

Minutes

Administrative Services Committee

August 13, 2018, 5:00 pm, Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Scudder, Himelein, Starks, Davis

Members Absent: Muldowney

Others: Ames, Spanos, Dennison, Caflisch, Bobseine, Gustafson, Abdella, Crow, Garrasi, Potter

Chairman Scudder called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (7/16/18)

MOVED by Legislator Himelein, SECONDED by Legislator Davis

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time.

Proposed Resolution- Authorizing the Sale of Property Adjacent To County Road 18
In North Harmony, New York

Mr. Spanos: Mr. Chairman, thank you. This resolution is to allow us to transfer the property back to the property owner adjacent to the road and we are keeping the necessary right away for our highway needs. I do have the maps here. It is about 2,230 square feet in area.

Mr. Scudder: Any questions? Comments? Concerns? All in favor? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Transfer of Tax Foreclosure Property in the Town of Ellicott

Mr. Abdella: This property on Jackson Avenue contains a building that is in severe disrepair. The County had taken a tax (*inaudible*) at one point and had a buyer for it from the auction but they ended up abandoning the sale. This was some years ago after they realized how bad the condition of the property was and it has continued to deteriorate. CREDC, the Chautauqua Region Economic Development Corporation, believes that they have a possible way

to get the building down. They are going to first do some environmental studies but are proposing that the County transfer the property to them for \$1.00 so they can attempt to undertake that remediation and work with a neighboring property owner to redevelop it. The County, should there ever be any (*inaudible*) sale which is unlikely that exceed the cost to do a demolition would get the proceeds up to the amount of the delinquent taxes, interest and penalties. It looks like it is our best chance at this point to try to take care of this problem property. I guess I could say that it is not unlike the Portage Inn was in Westfield. It is one that just needs to come down at some point.

Chairman Scudder: Any questions for Steve?

Legislator Himelein: Well, if it's a blight to the neighborhood we ought to get rid of it.

Chairman Scudder: All in favor say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Amend Chautauqua County Purchasing Policy

Mr. Abdella: I believe there is an updated version that now has a list of County Officers and employees who have been designated purchasing authority. So first, perhaps you would want to have a motion to amend by substitution to put in that modified resolution with the list of names.

Chairman Scudder: Ok.

Legislator Davis: I will make that motion.

Legislator Starks: I'll second that.

Chairman Scudder: All in favor of the amendment? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried to Amend by Substitution

Mr. Abdella: I can give a quick explanation of the resolution as amended and then Kitty may have a tweak to the language that she wants to suggest to you in a moment. Primarily, these amendments to the purchasing policy are accomplishing a couple things. One is there is some additional language being added to create and enhance preference for local vendors within a certain range of purchasing between 5 and 35,000 which is outside of the mandatory state bid requirements. The policy already had language that stated that the county would acquire goods and services from local vendors, but this gives it some additional strength to that policy by allowing local vendors in some instances to match proposals made by out of county vendors. It also provides that in the event of a tie bid between a local vendor and a non-local vendor that the County may award the contract to the local vendor. Then in addition to that, there is language that restricts the circumstances in which contractors who may have been involved in the development of an RFP would not be allowed to submit a proposal on that RFP. That is just

making it clear that if the County does employ someone to assist in developing an RFP that entity won't be able to make a proposal on that project or services. In addition, it provides that when RFP's and invitations to bid are issued that all vendor questions will need to go to the purchasing manager. That is to keep that process centralized and if questions come in they are not responded to in a piecemeal manner and that those questions are answered and the answers to those are circulated to all potential bidders or proposers. Lastly, what I'll describe- this does insert into the policy, a specific provision stating that employees are subject to disciplinary action or a referral to the ethics board for violations of the policies just to make it clear that these are serious requirements that need to be adhered to. Now I think Kitty has some changes on credit card usage- just some tweaks to the language.

