

REAL PROPERTY TAX Transcript 10-25-21

SPEAKERS

Ed Kinowski, Steve Bulger, Andrew Jarosh, Chris Schall, Mo Wright, Michael Naughton, Anna Stanko, Bill Peck, Dan Pemrick, Michael Hartnett, Eric Connolly, Jack Lawler, Several Supervisors, Mike Smith, Therese Connolly, Bridget Rider

Eric Connolly

Are you? Good afternoon. It's 4:01pm on October 25th. I like to call this meeting of the Real Property Tax Committee to order. We'll start out with attendance, has that been taken.

Bridget Rider

It has.

Eric Connolly

Thank you. Approval of the minutes of the September 27, 2021 meeting, can I get a motion?

Ed Kinowski

I'll make the motion, Supervisor Kinowski.

Eric Connolly

Thank you and a second?

Bill Peck

I'll second.

Eric Connolly

Who was that? Supervisor Peck, thank you. Any discussion on the minutes? All in favor?

Several Supervisors

Aye.

Eric Connolly

Opposed? Passes. Item number three, Third Quarter Update, Chris Schall County Auditor.

Chris Schall

Good afternoon. As you can see the third quarter there were no credits, no refunds or corrections. So pretty quick.

Eric Connolly

Thank you, Chris. Item number four, approving the 2022 tax bill flyer, Steve Bulger County Administrator.

Steve Bulger

Chairman Yes. It's essentially the same message that goes out each year. And it should be in your packet, actually a copy of both the old and the new flyer, and basically, we highlighted, we changed the format a little bit to highlight the message about the mandates and the impact they have. And I want to thank Christine Rush, in particular, for working on this to redesign a little bit. We've also included a section in there, that gives contact information for a variety of the departments throughout the County. Previously, it had only been the federal and state elected officials so we added that as well, just to make it a little easier for any constituents who want to reach out to the County. I'm not 100% sure how many of these tax bills go out, but I think it is approaching 100,000 is what I'm told. So this will get wide distribution across the County. And so really, it's just a redesign in conformance with the policy that's in place. So that's it. Thank you.

Eric Connolly

Good to see we updated things. Item number five acceptance of tender offer, Andrew Jarosh County, oh, I'm sorry.

Bill Peck

No, before you go on from that I think we probably need a motion.

Eric Connolly

We do. Thank you. Can I get a motion on the acceptance?

Bill Peck

So moved.

Eric Connolly

Supervisor Peck. Can I get a second?

Jack Lawler

Second.

Eric Connolly

Thank you, Supervisor Lawler. Any discussion on that?

Bill Peck

Yeah. Supervisor Peck here.

Eric Connolly

Yes, Sir.

Bill Peck

Just for Steve, the highlighted portions of the unfunded mandates. Are those updated numbers?

Steve Bulger

No, we're waiting for those, glad you brought that up, we're waiting for those updated numbers. Once we get those, they will be plugged in. Those are last year's numbers that are in there in the highlighted section. So we should have those by early next month.

Bill Peck

Okay, cuz I just want to make sure the, so those are old numbers. That's what I thought because the, from the budget and also the Law and Finance hearing, you're expecting to do 67 million in property tax and the current version here says 65 and change so okay, as long as those are going to be correct. All right. Thank you.

Eric Connolly

Thank you. Any other discussion? Hearing none, we'll take a vote. All in favor?

Several Supervisors

Aye.

Eric Connolly

Opposed? Passes. Item number six, State moratorium on utility service termination and impact on utility relevy, Michael Hartnett, County Attorney. Oh, sorry. I'm going a little fast. Acceptance of tender offer, Andrew Jarosh, County Treasurer.

Andrew Jarosh

Thank you, Chairman. I have one tender offer for the committee to consider this is a property on Worth Road in Wilton, it was in bankruptcy and came out of bankruptcy. It's SPL 140.-2-4.113 The total amount is \$48,224.48.

