

**WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2023  
3:30 P.M.**

PRESENT: Leigh J. Benton, Chairman  
Mike Anagnostakis, James D. O'Donnell, Thomas J. Faggione,  
Michael D. Paduch, Barry J. Cheney

ALSO

PRESENT: Katie Bonelli, Chairwoman  
Betsy N. Abraham, Esq., Legislative Counsel  
Harold J. Porr, Deputy County Executive  
Michael Torelli, Assistant to the County Executive  
Richard B. Golden, County Attorney  
Matthew Nothnagle, Chief Assistant County Attorney  
Stacy Butler, Senior Assistant County Attorney  
Alicia D'Amico, Director of Operations and Cost Control  
Kerry Gallagher, Commissioner of Finance  
Michael Schreiber, Deputy Commissioner of Finance  
Andrea Concannon, Deputy Commissioner of Finance  
Jennifer L. Roman, D.O., Orange County Medical Examiner  
Erik Denega, Commissioner, Department of Public Works  
Travis Ewald, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works/Engineering Div.  
Brian Titsworth, Brian W. Titsworth, Deputy Commissioner, Infrastructure Services  
Scott K. Razzano, Director of Professional Services, Dept. of Public Works/Buildings  
Robert Gray, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works/  
Environmental Facilities & Services  
Deanna Crawford, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Parks, Recreation and Conservation  
Alan Sorensen, Commissioner of Planning  
Paul Arteta, Sheriff  
Wilfredo Garcia, Undersheriff  
Brendan R. Casey, Commissioner, Dept. of Emergency Services  
Robert Doss, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Emergency Services/Police Liaison  
Vini Tankasali, Deputy Commissioner, Fire Services  
Paul Wiley, Director, Real Property Tax Service  
Deborah Slesinski, Budget Director  
Gretchen Riordan, Deputy Budget Director  
Dr. Kristine Young, President, Orange County Community College  
Paul G. Martland, Vice President of Admin./Finance, Orange County Community College  
Jared P. Pickard, CPA, Manager, Certified Public Accountant, Drescher and Malecki, LLP  
Matthew J. Montalbo, Partner, Certified Public Accountant, Drescher and Malecki, LLP

Chairman Benton opened the committee meeting at 3:32 p.m. by asking everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. All committee members were present with the exception of Legislators Brescia and Hines who were absent and Legislator Sierra who was excused.

Mr. Faggione moved the request approval and supplemental appropriation for updated ARPA projects, seconded by Mr. Cheney.

Ms. Slesinski and Ms. Gallagher addressed the committee. Ms. Slesinski stated this project began in the summer of 2021. She has looked over many projects and worked with several departments. While some of the projects originally made the list and upon careful review, some would not make the timeline required. Over the past year, many other projects have been evaluated. A list has been created that can meet the criteria of encumbering the funds by December of 2024 and having the project complete by December of 2026. She then began the review of the **ARPA Funding** (on file in Clerk, Legislative Office) which included the Original Proposal, Proposed Changes, New Projects, and DPW ARPA Projects.

Mr. Anagnostakis commented that he finds it hard to believe that with a completion date of 2026, the Medical Examiner's Building cannot be done before then.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed with Legislator Anagnostakis and thinks there is a possibility of having one building with the Medical Examiner on one wing and the Health Department on another which would save a ton of money and they could share a lab. He can guarantee that the amount of effort being put into looking at this is zero. He then asked that the Medical Examiner be put on next month's committee meeting agenda.

Mr. Paduch expressed his concerns about the legislature being left out of the ARPA process except for the Chairwoman and the Chair of Ways and the Means Committee. Leadership was not involved in any decisions, the Legislature owns all of the property in Orange County, and yet, they do not have a say. He has made it clear that he is "disgusted" with the process and cannot support this.

Mr. O'Donnell asked why there is a four-year timeline for these projects.

Ms. Slesinski replied the funds must be encumbered within 18 months, the RFP process takes time, and other items come along with the process.

Mr. Denega explained that he looked at the schedule for the Medical Examiner's Building and compared it to the schedule of the Government Center Building and other projects. From point A to point Z, there is a lot that goes into it than just construction. Construction can take a year and a half on its own. He stated planning, feasibility studies, and getting into the design along with everything else that is involved, can take up to four years. It is not a guarantee that the project would get done as there could be delays.

Mr. Pickard stated there is a lot to take into consideration with a timeline and having certain contracts in place by December 2024.

Mr. O'Donnell commented that his mindset is that government can work quickly when they put their mind too, therefore, he still does not understand why this cannot be done especially when a lot of money can be saved by combining two departments.

Ms. Gallagher continued to review of the proposed projects.

Regarding the redistricting project, Mr. Paduch asked if \$100,000.00 is enough and if further supplemental appropriation is needed, will they be able to get it.

Ms. Gallagher replied that this was the requested estimated dollar amount and the Finance Department added \$25,000.00 in case further funding was needed.

Mr. Anagnostakis asked what would happen to the \$25,000.00 of ARPA funding if it was not needed.

Ms. Slesinski replied the funds will be repurposed for something else.

Chairwoman Bonelli stated that Legislative Counsel Abraham researched the average cost of redistricting as each county is unique. They felt that \$75,000.00 was reasonable.

As Ms. Gallagher continued to review the projects, she explained the funds needed for laptops as not everyone in the workforce has one and it is important in case we are told to get up and leave right away.

Mr. Anagnostakis asked how many people are without a laptop and how many people really need one. He stated that they are bypassing critical projects and spending the funds on things that are not needed right away.

Ms. D'Amico responded that this is a costly expense, has been needed since COVID-19, and they wanted to switch everyone in the workforce over to a laptop, not so much for remote, but for mobile. This will allow for when someone leaves their desk and goes elsewhere to work, they can grab the laptop and go (whether it be home or to another meeting). She stated this is in hopes that one day there will be a flexible remote workforce. Six-hundred and fifty laptops have been purchased since COVID-19 and there are 2,220 employees, therefore, another 1,700 need to be purchased.

Mr. Anagnostakis asked how much a laptop costs.

Ms. D'Amico replied they cost \$1,700.00 apiece.

Mr. Anagnostakis stated that comes to \$3.4 million and asked what the extra \$1.2 million will be used for.

Ms. D'Amico replied that it will be used for docking stations, knapsacks, professional services (consulting firm), etc. She stated this is not just a random number, everything has been calculated and negotiated.

Mr. O'Donnell clarified that 30% of the workforce has a laptop.

Ms. D'Amico stated that is correct.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if a study was done to see how much that increased deficiency.

Ms. D'Amico replied that a study was not done, but they have received verbal replied that having a laptop has made work life easier. She stated a written study across the board was not done.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that he would like to go into executive session at another time to further discuss this and asked for a report on the laptops regarding how often they are checked, the security, what happens off-hours, etc.

Ms. D'Amico stated they already have that information because someone from IT can get into the laptop.

Mr. O'Donnell reiterated that he will not ask to go into executive session today to see what percentage of people would be a problem, but he is sure there are a certain number which can be discussed at another time.

Ms. Slesinski continued reviewing the projects with the committee.

Mr. Faggione asked Ms. Slesinski and Ms. Gallagher if they came up with the projects and how the funds would be spent are their own.

Ms. Slesinski and Ms. Gallagher replied no.

Mr. Faggione then clarified that this was not done secretly.

Ms. Slesinski stated that is correct. This was reviewed with several departments.

In terms of redistricting, Mr. Faggione asked how it came to be a part of the ARPA funding.

Ms. Slesinski replied that it came from Chairwoman Bonelli.

Mr. Faggione then clarified that Chairwoman Bonelli was involved in the meetings that took place regarding ARPA.

Ms. Gallagher stated that is correct, she and Legislator Benton were involved.

Mr. Faggione commented that he has full faith and confidence in Legislator Benton as well as the leadership of Chairwoman Bonelli as the door has always been open. To suggest here that leadership was not involved, is not only preposterous, but also unfair to the Chairwoman.

Mr. O'Donnell disagreed and stated that the leaders should have been involved. Chairwoman Bonelli does a great job keeping the legislators informed, but Minority Leader Paduch's complaint is that this was not discussed with any of them until now. One example is the radio project for the Emergency Services Department.

