

**Physical Services Committee Meeting
Held in Room #318
Putnam County Office Building
Members: Chairman Albano & Legislators Castellano and Wright**

Wednesday

September 16, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 6:30p.m. by Chairman Albano who requested that Legislator Wright lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call, Chairman Albano and Legislators Castellano and Wright were present.

Item #3) Approval/Recommendation of the Initial Offer Amounts for Properties Authorized to be Sold via Real Estate Brokers & MLS

Chair Albano made a motion to approve Recommendation of the Initial Offer Amounts for Properties Authorized to be Sold via Real Estate Brokers & MLS; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Item #4) Approval/Pursuing an Amendment to Watershed Agricultural Council Conservation Easement for Tilly Foster Farm

Deputy County Executive Walker stated when the County entered into the agreement and purchase of the Tilly Foster Farm (Farm) Property the County also entered into a Watershed Agriculture Conservation Easement Agreement (WAC). He stated the easement was based on the existing use of the property. He stated based on some of the work done at the Farm, noting the expansion of the parking in the back lot and moving the septic from the front of the lodge to the back and the annexation of Pugliese property, the WAC Council has recommended that the conversation be reopened in regards to the actual easement that is at the Farm with the intent to modify it to better address what the County will actually do with the property. He stated the recommendation of the WAC Council was to bring the matter to the Legislature to obtain an approval of a Resolution that would state the discussion will be opened in terms of any easement to modify the property. He stated the WAC Council did not want negotiations to begin without the Legislature having some understanding with regards to the possibility of some modifications to the easement. He stated the draft resolution brought forward tonight was prepared by the County Law Department. He stated that it contains the points suggested by the WAC Council. He stated the resolution states that negotiations will be reopened to modify the existing easement.

Legislator LoBue requested that a copy of the original Easement be pulled and a copy be provided to the Legislature. She stated that she believes that goes back to 2006.

Deputy County Executive Walker stated that he believes it was before 2006.

First Deputy County Attorney Negro stated that the Easement was negotiated over a course of time he stated that he believes the final easement was executed in 2006.

Legislator LoBue stated the modification to the parking lot has already been done. She questioned why now is it time to change the Easement?

Deputy County Executive Walker stated that all of the work has been approved by the WAC Council. He stated based on any future work and use of the Farm the WAC Council requested that this be brought forward to the Legislature. He stated the resolution states that the Administration can have discussions with the WAC Council regarding any needed modification and then bring it forward to the Legislature for final approval to fund the work.

Legislator LoBue stated that the recent SEQRA that was recently submitted to the Legislature stating that it was a Type II action also stated that the septic was the same volume. She stated that she does not believe that would be the case. She stated that the plan that has been discussed includes an eatery/catering type of facility.

Deputy County Executive Walker stated that the existing Board of Health has worked on this matter. He stated it has been recognized that residential use on a property has a significantly greater impact on a septic field than any other usage. He stated that the property was a residential property with residential usage.

Legislator LoBue questioned if the Pugliese House can be considered to be separated from the Farm. She stated that Farm was purchased in its entirety, which the Pugliese House was part of that.

Chair Albano stated that separation of the Pugliese House is not on the table tonight. He stated that he would like to stay on the topic that is on the agenda.

Legislator Wright stated that he would think the resolution that is being requested to approve should identify the areas that will be discussed, the current format of the proposed resolution before the Committee tonight, in his opinion, is too open ended.

Chair Albano stated at this point he believes there is a lot of open ended issues to be address with this project. He stated he is fine with the proposed resolution. He stated that each matter will have to come before the Legislature.

Legislator Nacerino stated the purpose of tonight's proposed resolution is to open the dialogue. She stated that she agrees that it would not be feasible to identify what matters may need to be addressed.

Deputy County Executive Walker stated that back when the original agreement was executed by the County; there was this idea on the WAC Council's part, that basically nothing was going to be done at the Farm. He stated that does not work for the taxpayers of this County. He stated today, after meeting with them and bringing them to the Farm and giving the same presentation to them that was presented to the Legislature in May of 2014, they understand where the County wants to go with this. He stated that they are not opposed to it, but they do want as a regulator, to conform their easement with what the County's potential future use is for the Farm.

Legislator Wright requested that the Legislature be given a copy of the written request from the WAC Council making this request.