Dan Pemrick

I'll move that.

Eric Connolly

Thank you. That was?

Dan Pemrick

Pemrick.

Eric Connolly

Thank you, Mr. Pemrick. Any second on that?

Ed Kinowski

Second.

Bill Peck

Second.

Eric Connolly

Thank you, Supervisor Kinowski. Any discussion on that? All in favor?

Several Supervisors

Aye.

Eric Connolly

Opposed? Passes. Item number six, State moratorium on utility service termination and impact on utility relevy. Michael Hart, County Attorney.

Michael Hartnett

Thank you Supervisor I was hoping to bring this up as a discussion only item. Assistant County Attorney Naughton is here to supplement any comments or answer, potentially, any questions that come up and to kick off the discussion. Many of you have received a letter or were copied on a letter from the Treasurer and the Director of Real Property Tax Services related to the water relevies, and this is created a bit of an issue statewide, and issues within the County with respect to the watery relevies and the moratorium issued there on. So in true kickoff fashion, I'll turn it over to the Treasurer to supplement on, on what the most current is.

Andrew Jarosh

Thank you attorney Hartnett. So as you guys know, a public serve, an amendment to public services law was enacted by the State Legislature, I'm paraphrasing here as the non attorney, I can do this, it basically said you can't relevy or lien any past due water bills, it's essentially what it said, there's a little more nuance to it, but we're talking specifically about municipal water bills being relevied into the next year's warrants and liens, which then become collectible by my office, by me and my office. And then someday, perhaps if they're still delinquent, we have to take further action into foreclosure and auction. We have both my office and Real Property and also the County Attorney's office have spent dozens of hours on this one issue in these past two weeks. Certainly this week, we've had quite a bit of discussion in the last several seven days on this and where we stand today, my understanding is this is where we stand today, we have one Town that properly followed the provisions of the new law, which says you can relevy the water bills with proper notice and the requirements for those notices, time and content, followed those procedures and the town was did conduct a permissible relevy of their, of most of their water bills. Of the villages which are also doing this, we have seven villages that have removed their water relevy from the tax information that they have provided to Real Property Tax Services to be included on the next year's bill. One is still pending, I think they're still working on it, and one other village, the Village of Corinth is insisting on including their water relevy in their water and their figures that they have given to Real Property Tax Services to be collected by me. We have gone back and forth with them several times. Their position, to the best that I can summarize it and represent it, again as not an attorney and I and they do have their attorney who I'm sure would love to speak right now, but their position is essentially that they conducted their action, they passed their budget for the next fiscal year starting on June 1, they passed that budget on May 4 of this year. At that time, the executive

order had expired and this law that I referenced had yet to become effective. That's their argument. The way I read it, with consult, from my staff from the Director of Real Property and from the Assistant County Attorney is that while that may be true, that they took action and passed a budget during the what we're calling the gap between the Executive Order and the enactment of the law, the law did become active on May 11 and the warrant of those relevies becomes effective and operational. The budget becomes in place on June 1, which is the start of the fiscal year of the Village, which then would seem to me that there relevy is impermissible for this law, cause this law definitely intended to thwart any June 1 liens for water relevy. That means that there is now, if our position is correct, and I'm pretty sure it is, that means that there is a conflict between our local law that tells that, a perceived conflict between our local law that says that I have to accept these relevies and the subsequent, much more subsequent and recent, higher jurisdiction state law that says that I can't. Because by taking on this the Village of Corinth relevies at this point, I believe that we'd be taking on an impermissible lien. Our interest in that then would be, if any of those become delinquent over time and as Tax Enforcement Officer I have to pursue foreclosure on those, I believe that we might have a problem for closing on those liens. I want to prevent that. Because of that I am recommending to this committee that we not accept the relevy from the Village of Corinth and let the chips fall where they may, on that. We're talking about a total of about \$91,000, of that, that's the total relevy, it's a little bit, it's a tick more than that I'm rounding, and of their water, we believe, includes 20, about \$22,000. The logistical issue here is that when the Villages provide the County, their relevied figures, they only include a bottom line figure, there is no calculation involved of how much of that number is property, water, and any other fees, anything else that they may have included, it's just a complete bottom line number. There's no way to back calculate out of that number. And without the Village's assistance in doing exactly that uncalculation, there's no way that I can be assured that I'd be putting the County in a good position by accepting those numbers and proceeding with collection on those numbers. I'll gladly take any questions from here. But I'd also defer to

