

**PUTNAM VALLEY TOWN BOARD**  
**TOWN BOARD MEETING**  
**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE MARIJUANA LAW
2. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED NOISE LAW

**TOWN BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

1. Departmental Reports
2. Legislative Report
3. School Report
4. Supervisor's Comments
5. Authorize Supervisor to sign the new Tax Collection Software
6. Presentation of Town Board of 2022 Budget
7. Assessor – Approve the consent order and judgement agreed to by both Petitioner and Respondents.
8. Approve Fire Department extending the maximum number of years of service
9. Parks and Recreation – Personnel
10. Parks and Recreation – Refunds
11. Districts – Pheasant Run Road/Strawberry Knolls Retention Pond Cleanup.
12. Lookout Manor Laborer
13. Building Daily Fee Report
14. Approval of Minutes
15. Audit of Monthly Bills
16. Budget Transfers and Amendments
17. Public Comment

**PUTNAM VALLEY TOWN BOARD**  
**PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

**PRESENT:** Supervisor Oliverio  
Councilwoman Annabi  
Councilwoman Whetsel  
Councilman Smith  
Councilman Luongo

**ALSO PRESENT:** Town Clerk Sherry Howard  
Town Counsel Robert Lusardi

Pledge of Allegiance and moment of silence for our troops throughout the world.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE MARIJUANA LAW**

Presented by Supervisor Oliverio

Supervisor Oliverio said this is the public's chance to share their opinions – the Town Board will not respond – we will only listen.

Supervisor Oliverio said this particular law only affects the sale of recreational marijuana in Town not medicinal marijuana. He believes the whole push for this from the State is about money.

Kristin McConnell from the Putnam Prevention Council spoke at the podium and said the following:

Each town/village board has to make a decision on whether to allow dispensaries to sell "recreational" marijuana and allow places for onsite marijuana consumption (lounges). If the respective Board does not vote to "opt-out" by December 31, 2021 they will not be able to decide to opt-out in the future. If the Board votes to "opt-out" before December 31, 2021, the Board can always decide to opt-in at a later date in the future. These are the some of the provisions of the new NY State Marijuana Regulation and Taxation Act that became law in March.

A new Cannabis Control Board (similar to the Alcohol Beverage Control Board) will be making the decisions on what marijuana products can be sold, pricing of products, if children will be able to accompany adults into dispensaries, what kind of advertising will be allowed, and every other aspect of marijuana sales and onsite consumption. Local governments will only be able to determine hours of operation, zoning issues, noise limits and number of people that can occupy a dispensary or lounge.

Since the new Cannabis Control Board is not yet operational and their regulations have not even begun to be discussed, it is prudent for all Villages, Towns, and Cities in NYS to opt-out until more is known. Opting-out will give municipalities time to consider the regulations established by the Cannabis Control Board and then decide the possible impact of dispensaries and lounges on a community.

Below are some of the research findings from communities in other states that have marijuana dispensaries:

-13-17 year old youth living close to dispensaries and exposed to marijuana advertising were more likely to report their intention to use marijuana. (Journal of Health Communication, 2020)

- Young adults living within a four mile radius of a dispensary are more likely to use marijuana, more likely to use heavily, and experience more problems related to their use. (Journal of Addictions, 2020)

- Home prices within a 0.36 mile area of a new dispensary fall by 3-4% on average relative to control areas. (Regional Science and Urban Economics, 2021)

In addition:

- While states that have retail marijuana dispensaries have higher rates of marijuana impaired driving, hospitalizations for marijuana poisonings, and hospitalizations for marijuana dependence, it is unclear how close the proximity to dispensaries impacts these consequences.

- A community's decision to opt-out sends a message that a community doesn't endorse "getting high" for fun and patience and additional data are needed as opposed to experimenting with their families.

Supervisor Oliverio said the vote will be two (2) weeks from now on October 6<sup>th</sup>. It gives people time to get any comments or opinions they have into us. Please send any emails to the Town Clerk - [showard@putnamvalley.com](mailto:showard@putnamvalley.com). She will disseminate your comments to us.

Supervisor Oliverio asked for any Public Comment. There was none. Supervisor Oliverio moved to close this part of the Public Hearing; but left the public comment portion open until October 6<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 PM.

Seconded by Councilman Luongo, unanimously carried

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED NOISE ORDINANCE**

Presented by Supervisor Oliverio

Supervisor Oliverio said this has been a controversial law and we got a ton of responses both positive and negative.

Resident Joe DiSalvo said he has gone through this and found it is just as ambiguous as the other one (1). It doesn't say how or who is going to make the determination if something is an annoyance. It defines who that person could be but that could be anybody. It doesn't say if the enforcement entity has to witness it. It outlaws all gun shooting. A lot of people own a lot of land in this Town. That means there will be no deer hunting at all. It could also be interpreted that you can't use an ATV if it annoys someone. I use one (1) all the time, there is no way to determine if something can be deemed an annoyance or not. There is no decibel level in here, and who is to judge that? If you are going to have something it should be more inclusive and more definitive. If it is in there it has to be enforced, and is an officer really going to come out for an ATV? This is creating a lot of problem between people.

Resident Christian Russo from Peekskill Hollow Road asked if it is possible to make the Ordinance specific to an area of Putnam Valley that it really affects like Lake Peekskill, rather than the whole Town. Supervisor Oliverio said yes we can do that but there are many places in Putnam Valley where it is also densely populated like Floradan Estates and Abele Park. Mr. Russo said to create a law for the whole of the Town based on a few complaints is unnecessary. It's too bad people can't communicate with each other. Targeting the people having the biggest problems might be the way to go.

Supervisor Oliverio thanked everyone who sent in an email. He said we got over 50 emails and it does help the Board see what the residents want.

Supervisor Oliverio asked for any Public Comment. There was none. Supervisor Oliverio moved to close this part of the Public Hearing; but left the public comment portion open until October 6<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 PM.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi, unanimously carried.

Sam,

- ① It's up to you to bring sanity to this New Proposed Noise Law. Vote no...we have a sound ordinance that should be used.

Thank you,

Joe Di Salvo  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 14, 2021 9:27 AM  
**To:** Jannabipvtb@gmail.com; Sam Oliverio; Wendy Whetsel; lluongopvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** New proposed noise laws

- ② RBL resident. NO

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 15, 2021 4:57 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio <[spoliverio@putnamvalley.com](mailto:spoliverio@putnamvalley.com)>  
**Subject:** Noise ordinance

Hi Sam. I hope this finds you well. Since I am not on Facebook and no longer have Optimum I just found out about the proposed revision to the noise ordinance. We absolutely need to have it revised. If you live on a property where neighbors are not that close to one another it might not be such a problem. But when you live in a community like Lake Peckskill or Floradan, what you neighbor does has a greater impact on your quality of life. Perhaps people who do not think the noise ordinance should be revised do not have neighbors from hell who make living in a close community unpleasant to say the least. When our neighbors from hell (and you know who I am referring to) are not building fires, cutting down trees in the Town Park they are riding their ATV's up and down Floradan roads for HOURS. That's after they idle and rev the ATV's for a very long time before riding. We have called the sheriff who either doesn't show up or catches them and just gives them a warning. They are back out the next day doing the same thing. We are hoping the noise ordinance revision includes noise from ATV's. Decibel levels from a leaf blowers from 50 feet is between 64 to 78 decibels. Decibel levels from ATV's are between 85 and 100 decibels. Noise levels over 70 decibels over a prolonged period of time may start to damage your hearing. I am hoping that ATV's will be included in the new noise ordinance. Imagine listening to that level of noise when you are outside on your property trying to enjoy some peace and quiet. No one should be allowed to destroy someone's quality of life. Thank you.

Sue Kimble

4 Please vote NO!

Michael Mocuiski, EMT-P, CIC

141 Lake Shore Road  
Putnam Valley, NY 10579

---

-----Original Message-----

From: warren smith,

Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 8:46 AM

5 To: Sam Oliverio <[soliverio@putnamvalley.com](mailto:soliverio@putnamvalley.com)>

Subject: Noise law

Sam I am opposed to changing the current law

Sent from my iPad

6 Good afternoon,

I am writing to voice my family's opinion that a new noise ordinance/ law is not necessary for Putnam valley. Thank you.

Signed,  
Kimberly Garay & Brian Garay

Please leave well enough alone! If those few can't get along make the ordinance just for them!!  
Thanks

7. Paul Hyndman

Sent from my iPhone

---

**Subject:** Noise law

Dear Supervisor and Town Board,

8. Please do not pass the proposed noise law. The existing laws are sufficient.

Sincerely,

Thomas O'Leary  
85 Sunset Hill Road.  
PUTNAM VALLEY, NY 10579

---

**Subject:** We support the new noise amendment & urge you to vote YES

9. After careful review & discussions, we agree that the proposed revised amendment to Chapter 82, the local law pertaining to noise would be very helpful to ensure that all residents of our community are treated equally & able to live their best lives freely yet peacefully. As our elected town officials, we hope that you have thoroughly reviewed it and agree that voting YES will bring us into alignment to current lifestyles while persevering the traditional qualities of our community as documented in other local communities. Thank you for your attention.  
Sincerely, Dan Hogan & Norm Jansa  
11 Point Drive South, Lake Peekskill, NY 10537

---

**Subject:** Noise Ordinance

10. As a resident of Lake Peekskill, I am in favor of the new proposed noise ordinance. I vote YES!!!

Regards,  
Michael Hritz

---

**Subject:** Noise Ordinance

11. As a resident of Lake Peekskill and a LPCA board member, I am in favor of the new proposed noise ordinance. I vote YES!!!