Deputy County Executive Walker stated that he will get it from the County Law Department and have it sent to the Legislature.

Legislator Wright stated he believes that there needs to be a general idea of what needs to be looked at. He stated especially since, per Deputy County Executive Walker, the WAC Council has a good understanding of where the County wants to go with this project. He stated he does not understand why that cannot be an addendum to the exploratory resolution.

Deputy County Executive Walker stated the Administration has sat with both the Department of Environmental Protection and WAC.

Legislator Wright stated the Legislature has not been a part of those meetings.

Deputy County Executive Walker stated the main concern of the WAC Council is the Regulations – Regulatory Law. He stated that their concern is the current vision for the Farm, which they understand and agree with, however does not comport with their existing Easement. They want to work with the County and get the Easement to comport with what the County is looking to do at the Farm.

Legislator Wright stated that he does not understand or support approving this resolution which does not include the issues that are already identified, however not to the Legislature. He stated that the resolution, in his opinion, should list all the current matters that need to be discussed, and then if something unforeseen comes up, then it is brought forward to the Legislature.

Chair Albano made a motion to approve the Amendment to Watershed Agricultural Council Conservation Easement for Tilly Foster Farm; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. One Nay vote- Legislator Wright.

Item #5) Approval/Ratifying Adjoining Property Sale

Legislator Castellano made a motion to approve Ratifying Adjoining Property Sale; Seconded by Chair Albano. All in favor.

Legislator LoBue requested to go back to agenda item #3. She stated in the past the Legislature received a report that included the amount of taxes that were in arrears for each property and what the projected amount of commission would be received by the Relator. She stated she would like to review that information prior to the October Full Legislature Meeting.

First Deputy Negro stated that he believes that information was included in the packet that was sent to the Legislature for approval of the bundles originally. He stated if the Legislature does not have it, the information can be obtained from Commissioner of Finance.

Chair Albano made a motion to waive the Rules and accept the Additional; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Item #6) Approval/ Extend Pilot Indexed Lump Sum Basis Snow and Ice Agreement with New York State

Chair Albano stated that the proposed resolutions will extend the existing agreement which reimburses the County for the State Roads that the County maintains throughout the Winter. He stated that there are two (2) additional resolutions that will approve the agreement through years 2017 and 2018.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to approve Extend Pilot Indexed Lump Sum Basis Snow and Ice Agreement with New York State; Seconded by Chair Albano. All in favor.

Item #7) Approval/County Attorney to Bring Legal Proceedings/9 Drew Lane, Rm# 1, Town of Carmel

Chair Albano made a motion to approve/County Attorney to Bring Legal Proceedings/9 Drew Lane, Rm# 1, Town of Carmel; Seconded Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Legislator Wright made a motion to waive the Rules and accept the Additional (proposed Lease Agreement for Item#8); Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Item #8) Approval/Danbury Vet Center “Outstation” For Putnam County

Chair Albano made a motion to approve the Danbury Vet Center “Outstation” For Putnam County License Agreement; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Item #9) Update/Three (3) County Owned Properties: 34 Gleneida, Pugliese House, White House

Commissioner Pena introduced Michael Cunningham, the County’s Asset Manager. He stated that he brought this matter to Asset Manager Cunningham for his review.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to waive the Rules and accept the Additional; Seconded by Chair Albano. All in favor.

Asset Manager Cunningham stated that he brought a presentation entitled “Analysis of Rental Potential of 3 County Owned Vacant Properties”. He stated that when speaking to the Assets of the County the topic of Risk Management must be included. He stated that the issue of utilization of the assets is key. He stated these three (3) assets are being underutilized and they are also a liability. He stated that in reviewing this issue he took a step back and determined what needs to be looked at from an Asset Management and Risk Management point of view. He stated that two (2) matters stick out: Landlord Function and the view should not be isolated to these three (3) properties. He stated that to do an accurate evaluation the entire portfolio of County assets need to be looked at. He stated that he compiled a list of County assets. He stated that some of the locations have tenants and some are vacant. He stated that there would need to be a business model developed to deal with the risks and rewards associated with managing multiple properties. He elaborated on the risks and rewards that he sees as being critical to consider. He stated that the County manages approximately 113 buildings/structures ranging from office buildings to radio towers to cabins at Camp Herrlich. He stated the average age of 46 key structures is 51 + years. He stated the older buildings present challenges in terms of energy efficiency, wear and tear and high ongoing maintenance demands. He stated the expansive area of the locations of the County’s assets presents much inefficiency in terms of operations. He stated a strategy needs to be put in place. He stated a consideration to be reviewed is the consolidation of assets. He stated rather than looking at the three (3) properties in isolation, it is his opinion that the whole picture needs to be looked at. He stated the first question that needs to be answered is “does the County really want to be in the Landlord business”.

