

Minutes

Planning & Economic Development Committee

December 8, 2021, 6:00 pm, Legislative Chamber

Livestreamed on Facebook

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Starks, Muldowney, Penhollow, Ward, Lawton

Members Absent: Harmon, Rankin

Others: Tampio, Ames, Zink, Chagnon, Dennison, Engstrom, Aldrich, Wurster, Geise, Curtiland, Panteli, Abdella

Complete video of meeting can be viewed on the County's Facebook Page

Acting Chairwoman Starks called the meeting to order at (6:01 p.m.)

Approval of Minutes 11/10/21

MOVED by Legislator Ward, SECONDED by Legislator Muldowney.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

Karen Engstrom: I shared with you a graph this evening that credit to the International Energy Agency. I wanted to bring to your attention a couple of changes talking about solar blight. Utility scales solar blight that is creeping into our community and I'm hoping that some of the details will help us devise methods to either delay it or prevent it because it will have environmental and economic impacts that cannot be reversed. First of all, the Pennsylvania legislature has introduced a law which they probably will pass that calls for the recycling of all solar utility units. Of course, Borrello has done the same here and so has - I can't remember her name. The assembly that's listed of our state has a law introduced and so does the senate. There are three of them total asking for recycling for these very valuable elements which are listed here, Dysprosium, Neodymium, Lithium, Cobalt, Copper, Tridium - we cannot let those go into landfills. What we're looking at here is an energy policy is being imposed on us from above but there are things that local people can do, local towns and local legislatures. According to the latest information at the National level a testimony by Robert Bryson before the Senate on November 16th, he spoke to the committee on energy and natural resources the United State Senate November 16th and he points out that if local policy makers and elected officials can just take a realistic view of energy, face the real cost

benefits as was noted in two days ago Post- Journal that we see claims by the renewable promoters of benefits financially but the real cost benefit as they analyzed in the Post-Journal was not. It was a cost of up to \$300 billion for this state and that's not even talking about the grid upgrades – not upgrades, I'm sorry that build outs. Upgrades would solve the problem – we wouldn't need to be putting in solar panels because we would increase the amount of electricity there's no longer lost on the wires. I think you could verify that. You lose a lot of electricity on the wires if we just upgraded them to what would be a standard carry electricity, efficiently we would not need to consider devastating our agriculture and rural areas. I would like to site from this testimony in the senate by Robert Bryce, the author of "Power Greedy the Myths of Renewable Energy and the Real Costs". He says "Policy makers in Washington need a dose of energy realism and an even bigger dose of energy humanism. The causes and implications of soaring global energy prices are clear. Europe provides a case study for what not to do. Millions of Europeans are facing a prospect of a cold winter without enough affordable energy to heat their homes. In September, a study done by the European Trade Union Confederation which represents 45 million members found that 15% of the EU's working poor does not have enough money to pay for their heating. These price spikes are the result of several factors. Most important, the diminution of hydro carbon production etc." And the second thing is, the weather related problems and the commitment to so many renewables that are unable to cope with regular cyclical weather situations when you have no sun or no solar you have no electricity. So, the implications for your price spikes include soaring inflation, deindustrialization and increasing energy burdens on consumers, especially the working poor. We can do something locally. We can do some things. The state is changing. There is pressure, there are 300 communities across the United States that said "no" to renewables because they can see that it's damaging to their rural communities, to the quality of life and to the character of their communities. But it doesn't make electricity – that's the whole problem - if it did we could make a sacrifice, we could say "yeah, you know this is a good thing" but right now we can see from that graph that the returns are minimal. I have one more thing – Robert Bryce says "Who will stand for rural American against these landscape destroying sprawls that solar and wind? Who will look at this expensive energy as an enemy of the poor? Who in the senate or the legislature in this case, who in congress will stand up for the affordability, resilience, reliability of our electric grid which is being undermined by the senseless rush to renewables? All you have to do is slow it down, get a (*Inaudible*) resolution recommendations – you know they're not binding or say "recycle" These guys cannot handle recycling - not to the degree that this legislation which is going to pass in Pennsylvania and it's very responsible can demand so yeah any questions? If anybody wants a copy of Robert Bryce, in fact I'll put it in your emails – its congressional testimony's the way it'll come to you and it substantiates -

Acting Chairman Starks: (*Inaudible*) hard copy with Olivia that would be great.

Karen Engstrom: I do have a hard copy.

