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I. CALL TO ORDER

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

Mr. Schu informed the committee that today is Mr. Wheeler’s 40th birthday. Happy Birthday!

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 8, 2020, MEETING MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. DEPARTMENT REQUESTS

A. Real Property Tax Service Agency

1. Relevy of Property Maintenance and Demolition Charges – Mrs. Jordan informed the committee that she has become aware of an appellate decision in Monroe County regarding demolition costs and the relevy of those and the ability to withhold the costs upon settlement with the County by the municipality. The court feels that it should be treated the same as a tax lien; it becomes a lien once the municipality puts it on. Our policy that we adopted here is that it allows them to be placed, and if the property is foreclosed, then the County would reimburse the municipality those demolition costs if the amount paid/received in the sale exceeds the County’s cost and the outstanding lien. The County would pay back any portion of the demolition costs. In light of this court decision, we will need to revise that policy.

Mr. Schu asked we didn’t reimburse the municipalities? Mrs. Jordan replied we did not make them whole at the time of settlement. Ms. Fitzpatrick asked if there are demolition costs we are to reimburse the municipalities and not withhold? Mrs. Jordan replied yes.

Mr. Wheeler stated this is a case we have been watching for years now. We do have exposure because we lose control of what the municipalities do and how much they essentially spend during the tax delinquency. Ms. Prossick stated this case started in 2016 and we just received the decision from the Court of Appeals. In 2012 we
adopted resolution #082-12 setting the policy and we should rescind that. I don’t think we need a resolution going forward as now we have case law.

**MOTION: RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 082-12 SETTING THE POLICY RELATIVE TO THE RELEVY OF PROPERTY MAINTENANCE AND DEMOLITION CHARGES MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO FOR DISCUSSION.**

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked are we making the towns and villages whole and including the demolition costs each year? Ms. Prossick replied that is correct. This plays well into Public Works’ policy of helping and will help to keep our costs down. This is a way to mitigate our exposure.

Mr. Swackhamer asked how much do we figure this will cost us? Mrs. Jordan replied the municipalities have to provide the amount and some detail. Mr. Schu asked this is for maintenance and demolition costs? Mr. Malter stated this is for the municipalities demolishing buildings and they are adding that cost to the tax roll and we are reimbursing them. Are we doing that at this point? Mrs. Jordan replied no. Mr. Malter stated so this leaves it open for demolitions that the County will have to pay? Mr. Wheeler replied yes and that is where our exposure is. There are also maintenance costs such as for lawn care, etc. Mr. Malter stated then we have the tax sale and we have already reimbursed them and that is the end at that point.

Mr. Horton asked how is that deeded? The cleanup and maintenance costs, is that just on the local code officer? Mr. Van Etten stated each municipality has their property maintenance laws in place. Mr. Wheeler stated I think we have to work with them to figure out a common sense way looking forward. There are a lot of unknowns with this. The town and city associations have been pushing for this for a long time.

Mrs. Ferratella stated we need to make sure the municipalities know they should be coming to Public Works first.

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

**B. Purchasing**

1. **Authorizing Purchase of Copiers from Copier Capital Project** – Mr. Morse requested authorization to purchase the remaining copiers for our fleet. We are on a four-year plan and this was our last year with Ricoh and we are replacing with Toshiba copiers. Mrs. Lando asked how many copiers are you replacing? Mr. Morse replied we are purchasing 10. We have about 58 in our fleet. This allows us to get rid of our $9,000 maintenance contract with Ricoh. These are on State contract and the rate is less. The total cost for the copiers is $46,774. Ms. Fitzpatrick asked is there an annual maintenance cost? Mr. Morse replied it is state contract negotiated. The image rate is based on the size of the machine. We have had good success so far.

**MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF PURCHASING TO PURCHASE 10 TOSHIBA COPIERS OUT OF THE COPIER CAPITAL PROJECT FOR A TOTAL COST OF $46,774 MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

2. **Authorizing Online Auction of Specific Surplus Equipment** – Mr. Morse requested authorization to hold an online auction for specific surplus equipment. This equipment includes three double-stack ovens, two forty-pound washers, one ice machine, one 911 UPS unit, the old Legislative sound system and miscellaneous office furniture. Mrs. Lando asked do these items work? Mr. Morse replied yes, however, I am not sure of the value. Mr. Schu asked who will be conducting the auction? Mr. Morse replied my recommendation would be Teitsworth.

**MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR PURCHASING TO HOLD AN ONLINE AUCTION WITH TEITSWORTH AUCTIONEERS FOR THE SALE OF SPECIFIC SURPLUS EQUIPMENT MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**
C. Clerk of the Legislature

1. Retirement Reporting – Mrs. Scotchmer stated she has received a record of activity from Attorney Peter Glanville. She noted she is still lacking the record of activity from Attorney Tom Bowes in the District Attorney’s Office. She stated that she needs the committee to review the Record of Activity for Attorney Glanville, which she has handed out, so that she may put forth a resolution adopting the report. Mr. Schu asked what do we do about Tom Bowes? Mrs. Scotchmer replied any action we could have taken would have been to withhold a pay raise, but we did not do those for management. There is no other recourse that I can take.

MOTION: APPROVING THE RECORD OF ACTIVITIES SUBMITTED BY ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY PETER GLANVILLE AND FORWARDING THE STANDARD WORKDAY AND RETIREMENT REPORTING RESOLUTION TO THE FULL LEGISLATURE FOR APPROVAL MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO FOR DISCUSSION.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked does this look reasonable from other reports you have seen? Mrs. Scotchmer replied yes. You can tell there is a break between March and July, because COVID hit. The State has indicated that you can make up the time later on in the year if there was a break in the amount of time that you worked. Mrs. Ferratella asked does this correlate to those that are assigned part-time? Mrs. Scotchmer replied some put in more time than others, but that is the nature of their caseload. It is hard to gauge with brand new attorneys when they come in because they are not really fully ramped up until about a year later. I always tell them that if they find they are working more hours than they had previously reported, they can do another calendar.

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

2. Ethics – Mrs. Scotchmer stated now we have the new Ethics Local Law and the time period for the permissive referendum has passed and it was filed with the State. Now, the Legislature needs to take other certain actions according to the Ethics law. Under Section I - Agency, it defines particular agencies that are required to do the financial disclosure form. In the past, we only really had the Industrial Development Agency (IDA) do it. However, according to General Municipal Law, it should be any non-government organization or entity that performs, or is organized to perform, a county-related function. So in reviewing our law, we had also included the Steuben County Land Bank and the Tobacco Asset Securitization Corporation. I just wanted to know if there are any other groups that you feel should be doing a financial disclosure form? This would specifically be groups that receive county funds or are performing a function for the County. Immediately what came to mind was the Conference and Visitors’ Bureau which receives room tax dollars and possibly Southern Tier Central Rural Planning & Development Board. On that end, STC is a three-county organization and do we really want to police other county elected officials? She stated that she herself does not want to and maybe not include them as they would each have to file them anyway, except for Schuyler County. They do not require financial disclosures as under State Law their population is lower than the threshold to have to do that. She stated she is just looking for guidance because we have to adopt a resolution designating what organizations we want to require to do a financial disclosure form.

Mr. Swackhamer stated I think if you feel comfortable with the ones you have named. Mrs. Scotchmer asked what about the Conference and Visitors’ Bureau? It would only be the Executive Director and the Board of Directors. Mr. Swackhamer stated I don’t think so. Mr. Schu asked do we have a choice? Mrs. Scotchmer replied you have a choice. If you only want to go with the ones named in the Local Law, we will not do a separate resolution. We will just keep that group. Ms. Fitzpatrick asked but you are questioning whether or not that is sufficient based on the way the State law is written? Mrs. Scotchmer replied right, because they are performing a County-related function. The Conference and Visitors’ Bureau clearly performs a County-related function; they were created for that purpose. Mrs. Lando commented you could say that about a lot of the boards; ProAction, Cornell Cooperative Extension, etc.
Mr. Wheeler commented I my view the IDA and Conference and Visitors’ Bureau are the outliers because the duties they are performing are an extension of one of your functions. In the some cases you cannot have a tourism bureau that is county-housed. In my opinion, I would say the Conference and Visitors’ Bureau and the IDA would be important to include.

Mrs. Scotchmer stated with the Land Bank and the Tobacco Securitization Corporation, they are mostly County officials anyway and if you serve on one those boards I will not require an additional disclosure form. I really feel that the Conference & Visitors’ Bureau should be included. Mr. Malter asked if we don’t list these other agencies, where are we from a liability standpoint? Mrs. Scotchmer replied I don’t believe there would be any liability. If they are spending County tax dollars and doing something wrong, it is not just an ethical issue. Ms. Prossick commented not-for-profits have their own rules that they have to follow under Ethics whether or not we were overseeing them. State Law oversees them, so it would not come back on us if they are violating it, especially if we have no knowledge of it.