Chair Albano stated that he was the one who requested the three (3) properties be looked at. He stated that in the perfect world we could have all of our assets in one place, on one (1) campus where all of the County’s efforts and assets could be directed.

Asset Manager Cunningham stated that he did do a more detailed analysis on each of the three (3) County properties that are on the agenda. He stated the Pugliese House is in bad shape. He stated that he cannot imagine that it would be worth putting any money into that property. He stated in addition the location of the house is at the apex of a turn on Route 312, making it difficult to get in and out of the property. Also, there is a brook that runs along each side of the house. He stated that the White House, would probably be the easiest to rent, however why not consider selling it.

Legislator Wright questioned what does the master plan of the 40 Gleneida Campus say about the White House property.

Chair Albano stated there is no master plan. He stated he would not be in favor of selling the White House or 34 Gleneida. He stated because of their location to the County Office Building he would recommend renting them. He stated allowing flexibility in the future if the County needs the space.

Asset Manager Cunningham stated he understands those points, however remember that they are older buildings.

Legislator LoBue stated that she agrees with keeping those two (2) properties. She stated that the previous Administration always believed it was better to own. She stated that often in the County there is lack of space issues. She stated that she does not believe selling the White House would generate enough money to justify releasing ownership of a property located on sewer and water near the Courthouse and the County Office Building.

Asset Manager Cunningham stated that the issue that must always be considered is “is it worth the risk”. He stated that the two (2) properties in terms of rentals will not generate a lot of income.

Commissioner Pena stated that an evaluation should be done to see how much would the County have to invest in those two (2) properties in order to attract potential leasers. He stated while Asset Manager Cunningham was researching comparable properties he indicated that the lack of parking and the fact that they are not ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant could serve as deterrents.

Chair Albano stated that there are many options to be considered. He stated that he personally does not want to see the properties sitting in a neutral zone. He stated that maybe the Pugliese House should be torn down and leave it as vacant land. He stated it is a shame that septic and well work was done at the property.

Legislator Nacerino questioned if putting an elevator in 34 Gleneida has been researched.

Commissioner Pena stated that they need to look at that.

Asset Manager Cunningham stated that they will look to see if the design of the offices could avoid the need to do that. He stated installing an elevator in terms of the age of that building it is the last option that the County should consider. He stated the expense would be substantial.

Chair Albano requested that Asset Manager Cunningham continue to look into this matter and come back to the Legislature with recommendations of course of actions to be taken.

Legislator Wright requested that the list that Asset Manager Cunningham provided, in his presentation of County owned assets, be addressed at the November Physical Meeting. He stated that he would like for each location to be addressed and speak to who is in the location, if anyone, the square footage, rent etc.

Asset Manager Cunningham stated that would be what he would plan to do.

Legislator Wright stated although the matter will need to wait to be addressed in November, because the October meeting is dedicated to the 2016 Budget, he requested that Asset Manager Cunningham send the spread sheet to the Legislature, once it is compiled.

Item #10) Update/ Hill Agor Farm/National Register of Historic Places

Chair Albano stated that a legal opinion regarding the possible ramifications of the County approving the application of the Hill Agor Farm to be included in the National Register of Historic Places was provided by Legislative Counsel VanRoss. He stated that a legal opinion from the County's Law Department is pending.

First Deputy Negro stated that he reviewed Legislative Counsel VanRoss's document. He stated that he agrees with some of the points raised. He stated that there are other restraints that come with a historic designation that he would like to point out. He stated that he would provide that information to the Legislature.

Chair Albano stated that he agrees before any action is taken, the County needs to make sure that moving forward with the historic registry does not cause any problems with the right of way, as an example. He did request that Commissioner Pena have his staff keep an eye on the place in an effort to prevent any further vandalism to the property.