Proposed Resolution – Amend Landfill and Transfer Station User Fees

Mr. Panteli: I provided the – my explanation in writing and I think it was extensive about three pages and I asked for questions or comments.

Acting Chairman Starks: Are the increases similar to increases that we've had in the past?

Mr. Panteli: For the most part, yes. We have adjusted some prices that were traditionally low and we cannot continue that low. But overall, the average price is (*Inaudible*) years even less. The average price for everything.

Legislator Penhollow: So, I guess to make this short, you've given us a lot of information – an awful lot of information. My concerns are this and I will eventually ask for – to table resolution. But I look at how much of an asset our landfill is. I know what it provides to our businesses. I know what it provides to our tax payers us individually as households. I understand the concept of inflation. I understand the concept of private enterprises, monopolies. I've read some of your justifications. My concerns going forward, I believe the increase on the C & D waste in my opinion based on information that I've read which is somewhat new to me and I'm experienced somewhat with the landfill operations and related to hauling garbage of refuse and I'm going to make a suggestion that we table it and that we spend more time as a committee. It is my understanding that these – the prices per ton are derived from your staff and with direction possibly with the county executive I believe at the end of the day there should be a board similar to a sewer district board to help oversee, give direction, give support, help develop our solid waste plan, all of this responsibility comes basically down to yourself, the budget director, the county executive, and your staff. I just don't as an individual I don't know enough about this to approve the resolution. And I think some of us need to go through this further into detail, for example, just some quick questions. The amount of sludge that comes into our landfill, the amount of C & D that comes into our landfill – these facts and figures – these are at a 30,000 foot view. I think to create a – to understand it better for myself, I would like to see more detail and I would also like to propose the idea to creating a board with a chair person going forward. Those are my comment and concerns.

Acting Chairman Starks: (*Inaudible*)

Legislator Penhollow: If I'm able – some of the reason this has developed is to give the users you know, time to prepare. The increase on the C & D is going to be passed on to the customers and also keep in mind as the more I think about this there's a lot of thoughts – and this has nothing to do with the way the landfill is run or operated because I've spent many years there in the past and my experience with the county planning board – outstanding managers – they've been commended from the DEC many times over the years and I've witnessed those comments in person. Just keep in mind that the county landfill perhaps is one of the few entities that every tax payer in Chautauqua County utilizes – everybody does and only – all of our garbage has to go there. So we look at North County Sewer District, South and Center Sewer District – they have user fees in place, they have structures, they have a director – Panteli is the director of the landfill. There's a chairperson, there's community members for example, I did write some notes

down, you know members and it's to help I mean at the end of the day when you look at the bigger picture of all this.

Acting Chairman Starks: *(Inaudible)*

Legislator Penhollow: And again, this is new to me how to propose and to navigate this. But at the end of the day I understand why it's being done, I understand this 30,000 foot view. Some notes I had you know, what is the progressive thinking, the planning reaching out to the customers Pantelis that plays in this? What are their goals and objectives? If we're going to run this like a business, the landfill, then we should be interacting with the customers at all levels. I don't know – I'm sure we do that I don't know if we have a structure I don't know if we have staff to do all those things?

Mr. Panteli: In what sense, the prices or in general?

Legislator Penhollow: In general. If we're running this as a business and I've read this a few different places then if we're going to run it like a *(Inaudible)* we need to treat it like that and we need to be working with our customers. The customers are the tax payers and the private haulers.

Mr. Panteli: And in what – how do you come to the conclusion that we are not communicating with the customers?

Legislator Penhollow: I didn't say that we're not, I'm asking those questions.

Mr. Panteli: Well, I've sent these prices out on November 3rd. Now this is a month later. Nobody's said anything until the middle of November. Nobody asked any questions. I got some calls today, I got some emails saying "We agree" so I thought I gave you the opportunity to call me and you called other people *(Inaudible)* – you didn't call me.

Legislator Penhollow: Are you directing that directly towards me?

Mr. Panteli: I'm saying, I gave everybody the opportunity to discuss this.

Legislator Penhollow: However, excuse me and in response to that Pantelis, this is not *(Inaudible)*, this is not to create any negativity or to upset anybody by any means. I've given you so many *(Inaudible)*. I'm just saying we have an airport commission, we have commissions on this, commissions on this – we have a comprehensive county plan, a comprehensive plan. Every town, village and city has one. We have this amazing landfill which is asset to our people.

Mr. Panteli: I appreciate your suggestions but those are suggestions are not for me.