Best regards,  
Christine Hritz

---

Subject: Noise Ordinance

12.

Dear Sam,

As a resident of Putnam Valley, in the neighborhood of Floradan Estates, for the past 21+ years, I have recently become aware of a proposed revision to the town noise ordinance. My issue specifically is the ATV use within Floradan Estates which according to board rules is illegal. Even when the Town rules such as excessive noise after 7pm on the weekend and holidays is violated, the PC Sherriff rarely enforces/penalizes for these offenses. With that being said, in a neighborhood with such close set houses such as Floradan and Lake Peekskill, maybe the noise ordinances should be expanded to include a different set of rules for the use of vehicles using repetitively loud noises at anytime of the day. Not only is it disturbing to my family, it makes my dogs crazy when the quads continually go back and forth, in and out the woods for hours on end. I live at the end of the road directly next to the entrance to the woods, so I'm not sure if these "quads" travel around the rest of the neighborhood as well, or if I'm just extra lucky to have them in and out constantly where I am situated. **The proximity of the houses to the noise must be taken into consideration, since this varies greatly within the town.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Thank you,  
Janice Hoyos

---

Subject: Noise Ordinance Revision

13.

Hi Sam,

For the record, I will state my opinion. It seems the current PV noise law is inadequate, as to time of day, etc., and has not been enforced properly. I don't know all the details, but for sure I am in favor of a stricter ordinance, as noise pollution in our personal environment would seem to be an infringement of our right to a peaceful and sane place to live. In the newly worded ordinance, I would also be sure to specify ATVs and music.

I was reading some of the comments on the Lake Peekskill FB page and the lack of sensitivity and respect for others is astounding. Arrogance and ignorance at it's finest.

Sincerely,  
Teresa DiMauro  
51 Floradan Rd.

---



14.

You, the Town Board, have before you, a well-researched and vetted amendment to Chapter 82. I urge your support for the measure.

Thank you  
Cathy Possenti

---

To the noise ordinance.

We need some peace and quiet in this town!

15

From Michele Leone Williams  
45 Argyle St  
Lake Peekskill, NY 10537  
347-673-9027

---

Subject: Noise Ordinance

16. Dear Sam,

I would like to say that Kevin and I are both in favor of a revised noise ordinance. We are residents here in Floradan Estates for over 21 years and as you know, this community has several problematic issues. One that has been increasing over the years and today, is at an all time high, is the use of ATV's on our small roads. The main perpetrators live below me on the stretch of Orchard Road that leads up to the Orchard Road Hill. At the top of the hill are only my house and the Hoyos'. There are 2 residents that have a total of 7 or 8 quads amongst them and they frequently have company that ride as well. Unfortunately both my house and Hoyos' house are in their line of driving into the woods. First of all, when 5 or 6 come by at once, it is like an earthquake - my house shakes, and the noise is deafening. My dogs get very agitated and the little one hides. We bear the brunt of these riders as we live right next to the entrance to the woods. I guarantee if they were constantly riding in front of many of the other homes in here there would have been a mutiny by now but as the saying goes, if it doesn't affect me - its not my problem, etc. I have spoken to the Sheriff but there has been no resolution. The Board in here is useless and one of the ATV offenders is on the Board so what does that tell you! I have literally taken my car and parked it in the road on several occasions at the top of the hill to stop them when it has become unbearable. I have tried to talk to them civilly but there is just no progress. If they went into the woods and stayed there for a decent amount of time and then came out - we are not unreasonable - that would be ok with me. It is the constant up and down and with guests, which is supposed to be prohibited, that makes it a quality of life issue. After working all week, Kevin would like to relax on a Saturday or Sunday and some days its like we are living at a Nascar race track! There have been several times as well, where they are driving around at 8 or 9pm. Kevin gets up at 4am for work and I did tell them if they wake him up (he is usually in bed by 7:30pm) I will have no control over what he might do. It is just ridiculous. People have no common sense or common courtesy. As you know, here in Floradan Estates most people's home are on top of eachother and without making an effort to keep noise at a suitable level, it is just a disaster waiting to happen. Not to mention these ATV riders have almost run over my dogs and hit one of my cars as we pull out of our driveway as they speed up the hill and we cannot see over the crest of the hill as we back-up - if the car windows are closed - which mine are all the time - I can't hear them - very dangerous. I don't want to hit a young person and yes, one parent rides with her 10 year old son! I also know there are signs in the woods that say no motor vehicles? Why can't we get this under control? We are not a campground in the Catskills!

Thanks for listening,  
Eliisa McMullen  
845-603-6171

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 12:03 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; cdminc@optonline.net; AnnabiPVtb@gmail.com;  
LLuongoPVtb@optonline.net; Ralph1014Smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Proposed Noise Law

17.

Dear Supervisor Sam Oliverio, and Members of the Town Board,

I strongly support the adoption of the proposed Noise Law. I believe it is well-researched, is enforceable, and is fair. The proposed law allows residents to fully enjoy their property and their hobbies and activities. Residents can have backyard barbeques, pool parties, and outdoor celebrations. Residents can listen to music while working on their car, or while enjoying a beautiful day. Children can play. Residents can cut their grass, blow their leaves, trim their hedges, reshingle their roofs. The proposed Noise Law does not infringe on anyone's rights to enjoy their property and it protects their rights to do so. The proposed Noise Law provides residents with clear descriptions and definitions, and provides law enforcement with defensible standards which will allow them to protect the rights of all residents in those circumstances when a resident complains of a noise disturbance.

It seems clear that Putnam Valley needs a Noise Law that is in effect more than 88 hours a week, and that gives residents a clear and reasonable idea of what is and is not allowed. The current proposal clearly defines a Noise Disturbance, provides protection to residents who live in more densely populated areas without unfairly limiting those who have 1-, 2-, or 3-acres, and it holds accountable the person who is committing the violation. I also believe that the proposed Noise Law also corrects the flaws that exist in Chapter 82.

Upon close examination of Chapter 82, some significant flaws are revealed; the biggest of which is that it allows the very things it expressly prohibits.

§ 82-5 Unreasonably loud, disturbing or unnecessary noise.

The creation of unreasonably loud, disturbing or unnecessary noise by any of the following acts and their causes is declared to be a violation of this chapter.

**A. Between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on weekdays (8:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. for the Town of Putnam Valley Highway Department, or any of its contractors repairing or maintaining public roads and highways, from June 1 through September 30), and the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. on weekends and holidays, the following acts are not permitted:**

- (1) The use of heavy equipment, motorized lawn equipment or any noise-making equipment.
  - (2) The operation of engines in residential zones outdoors. This would include the stationary idling of any engine, including but not limited to automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, motorboats, minibikes, snowmobiles or all-terrain vehicles for more than five minutes.
  - (3) Any noise from a vehicle, machine or signaling device for an unnecessary or unreasonable period of time.
-

- (4) The use of explosives, firearms or similar devices.
- (5) The operation of any audio equipment or the use of any musical instrument or human voice, including but not limited to in parked or moving vehicles, in such a manner or with such volume as to annoy or disturb the quiet, comfort or repose of persons in any dwelling, hotel or other type of residence.
- (6) Every motorboat over two horsepower shall be provided with an underwater exhaust or muffler so constructed and used as to muffle the noise so that the noise of the motor shall be effectively muffled. The use of cutouts or similar appliances is prohibited.

D. In the PD (Preservation District), CD (Conservation District), R-3 (Low-Density Residence District), R-2 (Moderate-Density Residence District), R-1 (Medium-Density Residence District) and LP (Lake Peekskill Residence District) persons may not engage in the acts listed in Subsection A(1) through (6) above in more than four instances during any two-week period without first obtaining a permit from the Code Enforcement Officer.

Let that sink in for a minute. If persons may not engage in the acts listed in A (1)-(6) more than 4 times in a 2-week period *without first obtaining a permit* from the Code Enforcement Officer, that means they CAN engage in A (1)-(6) 4 or fewer times in a 2-week period without obtaining a permit from the CEO.

That means that anybody can use their leaf blower lawn mower, chainsaw, nail gun, or whatever loud equipment at 6 AM every Saturday and Sunday, of every weekend if they want; and they won't ever need a permit (there will never be more than 4 weekend days in any 2-week period). ATVs, target practice, garage band practice... all allowed at any time on any day in any neighborhood as long as it is not more than 4 times in a 2-week period. And who is supposed to keep track of that calendar?