Legislator LoBue questioned for clarification, based on the legal opinion from Legislative Counsel VanRoss, who owns the easement into the Hill Agor Farm.

Chair Albano stated that he believes the County owns it and gave the right of way to the Town.

First Deputy Negro stated the County owns the property and the Town of Carmel owns the Easement.

Legislator LoBue stated the County owns the property, therefore the County can erect a sign on the left side of the entranceway designating the Hill Agor Farm is located there. She stated that

last month we discussed this matter and the matter of placing a sign at the entranceway identifying the Hill Agor Farm. However, at that time she was under the impression that the Town needed to give permission. She stated that is not the case.

Legislator Castellano stated that sign ordinances need approval from the local municipality.

Legislator LoBue stated the County overrides that. She stated the County has never had to get approval to erect and sign. She cited the example of the huge sign for the Putnam Golf Course; the County did not go to the Town for approval to put that sign up. She stated so the County can move forward and put the sign up advertising the existence of the Hill Agor Farm.

Chair Albano stated that he does not believe there is an issue here, he would just like to make sure that everyone is on the same page.

Legislator Wright questioned if the Right of Way is in perpetuity to the Town. He stated he would imagine that the Right of Way would run with the lease.

First Deputy Negro stated that he would have to check, the lease is a long term lease.

Chair Albano stated at this time he agrees with posting a sign.

Legislator LoBue stated that Town of Councilman Lupinacci agreed at last month's meeting to have the sign installed. She stated that once she confirmed that it is County owned property, she notified him that the County will install the sign. She stated she believes that there is private funding to pay for the sign. She stated there are constituents, some who are present this evening, who are very interested in preserving the Hill Agor Farm House. She stated posting a sign may be a positive step in helping deter future vandalism to the site.

Town of Carmel Councilman Lupinacci stated that he did begin to take action to post the sign, but as Legislator LoBue stated, she contacted him and it was decided that the County would post a separate sign that would have a historic flare to its design.

Legislator LoBue stated for clarification that First Deputy Negro will provide his legal opinion regarding the historic designation and what can and cannot be done.

First Deputy Negro confirmed that he will provide that information.

Item #11) Update/Road Condition/Farm to Market Road

Commissioner Pena stated he received a correspondence from Physical Services Chairman Albano stating that there was a concern filed with the County road: Farm to Market from a

constituent of Legislator Nacerino which had originated with the Town of Patterson Supervisor M. Griffin. He stated that he had the roadway checked and did not see an issue with it. He stated that there was paving work, drainage work and catch basin work performed on Farm to Market Road in 2012 and 2013. He stated he is unaware of what the specific complaint was.

Legislator Nacerino stated that the email which was forwarded to her from Supervisor Griffin is all of the information that she had, and a copy of the said email was sent to Commissioner Pena. She stated respectfully she would like Commissioner Pena to send a formal response to the Legislature indicating that he and his department have investigated the roadway and did not find any issues. She stated then that correspondence will be forwarded to the constituent and the Town of Patterson Supervisor, reflecting the County has done its due diligence in regards to the matter.

Legislator Wright stated that he has a concern with having the Commissioner of Highways and Facilities responding to a matter, which the complainant believes is a specific request that he documented, when in fact the Commissioner has never seen the e-mail that includes the specific complaint.

Legislator Nacerino stated that the Legislature did not receive the original e-mail from the constituent. She stated she was notified of this matter via inclusion in a distribution list, which was a response from Supervisor Griffin and it did not specify the complaint. She stated that if she needs to, she will contact Supervisor Griffin. She stated that she believes the constituent deserves a response. She repeated that she would like a formal response to be written from the County's Highway and Facilities Department in order for her to respond to this matter.

Legislator Castellano spoke to a matter that was brought to his attention on Wagon Lane this past winter.

Legislator Nacerino stated that is a separate matter.

Legislator Addonizio stated that the e-mail that Supervisor Griffin sent mentioned also having a concern addressed regarding speeding on Route 164.

Legislator Nacerino stated she forwarded a memo to Sheriff Smith requesting the Traffic Safety Board address that matter.

Item #12) FYI: Correspondence Fr: County Planner B. Barosa Re Tilly Foster Farm-Request for SEQRA Determination Clarification D: August 20, 2015

Chair Albano stated that he is satisfied with the most recent explanation as to how the Type II SEQRA determination was declared.