Eric Connolly

Supervisor Lawler has a question.

Jack Lawler

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to just back up a second. Josh, before getting into the Corinth...

Andrew Jarosh

Drew.

Jack Lawler

issue in particular. I, you folks are mentioning water, but I believe we were told in an email, that the interpretation of that statute also extended to sewer relevies.

Andrew Jarosh

That changed subsequent, I'll let the attorneys speak to that, but that subsequent understanding was that it did not refer to sewer systems only to municipal water authorities.

Michael Hartnett

It's correct. It is water, its water relevies.

Jack Lawler

Perhaps I missed it, but did something go out relative to that? Because the last correspondence I recall, whether it was from Josh, Mike or from you, I can't remember, but we were specifically said that the interpretation was that this would apply to sewer. Now, I would have hoped if that's subsequently change that somebody would have, would have told us that cause we have our own Sewer District.

Andrew Jarosh

The County Sewer District also elected not to include their back do amounts on the next year's tax to re levy this year, and you can maintain collection, but the County took the same position as a just in case kind of position, just to be doubly sure.

Jack Lawler

I, Okay. That's a little at odds with what you both just said, which was that there was a subsequent interpretation that said it didn't apply to sewer. So my, my question is pretty simple, does it or does it not apply to sewer? If it doesn't apply to sewer, I wish somebody would have told us because we would have relevied as opposed to not reliving because it's a it's a material amount of money for us.

Andrew Jarosh

I will say that I believe that interpretation was guided by advice from, I'm not sure if it was NYCOM, or Council of Towns, by one of the NYSAC divisions. And

Jack Lawler

I understand you guys put your best foot forward. I'm not I'm not questioning that you know, you guys did you gave us the information you had at the time. I guess I'm just a little bit concerned that there was a subsequent revision to that decision that was not communicated. And because it wasn't communicated, we didn't relevy our unpaid sewer. So I'm not running the meeting. Eric, somebody.

Eric Connolly

Thank you, Anna Stanko.

Anna Stanko

Supervisor, you can still relevy your sewer.

Jack Lawler

Great.

Anna Stanko

That's not that.

Jack Lawler

Great.

Anna Stanko

You still have time to do that.

Jack Lawler

Okay.

Anna Stanko

Before Mike goes could I just add that a further complication of adding these village taxes with the watery levies is, as we all believe the laws interpreted is that we cannot add any penalties and interest the minute. No, what?

Andrew Jarosh

No, we can just not to any that have entered into a deferred payment agreement.

Anna Stanko

Oh, well right. Okay, well, when we accept their,

Andrew Jarosh

Which we don't know, actually if they have or have not.

Jack Lawler

So, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask Anna a question.

Eric Connolly

Please do. And I think Supervisor Smith has joined us on the phone. Is that right? Supervisor Smith?

Mike Smith

Yeah.

Eric Connolly

Thank you.

Jack Lawler

Anna what's the date by which you need that so I can make sure we get it up to you.

Anna Stanko

The Assessor can bring, if she wants to bring us an unload of her file, she can bring that up till November tenth.

Jack Lawler

Thank you. And that solves a big problem for us. Thank you very much. Now back to the to the Corinth situation. I don't recall, I understand what you're asking us Drew and I can see you're in a very difficult position, I get that. But I don't, and maybe Steve or Mike, somebody has this, is it this committee's, do

we have that responsibility to approve or disapprove of a relevy? I don't recall that being an issue in the past, but perhaps my recall is faulty.

