

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
VILLAGE OF WARWICK  
JUNE 16, 2025**

**10,748**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Warwick was held on Monday, June 16, 2025, at 7:30 p.m. in Village Hall, 77 Main Street, Warwick, NY. Present was: Mayor, Michael J. Newhard. Trustees: Barry Cheney, Carly Foster, Thomas McKnight, and Mary Collura. Also, present was Village Clerk, Raina Abramson and Village Attorney, Benjamin Gailey. Others present, Malcolm Spurlock, Resident Attendee, Brian Torpie, Tony Cornelius, Tim McNichol, Peggy Dellabough, and Isabelle Hayes.

The Mayor called the meeting to order and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.  
The Village Clerk held the roll call.

Mayor Newhard introduced the Village's new Attorney, Benjamin Gailey, along with his associate, Isabelle Hayes, both from J&G Law, LLP.

**Acceptance of Minutes**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee McKnight, seconded by Trustee Collura and carried for the Acceptance of Minutes: June 2, 2025.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye    Trustee Foster Aye    Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye    Mayor Newhard Aye

**Acceptance of Reports**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Collura, seconded by Trustee Foster and carried for the Acceptance of Reports – May 2025: Clerk's Office, Justice Department, Planning Department, Building Department, and Department of Public Works.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye    Trustee Foster Aye    Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye    Mayor Newhard Aye

**Authorization to Pay all Approved and Audited Claims**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee McKnight, seconded by Trustee Cheney and carried for the Authorization to Pay all Approved and Audited Claims in the amount of \$397,784.96.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye    Trustee Foster Aye    Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye    Mayor Newhard Aye

1. Police Report.

No report.

Mayor Newhard noted that Chief Rader was not present, so there would be no official police report. However, he took a moment to commend the police force for their outstanding performance during a very busy Saturday in the Village, which included a “No-King” demonstration on Main Street followed by a large fireman’s parade. Due to limited staffing caused by an exam many officers were taking, the State Police were brought in to assist with the morning demonstration. The Mayor shared that he had received only positive feedback from those involved and praised the Chief for his excellent leadership and composure under pressure, stating that the Village successfully got through a stressful day thanks to the department’s efforts.

**Correspondence**

1. Letter from David Orr, Director of the New York State LTAP Center – Cornell Local Roads Program, recognizing the Village of Warwick’s Department of Public Works for outstanding achievement in innovation through the 2025 Build a Better Mousetrap Competition in the development of the “Fin-Bin”.

Mayor Newhard shared that the recognition was part of the 2025 “Build a Better Mousetrap” competition for the development of the “Fin Bin.” The Fin Bin, designed by Assistant DPW Supervisor Mike Finelli—nicknamed “Finn”—is a custom, washable cover created for large municipal bins typically used for garbage or recycling at public events. The cover fits snugly, is easy to apply, and can be customized. Mr. Finelli created a prototype and presented it in Ithaca. The Mayor praised Mr. Finelli as a creative young man and congratulated him on the accomplishment.

**Discussion**

1. Village Code Chapter 36, Article II Keeping of Fowl, Rabbits and Pigeons.  
<https://ecode360.com/11147129?highlight=fowl&searchId=44431909051308>

Mayor Newhard noted that the Board was finally meeting with all members present, which had not happened in nearly a month due to scheduling conflicts. He introduced a discussion initiated by Trustee Foster to revisit Village Code Chapter 36, Article II, which addresses the keeping of fowl, rabbits, and pigeons. Following a prior meeting on the topic, the Mayor reached out to the Cornell Cooperative Extension and received a positive response from Mary Ulrich, who oversees that division. She has offered to provide guidance and is willing to speak directly with the Board.

The Mayor mentioned that since the topic came up—either through meeting coverage or online discussions—the Village has received numerous emails both supporting and opposing the idea of allowing chickens. These responses reflect a range of perspectives and desires. He noted that Trustee Carly Foster had drafted a mock local law as a starting point for discussion, though it would require revisions if pursued. The Mayor emphasized that it is now up to the Board to decide whether to move forward, weighing the time, effort, and cost involved in crafting a new local law. He opened the topic for Board discussion.

Trustee Foster provided context for revisiting the current Village Code on the keeping of fowl, rabbits, and pigeons. She explained that, upon review, the law—originally passed in the 1970s—appeared to represent legislative overreach, especially as there has been a growing movement nationwide to allow chickens in more urban environments. She noted that she drafted a sample ordinance, intended as a starting point for discussion, after reviewing similar laws from across the country, including other New York municipalities and the Town of Warwick.

Trustee Foster pointed out that in her draft, she removed references to rabbits, as the original code prohibited them even as pets—while animals like guinea pigs, which might also be used for meat, were not mentioned. She felt that omission made the ordinance inconsistent and overly restrictive regarding animals other than cats and dogs.

She also acknowledged the range of community feedback the Board had received on the issue, both in support and opposition. She mentioned a petition submitted by residents in favor of allowing chickens in the Village, which she had forwarded to the Village Clerk. The petition included 113 signatures, with approximately 70 to 80 from Village residents, the rest being Town residents.

Trustee Foster urged the Board to consider moving forward with updating the law, highlighting community resilience as an important consideration. She referenced past and potential future supply chain disruptions—such as those experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic or due to avian flu—and argued that enabling residents to raise chickens could offer a level of food security, especially in terms of egg supply.

She acknowledged prior concerns that had led to the prohibition of chickens, such as noise and the potential attraction of predators, but asserted that these could be addressed through proper regulations. Concluding her remarks, she stated her belief that the Village should regulate only to the extent necessary to ensure health, safety, and well-being, and that the outright ban on chickens was unnecessarily restrictive given the solutions demonstrated by other communities, including highly urbanized areas like New York City.

