale are in the display cases right here in Village Hall.

There will be a question and answer session held at the Fox Center this Wednesday, October 24<sup>th</sup> at 12:45. This is a repeat of a session that was done here in the evening, for people to ask questions and have a discussion for people who were not able to attend in the evening. I think that will be a great worthwhile session and its open to anyone who wants to come.

I wanted to point out that from October 15<sup>th</sup> to December 7<sup>th</sup> is open enrollment for Medicare. It is for individuals already involved in Medicare who can change their health plans for 2019. If you need assistance in our Library every Wednesday, from 10:30 am to 1:30 pm is the Senior Benefits Information Center. They are amazing, they will help you analyze what your needs are and they will go through your possibilities for a drug plan. Just bring all of the medications and doses of medications you take. There is a computerized program and they will tell you which plan is more cost effective for you. It's worth doing, it's a free service, no reservations are required, and the volunteers there are incredibly knowledgeable and helpful.

Finally, the Nationally Prescription drug take back day is Saturday, October 27<sup>th</sup> from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm at Northern Westchester Hospital, 400 East Main Street.

Mayor Picinich stated that she had the wonderful opportunity last week to go meet with Stuart Marwell, CEO at Curtis Instruments. I just don't think that everyone in this community understands the gem that we have in this community. Curtis Instruments was founded in Mount Kisco in 1960 and they are a leader and innovator in electric vehicle technology, but they are not focused on the automotive industry. They provide solutions for medical wheelchairs, golf carts, and warehouse equipment. The largest percentage of their employees are mechanical engineers and they are based right here in Mount Kisco. They have offices in places around the world and they are an important employer in Mount Kisco and most importantly they are really good corporate citizens in our community.

Mayor Picinich thanked the students from Mr. Albano's English Classes. I had the opportunity to go meet with them. They were having a very interesting conversation real vs. romantic views of history as represented in statuary. Chief Kisco and our Columbus statue were the topic and focus of conversation.

Lastly, I want to remind everyone that yes we know that the light at Preston Way is out. We are working to get that repaired, we have parts that are on backorder and need to be installed, and hopefully we will have a date on that soon. In the meantime, there are stop signs there, so simply follow the rules for stop signs and we appreciate everybody's patience and safety on the road.

**6. Old Business:** None.

**7. New Business:**

a. Resolution authorizing Tax Certiorari Settlement – Gencon Management vs. Village of Mount Kisco.

The following resolution was offered by Trustee Schleimer and seconded by Deputy Mayor Farber.

WHEREAS, petitions have been filed by the property owner below, challenging real property tax assessments on the Town and Village assessment rolls with respect to the following parcels:

<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>Tax Designation</u>	<u>Years</u>
Gencon Mgmt. Group Inc.	80.25-1-1	2013 to 2018 (Town & Village)

WHEREAS, petitioner's court challenge is now pending in the Supreme Court, Westchester County; and

WHEREAS, the Village and the property owner have reached a mutually agreeable resolution;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Office of the Village Attorney is authorized to execute a settlement on behalf of the Town for assessments for no less than the following: Town Proceedings Discontinued for all Years

Village Proceedings:

<u>Assessment Year:</u>	<u>Original:</u>	<u>Proposed Settlement:</u>	<u>Reduction:</u>
2013	\$300,000	\$286,750	\$13,250
2014	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0
2015	\$300,000	\$265,980	\$34,020
2016	\$300,000	\$266,490	\$33,510
2017	\$300,000	\$263,040	\$36,960
2018	\$270,000	\$265,600	\$4,400

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

b. Resolution authorizing the adoption of the 2015 Westchester County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.

The following motion was offered by Trustee Grunthal and seconded by Trustee Albanese.

**WHEREAS**, all jurisdictions within Westchester County have exposure to natural hazards that increase the risk to life, property, environment, and the County and local economy;

**WHEREAS**; pro-active mitigation of known hazards before a disaster event can reduce or eliminate long-term risk to life and property;

**WHEREAS**, The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-390) established new requirements for pre- and post- disaster hazard mitigation programs;

**WHEREAS**; a coalition of Westchester County municipalities with like planning objectives has been formed to pool resources and create consistent mitigation strategies within Westchester County; and

**WHEREAS**, the coalition has completed a planning process that engages the public, assesses the risk and vulnerability to the impacts of natural hazards, develops a mitigation strategy consistent with a set of uniform goals and objectives, and creates a plan for implementing, evaluating, and revising this strategy.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Village/Town of Mount Kisco:

