

STEBEN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, June 13, 2023

9:00 a.m.

*Legislative Chambers, 3rd Floor, Annex Building
Bath, New York*

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE:	Brian C. Schu, Chair Hilda T. Lando	Robert V. Nichols, Vice Chair Gary D. Swackhamer	Kelly H. Fitzpatrick
STAFF:	Jack K. Wheeler Brenda Scotchmer Jennifer DeMonstoy Jennifer Galvan Mitch Alger Brooks Baker	Christopher Brewer Nate Alderman Andy Morse Wendy Jordan Vicky Olin	Jennifer Prossick Auralee Jefferds Colleen Hauryski Tammy Hurd-Harvey James Allard
LEGISLATORS:	Scott J. Van Etten Jeffrey P. Horton Nicholas D. Pelham	Carol A. Ferratella Wendy Lozo Frederick G. Potter	K. Michael Hanna John V. Malter
OTHERS:	Mary Perham		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schu called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and asked Mr. Nichols to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 9, 2023, AND MAY 22, 2023, MEETINGS MADE BY MRS. LANDO. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. DEPARTMENT REQUESTS

A. Purchasing

1. **Bid Award – Printing** – Mr. Morse informed the committee they received three bids for printing services. He recommended awarding to all bidders on a line item basis.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR PRINTING SERVICES TO THE FOLLOWING VENDORS ON A LINE ITEM BASIS: CHECK-O-MATIC; IMAGE NOW AND STRATEGIC FACILITIES MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

B. Clerk of the Legislature

1. **Rules of Procedure** – Mrs. Scotchmer asked if there were any questions on the proposed amendments to the *Rules of Procedure*? Mrs. Lando stated we have already talked meetings and video. My question is we can call in and listen to all of the committee meetings but we can't Zoom in to the Board Meeting and I was wondering why? Mrs. Scotchmer replied you could attend the Legislative meetings remotely if it is under the extraordinary circumstances. Mrs. Lando stated but I can attend any committee meeting, even if I can't talk, but I can at least see what is going on and I can hear it. Mrs. Scotchmer stated we do that to give the department heads the ability to attend the meeting virtually. Mrs. Lando stated the *Rules of Procedure* do not say that we cannot use Zoom for the Board meetings, right? When I read what you sent us, it does not say that we can't have a Zoom meeting. Mrs. Scotchmer stated correct. The rules are set based upon State Law. The State Law is what allows Legislators to attend via Zoom under extraordinary circumstances, if we adopted that. If we

did not adopt that State Law, there would be no attending virtually. Mrs. Lando stated I understand that. My question is what is the difference between committee meetings and the Legislative meeting? Mrs. Scotchmer replied that was a decision made by the Chairman to allow department heads to attend virtually and not sit here for an hour waiting for their item to come up. That was the only reason. Mrs. Van Etten stated it was a decision for department heads to attend virtually because I did not like the idea of some of them sitting here for two hours to present for three minutes, or if they just want to continue to work in their office and call in and listen, then they could do that.

Mrs. Lando stated my concern is, and I guess that is my own fault if I am not under special circumstances, is I can attend virtually and listen to any committee meeting, but there is no Zoom and I cannot do that for the Legislative meeting and I don't understand and that does not make sense to me. Do we have to submit a request to change that? I can listen to committee meetings, but for the main meeting, which is just as important, there is no link to Zoom in unless I have special circumstances. Mrs. Scotchmer stated originally it applied to all meetings and we only sent the Zoom link to any Legislators that were attending under extraordinary circumstance, but the Chairman had wanted the department heads to have the ability to attend virtually as it would be more efficient. Mr. Van Etten stated if you think about it, before COVID, there was no Zoom so if you were not here, you were not here. You could not call in and listen to anything. We now have the ability to conference in for committee meetings and listen, but not for the Legislative meetings.