Chapter 82 says you can engage in A. (1)-(6) more than 4 times in a 2-week period *if you get a permit* from the Code Enforcement Officer. What permit would that be? A permit to play your car radio loudly [A.(5)]? To idle your engine for more than 5 minutes [A. (2)]? Does the CEO actually give permits for that? Or for using firearms [A. (4)]?

In addition, Chapter 82 doesn't even hold accountable the person committing a violation:

§ 82-6 Persons liable for violations.

The owner, tenant and person in charge of the premises on which a violation under the provisions of this chapter has been committed shall be deemed to have permitted such violation on the subject premises and, as such, shall be guilty of such violation.

The proposed Noise Law corrects this flaw as well:

IV. PERSONS LIABLE FOR VIOLATIONS.

*The person committing the offense*, as well as the owner, tenant, or person in charge of the premises or device which is the source of a violation under the provisions of this chapter shall be deemed to have committed such violation.

We currently have a law that is only applicable at night, that permits what it prohibits, that does not hold the violator accountable - and those are the obvious flaws. I suspect the flaws make the law entirely unenforceable. **The remedy is before you in the form of the proposed Noise Law.** I believe it should be adopted by this Town Board.

Thank you.

Agnes Powe  
PO Box 325  
Putnam Valley, NY 10579  
914-318-5092

---

18.

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 8:14 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; Cdminc@optonline.net; Annabipvtb@gmail.com; Luongopvtb@optonline.net; Ralph1014Smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Please Vote YES For The Proposed Noise Ordinance!

Dear Town of Putnam Valley Board Member,

I am writing to urge you to support the modernized Noise Ordinance being introduced in the town of Putnam Valley, specifically as it affects our lake communities, such as Lake Peekskill. As sound waves travel beyond land borders, common sense regulations must be in place to ensure that everyone can enjoy life, living peaceably and respectfully together.

Having lived in Lake Peekskill for nearly 9 years, I have felt a change in the behavior of its residents, and what some consider appropriate, civil behavior. I believe that everyone has a right to enjoy their own property, including enjoying a modicum of peace and tranquility, if they so desire. One should, at the very least, not have to endure intense vibrations from high-decibel music being played from another property.

Hearing someone else's music is one thing, but having the bass from it vibrate inside your home is quite another. I have felt the vibrations from a resident living quarter of a mile away, vibrating up my arm from my hand placed on the stone wall surrounding my home.

For many in Putnam Valley, this may not seem to be a high priority issue, as many areas are not as densely populated as in Lake Peekskill.

Additionally, most residents don't have the echoing and amplifying effect of the lake surface to contend with, so they may not deem more specific regulations necessary. More distance between neighbors allows sound to be absorbed and dissipate, not causing any disturbance. When living on small lots clustered together, some as close as 30 or 40 feet of each other, sound disturbances are very real. Spend some time in Lake Peekskill and you will be awakened regularly by illegal fireworks, and you will need to close your windows to block out music, well past mid-night, or the sound your neighbor, just 75 feet away, screaming abuse and profanities at 2:30 a.m, presumably because someone asked them to turn down their music. It's as if they believe that the sounds they make stop at their property borders.

Some argue that they have the right to live as they want. I agree, as I too have the same right to live as I want - to conduct business via Zoom, as many of us now work from home, or watch television at a moderate volume, or enjoy a full night's sleep with the windows open.

These are not unreasonable expectations, nor are these actions that infringe upon another resident's rights. This seems to be the fundamental issue: people who behave unreasonably are offended when those affected complain. They feel their "freedoms" are infringed upon, oblivious that we all share the same freedoms.

Some have expressed concern that the penalties are too high or unnecessary. They miss the point. No one will be fined or imprisoned, they will simply be asked by law or code enforcement to cease the disturbance. It is those who refuse to comply with the enforcement, or begin to act with malicious intent that need to worry about consequences.

No one expects silence here- we can hear each other sneeze two houses away. It is because we are so close, that we should be more aware of our neighbors, not less. It's nice to hear your neighbors enjoying themselves, listening to music, and having fun. That is to be expected.

What is not nice are the outrageously loud and startling sounds that force one to have to alter the home/office environment or change ones plans.

---

This thoughtful and well-conceived ordinance defines common sense, civil behavior regarding noise in a clear and concise manner, that protects the peace, and grants freedoms to all residents. The current ordinance doesn't work because it's too vague. In an ideal world, neighbors would want to be civil to each other. This ordinance is a simple guide to being a good neighbor.

Kind Regards,

David Mei and Rosanne Walsh

Lake Peekskill, NY

Subject: REGARDING THE PROPOSED NEW NOISE ORDINANCE

9. Good afternoon Sam,

I'd just like to go on the record that I am NOT in favor of passing a new noise ordinance law and or regulation here in the (typically peaceful and quiet) Town of Putnam Valley.

I would also like to go on the record to say that I AM in favor of importing more foreigners into the town (especially those cute little pups from Germany, such as Billabong).

Thanks for your time.

Regards,

Peter F. Marsh  
338 Peekskill Hollow Road  
Putnam Valley, New York 10579

(Sent from my Get-Smart shoe phone)

From: DiGangi, Maric

Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 3:00 PM

To: Sam Oliverio <[soliverio@putnamvalley.com](mailto:soliverio@putnamvalley.com)>; [annabipvtb@gmail.com](mailto:annabipvtb@gmail.com); [lluongopvtb@optonline.net](mailto:lluongopvtb@optonline.net);  
[ralph1014smith@gmail.com](mailto:ralph1014smith@gmail.com); Wendy Whetsel <[wwhetsel@putnamvalley.com](mailto:wwhetsel@putnamvalley.com)>

Subject: Letter of support for noise law amendment

20  
Dear Putnam Valley Town Board,

I urge you to pass the proposed Noise Ordinance, which is the product of a great deal of collaborative labor among members of our community. The ad-hoc commission to explore viable noise laws was constituted in good faith to find an answer to an ongoing problem, and I ask you to show the same good faith in ratifying the solution that they have found.

You have heard from me many times in support of a noise law. I imagine that you will also hear from some constituents who oppose the law. I urge you not to be swayed by these voices. Anyone who has lived through what residents of Lake Drive have endured over the last two years wouldn't hesitate to support a fair, objective noise law. (Imagine a 12,000 watt speaker with enhanced bass 100 feet from your front door). There will always be residents who oppose a law that is for the common good. Residents might oppose a stricter littering law, for

instance. That opposition doesn't mean the law is bad for ~~the community; it might mean that~~ people are misinformed or unnecessarily worried that neighbors will abuse the law. (As those of us who support a fair noise law have said many times, nobody wants to call the Sheriff on kids playing outside or on a family gathering with reasonable music and conversation).

Just a final thought on the consequences of not having a daytime noise law. Our next-door neighbors, Gary Larson and Travis Webster, who lived directly across the street from our habitually loud neighbor, recently moved to Virginia. They moved because Travis received an attractive job offer. But the prospect of continued noise harassment was a factor in their decision. Travis and Gary had called the Sheriff's office several times over the past few years to complain about noise, only to be told what we all have been told—that nothing can be done about daytime noise because there is no law. Gary had attended several public hearings on the proposed law. Travis had also spoken several times to Lieutenant McManus in the Sheriff's Office about the problem. Gary was an ideal citizen of this town: he was a poll volunteer and a Covid vaccination volunteer. It's a shame that the absence of a daytime noise law made Gary and Travis feel less than certain that Lake Peekskill could be their permanent home.

Voting for a daytime noise ordinance means supporting neighbors like Gary, instead of neighbors who harass neighbors like Gary. Please do the right thing for our community.

Yours,

Mario DiGangi

---



**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 11:12 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetsel; lluongopvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** No to the town noise ordinance

I vote no to the town Ordinance. I reside Reside in lake Peekskill Thanks Natasha

**From:** Alan Paley  
**Date:** September 21, 2021 at 9:51:57 PM EDT  
**To:** Jacqueline Annabi <annabipvtb@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed Noise Ordinance

22  
Thanks, Jackie. In a number of respects, I think this is the worst version proposed yet. The standard is completely subjective, not objective or quantitative, and involves the discretion of the officer enforcing the law. Moreover, it expressly applies to home power tools, used by many homeowners in Putnam Valley. I don't know all the objections to the previous proposals, but surely we can do better.  
Alan

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 11:50 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetsel; lluongopvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
3 **Subject:** Noise Ordinance- Vote No

I am against the proposed Noise Ordinance.

David DiLapi  
90 Oscawana Heights Road

24  
Good Afternoon,

We aware of the new noise ordinance law and are against any change to the law and feel it is completely unnecessary.

Ray and Crista Straub

---

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 2:31 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetsel; luongopvtb@optonline.net;  
ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** VOICE ORDINANCE: NO

25

Jeff Dellin  
27 Marsh Hill Rd.  
Putnam Valley, NY 10579

On Sep 21, 2021, at 5:40 PM, Julie Dinizo

26

Hi Jackie,

I can't make the meeting but I think the law we have in place should just be enforced.