Eric Connolly

Attorney Hartnett.

Michael Hartnett

Supervisor, I don't, I don't know exactly if it's ever come up in that context, and I, I wouldn't say that the role of this committee is necessarily to approve or disapprove of a village relevy or a municipality that's not us. I may be speaking for Drew here a little bit, but I think he's looking for endorsement of not accepting it.

Jack Lawler

I, but I would say that I, I have every confidence in Drew if he thinks that that that he should reject that levy, I'm comfortable with that. I'm not uncomfortable with a vote either. But I just, I just want to be clear that the authority rests in the Treasurer's office, and that any action we take is advisory, or if that's not the case, somebody educate me.

Eric Connolly

I think that was what this is on the agenda for his discussion and just to hear the Treasurer out, and to give him a chance to inform us of his position and just seeking advice on his position.

Jack Lawler

This is basically a non binding vote of support, or lack thereof.

Eric Connolly

That's my understanding.

Jack Lawler

Alright, thank you, gentlemen.

Andrew Jarosh

That being said, if I may.

Bill Peck

Mr. Chair.

Andrew Jarosh

If I may, go ahead Bill.

Eric Connolly

Supervisor Peck.

Bill Peck

What are the ramifications when you as the Treasurer don't accept the Village of Corinth, what's the next steps for them? Just so we're aware of that.

Andrew Jarosh

I understood. I'll answer that second, if I may, because that's kind of the Part B of what I was just about to mention. Part A, which is the new law, in effect by the legislature, specifically references section 25 of the Public Services Law, which talks about penalties. And I'd like to read this for the record, it says any, this is the penalty portion of the law, it says "any public utility company, corporation or person and the officers, agents and employees there of that knowingly fails or neglects to obey or comply with a provision of this chapter or an order adopted under authority of this chapter, so long as the same shall be enforced, shall forfeit to the people the State of New York a sum not exceeding \$100,000 constituting a civil penalty for each and every offense and in the case of the continuing violation, each day shall be deemed a separate and distinct offense." I am trying to prevent anyone from being subjected to that portion of this law. This is the most recent subsequent law in effect by the state of New York. Supervisor Peck, to answer your second question or what I am answering second is your question, which is our local law that governs the relieves doesn't address particularly the ramifications of not accepting a levy that of the tax, or of the Real Property Tax Services Department not accepting the relevy. In my understanding, it would require the Village then to reevaluate their budget and cash flow and to correct the numbers which I'm not going to sugarcoat that in any way that is an ordeal for the Village to undertake. It is a, it is a big lift that the Village would have to take on. I think in order for us to accept the relevy, they would need to recalculate the numbers without the water portion, which also is a heavy lift, which means in my opinion, they have a heavy lift to do either way.

Dan Pemrick

Josh, what can the County do to assist the Village of Corinth, the Town of Corinth to get through this?

Andrew Jarosh

Specifically, we are talking about the Village, I will say that,

Dan Pemrick

Okay. We've just described it as a heavy lift. We don't want them to suffer from financial consequences. From the way I understand how it was described earlier, they were acting in good faith, they got out in front of new legislation that was passed. I back to my original question, is there anything that the County can do to assist them.

Andrew Jarosh

There may be some manpower that the County can provide. But on the note that you just also mentioned, seven of the other villages did go through the effort of removing the water relevy from their calculations before providing them to the County.

Dan Pemrick

Okay, all right. Well, that that certainly accounts for something. And I'm assuming that somebody has sat down with them. This has been, the Village's position is being driven by their attorney it would seem.

Andrew Jarosh

I would agree with that, sure. Yeah, I would agree with that.

Dan Pemrick

And has the County Attorney's sat with this gentleman to, or lady, to I guess completely illuminate the possible consequences that the Village is facing here?