Mrs. Lando asked what is the difference? If you are going to Zoom into any of the committee meetings, then why can't you Zoom in to the Legislative meetings? The department heads should be able to do the same thing as well. Why aren't we doing both? It just doesn't make sense. Mrs. Scotchmer explained the reason is because of the public comment portion that is offered during the Legislative Meeting. If you did Zoom for the Legislative meetings, then you would also have to allow the public to be able to attend and speak, under public comment, on Zoom. Mrs. Lando stated but I don't speak if I'm not under special circumstances. Mrs. Scotchmer stated that's because there is public comment on the agenda for every Legislative Meeting, but there is not for committees and that is the entire reason why. We did not want to open up that can of worms.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked so we made a conscious decision to allow Zoom for committee meetings and then not allow for the Legislative Meeting when we adopted the State Law, or is that part of the State Law? Mrs. Scotchmer replied State Law applies to the ability for legislative members to attend by Zoom under extraordinary circumstances. The decision to allow department heads was an administrative decision. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated okay, but that still doesn't answer the question. Did we consciously make a decision to not allow the main meeting? Mr. Van Etten stated yes, because of the public comment. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated I am not against that, but I wanted to make sure that everybody was understanding the question and understanding the answer.

Mrs. Lando stated I still say that I cannot speak; I can listen, but I cannot speak. If you allow Zoom to just hear the meeting and see the meeting for everybody, but then you've got the Zoom to at least allow people to call into the meeting and listen to what is going on even if there is no way to talk for anybody. My point is that at least I can Zoom into the meeting. So we don't need public comments if you can't talk anyway. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated what Mrs. Scotchmer is saying is that we would have to allow the public to talk and they can sign up for public comment on Zoom at the meeting and we don't want that. Mr. Van Etten stated you can attend and make public comment in person. Mr. Malter stated you cannot split the situation. It's either one way or no way. Mrs. Scotchmer stated this could all change next year anyway because the State Law sunsets next June or July.

Mr. Van Etten stated on page 9 regarding the adoption of resolutions; we have never done it the way that it is in the *Rules of Procedure* since I have been here. It reads "After a resolution has been duly moved for adoption and seconded and before it is put to a vote of the legislative members, any Legislator may move to modify the terms of the resolution in one or more particulars. If the sponsoring Legislator(s) accept(s) the amendment, the resolution shall be put to a vote of the legislative membership as if the original resolution had been so amended." We have never done it that way. Whenever someone wants to amend a resolution, we vote on the amendment first and then on the resolution. Mrs. Scotchmer replied a lot of that comes from how the Chair runs the meeting. Mr. Swackhamer stated if someone makes a change to my resolution and you ask me if that is okay and I okay it

and the second person okays it, then there is no vote. Mr. Van Etten asked so there is no vote on the amendment as its part of the original? Mr. Swackhamer replied correct. Mrs. Scotchmer stated as long as the mover and seconder approve the change, then you don't need to do a separate vote. Mr. Wheeler stated you have always done the acclamation on the amendment. Mrs. Scotchmer asked do you want me to change that? Mr. Van Etten stated no; I was just reading it and thought that was not how we do it.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked should it address what we actually do? If that's the way we are used to doing it, should it be reflected what the actual procedure we follow is? Mr. Swackhamer stated there are two or three items in the *Rules of Procedure* that we do not do that we should be doing. One is, for instance, and I'm not picking on Mr. Van Etten, but he is not supposed to say anything when he is sitting up there. He is supposed to appoint somebody to go up there so he can come down and discuss. That is in the *Rules of Order*. That is what we always had done. Mr. Wheeler stated again this has been a COVID change where everyone is just interacting. That would be one that I would recommend changing for efficiency. Mr. Swackhamer commented that is just one example in the *Rules of Procedure* that we do not follow and nobody has objected to you doing it. Mrs. Scotchmer commented it is usually only for when the Chair wants to debate. The Chair can speak, but if they wanted to debate an issue then they would step down. Mr. Swackhamer asked is there a difference between speaking and debating? Mrs. Scotchmer stated yes; do you want to allow the Chair to participate in debate without having to step down? Mr. Van Etten replied I think that would be more efficient, no matter who is the Chairperson. We have conversations here; we don't do it formally and I prefer it that way. Mrs. Scotchmer stated this is addressed on page 11; the Right of Debate in Open Meetings. Mr. Schu asked would we just delete all of the Chairperson's section? Mr. Van Etten asked what is a debate? If two people have a different opinion, that is a debate. Mr. Wheeler commented technically, in my opinion, it is any comment on a resolution. Mrs. Scotchmer noted we also don't always allow the Chair to recognize a Legislator before they speak and that is in there. Mr. Van Etten recommended striking out the new #13 "Chairperson Taking the Floor in Open Meetings" on page 11. Mr. Malter commented most of the debates happen in the committee meetings anyway.