- 1) Adopts in its entirety, the 2015 Westchester County Hazard Mitigation Plan (the "Plan") as the jurisdiction's Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions identified in the Plan that pertain to this jurisdiction.
- 2) Will use the adopted and approved portions of the Plan to guide pre- and post-disaster mitigation of the hazards identified.
- 3) Will coordinate the strategies identified in the Plan with other planning programs and mechanisms under its jurisdictional authority.
- 4) Will continue its support of the Mitigation Planning Committee as described within the Plan.
- 5) Will help to promote and support the mitigation successes of all participants in this Plan.
- 6) Will incorporate mitigation planning as an integral component of government and partner operations.
- 7) Will provide an update of the Plan in conjunction with the County no less than every five years.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Abstain

c. Schedule Public Hearing for 11/19/2018 re: CDBG Carpenter Avenue & North Moger Sidewalk Improvements.

The following motion was offered by Trustee Schleimer and seconded by Deputy Mayor Farber.

The Village/Town of Mount Kisco will hold a public hearing on November 19, 2018 at 7:00 pm or soon thereafter in the Frank J. DiMicco Board Room, Village Hall 104 Main Street, Mount Kisco, New York for the purposes of hearing public comments on the Village/Town of Mount Kisco's current Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) project: 1517WC-PF206, Carpenter Avenue and North Moger Sidewalk Improvement \$200,000. The CDBG program is administered by the New York State Office of Community

Renewal (OCR), and provides resources to eligible local governments for housing, economic development, public facilities, public infrastructure, and planning activities, with the principal purpose of benefitting low/moderate income persons. The hearing will provide further information about the progress of the ongoing CDBG project. Comments related to the effectiveness of administration of the CDBG project will also be received at this time. The hearing is being conducted pursuant to Section 570.486, Subpart I of the CFR and in compliance with the requirements of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

The Frank J. DiMicco Board Room in Village Hall is accessible to persons with disabilities. If special accommodations are needed for persons with disabilities, those with hearing impairments, or those in need of translation from English, those individuals should contact the Village Manager at 914-864-0001 or [villagemgr@mountkisco.ny.gov](mailto:villagemgr@mountkisco.ny.gov) until November 29, 2018.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

d. Schedule Pubic Hearing for 11/19/2018 re: CDBG Senior Bus.

The following motion was offered by Deputy Mayor Farber and seconded by Trustee Schleimer.

The Village/Town of Mount Kisco will hold a public hearing on November 19, 2018 at 7:00 pm or soon thereafter in the Frank J. DiMicco Board Room, Village Hall 104 Main Street, Mount Kisco, New York for the purposes of hearing public comments on the Village/Town of Mount Kisco's current Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) project: 1517WC-PF208, Mount Kisco Senior Bus, \$30,000. The CDBG program is administered by the New York State Office of Community Renewal (OCR), and provides resources to eligible local governments for housing, economic development, public facilities, public infrastructure, and planning activities, with the principal purpose of benefitting low/moderate income persons. The hearing will provide further information about the progress of the ongoing CDBG project. Comments related to the effectiveness of administration of the CDBG project will also be received at this time. The hearing is being conducted pursuant to Section 570.486, Subpart I of the CFR and in compliance with the requirements of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

The Frank J. DiMicco Board Room in Village Hall is accessible to persons with disabilities. If special accommodations are needed for persons with disabilities, those with hearing impairments, or those in need of translation from English, those individuals should contact the Village Manager at 914-864-0001 or [villagemgr@mountkisco.ny.gov](mailto:villagemgr@mountkisco.ny.gov) until November 29, 2018.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

e. Finance Department First Quarter Spending Activity Report.

Village Treasurer Robert Wheeling presented the following report for the First Quarter Spending Activity. This report will be done on a quarterly basis.

**VILLAGE/TOWN OF MOUNT KISCO**  
**SUMMARY**  
**1ST QUARTER 2018-2019**

**GENERAL FUND**

	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>%</u>
Revenues	15,658,808.31	22,044,764.00	(6,385,955.69)	71.03%
Expenses	4,554,833.69	22,046,953.01	17,492,119.32	20.66%
Total	11,103,974.62	(2,189.01)	11,106,163.63	

**LIBRARY FUND**

	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>%</u>
Revenues	621,653.55	1,902,113.00	(1,280,459.45)	32.68%
Expenses	769,402.56	1,902,113.00	1,132,710.44	40.45%
Total	(147,749.01)	0.00	(147,749.01)	