Ms. Crow: It's the last paragraph under credit card usage which is the paragraph just above violations. That paragraph starts out, "the purchasing manager will review the periodic audit reports," is everyone there? I would like to- in the last sentence where it is currently underlined "attend or view the purchasing manager's annual purchasing training," I would like to strike the words "or view." So it will just read, "must attend the purchasing manager's annual purchasing training." The training is pretty comprehensive and it is a lot of content. We feel that attending in person would be the preference. We do offer the training two times per year and multiple sessions to choose from at each time of the year and certainly make ups can be made on a one-on-one basis. There are ample opportunities for people to attend.

Mr. Abdella: We would need a motion to amend to strike those words.

Legislator Starks: I'll make a motion to strike those words.

Legislator Davis: I'll second that-

Mrs. Dennison: Mr. Chairman, may I just ask a question? If you are striking "or view," do you also want to strike "available on the Chautauqua County intranet?"

Ms. Crow: You're right. Yes. Thank you.

Chairman Scudder: Ok, let's change that also. Is everyone still good with the amendment and the second still?

Legislator Starks: Yes. I will still make a motion to amend.

Legislator Davis: Yes.

Chairman Scudder: All in favor of amending the resolution by striking out those words? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried to Amend the Resolution

Chairman Scudder: Any questions or concerns? I would just like to comment that I like the local purchasing change. I think that was much needed and I'm glad to see it. It will give our

County people a shot at as much as they can. All in favor of this resolution as amended?
Opposed?

Unanimously Carried as Amended

Proposed Resolution- Standard Workday and Reporting Resolution

Mr. Abdella: As you will recall, this is a resolution that Legislators and some other county officers need to periodically do a time study of their record of activities for New York State retirement system purposes. This is another one of those resolutions to confirm the record of activity submitted by the individuals listed. Looking at this just before the meeting it looks like there may be a typo on the second page involving the Assistant Public Defender Woodfield. There are two entries for that individual and it looks like they had a record of activities covering two different term periods. I think that first one which shows 7/10/17-12/31/19- I think it should be 12/31/17 because the second entry then commences with 1/1/18 and goes through 12/31/19. We can check on that, but I have a feeling that it is meant to be a 7-

Mrs. Dennison: I raised that same question to Human Resources and Jan McCanna who prepares the schedule explained to me why there are two entries and I have to admit that I cannot remember the complete explanation but it was reasonable. I think it was that she was a part time employee and then changed to a full time employee so she had two different time studies. One was based on part time hours and one based on full time hours. The timing of the change- her original employment for part time was from 7/10/17 through the end of 2019 and then she became full time in January of this year.

Mr. Abdella: Ok.

Mrs. Dennison: There was a reasonable explanation for the two entries.

Mr. Abdella: We will just have to check on that.

Chairman Scudder: So we should leave it as is for now?

Mr. Abdella: I would probably leave it for now and we will double check.

Chairman Scudder: Any questions? Comments? Concerns? All in favor? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorizing Contract for 2019 Administration of Chautauqua County
Self-Insurance Plan (Workers' Compensation)

Ms. Crow: This resolution and the other one that you will hopefully consider under other, are the annual resolutions to set the administrative costs for the workers comp plan and the other resolution would be for setting the rates for all the various municipalities for the 2019 plan year. On the Admin fees, I would like to propose an amendment to the amount. Legislator Chagnon

had questioned the increase from last year and in review of my calculations I did see that I had applied a percentage to a figure I should not have in the calculations. I excluded that and the revised amount should be \$172,020.00 which represents a 5% increase over last year's administrative fees for the comp plan.

Legislator Himelein: Can you repeat the number?

Ms. Crow: It should be 1-7-2-0-2-0.00.

Chairman Scudder: One hundred seventy-two thousand twenty dollars. So let's amend this to the correct number.

Legislator Starks: I'll make a motion to amend to the corrected dollar amount.

Legislator Davis: I'll second that.