Andrew Jarosh

Without speaking for the Assistant County Attorney, I will say that I've been a party to a conference call between them last Friday, also today, there's been numerous emails going back and forth on this issue between the attorneys.

Michael Hartnett

Supervisor this is Mike Hartnett. I can confirm that Michael Naughton in our office has been running point on this legislation in all the changes and has interfaced with counsel from the Village of Corinth to attempt to resolve the issue in in some way that was mutually agreeable.

Dan Pemrick

Okay. And there's been no movement in that area that we're aware of?

Michael Hartnett

I will defer to Mr. Naughton who's who was I think the updates are almost in real time at this point, so I'll defer to him as to what the most, the very most recent is.

Michael Naughton

Just for a point of clarification, we have had discussions with Karla Buettner, who is the attorney for the Village of Corinth. We did discuss the impacts of the legislation but we did not speak specifically to Section 25 yet. Their senior partner Paul Pontiff passed away and so they're going to be out of the office today and tomorrow for those services. So I haven't had an opportunity to talk to her directly about the \$100,000 provision, but I intend to do that. One point of clarification with regard to what Treasurer Jarosh said, it wasn't the executive order that expired it was the previous law that expired in March 31, 2021. It was put into law last year, the governor said ratepayers need a break because of COVID, that law sunset March 31, 2021. The governor then signed the new legislation which put back into effect the law on May 11, 2021. The actual COVID emergency was declared over by the governor on June 23, but the law does provide for an 180 day provision which puts into effect the law for another 180 days after the secession of the COVID emergency. Our point is, is the fact that we believe the Village of Corinth did not comply with the law, because the law required two notices to be provided to ratepayers when they intended to go forward with a relevy. They sent those two notices out June 1st. I know their intent was that they were complying with the spirit and intent of the law when they did the, when they did the calculation for the relevy in May during their budget, but they actually went out with the bills and the notices in June, June 1, the law requires that they give those notices 30 days in advance of when they establish the lien, so they're in violation of the law in that regard.

Michael Naughton

With regard to the, I just I don't want to stir up. Certainly, Supervisor Pemrick. One thing to point out with regard to the email that went out earlier, it did specifically only say water. And then the letter that went out for more, the memo from Anna and Treasurer Jarosh spoke about a utility moratorium it didn't talk about sewer. When I read the law from the get go I said sewer didn't apply. I know a lot of municipalities relied upon the Association of Towns which had a presentation that said it applied to sewer and water. But from our perspective, it was never sewer and that email that went out from County Administrator Bulger it basically just said water didn't mention sewer at all. So just wanted to clarify that point.

Dan Pemrick

Okay, thanks Mike.

Eric Connolly

Thank you for all those points clarification and if you're on the phone Supervisors, if you would, please just ask to be recognized and we'll happily recognize you that was Supervisor Pemrick with the last question. Supervisor Kinowski.

Ed Kinowski

Hi. First of all, I don't have the letter in front of me but I somewhere, I didn't pull sewer out of my hat, I read it somewhere, so I'll have to figure that one out. But secondly, we know at the end of the, at the end of all this, there's going to be a relevy. So if that's the case, is there any chance of the County doing paying the relevy, but the Towns or Villages keeping track of it? Drew, you don't have the mechanisms or their computer, probably that the system that Corinth has, they got to know who owes. Our billing system does that but we had to make corrections to our billing system, because it wasn't prepared for this either. But likewise, it starts with us. And so if we can keep track of that, then we know who owes what, but at least the County made us whole. So if it's going to happen anyway, and it may happen, they may not pay at all, until the next relevy when we can, unless the state does another extension of some sort, you know, of some kind. But we, since we have the ability, and it's normal, anyway, why can't the Town report a relevy, in whole, the County makes us whole, and then the Towns are required to keep track of and or make agreements with each and every one of the homeowners? Just a question.