Mr. Van Etten asked what about Cornell Cooperative Extension? Mr. Wheeler stated I don’t believe so as you are allocating funding for a purpose you set, but it is not necessarily a County function. You don’t have to give them any funding. With the Conference and Visitors’ Bureau, you have to use the room tax dollars for a specific purpose. Mrs. Scotchmer stated the Legislature created the Conference and Visitors’ Bureau and the IDA. We did not create Cornell Cooperative Extension; they were their own organization that came to us for funding. Mr. Malter stated that should be the benchmark then. Just follow that guideline.

**MOTION: INCLUDING THE STEUBEN COUNTY CONFERENCE AND VISITORS’ BUREAU IN THE LIST OF AGENCIES REQUIRED TO FILE AN ETHICS FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORM ON AN ANNUAL BASIS PURSUANT TO STEUBEN COUNTY’S ETHICS LOCAL LAW MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK, SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.**

Mrs. Scotchmer stated another area we need to clarify is under Section I of the Ethics Law, the definition of County officials. In the past the Chairman of the Legislature would create a list of titles of individuals that would have to do a financial disclosure form; generally department heads, deputy department heads and elected officials. In the new local law, it includes other employees of such departments, divisions, boards, commissions, councils or agencies, who hold policy making positions, whether paid or not, to do a financial disclosure form. Mrs. Scotchmer provided a list of all management employees and there are also a small group of confidential employees that are not in positions of policy making, however in State Law there are some indicators that it seems as though they would like these individuals to do them. I myself am not in favor because they would not be the end all of making decisions in a department. However, I do feel that we should expand our list of individuals to include all of the attorneys in all of the departments because I am finding as we are doing outside employment forms and the new ethics attestations; I’ve been compiling all those together, and there are only a couple of attorneys in the Public Defender’s Office that even did an outside employment form. We have preached and done the training for the past several years and we still are not getting anything. I know there are attorneys out there that have private practices and if they are not submitting their form, this would be another way we could get that information. Mr. Van Etten asked what’s to say that they are going to submit this? Mrs. Scotchmer replied they would be required by our local law to do it and if they do not, then the Ethics Board could actually sanction them. The Ethics Board could actually fine them for not doing their financial disclosure form and not doing it timely. This new law gives the Ethics Board a little more authority; if we know someone isn’t in compliance, we don’t even have to wait for someone to report it, we can call them out on it.

Mr. Malter asked how many attorneys do we have on the payroll in this County? Mrs. Scotchmer replied the number that are on the list that was provided. Mr. Schu asked why would we include confidential management employees? They do not have any policy making authority. Mrs. Scotchmer replied I would not recommend including the confidential management employees. I would however recommend the balance of the list which we already require of most of them, but this would expand it to a few others that we do not.
MOTION: DESIGNATING THE LIST OF MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF CONFIDENTIAL MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES, LOCAL LAW EMPLOYEES AND SPECIFIC MISCELLANEOUS AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES THAT SHALL BE REQUIRED TO FILE, ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, A FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORM MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required

Mrs. Scotchmer stated the last item is we need to identify those employees who are not allowed to participate in the real property tax sale and surplus tax auction. There are specific departments where their employees are not allowed to participate in the real property tax auction. I just need to clarify these in a resolution because with the new law we have to identify them again. Right now they are only included in the actual rules that the Finance Commissioner publishes. This says we need to do a resolution identifying those departments as not being able to participate in the real property tax auction. It would also include any members of their household; significant other, spouse, etc. The list would include employees of the following departments: Finance Office, Law Department, County Manager’s Office, Clerk of the Legislature, County Legislature, and the Real Property Tax Service Agency for the tax auction and Purchasing for the surplus auction.

MOTION: DESIGNATING EMPLOYEES IN THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENTS AS NOT BEING ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE REAL PROPERTY TAX SALE AUCTION: FINANCE OFFICE, LAW DEPARTMENT, COUNTY MANAGER’S OFFICE, CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE, COUNTY LEGISLATURE AND REAL PROPERTY TAX SERVICE MADE BY MRS. LANDO. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

D. Personnel

1. Reclassification – Emergency Management Office – Mr. Alderman requested authorization to reclassify one (1) Radio Technician position, Grade XII to one (1) Senior Radio Technician position, Grade XIV. He noted that the duties of the position warrant an upgrade.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ONE (1) RADIO TECHNICIAN POSITION, GRADE XII TO ONE (1) SENIOR RADIO TECHNICIAN POSITION, GRADE XIV IN THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MS. LATTIMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

2. Authorization to Hire Permanent, Part-Time Radio Technician – Mr. Alderman stated the Office of Emergency Management is requesting authorization to hire a permanent part-time Radio Technician. They previously had a part-time radio technician for training.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT TO HIRE A PERMANENT, PART-TIME RADIO TECHNICIAN MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MS. LATTIMER FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Wheeler stated we had an individual in the part-time Radio Technician role that was helping out and they were very successful. That was a temporary position and we are only allowed to do that for a certain period of time under Civil Service Law and that is why we are requesting that it be changed to a permanent, part-time position.