**WATER FUND**

	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>%</u>
Revenues	308,995.02	4,496,686.00	(4,187,690.98)	6.87%
Expenses	2,186,069.20	4,517,256.00	2,331,186.80	48.39%
Total	(1,877,074.18)	(20,570.00)	(1,856,504.18)	

**SEWER FUND**

	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>%</u>
Revenues	53,592.97	886,956.00	(833,363.03)	6.04%
Expenses	198,398.95	886,956.00	688,557.05	22.37%
Total	(144,805.98)	0.00	(144,805.98)	

**VILLAGE/TOWN OF MOUNT KISCO**  
**GENERAL FUND**  
**1ST QUARTER 2018-2019**

<u>REVENUES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Tax Items including PILOT's	14,887,540	17,031,384	(2,143,844)	87.41%
Departmental Fees	304,952	1,616,500	(1,311,548)	18.86%
Departmental Programs	135,970	1,218,580	(1,082,610)	11.16%
Use of Money & Property	93,189	350,900	(257,711)	26.56%
Licenses	23,985	105,000	(81,015)	22.84%
Fines & Forfeitures	153,378	502,500	(349,122)	30.52%
Misc Sales & donations	31,669	48,000	(16,331)	65.98%
State Aid	5,008	385,398	(380,390)	1.30%
Federal Aid	23,117	72,000	(48,883)	32.11%
Appropriated Fund Balances	0	714,502	(714,502)	0.00%
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>15,658,808</b>	<b>22,044,764</b>	<b>(6,385,956)</b>	<b>71.03%</b>

<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Labor	1,259,518	4,474,052	3,214,534	28.15%
Benefits	1,006,305	3,712,240	2,705,935	27.11%
Total Labor & Benefits	2,265,823	8,186,292	5,920,469	27.68%
Contingency	0	409,820	409,820	0.00%
Contractual Expenses	692,949	3,301,825	2,608,876	20.99%
Equipment	6,075	81,525	75,450	7.45%
Insurance	140,382	150,000	9,618	93.59%
Judgements & Claims	126,838	175,000	48,162	72.48%
Legal & Engineering	42,578	314,500	271,922	13.54%
Police Contract	571,606	6,891,259	6,319,653	8.29%
Total	1,580,429	11,323,929	9,743,500	13.96%
Debt Service	88,582	308,732	220,150	28.69%
Interfund Transfers	620,000	2,228,000	1,608,000	27.83%
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>4,554,834</b>	<b>22,046,953</b>	<b>17,492,119</b>	<b>20.66%</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES LESS EXPENSES</b>	<b>11,103,975</b>	<b>(2,189)</b>	<b>11,106,164</b>	

# VILLAGE/TOWN OF MOUNT KISCO

## LIBRARY FUND

### 1ST QUARTER 2018-2019

<u>REVENUES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Fees & Charges	458	2,500	(2,042)	18.33%
Gifts & Donations	0	250	(250)	0.00%
Interest & Earnings	105	250	(145)	41.98%
Other Transfers & Fund Balance	0	79,113	(79,113)	0.00%
Refunds - Prior Year Expenses	48	0	48	n/a
Rental & Rental Security	1,013	14,500	(13,488)	6.98%
State Aid	30	2,500	(2,470)	1.20%
Transfer from General Fund	<u>620,000</u>	<u>1,803,000</u>	<u>(1,183,000)</u>	<u>34.39%</u>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>621,654</b>	<b>1,902,113</b>	<b>(1,280,459)</b>	<b>32.68%</b>

<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Labor	139,063	663,073	524,010	20.97%
Benefits	<u>45,968</u>	<u>315,854</u>	<u>269,886</u>	<u>14.55%</u>
Total Labor & Benefits	185,032	978,927	793,895	18.90%
Contingency	<u>0</u>	15,000	15,000	0.00%
Contractual Expenses	59,506	237,872	178,366	25.02%
Equipment	0	3,250	3,250	0.00%
Insurance	<u>12,752</u>	<u>14,500</u>	<u>1,748</u>	<u>87.95%</u>
Total	72,258	270,622	198,364	26.70%
Debt Service	512,113	652,564	140,452	78.48%
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>769,403</b>	<b>1,902,113</b>	<b>1,132,710</b>	<b>40.45%</b>
<b><u>TOTAL REVENUES LESS EXPENSES</u></b>	<b>(147,749)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(147,749)</b>	

