I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Malter 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 AUGUST 2, 2021, AND AUGUST 23, 2021, MEETINGS MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. MULLEN ABSENT FOR VOTE)

III. DEPARTMENT REQUESTS

A. Public Defender

1. AmeriCorps Contract – Mr. Sauro requested authorization to extend the contract with AmeriCorps for one year. This contract is part of our Hurrell-Harring quality improvement program. This contract provides us with two individuals; an intake coordinator and an outreach coordinator. This will be year three.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC DEFENDER TO RENEW THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICORPS FOR ONE INTAKE COORDINATOR AND ONE OUTREACH COORDINATOR MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. MULLEN ABSENT FOR VOTE)

2. Upstate Family Court Grant – Mr. Sauro explained the State and ILS (Indigent Legal Services) are moving toward similar standards with the Family Court program as they have with the Criminal Court program. The Public Defender’s Family Court program has three attorneys and one support staff. ILS is proposing caseload standards which are not mandatory yet. This grant will provide $500,000 over three years. They will be mandating caseload standards for Article 10 cases which are abuse and neglect cases. They will allow 33.3 Article 10 proceedings per attorney, per year. Our average now is 24 proceedings per attorney per year, along with the other cases they handle. I would propose creating another full-time Family Court position that will be handling Article 10 cases and also one support staff which would be a paralegal. The reduced
caseload will give the attorneys time to address the quality improvement components. He stated this is a competitive grant.

**MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC DEFENDER TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION FOR THE UPSTATE FAMILY COURT GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF $500,000 OVER THREE YEARS MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON FOR DISCUSSION.**

Mr. Horton asked you will only hire this additional staff if you receive the $500,000 grant? Mr. Sauro replied yes. Mr. Malter asked after the end of the grant will you retain the staff? Mr. Sauro replied historically these grants tend not to terminate. We have a number of grants that are ongoing and I have the expectation that will continue.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked what is the cost per year and is the grant for longer than one year? Mr. Sauro replied the grant is for three years. They will pay $166,000 per year across the three years. Based on the salary and fringe, the costs in year one will be $160,000 with $6,666 to do training. Year two cost is $162,500 and year three cost is $165,062. There is a reduced amount for training each year to make sure we are not going over $500,000.

Mr. Van Etten asked what is your confidence level that you will be able to hire people? Mr. Sauro replied it is low. All signs point to ILS making this mandatory. If we can get rolling early, we can get some traction. Mrs. Lando asked do you have office space for additional people? Mr. Sauro replied yes.

**VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. MULLEN ABSENT FOR VOTE)**

Mr. Swackhamer stated I would like to see a budget for this when it comes to Finance. Mr. Wheeler stated we will not budget for the grant until we get it. We will show you the budget breakdown and if it gets awarded it will come to Finance. Mr. Sauro stated I can submit the entire budget proposal that will go with the application.

B. Emergency Services/911

1. FY21 SHSP – Mr. Marshall explained this is the grant that provides funding to both Emergency Services and the Sheriff’s Office. The total amount of the grant is $110,965 with $83,224 being allocated to Emergency Services and $27,741 being allocated to the Sheriff’s Office. With changes over the last couple of years, they require us to spend a certain amount of money in certain categories such as IT support, cyber security, and critical infrastructure specific to identifying emerging threats. The other funding can be used for programs that we have been using.

**MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SAFETY TO ACCEPT THE FY21 STATE HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF $110,965 WITH $83,224 BEING ALLOCATED TO EMERGENCY SERVICES AND $27,741 BEING ALLOCATED TO THE SHERIFF’S OFFICE MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. MULLEN ABSENT FOR VOTE)**

2. FY21 LEMPG – Mr. Marshall requested authorization to accept the FY21 LEMPG in the amount of $41,441.

**MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SAFETY TO ACCEPT THE FY21 LEMPG IN THE AMOUNT OF $41,441 MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

3. Flood Recovery Update/FEMA Declaration – Mr. Nichols asked how close are we to FEMA’s $30 million threshold? Mr. Marshall replied we are continuing to work with the State. I think we are close to that limit ourselves within Steuben County. We have $12.1 million in Town and County roads damage. If you add the Jasper-Troupsburg School, we are close to $20 million or more. That would be on top of what other counties
across the State have; Allegany, Yates and Oneida. Mr. Nichols asked what about home damage? Mr. Marshall replied that is accounted for differently. He stated that SBA and FEMA came in last week and looked at individual housing costs. We have met the limit for the SBA loan program and are still waiting to hear back from FEMA.

Mr. Malter asked is the $30 million the combination of all the counties hit by the same storm? Mr. Marshall replied each county in the State has a cap to meet; Steuben’s cap is $380,000. Each county has a different amount based on per capita. The total for New York State is $30 million for public assistance only, which is roads, bridges, schools, town highway shops, waste water treatment plants. Individual assistance is formula based. There are a number of properties that were uninsured or under-insured. That formula looks at the poverty level and the number of structures within the region.

Mr. Potter asked is the school damage above and beyond what the insurance will cover? Mr. Marshall replied they look at the cost to put the building back to its prior condition before the flood. They do factor in insurance and the insurance for the school was minimal compared to the damage. If we get the FEMA declaration, then FEMA will come in and look at the mitigating factors. Mr. Wheeler stated we just need the State to agree that we have hit $30 million statewide so that we can get the FEMA declaration. Then we can work through the insurance. This will be a multi-year process. We have been working with Labella, and the school damage, coupled with the road damage puts us well over.

Mrs. Ferratella asked what is the percent on the SBA loans? Mr. Marshall replied individual loans are 1 percent and business loans are 3 percent. The rates are pretty low compared to what is out there right now.

C. Sheriff’s Office

1. Commendation – Sheriff Allard stated this will be held until the October meeting. The commendation is actually for two agencies, the South Hornell Fire Department and Canisteo Fire Department, who were unable to attend today. The commendation is in recognition of their assistance in searching for a missing person. They were instrumental in helping us. They will be attending next month.

2. Donation – K-9 Unit – Sheriff Allard requested authorization to accept a $50 donation from the E.J. Cottrell Memorial Library in Atlanta, NY to the K-9 Unit.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE SHERIFF TO ACCEPT A $50.00 DONATION FROM THE E.J. COTTRELL MEMORIAL LIBRARY IN ATLANTA, NY TO THE K-9 UNIT MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

3. Donation – Bicycle Helmets – Sheriff Allard requested authorization to accept a $500.00 donation from the Kiwanis Club. This donation will be used to purchase bicycle helmets.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE SHERIFF TO ACCEPT A $500.00 DONATION FROM THE KIWANIS CLUB TO BE USED FOR THE PURCHASE OF BICYCLE HELMETS MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

4. Accept 2022 STOP-DWI Grant Plan – Sheriff Allard requested approval of the 2022 STOP-DWI Grant Plan. This plan is virtually identical to last year.

MOTION: ACCEPTING THE 2022 STOP-DWI GRANT PLAN AS PRESENTED BY THE SHERIFF AND FORWARDING TO THE FULL LEGISLATURE FOR APPROVAL MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. POTTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

5. Arkport/Hornell SRO Agreement – Sheriff Allard requested approval of the SRO Agreement with the Arkport and Hornell City School Districts. We are doing a hybrid agreement and the two school districts
are sharing one full-time deputy. This deputy is an EMT and will be able to do home visits. The deputy will work 20 hours per week at each district.

**MOTION: APPROVING THE SRO DEPUTY AGREEMENT WITH THE ARKPORT AND HORNELL CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON FOR DISCUSSION.**

Mr. Horton asked do you control the schedule or do the schools? Sheriff Allard replied it is a joint discussion. Each district will communicate with the SRO and with us about the hours, place and dates. The goal is to meet the needs of the district. Mr. Van Etten asked can you explain the home visits? Sheriff Allard replied at-risk students get a home visit with a Social Worker and a deputy goes to make sure things are going well. Sometimes the deputy will go with Child Protective as well. Our retiree SRO’s cannot provide that service because of their designation. The deputy can actually go and assist in these situations.

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

6. **September 11th Remembrance** – Sheriff Allard stated Saturday, September 11th will be the 20th anniversary of the terrorist attack. There will be several memorial services around the County. There will be a ceremony at the First Responder Honor Park in the Town of Erwin at 11:00 a.m. He noted that two county agencies will be honored at that service. Also, Matthew Marmour, Steuben County Emergency Health Coordinator, will be named First Responder of the Year. His name was submitted for his outstanding work during COVID. The First Responder Agency of the Year is the Sheriff’s Office. I would invite all of you to attend at 11:00 a.m. and to keep the first responders in your prayers that day. Mr. Van Etten stated former Legislator Don Creath has been instrumental in creating the park and the County is also being recognized for building and supporting the park. He stated he was asked to attend. Mr. Marshall commented this park honors first responders in Steuben, Chemung and Schuyler counties.

D. **Personnel**

1. **District Attorney’s Office**

   a. **Request to Set Starting Salary for Part-Time Assistant District Attorney** – Mr. Alderman informed the committee the District Attorney would like to hire a part-time Assistant District Attorney and is requesting to hire the individual at $41,708. This part-time position is half of a Step XII. Mr. Baker stated Thomas Bowes is leaving and Chris Ferratella will be filling the position. He noted that Mr. Ferratella has 15 years of experience.

   **MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO HIRE A PART-TIME ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY ABOVE THE MID-POINT AND SETTING THE SALARY AT $41,708 MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. POTTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

   b. **Residency Requirement for Full-Time Assistant District Attorneys** – Mr. Baker requested adoption of a local law waiving the residency requirements for full-time Assistant District Attorneys. He noted the Legislature has adopted a local law waiving the residency requirement for part-time Assistant District Attorneys. He is requesting the residency waiver given the current recruiting process and given our ability to search for a wider pool of applicants. If this is adopted, he stated his first preference will always be to hire a Steuben County resident. He stated a residency waiver will give us more flexibility. Some counties including Yates, Allegany, Livingston and Cortland, are doing this.

   Mr. Malter stated Mrs. Lando had indicated a local law was passed in 2016 for part-time Assistant District Attorneys. Mr. Baker stated that is correct. Mr. Horton asked what was the reasoning for not waiving the requirement for all? Mr. Baker explained in 2016 we had a shared services contract with Schuyler County and together we hired an Assistant District Attorney and that individual was living outside of the county. That was the basis for doing that local law then. We now have a part-time Assistant District Attorney living outside the county.
MOTION: WAIVING THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR FULL-TIME ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEYS MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. POTTER FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Horton stated elected officials live in the County but we have discussed letting a number of appointed officials live outside the County. What was the law that was written that states you have to live in the County? Ms. Prossick replied Public Officers’ Law states officials must live in the county in which they work. That is where the requirement came from. The Assistant District Attorneys qualify as public officers.

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

E. District Attorney’s Office
   1. Traffic Diversion Program – Mr. Baker stated he is requesting a modification to the terms of fines for the Traffic Diversion Program. Diversion Management is offering a second program which is aimed at reducing the number of uninsured drivers on our County roadways. This is a significant issue and something that is difficult to deal with. This program would give us a way to reduce that. This will not be a large money making program. Diversion Management carries all the risk and there are no up-front costs or fixed costs for the County. They will provide 10 – 12 plate readers in locations throughout the County. These would be at no cost and they will do all of the maintenance, etc. Mr. Baker explained these plate readers will track license plates. We will have control of putting additional information in to track. With Diversion Management’s program, they will track every plate that goes by the plate readers and they will get a hot list of uninsured plates for New York, Pennsylvania and a few other states. When a car is not insured and hits the radar, it is flagged and the plate reader takes a picture. That is then forwarded to our law enforcement in the County and we compare that to the hot list. Diversion Management pays the fee for the officer to do that. The officer will indicate if there is a violation and if there is, Diversion Management will send a letter to the owner of the vehicle. The owner has the option of entering a diversion program and getting insured. Diversion Management will help them with that process and they have to sign a promise that acknowledges they have to be insured and that they will do what is needed to maintain coverage. The cost for the owner of the vehicle is $350 and if they pay the fee and go through diversion, their ticket is released. If the owner does not complete the program or does not sign up for the program, then the law enforcement agency will write the violation and serve it on the defendant and we will process it as a regular ticket in the County. Mr. Baker stated this is a huge benefit for the owner as every no insurance ticket is a $500 civil penalty and the total ticket cost is about $700. This program is half that cost.

Mr. Malter commented someone is losing revenue. Mr. Baker stated no. These are tickets that would not normally be written and is revenue that is not being generated. Diversion Management is asking to split the revenue; they would take $175.00 per ticket and we would get $175.00 per ticket. Mr. Malter stated if there is a $500 penalty for not having insurance, the State is not losing revenue? Mr. Baker replied no because the tickets currently are never being written. The only way we know that someone does not have insurance is if they are stopped for another violation or if they are involved in an accident. There is no revenue that will be lost.

Mr. Mullen stated I am concerned that we are privatizing law enforcement in the county. The settlement is basically the individual sends in money and they are not prosecuted. What is the legality of that? Ms. Prossick replied this does not fit under the current Local Law. It is something that will need to be amended or rewritten. Under the current structure, revenue goes back to law enforcement. I have similar concerns as you are expressing. If you don’t pay and you get a ticket, they are currently running through traffic diversion on their own. If you include lack of insurance, the question is can you run that through traffic diversion. This is a pre-ticket; it is a private agency and they are sending money back to the Sheriff for a statutory duty. We should not get paid for what we are required to do by statute.

Mr. Baker stated we are not privatizing the law enforcement function. Law Enforcement is comparing the plate readers to the hot list. There is no privatization; they would be doing that. Mr. Van Etten stated the private agency is getting half the proceeds. Mr. Baker explained we are paying back that cost for the capital outlay of the plate readers and the administration of the program. Diversion Management is also assisting individuals in getting insurance. This program has been done in six or seven states so far. There are two other counties in New
York State that are also looking at this. They have seen over time tickets go down as compliance goes up. This is not a large money making proposition. We don’t know how many will come through. We want to make the highways safer through a traffic safety program.

Mr. Malter stated I am assuming any additional revenue would offset the costs that you already have? Mr. Baker replied we are not adding anything to do this. We have the ability to have plate readers out there and we would have our own internal monitoring alert system. This would be a huge benefit and would also reduce the number of uninsured drivers in the County.

Mr. Wheeler commented getting plate readers would be beneficial to us. My concern is not having any other counties in New York State up and running with this yet; it is good to have a little experience that way. As we learned with the stop arm school buses, there are a lot of nuances. Not having any experience with this in New York State is a big question. Ms. Prossick stated I think there might be a way for it to work, but I’m not sure if this is the way. Sometimes it is easier to watch someone else go first. That is part of my hesitancy.

Mr. Van Etten asked who would own the plate readers? Mr. Baker replied Diversion Management. Mr. Van Etten asked where would they be placed? Mr. Baker replied Diversion Management would be responsible for placing them. Typically they rent billboards and rent barns on private land. They take all of the risk and they can take them back at any time and shut the program down. One of the reasons they came to us and Otsego to be the first program, is because we already have the Traffic Diversion program and we have a relationship with them. We have three interstates running through the County. This is not something that is being offered to everyone in the State.

Mr. Malter stated one of my concerns is the more we add to the program, is the State going to come in and look at it and say that we are illegal? Mr. Baker replied they could tell us at some point that we cannot do this. We are not investing anything in this program; no staff, equipment, etc. We could turn it off. There is no history of the State coming in and saying that we have to give the fine money back. Years ago the Village of Hammondsport was issuing traffic tickets as a violation of village code and at some point the State did come in and determined it was unlawful, but there was no call to repay the fines. A prosecution ticket is in the District Attorney’s discretion. If we want to do a diversion program, that is up to us. The current Statewide model is to push pre-arrest diversion and this program is consistent with that.

Mr. Nichols commented I think it would be a good program. You never know who is not keeping their insurance up.

Mr. Horton asked can this end at any time? Mr. Baker replied yes, that is how we would write the contract. They can end the program at any time. Mr. Horton asked if someone is stopped for non-insurance, is that an automatic license loss? Mr. Baker replied there is a suspension period of up to one year. Mr. Horton asked with this program if a ticket is issued would the loss of license still be on the table? Mr. Baker replied if there is a ticket and they don’t go through the diversion program, then that would apply. No driver ticket is issued in this instance; there is only a ticket for the owner of the uninsured vehicle which is issued under the bad vehicle statute.

Mr. Malter asked do we need to rewrite the Local Law? Ms. Prossick replied my advice would be to do a separate Local Law. We do not want to see the Traffic Diversion Program jeopardized as it is a revenue generator. Mr. Malter stated we will wait to see what the new Local Law is before we do anything. Ms. Prossick stated we can work on something. Mr. Malter stated we just need to see what it will look like.

Mr. Van Etten stated I would be surprised if we see a revenue increase from this. If we do 20 per month or 240 per year, that is only $82,000 and Diversion Management is getting half of that. There is not a lot of return on investment for 10 – 12 plate readers. Mr. Baker stated it will take them ten years or better to make their investment money back. The benefit for us is the cameras and the ability to track drug dealers, missing adults, missing children, etc. Mr. Van Etten stated my concern is having Diversion Management paying a deputy. How is this different than the Traffic Diversion Program where we had a clerk managing it? Ms. Prossick replied that
person was already on staff and they had other tasks under Civil Service. My comfort level would be better if the deputy were reviewing the information from the get go and they could then report it to Diversion Management so they could send the letter.

Mr. Baker stated that is the way it works. The license plate reader will be read by the deputy and compared to a computer-generated hot list. Diversion Management does not have access to the hot list. That list is provided by the law enforcement agency. Mr. Van Etten stated Diversion Management sees the plate readers; they have to notify law enforcement. Mr. Baker stated the deputy can access the hot list. Once a plate is flagged the deputy looks at the list and plate number. Essentially they are doing what they would do when they are in their patrol vehicle. All of the comparisons are done by law enforcement.

Ms. Fitzpatrick commented one of the benefits from a public safety perspective is we have no idea how many vehicles are uninsured and now we have the potential to check those and whatever else you would want to check. I have full faith and confidence in Ms. Prossick to write a local law and develop the comfort level.

Mr. Terwilliger explained these cameras will not only be used on the interstates, but also in sections of the county were there are not regular patrols. Diversion Management will not make a move until a deputy or a designee of the District Attorney’s Office reviews the comparison and then forwards it to Diversion Management.

Mrs. Lando commented the benefits outweigh the risks.

Mr. Mullen asked with the communication of violations coming from Diversion Management will the Sheriff need more staffing to monitor? Mr. Baker explained the communication of violation comes from the deputy that observes the violation. The plate reader will pick up every plate and compare it with the hot list and then the deputy looks at the hot list and the plate. Then the deputy contacts Diversion Management and provides that information to them. With regard to costs, I don’t know if it is a full-time job and I don’t think it would be, and again, Diversion Management would pay for that. There is zero cost to the County.

Mr. Malter stated we will wait to see the Local Law and if there are no further questions, that will be brought to committee next month.

Mr. Van Etten commented it could be a resource issue in the Sheriff’s Office as there will be a dozen plate readers snapshotting every license and someone has to look at all of those. Diversion Management will expect that data is looked at and analyzed. Mr. Baker stated they will only be looking at those vehicles in violation. They will compare to the hot list and if they are flagged, that goes into the que for the deputy to look at. Funding is provided for that. Mr. Malter asked is it a function of the software to notify the deputy? Mr. Terwilliger explained there is a computer analysis between the hot list and the images seen on the plate reader. If a plate is flagged, that specific plate is forwarded to the deputy or a designee of the District Attorney’s Office to review. Those will be the only items reviewed. From that review, the deputy makes a determination to check the validity of insurance and if insurance is not in effect, then that is forwarded to Diversion Management for diversion.

Mr. Wheeler stated we will need additional technology information as it sounds like the company has access to the hot list. Mr. Malter asked who generates the hot list? Mr. Baker replied it is generated by Motor Vehicles and is accessible by law enforcement.

Mr. Swackhamer asked who puts that list into the computer? If they were not making money they would not be in the business. They have some idea of how much money they will make. Mr. Baker explained we are splitting the $350 diversion fee. Mr. Swackhamer stated that is not paying for the program.

Mr. Malter asked what is the cost for the plate readers? Mr. Baker replied several years ago we were looking at three sets of them and at that time they were $200,000. We could find out the cost from Diversion Management, unless it is proprietary information.
2. **Office Structure** – Mr. Baker stated Corning, Inc. donated the time of one of their senior organization HR experts, Mike Rayburn, to look at our office structure and make sure we are more efficient, particularly as we are getting ready to move into our new office. He stated that Mr. Rayburn has over 30 years of experience. We have set up a steering committee which is made up of Joe Hauryski, Sheriff Allard, Chuck Vail (Corning, Inc. executive), Judge Marianne Furfure, John Tunney and Pam Aini. He noted that Mr. Rayburn met with the steering committee and staff and is putting together a plan for an office command structure. The significant key to this plan is having an office manager. We have been using an attorney for that function and Mr. Rayburn feels that is a waste of resources. He is focusing on the idea of an office manager and that will be a part of the plan. Mr. Baker stated that Mr. Rayburn is still working on the plan. He stated he has talked with Personnel and an officer manager would be a Civil Service position. We do have a zero-based paralegal position. He stated he would be looking at a contract with someone like Finger Lakes Paralegal, to come in and train staff in the new procedures and then hand it off to the office manager. Mr. Rayburn has put in several hours on this and our office is very excited and engaged. The steering committee had some great suggestions and the process is moving forward. This should put us in a position of being more efficient and doing everything we need to do.

Mr. Malter asked when will you have the final report? Mr. Baker replied the plan is to have it set and ready when we move into our new office space in October. Our process is to put together the final plan and Mr. Rayburn will meet with me and senior management to talk about it. It will then be presented to the steering committee to get their suggestions and then we will have the final product. Our goal is to move into our new office space with this plan in place. Mrs. Ferratella asked will the plan be presented to the Legislature? Mr. Baker replied yes.

3. **Agreement** – Mr. Baker explained we have been using T&R Towing for forfeiture based tows. We typically have six to eight a year and the cost is under $2,000. We have been operating under that quote since 2012. We do not need to go out to bid as the contract is under $2,000, however, we will be seeking other quotes from within the County.

MOTION: **TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature
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