Chairman Scudder: All in favor of amending this resolution? Aye? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried to Amend the Proposed Resolution

Chairman Scudder: Any discussion on this resolution? All in favor? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried as Amended

Other-

Proposed Resolution- Authorizing 2019 Levy of Participant's Share of Chautauqua County Self-Insurance Plan (Workers' Compensation) Costs

Ms. Crow: I have to give some credit to Dennis here, he has certainly done a lot of work over the last few years keeping our workers comp expenses low and getting things settled. This year we were able to not increase the participant assessments so the budget will remain at \$5,000,000.00 which is what it was last year. Changes to individual municipality amounts would be as a result of their (*inaudible*) changed or if their experience changed. The calculation is based- their share of the comp assessment is based 40% on valuation and 60% on their experience. So, that's factored in if there was a change in the amount for an individual municipality. Overall, the total is not increasing.

Chairman Scudder: Questions? Comments? Concerns?

Ms. Crow: If anyone is interested in knowing the change in a particular municipality I can provide that to them.

Chairman Scudder: Do you have an actual sheet with all of them listed?

Ms. Crow: I do, yes. I will send that to the committee.

Chairman Scudder: That would be great. All in favor? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Quit Claim Deeds

Mr. Caflisch: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. These are more properties through the auction that didn't get put on the prefile for last month, so they are here for your approval.

Chairman Scudder: Is this- does this wrap it up as far as-

Mr. Caflisch: Yes, other than anything special going on.

Chairman Scudder: Thank you.

Legislator Himelein: Looks like we made pretty good money.

Mr. Caflisch: We did OK.

Legislator Davis: I'm assuming the ones that are lower are a result of extenuating circumstances?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes. Usually there is some distress to that property.

Chairman Scudder: Any idea how many got through without being bid on?

Mr. Caflisch: We had about 50, I think. Those will just go back on the website for RFP's.

Chairman Scudder: Ok. I'm going to ask for a little help here-

Mr. Abdella: There are three additional properties that were the subject of discussion at the committee meeting last month. I believe Mr. Caflisch is going to give a brief follow up discussion to that and then you may entertain further comments-

Chairman Scudder: Yes. Do we need to describe these properties? Is everyone familiar with these properties that we are talking about?

Mr. Caflisch: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, there was no indication that there has been any problem of any delivery of any tax bill or delinquent notice to the foreclosed owner over the years. Our office followed every procedure that is in place to make sure that notices were delivered and mailed out. When these properties came into foreclosure the foreclosure process- there was notice and petition served. It was served by first class mail-served by certified mail. All of the certified mail was received. It was signed for. As that process went through January, February, March and into April, there was no contact with our office that we were able

to discern from the foreclosed property owner. Our first contact came when the owner came to our office on May 29th. He came to our office with a companion and she had one reacquisition letter. Four reacquisition letters had been sent out and she had one. When he came to the office he presented the letter and our legal aide went to retrieve the file. He also asked about another property that was not in foreclosure that did have delinquent taxes. He wanted to pay by check and he was told that he would have to go to the bank to get a certified check to get the foreclosed property out of foreclosure, which is our policy. He left and got a certified check and came back. He asked about that one other property on Maytum Road. That is the only other inquiry that he made. Our staff is very sure about that. The events have been chronicled and he paid the delinquent property, the paperwork was presented for the foreclosed property for him to reacquire and that was the end of the conversation. I was never brought into the situation personally. I was never asked to contact the foreclosed owner. There were several discrepancies here from what we see from the last meeting to what our staff has given us. I just give you the basic outline points and I can go into further details if necessary. It would be my recommendation that the foreclosed owner not be allowed to reacquire. The auction occurred and there was plenty of notice. Auction signs are not legally required. These were vacant properties too. We try to get signs on all the properties just for promotional marketing purposes but it is not a legal purpose.

Chairman Scudder: Any questions for Mr. Caflisch? Mr. Bobseine, would you like to come up?

Mr. Bobseine: Thank you, my name James Bobseine.

Mr. Garrasi: I am Bernard Garrasi the 2nd.

Chairman Scudder: Thank you.