Legislature Penhollow: Why didn't we know about this earlier too? Just as well. In your development going forward. If this came in November, you said our waste is down 20%. I don't know – we don't know when that happened. We don't even know who the haulers – those are all things that are important for us to know as a committee, they are. I just can't look at this in good

conscious just agree to have a price increase with some facts and figures on two and a half pieces of paper. I can tell you this, I very well might at the end of the day might completely agree and say “Pantelis, maybe we should increase some more” That could be a possibility. But if I’m running a budget in my home, in my business, then I just personally don’t feel there’s enough here for me, and I’m just one small vote and I would just ask that we table it on the C & D portion and I would like to individually understand more about our waste flows, the type of waste and our customers in county, out of county – those type of things. It very well easily could be – we come to the landfill and we spend a half a day and we just sit down and understand how the landfill operates.

Mr. Panteli: I have invited the legislature many times to comes to the landfill so I can show them what we do, what we built, where the money goes and how the money comes in. Now, it’s the end of the year. All businesses needed to know. I already talked to all of our businesses, I gave them a heads up on what the possible increases are. They gave me their feedback. They didn’t have any problems and I’ve been doing what I’ve been doing for the last 25 years.

Legislator Penhollow: And I commend you, however, how can it hurt to have – or I should say, why can’t it help you improve to do –

Mr. Panteli: I welcome any suggestions at any – for any improvement. But the businesses, the businesses that come to the landfill, take our prices, take our fees and then they adjust their fees for the next year. They don’t change their prices in the middle of the year.

Legislator Penhollow: I disagree with that Pantelis. With what’s going on with the pandemic, the cost of fuel inflation, the cost of parts, the cost of labor – pricing now is adjusting in the private industry. You’ve been in county government for 27 years and I’ve been in the same amount of time in private industry and they’re similar in many ways but they’re also different animals with all due respect.

Acting Chairman Starks: So if the haulers and the others users know the anticipated and they’re already budgeting for it, they’re budgets will hold if the conversation continues.

Mr. Panteli: (*Inaduable*) they will pass the changes to their customers and maybe they will pass them from the first of the year regardless of what we do. Now, you said you want us to run it like business – we do the best we can with what we know. Now, if there are any suggestions for improvements they’re welcomed.

Chairman Chagnon: I spoke with a county attorney today about how the legislature could become more informed and more aware of the background information that supports the recommendations for tipping fees and what the county attorney suggested if we wanted to do something quickly is that we form a working group of several legislators – not a quorum of any committees. Just a working group to work contemporaneously with Pantelis and the landfill staff to understand better the background and the details and so then they can come back to this committee and to the legislature and make a recommendation as to what their suggestion is and what we should do.

Acting Chairman Starks: *(Inaudible)*

Chairman Chagnon: Yes, a working group. So rather than have this committee in a whole which would then have to be public noticed and all those requirements of the public law. We would form a working group of a couple of legislators and I already have one volunteer who is not here because he's not on this committee who's spoken to Pantelis today, offered to be part of working group. I will seek other volunteers to serve on that working group and *(Cross talking)*. So that will, I believe help the legislature going forward and now as far as the committee wants to do with the resolution that's before you, that's up to the committee so I'll step back now.

Legislator Lawton: I really appreciate Jon's willingness to get involved and support *(Inaudible)* The thought on my mind at the moment is that's going to take some time and we aren't going to have something in place by January 1st. I would encourage us or at least encourage some discussion of moving forward with Pantelis' experience in 25 years and the discussions you've had with other haulers that might be passing along the fees and I think we could probably lower fees at the end of 2021 if we felt that was the result of that committee and that we move forward with the work that Pantelis has done and *(Inaudible)*