Thank you,

Julie

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 8:34 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; Wendy Whetsel; luongopvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com;  
Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Noise Ordinance NO

27

Regards,  
PV Resident

28

Good morning,

I am against the proposed noise ordinance. How do I get my vote against this proposed ordinance counted?

Thank you.

Amanda Echevarria  
10 Briar Ct

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** wednesday, September 22, 2021 7:21 AM  
**To:** lluongopvtb@optonline.net; cdminc@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Sam Oliverio  
**Subject:** Against the proposed noise ordinance law

A.

**I am against the proposed noise ordinance law. We do not live in a condo complex. Most of the families who live here have been here for generations and it's a tightknit community. We don't need strict laws that are only going to divide us. With this new ordinance in place someone who can faintly hear a radio coming from someone else's property will call the police on their neighbor which will start a much bigger issue then a little noise. The same thing goes for shooting guns. Most of us have been here for generations and we have grown up hunting these lands shooting on our own property safely and respectfully. It has been a part of our community and also why these landowners are not developing our properties because we enjoy our small town way of life and the freedoms that come with it.**

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** Malik Tekesin  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 10:38 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio <[soliverio@putnamvalley.com](mailto:soliverio@putnamvalley.com)>  
**Subject:** Support for Noise ordinance

Hello, My name is Tekesinovic Malik I live in Putnam valley. I support the noise ordinance rule being proposed tomorrow at the town hall.

MALik

---

**From:** Tommyg  
**Date:** September 22, 2021 at 3:08:33 PM EDT  
**To:** [medic@bestweb.net](mailto:medic@bestweb.net), [ALSAL@moheganassoc.com](mailto:ALSAL@moheganassoc.com), [ANNABIpvtb@gmail.com](mailto:ANNABIpvtb@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [dennbjr@gmail.com](mailto:dennbjr@gmail.com), [drew260@aol.com](mailto:drew260@aol.com), [alfredsalanitro@comcast.net](mailto:alfredsalanitro@comcast.net),  
[jjb620@comcast.net](mailto:jjb620@comcast.net), [Mbrown255@comcast.net](mailto:Mbrown255@comcast.net)  
**Subject:** **Re: Important information**  
**Reply-To:** Tommyg <[tommvgazz@aol.com](mailto:tommvgazz@aol.com)>

*Hi Jackie,*

*We have been informed that the Town Board will be voting on a noise ordinance. Without sufficient information on what this ordinance entails we and our families would currently like to vote no. Living up in RBL we have never been insanely disturbed by loud noise. Every now and then a neighbor may entertain guests and get a little loud, but this is called living. Lawn equipment and chain saws are annoying but also part of living. If we want to host a party during the day which may get loud, especially living lake front where voices carry, we do not want the police ringing my bell asking our guests to whisper. We also do not appreciate the town board chiseling away at our freedom. We all pay high taxes to live here because it is mostly a free society, We would like to keep it that way*

*Sincerely,*

Dennis Berdecia Jr  
Amalia Berdecia  
Dennis Berdecia III  
Jerry Bianco  
Kay Bianco  
Caroline Bianco  
Gigi Bianco  
Thomas Gazzola  
Lisa Gazzola  
Alexandra Gazzola  
Amanda Gazzola  
Josephine Gazzola  
Michael Moczulski

---

Minerva Moczulski  
Alfred J. Salanitro  
Nina Salanitro  
Julia Salanitro

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 23, 2021 12:31 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetset; lluongopvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Follow Up Questions to the PROPOSED PUTNAM VALLEY NOISE LAW

32.

Sam, Ralph, Wendy Jackie and Louie,

Last night's PV Town board meeting it was insightful as to how the New Proposed Putnam Valley Noise Law originated and was formulated. It by no means was put together overnight and that credit goes to Ralph Smith and Mr. Lusardi. With that being said, I see two major flaws in their research and development of the Ordinance. First, it was developed in consultation with some of the residents from Lake Peekskill excluding the rest of the town. Two, it seems it was put together to just check the box that the current PV Noise Ordinance was updated and now able to pass muster within the NYS Appellate Court. These two points only seem to divide the board as well as the residents of PV. If the board wants to avoid wasted time it should read, read and reread proposals looking at all the possible pro and cons before the community sees it. This does not mean that the board did not read the Ordinance but certainly something was missed. Also I have no idea how the board can change the proposed law without another public hearing but I'm not versed on all the rules of the passage of a law in PV. There's an old saying that applies to many situations "Measure twice and Cut once." There's no use putting another law on the PV books that can or cannot be enforced or worse will not be enforced.

As many answers that were present there are many that were not. I have multiple questions that I hope to receive answers or at a minimum have the members of the Board ask themselves.

In the section below how many of the 11 points need to be met to be considered a noise disturbance?

**1. Standards.**

Standards to be considered in determining whether Noise Disturbance exists in a given situation, include the following:

- (1) The intensity of the noise. How is the intensity of the noise measured or is it up the claimant?
- (2) Whether the nature of the noise is usual or unusual. If it is a disturbance, why does its nature matter?
- (3) Whether the origin of the noise is natural or unnatural. If it a disturbance why does it matter if its natural or unnatural?

- (4) The intensity of the background noise. How is the intensity of the background noise measured or is it up to the claimant?
- (5) The proximity of the noise to sleeping facilities. What is meant by the proximity? Is it defined in the Ordinance?
- (6) The nature and the zoning district of the area within which the noise emanates. Does this mean that the zoning where the disturbance occurs dictates different noise disturbance rules?
- ~~(7) The time of the day or night the noise occurs.~~
- (8) The duration of the noise. How long does a perceived noise disturbance need to be before it violates the Noise Ordinance?
- (9) Whether the sound source is temporary. Does this mean that a temporary noise is or is not a disturbance?
- (10) Whether the noise is continuous or intermittent? Is a continuous or intermittent noise a disturbance or both?
- (11) Whether alternate methods are available to achieve the objectives of the sound producing activity. What does this mean? I'm not being sarcastic but is this a push to move all outdoor equipment to electric (battery)?

#### **Section B: SPECIFIC PROHIBITED ACTS**

There are so many activities in this section which are too numerous to detail. Mr. Lusardi specifically said that New Proposed Putnam Valley Noise Law does not outlaw firearm firing, but it is in the section that is titled **SPECIFIC PROHIBITED ACTS**. Please clarify this section. If the list of activities are allowed but only within certain times why is a prohibited acts section even in the Ordinance?

Section IV. makes the property owner just as liable as the offending person even if he/she was not present during the perceived offense. Please clarify

#### **Sec VI. Enforcement**

Do the designated enforcement agencies need to be present to witness the claimant's perceived disturbance or will the enforcement agency be able to issue an appearance ticket based on the claimant's complaint whether he/she witnessed the disturbance?

#### **VII. Penalties for Offenses**

Any person who violates any provision of this chapter shall be guilty of a violation and shall be subject to a fine not to exceed \$500 for each offense, imprisonment not to exceed 15 days, or both such fine and imprisonment. Does this mean that if a person violates the Ordinance, he/she is automatically guilty without a trial and can be fined up to \$500 and imprisoned not to exceed 15 days or both? Please clarify.

33

**From:** Al Salanitro  
**Date:** September 22, 2021 at 1:32:49 PM EDT  
**To:** Jacqueline Annabi <[annabiptyb@gmail.com](mailto:annabiptyb@gmail.com)>, Tommyg <[tommygazz@aol.com](mailto:tommygazz@aol.com)>  
**Cc:** [dennbjr@gmail.com](mailto:dennbjr@gmail.com), [drew260@aol.com](mailto:drew260@aol.com), [alfredsalanitro@comcast.net](mailto:alfredsalanitro@comcast.net), [medic@bestweb.net](mailto:medic@bestweb.net)  
**Subject:** RE: Important information

Nina Salanitro and I, Alfred J. Salanitro officially vote against the proposed amendment to the law regarding noise.

**Al Salanitro P.M.**  
Mohegan Associates Inc.  
Tel: 845-225-6468  
Please note the new Email address:  
[ALSAL@Moheganassoc.com](mailto:ALSAL@Moheganassoc.com)



34

Dear Sam et al,

Thank you for updating the Noise law that has become out-of-date and unsustainable in the courts.

I appreciate you enacting these revisions.

Laura A. Triglia

448 Oscawana Lake Road

Putnam Valley New York

---

319 Lake Drive

Lake Peekskill, NY 10537

September 22, 2021

Town of Putnam Valley Board Members

Town of Putnam Valley Town Supervisor

265 Oscawana Lake Road

Putnam Valley, NY 10537

**Subject: In support of Proposed Amendment to Chapter 82; "Noise" Ordinance**

35  
I write in support of the proposed Amendment to Chapter 82. Enactment of this Amendment is essential to the peaceful environment and enjoyment of Lake Peekskill. I have written to the Board before to seek the assistance of both statute and enforcement to address the intransigence of neighbors who exhibit no empathy or consideration for their neighbors with respect to noise.