Andrew Jarosh

My understanding of that, and here I would defer to Attorney Naughton, but my understanding of that would be the law states any attempts of collection or of lien, and pursuance of that lien, the warrant is effectively in a lien against the property effective on the first day of the fiscal year, which is when the warrant becomes operable. This that's number one. Number two, I'd refer back to the penalties that the law references up to \$100,000 per property per day.

Ed Kinowski

I get that portion of it but, I'm looking at is there a way for us because of this difference, this is not normal, they produced a law to this, could we not still pay, we're taking on the responsibility of tracking, you're giving us a warrant back for the collection of taxes, all right, but you're paying us for them. But

we have an exception, the exception to the rule is worth the water payment, the water payment is deferred until the next relevely. Something to that or defer it until.

Andrew Jarosh

And that, that's what most of the Towns and Villages are doing, is exactly that, they're maintaining the water as a receivable, and then it will relevely or reapply it on the next year's water?

Jack Lawler

Well, and I understand what you're saying, Drew, and I think what Ed is suggesting, and he and I chatted about this when I first walked in, not suggesting that you try to enforce a levy at this time, which would trigger those penalties, which nobody wants to be on the wrong side of the law, let alone on the wrong side of those penalties, but I think what we were trying to get to was to, rather than us record a receivable, the County would record the receivable on the relevely, the County, which has a lot of cash, right and this certainly would qualify because it's a water related thing, even for COVID money, I think you could make that argument, I don't know for sure but we certainly have enough cash. And I think that the financial impact on the municipal water districts is going to be very severe. I think that's the part of this entire situation that hasn't gotten a lot of discussion because the individual water districts, you know, they're struggling to balance their budgets and this is, in my town it's hundreds of thousands of dollars, I would say in larger communities, it's much, much more than that. And I'm wondering if it wouldn't be possible for the County to continue to make the municipal water districts whole, but simply defer, as you're going to do anyway, defer enforcement of a levy until such time as it's appropriate and legal to do so. But what we're suggesting basically is instead of the Town's carrying a receivable in their individual water districts, that the County would carry the receivable. And then you would be able to go ahead and enforce that at some point down the road, which you're gonna do anyway.

Andrew Jarosh

So I think the part of the law that I would refer back to is where it says that no lien or warrant can be, well, no, it says no lien can be enforced for the for delinquent water bills. When we relevely come January 1st, a warrant is issued against the against the parcels, against real property that includes that amount. That is the part where I would believe that the County would be in violation. And so I don't want to put us in a position where we might be subject to that penalty.

Jack Lawler

I don't think I've explained myself well Drew, I apologize for that. What I'm suggesting is the County not relevely.

Andrew Jarosh

Okay.

Jack Lawler

Not move forward with a relevely on the tax bills, that you hold that in abeyance, don't do the relevely. So what I'm saying is that make the Town's whole the receivable is here at the County.

Andrew Jarosh

How would I make the Town's whole without relevy?

Jack Lawler

Well, we because we can tell you how much the levy would have been, we can give you that number.

Andrew Jarosh

Without the water?

Jack Lawler

No forget, forget the forget the, again, we can tell you how much the water portion of the levy would have been. What we have sent to you now does not include water. But we can tell you what the water relevy would have been.

Andrew Jarosh

Okay.

Jack Lawler

What I'm suggesting is the County do what it's always done in the past, which is to simply make those municipalities whole for that amount, not try to go collect it on that tax bill. But at some point down the road it will be legal again to try to go recover that money and at that point, the County would go and recover the money and basically reimburse itself for having made the municipalities whole.

Jack Lawler

Yeah.

Andrew Jarosh

I would also come back to I don't believe, I don't believe from an accounting point of view that the municipalities or the water authorities will be out any money. They're still due this money.

Andrew Jarosh

They'll carry it as a receivable, it's an account receivable to the water authority.