Mr. Schu stated what we can do is entertain a motion to adopt the *Rules of Procedure* as proposed by Mrs. Scotchmer with that modification.

Mr. Van Etten asked at the beginning of page 11 "Form and Contents of Resolutions," you totally struck out the third paragraph which states "When a committee resolution sponsored by a Committee Chairperson is introduced to the full Legislature it will include a notation of the vote of each committee to which it has been presented..." Mrs. Scotchmer explained Mrs. Chapman and I have been testing that for the last four months and your vote has not been on there. Because the majority of the Legislature attends every committee meeting, we found it unnecessary. Mr. Van Etten asked so all that referred to was on the actual written resolution where it shows the committee vote? Mrs. Scotchmer replied yes. Since nobody noticed, I deleted it as it will be less work on our office.

Mrs. Scotchmer asked if anyone had any questions regarding the rewrite regarding new positions? That was a really big change. This is on page 16. Mr. Van Etten asked this is in relation to 16B's? Mr. Wheeler replied yes and Mrs. Scotchmer did a very good job drafting that. This is a reflection of how we operate. Ms. Fitzpatrick asked we are just trying to clean it up and make the process more efficient? Mr. Wheeler replied yes. I think times have changed so much that the vast majority of positions that you have created are either grant funded, State mandated or something that was brought to a committee that you all wanted to do. For the department heads to get those requests to us in May; this year, as an example, we didn't have a State budget finished. That process has not been used in quite some time. Mrs. Scotchmer explained that had been changed in the 1990's when both DSS and Mental Health were growing exponentially. Mr. Van Etten commented I can see why you would put that control in place, but it actually ends up being an eight month delay in hiring. If you actually needed people, I think that is why we continuously waive Rule 16B because we don't add people that we don't need. We identify the need and we approve putting in the position. Mr. Swackhamer stated many things have changed since the 1990's, but there were reasons for this at the time. Mr. Van Etten commented that he is fine with those changes.

Mrs. Scotchmer stated she included the new weights and the rest of the changes were just small changes. She stated that she included, and didn't realize that it was not in there before, language that allows a member of the public who could not attend in person, to submit written comments.