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

3. Reclassification – Public Health – Mr. Alderman requested authorization to reclassify one, vacant funded Registered Professional Nurse, Grade XV to one Accountant, Grade XIV. This is in response to the impending retirement of the Chief Fiscal Officer. This Accountant will be the financial person in the office.
MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ONE (1) VACANT, FUNDED REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL NURSE, GRADE XV TO ONE (1) ACCOUNTANT, GRADE XIV IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING SERVICES DEPARTMENT MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER FOR DISCUSSION.

Mrs. Lando asked don’t we need the RN position? Mr. Alderman replied we always need RN’s, but this is an extra position that has been sitting vacant and it is necessary to keep the financial operation going. The Accountant is more needed at this time than the RN. Mrs. Smith explained I have an open RN position right now that I cannot fill.

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

4. Reclassification – Information Technology – Mr. Alderman stated there are two reclassifications. The first is a reclassification of one vacant Assistant Director of Information Technology position, Grade XVII to one Help Desk Technical Assistant position, Grade VIII. The second is the reclassification of one vacant Personal Computer Coordinator position, Grade XII to one Help Desk Technical Assistant position, Grade VIII. Mr. Wolverton explained both are downgrades and are part of my plan to restructure the department. We are expanding our Help Desk and getting rid of our higher cost Personal Computer Coordinator and Assistant Director positions. Ms. Fitzpatrick asked do you have people for these positions? Mr. Wolverton replied we are hiring two individuals.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ONE (1) VACANT ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POSITION, GRADE XVII TO ONE (1) HELP DESK TECHNICAL ASSISTANT POSITION, GRADE VIII AND THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ONE (1) VACANT PERSONAL COMPUTER COORDINATOR POSITION, GRADE XII TO ONE (1) HELP DESK TECHNICAL ASSISTANT Position, Grade VIII IN THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Wolverton explained we currently have two Help Desk Assistants and we will be increasing to four. We are not filling the Personal Computer Coordinator position or the Assistant Director position. He commented that for the last five years, the individual in the Assistant Director position had been doing Help Desk calls. Mr. Alderman commented both positions are vacant.

Mr. Swackhamer asked what do the Help Desk Technical Assistants do? Mr. Wolverton explained any time there is a problem with a computer they help with that. If they can help over the phone that is what they do. They will also go to the computer if they are unable to help by phone. Additionally they have the capability of accessing computers remotely. Going forward the Help Desk Technical Assistants will be doing more of what the Personal Computer Coordinator was doing which is trouble-shooting printer issues and setting up new computers.

Mrs. Lando asked are you losing your Assistant Director position? Mr. Wolverton replied the Assistant Director position was a union position and I have a Deputy Director. Mr. Wheeler commented this has been pending the individual’s retirement and we have been looking to reclassify that down.

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

5. Public Works Professional Engineer – Mr. Alderman informed the committee that the Professional Engineer in the Public Works Department has retired and we are looking to hire a new individual. It is very difficult to recruit for this title and we have found someone who is very well qualified and we are asking to hire this individual above Step 5 on the salary schedule. He requested authorization to hire the individual at Step 8 which is $99,532. Mr. Wheeler stated we have reviewed the qualifications and years of experience and it is in
Mr. Spagnoletti stated the Engineer’s job is primarily to design and make sure the 331 bridges are safe. We advertised throughout the State and received four applicants. Two did not meet the minimum requirements. This applicant is comparable in skill to Mr. Catherman who was making $122,000. If we can get this individual up to $99,000 it would be well worth it as this position is very critical to our department. Mr. Van Etten commented I am surprised that you can get an individual that qualified for this price. Mr. Swackhamer stated I have talked with Mr. Spagnoletti about this and this is something we need. Mr. Hanna asked where is this individual coming from? Mr. Spagnoletti replied the applicant lives in Swain. Mr. Hanna asked where did the individual work before? Mr. Spagnoletti replied the applicant worked 7 years at Labella and 4 years with New York State Department of Transportation.