Mr. Bobseine: I would like to address a couple of the things that Mr. Caflisch said that- first, I would like to put this into a little context if you'll permit me. Mr. Caflisch and the County has expressed or suggested that this is just an ordinary situation in which any tax payers contesting the rightful sale of their property for a lawful administratively appropriate process and I would just like to suggest to you that this isn't the ordinary situation. The County has thousands of properites that it assesses and that it collects real property taxes on and that is a big responsibility. A small subset of those properties each year- people don't pay their property taxes and the County has the very difficult job of doing something about that. They go through the process that Mr. Caflisch described. When it is followed, when it works, when notice is received and when tax payers are giving due process then it is an appropriate process and it's a good effort made by the County to satisfy its responsibilities. A small percentage of those tax payers come before you, approach individual legislators, talk to lawyers and say I have had a difficult situation- I had health issues or I lost my job. These are awful situations that have prevented them from meeting their obligations and nonetheless, the County has the very difficult task of handling those properties according to the procedures that it has set up. Certainly those features that you would see are present in Mr. Garrasi's case that involves the property that is owned by him and his family. I'm happy to get into those, but that is not what we are talking about. We are not talking about the ability of Mr. Garrasi to pay for his kid's school through leveraging this

property that he has paid taxes on since 1994. We are not focused on that. What we are focused on is the date that Mr. Caflisch acknowledges happened. On May 29th Mr. Garrasi comes to the County and he presents himself with the ability to pay, and the desire to pay property taxes on certain property taxes that he owns. Nobody disputes that. Mr. Caflisch doesn't dispute it; Mr. Caflisch's employees don't dispute it. We get into this- what the County wants you to believe is a he said- she said when we talk about Mr. Garrasi then asked do I- I don't have the paperwork with me. I never received this paperwork. Not the paperwork that Mr. Caflisch represented- I didn't receive any paperwork. Can you look up my last name and tell me if I have any other obligations outstanding to the County? Mr. Garrasi makes a credible claim that he asked a County official that question. Not once, not twice, multiple times. This is what- that is what makes this different. The very thing that the County requests it's taxpayers do, which is make contact with the Real Property Tax Office and demonstrate an ability and a desire to pay is what Mr. Garrasi did. With respect to the record that Mr. Caflisch has indicated has been created- look, there is a factual dispute over what happened. We aren't talking about a flying by the seat of his pants individual who doesn't have any corroborating evidence that this is what he did on May 29th and this is what he asked and these are the steps he took. He had an individual that accompanied him, his partner who is here today. There are certain (*inaudible*) as he walked through- as he talked to the County employees. He said, I need a certified check, oh shoot, before I go to Westfield-before I trek all the way to Westfield and get the money for this one property that I understand based upon seeing a sign posted on my property that I owe money on- before I go through those steps, can you tell me if I owe anything else? They said no- no, you need a cashier's check- a cashier's check for the Maytum Road property. I think what Mr.- my understanding, and I think this is a legitimate concern, is that there are a lot of properties in this County and there are a lot of tax payers and I don't want to be in the business of asking you Legislators to create a situation where the County can't do its job- where Mr. Caflisch can't do his job because like I said, it's a really important job. I have talked to a lot of people about this and there are tough stories about people losing their property, but I haven't heard anything like somebody coming to the Property Tax Office and credibly claiming to ask the County officials the things that Mr. Garrasi asked. So, it's not just a he said- she said in which you guys can just throw up your arms. This is a situation in which a taxpayer is asking for relief based on the procedural issues that are present in his individual case. In this case that is unlike the ordinary case that you would see. One last thing, look, we have a- to the extent that this is just a factual dispute, something that you guys are presented- a difficulty that you guys are presented with resolving. I would just suggest to you that we are not asking you to disbelieve the County employees or tar the good work- the good faith of the County employees. I have an immense amount of respect for the work that Mr. Caflisch's office does. I don't want to hammer on it, but it's a really difficult job and I believe that they do a good job doing it, but if you reject Mr. Garrasi's application then you would be rejecting the request that he is making which is- can I, a taxpayer, who is credibly claimed to have a desire and an ability to pay his property taxes be given the benefit of the doubt in this situation. You don't see this every day, or every year. On that basis we would request relief. We would request that this committee recommend that a quit claim deed be issued to the genuine- the prior owner of this property, the equitably sound owner of this property and in our opinion, the legally valid owner of this property and that is Mr. Garrasi. I am happy to answer any questions and I know that Bernie- Mr. Garrasi is, as well.