Mr. Van Etten stated I see we have done away with pronouns. Mrs. Scotchmer stated yes. She stated that she wanted to mention a couple of bills that were approved. One is the gender neutral legislation. All of our local laws and rules will need to be updated so that there are no pronouns. It is no longer he/she; it will be they/their and she did try to incorporate that into this document knowing that it was coming. The other thing that was approved was changing the election cycle to even numbered years to coincide with the Presidential election. I am not sure how that is going to work for us. It works for one group to be on the Presidential election cycle, but because we are staggered it does not work for the other group. We are still trying to work out how we are going to do that with our staggered terms. This legislation passed, but has not gone to the Governor yet. This change will not affect the County Clerk, District Attorney or the Sheriff. There is no mention of the Coroners and we may need to change them as well. That change will be effective for January 1, 2025 so those running this year will not be affected. Those running in 2025 would be running for one three-year term and then the next time you ran would be for a four-year term and it also changes all the term limits; everybody resets. She noted that cities are not included in this change. The new law is that all county elected officials will have to run in even number years after 2025 to coincide with the Presidential or statewide elections. The first group would run with the 2028 Presidential election. Mr. Wheeler stated you would either run in a Presidential year or a mid-term year. Mrs. Scotchmer stated this new legislation applies to the towns as well. This does not affect city or village officials. Mr. Swackhamer asked for those running in 2025, they will run for a three-year term? Mrs. Scotchmer replied yes. Mr. Wheeler stated that is why the term limits reset because it is consecutive four-year terms. Mr. Nichols asked what happens with the other group? Mrs. Scotchmer replied when they run in 2027, they will run for a three-year term through 2030 and then they will run for another four-year, but again, there is another Presidential election in 2032, so I am not sure how that will work.

Mr. Swackhamer asked so the public who voted for term limits at the time, it doesn't make a difference? Mrs. Scotchmer replied no. My State Association wrote a letter to the Governor and State Legislature opposing this. Some counties only have three-year terms and we made mention of the fact that those of us with staggered terms, how do we do that? Do we have to take them back to a two-year term instead of a four-year term? We don't know.

Mr. Malter asked when this all passes, the whole Legislature would be up for re-election at one given time? Mrs. Scotchmer replied at some given time you will run for one three-year term in order for you to get on an even year cycle. Mr. Wheeler explained that will not be everybody at the same time. We have to see if the Governor signs the bill, but it is likely. We need to get more information from the State about how to handle this. Mr. Van Etten commented the goal is to get more voters involved because people elected in off years, there is much less voter participation. They wanted to put as many local offices aligned with the Presidential or Gubernatorial elections so they could get more voters out. Mr. Nichols asked does that mean the public will only vote every other year? Mrs. Scotchmer replied no this legislation does not apply to cities, villages, the County Clerk, District Attorney or Sheriff.

Mr. Pelham commented this will swamp the Board of Elections. Mrs. Scotchmer stated yes, the Board of Elections will have a lot of work over the next few years. Mr. Swackhamer asked when does this start? Mrs. Scotchmer replied we have to institute it by 2025. We have to have it worked out by the end of next year. You could go back to not having staggered terms and that would require a mandatory referendum and getting that done by 2025 will not be easy.

Mr. Van Etten stated page 12, #14 Executive Session states that no executive session participant in open session shall disclose what business may have been transacted executive session. This is in bold and that would be in violation of the Ethics Law. We have had issues with this in the past. If there is a discussion in executive session, that is where it stays. Mrs. Scotchmer commented this is also part of the Ethics Law. This section refers to the disclosure of information from executive session and that could trigger an investigation by the Ethics Board.

MOTION: APPROVING THE AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AS PRESENTED AND FORWARDING TO THE LEGISLATURE FOR APPROVAL MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

Mrs. Scotchmer commented this is a presenting resolution this month with final adoption the following month.

C. Elections

1. **Grant Approvals** – Mrs. Olin requested authorization to accept the Technology Innovation and Resource (TIER) Grant in the amount of \$96,920.62, the Absentee Ballot Pre-Paid Postage Grant in the amount of \$27,821.26, the Temporary Poll Site Improvement Grant Extension in the amount of \$10,623.42 and the Cyber Security Grant Extension in the amount of \$4,766.23.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONERS OF ELECTIONS TO ACCEPT THE FOLLOWING GRANTS: TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION AND RESOURCE (TIER) GRANT - \$96,920.62; ABSENTEE BALLOT PRE-PAID POSTAGE GRANT - \$27,821.26, TEMPORARY POLL SITE IMPROVEMENT GRANT EXTENSION - \$10,623.42 AND CYBER SECURITY GRANT EXTENSION - \$4,766.23 MADE BY MR. NICHOLS. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked what are you using the TIER Grant for? Mrs. Olin replied we are waiting to purchase ballot on-demand printers. We have to be able to print 22” ballots. The company has to change their software to accommodate this as well as to work with our e-poll book system. We also want to purchase more electronic poll books so we have more of those at the poll sites.

Mrs. Ferratella asked what do you use the postage grant for? Mrs. Olin replied we put money on a postage account at the Post Office for everything that comes back to our office. We have to mail postage paid return envelopes and last year we had \$10,000 in that account. This pays for outgoing postage and we also purchased items to receive absentee ballots in the office.

Mr. Potter asked how frequently are you using the temporary poll sites? Mrs. Olin replied not a lot. We purchased some stand-alone privacy units because we do have a couple of poll sites that are very small in Rathbone and Bradford. If these work well in the primary elections we will purchase more of these.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mrs. Lando asked have you been getting calls about changing/consolidating sites? Mrs. Olin replied yes. We sent out blue cards to everyone in Corning Town 2 and 3 and the registration system swapped and sent out the incorrect information. We are still working with the vendor to fix that in the system. All of those individuals will get a postcard explaining the error and indicating where the correct poll site is. For the majority of individuals, many do not want to have to drive to another site, but we have early voting in Bath. Once people get through the initial change, in most cases they will find that it is more streamlined when they show up to vote. The only district that will be different is Erwin as 1 and 4 will still be at the same site. She noted they cannot change the sites in the cities.

Mr. Van Etten asked has there been any solution to the biggest complaint of the ability to sign your name on the iPad? Mrs. Olin replied we purchased signature pads last year and put them in place. This year we will put them on top of their black case so they will be raised up. People were much happier with the signature pads that we used last year. We purchased keyboards for the tablets and the inspectors were very happy with that.

D. Personnel

1. **Finance** – Mr. Alderman requested authorization to reclassify one vacant Senior Account Clerk-Typist position, CSEA Grade I to an Accounting Manager, Management Grade H in the Finance Office. He noted the duties of the position fit this title and they have a need for a high level accounting position to manage accounting functions for the County.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ONE VACANT SENIOR ACCOUNT CLERK-TYPIST POSITION, CSEA GRADE I TO AN ACCOUNTING MANAGER, MANAGEMENT GRADE H IN THE FINANCE OFFICE MADE BY MRS. LANDO. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

Mr. Alderman requested authorization to amend the Management Salary Plan to include the new title of Accounting Manager, Management Grade H.

MOTION: AMENDING THE MANAGEMENT SALARY PLAN TO INCLUDE THE NEW TITLE OF ACCOUNTING MANAGER, MANAGEMENT GRADE H MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

2. **Sheriff's Office** – Mr. Alderman requested approval of a Memorandum of Agreement with the Deputy Sheriff's Association. This change will allow Deputy Sheriff's and Building Security Deputies to do a lateral transfer on a year for year basis and move up and not have a cap at year five.

MOTION: APPROVING THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH THE DEPUTY SHERIFF'S ASSOCIATION RELATIVE TO THE NEW APPOINTMENT OR LATERAL TRANSFER OF A DEPUTY SHERIFF OR BUILDING SECURITY DEPUTY MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

3. **Real Property – Appointing Deputy Director** – Mr. Alderman stated he will hold this item and bring it up at a later date. Mr. Wheeler explained we will need to have an internal discussion regarding a charter amendment and a local law.

4. **Community Services** – Mr. Alderman requested authorization to waive Rule 16B and create two Staff Social Worker positions, CSEA Grade L. These positions will be funded with opioid settlement funds.

MOTION: WAIVING RULE 16B AND AUTHORIZING THE CREATION OF TWO STAFF SOCIAL WORKER POSITIONS, CSEA GRADE L IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES TO BE FUNDED USING OPIOID SETTLEMENT FUNDS MADE BY MR. NICHOLS. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK.