Trustee McKnight thanked Trustee Foster for her thorough remarks but shared that he was approaching the issue from a different perspective—focusing less on whether chickens are beneficial and more on whether they are appropriate for the Village of Warwick, given its density. He explained that after reviewing tax assessor records, he found that the Village has 2,519 residential parcels, and approximately 49.5% of those are less than a quarter acre in size. An additional 33–34% of parcels fall between a quarter acre and less than a half acre, meaning that roughly 83% of Village parcels are under half an acre. He felt this indicated a high level of residential density. Given that context, he expressed concerns about spatial constraints for implementing necessary requirements such as fencing, coops, appropriate chicken run sizes, and setbacks. He cited the Village's current zoning code, referencing the bulk table on page 95, which calls for side yard setbacks of 20 feet.

Trustee Cheney interjected to clarify that the setbacks Trustee McKnight referred to were from the existing zoning code, which did not account for the presence of chickens when it was developed.

Trustee Foster responded by noting that chicken coops are rarely permanent structures. She explained that many residents tend to move them around their property, which would need to be taken into consideration. Any regulations would need to account for the space required not just for a fixed location, but also to allow for occasional repositioning of the coop.

Trustee Collura expressed skepticism about the feasibility of moving chicken coops on smaller lots, stating that there would be no room to move them given the limited space on many Village properties.

Trustee Cheney agreed, noting that it would be necessary to establish a defined "envelope" within which a movable coop could be relocated. He emphasized that this space would need to be constrained by appropriate setbacks to ensure adequate distance from neighbors, thereby minimizing potential impacts such as noise, odor, and other related concerns.

Trustee Foster pointed out that if increased setbacks are intended to address concerns like noise and odor, then those same requirements would naturally limit the number of properties eligible to keep chickens. She questioned the need for a blanket prohibition when setback regulations alone would likely restrict chicken ownership to only those parcels with sufficient space.

Trustee McKnight continued by contrasting the Village's lot sizes with those in the Town, where it is common for properties to be over an acre. In the Village, however, only 7% of parcels are larger than one acre, meaning 93% are smaller—highlighting the Village's relatively high density. While setbacks are one important factor, he expressed concern that allowing chickens in such close quarters could lead to increased neighbor disputes. He noted that even if current neighbors are on good terms, that dynamic could change over time. Given the density and potential for conflict, he concluded that, in his opinion, permitting chickens did not make sense for the Village.

Trustee Foster questioned why it should be the Board's responsibility to proactively prevent potential disputes between neighbors that may or may not arise. She implied that anticipating every possible conflict could lead to overly restrictive governance and that such hypothetical issues should not be the sole basis for prohibiting chickens.

Trustee Collura agreed with the concerns raised about lot sizes and housing density, stating that she did not believe keeping chickens was a good fit for the Village. She added that, beyond land use considerations, the practical impact on the Building Department and Code Enforcement was a serious concern. She noted that the department is still adjusting to the recently adopted short-term rental code, and introducing another permitted use like backyard chickens would add to their responsibilities. It would require inspections, complaint management, and enforcement, and she expressed doubt that the department was currently equipped to take on that additional burden.

Trustee Foster posed a rhetorical question to the Board, asking whether inconvenience to the Village—such as the additional responsibilities placed on the Building Department—should be considered a valid justification for making something illegal.

Trustee Collura responded by stating that if the Building Department is required to take on more work as a result of allowing chickens, it would ultimately lead to increased costs for the Village, as additional compensation or resources would likely be necessary to support the added responsibilities.

Trustee Foster continued by questioning whether administrative burden or potential neighbor discomfort should justify making something illegal that might otherwise be considered reasonable. She drew a comparison to dog ownership, suggesting that a

neighbor's dislike of her dog would not give them the authority to determine whether she could have one. Similarly, she implied, personal preferences or anticipated inconveniences should not be the basis for a blanket prohibition on keeping chickens.

Trustee Collura responded by noting that, unlike chickens, dogs are typically kept inside the house most of the time, highlighting the distinction between pets like dogs and animals like chickens, which are kept outdoors and may have a greater impact on neighbors.

Trustee Foster responded by pointing out that even if her dog were kept in a fenced-in backyard, it could still be a source of noise or nuisance—yet that is generally accepted as part of living in a community. She emphasized that all kinds of nuisances arise between neighbors, and part of community life involves working through those challenges together. She questioned why the Village of Warwick would be any less capable than other communities of managing such issues among neighbors.

Trustee Collura stated that there are other existing issues in the Village that need to be addressed before introducing new regulations. She specifically mentioned concerns about stray or nuisance cats in her neighborhood and others, suggesting that the Village should resolve those problems before considering allowing chickens. She added that she wouldn't know what to do if she came home to find a chicken on her porch, underscoring her hesitation about introducing chickens into the community.

Trustee Foster responded by asserting that the cat issue is unrelated to the discussion about chickens. She emphasized that the presence of problems with cats should not be used as a reason to avoid considering separate and distinct legislation regarding chickens.

Trustee Collura clarified that her point was not about equating cats and chickens directly, but rather emphasizing that there are existing issues the Village should focus on and resolve before introducing new policies. She expressed a preference for tightening up current regulations and addressing ongoing concerns before expanding the scope of what is permitted.

Trustee McKnight returned to the topic of the Building Department, noting that last year the Village received 240 permit applications. He emphasized that anyone looking to build a chicken coop would be required to obtain a building permit, which involves administrative work and on-site inspections. He pointed out that while there were only 52 violations last year, those incidents tend to consume more time per case than routine permit reviews or site plan evaluations. He added that violations often require involvement from the Village's legal counsel, which introduces additional costs. While

he acknowledged the ideal that everyone would follow the code as written, he stated that laws can't be drafted based solely on the assumption that everyone will comply perfectly.

Trustee Collura shared that she agreed with Trustee McKnight's concerns, adding that there are gray areas that make regulating chickens challenging. She pointed out that while it might be easy to write "no roosters" into the law, in practice it's difficult to enforce because, under New York State regulations, chickens are often sold in groups of six at an age when it's not yet possible to determine their sex. She also noted that the Humane Society has stated it does not accept roosters, making it hard to relocate them if one is mistakenly acquired.