This conversation has been going on for at least four years. With every attempt to seek a remedy, and the inability of the Sheriff's office to enforce the current law, my offending neighbor has been emboldened to impose noise in increasing measure. So much so that my direct neighbors having moved to Lake Peekskill two years ago moved out a month ago as a result of the trauma of weaponized noise.

Following the prior public hearings, the Board directed a review of Chapter 82, measures implemented in other areas and a determination in consultation with the Sheriff of what can be enforced, as well as decisions of the Courts. I commend the work that was undertaken by Member Smith, the LPCA, other concerned citizens and the Town Attorney in meeting that objective.

At various times we, the surrounding and affected neighbors have called the Sheriff's office. They occasionally respond, but then advise that there is no standard in Chapter 82 that they can enforce. There have been suggestions that State Law provides alternative remedies, however, meeting these standards in a Court eight months to a year later is no substitute for an on time local law enforcement response and sanction of a summons or fine.

It has been pointed out by others that the existing language of Chapter 82 is in conflict with itself; both contradictory and confusing. The current language is so lacking that there are hours of the day where no standard governing noise is in place. This cannot stand. It behooves the Board as public officials, knowing that the Law is flawed to act on an Amendment to address the defect. The proposal before the Board for consideration, having been researched by the Town Attorney meets the objectives of the community that has been negatively impacted and the criteria upheld by the Courts.



I have a further point to make. If social media is informative, the residents of Putnam Valley who are in opposition to the Amendment - actually any statute that constrains behavior - predominantly reside in areas of Putnam Valley where property is larger. They are far removed from the issues facing Lake Peekskill where separation from neighbors is a matter of a few feet or yards. And it should be recognized that the mountain rock and rock basin of Lake Peekskill further amplifies noise. It is understandable to me that these residents have little empathy for those in Lake Peekskill who are most negatively impacted. It is for this reason, that I implore you to consider this amendment and remedy for Lake Peekskill.

I see rhetoric on social media calling for majority rule in this matter. And it may be that the volume of comments submitted to the Board are in opposition to this Amendment. But I would argue that there is a silent majority that have been imbued with fatalism that any relief from intransigent neighbors behavior will be forthcoming. We have had their encounters with Sheriff's Deputies claiming that they cannot enforce the statute, or endured reprisals from neighbors after attempts to have Chapter 82 enforced.

I would argue that not every decision of public policy can be made by rule of the majority. In my career in government, I have had to make some decisions that protect the minority in the interest of the greater good. Our government is structured with several safeguards to protect the minority in particular matters of public policy. I believe Chapter 82 is one such example. The Amendment benefits all residents of the Town. If one's noise does not impact a neighbor, no sanction will be invoked. It makes the concerns of that majority moot. I would hope that Chapter 82 be amended with language to correct the conflicting language. However, should the Board determine that Lake Peekskill because of the proximity of neighbors and other geography is far more affected by egregious noise and the disturbance of the peace, and that the Sheriff requires improved tools for enforcement, then I would urge, at minimum, an Amendment for the District of Lake Peekskill be adopted.

In closing I want to acknowledge and thank Supervisor Oliverio for his guidance and support for those of us so negatively impacted by this excessive noise, as well as the team that has performed the research that informed this draft of an Amendment. I cannot fully convey how important it is to recognize how much excessive noise disturbs the peaceful enjoyment and well being of our Lake Peekskill Community; and potentially the animals as well. And the critical importance of providing enforcement tools to the Sheriff and to the Town Supervisor. I urge you to enact this Amendment. Thank you.

Sincerely, Lisa Diaz

cc: Jaqueline Annabi

Louie Luongo

Ralph Smith

Wendy Whetsel

Sam Oliverio

---

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:** [redacted]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 22, 2021 4:08 PM  
**To:** Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Noise ordinance

Hi Sherry, 36

I fully support the revised noise ordinance -- it makes a lot of sense. I can't be there for the public hearing tonight, but please forward to the Town Board.

Thanks! and I hope you're well,

Priscilla Keresey

37.

Dear Town Board members:

There has been an impressive collaborative effort of the noise law. Please pass it.

No one should be harassed in the name of free expression. Let's have a caring community.

Thank you,

Dawn Powell

38

This new noise ordinance is needed. A very small percentage of residents can make life extremely unpleasant for their neighbors. Give the Sheriff something tangible to measure and enforce.

Thank you for your consideration.

Victoria Billings

Sam,

39

Good evening. My wife, three kids and I have been living in Abele Park now for a year and a half and just recently purchased 67 Cayuga Rd. I'm emailing you in support of the new noise ordinance law. We've seen an uptick with parties and loud vehicles lately. This past Saturday I had to knock on a neighbors door at 11 pm to ask them to be quiet, thankfully they were respectful and moved the party inside.

Feel free to reach out to me if needed.

Adam and Toni Zee

---

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:** Sam Oliverio  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 23, 2021 6:44 AM  
**To:** Austin Kilduff  
**Cc:** Sherry Howard; lluongpvtb@optonline.net; Jacqueline Annabi; Wendy Whetsel; ralph1014smith@gmail.com  
**Subject:** RE: No noise ordinance

40 Thank you Austin. Your opinion will be placed in the public record.

Sam Oliverio  
Supervisor - Town of Putnam Valley  
845-526-2121  
Carpe Diem

**From:** Stephen Brindisi  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 22, 2021 10:29 AM  
41 **To:** Sam Oliverio <soliverio@putnamvalley.com>; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetsel <wwhetsel@putnamvalley.com>; lluongpvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard <showard@putnamvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Noise Ordinance No

Respectfully,

Stephen Brindisi

42 Hi Sam,

I vote "no" for the new noise ordinance.

Thank you!

Laurie Anthony

43 PV Board my vote for the New Sound Ordinance is a resound **NO**.

**Karen Di Salvo**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 26, 2021 2:57 PM  
**To:** 44 Sam Oliverio; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetsel; lluongpvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Noise Ordinance NO

**From:** 45.  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 26, 2021 2:48 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliverio; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetsel; lluongpvtb@optonline.net; ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Noise ordinance NO

---

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** wednesday, September 29, 2021 10:43 AM  
**To:** Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Fwd: Please vote yes on the proposed update to the Town Noise Ordinance

4/6

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Ina Cholst <[icholst@gmail.com](mailto:icholst@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Wed, Sep 29, 2021 at 10:20 AM  
**Subject:** Please vote yes on the proposed update to the Town Noise Ordinance  
**To:** Sam Oliverio <[soliverio@putnamvalley.com](mailto:soliverio@putnamvalley.com)>, Ralph Smith <[ralph1014smith@gmail.com](mailto:ralph1014smith@gmail.com)>, Wendy Whetsel <[cdminc@optonline.net](mailto:cdminc@optonline.net)>, Jackie Annabi <[annabipvtb@gmail.com](mailto:annabipvtb@gmail.com)>, Louie <[luongopvth@optonline.net](mailto:luongopvth@optonline.net)>, Town Clerk Putnam Valley Sherry Howard <[showard@putnamvalley.com](mailto:showard@putnamvalley.com)>

Dear Sam and Town Board members,

In a week, you will vote yes or no on the proposed update to the Town Noise Ordinance.

In my understanding, the new noise law does not change anything relating to the rights or privileges of Putnam Valley citizens. It does not infringe on the legal use of legal firearms, legal fireworks, or licensed ATV's.

What it does do is to take the law that we have now and add some safeguards to make it more enforceable and legally defensible.

The proposed new law will make no difference for the vast majority of PV citizens who go about their daily lives in a way that is considerate and respectful of their neighbors. For the very tiny number of Putnam Valley residents who are inconsiderate of their neighbors, the proposed law allows full protection of the law, in a court, by a judge, for both the alleged perpetrator of the unreasonable noise and the alleged victim.

In addition, the full protection of the law, as outlined in the proposed new Noise Ordinance, should be extended to every citizen of Putnam Valley, not just to those of a few Districts. Noise regulation, and the protection of the law, shouldn't be inconsistent across the Town. Most citizens have had no problem with the old law and they will have no problem with the new one either. It is essentially the same law, except more enforceable and legally defensible.

The proposed updating of the Town Noise Ordinance is consistent with being a responsible Town Board member and elected official. I hope that you will vote yes.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Sincerely,  
Ina

Ina Cholst  
370 Lake Shore Rd

---

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:** ..  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2021 4:45 PM  
**To:** Sam Oliver**to**; annabipvtb@gmail.com; Wendy Whetse**;** lluongopvtb@optonline.net;  
ralph1014smith@gmail.com; Sherry Howard; Karen Kroboth  
**Subject:** 47  
Draft Proposed Putnam Valley Noise Law I Vote No

Town Board, I am totally against this proposed noise Law. My vote is NO! John DeLuca Abele  
Park

Dear all, 48

I live in Lake Peekskill and would like you to vote YES on behalf of the residents on the new Noise Ordinance.

Thank you.

Best,  
Elizabeth Meyer

49  
User name: Sam Davis  
Email address:  
Message contents: Hi Sherry,

I hope you're well. '

Please forward the message to Supervisor Oliverio, and the Town Board members, that I urge them to vote yes on the noise law.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Sam Davis

Putnam Valley Town Board ~ 50

I was recently made aware of a newly proposed noise ordinance being voted on for Putnam Valley via facebook.