**VILLAGE/TOWN OF MOUNT KISCO**  
**WATER FUND**  
**1ST QUARTER 2018-2019**

<u>REVENUES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Metered Water Sales	232,026	4,235,554	(4,003,528)	5.48%
Water Service Charges	39,120	165,000	(125,880)	23.71%
Interest & Penalties	2,957	40,000	(37,043)	7.39%
Interest - Water Filtration Plant	27,702	49,632	(21,930)	55.82%
Interest & Earnings	1,864	2,500	(636)	74.56%
Fishing & Boat Permits	850	4,000	(3,150)	21.25%
Refunds - Prior Year Expenses	4,455	0	4,455	n/a
Unclassified	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>n/a</u>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>308,995</b>	<b>4,496,686</b>	<b>(4,187,691)</b>	<b>6.87%</b>
<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Labor	202,199	774,274	572,075	26.11%
Benefits	<u>88,567</u>	<u>474,156</u>	<u>385,589</u>	<u>18.68%</u>
Total Labor & Benefits	290,766	1,248,430	957,664	23.29%
Capital Projects	183,944	0	(183,944)	n/a
Contingency	0	127,639	127,639	0.00%
Contractual Expenses	165,505	1,157,814	992,309	14.29%
Equipment	1,332	46,070	44,738	2.89%
Insurance	107,686	115,000	7,314	93.64%
Judgements & Claims	0	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Taxes & Assessments	<u>0</u>	<u>156,362</u>	<u>156,362</u>	<u>0.00%</u>
Total	458,467	1,605,385	1,146,918	28.56%
Debt Service	1,436,837	1,663,441	226,604	86.38%
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>2,186,069</b>	<b>4,517,256</b>	<b>2,331,187</b>	<b>48.39%</b>
<b><u>TOTAL REVENUES LESS EXPENSES</u></b>	<b>(1,877,074)</b>	<b>(20,570)</b>	<b>(1,856,504)</b>	

**VILLAGE/TOWN OF MOUNT KISCO**  
**SEWER FUND**  
**1ST QUARTER 2018-2019**

<u>REVENUES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Metered Sewer Sales	50,945	878,956	(828,011)	5.80%
Interest & Penalties	615	7,000	(6,385)	8.78%
Interest & Earnings	2,012	1,000	1,012	201.16%
Refunds - Prior Year Expenses	<u>21</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>21</u>	n/a
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>53,593</b>	<b>886,956</b>	<b>(833,363)</b>	<b>6.04%</b>

<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>% OF BUDGET</u>
Labor	85,185	402,955	317,770	21.14%
Benefits	<u>31,160</u>	<u>196,173</u>	<u>165,013</u>	<u>15.88%</u>
Total Labor & Benefits	116,345	599,128	482,783	19.42%
Capital Expense	41,898	0	(41,898)	n/a
Contingency	<u>0</u>	53,757	53,757	0.00%
Contractual Expenses	20,544	131,541	110,997	15.62%
Equipment	1,332	5,000	3,668	26.64%
Insurance	21,254	23,000	1,746	92.41%
Judgements & Claims	<u>0</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>0.00%</u>
Total	85,027	213,548	128,521	39.82%
Debt Service	(2,973)	74,280	77,253	-4.00%
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>198,399</b>	<b>886,956</b>	<b>688,557</b>	<b>22.37%</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES LESS EXPENSES</b>	<b>(144,806)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(144,806)</b>	

**8. Bills:**

The following motion was offered by Trustee Grunthal and seconded by Trustee Albanese to pay the bills as presented to the Board dated October 16, 2018 for the months of September & October 2018; all in favor.

General Fund	\$167,713.80
Water Fund	\$550,314.43
Sewer Fund	\$ 3,903.60

Library Fund	\$ 2,946.43
Capital Fund	\$314,018.57
Trust Fund	\$ 6,844.75
LOSAP Fund	\$ 750.00
TOTAL	\$1,048,491.58

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

**9. Minutes:**

The following motion was offered by Deputy Mayor Farber and seconded by Trustee Grunthal approving the Regular Meeting Minutes of September 17, 2018 as submitted; all in favor.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

The following motion was offered by Trustee Schleimer and seconded by Deputy Mayor Farber approving the Regular Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2018 with the corrections noted on page 14.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Abstain – Absent from meeting
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

**10. Non-Local Business: None.**

**11. Public Comment: None.**

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion to close the Regular Village Board meeting at 9:45 pm was made by Deputy Mayor Farber and seconded by Trustee Schleimer, all in favor.

Motion Adopted

Mayor Picinich	Aye
Deputy Mayor Farber	Aye
Trustee Albanese	Aye
Trustee Grunthal	Aye
Trustee Schleimer	Aye

---

Edward W. Brancati  
Village Manager

/pm