Mr. Abdella: Just a few procedural point I'll make. If say, for instance this committee would have tabled this resolution I think it's to my understanding it did pass public facilities so it has been signed by some legislators so it would be still none the less going to the full legislature unless those legislators were to withdraw their support for it. Of course it could be tabled at the full legislature as well. Secondly, with regard to the setting of fees as Mrs. Starks referred to you know I think the pattern, the business pattern that the landfill has operated in has been to annually promulgate fees. It is not – there is no legal requirement that the fees be set annually. You could change them at any time. So I think that you're free to put fees in place and six months from now, adjust those fees. Pantelis might want to weigh in on from a business stand point that – or anyone might want to weigh in that there might be benefits to doing it on a one year interval for businesses to have – for planning purposes of expectation of what's going on but it is still within the legislature's discretion to modify the fees at any time. So you could put some in even if in your mind you might be in the process of reviewing and may wish to make adjustments you could still move forward on *(Inaudible)* basis if you wanted to call it that with this fee schedule starting January 1st and then change it down the road. With regard to there being a working group I think as the chairman mentioned you know that would be an informal group not constituting a quorum of any committee. I think the purpose would be for that group to do some fact finding and investigation and issue spotting you know perhaps make some recommendations however, if that group of legislators was going to you know blossom into something where they would be having extensive deliberations there would be of the character of a committee then we would need to notice those meetings but I think if a group of legislators are going to go up to the landfill and have discussion with Panteli or landfill staff and investigate the finances I mean that's of the nature of informal fact finding and investigation and you could do that.

(Inaudible)

Legislator Penhollow: Well however long term - I believe the board and I'm not one for additional levels of government because I come from private industry, not at all for that. However, honestly I don't even know the total operating budget of the county landfill. What are the total gross sales of the county landfill?

Mr. Panteli: Every year we publish the (*Inaudible*) it's all there. Where the money comes from and where it goes.

Legislator Penhollow: Thank you. My last point will be this, it says "The New York State DEC requires all municipalities to prepare and adopt a long term comprehensive solid waste management plan" Rather than making that just a requirement to check off a box that it was something completed. When I was in business I met business. My highway (*Inaudible*) tax forms, check, it's done. My safety training, done. Sexually harassment training, done. Why can't we think out of the box, look forward, create this small board working group to enhance, develop – maybe we could turn the landfill – that property into more than just what it is now. We don't know what it is – we don't know what you and your team have even looked at because maybe nobody's asked those questions. I look at this Pantelis as just the opposite of what I feel that you think it is and I could be wrong but I'm suggestion we have a lot of knowledge in our county, we have your extensive experience, we have the extensive experience of the operators on the working face landfill, we have extensive experience in private industry in our county. This is a major asset. We look at the BPU, it offers low cost energy to every resident in the city of Jamestown. We hear that on the radio every day. These are all just small little suggestions that we start filling a funnel, positive things are going to come out of it and that's all that I'm trying to say. We may find that you know the \$3 or \$4 dollar increase may not even be enough. But again I sat on the county planning board. We didn't have you folks come in the last few years because it was an enterprise fund so we could just pass through – agree to okay on capital equipment. Anybody in their right mind doesn't run a business like that. I want to be positive about all this going forward and it's just a suggestion on my behalf so, thank you.

Acting Chairman Starks: Any thoughts on those last few, committee?

Legislator Muldowney: Question about the finances. If we were to put this off for 6 months, what would it do to operations? Put you in a real hole in 6 months by not increasing these.

Mr. Panteli: It's possible. We are – the revenues are low right now with the prices we have for this 2021. That's why we make adjustments this time of the year based on what we learned the current and the previous years.

Legislator Muldowney: How long ago and I probably should know this but were adjustments made for fees I mean when was the last time –

Mr. Panteli: Last year.

Legislator Muldowney: So you do it annually basically?

Mr. Panteli: If necessary, yeah.

Legislator Muldowney: And you've said that you talked with your customers – the construction and the demolition people and I guess the haulers –

Mr. Panteli: A few key *(Inaudible)*

Acting Chairman Starks: None of them have a problem with increase?

Mr. Panteli: Every year I talk to them, make sure that they understand why we're doing what we're doing – what we propose and if it's okay with them and there are years where we don't increase the prices and they do theirs.

Legislator Muldowney: I like the idea of the working group because I don't know anything about this.

Mr. Panteli: Well I provided a comprehensive – a 10 year comprehensive plan for solid waste that I worked on for many years and it needs to be looked at by somebody else because and you know the legislature and then present it to the people to decide going forward the next 10 years what they want to see with their waste disposal, waste management *(Inaudible)*. So there's a lot of information there I don't know if you got a copy, start from there.

(Inaudible)

Mr. Panteli: We use to have way way in the 90's Norm Herpee was leader and they use to – *(Inaudible)* they use to come to the landfill every month and we use to sit down for an hour and go over what's going on at the landfill and it was the environmental committee at the time. Then they retired *(Inaudible)*

Chairman Chagnon: I am tending to follow through on creating the work. That's my commitment to this committee. Bill asked a question if that was what John was recommending in terms of a board. In discussions with the county attorney, if we are to go in that direction that would take some considerable time and effort to create that structure so I'm trying to be responsive to the immediate question that's in front of us now by forming this working group but that's not to say that discussion of the future has to end there – that we could ultimately create a sub-committee or a committee or a commission as was in place of the past to continue those efforts or expand those efforts. But I think this working group is a really good start to start us down that path of discussion and understanding to the visions that John has shared with us.

Legislator Ward: And is that type of group traditionally perhaps a way to evolve into a board or commission – is that sort of thing happened before?

Chairman Chagnon: I don't know if I can answer that. Not in my experience.

Mr. Abdella: Not that I can think of but it could. It certainly could

Acting Chairman Starks: If that group met frequently and (*Inaudible*) deep into things then yes it would be to -

Legislator Ward: They could make a recommendation in the form of a resolution –

Mr. Abdella: I mean, right now essentially the home committee of the landfill is the public facilities committee so you have a committee assigned that. As was mentioned by Pantelis, at one time there was an additional committee of the legislature called the Environmental Committee that was the home committee of the landfill and that was separate and apart from what was then called the public works committee. It's evolved overtime – how many formal committees this legislature has had and it relates to what the works demands are and what your interests are. And so I think if you have a few legislators temporarily look at what sort of oversight do we wish to have, what kind of input do we want to have – you could do that in one of the things they could look at is whether or not it's appropriate to have a more permanent subcommittee or advisory board or whatever it might be.

Legislator Ward: I for one (*Inaudible*) the disappearance of an environmental (*Inaudible*) It seems that, that sort of thing is necessary perhaps now more than ever (*Inaudible*)

Acting Chairman Starks: Okay so then what's before us is the idea to table or shall we vote?

Legislator Lawton: I love John's idea (*Inaudible*) I guess if you okay with that idea as well and I think good things could come out of it but I think doing (*Inaudible*) – if he says this is what we should do then that is what we should do (*Inaudible*), I would encourage us to support what he's proposing (*Inaudible*).

Legislator Penhollow: My view is slightly different. Why not can we approve the landfill fees for the municipal solid waste, .50 cents a ton, contaminated soil \$2.00 a ton and amend the resolution to leave construction demolition right where it is at \$36.50 per ton at the landfill and whatever's a corresponding cost per ton at the transfer station and then approve the resolution and it'll go to the full legislature next week and again this is not to question or undermine anything that's going on at the landfill, it just comes down to we're looking at it the wrong way and this was a road, an avenue, for me to bring this up. I'm new to the legislature, I have some experience with this and I know from past history that you have an awful lot on your plate at the landfill, regulations, workforce, state, federal regulations that you are responsible for but you know, and some of the information you gave to us it says this it says "The final steps" and again referring to the comprehensive solid waste management plan "The final steps are for the county residents and the representatives need to accept and adopt implement their plan." It's our plan, you're the director of the landfill, we give you the support, you're the professional engineer, and you're paid to do that. And I want to help or contribute to improve. That's all that I'm saying at the end of the day.

Mr. Panteli: Can I respond?

Legislator Penhollow: Yes, please.

Mr. Panteli: I welcome and that's the contribution from more people because like it's your landfill, it's not my landfill. I'm just there (*Inaudible*). The other thing I want to say the prices were set – looking at the whole picture (*Inaudible*) all together and they were set in such a way that we won't lose any out of county waste and that's very new. But retain the out of county waste that we have been getting this year which is 20% less of the previous year. Without losing any other waste from C & D because our C & D prices are way way low, compared to the other landfills so we stay competitive. Now if we come now and say leave the C & D alone and they just raise .50 cents here and there it's not going to cut, it's not going to be enough. At the end of the year you're going to question "why did the landfill lose money, why is it in (*Inaudible*)?" And you will be questioning these at the end of this year.

Mr. Abdella: Yeah, I mean this committee could make amendments

Legislator Ward: But how would that work? If we would make amendments that would be retroactive to the resolution has already been passed.

Mr. Abdella: We have multiple committees, in this case actually three reviewing but if one of the committees makes amendments, those amendments will show on the floor then the full legislature, including the members of public facilities would be free to move to amend and strike the amendments made by this committee but I think our practice has been if amendments are made at committee, that's the version that gets to the floor.

Legislator Muldowney: So if we amend this, this evening and audit and control looks at it tomorrow and differ with us (*Inaudible*) so then come judgement day on Wednesday you got three different amendments?