**I am writing in support of this new ordinance.**

Please let me know when this ordinance will be voted on, and if you need anything else from me to voice my support.

All the best,  
John Powers  
41 Nampaugh Rd,  
Putnam Valley,  
NY 10579

**Sherry Howard**

---

**From:** ↓  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 30, 2021 11:37 AM  
**To:** Sherry Howard  
**Subject:** Noise law

I Robert J. Stiles am writing to say, i do not support this and think it will bring more problems than solutions. With that being said i hope you will listen to We The People and make your decision off of that. Thank you for your time.

---

Sent from the all new AOL app for Android

Councilman Luongo read the Putnam Valley Volunteer Fire Department report for the month of August 2021 as follows:

- 9 PIAA's
- 2 motor vehicle accidents – no injuries
- 1 Search for a person
- 1 CO Detector
- 1 shortage of electrical equipment
- 1 cancel enroute
- 1 no incident
- 5 Smoke Detector
- 3 Stand By/Mutual Aid
- 2 Propane Leak
- 5 EMS Assist
- 1 Outside Equipment Fire

For a total of 32 calls and 419 man hours for the month of August 2021.

Councilman Luongo said the 3 Mutual Aid calls were for their FAST Team. He said we are the only ones in the County with an active FAST Team. It stands for Firefighters Assistant Search Team. This Team is to find and assist a Firefighter if he/she goes down in a fire. We have ten (10) individuals that are trained especially in that and for that.

### COUNTY LEGISLATOR REPORT

Presented by Councilwoman Annabi

Councilwoman Annabi read the report from County Legislator Gouldman as follows:

**Legislator Bill Gouldman is not able to be here today because he has a Legislative Meeting so he requested I give his report.**

**\*\* He would like to remind everyone that School is open, and he wish's all the students a successful year. Lets get back to basics and remember road safety. These are our children, our neighbors children and the future of our community. Please keep them safe.**

**\*\* September is Suicide Prevention Awareness Month. The subject of suicide can be a difficult topic to discuss, but there is help if you need it. Please reach out.**

**\*\* Legislator Gouldman would like to encourage everyone to get involved in the 2022 Putnam County Budget process. See how the county obtains and uses revenues and how your tax dollar is used.**

**The process starts on October 6 at 7:00pm, when Putnam County Executive MaryEllen Odell will be presenting her 2022 Budget to the County Legislature and community leaders at the Historic Courthouse in Carmel. He hopes you will be able to participate.**

---



**PUTNAM VALLEY TOWN BOARD**  
**REGULAR TOWN BOARD MEETING**  
**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2021**  
**6:00 PM**

**PRESENT:** Supervisor Oliverio  
Councilwoman Annabi  
Councilwoman Whetsel  
Councilman Smith  
Councilman Luongo

**ALSO PRESENT:** Town Clerk Sherry Howard  
Town Counsel Robert Lusardi

Supervisor Oliverio opened the Regular Town Board Meeting and welcomed everyone to the Meeting.

**SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS**

Supervisor Oliverio said this Saturday there is a grand parade. Councilman Luongo said first and foremost he would like to thank his committee for making this happen. He said step-off for the parade begins at 3:00 PM at the Town Hall. They will be marching to the Town Park. The VFW will be coming with the color guard, and there are 20 Fire Departments participating. The Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts will also be there. Sadly, we can't get the Public into the Town Park because of logistics. We wanted to do more and even have fireworks. Due to Covid we had to scale back our celebration. We are all strictly volunteers! Please come out and watch, the road will be closed. Eric Gross will be the announcer at the Town Park.

Supervisor Oliverio said school has started, be careful on the roads.

**DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS**

Presented by Councilwoman Annabi

Ryan LePore, Commander of VFW Post 391 spoke at the podium. He said they are having a fall membership drive. He said, we have the same five (5) crew that have to do everything. We have a lot of great programs, and great resources but we can't put them into place because we need more people. Please give the VFW a try, we get back way more than you could possibly imagine.

We meet the first Thursday of every month. You can contact us by email at [VFW391PVNY@gmail.com](mailto:VFW391PVNY@gmail.com), or look us up on Instagram – VFW391PVNY. Supervisor Oliverio said he is one (1) of the founding members of the post along with his Dad. The VFW is an important component for Veterans of Foreign Wars. These individuals served overseas in battle torn areas like Korea, Afghanistan and Iraq. We need the young people to keep the VFW going. Please contact the VFW and Ryan, it is a great organization.

Councilwoman Annabi read the Ambulance Corp. report from Captain Sandy Bohl. It read as follows:

The PV Ambulance Corp. had 0 calls for the month of August. We had 35 medical emergencies, 8 car accidents, 2 standbys, 3 mutual aid out, 21 mutual aid in and 11 mutual aid out of County. We rostered a total of 378 hours, 290 of those were in house at the Station on Oscawana Lake Road. We are still having problems finding addresses. Please make sure your street number is visible on both sides of your mailbox or at the street. If you have an emergency we don't want to be guessing where you are.

Councilwoman Annabi then read the report from Tompkins Corners Cultural Center as follows:

On Sunday, October 10<sup>th</sup>, there are two special outdoor events, one from 11am to 12:30pm called Conversation, Coffee and Cookies with special guest, LoHud Journal News columnist David McKay Wilson, who is very excited about his discovery of "The Mohegan Nation and Putnam County." On the same day, we have our wonderful Poets' Corner with featured poet, Dr. Adam Boaz and the open microphone for our poets and poetry lovers.

Saturday, October 23<sup>rd</sup>, from 12-4 pm our annual Harvest Festival featuring the amazing Arm of the Sea Theater, lots of live music, craft vendors, the farmer's market and food. Don't miss it, we look forward to seeing you.

**Page # 2**

**\*\* Putnam County will be having a Household Hazardous Waste Collection Day for Putnam County residents on Saturday, October 9th.**

**Hours – 9am – 12pm**

**Location – Fahnestock State Park  
Canopus Beach Parking Lot  
Route 301  
Kent. NY**

**Pre-Registration is required. For more information call 845-808-1390 or visit [putnamcounty.com/green-putnam](http://putnamcounty.com/green-putnam) and select “Special Waste”**

**\*\* Legislature Gouldman is interested in your concerns. There is help out there, for whatever you may be going through. If you have an issue, please give him a call at 845-808-1020. He will make every effort to assist.**

**SCHOOL REPORT**

Presented by Councilman Smith

Councilman Smith said he spoke briefly to Dr. Luft who told him that they are trying to get back to the new normal and it has begun to happen. School pictures and senior portraits are being taken; there is a Back to School Night planned, these are the things we are used to. They are looking forward to Color Wars at the end of October. There is the PVCSD website to look at for more information.

Councilman Smith said there is a food truck Friday at the Mahopac National Bank in conjunction with the Putnam Valley Food Pantry. The proceeds will be donated to the Food Pantry which is still operating up and moving.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

Presented by Supervisor Oliverio

**RESOLUTION #21-223**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board move #8 on the Agenda, entitled the "Presentation of the Budget" to #11C. Additionally, the Town Board will move #9B "Approval of the Fire Department's extending the maximum number of years of service" to #8.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi, unanimously carried

**SIGN CONTRACT WITH VPS FOR ON-LINE TAX PAYMENTS**

Presented by Councilman Luongo

**RESOLUTION #21-224**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board authorize the Supervisor to sign the contract with Value Payment Systems, 155 Franklin Road, Suite 330, Brentwood, Tennessee 37027 to upgrade our on-line tax collection system. We currently use SCA for our on-line check payments and PayPal Braintree for our on-line credit card collection service. SCA will no longer be providing this service. SCA will now be working with Value Payment Services to provide both credit card and check on-line collection services. Value Payment Systems will be matching the 2.5% credit card interest amount which is currently being charged to our residents.

Value Payment Systems does charge \$1.00 per check transaction, which has incorporated into the 2022 budget. This is pending Town Attorney Lusardi's approval of the contract.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi for discussion.

Town Clerk Howard explained that the tax software company that we are currently using to take on-line tax payments by check and credit card is switching companies, so we are going to switch with them. Town Attorney Lusardi looked at the contract. He wanted VPS to add something to the contract, which they did, so he approved it.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi for discussion. It was voted on by the Town Board and unanimously carried.

**APPROVE FIRE DEPARTMENTS EXTENDING THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE**

Presented by Councilwoman Annabi

Councilwoman Annabi explained that LOSAP is the Fire Departments Length of Service Awards Program (it is their retirement benefit system). After 5 years of volunteer service the volunteer Fire Fighter begin to accrue \$20.00 a month for every year they have served towards their retirement benefit. The State extended the maximum number of years of service by ten (10) years to a maximum number of 50 years. Previously the maximum number of years of service allowed was 40 years. This is not retroactive to members that have already retired. You must reach 65 years of age to begin getting this retirement benefit.

**RESOLUTION #21-225**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board approve the LOSAP Amendment of the General Municipal Law Section 218 (b) which reads in part, "extends the maximum number of years of service for which a participant may receive a contribution for up to an additional ten years to a maximum of 50 years.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi, Councilman Luongo recused himself as he is a member of the PVVFD.

By a vote of 4 ayes, and 1 recusal the Resolution passes.

**APPROVE CONSENT AND ORDER JUDGEMENT**

Presented by Councilwoman Whetsel

**RESOLUTION #21-226**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board approve the Consent Order and Judgement agreed to by both Petitioner and Respondents (Index No. 2021/501041) with respect to the tax certiorari case of Cesarini v. Town of Putnam Valley, et al. This will reduce the 2021 assessment from \$575,000.00 to \$431,000.00. The case is attached.

Seconded by Supervisor Oliverio for discussion.

Town Attorney Lusardi offered the following explanation of this Resolution. Town Attorney Lusardi said that the Town has another attorney that represents the Assessor in tax certiorari proceedings. If you disagree with your tax assessment you can bring a tax grievance before the Board of Assessment Review of the Town. If you do not agree with their decision then you can bring a tax certiorari proceeding to the Supreme Court. Usually these cases go to a point and then the property owner and the Assessor come to a compromise over what the assessment should be.

Then there is a consent order which states what the agreement is, next it goes into a court order followed by a consent order. The consent order is then signed by a judge. Additionally, it must also be approved by the Town Board.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi, unanimously carried.

**PARKS AND RECREATION PERSONNEL**

Presented by Councilman Smith

**RESOLUTION #R21-227**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board accept the following Parks and Recreation Personnel additions:

1. Michael Holowiak, PV Children's Center, @ \$12.80 per hour.
2. Ashley Dring, PV Children's Center, @ \$13.00 per hour.
3. Jacob Nachamie, PV Children's Center, @ \$12.80 per hour.
4. Samantha Vulcano, PV Children's Center, @ \$12.80 per hour.
5. Quinn Strang, PV Children's Center, @ \$13.00 per hour.
6. Cassandra Tenesaca, PV Children's Center, @ \$13.00 per hour.
7. Nick Pezzola, PV Children's Center, @ \$13.00 per hour.
8. Olivia Goncalves, PV Children's Center, @ \$12.80 per hour.
9. Amy Chamish, PV Children's Center, @ \$13.00 per hour.

Seconded by Councilwoman Whetsel, unanimously carried.

**PARKS AND RECREATION REFUNDS**

Presented by Councilman Luongo

**RESOLUTION #R21-228**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board accept the following Parks and Recreation Refunds:

Jason Bossert	\$500.00
54 Northway	LPCC
Lake Peekskill, NY 10537	Deposit Refund

Jennifer Yanza	\$500.00
192 Tanglewylde Road	LPCC
Lake Peekskill, NY 10537	Deposit Refund

Lucrecia Gonzalez	\$500.00
107 Kramers Pond Road	LPCC
Putnam Valley, NY 10579	Deposit Refund

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi, unanimously carried.

**RETENTION POND CLEAN UP – PHEASANT RUN ROAD/STRAWBERRY KNOLLS**

Presented by Councilwoman Annabi

**RESOLUTION #R21-229**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board authorize the expenditure of \$4,800.00 for the labor, material, equipment, and cleanup necessary to clear the retention ponds located at Pheasant Run and Strawberry Knolls. The work will be done by Landwork Contractors. The Funds will come from the Drainage District Budget.

Seconded by Councilwoman Whetsel, unanimously carried

**LOOKOUT MANOR LABORER**

Presented by Councilwoman Whetsel

**RESOLUTION #R21-230**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board authorize \$250.00 be paid to Abby O'Brien for the seasonal closing of Lookout Manor.

Seconded by Councilman Smith, unanimously carried

**PRESENTATION OF TOWN BOARD OF 2022 BUDGET**

Presented by Supervisor Oliverio

Town Clerk Howard presented the Town Board Members with a draft of the 2022 Budget.

Supervisor Oliverio said we are going to discuss this at length at our next few meetings. He added that this is a draft budget and we are under the CAP which is 2%. We are looking at a 1.98% increase. We are relying heavily on the Covid Money (ARPA) to offset many of the bills we have faced or will be facing. More detailed discussion will occur. The budget will be put on the web, and Tony will put a message on the scroll to look for the budget on our website. This budget includes what the settlement might be with both the CSEA and the Management Contract. The biggest hit that we always have is retirement and health insurance. But the good news is we can use the covid money for revenues that were lost during covid and that amounts to almost \$400,000.00. We lost about \$200,000.00 in our pre and post school program. We lost about \$100,000 in our mortgage revenue and courts due to closures and quarantines. Now we can use that money as part of our fund balance and it doesn't impact the Town at all. If we adopt this budget we still have about a 24% Fund Balance.

Supervisor Ollverio thanked Maria Angelico for all her hard work on the budget and for going above and beyond. She did a masterful job with the projections and predictions. He is pleased with the budget. Supervisor Oliverio said we will be further discussing this on October 6<sup>th</sup>, along with the vote on the Marijuana Law and Noise Ordinance.

Councilwoman Annabi said how can we vote on either the Noise Law or the Marijuana Law when we have not discussed them as a Board? We have not gotten a chance to say how we feel. If we want to make any changes on the laws that were proposed to us we would have to have another Public Hearing. Supervisor Oliverio said the only way you can change something is if you have a majority vote. Councilwoman Annabi said we may want to make changes after reading through all of the emails we received from residents on the Noise Ordinance. Supervisor Oliverio said how long do you want to discuss this – we have been on this topic for a year and one-half. We either accept it or reject it. Councilwoman Annabi said if we make any suggestions we would need another Public Hearing. Supervisor Oliverio said if you have some suggestions email them to us and we will discuss them on October 6<sup>th</sup>. Councilwoman Annabi said there are many things she would change – this current law picked and chose what they wanted to add and subtract. There are so many things in there that are subjective. You are putting a law in place just to feel good. The discussion then continued for a short while. Councilwoman Annabi agreed that our current law needs to be tweaked but this new one is full of picking and choosing and does not suit our needs.

Councilman Smith said that he would like to end the discussion by reviewing the facts of what has occurred. He said we currently have a Noise Law on the books which was enacted in 1999 and then revised in 2014. We had several months of discussions and revisions which did not pass muster. Supervisor Oliverio asked if he (Councilman Smith) would discuss this topic to update the law to make it more enforceable and legally strong.

A committee was formed and this led to many meetings with the Sheriff and our Legal Counsel. The Sheriff had suggestions and input. There was a survey put on social media by Agnes Powe, which had over 200 responses. There was a community meeting held in Lake Peekskill. The committee read over all of the letters, emails, and comments sent to the Town Board. They also read a 277 page document on Noise Laws.

The concentration was on the legal strength of the Ordinance and our Town Counsel said that although our current law is not terrible there are certain parts of it that don't pass certain legal tests. To be specific there were two (2) major cases from New York State that Attorney Lusardi brought to the committee. From this we found out our current law was not one (1) that would hold up under the current standards. One (1) was a Poughkeepsie case that was found to be unconstitutional; and one (1) in 2016 that was upheld due to something called the "double trigger" concept within the law. The law that was upheld had no decibels in place, and additionally, the Sheriff was also not in favor of using decibel readings in the new law. The committee came up with a new amended law that would be stronger in court if ever needed.



Councilman Smith said he understands upon first reading some parts of this law can be misread if you don't look deeply into it as to what courts require. It does not ban any guns or ATV's that is not the intent. This law uses the "double trigger" and is meant only to keep people from harassing each other. This updated law has the blessing of Law Enforcement, and Legal Counsel, that's why it was brought forward. This was deeply dove into and done with a deep analysis.

Councilwoman Annabi said you said hunting was not prohibited but under #3 "Firearms" it says they are not permitted. Town Attorney Lusardi said he is Democrat, gun owner and member of the NRA, so he would never draft an anti-gun Statute. Town Attorney Lusardi explained the action of the "double trigger" in the proposed law pertaining to the firing of a firearm.

Councilman Luongo asked what the determination for calling the Sheriff is. Is it length of time that the noise is bothering a neighbor or is it the noise itself bothering the neighbor? Councilman Smith said that is what a Police Officer would be in charge of doing. Councilman Luongo does not want to sign onto another half law that may not be enforced. Councilman Luongo used this example – if he is renting an apartment in Town and cranks up the radio and the neighbor complains -when the owner comes back, (who knows nothing about this), he can be fined also. That should not be an option when the owner had no control over the situation.

Councilman Smith said if people are neighborly this shouldn't be a problem. Most laws are not meant for the masses; but for the aberration. This law goes by previous court decisions and is an updated version of the current law.

Supervisor Oliverio said he will find out if this can be done by District rather than Town wide. Most of the complaints he has received have come from two (2) Districts only. Maybe we could incorporate them into their District guidelines – like the Septic Pump-out Laws. Councilwoman Whetsel agreed with this idea.