Regarding Mr. Faggione's comments, Mr. Paduch stated that each of these projects are under departments pertaining to the scope of our statutory committees. If this was done throughout the year and legislators were involved, this discussion would not be taking place.

Chairwoman Bonelli stated that this conversation is taking a different turn which seems to be self-serving on some legislator's parts. Most of the people in this room have worked endlessly on this project. As legislators, no one understands or knows what has taken place behind the scenes, except for those who have had the opportunity to follow it. She and Legislator Benton are open to entertain any ideas anyone may have. The consultants have been a part of this from the

beginning and the information and regulations have changed and with that, they have had to change. Throughout this process, she has heard a lot of legislators ask for certain projects to be done with ARPA funds, but it could not be done because it did not meet the criteria that had to be followed. She reiterated that these people have worked endlessly to provide the committee with a list, therefore, everyone needs to focus on these projects. She commended the departments and consultants for their hard work and respects the comments from the committee members.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that his comments were not meant to be self-serving, he is here to serve the citizens of Orange County. He understands the amount of time and work that went into this and appreciates it.

Mr. Paduch stated that all departments did a great job, but the fact is, the legislators need to know before voting. He emphasized that all legislators, especially the Majority and Minority Leader should have been involved in this process, but he will support this since it will happen anyway, and they are good projects. The more information, the better, so he can make a positive vote.

Motion carried. All in favor.

The next agenda item was a Sales Tax Update which included County of Orange Sales Tax Received Year-To-Date (County Portion Only) and a 4-Year Gross Sales Tax Comparison (on file in Clerk, Legislative Office). Ms. Gallagher stated these are the final numbers for 2022.

Ms. Slesinski addressed the committee with an update regarding the General Fund Status Report as of December 2022 and January 2023 (on file in Clerk, Legislative Office). She stated that as of February, there are 359 vacant funded positions and at this time last year, there were 337.

Regarding the next agenda item, Mr. Benton pointed out that the original request that was on the agenda (**Request supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 2022/2023 budget to fund the salary and benefits of a Vice President and General Counsel and to fund occasional outside counsel to provide legal services previously provided by the County Attorney's office, \$275,000.00 (LR#276)**(TABLED FOR 30 DAYS AT 1/20/23 E&E AND 1/24/23 WAYS & MEANS)), was amended at the Education and Economic Development Committee meeting.

Mr. Faggione stated that discussion ensued last Friday at the Education and Economic Development Committee meeting regarding this resolution which was tabled last month. He then asked Chairwoman Bonelli to further explain the amendment from the time between the last meeting (January) and the committee meeting last week.

Chairwoman Bonelli explained at those meetings it was decided that the agenda item would be withdrawn so they would have an opportunity to speak with the college and come up with something that was palatable to everyone. She had a meeting with Dr. Young, Mr. Martland, Majority Leader Faggione, and Minority Leader Paduch and at the end of the discussion, it was determined that there was not a lot of support for hiring a person that would serve as legal counsel/vice president, so it was removed from the table. They then took a careful look at the finances and what the surrounding colleges were doing. She stated that this will be monitored, further discussed over the next few months in regard to how things are going, and the amount was adjusted to \$50,000.00.

Mr. Faggione stated that before them is the resolution that was tabled and most recently amended in committee.

Dr. Young stated this has been well covered and thanked Chairwoman Bonelli as well as leadership for coming together. They realize this was a situation put before the college and the legislature that was difficult, but everyone came up with a solution efficiently and responsibly. Furthermore, there will be records kept of the services used and a detailed conversation will take place in a few months regarding the future.

Mr. Anagnostakis asked if this will be a "stop gap" and they will come back next year with a proposal that was similar to the first proposal.

Mr. Martland replied, no that is not their intention. He stated they would be looking at more money for the new budget year because this amount of \$50,000.00 is only a portion for half the year.

Mr. Anagnostakis then asked if they arrived at this conclusion because they felt and/or sensed that there was not enough support or did they come to the conclusion by reviewing the numbers, requests, and data that was out there.

Dr. Young replied that she believes the first proposal was sound, but she would also like this to be complete.

Mr. Anagnostakis commented that he questions the need for a full-time lawyer on staff.

Chairwoman Bonelli mentioned that at the previous meeting in January, she made a statement that there will be supplemental appropriation and it will not affect the floor. She reiterated that this will be monitored closely as they move forward.

Mr. Paduch clarified that there is a surplus of \$7 million in the operating fund balance and \$3 million in restricted funds.

Mr. Martland stated that is correct.

Mr. Faggione moved to amend the current request by Orange County Community College to appropriate \$50,000.00 to be used to retain legal services of an outside counsel, seconded by Mr. Anagnostakis.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Cheney moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the 2023 Planning Department budget to increase the budget line for Land Preservation Services. The increase will allow the consultant to monitor the County's Conservation Easements, \$50,000.00, seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Mr. Sorensen stated that these funds are needed to oversee the conservation easements which involves going out into the field and inspecting properties.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. O'Donnell moved to approve the request to accept and appropriate grant funds in the amount of \$22,616,598.00. These funds are appropriated to Orange County via the Federal 5307 funding program. The FTA Grant amount is \$22,616,598.00, the NYS match is \$2,827,075.00 and the County share is \$2,827,075.00. This project consists of the creation of the Schunnemunk Rail Trail which once acquired by Orange County and permanently protected, would facilitate the creation of bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Salisbury Mills train station, Chester Park & Ride and Dial-a-Bus services in the Village/Town of Chester. The proposed Schunnemunk Rail Trail would dramatically improve public transit use and services by providing pedestrian and bicyclist connections to existing transit facilities while also opening opportunities to expand service with this area of Orange County. The grant application for the use of 5307 funds will include ROW Incidentals, Engineering & Design, Construction, and Construction Review, \$2,827,075.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Mr. Sorensen explained that this is another step in the process of developing the Schunnemunk Rail Trail and he came before the committee last month requesting the increase of the county share and the price of it. The funding has been committed from the FAA and this is another step in the process to move forward.

Mr. O'Donnell clarified that the state funding has been approved.

Mr. Sorensen stated that is correct. They went through the Orange County Transportation Council and the project has been added to the Transportation Program.

Mr. O'Donnell then asked if there are any time constraints.

Mr. Sorensen replied yes, there are time constraints, but the one good thing about this opportunity is the funding because it lapsed and they have five years to complete the project.

Mr. O'Donnell clarified that the trail will be wider than what we have now.

Mr. Sorensen stated that is correct.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Cheney moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the capital projects budget for the Parks Various Capital Improvements. Upon approval, a new capital project will be created, \$350,000.00, seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Ms. Crawford stated this request is for various capital improvements and referred the back-up sheet (on file in Clerk, Legislative Office).

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Faggione moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the capital projects budget for the replacement of the Fire Investigation Response Truck and the purchase of Water Rescue Boats and related equipment for the Technical Rescue Team. This is proposed Capital Project No. 66 in the 2023 Capital Plan. Upon approval, a new capital project will be created, \$230,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Paduch.

Mr. Tankasali stated this capital project has been discussed for a year. The current fire investigation vehicle is an old mini bus that is over 20 years old. He further stated that the new boat will include the capability of technical rescue which is needed as well as allow for them to use more apparatus for shared purposes as the water rescue volume has increased.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Anagnostakis moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the capital projects budget in the amount of \$869,147.00 for the purchase of body cameras. The Sheriff's Office currently has Capital Project No. 324 to purchase body cameras in the amount of \$725,000.00. Upon approval, the funds will increase Capital Project No. 324 to a total of \$1,594,147.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Sheriff Arteta stated this was created and approved prior to his administration. These are the payments that were agreed upon for the next four years for the body cameras.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Regarding the next agenda item, Mr. Benton stated that the amount was amended yesterday at the Physical Services to \$40,000.00.

Mr. Cheney moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the capital projects budget for renovation of the Sheriff's K-9 Facility. This project has been approved under the 2023 Capital Plan as Project No. 123. Upon approval, a new capital project will be created, \$40,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Faggione.

(NO ACTION TAKEN AT 2/16/23 PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING)

Mr. Titsworth passed around pictures of the floor for the committee to see.

Undersheriff Garcia explained that it is obvious the floor needs to be repaired as soon as possible because it is dangerous to the members who attend the training as well as the animals. Instead of renovating the entire facility, they have decided to replace the floors so they can operate properly.

Mr. Benton commented that the facility gets a lot of use and dogs from all over the area are trained.

Sheriff Arteta stated they currently have a K-9 class with ten new dogs.



Mr. Benton clarified that other counties are included.

Sheriff Arteta stated that is correct.

Motion carried. All in favor.

The next agenda item was withdrawn from the Physical Services Committee, but there was discussion and this committee will do the same. **(Request supplemental appropriation to the capital projects budget in the amount of \$2,500,000.00 for the building expansion at the Orange County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office has Capital Project No. 326 for the expansion in the amount of \$350,000.00. Upon approval, the funds will increase Capital Project No. 326 to a total \$2,850,000.00 (bonding) (LR#027))**  
**(NO ACTION TAKEN AT 2/16/23 PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING).**

Mr. Titsworth stated everything is still in draft form, so he will have it for the committee next month. He spoke to LAN Associates today because there are a few revisions that need to be made.

Mr. Benton asked that the draft be sent as soon as he receives it so there is time to discuss it prior to the committee meetings.

Mr. Paduch moved to approve the request to confirm all rates including increasing certain rates charged at Orange County owned Solid Waste Disposal facilities for Single Stream Recycling and Municipal Solid Waste effective 4/1/2023. Increase Tipping Fees due to increased Hauling and Processing Fees as follows:

- Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) – increase from current rate of \$121.25 to \$129.00
- Single Stream Recycling (SSR) – increase from current rate of \$110.00 to \$117.50
- Implement a \$100.00 per load fee to be assessed to a vendor who brings a SSR load that is contaminated with 10% or more MSW (LR#061), seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Mr. Denega explained that these increases were discussed at yesterday's Physical Service's Committee meeting and modified. The prices listed (on file in Clerk, Legislative Office) are by the ton, they rebid the contract for Single Stream Recycling (SSR) and increased the contract by 5% for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW). The price for SSR went from \$70.00 a ton to \$125.00 a ton and MSW went from \$121.25 to \$129.00 which is based on the 5% increase per the contractor. Regarding recycling, there is more of an industry/market issue which Mr. Gray will further explain. They looked at some comparable rates in other counties and municipalities because they do not want to out price themselves from that market. He stated the fee on the request is \$100.00 because the new contract for SSR is now with a different vendor who requested that a penalty fee be included for a spoiled load that must be handled specially. This would be a chargeback to the county, but to do that and help prevent contamination of recycled materials, it would be pertinent to add the \$100.00 to those. The fee is substantiated by their calculation of labor and estimated time for the material to get handled, it is not an arbitrary number. Furthermore, the rates were amended yesterday as

follows: Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) – increase from current rate of \$121.25 to \$128.25, Single Stream Recycling (SSR) – increase from current rate of \$110.00 to \$120.00 and implement a \$100.00 per load fee to be assessed to a vendor who brings a SSR load that is contaminated with 10% or more MSW.

Mr. Cheney moved to amend the request to confirm all rates including increasing certain rates charged at Orange County owned Solid Waste Disposal facilities for Single Stream Recycling and Municipal Solid Waste effective 4/1/2023. Increase Tipping Fees due to increased Hauling and Processing Fees as follows:

- Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) – increase from current rate of \$121.25 to \$128.25
- Single Stream Recycling (SSR) – increase from current rate of \$110.00 to \$120.00
- Implement a \$100.00 per load fee to be assessed to a vendor who brings a SSR load that is contaminated with 10% or more MSW, seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Mr. O'Donnell asked how many bids were received.

Mr. Gray replied two bids were received.

Mr. O'Donnell clarified that they went with the current vendor.

Mr. Denega stated that they went with the higher bidder and the current vendor refused a contract extension.

Mr. Paduch commented that he spoke about the \$100.00 fee at the committee meeting yesterday and he is aware that there were concerns and suggested a fine be added to the new contracts for those who do not obey the rules.

Mr. Denega stated that he spoke with the County Attorney about what they are permitted to do and their options for reinforcement. It came down to jeopardizing the license of the vendors. They did not get too specific about additional fees. His understanding is that the fee built into the transfer station location couldn't be an arbitrary fee as it must be based on a calculated cost to the county.

Mr. Paduch commented that he is hoping this will deter people from throwing their trash and recyclables in the same bin.

Motion carried. All in favor of the amendment with the exception of Legislator Benton who abstained, Legislators Brescia and Hines who were absent, and Legislator Sierra who was excused.

Mr. Anagnostakis inquired about how the revenue at the transfer station is collected, how it is controlled and how much revenue is received from those who dump their garbage on a yearly basis.

Mr. Gray responded that he does not have the breakdown but will get it.

Mr. O'Donnell moved to approve the recommendation by Mr. Wiley to not grant a taxpayers request of a correction of error to remove the school district tax re-levy from the 2023 County and Town tax. Taxpayer claimed the payment had been made to the lockbox company in time. The check was dated the day before payment was to be received before being re-levied on the County and Town tax bill. The lockbox company may or may not have received in time, however, the postmark of the payment could not be verified. In Real Property Tax Law, the postmark of payment is used as the date payment is received. If it cannot be proven, then the payment date is the date the tax collector receives the payment, which was after the final date for collection by the school district, seconded by Mr. Benton.

Mr. Wiley stated that there is a local law that states anything under \$2,500.00 does not need to be approved by the legislature, but in this case the re-levy is \$6,700.00 and the person was desperately trying to get the penalties and interest waived. The school district said it was received in time, but according to the lockbox company, there was no proof that payment was received on time, therefore, he is asking that this be rejected.

Mr. Benton asked if an action needs to be taken.

Legislative Counsel Abraham replied yes. She recommends that action be taken coinciding with Mr. Wiley's recommendation.

Motion carried. All in favor of accepting Mr. Wiley's recommendation to not grant the taxpayer's request.

Mr. Paduch moved to accept Mr. Wiley's recommendation to grant a taxpayer's request who had their school district tax bill re-levied onto the County and Town tax bill after mailing two checks within the collection period. The checks were returned to the taxpayer in December 2022 with "Return to Sender – Undeliverable" messages from the USPS. Address has been verified as being correct and the postmarks were within the first and second month of the school district collection period. Real Property Director cannot remove fees and penalties from the County and Town tax bill, but the Director recommends that since postmarks, address and checks were validated the fees and penalties should be refunded from the County and Town tax bill which has been paid by the tax collector in full, seconded by Mr. Faggione.

Mr. Wiley stated this request is the opposite of the previous one. This person showed proof that they tried twice to mail the payment, but it was never received by the tax collector.

Motion carried. All in favor of accepting Mr. Wiley's recommendation to grant the taxpayer's request.

Mr. Anagnostakis left the committee meeting at 5:27 p.m.

Mr. O'Donnell moved to discuss deed sale parcels,  
seconded by Mr. Faggione.

The first deed sale parcel is in the Town of Blooming Grove (29-3-3) has a minimum bid of \$500.00 and an amount bid of \$500.00. He recommends it be approved. Parcel number two located in the Town of Warwick (73-4-146, 73-4-147, 73-4-148, 73-4-149) has a minimum bid of \$3,600.00 and an amount bid of \$3, 710.00. He stated that he recommended this parcel be denied, but would like to change it so that it be approved because it four small lots, there is no road frontage, and is not an adjoining property owner.

Mr. O'Donnell asked how many times this has been put out to bid.

Mr. Benton replied five years.

Mr. O'Donnell stated the property owner will not be able to do much with it, so he agrees that it should be sold.

Mr. O'Donnell moved to accept Mr. Wiley's  
recommendation to change deed sale parcel  
No. 2 from a "no" to a "yes", seconded by  
Mr. Cheney.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Motion carried. All in favor of accepting Mr. Wiley's  
recommendation to approve deed sale parcels Nos.  
1 and 2.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.