Andrew Jarosh

No, what I'm suggesting is

Andrew Jarosh

That's fair, that's a second issue. That is a second issue and I can appreciate that.

Eric Connolly

We need your microphone on Supervisor, thank you.

Mo Wright

For certain districts it's a huge cashflow problem, especially in my case, because my districts aren't that big. I rely on this money and my budget is very fine, I'm going to have a cash flow problem. I mean, you

take \$10,000 and it sounds like not a lot of money that's a third of my budget for some of my water districts. That's a cash flow problem on my part, that's, that's where we're gonna be in trouble.

Eric Connolly

Attorney Naughton.

Jack Lawler

So basically, all I'm suggesting is that the County basically takes on the debt.

Andrew Jarosh

How do we do that without the relevy?

Jack Lawler

You don't, you don't need a relevy. All you need is, you don't need to relevy until you want to go get the money.

Andrew Jarosh

No, we relevy when the bill, when the warrant comes out, making a collectible.

Jack Lawler

But we can't relevy, we can tell you now, I can say to you Drew if we had been able to relevy we'd of relevied \$100.

Andrew Jarosh

So am I correct in that you kind of want to do this as a whole separate transaction outside of the relevy process?

Jack Lawler

Yes. Exactly. Now you got it. Yes.

Andrew Jarosh

So you want the County to just front money to the Towns.

Jack Lawler

Yeah.

Andrew Jarosh

Equal to an amount of what would have been relevied without actually relevying.

Jack Lawler

Yeah. And then at some point down the road we relevy and you get your money back.

Eric Connolly

Attorney Naughton. Did you have some wisdom here?

Michael Naughton

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just offer one possible resolution to this to honor what you're trying to do and that would be for the County Attorney to reach out to the Public Service Commission and possibly ask if they would entertain a non enforcement agreement so that by possibly the County could accept the relevies, have it on the books so to speak, and then have the public servers Public Service Commission agree not to bring any enforcement action against the County and the County can then reimburse the municipalities knowing full well that the County would not then effectuate any type of relevy action, enforcement action against those non payers. So that in effect would then put into the books the fact that the charges would be relevied, but then we would have an agreement and avoid any type of enforcement by the Public Service Commission.

Jack Lawler

Well, the enforcement is only triggered when you do the relevy and I'm not suggesting we do a relevy. I'm simply suggesting that the County make the water municipalities whole and that when the relevy is legally permissible, the relevy takes place to the benefit of the County. The County advances the county sends money to the municipalities, all of us, we on for various reasons, right? I mean, there's all kinds of reasons why the County sends money, whether it's the landfill, the Veterans Program, the economic development program, there's all kinds of examples of the County based on a resolution of the Board of Supervisors simply sent reimburses the County for expenses. I'm, while I don't have any problem with your suggestion about going to the Public Service Commission, I come back to what super Supervisor Wright said, this is going to be a cash flow issue long before the PSC will ever give us an answer. And I'm don't have any problem with going to the PSC but it, but I also don't see why the suggestion I making, it doesn't run afoul of the law, it doesn't create an enforcement issue, it's consistent with County actions in the past to send money to the municipalities, it seems like and the County has the cash flow to do it. So I think, I think it's a way for the County to actually extend a very important helping hand to the municipalities to the water systems in this in this County, that are going to have a problem. That's not that's not a figment of my imagination. There are water systems in this County water municipal, municipal water systems in this County that are going to be looking at real cashflow problems this year and I think if we can help them avoid that, that's, that's good. If we can do it legally and do it without creating a nightmare with an enforcement issue, I would never suggest otherwise to that.

Andrew Jarosh

If I may.

Eric Connolly

Yeah, Treasurer.