Mr. Abdella: Well, yeah and I don't know if that has ever happened but I think what we would do is audit and control would get benefit of being the last committee. Their version would be the one on the floor but we would show the amendments that have been made in this committee even if audit and control chose to reverse them.

Legislator Muldowney: They can see the history but its audit and control amendment or –

Mr. Abdella: That's what we would do, yeah.

Acting Chairman Starks: (*Inaudible*)

Legislator Penhollow: You know, just add a few more insights and ideas to this at the end of the day I personally agree with about all of these other than with the construction demolition. This is an opportunity for us to really analyze what we have there, what successes we've had. What can improve going forward? And I'm going to take a guess here Pantelis, does C&D waste volumes increase January, February and March?

Mr. Panteli: No

Legislator Penhollow: So we're probably a guess, we're probably safe increasing *(Inaudible)* .50 cents. Increase all the other items but this gives us an opportunity also to evaluate every municipality that brings sludge into the landfill, in county, out of county within New York State and then out of state. Those are all things that you know, we're just rubber stamping this. I can only assume when the county executive asks each individual department to bring cost reductions in, I assume that you do that. I haven't been *(Inaudible)* to any of those in any departments within the legislature but I was on the county planning board. And I didn't see that from the landfill. And that's not a criticism – that's just a fact, that's all that it is. It's not a criticism and we may find out at the end of the day that our rates are not high enough but we also may find out maybe we could represent our landfill asset differently to out of county and out of state haulers as well. In manufacturing sometimes you have to cut pricing and increase volume and pick up efficiencies. All those things that there's a lot of people sitting in this room and residents that live in this county can help you, help the county. I suppose we could sit and talk all night long chair so whatever you decide to do, that's up to you.

Acting Chairman Starks: Pantelis, would you like to share anything else because I believe we are going to vote.

Mr. Panteli: I keep data over the landfill since 1991 and I keep track of the cost of every aspect operations per ton. And also the prices and the rest of the – our competitor fees and everything so our average price in the 90's, 95, 96 was \$36 per ton for overall. Right now it's less than that. Average price, it's \$31 right now and we're going up by maybe .50 cents overall. So we're less than what we were 30 years ago. Why? Because we want to be competitive and attract waste from out of county, increase our efficiencies and maintain lower price for our county in our industries, in our people, in our *(Inaudible)* and everyone. So yeah you can increase the prices as much as want. I mean, there are landfills where they charge \$100 dollars a ton right now. *(Inaudible)* they operate with – we get 8, 900 tons a day, they get 3 or 4. They're inefficient and the people pay what – because they have to. There's no other option.

Acting Chairman Starks: *(Inaudible)*

Legislator Ward: The only comment that I would have is that *(Inaudible)* but I hear from *(Inaudible)* all over the place who are surprised when they hear the words competitors and that we go out of town to look for business for our landfill. There are a lot of folks who just simply think that Chautauqua County landfill is a place to put our waste and that we are not in the waste business and we are. I would hope that any such counsel, any such group and even though I'm going to be leaving this office after the first I would be happy to be a part of that group to explore even our philosophy with regards to waste, with regards to shopping, our facility now and whether that's an ecologically wise for us to do. That's just an *(Inaudible)* but that's *(Inaudible)* in anticipation of these discussions that maybe *(Inaudible)*.

Acting Chairman Starks: So, with the resolution that we have before us, lets vote. All those in favor? Opposed?

Legislator Penhollow: Me.

Acting Chairman Starks: I was going to ask, may we have the detail notes of this recorded.

Mrs. Lee: Sure, would you just like this resolution transcribed?

Acting Chairman Starks: Yes, just this resolution because there was such an in depth and detailed discussion and I think it would be good to have it documented for that working group.

Mrs. Lee: Sure

Legislator Lawton: I would have changed my vote. I think John's point is the key point here and I *(Inaudible)* I didn't think you were willing to work with John with this working group *(Inaudible)* change my vote because I think that that's the more important topic rather than these rates. As long as there's a – moving forward I think our conversations I think *(Inaudible)* fully support but you are kind of a tough guy Pantelis too and we're going to be open here and I don't have any doubt but I would change my vote if I thought you wouldn't *(Inaudible)*.

Carried with Legislator Penhollow voting no.

MOVED by Legislator Muldowney, SECONDED by Legislator Penhollow to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (7:28 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Kathy Tampio, Clerk/Olivia Lee, Deputy Clerk/Kristi Zink, Sr. Stenographer