Chairman Scudder: Did you want to-

Mr. Garrasi: First of all, I would like to thank everyone here for your time and conscientious effort to try and resolve my matter that is before you. I'm an old political science major who worked in Washington, DC. I see this country through the eyes of a constitutional republic and it's you, elected officials that take the squiggly lines out of the day to day applications of law and procedure and kind of straighten them out the best as we can as representatives of the people. There are some discrepancies in the portrayal that Mr. Caflisch presented to you just a short time ago. They are very stark the contrast of reality of what happened. On our way here we contacted the Real Property Tax Office by phone the day of the 29th of May and asked a representative from that office if it was OK if we showed up because we had forgotten our paperwork at home. We had gotten off the Fredonia exit and we were on our way here and they said that it wasn't a problem and they could look everything up under your last name. I said OK. I said I had my wallet with me and my driver's license, I can prove to you that I'm the owner and this is who I am. In proceeding here on the grounds and making it to the department, we provided that information and explained to them our situation. We did not bring any paperwork with us at all, none. No paperwork was every presented to the clerks in your office and I wish you had some video surveillance of that front desk because as God as my witness, that's the truth. We provided that information and the clerk took that information. Mrs. Cady, Becky as you call her, came up to the front desk, took my information again- the first clerk had taken my last name down, and proceeded to go through the computer system to find out what I was trying to resolve and what piece of property was in foreclosure. At that time, the only piece of property that I knew of that was in foreclosure, that I owned was the piece of property that was placarded next door to my parent's property. I had no idea that any other piece of property that I owned had not had its taxes paid. Upon my presentation of myself I feel, and I'm not alone in this, but in contacting other counties and their tax departments I feel that presenting myself and asking not once, but twice- certainly before I proceeded to the bank because I was told that I would need a cashier's check and I informed her that I'd have to go to Lakeshore bank- is there one here in town? And she informed me that no, the closest one would be in Westfield. My (*inaudible*) reasoning at that point was well are you sure there are no other outstanding properties or taxes that I owe? I was assured at that point that there was not because if I was going to drive to Westfield to go and receive that check from my account I wanted to make sure that I wouldn't have to make the trip twice. I was assured that I did not have anything outstanding other than that single piece of property that I had come to Mayville to pay, in good faith and good effort and I was misled and not given the appropriate information that I needed. I proceeded to the bank and came back and I asked again, is there anything else outstanding? Anything I don't know about? They said nope, you're all good. We looked it up on the computer. I was presented paperwork with my last name on it and properties and I had said well there is a property on Maytum Road that I own and I haven't received the bill for it yet, could you look that up for me? They looked that up for me and they said well- I said, I asked before I left- is this something I can pay by personal check? I was informed that yes, I could pay that with a personal check, which I did at that time. Apparently, the previous owner was sent the bill for that property and not myself and they were due in February. When we called on the 20th of June- another misrepresentation. I was talking directly with Becky who I had dealt with on the 29th of May and she must have immediately recognized either my name or my voice or my situation, but she stated to me that she had helped me with both foreclosed pieces of properties. In which case, I said well there was only one of foreclosed piece property when I came to you on the 29th and said that no, there were