Item #13) Other Business

a. Discussion/Butterfield Letter of Intent

Chair Albano stated that a copy of the Butterfield Letter of Intent (Document) was received in the Legislative Office after being requested.

Legislator LoBue stated that she requested the copy of the Document at the August, last month, Physical Services Meeting. She stated that County Attorney Bumgarner stated that she would supply a copy of the Document to the Legislature. She stated First Deputy Negro was on vacation at the time. She stated the Legislature was told that the Document was on its way from the Developer's Office. She stated that was over two (2) weeks ago. She stated that she wanted to go on record with that timeline. She stated and now that it has arrived it is obvious changes have been made to the Document, since it was passed by the Legislature. She stated since the Document arrived in the Legislature at 4:00p.m. today, she is not prepared to speak to it.

Chair Albano stated it is his understanding that the County did have it, if anyone would like to discuss the Document it would require an Executive Session.

Legislator LoBue questioned if the Document was here in the County why did it take two (2) plus weeks to get a copy in the Legislative Office, per her request.

Chair Albano stated that he is not sure. He stated that he was told that the County did get a copy back in May, but it was filed and a copy was never sent to the Legislature.

Legislator LoBue questioned for clarification if the Document had been filed in the Legislative Office since May.

Chair Albano stated no, he is not sure where it was, but no it was not in the Legislative Office.

Legislator Wright stated that we are back at square one, this is a new Letter of Intent.

Chair Albano stated it is the original Letter of Intent with some modifications to it.

Legislator LoBue stated that Legislator Wright's point is correct. The Legislature passed a resolution based on content that was in the original Letter of Intent. She stated however, the Document has now come back to the Legislature approximately five (5) months later and the Document has been changed. She stated that in her opinion this is an embarrassment. She questioned why the Legislature was not notified in May, when the Developer, Paul Guillaro, signed and modified the Document.

Chair Albano facilitated further discussion amongst the Legislators in regards to their dissatisfaction with the way this matter has been handled.

Chair Albano stated that he believes that the County needs to look at what is at hand, now, in regards to this project and move forward.

Legislator Nacerino stated that the Legislative body did its due diligence with this project. She stated last year there was a Physical Services meeting held on the Western side of the County to hear from the residents and elected officials in regards to this project. There have been many meetings discussing the feasibility and benefits of the Butterfield Project. She stated the Legislature's approval to move forward was based on facts that are no longer the facts; everything has been changed.

Chair Albano stated being in the construction business himself, things change with projects. He supports staying open looking at the new recommendations and taking it from there.

Legislator LoBue stated that the newspapers have reported that the Butterfield Project is moving forward; there was a ribbon cutting ceremony.

Chair Albano stated the Butterfield Project will move forward regardless if the County is involved or not. He stated if the Senior Center project can work there, that is a plus.

Legislator LoBue stated that the Seniors on the Western side have been told by the Administration that the County will be moving forward with a Lease at the Butterfield Site. She stated that she will not be supporting it; the money is outrageous for a Lease. She stated that the County could have purchased the VFW and put up a state of the building there.

Chair Albano stated an offer to purchase the VFW was never presented in writing. He stated the bottom line is these projects take a lot of time, this is our job, and we are going to do it right.

Legislator Nacerino stated that she believes the County has done an injustice to the Seniors who have been led to believe this project is moving forward. She stated because now we are saying, nothing is set in stone, the Legislature will take a second look and take it from this point.

Chair Albano stated that the proposal of a Senior Center is still in front of the County. He stated the Legislature needs to take another look and see if there can be a resolution to the problems that have been raised and find a better solution.

Legislator Nacerino stated that she believes this is disappointing for the Seniors.

Chair Albano stated he can agree that it is disappointing, but not a disservice, because the County is doing all that it can. He stated the fact is when things shift and change with construction projects there is a need to shift gears and take a look at them. He stated the County is genuinely interested in getting this project done.

Legislator Nacerino stated the proposed change is significant; going from a brand new construction facility, to considering now a 30-35 year old facility. She stated again that was information the Legislature was not privy to until four (4) weeks ago.

Chair Albano stated the proposed new site has not been explored yet. He stated until that is done we do not know if it has any merit or not.