Trustee Collura also expressed concern about other types of fowl, sharing a personal experience from her childhood in which neighbors kept peacocks that were extremely noisy and disruptive. While she acknowledged that some municipalities allow chickens on properties over one acre, she was uncomfortable with the idea of basing the right to own chickens solely on property size. She felt this approach would be unfair to many of the residents currently advocating for the change, as their properties likely would not qualify under such a restriction.

Trustee Foster clarified that the current draft ordinance does not require a minimum property size to allow chickens. Instead, it is structured to require a specific amount of square footage per chicken and already includes an explicit prohibition on peacocks. She emphasized that these details are all open for discussion and refinement.

She then drew a parallel to the Board's handling of short-term rentals, noting that former Village Attorney Stephen Gaba had advised the Board at the time that they were under no obligation to allow such rentals at all. Despite knowing that regulating short-term rentals would create administrative costs and require oversight to ensure public health and safety, the Board ultimately chose to permit them. Trustee Foster argued that the added burden of ensuring compliance with chicken regulations is not a sufficient reason to prohibit them, especially when the level of burden is comparable to that of managing short-term rentals.

Trustee Collura responded by disagreeing with Trustee Foster's comparison, stating that short-term rentals bring visitors to the Village who spend money locally, which benefits the entire community. She implied that, unlike chickens, short-term rentals provide a clear economic advantage that helps justify the additional administrative burden.

Trustee Foster responded by acknowledging that her argument for allowing chickens focused on a different type of community benefit. While short-term rentals may provide economic value, she emphasized that backyard chickens offer a resilience-related benefit

by enhancing food security and self-sufficiency. She noted that both economic and resilience factors are important considerations when evaluating what is in the best interest of the community.

Trustee Cheney reiterated some of his previously expressed concerns, emphasizing that the Board's primary focus should be on minimizing the impact on neighbors. He identified noise, odors, and the attraction of predators as key issues. He noted that predators drawn to chickens could pose risks to neighbors' small pets, such as cats and small dogs.

While open to further discussion, Trustee Cheney expressed skepticism about how many properties in the Village would realistically qualify to keep chickens once proper setback and distancing requirements are established. He aligned with Trustee McKnight's earlier point, suggesting that the number of eligible properties would likely be quite limited once the necessary conditions are defined.

Mayor Newhard proposed forming a small task force to review and refine the draft local law presented by Trustee Foster. He suggested that the group could work on fleshing out and tweaking the proposal before the full Board considers any legislative action. He also recommended inviting Maire Ullrich from Cornell Cooperative Extension to speak to the Board, emphasizing that these steps would help ensure proper due diligence before making any major decisions.

The Mayor reflected on the historical context of the existing ban, noting that when it was enacted in the 1970s, there was a trend toward greater suburbanization and a shift in mindset away from agricultural practices. He acknowledged that while there are no farms within the Village itself, it is surrounded by farmland, and he personally hears a rooster each morning because he lives near the Town border.

Trustee Cheney suggested that, as part of the proposed task force or broader discussion, the Board should first focus on the fundamental requirements rather than getting too caught up in the specific wording of the draft law. He recommended beginning with basic elements such as how many chickens would be allowed, the required setbacks from property lines, the dimensions of the space needed to accommodate a movable coop, and how coop size should correspond to the number of chickens. Once there is agreement—or at least active discussion—on those core requirements, the group can then move on to refining the detailed language of the law.

Trustee Foster added that any basic requirements should be defined in alignment with the goals of the ordinance. She emphasized that restrictions—such as limiting the number of chickens—should be grounded in clear objectives.



Trustee Cheney agreed that the ordinance should be guided by clearly defined goals and added that any limitations—such as the number of chickens permitted—should be justified based on practical considerations. He suggested that the Board consider how many chickens would reasonably be needed to support a household, such as a family of five, emphasizing that the intent should be to enable self-sufficiency rather than to create commercial opportunities. While acknowledging that sharing eggs with neighbors may happen informally, he stressed that the ordinance should not open the door to commercial-scale egg production within the Village.

Trustee Foster agreed that any restrictions included in the ordinance must be supported by clear, rational justification. She emphasized that if the Board chooses to limit the number of chickens or prohibit egg sales, those decisions should be based on objective data or expert guidance—such as studies from Cornell Cooperative Extension indicating impacts like odor beyond a certain number of chickens. She cautioned against making assumptions or imposing arbitrary limits without a demonstrated connection to public health, safety, or welfare, stating that regulations must have a logical and defensible basis.

Mayor Newhard commented that he believed the draft ordinance already included a provision prohibiting the sale of eggs.

Trustee Foster clarified that the draft ordinance prohibits commercialization rather than specifically banning the sale of eggs, noting there is a distinction between the two. She then brought the Board's attention to a potentially relevant detail in the Village's existing zoning code, which lists "agriculture" as a permitted use in residential zones. She remarked that this was an interesting point and questioned its implications, acknowledging uncertainty about whether it is directly material to the current discussion but suggesting it may warrant further exploration.

Trustee Collura added that she believed the reason rabbits and chickens are addressed together in the same section of the Village Code is due to the similarity in housing structures. She explained that, like chicken coops, bunny hutches are typically kept outside the home, which may be why both animals were grouped under the same regulatory provisions.

Trustee Foster responded by noting that some people do keep rabbits inside their homes as pets, which the current code does not seem to allow. She pointed out that the existing language prohibits the keeping of rabbits altogether, not just in outdoor hutches, effectively banning them as pets.

Trustee Cheney remarked that he couldn't recall a time when the Village had sent the Code Enforcement Officer into someone's home to check for pet rabbits.

Mayor Newhard shared that he did recall an instance during his tenure when Code Enforcement was sent to a residence due to a backyard rabbit hutch.

Trustee Foster read from the existing Village Code, pointing out that it states, "On or after the effective date of this article, no person shall raise, keep, harbor, or maintain any of these animals herein referred to as fowl or birds or rabbits, either as pets or as a source of food supply within the limits of the Village of Warwick." She noted that the only exception specified is for household birds such as canaries, parakeets, parrots, or similar, which are not affected by the article.

Mayor Newhard asked the Board how they would like to proceed with the matter.

Trustee McKnight stated that, in his opinion, the Board should not move forward on this particular subject.

Trustee Foster responded that she would likely bring the issue up multiple times in the future.

Mayor Newhard stated that while he has concerns about allowing chickens in the Village, he believes the issue warrants thorough investigation and is not prepared to end the conversation at this time. He expressed interest in continuing the dialogue due to the valid points raised by both supporters and opponents. He acknowledged that opponents' concerns—particularly about predators—are understandable, noting that the Village currently has a high level of predator activity, including coyotes, foxes, and hawks.

The Mayor emphasized the importance of clearly defining parcel size limitations, setbacks, and requirements for runs, coops, and fencing if the Board were to move forward with any legislation. He stressed that such specifics would need to be clearly stated in the law.

Trustee Foster expressed support for forming a working group, agreeing that concerns such as predators, noise, and odor must be demonstrably addressable through well-crafted ordinance language. She emphasized the need for case studies and evidence showing how other communities have successfully managed these issues. While she has conducted her own research, she acknowledged the value of incorporating additional perspectives. She felt it was important to be able to clearly articulate both the pros and cons of allowing chickens, along with practical solutions drawn from real-world examples.

Trustee Collura stated that it would be important to speak with the Planning Department Secretary and the Code Enforcement Officers to understand how allowing chickens might impact their daily responsibilities.

Trustee Foster agreed, stating that it would be necessary to research what responsibilities would fall to Village staff—such as the Planning Department and Code Enforcement—under any proposed ordinance. She emphasized that understanding the operational impact should be an integral part of the conversation.

Trustee McKnight posed a question to Village Attorney Benjamin Gailey, asking whether it is common for municipalities to base laws on parcel size, or if that approach could be considered discriminatory, given that not all residents have equal lot sizes. He also asked whether regulations are more typically structured around setbacks rather than overall parcel dimensions.

Village Attorney Benjamin Gailey responded that using lot area as a basis for regulation is common in municipal law.

Trustee McKnight said he would be interested in seeing any data Cornell Cooperative Extension might have regarding lot sizes and their relationship to keeping chickens. He noted that, given 93% of all parcels in the Village are under an acre, most properties would presumably be excluded if regulations were based on minimum lot size.

Trustee Foster responded that owning an acre is not a necessary requirement for keeping chickens.

Trustee McKnight replied by noting that 83% of Village parcels are less than half an acre, implying that space limitations would still affect the majority of properties even without a one-acre minimum.

Trustee Foster pointed out that assuming half an acre as the threshold for allowing chickens is premature, as no specific boundary has been established yet in the discussion or proposed ordinance.

Trustee Collura remarked that neighborhoods within the Village vary greatly in layout and density. She shared a recent experience at a backyard party where she observed that the homes were extremely close together, with backyards directly adjacent and multiple properties visible from one location. She emphasized that this level of proximity is common in more condensed areas of the Village and should be carefully considered when evaluating the feasibility of allowing chickens.

Mayor Newhard proposed moving forward with the formation of a working group to further explore the issue. He suggested including two Trustees and one or two members of the public, believing such a group would be effective. He also recommended inviting a representative from Cornell Cooperative Extension to speak with the Board and help address some of the questions that have been raised.

Trustee McKnight questioned the proposal, asking why representatives from Cornell Cooperative Extension would come to speak with the Board.

Trustee Cheney responded that Cornell Cooperative Extension had offered to come and speak with the Board and had done so during a previous consideration of the topic, which led to a productive discussion. Mayor Newhard added that the representatives would not be coming directly from Cornell's main campus, but rather from their local office in Middletown.

Trustee Foster added that the Cornell Cooperative Extension representatives could be invited to speak with the Board at any time that works for them, and that their visit does not need to wait for the working group to complete its discussions.

Mayor Newhard concluded the discussion by stating that the Board had thoroughly talked through the issue and would move forward with forming a small task force. He added that he would reach out to Cornell Cooperative Extension and contact Mary Ulrich to begin coordinating further input.

### **Public Comment - Agenda Items Only**

#### **GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

The public may speak only during the meeting's Public Comment period and at any other time a majority of the Board allows. Speakers must be recognized by the presiding officer, step to the front of the room/microphone, give their name, residency, and organization, if any. Speakers must limit their remarks to three minutes (this time limit may be changed to accommodate the number of speakers) and may not yield any remaining time they may have to another speaker. Board members may, with the permission of the mayor, interrupt a speaker during their remarks, but only for the purpose of clarification or information. The Village Board is not required to accept or respond to questions from the public at meetings but may request that inquiries be submitted in writing to be responded to at a later date. All remarks must be addressed to the Board as a body and not to individual Board members. Interested parties or their representatives may also address the Board by written communications.

Brian Torpie:

Resident Brian Torpie spoke in support of allowing chickens in the Village and shared his observations from speaking with neighbors while distributing informational signs. He noted that many newer residents—particularly those from New York City boroughs like Queens and Brooklyn—were surprised to learn that chickens were not already permitted in the Village, as backyard chickens are allowed in many urban areas.

Mr. Torpie said the primary motivations he heard from supporters included educational value for their children and the desire for a closer connection to where food comes from. He emphasized that, for most, the decision was not about saving money on eggs, as raising chickens is typically an investment without short-term financial return.

He acknowledged three common concerns raised by opponents: noise, odor, and the potential spread of bird flu. He addressed each one, stating that:

- Chickens are generally not noisy unless roosters are involved.
- Odor is minimal with proper care and composting of manure, which can even benefit gardens and lawns.
- He found no CDC data confirming transmission of bird flu to humans from backyard chickens in non-commercial settings.

Mr. Torpie suggested that underlying some of the opposition may be a lack of trust between neighbors. He felt that fostering community ties is an important and underappreciated benefit of allowing chickens. He mentioned how this issue had helped him connect more deeply with others in the Village and believed it could serve as a positive opportunity for community-building, particularly among parents and families seeking shared interests.