6. 911 Director – Mr. Van Etten asked where are we with recruitment for 911 Director? Mr. Wheeler stated that discussion would be appropriate for Executive Session.

E. County Manager

1. 2021 Open Gov Contract – Mr. Wheeler requested authorization to renew the contract with Open Gov for one year for $43,000. This contract is for budgeting transparency, salaries and workforce planning. We are actively looking at the replacement for the ERP system which will include budgeting and we started last year with product demos. He commented that Mrs. Hurd-Harvey and Mr. Alger are leading that. We have done product demos and there are many products available through State contract. Last year in October/November we had anticipated this as the last year of our stand alone budgeting platform. We should have an ERP recommendation for you within the next few months. Mr. Van Etten asked are you down to a select number on the ERP? Mr. Wheeler replied we are down to three. Mr. Van Etten asked does that include Open Gov? Mr. Wheeler replied yes.

Mr. Van Etten asked what will be the transition time to switch over? Mr. Wheeler replied it will take a good portion of a year. We are thinking within the next few months we will be bringing a recommendation so we can start the transition. We will run E-Finance along with the new software. For the 2022 budget we will not be using the new ERP. We will be fully functional with the new ERP for 2022. Mr. Van Etten asked is this the last year of E-Finance support? Mr. Wheeler replied yes.

Ms. Fitzpatrick commented we have invested a lot of time into Open Gov. Do the other companies complement Open Gov or are comparable to? Mr. Wheeler replied the other companies are comparable. Regardless of the ERP choice, the software does have a budgeting module that will be far better than E-Finance. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated we have Open Gov and we went to that to have more access to different reports and to provide access to the Legislators. I would wonder why we would consider anything else. Mr. Wheeler stated there will be more to come on that when we discuss the transition. There are certainly two other very viable solutions. It will take time to learn the system, but it goes to the broader cost of staff time, the annual cost and the ongoing cost. We will certainly provide you, within the next few months, a very comprehensive view of where we are.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO RENEW THE CONTRACT WITH OPEN GOV FOR ONE YEAR FOR AN ANNUAL COST OF $43,000 MADE BY MS. FITZPATRICK. SECONDED BY MS. LATTIMER FOR DISCUSSION.
Mr. Malter asked do you have the costs for the other modules? Mr. Van Etten stated it is still too early. That discussion is a couple of months away as they are still looking at the programs. Mr. Wheeler stated along with the ERP solution there will be a budgeting module and we will no longer need a stand-alone budgeting software.

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

Mr. Malter asked do we have a capital project to start funding this? Mr. Wheeler replied yes, we have an existing capital project that we can utilize for this.

2. Renew Vehicle Lease with Enterprise Fleet Management, Inc. – Mr. Brewer requested authorization for the fourth and final renewal of the lease agreement with Enterprise Fleet Management, Inc. For 2021 we have 29 cars under lease for a cost of $189,376 and that cost is spread across many departments. Toward the end of the year we will reissue the RFP.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO RENEW THE LEASE AGREEMENT WITH ENTERPRISE FLEET MANAGEMENT, INC. FOR ONE YEAR FOR A TOTAL COST OF $189,376 FOR 29 VEHICLES MADE BY MS. LATTIMER. SECONDED BY MRS. LANDO FOR DISCUSSION.

Mrs. Lando asked is this working really well for us? Mr. Brewer replied yes. This year the Sheriff’s Office will be leasing four vehicles. This year we had three to get lease renewals and we upgraded some of our three year vehicles and that will save on vehicle maintenance costs.

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

MOTION: TO ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION AND RECONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC OFFICERS’ LAW, ARTICLE 7§ 105.1.E. COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS PURSUANT TO ARTICLE FOURTEEN OF THE CIVIL SERVICE LAW; AND ARTICLE 7§ 105.1.F. THE MEDICAL, FINANCIAL, CREDIT OR EMPLOYMENT HISTORY OF A PARTICULAR PERSON OR CORPORATION, OR MATTERS LEADING TO THE APPOINTMENT, EMPLOYMENT, PROMOTION, DEMOTION, DISCIPLINE, SUSPENSION, DISMISSAL OR REMOVAL OF A PARTICULAR PERSON OR CORPORATION MADE BY MRS. LANDO. SECONDED BY MS. FITZPATRICK. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

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

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

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

**NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR**
Tuesday, February 9, 2021
9:00 a.m.
Please send agenda items to the Clerk of the Legislature’s Office
NO LATER THAN NOON
Wednesday, February 3, 2021