two. I said no there was only one. I said that I did pay on another piece of property on that day as well and that was the Maytum Road property that I had paid with a personal check. So, to hear Mr. Caflisch state that he was never told to contact me or was never part of the loop was incorrect because our conversation ended with her stating that her director would contact me directly. As I stated in the previous meeting, on the 16th of July, I still have not received that phone call. At some point I would have to think that he had to have been made aware by the employee that I was in desire in speaking with him because she wasn't able to resolve the conflict that I had with the fact that I'd found out that this other piece of property existed, was never informed about it existing- we did later find the letter that had been mailed to me, all unopened and they were provided to my attorney. To me, the definition of the word notice is that the property owner is actually notified that something is a mess- that some connection or contact is made with the actual property owner, which would be me. Until the 29th of May, I had no opportunity at all to know that anything was outstanding other than the piece of property that I came to Mayville on that day to pay, which was the Route 5 property. I feel as though both of my requests to know if anything else was outstanding, as a procedural policy of your department, should have been provided to me so that I knew- hey, yes you do owe on this property Mr. Garrasi, but you also owe taxes on these properties or this other property as well. That was not afforded to me. So, notice was never received by me until the 19th of June and it was the 20th of June and unfortunately the hours were closed because it was after 5:00 p.m. It was on the 20th of June when I actually made contact with the property- Real Property Tax Department and spoke with Becky and was then informed that yes, in fact, this other piece of property was sold at auction on that previous Saturday. So, at that point I spoke with Mr. Gustafson and I have spoke with the County Executive and I was given an opportunity to explore some of the things that had occurred and try to come to a fortuitous conclusion to resolve this matter, and certainly I appreciate your time on the 16th of July to do the same and I appreciate it again tonight. I feel like a clerical error was made. I don't feel like a deliberate error was made. I simply want the opportunity to pay my taxes on my property that I have owned since 1994 that represent a large investment and my children's future. It is going to affect them more than it is going to affect me and it is a substantial amount of money. I also believe that what I owe is a larger amount than what was paid for the property at auction and it would just be a terrible injustice to lose this piece of property over a lack of notification to me, the property owner, despite me requesting it. Any misrepresentations are unfortunate because if this was dealt with very honestly and in a very direct way this matter could have been resolved on the 29th of May instead of proceeding to the point that it is now. I ask for your judgement and with your conscientious effort to try to make this right and I feel as though the pressure that has been possibly placed on you to not want to set a precedent misses the point of what a representative republic is and that is for the people that are elected to try to help us, the represented people to straighten out inconsistencies. I can't speak for other occupations but I can tell you that the letter of the law for vehicle and traffic, criminal procedure law, penal law in the State of New York, other selected laws in the State of New York, marine law in the State of New York which was under my purview in my previous occupation, tells me that vehicles are stopped every day in this country and in this state and no tickets- no arrests are made because the officers- thousands of times every day across the state discretion is used by the executive officers of the State of New York to just do the right thing and try to inform people that hey, you have a light out or you might have been going too fast, instead of coming down and issuing a ticket every time instead of trying to help people to see that there is something that is not right and we can try to make it right and take care of it and send you on

your way. I know I have done that numerous times and I know that people that have worked for me have done it numerous times because to me, we were always servants to the people and that was the most important thing. So, I hope that you can see- understand my perspective in this matter and resolve it accordingly which I think is the right and proper thing to do, which is honestly just allowing me to pay any taxes and any interest that I owe and any penalties that I owe so that I can retain the right to this property that I have been investing in since 1994. Thank you.

Chairman Scudder: Any questions for either of the two gentlemen? Well, I'm going to ask a question. I find it interesting- so, you don't pay your taxes? You personally don't pay your taxes?

Mr. Garrasi: Well, Chris is- obviously, I trust her with everything including most of our home paperwork and bills and she typically takes care of everything and is generally very good with that. She obviously lost her father recently. My parents have had health issues but she, herself, has been to Roswell over the last few years and it is obviously a massive impact on your life. Rather than throw her under the bus and say, Hun, you know these should have been paid- there is no reason for these not to be paid- even the envelopes that had been sent, which I assumed at the time when they identified her signature on them in the Real Property Tax Department had her name signed to them. I assumed they were multiple mailings for just the one piece of property that I had come to see. It turns out that three of those receipts were actually for another property that I was never told about. Had I been told about it that day, obviously I could have addressed it during my trip to Westfield and the bank. But yes, Chris generally takes care of those things and she does a very good job but this was missed and has caused a lot of turbulence. She is a very fine person and despite this I wouldn't have anyone else that I would trust more with my financial records and payments. Generally our agreement was that I would try to take care of everything outside of the- she does have a Bachelor's in mathematics and she is quite good at it, so this is just another failure to open some letters and alert me and not to pay the taxes. I feel like that all could have been resolved on the 29th of May when I actually appeared in person here in Mayville and approached the personnel in the office. I could have been notified as I requested to be informed then and I could have paid it then. So-

Chairman Scudder: Was she with you when you came down to pay the taxes?