Andrew Jarosh

I think if the Board wants to discuss and entertain any sort of aid package to the Town's and to other municipal authorities, that would be outside of the outside of this discussion, I understand that it's related to this discussion, because the numbers would equal. And so I will leave that for another discussion and I'm not I'm not going to take a position on that in this forum either way. We collect these

taxes because of a local law passed by this Board of Supervisors so this Board of Supervisors would need to probably review that and determine what is and is not permissible in my opinion. It is a local law that is why we're discussing this in any fashion. I don't, I don't know if that's if pursuing, how do I phrase this?

Eric Connolly

Very carefully.

Andrew Jarosh

Yeah, yeah, yeah, that's yeah, that's the answer. Not taking the proper numbers at the proper time by law I don't know if that puts the County in any other position that I would endorse. I, I'd want to make sure we did, you're basically saying the County is going to carry it and then fix it later. I'm not entirely comfortable with that, certainly without speaking to the attorneys.

Eric Connolly

And I think that's where we're going to leave it for now. I think the County Attorneys are capable of reaching out to Supervisor Lawler in particular, but Supervisor Wright and Supervisor Kinowski who have expressed concern, Supervisor Pemrick. Small towns need, you know, this assistance and totally understandable that you would want to flush this out some more discuss this more.

Jack Lawler

Miss Chairman given, if I could be recognized,

Eric Connolly

Yes, please.

Jack Lawler

I mean, given the number of municipal water districts in the County, I would just ask that perhaps this issue be presented to the, and whatever the Attorney and the Treasurer, whatever guidance they want to give on it, let's share that with the whole Board. So I mean, there's a lot of water districts that obviously aren't here in the room today that would I think they would find this topic interesting to be well aware of.

Eric Connolly

It's a challenge. Definitely legal and accounting challenge, but we'll approach it. Alright. You're welcome. Item number seven discussion In REM Procedure, Anna Stanko, Director of Real Property Tax Services.

Jack Lawler

Mr. Chairman, did you want to do a resolution, the advisory resolution before we move off of that topic for the Treasurer?

Eric Connolly

I believe that item number six was just discussion.

Jack Lawler

I don't think we took the resolution, did we?

Michael Hartnett

I apologize. My microphone was not on.

Jack Lawler

I just don't want to move past, if he's looking for a resolution, I didn't want to accidentally move past it.

Michael Hartnett

I added this. I asked this to be on the agenda as discussion only I believe it was Treasurer Josh's request that the committee entertain a resolution, so I'll defer.

Eric Connolly

And the resolution would be to bring it to the full board?

Jack Lawler

I think

Andrew Jarosh

I think the resolution of the committee would suffice. I'm just looking for, as you phrased it Chairman, as more of an endorsement of the action at this point, pending any further resolution between the Office of Real Property Tax Services, my office and the Village.

Jack Lawler

And that would be to reject.

Andrew Jarosh

Right now to reject because, frankly, per the state law and per our local law, there's really only two options either accept it or not accept it. There's no third option.

Jack Lawler

I'll make a motion to reject the levy.

Eric Connolly

Thank you. Can I get a second?

Mo Wright

I'll second.

Eric Connolly

Supervisor Wright. Thank you, any discussion? All in favor?

Several Supervisors

Aye.

Eric Connolly

Opposed? Passes. Item number seven discussion In Rem Procedure, Anna Stanko Director of Real Property Tax Services.

Anna Stanko

Good afternoon. This is just more of a to keep the guys all in the loop, the three properties that we discussed at the last meeting Maplewood Manor, 44 Middle Street and the Magnum property have all been officially and legally posted by my staff so we're ready to move forward. That's all I got.

Eric Connolly

Thank you. Item eight, other businesses. Anyone have any other business that they'd like to bring forward? Item nine, can I get a motion to adjourn?

Mo Wright

So moved.

Eric Connolly

Second.

Dan Pemrick

Second.

Eric Connolly

Thank you. All in favor.

Several Supervisors

Aye.

Eric Connolly

Opposed? We are adjourned. Thank you.

Andrew Jarosh

Thank you, committee.