### **BUILDING DAILY REPORT – AUGUST 2021**

Presented by Councilman Smith

### **RESOLUTION #R21-231**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board accept the Building Department daily fee report and summary for the month of August 2021, for filing with the Town Clerk.

**TOWN OF PUTNAM VALLEY**  
**OFFICE OF BUILDING & ZONING**  
**265 Oscawana Lake Road**  
**Daily Fee Report - Summary**

12

From: 8/1/2021 To: 8/31/2021

<u>Fee Type</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Amount</u>
ADDITION/ALTERATION	5	\$5,613.00
ANTENNA	1	\$15,000.00
CW	5	\$375.00
DECK	1	\$206.00
ELECTRI APP/NY ELEC	10	\$300.00
ELECTRIC APP/SWIS	15	\$450.00
FENCE/WALL	2	\$150.00
GAS/PROPANE	4	\$300.00
GENERATOR PERMIT	6	\$450.00
HVAC	9	\$1,275.00
MI	1	\$75.00
OIL TANK	6	\$650.00
OPERATING PERMIT	1	\$100.00
PERM	8	\$905.00
PL	4	\$450.00
RE	17	\$4,039.00
RU	2	\$375.00
SEARC	33	\$4,950.00
WOOD STOVE PERMIT	1	\$75.00
WT/S	10	\$1,000.00
<b>Total Fees Collected:</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>\$36,738.00</b>
Cash	4	\$305.00
Check	136	\$36,308.00
Money Order	1	\$125.00

Seconded by Councilwoman Whetsel, unanimously carried.

**ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

Presented by Councilman Luongo

**RESOLUTION #R21-232**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board accept the Town Board Meeting Minutes from August 11<sup>th</sup>, August 18<sup>th</sup>, and September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

Seconded by Councilman Smith, unanimously carried.

Councilman Luongo recused himself from voting on the September 8, 2021 Minutes as he was absent from that meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Presented by Supervisor Oliverio

Resident Joe DiSalvo said a noise can be annoying to one (1) person and not another. Additionally, is there a time frame where the noise goes from okay to annoying – it's subjective. Also, does the Respondent have to witness the noise or will they take the complainants word for it? Even if someone makes a complaint - generally by the time the Sheriff gets there it will be over. How will this be enforced? In essence if the complainant has the authority to carry this through you are giving my neighbor the ability to put me in jail for 12 days.

Resident Charlene Pateman said she is taking this seriously, (as well as other Town issues), and when the question of the Districts came up she said she has spoken to certain people, and they say it doesn't affect them. She added, "when somethings not bothering you it's scary thing to say let's change it". The District thing is something she would like to hear about because of the adage if something's not broken.... Not to mention the current law can be tweaked. She does not know if doing it by District is legal or not legal. Ms. Pateman said she agrees with Councilman Smith that this law will not apply to most people; but it does have a lot of evasiveness with the disturbing or not disturbing. She believes the timeframes that we have in the existing law are reasonable. What bothers her are the new daytime restrictions. Could there be a property size restriction instead? It is not bothering her but she has spoken to people who are really affected by noise. It is real for whoever it is going on for. A solution could be to limit it to Districts.

Resident Joe DiSalvo, said as far as Districts go last year we made a law about Bubblers which solely pertains to Oscawana Lake even though the Town has other lakes. Comments at that time suggested that those other lakes have dams - but you have a floating dock a dam does not help that because the water is going down and the dock is still going to sit there. If you were able to do it then why can't we do it here?

Resident Rusmir Kolenovic of Abele Park said he lives on about an acre of property. He has close neighbors but for the most part everyone is about 200 to 300 feet away from him. He has had issues all summer long with parties three (3) blocks away from him and neighbors that play music all day long.

His addressing it with the Town led to bad blood with the neighbor. Abele Park is a dense area, and even though he has an acre he is still dealing with this. So the double trigger has to be an issue which has to be addressed. How are we going to control this if we don't have this?

### **BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS**

Presented by Councilwoman Annabi

### **RESOLUTION #R21-233**

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Board approve the following budget transfers and amendments for year to date September 2021:

**Budget Adjustment Form**

Year: 2021 Period: 9 Trans Type: B1 - Transfer Status: Posted  
 Trans No: 114418 Trans Date: 09/17/2021 User Ref: MANGELICO  
 Requested Approved: Created by: MANGELICO 09/17/2021  
 Description: BUDGET TRANSFERS THROUGH 9/17/2021  
 Account # Order: Yes  
 Print Parent Account: No

Account No.	Account Description	Amount
A.1420.400	LAW.SPECIAL LEGAL COUNSEL	7,000.00
A.1620.478	BUILDINGS.CLEANING & MISC	1,500.00
A.1660.410	CENTRAL SERVICE.PRINTING & ADV	2,000.00
A.1990.400	CONTINGENT ACCOUNT	-7,000.00
A.1990.400	CONTINGENT ACCOUNT	-1,500.00
A.1990.400	CONTINGENT ACCOUNT	-2,000.00
A.1990.400	CONTINGENT ACCOUNT	-407.50
A.3310.200	SIGNS.TRAFFIC SIGNS	407.50
A.5010.424	HIGHWAY SUPT.CONTRACTUAL	300.00
A.5132.400	GARAGE.CONTRACTUAL	-300.00
A.7020.400	RECREATION.CONTRACTUAL	-2,070.00
A.7020.410	LIFEGUARD TRAINING.EXPENSES	2,070.00
A.7021.110	PROGRAMS.PERSONNEL	-455.92
A.7310.200	CHILDRENS CENTER.EQUIPMENT	125.00
A.7310.400	CHILDRENS CENTER.CONTRACTUAL	-125.00
A.8810.100	CEMETERIES	455.92
SM01.1630.400	ADMIN & CLERICAL.EXPENSE	92.37
SM01.1640.220	GARAGE.TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT	-92.37
SM03.7110.120	RECREATION.LIFEGUARDS	-267.62
SM03.7180.400	BEACH.SUPPLIES	267.62
SM04.7180.210	BEACH.IMPROVEMENTS	27.34
SM04.7180.400	BEACH.SUPPLIES	5.20
SM04.7180.410	BEACH TAGS & PARKING STICKERS	322.50
SM04.7180.416	SUMMER RECREATION	26.86
SM04.7180.471	BEACH.MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS	-381.92
SM05.7110.120	RECREATION.LIFEGUARDS	574.38
SM05.7180.230	BEACHES/LAKE & SAND	60.00
SM05.7180.400	BEACH.SUPPLIES	2.60
SM05.7180.471	BEACH.MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS	-636.96
SM07.7110.120	RECREATION.LIFEGUARDS	-693.67
SM07.7180.200	BEACH.EQUIPMENT	-1,000.00
SM07.7180.400	BEACH.SUPPLIES	7.60
SM07.7180.471	BEACH.MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS	1,886.07

**Budget Adjustment Form**

Year: 2021 Period: 9 Trans Type: B2 - Amend Status: Posted  
 Trans No: 114419 Trans Date: 09/17/2021 User Ref: MANGELICO  
 Requested: Approved: Created by: MANGELICO 09/17/2021  
 Description: BUDGET AMENDMENTS THROUGH 9/17/2021 Account # Order: Yes  
 Print Parent Account: No

Account No.	Account Description	Amount
DA.5112.200	IMPROVEMENTS,CAPITAL OUTLAY	276,223.64
DA.5130.200	MACHINERY,EQUIPMENT	266,480.27
SM09.1420.400	SPEC LEGAL COUNSEL	1,088.00
SM09.8320.453	WATER,CHEMICALS	35.18
SM09.8320.472	WATER,MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS	1,181.54
SM09.9030.800	SOCIAL SECURITY	35.36
SM09.9035.800	MEDICARE	5.84
SW01.1630.472	POWER AND LIGHT	618.40
<b>Total Amount:</b>		<b>545,628.20</b>

**Budget Adjustment Form**

Account No.	Account Description	Amount
SM08.7110.120	RECREATION,LIFEGUARDS	-100.00
SM08.7110.130	RECREATION,LAKE SUPERINTENDENT	100.00
SM10.1630.400	ADMIN & CLERICAL,EXPENSE	19.72
SM10.7180.200	BEACH,EQUIPMENT	1,959.50
SM10.7180.230	BEACH,SAND	168.35
SM10.7180.471	BEACH,MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS	-1,000.00
SM10.7180.472	BEACH,CONSERVATION	-1,145.57
SM11.1420.400	LAW,CONTRACTUAL	161.55
SM11.1630.400	ADMIN & CLERICAL,EXPENSE	-161.55
SM11.1640.472	HARVESTER MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR	-1,000.00
SM11.7180.472	LAKE SURVEY/FISH STOCKING	1,000.00
SW01.1630.472	POWER AND LIGHT	618.40
SW01.1630.472	POWER AND LIGHT	-618.40
<b>Total Amount:</b>		<b>0.00</b>



Supervisor Oliverio closed the Town Board Meeting at 7:26 PM.

Seconded by Councilwoman Annabi, unanimously carried.

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sherry Howard', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Sherry Howard  
Town Clerk  
09-01-2021