Mr. Garrasi: Yes. She was here with me. She identified her signature and Becky, who was very nice as all the people that I have dealt with in the office have been- Chris identified her signature on it and that's why I was never notified. I never received any notice. Even in my attempts to be notified- It makes it very difficult for me as the actual land owner, to know that hey you have another piece of property that is being foreclosed on. They are going to be sold at auction two weeks and some days later-

Ms. Potter: That was my misunderstanding too, part of it. I knew I had walked in a payment in Sheridan-Silver Creek- whatever you want to call it-

Mr. Garrasi: Town of Hanover.

Ms. Potter: So, I was thinking yeah I walked it in, remember? And it was my fault. That was my fault. I was with him that day when we walked in and he will tell you that I was in tears. Becky and the first girl that waited on us will tell you that I was in tears because it wasn't a good ride down. He did ask before I went back out to the car if there was anything else outstanding and owed that we needed to take care of and she got out the four papers that I signed- I pick up the mail so I'm sure I did sign for them because I pick it up, we take it to his parents because they are older and have their own things going on. I pick up their stuff, I pick up his, I pick up ours and just- he did ask. I heard him ask and I was with him in the car when he told her that we don't have anything. I didn't find those letters until weeks later when I gave them to Jeb and they were in the trunk of the car just tearing everything apart trying to find them. I had just- but he did ask. He absolutely asked her if there was anything outstanding that we need to- we even- the day after the auction I'm like yeah it's saying it's paid. It shows where I went in and paid and these others are paid and it's not making sense because they were showing- whatever, I don't know. But I was in the car with the phone conversation of Becky telling us that she was not going to take responsibility for it because she did not look up our information- that her coworker had looked up his name and information so she was not taking responsibility for it.

Mr. Garrasi: And that she would have her director get ahold of us so that we could resolve it with him. I appreciate you understanding but I do feel like it is a unique situation and one that only you elected officials can resolve. I appreciate your time.

Chairman Scudder: Anything else? OK, where do we go from here? This is my idea, it isn't Steve's idea.

Mr. Abdella: Do you want to have an executive session?

Chairman Scudder: I think we need to do that.

Mr. Abdella: Alright. You need a motion to go into executive session to discuss threatened litigation.

MOVED by Legislator Himelein, SECONDED by Legislator Starks to enter Executive Session to discuss threatened litigation.

Unanimously Carried (6:00 p.m.)

MOVED by Legislator Starks, SECONDED by Legislator Davis to close Executive Session.

Unanimously Carried (6:39 p.m.)

Chairman Scudder: So we are on the Quit Claim Deeds proposed resolution. We are looking over the list that Mr. Caflisch gave us.

Legislator Davis: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we amend the Quit Claim Deeds to add the following regarding PA-267-2018, PA329-2018 and PA-330-2018. I make a motion that we add those deeded to the high bidder at the auction, Bradley Mason.

Chairman Scudder: Do we have a second?

Legislator Himelein: I will second it.

Chairman Scudder: So we have the amendment with the three properties being awarded to Bradley Mason, the purchaser. Any discussion on that? All in favor of the amendment? Aye? Opposed?

Legislator Starks: Nay.

Chairman Scudder: Nay. Two and two.

Proposed Amendment Fails

Chairman Scudder: So, the amendment to the resolution fails. Let's go back to the original resolution. All in favor say aye? Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

MOVED by Legislator Starks, SECONDED by Legislator Davis to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (6:41 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Olivia L. Ames, Committee Secretary