Tony Cornelli:

Resident Tony Cornelli addressed the Board in support of allowing chickens, stating that since the last meeting, he had spoken with many community members—both supporters and opponents—but found that most people he spoke with were in favor. He noted that a common theme in the opposition was a lack of trust in neighbors to responsibly care for chickens, such as concerns about birds escaping their enclosures. Mr. Cornelli suggested that this issue reflected broader community trust challenges and shouldn't be the basis for policy decisions.

He shared that the chicken conversation had already fostered community building in his own neighborhood. After starting a garden, his neighbors became curious and began

gardening themselves. He believes a similar effect could result from allowing chickens. Regarding predators, he acknowledged their presence in the area but stressed the importance of keeping chickens enclosed to protect them, which he said responsible owners would naturally do.

Mr. Cornellius addressed concerns about lot size by stating that chickens can be kept discreetly and successfully even on small parcels, such as a quarter acre. He noted that certain chicken breeds are quiet, typically making noise only when laying eggs or if startled by a predator. On the issue of odor, he explained the "deep litter method," which involves layering straw or bedding in the coop and allowing it to compost over time. This method, he said, mitigates odor effectively.

He also described his intention to use a "chicken tractor"—a small, mobile coop that can be moved around the yard daily. This approach gives chickens access to fresh grass and insects while spreading manure more evenly, reducing odor and helping control the tick population. Mr. Cornellius concluded by expressing interest in seeing the content of opposition emails and stated that many of the concerns raised thus far are ones he has already encountered and believes can be addressed through proper education and practices.

Mayor Newhard interjected to clarify that he did not believe the opposition was necessarily rooted in a lack of trust in neighbors. Rather, he suggested the concern may be that not everyone will follow the rules, which is why regulations are necessary—to ensure consistency and accountability across the community.

Trustee Collura added that her concerns about cats in the Village are not due to a lack of trust in her neighbors. She clarified that she does trust them, but it seems like the number of cats is increasing regardless—possibly from people dropping them off or other unknown sources—not necessarily because neighbors are letting them roam freely.

Mr. Cornellius reiterated that while he understands and hears the concerns being raised—such as odor and predators—he believes there are effective ways to address them. With proper practices in place, he felt that both the smell and predator risks could be significantly minimized.

Malcolm Spurlock:

Resident Malcolm Spurlock reintroduced himself, stating that he had spoken earlier in the month in support of allowing chickens and remained in favor. He shared that he is a local elementary school teacher in New Jersey and believes that keeping chickens would offer valuable educational opportunities. He mentioned that he has several young nieces and

nephews in the Village and that he looks forward to giving them the chance to learn firsthand about the chickens' life cycle and development.

Mr. Spurlock noted that his property is just about an acre, placing him among the minority of Village residents who meet that threshold. He expressed interest in the upcoming input from Cornell Cooperative Extension, believing it will provide helpful information to guide the Board's decision. He praised Trustee Foster's earlier outline of the issues and added that, if the Board ultimately decides against allowing chickens, he hopes they will clearly explain why—ideally using insights from Cornell.

He also referenced existing local regulations for beekeeping, which require hives to be located at least 50 feet from property lines. He pointed out that such a rule already excludes some residents based on lot size and suggested that a similar approach might be appropriate for chickens. Mr. Spurlock encouraged the Board to keep an open mind and consider allowing chickens on qualifying parcels, even if only for properties over a certain size, such as one acre. He concluded by noting the Village's strong agricultural heritage and expressing a desire to see that tradition continue. There were no further comments.

**Amend Resolution Adopted on April 7, 2025 – Well #3 Project**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Cheney, seconded by Trustee Foster and carried to amend the resolution adopted on April 7, 2025, to fund the Well #3 project with the estimated cost of the said project of \$1,295,800.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Resolution To Fund Well #3 Project - Amended**

WHEREAS, the Village Board of the Village of Warwick has undertaken and approved a project for the establishment of Well #3; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost of the said project is \$1,446,700; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board of the of Warwick proposes to pay for the said project with ARPA funds to the extent of \$486,948 and with federal funds from an EPA

Clean Drinking Water Grant to the extent of \$959,752;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby resolved as follows:

That the Village Board approves the aforesaid expenditure of funds from the said sources for establishment of Well #3; and

That the Village Mayor is authorized to sign all documents necessary to carry of the terms hereof.

Trustee Cheney presented the foregoing resolution which was seconded by

Trustee Foster,

The vote on the foregoing resolution was as follows: **APPROVED**

Barry Cheney, Trustee, voting Aye

Carly Foster, Trustee, voting Aye

Thomas McKnight, Trustee, voting Aye

Mary Collura, Trustee, voting Aye

Michael Newhard, Mayor, voting Aye

**TAM Enterprises, Payment #8 – Well #3 Treatment Plant Project**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Cheney, seconded by Trustee Foster and carried to approve payment #8 in the amount of \$69,248.29 to TAM Enterprises, Inc. for the Well #3 Treatment Plant Project as per the recommendation of Pitingaro & Doetsch Consulting Engineers, P.C. Funds are appropriated in budget code H.8330.2000.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows: **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye Trustee Foster Aye Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye Mayor Newhard Aye



**Joseph Warren Electrical, Payment #1 - Well #3 Treatment Plant Project**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Cheney, seconded by Trustee Collura and carried to approve payment #1 in the amount of \$14,820.00 to Joseph Warren Electrical for the Well #3 Treatment Plant Project as per the recommendation of Pitingaro & Doetsch Consulting Engineers, P.C. Funds are appropriated in budget code H.8330.2000.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Vacation Carry Over – Jason Makuch**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Cheney, seconded by Trustee Collura and carried to grant permission to Village of Warwick Employee, Jason Makuch, to carry over 4.5 vacation days.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Closure of Two (2) Parking Spots – Church Street, June 21, 2025**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Foster, seconded by Trustee Cheney and carried to grant permission to close off two (2) parking spots on Church Street, along Lewis Park, on Saturday, June 21, 2025, from 3:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. to accommodate the catering team for The Town of Warwick Historical Society's annual Party in the Park event. Certificate of insurance has been received.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Facility Use – Stanley-Deming Park, Warwick Assembly Back to School Bash**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Foster, seconded by Trustee Collura and carried to grant permission to Warwick Assembly to use the pavilion, gazebo, and grass area in between, in Stanley-Deming Park on Saturday, August 2, 2025, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. for a Back to School Bash event. Permission includes the use of electricity, speakers for music, restrooms, and (1) one ice-cream truck parked on the handball court. Completed park permit and security deposit have been received. Approval pending proof of insurance from the ice-cream truck vendor and Warwick Assembly.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye    Trustee Foster Aye    Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye    Mayor Newhard Aye

**Facility Use – Veteran’s Memorial Park Pavilion, Boy Scout Troop 45 Court of Awards**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Foster, seconded by Trustee Cheney and carried to grant permission to Boy Scout Troop 45 to use the Veteran’s Memorial Park Pavilion for a Court of Awards Ceremony and end of the year BBQ on Monday, June 23, 2025, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Request includes use of four (4) village owned tables and (40) chairs, restrooms, electricity, and pavilion lights. Completed park permit and proof of insurance have been received.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye    Trustee Foster Aye    Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye    Mayor Newhard Aye

**Discussion**

Trustee McKnight asked who would be responsible for setting up the tables and chairs, specifying that they were Village-owned equipment.

Mayor Newhard responded that the Village does not typically set up the tables and chairs; they are simply left out for the Scouts to handle.

Trustee McKnight asked for clarification, confirming whether the Department of Public Works is responsible for bringing the tables and chairs down to the location.

Mayor Newhard clarified that the tables and chairs are stored in a shed right next to the pavilion, so there is no need for the Department of Public Works to transport them.

Trustee McKnight acknowledged the clarification and explained that he was simply checking to see whether any group—regardless of who it is—was requesting the use of Village resources to set up the tables and chairs. He confirmed that he understood they are just left there for use.

Trustee Collura added that, for future reference, the Village has either 18 or 19 tables. She advised that if anyone requests more tables than that, it should be noted and kept in mind when reviewing such requests.

Trustee McKnight noted that the facility use permit includes a section asking whether the applicant wishes to use tables and chairs. He assumed that this section applies specifically to Memorial Park and not to Stanley-Deming Park, and added that he believed the same process likely applies universally across both parks.

Mayor Newhard clarified that the table and chair request section on the facility use permit could apply to any event, but it is rarely used. Most requests typically pertain to Memorial Park because of the presence of the pavilion.

Trustee McKnight emphasized the importance of being mindful about how Village resources are used, particularly when it comes to setting up for events. He noted that the tables and chairs, while relatively small in value, are Village-owned assets and subject to wear and tear with each use. He questioned whether it was appropriate for the facility use permit to include an open option for table and chair use without clearly addressing the associated responsibilities or implications.

Mayor Newhard responded by questioning what alternatives groups like the Scouts would have if not allowed to use Village-owned tables and chairs, asking rhetorically whether they would be expected to rent them.

Trustee McKnight clarified that his concern was not specifically about the Scouts, but about any group submitting a facility use permit. He emphasized that his point was about the general policy—whether any applicant, regardless of who they are, should automatically be allowed to use Village-owned tables and chairs without further consideration.

Trustee Foster asked whether the Village should consider implementing a rental fee for the use of tables and chairs as a way to recoup maintenance or replacement costs. Trustee Foster noted that it was just an idea, suggesting that while the Village does not currently

charge for facility use, it could consider charging a fee specifically for renting equipment like tables and chairs if wear and maintenance are a concern.

Trustee McKnight clarified that his main concern was about ensuring the Village does not turn the Department of Public Works into an event rental service. While he was satisfied that this wasn't currently the case, he agreed it might be worth discussing the possibility of charging a fee to rent Village equipment. He raised additional concerns about the risk of tables being stolen or damaged.

Trustee Foster asked for clarification, confirming that Trustee McKnight was drawing a distinction between public events organized by local groups and open to the community, versus private parties.

Trustee McKnight clarified that his distinction was not between public and private events, but rather between Village-sponsored or Village-partnered programs and all other uses. He stated that it makes sense for Village equipment to be used in official or partnered events, but expressed concern about broader access—such as for family reunions or nonprofit events—through the standard facility use permit process. He noted that if the equipment is available to anyone and not monitored, there is a risk of damage or loss, which could result in taxpayer dollars being spent on replacements.

Trustee Cheney pointed out that the Village does collect a security deposit or fee in conjunction with facility use, which could be used to cover the cost of any damage or missing equipment. If any issues were identified, the cost could be deducted from that fee.

#### **Garage Sale Permit Refund – Jennifer Valent**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Collura, seconded by Trustee McKnight and carried to authorize a refund to Jennifer Valent in the amount of \$10.00 for Garage Sale Permit #1851-25, due to an administrative error. At the time of application, the \$25 security deposit was incorrectly deposited, while the \$15 permit fee was mistakenly held as the security deposit.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Budget Modification Request**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Collura, seconded by Trustee Foster and carried to approve the budget modification request to transfer available appropriations for certain FY2024-25 budget account lines per the Village Treasurer's memo dated June 11, 2025.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Budget Modification Request – Street Light Capital Project**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee Collura, seconded by Trustee Cheney and carried to approve the budget modification request to modify the budget appropriations and revenue for the Street Light Capital Project per the Village Treasurer's memo received on June 11, 2025.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye

**Discussion**

Trustee Cheney explained that the initial budget did not include a sufficient line item to cover a particular expense because the timing and details of the need were still uncertain. As a result, the funding was addressed through an interfund transfer. He clarified that there were no initial appropriations for the expense in question, and the necessary funds had to be transferred from another budget line to cover it.

The Board discussed which budget line the funds were transferred from and concluded that, due to the timing of entering into the new fiscal year, the money had been transferred from the previous year's budget.

**Edmunds GovTech Cloud Hosting Services**

A **MOTION** made by Trustee McKnight, seconded by Trustee Cheney and carried to accept the proposal from Edmunds GovTech for cloud hosting services and to authorize the mayor to sign

the same. The \$3,500 annual fee will be prorated from the date of setup to December 31, 2025, followed by a total annual fee of \$3,500 for the period of January 1, 2026 – December 31, 2026. Funds are appropriated in budget codes A1325.4570, F8310.4570 and G8110.4570.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows: **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye Trustee Foster Aye Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye Mayor Newhard Aye

### **Acceptance of Proposal – NYS Solar Farm**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee McKnight, seconded by Trustee Foster and carried to accept the proposal from NYS Solar Farm with a Gross PV Cost of \$302,316.00 for the design and installation of a Roof-Mounted Photovoltaic System at the DPW Garage as per the recommendation of Village Engineer, Engineering & Surveying Properties. Funds are appropriated in budget code A-1640-4950.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows: **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye Trustee Foster Aye Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye Mayor Newhard Aye

### **Discussion**

Trustee Cheney referred to a line item labeled "estimated federal tax credit" and noted that it factored into the calculations used to determine the Village's financial responsibility. He asked what would happen if those tax credits were not realized, and it was confirmed that the Village would be responsible for covering the shortfall.

Trustee McKnight pointed out that if the estimated federal tax credits were not realized, what was expected to be a cost-neutral project could instead result in a significant out-of-pocket expense for the Village. He estimated that instead of paying \$1,000, the Village could be responsible for \$90,000, which would take approximately two years to recoup based on projected savings in electricity costs.

Trustee Cheney asked whether the Village had any control over the realization of the estimated federal tax credits at this point in the process.

Trustee McKnight explained that they had spoken with the vendor involved in the project

and offered to discuss how the decision was reached, if desired. He noted that, according to the vendor—whose experience is in this area—even if the federal administration were to eliminate the tax credits, it would likely take one to two years for such a change to take effect. He acknowledged that he could be mistaken but emphasized that this was his understanding based on the vendor's input.

Trustee Cheney clarified that the financial assumptions were based on the federal tax code as it existed at the time the calculations were made—likely within the past few weeks. He asked whether the Village's cost exposure would only change if the tax code itself changed, or if it could also be affected by the selected company's failure to properly apply for or secure the tax credits. He sought clarification on whether the risk was solely tied to legislative changes or if vendor error could also result in unanticipated costs for the Village.

Trustee Cheney confirmed that, based on Trustee McKnight's explanation, the only risk to the Village in terms of not receiving the estimated federal tax credit would be if the tax code itself changes. Trustee McKnight affirmed that understanding.

Trustee McKnight provided a summary of the solar project selection process, thanking Village Clerk Raina for managing the process across three rounds and commending the Village's engineering partners for their support. He noted that four vendors were seriously considered, as shown in the matrix on the last page of the agenda packet. While more vendors initially submitted bids, only four met the Village's minimum qualifications.

He highlighted several factors that led to the selection of NYS Solar Farm, including the superior quality of their product and warranty, which exceeded those offered by other bidders. He noted that their levelized cost of energy was competitive and that their estimated annual energy production ranked near the top among all proposals. The vendor also submitted the most comprehensive proposal and was one of the few that provided reliable references.

Trustee McKnight reviewed the financial elements of the project, noting that the Village has already secured a \$147,000 NYSERDA contract and a \$37,500 grant. An additional \$25,000 NY-Sun rebate may also be available, though he said he was not concerned about that piece. The main financial variable is the \$90,000 federal tax credit, which the Village will apply for once the system is operational. Assuming the credit is awarded and there are no change orders or other deviations, the Village's total out-of-pocket cost would be \$1,000, making the project nearly cost-neutral with an estimated annual electricity savings of approximately \$45,000.

Trustee Foster added that the selected vendor, NYS Solar Farm, also includes annual preventative maintenance for the first few years as part of their proposal—an offering that none of the other vendors included.

Trustee Cheney stated that the Village would need to initially front \$302,316 for the solar project.

Trustee McKnight confirmed that the Village would need to front the full amount but noted that \$187,500 in funding has already been secured through the NYSERDA contract and a grant, reducing the net financial impact.

Trustee Cheney confirmed that the Village would be signing a contract with NYS Solar Farm for the full amount of \$302,316. He noted that the vendor would install the system in full, after which the Village would pursue the various grants and the federal tax credit to offset the cost.

Trustee McKnight explained that the Village already has the \$37,500 grant funds in hand. Once the contract is signed with NYS Solar Farm, NYSERDA will release 25% of the \$147,500 contract amount, with the remaining 75% to be paid upon project completion. While this structure requires the Village to front some of the funds, he noted that he worked with the Village Treasurer during the budgeting process to ensure those funds were set aside. He added that he would like to see the project move forward with urgency once the vendor is engaged, so the installation can be completed and the Village can apply for the federal tax credit as soon as possible.

Trustee Cheney asked about the time requirements outlined in the contract with the vendor, noting that the vendor's project schedule will determine the pace of the work and billing. He emphasized that as the vendor completes phases of the project and submits invoices, the Village should be able to request corresponding reimbursements from NYSERDA.

Trustee McKnight clarified that the Village has not yet entered into a contract with the vendor. Finalizing the contract will be the next step in the process.

Trustee Cheney asked whether the original RFP included any stipulated performance requirements related to timing, and whether the selected vendor had provided any proposed timeline in their response.

Trustee McKnight responded that while the RFP itself did not include specific performance timelines, it referenced the Village's contract with NYSERDA, which does contain a timing requirement. He noted that the project must be completed within



approximately 18 months, according to that agreement.

Trustee Foster asked whether the contract with the selected vendor would include a required timeline.

Trustee Cheney agreed and stated that the Village should negotiate a specific project timeline as part of the contract with the vendor.

Village Attorney Benjamin Gailey stated that any agreement with the vendor would be subject to approval of a contract by the Board.

Trustee McKnight added that NYSERDA would also need to review the Village's contract with the selected vendor. He noted that the Village has established contacts at NYSERDA and encouraged Board members to ask any questions they may have.

Trustee Cheney thanked Trustee McKnight for his efforts in bringing the project to the finish line, particularly with regard to coordinating with Village Clerk Raina Abramson and managing the complexities of the vendor selection process. He also expressed appreciation for the strong start provided by the initial planning and preparation.

Mayor Newhard acknowledged that a tremendous amount of work went into the project and noted that, in addition to its long history, the process faced complications.

Trustee McKnight explained that the initial round of bidding did not go as expected, with bidders failing to follow the requirements, which forced the Village to go out to bid a second time.

## **Reports**

### **Trustee Cheney's Report:**

Trustee Cheney reported that there is significant construction activity taking place in and around the Village, which many residents have likely noticed or been inconvenienced by. He reminded the public that the Town is currently replacing the culvert under Ball Road, and that the detour for this work is expected to remain in place for another three to five weeks, possibly less. Regarding the New York State Department of Transportation paving project, Trustee Cheney stated that it covers 14 miles of roadway and includes resurfacing, pedestrian enhancements, drainage improvements, and the addition of a new roundabout. Project work is expected to continue over the next one to two months.

He provided the following location-specific updates:

- Village of Florida (primarily along Route 17/94): Utility work is taking place.
- Village of Warwick: Utility work will occur at the intersection of Route 17A, Main Street, and West Street, with daily lane closures expected for approximately one week.
- Route 94 at Clifford Court: Sight distance improvements are underway with daily lane closures expected to last two to three weeks.
- Route 94 near Walling Road: Drainage improvements are taking place, also requiring daily lane closures for two to three weeks.
- Route 94 between Warwick Turnpike and Sanfordville Road near Pennings Lane: A significant culvert replacement is planned, with one-way traffic managed by a temporary signal. This is expected to take approximately two months.
- Route 94 between the New Jersey line and Warwick Turnpike: Shoulder repairs are scheduled, with daily lane closures anticipated for two to three weeks.

Trustee Cheney urged residents to exercise caution when driving through work zones, emphasizing the importance of being aware of workers' presence to prevent accidents or injuries.

Mayor Newhard asked whether the utility work scheduled for West Street was planned to take place at night.

Trustee Cheney responded that, according to the release he reviewed, the upcoming work on West Street is not scheduled to take place at night—though that may happen later in the project. He clarified that the current phase involves utility work, possibly including the relocation of poles and other infrastructure such as gas lines, to facilitate the planned drainage improvements and replacement of catch basins.

#### **Trustee Foster's Report:**

Trustee Foster reported that proposals have been received for the Village's Transportation Safety Action Plan. She is currently assembling evaluation materials and noted that the evaluation committee will need to convene soon to determine the next steps. She expressed enthusiasm about the project's progress, noting that it will include the "Slow Down Warwick" campaign and represents the beginning of a new and important chapter for the Village.

#### **Trustee Collura's Report:**

Trustee Collura reminded residents that the Village's summer newsletter should have arrived in the mail and noted a correction to the concert schedule: the *Sunday, July 13* High Street concert will begin at **5:00 p.m.**, not 7:00 p.m. as listed.

She also mentioned the new Architectural Walking Tour brochure, which is available at both Village Hall and the Warwick Tourism Center next door.

Lastly, she shared that the Warwick Historical Society is putting together a community cookbook. Residents are invited to submit their favorite personal or family recipes by July 31, 2025. The cookbook will be released in time for the holiday season, and submissions can be made at [warwickhistory.org](http://warwickhistory.org).

**Trustee McKnight's Report:**

No report.

**Mayor Newhard's Report:**

Mayor Newhard announced several upcoming community events. He noted that Juneteenth will be celebrated on Thursday, with a day-long celebration on Railroad Green organized by the UAME Church (Union African Methodist Episcopal Church). The festivities will conclude with a concert as part of the Village's summer concert series. He praised the organizers for their energy and effort in putting together what he expects to be a wonderful event.

The Mayor also highlighted the upcoming Pollinator Festival, which will take place at Park Avenue Elementary School on Saturday from 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The festival celebrates Warwick's status as the first Monarch Village in New York State. It will showcase projects from local schools and students focused on pollinators such as monarch butterflies and bats. Mayor Newhard noted the months of work teachers and students have put into these projects and encouraged the public to attend, saying the creativity and depth of the displays are impressive. He also mentioned that the Strawberry Picnic will be taking place on Saturday as well.

Trustee Collura added that the Strawberry Picnic will take place on Saturday, June 21 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at Stanley-Deming Park. The event is organized by Nicole Hixon, Warwick's Artist in Residence, in collaboration with Warwick Works. The community is invited to celebrate summer at *The Divine Feminine: Feeding Nature* event, which will include a strawberry social potluck, themed activities, and strawberry treats to share.

Trustee Foster confirmed that the timing of the events on Saturday would allow residents to attend both the Pollinator Festival at Park Avenue Elementary School and the Strawberry Picnic at Stanley-Deming Park.

Mayor Newhard shared that a pollinator garden next to Stanley-Deming Park has recently been revived and is looking beautiful. He also highlighted a Girl Scout Silver Award project, which involved creating another pollinator garden adjacent to the playground along South Street. He encouraged residents to stop by and enjoy the gardens.

The Mayor also extended congratulations to the Warwick Fire Department for their successful celebration and large parade over the past weekend. He commended the Police Department for their efforts in ensuring public safety throughout the event. Mayor Newhard noted that the parade was an excellent showcase of the dedication and spirit of the region's volunteer firefighters and described it as an opportunity for them to proudly display their hard work.

He remarked on the huge size of the trophies awarded during the celebration, including one his own store received for best window display, which is now on view in the shop window. The Mayor gave special recognition to Chief Lemin, noting that this is his final year as Fire Chief, and praised the coordination and spirit of the entire event. He concluded by reflecting on how fortunate the Village is to host such vibrant and well-supported community parades.

**Public Comment – *Non-Agenda Items***

No comments.

**Final Comments from the Board**

No comments.

**Adjournment**

A **MOTION** was made by Trustee McKnight, seconded by Trustee Collura and carried to adjourn the regular meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows:      **APPROVED**

Trustee Cheney Aye      Trustee Foster Aye      Trustee Collura Aye

Trustee McKnight Aye      Mayor Newhard Aye