Mrs. Lando asked will we be using the new allocation from the State? Mr. Wheeler replied we will be using the previous opioid settlement funds for these positions.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

Mr. Nichols asked if the funding ends will these positions go away? Mr. Wheeler replied we would need to discuss that during the budget process. These positions can bill insurance and we would very likely recommend keeping them.

Mr. Alderman requested authorization to reclassify one vacant Staff Psychologist position, CSEA Grade T to Mental Health Program Coordinator, CSEA Grade T. He noted this title fits the duties well. Mr. Wheeler stated Ms. Lewis had previously sent out a breakdown of this proposal and the current management structure.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ONE VACANT STAFF PSYCHOLOGIST POSITION, CSEA GRADE T TO MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM COORDINATOR, CSEA GRADE T IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES MADE BY MR. NICHOLS. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

5. **Civil Service Exam Fees** – Mr. Alderman informed the committee that there has been discussion in his State Association regarding exam fees. Many of our positions are tested. In order to take an exam, there is

a fee associated with that, typically between \$15.00 - \$25.00 per exam and that has been in place for many years. The State does charge us for each booklet they send to us. Half of the exam fee we collect we keep and the other half we pay back to the State. With recruitment difficulties, one idea is to suspend the exam fee. One downside is that we would not be taking in any revenue. Over the past 10-15 years, we annually take in between \$3,000 - \$14,000 in exam fees with half of that being paid back to the State. A number of counties are looking to suspend the exam fee. New York State has suspended their fees for State exams and have suggested the counties do the same. We would still need to pay the State for the exam booklets, which is between \$3,000 - \$6,000 annually. He stated he is bringing this up to get the committee's opinion. Mr. Alderman stated he would recommend we suspend the fees as we are having recruitment difficulties and if we do, it may encourage more individuals to come in and take exams.

Mrs. Lando asked do we really think eliminating test fees will bring more people in? Mr. Alderman replied honestly, no, but I think it will bring some people in. I think we may see more people that sign up for the exams and then don't show. Mr. Wheeler stated there will be efficiencies and it may make it easier to get more people in to take exams. Mr. Alderman stated he would suggest not doing this indefinitely. The State has suspended their civil service exam fees through 2025 and I would recommend the same.

Mr. Schu stated we can take this up at next month's meeting. It makes sense if everyone around us is waiving the fee. Mr. Alderman commented not everyone is, however, given the landscape, we probably should do this. Mr. Wheeler stated there will be a loss of a few thousand dollars, but what is the harm in trying?

Mrs. Lando stated I would say maybe suspend the fee for a year. Mr. Swackhamer stated without the fee, some people may take many different tests. Mr. Wheeler stated yes, and we would like to see that and see more applicants. Mr. Malter commented it would save time for the Finance Office. Mr. Schu stated we will put this on the agenda for next month. Mr. Van Etten commented he is in favor of waiving the fee. There are a lot of other places where people don't have to take a test. We want to make it as easy as possible.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION AND RECONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC OFFICERS' LAW, ARTICLE 7§ 105.1.D. DISCUSSION REGARDING PROPOSED, PENDING, OR CURRENT LITIGATION MADE MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE LAW DEPARTMENT TO RETAIN NAPOLI SHKOLNIK PLLC TO REPRESENT THE COUNTY IN A DIABETIC DRUG MANUFACTURING PRICE FIXING LAWSUIT MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.
Resolution Required.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN EXECUTIVE SESSION AND RECONVENE IN REGULAR SESSION MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MR. NICHOLS. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted by Amanda L. Chapman, Deputy Clerk, Steuben County Legislature

**NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR
Tuesday, July 11, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.**

**Agenda items due to the Clerk of the Legislature's Office
NO LATER THAN NOON
Wednesday, July 5, 2023**