Legislator Addonizio stated that one of the reasons reported to the Legislature which prohibits the original new building location as being suitable, is the inability for the buses to turn around and provide a safe drop off for the Seniors. She stated she was shocked by that. She stated that is something that should have been explored from the beginning when considering a site for a Senior Center.

Chair Albano stated from what he understands it could work, but it was not an ideal setup. He stated if there is a better alternative he is in support of taking a look at it. He stated if it takes an extra six (6) months because it needs to be done right; he has no problem with that. He stated and if it is not meant to be, again he has no problem with that. He stated the County's intentions are good, but it has to be right and that is what is trying to be done.

First Deputy County Attorney Negro stated he would like to clarify that the Letter of Intent referenced tonight states Building #2 and this was part of the original Letter of Intent. He stated after the Letter of Intent was sent the Developer, Paul Guillaro, sent a proposed Lease which went to the July Physical Services Meeting. He stated in the propose Lease again Building #2 the Second Floor was in that document. He stated that premise has not changed formally. He stated that it has been discussed informally through conversation that another location may work for certain reasons, such as the bus turn around area and so forth. He stated from the inception the lease premises has always been Building #2.

Chair Albano thanked First Deputy County Attorney Negro for that clarification. He stated in his opinion if there is a premise that may be a better solution and more suitable for the buses, he believes it should be looked at and considered. He would not agree with moving forward with the current lease without researching this new option.

Legislator LoBue stated for clarification, Deputy County Executive Walker came to the Legislature at the July Physical Services meeting and reported that the County is seriously

considering going to the other building because of issues with the access to the building from getting off the buses. She stated that she will reiterate that the Letter of Intent was signed by the Developer on May 28, 2015, which the Legislature just received. She stated the Letter of Intent was to be used in conjunction with the proposed Lease. She stated this entire process, in her opinion, has been handled unprofessionally. She stated that there are facts missing and she agrees that the Legislature is going to move forward. She stated that her hope is that the Legislature will be provided all of the information before we are again running to a Full Legislature Meeting to approve something without all of the details, as in the case of the Letter of Intent.

Legislator Wright stated his point is that May 28th; the County was apprised that the Letter of Intent, as submitted, was not acceptable. He stated the whole dissatisfaction, from his point of view, is that when the document was presented to the Legislature it says (*implies*) the Developer and the County have reached a meeting of the minds as it is embodied in this Letter of Intent and we need the Legislators to give their Legislative approval. He stated somebody deceived the Legislators. He stated it was not the Developers intent to execute the Letter of Intent the Legislature was asked to approve. He stated so somebody did not get it right and he almost does not care where the responsibility lies. He stated the point is that the Legislative Body was presented with a document, the Letter of Intent. He stated it was reported to the Legislature that there was a meeting of the minds, the devil is in the details, but let's get the Letter of Intent going. He stated then the Legislative Body finds out the document had nothing whatsoever to do with what the Developer's intentions were. He stated that he believes there is a genuine outrage on his part. He stated that he spent a lot of time and attention on this matter. He stated the Deputy County Executive has stated that he does not want his time wasted; but it is okay that the time of nine (9) Legislators, the Legislature's Staff, the County Attorney's office and Legislative Counsel's time gets wasted. He stated that he is disturbed by what took place and it under minds any confidence he has for the ability of this Legislature to be given documents that can be relied on. He stated that is why he requested greater specification on the Conservation Easement documentation. He stated he does not know what the WAC Councils intent is, but the County can specify what they intend.

Chair Albano stated that he is not an attorney, however he sees a Letter of Intent as a "hug" between the parties involved. He stated when a contract is completed and signed and then sent to the other party for signature. If that contract is then amended it needs to be resigned by the originating party. He stated until a lease is signed nothing is written in stone.

Legislator Nacerino stated the lack of process and lapse of time from the time the Developer signed the Letter of Intent and modified the Document, which was ten (10) days after the Legislature had signed off of it. She stated then the Legislature was not privy to any of the modification until late August or September, is disturbing to this Legislative Body.

Legislator Wright stated speaking to Chair Albano's point, if the Letter of Intent was an agreement to "hug" then why did the Developer need to amend it.

Chair Albano stated the bottom line is nothing is finalized until it is approved. He stated that all that is left to be done now is to gather the facts and move forward.

Item #14) Adjournment

There being no further business, at 8:07P.M., Chair Albano made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Diane Trabulsy, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature.