

RULES, ENACTMENTS & INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE
Held In Room 318
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512

Members: Chairwoman LoBue and Legislators Albano, Castellano, & Scuccimarra

Thursday **6:30pm** **September 22, 2016**

The meeting was called to order at 6:34p.m. by Chairwoman LoBue who requested that Legislator Castellano lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call Legislators Albano, Castellano, Scuccimarra, and Chairwoman LoBue were present.

Some of the agenda items were addressed out of order.

Item #3 - Approval of Minutes – August 15, 2016

The minutes were approved as submitted.

Item #4 - Approval/ Litigation Settlement/ Partenza-Mahoney v. County of Putnam

Chairwoman LoBue stated there was no one present from the Law Department so the following agenda items would be addressed in the meantime.

Item #5 - Approval/ Budgetary Amendment 16A063/ Veteran's Peer-to-Peer Program/ Cover Contract with Mental Health Association of Putnam County

Chairwoman LoBue stated agenda items #5, #6, and #8 would be addressed together because they are related to the Veteran's Peer-to-Peer Program.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to approve Budgetary Amendment 16A063; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Item #6 - Approval/ Fund Transfer 16T248/ Veteran's Peer-to-Peer Program/ Cover Contract with Mental Health Association of Putnam County

Legislator Castellano made a motion to approve Fund Transfer 16T248; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Item #8 - Approval/ Budgetary Amendment 16A065/ Veteran's Peer-to-Peer Program/ Additional \$60,000 in Funding

Director of Veteran's Affairs Karl Rohde stated there is no match for the additional \$60,000 in funding. He stated he just found out yesterday that there is also another \$60,000 coming, totaling \$120,000 which needs to be spent by June 2018. He stated

the Veterans Peer-to-Peer program began four (4) years ago and had a slow start because New York State provided no guidance in regards to this program. He stated to help improve the program, Veteran's Affairs entered into a contract with the Mental Health Association (MHA) of Putnam County. He stated there are three (3) established groups that meet monthly: a general group for any Veteran to attend, a group consisting of family members of Veterans, and a group for younger Veterans. He stated the group for the young Veterans is a new group that is going very well. He provided an example of a young Veteran who got involved in the group and found a job through Veteran's Affairs. He stated a fourth group, for women, is beginning in October. He stated a nurse who served in Vietnam will be running the women's group.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated she has known the woman who will be running the women's group for about 25 years and only recently found out that she had been a nurse in Vietnam. She stated it was extremely difficult for her to discuss her experiences and it is important that individuals who have had similar experiences have a place to discuss this time in their lives with others who truly understand.

Director Rohde stated the peer model works better than almost anything else. He stated there have been many successful events such as the Veteran's outing to a Renegades game, where 125 Veterans, over 3 days, attended a game with their families. He stated they have movie mornings where popcorn and a drink are provided and Veterans can take their children or grandchildren. He stated when movie mornings began there were about five (5) attendees and the number has now grown to about 70.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned if there are any counselors on staff.

Director Rohde stated the program is run through MHA. He stated there are no licensed clinicians because it is recommended that the program be run by Veterans. He stated John Bourges, one (1) of the County coroners is the coordinator of the program. He stated through the Peer-to-Peer Program, nurses go to the Veteran's Residence once a month to check the tenant's blood pressure, test their blood, and to go over nutrition with them. He stated there are currently 10 residents. He stated the State of New York requires them to provide monthly reports, which he provided to the Committee.

Chairwoman LoBue made a motion to waive the rules and accept the additional; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

Ann Fanizzi, constituent questioned how many people are usually in each group.

Director Rohde stated the general group has about 6-10 members.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned where the groups meet.

Director Rohde stated they meet at the Patterson Rec Center.

Ms. Fanizzi requested clarification regarding why there are no licensed clinicians involved in the program.

Director Rohde stated it is recommended not to have licensed clinicians and no advice is being given in the group meetings. He stated if a Veteran was facing an issue that needed to be addressed by a professional, they would be referred to Veterans Affairs where they would then be assisted to receive the help they need.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned how that is determined. She questioned if there is a credentialed employee on staff who may be consulted with.

Director Rohde stated there is a clinical psychologist who works in Veterans Affairs who they will consult with regarding specific problems that the Veterans may be facing. He stated the individuals running the program are familiar with the signs that may arise when a Veteran needs help. He stated the employees do attend training programs.

Ms. Fanizzi stated she is concerned because although the program is well intentioned, the peer-to-peer model needs structure and guidance.

Director Rohde he is a Certified Service Officer trained by the American Legion and the VA. He stated John Bourges, who has a background as a nurse, attends trainings for psychiatry. He stated all of the staff completes an on-line counselor training done by the State of New York under the auspices of the Department of Education. He stated there is also a three (3) day training program held at SUNY Albany by the School of Social Work for the administrators of peer-to-peer programs.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned if State officials come and observe the program.

Director Rohde stated a Certified Veterans Service Officer is in their office two (2) days a week and is part of the peer-to-peer program. He stated MHA has counselors and psychologists that are available to refer Veterans to.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned if anyone is salaried.

Director Rohde stated the four (4) people that run the groups receive a stipend and John Bourges is salaried. He stated this funding comes from the State of New York.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned about how long each group meets for.

Director Rohde stated the length of the meetings vary.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned if the groups have steady attendees and if there is a big turnover.

Director Rohde stated there are some members who are always at the meetings and there are other members who are not as consistent.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned what the ages of the people are who attend the meetings.

Director Rohde stated in the general group, the Veterans range from local to WWII. He stated the younger group is composed of Veterans who served in Desert Storm and later. He stated he is unaware of the ages of participants in the other groups.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned if there is a larger number of younger Veterans attending the meetings.

Director Rohde stated there are a higher number of older Veterans because the younger Veterans are more difficult to draw out. He stated they have been working on ways to entice the younger Veterans to participate in programs. He stated this spring they are holding a Veteran's Triathlon, including miniature golf, darts, and horseshoes, to try to involve the younger generation of Veterans.

Ms. Fanizzi requested clarification of the \$60,000 in funding.

Director Rohde stated the funding is State Aid that comes through Mental Health. He stated there are 15 counties in the State with a peer-to-peer program and the United States Senate decides which counties receive the funding. He stated this is the second time Putnam County is receiving funding. He restated that the program was started with very little guidance; however it must help those with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), which also includes Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and Military Sexual Trauma (MST).

Ms. Fanizzi stated she is trying to find structure to this program; however she understands that the program has little guidance.

Director Rohde stated the first few counties with this program were bigger counties that had a larger population and were able to utilize colleges in their area. He stated when smaller counties, such as Putnam, began their peer-to-peer programs they tried to structure it after these larger counties; however the structure was not sustainable in the smaller area.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned how the allocation of funding is determined.

Director Rohde stated the smaller counties receive \$120,000 for two (2) years and the larger counties receive \$165,000 for two (2) years. He stated the success of the program contributes to the determination of which counties receive funding. He stated the key is having a contract with a structured group such as MHA who is familiar with this type of work.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned if Director Rohde receives a stipend.

Director Rohde stated he does not receive a stipend.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned how the success of the program is measured without a structured environment.

Director Rohde stated the School of Social Work at SUNY Albany has developed a matrix that measures success. He stated representatives also come down and interview Veterans.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to approve Budgetary Amendment 16A065; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Item #7 - Approval/ Budgetary Amendment 16A064/ County Clerk/ Local Government Records Management Improvement Fund (LGRMIF) Grant Award

Deputy County Clerk Jimmy McConnell stated this grant is given out annually through New York State Archives. He stated this grant is a shared service document conversion and access grant. He stated under this grant, the County is partnering with the Town of Philipstown, the Village of Cold Spring, and the Village of Nelsonville to scan and digitize paper records and provide electronic access to them. He stated this will free up space, provide organization of documents, and make searching for documents more convenient.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the County is partnered with the Town of Southeast, the Town of Carmel, and the Town of Kent. She questioned what the difference is.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated when the grant was available to be applied for he and County Clerk Michael Bartolotti were interested in applying. He stated in speaking with their Regional Advisory Officer from New York State Archives, she indicated that the Town of Philipstown, the Village of Cold Spring, and the Village of Nelsonville were also going to be applying for the grant. He stated having the four (4) municipalities join and apply for the grant together makes the application stronger.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned if a server would be shared between the four (4) municipalities.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated Philipstown has chosen building, planning, and zoning records for the priority of what they would like to have scanned. He stated priority records for the County are the well and septic records from the Health Department because multiple FOIL (Freedom of Information Law) requests come in on a daily basis for these records. He stated the paper records are currently stored at the records center. He stated when those FOIL requests come in, the file needs to be pulled, copied, and reviewed by the Health Department. He stated once these documents are scanned in and digitized, the Department would have access to them through the software, making the process more efficient and streamlined. He stated the concept would be the same for the Town and the Villages.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned if the County would partner with the other towns if this program is successful.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated it is their plan to apply for this grant every year. He stated through the grant, the project must be completed by June 2017. He stated there are over 600 images to be scanned.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned if this project will require extra help.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated they are not requested additional personnel. He stated as part of the grant, they contract with a vendor through NYSID (New York State Industries for the Disabled) and much of the scanning will be done off site.

Legislator Castellano questioned which company is being used.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated the company is IMA.

Legislator Castellano stated Westchester County uses Edocs and they do a great job.

Legislator Albano stated this process should save money in the long run.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated it is mainly to make the process more efficient and to free up space in offices and the records centers throughout the municipalities.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated it will also be more convenient for residents looking for documents.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated that is correct. He stated although this is a collaboration, each municipality has ownership of their own records.

Legislator Castellano questioned if part of the funding is to dispose of the documents once they are scanned.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated right now the plan is to have the documents scanned by the vendor and then have the paper records returned. He stated the records can be shredded once they are scanned in, however nothing has been destroyed as of yet. He stated they are allowing time to ensure nothing gets lost.

Legislator Castellano stated Westchester County scans documents and keeps them for six (6) months.

Alexandra Ballantine, constituent, stated her concern regarding security of the scanned documents. She questioned if there anything in place to ensure the security of the documents.

Deputy County Clerk McConnell stated the scanned documents would be stored on the County servers.

Legislator Albano made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Item #9 - Discussion/ Possible Inquiry to Attorney General/ Use of County Buses
(Requested by Legislator Wright at September 6, 2016 Full Meeting)

Agenda Items #9 and #10 were addressed together.

Item #10 - Discussion/ Possible Inquiry to Attorney General/ Influence of Constituency by County Department Head (Requested by Legislator Wright at September 6, 2016 Full Meeting)

Agenda Items #9 and #10 were addressed together.

Legislator Wright stated he believes it is improper to use County buses to transport various interest groups for the purposes of influencing the outcome of Legislative meetings. He stated if there is any serious dispute as to the legality of that, he believes an opinion from the Attorney General would be beneficial. He stated in his opinion, it is unquestionably improper.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated the Office for Senior Resources provides transportation for seniors to anything they want to go to. She stated seniors have been transported to Albany to lobby for issues regarding senior citizens or events such as memorial services. She stated she does not believe it is necessary to involve the Attorney General.

Legislator Wright stated the use of County equipment to transport seniors who have so requested to voice their views on matters of other upper level governmental affairs may be legitimate. He stated the use of County equipment to influence the votes and determination of this County Legislature is where the problem occurs.

Chairwoman LoBue stated seniors were also bused to the previous Full Meeting to influence the determination of the Legislative vote.

Legislator Albano stated many seniors may not have access to transportation on their own. He stated the item on the agenda was regarding seniors. He stated he does not agree with providing transportation to the seniors with the idea that they will support the agenda item, but rather to gain information about it.

Chairwoman LoBue referenced the September flyer with the menu and calendar that was distributed to each senior center. She stated the flyer includes a note stating that the finalization of the Butterfield lease will be on the Full Legislative Meeting agenda and "All seniors are encouraged to come and offer their support for this important project."

Legislator Albano stated he agrees that sentence should not have been included. He stated he agrees with alerting the seniors of an issue that may concern them, and providing transportation so they have the ability to attend the meetings.

Chairwoman LoBue stated she has never heard of anything like this happening throughout her time as a Legislator. She stated this correspondence is a menu and calendar that is generated by the Office for Senior Resources and distributed to the seniors. She stated the flyer also advertises an event being held by Senator Serino in Dutchess County. She stated the function of this flyer should not be to advertise events such as these.

Legislator Albano stated the seniors should be made aware of events being held in the area.

Chairwoman LoBue stated this is not an advertisement in the newspaper; it is a calendar and menu generated by the Office for Senior Resources and circulated to the seniors. She stated she believes including a political advertisement and lobbying effort for the Legislative vote on this flyer is improper.

Legislator Castellano stated he believes Elected Officials should not have events advertised on correspondences such as the flyer. He stated he believes the note regarding the Full Legislative Meeting was well intended, however it was worded incorrectly. He stated it should have been a notice for anyone interested in attending the meeting. He stated the fee for the transportation to the Full Meeting was billed to the riders. He stated he has a copy of a check that paid for the three (3) bus trips to Full Legislative Meetings.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned if the transportation to the Full Meetings regarding the senior center were invoiced.

Legislator Castellano stated there are invoices for the three (3) meetings. He stated he believes providing transportation to the seniors is important. He restated that the County was paid for that service.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the check amount is for \$742.00 and was paid by Donna Anderson. She stated the meeting took place September 6, 2016 and the check is dated September 9, 2016.

Legislator Nacerino stated valid points have been raised throughout this discussion. She stated although the notice on the flyer may not have been worded properly or did not appear to be open to everyone no matter their opinion, she believes it is important to encourage the senior population, who may not have the ability to drive long distances and/or at night, to be involved in their government. She stated the wording and intent of the notice in the flyer seemed slanted; however she does not disagree with providing transportation to seniors. She stated she agrees with Chairwoman LoBue's statements

regarding the advertisement for an event being held by Senator Serino; however the event was a gathering for seniors and she believes the noticing of it was well intended. She stated going forward, that practice should not be maintained.

Legislator Wright stated the Director of Senior Resources also implied that those in attendance at the meeting should note how each Legislator votes and reward or punish the Legislators accordingly on Election Day. He stated he is concerned with the culture of County Government accepting such discourse from Department Heads and loose use of taxpayer facilities.

Legislator Nacerino stated she does not believe the intent of the notices on the flyer was disingenuous.

Chairwoman LoBue stated she respects Legislator Nacerino's opinion, however she disagrees.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated she is surprised that the Director of Senior Resources was not invited to the Meeting to speak on her own behalf. She stated she would like to read an email sent by the Director of Senior Resources, if it will be accepted as additional.

Chairwoman LoBue stated she would not be accepting the additional.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated she would like to make a motion to accept the additional.

Legislator Wright suggested inviting the Director of Senior Resources to the next Rules, Enactments, & Intergovernmental Relations Committee Meeting.

Legislative Counsel Clement Van Ross stated the proposition of additional is subject to Rule 24 of the Legislative Manual, stating that a unanimous vote is needed to accept.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated this should not be discussed any further until the Director of Senior Resources can be present.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned what the Ethics Code of the County says in terms of Elected Officials advertising events on correspondence such as the flyer distributed to the senior centers. She stated Senators have all kinds of privileges under which they can communicate with their constituents. She stated Senator Serino is currently utilizing office space within the Putnam Valley Senior Center and has now advertised an event through their calendar. She stated it needs to be made very clear that there is a boundary and sometimes, although well intentioned, the boundary gets blurred.

Legislator Albano stated he does not have an issue with transporting seniors to a meeting that involves a matter relating to seniors. He stated the advertisement Senator Serino, who is the Chair of the New York State Aging Committee, had on the calendar was for an event she was hosting for seniors in the area. He stated the Legislature as a

group can come together to make determinations on how to move forward. He stated he does not believe contacting the Attorney General for an opinion is necessary.

Stephanie Hawkins, constituent, stated Senator Serino is currently running for re-election and was the only State Official noticed on the correspondence, which she finds problematic. She stated the same goes for the note encouraging attendance at the Full Legislative Meeting to support a specific agenda item. She questioned if County transportation services are for hire and if so, where the business plan is. She stated the transportation to the Full Legislative Meeting has been described as "widely offered." She stated that she lives in the Village of Cold Spring and knows many seniors who go to the nutrition center and she believes the transportation was not widely offered. She stated on September 1, 2016 Philipstown Deputy Supervisor Nancy Montgomery attended a meeting where Legislator Scuccimarra announced that a bus would be picking up seniors at 6:30 at Chestnut Ridge to attend the September 6, 2016 Legislative Meeting. She stated Deputy Supervisor Montgomery did not believe there was a cost for the offered transportation. She stated she knows many seniors who are able to drive themselves.

Legislator Nacerino stated many people are not comfortable driving at night.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated the roads connecting the east and west side of the County are not the best.

Ms. Hawkins stated that may be true. She stated she finds it interesting that invoices are now presenting themselves.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the County transportation services are not for hire. She stated the question of the buses going off the route has been raised previously and as far as she understands, the buses are not permitted to deviate more than one (1) mile from the route.

Ms. Fanizzi requested clarification regarding the check made out to the County. She questioned if the seniors were charged for the transportation.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated yes, the seniors were charged for the transportation.

Chairwoman LoBue stated one (1) individual paid for everyone to take the bus. She stated there are several invoices.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned where the invoices came from.

Legislator Castellano stated he inquired as to whether or not the County paid for the transportation.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the invoices are from the Office of Senior Resources and are all dated September 8, 2016 but are for the Full Legislative Meetings that took place on May 3, 2016, August 23, 2016, and September 6, 2016.

Ms. Ballantine stated she is concerned about the use of the buses. She stated as she recalls, the first bus was made available in April, however there is no invoice for that.

Legislator Castellano stated the invoice for the April meeting was issued right after the meeting.

Ms. Ballantine questioned if it was paid immediately.

Legislator Castellano stated the payment was received in September.

Ms. Ballantine stated she would like to extend her gratitude to Legislator Wright for bringing this issue up and stated that she respects his opinions and concerns. She stated it is unusual for expensive County equipment to be made available to certain groups of people. She stated aside from the issue with the senior center flyer, there were signs held up by seniors at various Legislative Meetings and she would like to know where the signs were made. She stated the signs did not look homemade.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated signs can be simply made on any computer.

Ms. Ballantine stated she is concerned that the signs may have been made utilizing County equipment and supplies. She stated the Director of Senior Resources made her opinion on this matter clear. She stated everyone is entitled to their own opinion, however she is a County employee and she suggested looking into what is and what is not appropriate when it comes to lobbying. She stated for example, she does not believe any seniors opposing the project were transported to the Meeting. She stated having residents involved in County Government is a positive thing; however there are other topics of interest to certain groups of residents. She stated she supports seeking input from the Attorney General.

Legislator Nacerino requested to table this item to give the Director of Senior Resources the opportunity to address the Committee. She stated the concerns that have been voiced are valid; however she does not believe the intent was disingenuous. She stated it is the responsibility of the Legislature to look into this matter moving forward from the standpoint of policy and procedure.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to table this item to the next Rules, Enactments, & Intergovernmental Relations Committee Meeting; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Item #13 - Discussion/ Putnam County Taxi & Limousine Operators

Chairwoman LoBue stated at the last Rules Meeting, an owner of a taxi company in the County discussed how she had filed complaints with the Sheriff's Department in regard to illegal operators of taxis.

Undersheriff Peter Convery stated the Sheriff's Department ran the individual's name and found no record in the server of any incident regarding taxis. He stated a search was also done for the name of the company and there was also no record in regards to illegal taxi operators; but some phone calls did come in in January and March of this year. He restated that there were no complaints made regarding issues with taxis. He stated the Sheriff believes there is no law enforcement reason to support any bill for regulation.

Legislator Albano stated he believes there should be some kind of regulation in place. He stated contractors such as electricians and plumbers are required to carry \$1,000,000 in liability. He stated taxis are transporting people, and some drivers do not even have a license. He stated perhaps creating a database to ensure that the taxi cabs are in compliance would be a basic sort of regulation.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the Towns have home rule, therefore the County does not have the authority to create such a database. She stated this topic has been discussed for over a year and letters have been sent to the Towns and Villages. She stated most of the Town and Villages did not reply to the letters.

Legislator Castellano stated within the last month, Dutchess County received approval from New York State to create a Taxi & Limousine Commission (TLC). She stated there are about 130 taxis that operate in Putnam County. She stated the Village of Cold Spring was interested in a County wide TLC. He stated the Town of Southeast voted on this topic, which resulted in a tie but he believes had everyone been present at that meeting it would have resulted in a 3-2 vote in favor of the County TLC. He stated the Town of Southeast would like more information. He stated it is a shame that the County cannot regulate taxis at all. He stated if a person utilizes a taxi, there is nowhere to complain if the service was improper, and the driver may not have a license. He stated if the County could regulate this, the vehicles could have a Putnam County sticker displayed, notifying the customer that it is a legitimate and safe taxi service with a licensed driver. He stated he does not believe government would be expanded by having a County wide TLC. He stated there are many limousine companies within Putnam County that are required to have Westchester TLC licenses. He stated New York City (NYC), Westchester, and Dutchess County all have a TLC and much of the industry is to transport people to and from the airports in Westchester and NYC. He stated sooner or later services such as Uber and Lyft will be in this area and there should be some kind of oversight.

Legislator Nacerino agreed with Legislator Castellano and would also like to see something brought forward. She stated the Town of Patterson did not reject the

proposal of a County wide TLC; they expressed that they would like to be involved in this matter going forward. She stated it is important for the drivers of taxis to be vetted and to ensure that they have the proper insurance. She stated her husband owns a private car service and pays fees to Westchester County in order to use their roads; however vehicles from Westchester are utilizing roads in Putnam County. She stated Putnam County could be missing out on a revenue source.

Legislator Wright questioned without TLC police, how Putnam County would enforce its regulations when unregistered taxis or limousines were utilizing Putnam County roadways.

Legislator Nacerino stated the vehicles would need to have something such as a sticker and livery license plates.

Legislator Wright questioned who would provide the enforcement.

Legislator Nacerino suggested reciprocal licenses for Putnam County and Westchester County.

Legislator Gouldman agreed that something should be done. He stated he has used taxi services within the County and the vehicles are not the best and the rates are inconsistent.

Legislator Addonizio stated she had suggested the possibility of issuing a sticker, however each Town and Village must agree to do so. She stated if this agreement is not reached, the County cannot move forward.

Chairwoman LoBue stated it has been made clear that the Village of Brewster is not interested in giving up their jurisdiction and revenue collected from their TLC.

Robert Lichtenberger, owner of Anna's Airport & Limousine Service, Inc. stated he has owned his business for 22 years and it is the only store front limousine company in Putnam County. He stated his company is Westchester-based, each vehicle has a point-to-point sticker, and each chauffeur has a \$200 annual license from the Westchester County Taxi & Limousine Commission. He stated reciprocity is very cumbersome. He stated since his company is Westchester-based, the vehicles can go from Westchester Airport to another destination in Westchester County. He stated they can also go from Westchester County and drop off in NYC. He stated they can pick up in NYC and leave out of the five (5) boroughs; however they cannot do point-to-point in NYC, meaning there is no reciprocal agreement. He stated the same goes for a NYC based company traveling into Westchester. He stated he is leery of Putnam County creating a County wide TLC because of the fact that there are no points of destination, such as an airport or corporate park. He stated as the largest limousine company in Putnam County, he would not purchase a Putnam County TLC because he has no points of destination within the County. He stated the limousine or taxi companies that he knows of have programs in place for drug testing or defensive driving capability. He

stated he has not come across an insurance company in the past 12 years that did not mandate proof that the staff has that education. He stated all of the chauffeurs that work for his business are drug tested twice each year. He stated he is unaware of any type of criminal activity in the area in regards to limousines and taxis. He stated limousines are very different from taxis. He stated companies such as Uber are very unethical in the industry and is illegal in the State of New York; however they are attempting to get State approval. He stated he believes that Uber will not receive this approval because each local municipality has the right to govern for hire service. He stated if this jurisdiction is given up, companies such as Uber will come to the area and therefore there will be unlicensed, uninsured, and inexperienced operators with no drug testing or background checks. He stated when a car is booked through Uber, a message appears stating that Uber cannot be sued because they are not a company, but a technology introducing the customer to a business owner in their own vehicle. He stated his company carries \$5 million in general liability. He stated a reciprocal agreement with Westchester County would require companies to purchase stickers and licenses for each car, from each County, which would lead to an increase in prices. He stated he does not believe a TLC would increase safety, but would make it more difficult and more expensive.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the biggest demand for limousine and taxi services is to be transported south of Putnam County. She stated if a TLC was needed in Putnam County, she believes more Towns and Villages would have their own. She stated the Village of Brewster is the only local municipality with their own TLC and it is because the demand in that area is high due to the train stations.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated one (1) taxi company is upset because when people are on the train and they fall asleep and end up in Brewster or Southeast, the Westchester taxis can come into Putnam to pick them up and take them back into Westchester. He stated with a reciprocal agreement, they would be licensed to do that anyway because they are picking up in Putnam and leaving. He stated they would not be able to transport point-to-point within Putnam.

Legislator Castellano requested clarification on where Anna's Airport & Limousine Service can transport customers.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated he cannot transport point-to-point in Putnam, but can pick up in Putnam and transport to Westchester. He stated they can pick up in Westchester and drop off in NYC, and vice versa. He stated he cannot do point-to-point in NYC; in order to do so he would need to purchase the NYC permit, which is \$550 per year, \$800 road tax, and a vehicle inspection every six (6) months. He stated he has not found it necessary to purchase the NYC permit.

Chairwoman LoBue stated in 2001, the Legislature passed a resolution, which was ultimately vetoed by then-Governor Pataki. She stated Dutchess County is much larger than Putnam.

Legislator Castellano questioned if a driver from Anna's Airport and Limousine Service picked up customers in Putnam County and dropped them off in NYC to stay for three (3) days, if he could go back and get those same customers at the end of the three (3) days.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated he is permitted to do that.

Legislator Castellano stated he read in the Dutchess County Law that a pick up like that must be done within 48 hours.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated if a continuous trip begins outside of Manhattan and ends outside of Manhattan with the same car and driver and is less than 12 hours, the driver can go point-to-point in Manhattan. He stated the law in Westchester County is unique in that a Westchester TLC license is required in order to drive into the County. He stated he sees no threat of other limousine companies coming up to this area and taking business.

Chairwoman LoBue stated Putnam County has a population of less than 100,000 and it is decreasing. She stated she does not believe the cost of having a TLC could be justified.

Legislator Castellano questioned if Putnam County could honor a Westchester County license, and that livery service could then transport point-to-point in Putnam.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated that is not how it is looked at.

Legislator Castellano questioned if the State regulates that.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated NYC did not want to give up their revenue source. He stated taxis and limousines from NYC were tired of being ticketed in Westchester, and Westchester taxi and limousines were tired of being ticketed in NYC, so they came to an agreement. He stated that agreement was if a vehicle has a permit in either Westchester or NYC, they could drop off and pick up and leave in the opposite location, but cannot do point-to-point there.

Legislator Castellano questioned who regulates that the opposite municipality cannot transport point-to-point: the State, or Westchester and NYC.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated Westchester and NYC made that determination.

Legislator Wright stated after years of discussion on this topic, he believes Mr. Lichtenberger, a successful private entrepreneur, has given the best testimony not to have a County wide TLC. He stated a County wide TLC is a solution to a problem that does not exist in Putnam. He stated there has not been any documented evidence of a history of problems regarding unregulated taxis.

Legislator Nacerino thanked Mr. Lichtenberger for providing further clarity into this subject. She stated there is a stark difference between a taxi and a limousine. She stated she is still concerned about taxi companies and taxi drivers that are not properly regulated.

Ruth Ayala-Quezada, owner of Carmel Taxi & Car Service thanked Mr. Lichtenberger for his explanation. She stated there is a big difference between the taxi industry and the limousine industry. She stated most of her business is point-to-point within Putnam County, and just 15% of her business is going down to the airport. She stated she generated a list of the taxi companies operating in the County and there are about 134 taxi cabs. She stated over the weekend of February 12-14, 2016 she made a phone call to the Sheriff's Department about a particular driver who has a North Carolina driver's license and was operating out of the Southeast train station. She stated a Deputy Sheriff came to the Southeast train station and told the driver that he could not operate there and asked him to leave. She stated the cab left, however he has since returned. She questioned who manages the Putnam County Sheriff's Department Facebook account. She stated on August 15, 2016 she messaged pictures of the vehicles that sit at the Southeast station to that account.

Undersheriff Convery stated by law, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Police are responsible for the patrol of the Southeast train station. He stated the Village of Brewster Police are responsible for the patrol of the Brewster train station. He stated the train station in the Village of Cold Spring is patrolled by the Village of Cold Spring police. He stated the Sheriff's Department splits the patrols in Garrison and Patterson with the State Police. He stated there are no complaints made by Ms. Ayala-Quezada in reference to this matter in the Sheriff's Department database.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated when she contacted the Sheriff's Department, a Deputy came to the Southeast train station. She questioned why the driver was only asked to leave.

Undersheriff Convery stated no crime had been committed.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated it is against the State law to operate a for-hire vehicle without a New York State driver's license.

Undersheriff Convery stated he has no statutory evidence of what Ms. Ayala-Quezada is claiming. He stated he has no information on the Facebook message allegedly sent.

Chairwoman LoBue requested clarification of the Facebook message.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated the Putnam County Sheriff's Department has a Facebook page and she messaged photos of the taxi cab she had complained about to that account.

Undersheriff Convery questioned if the photos of the cab were taken at the Southeast train station.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated they were.

Undersheriff Convery stated the MTA Police have the authority at the Southeast train station.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada requested clarification if she had sent the same pictures of the taxi located outside of Fiddler's Green in Putnam Plaza.

Undersheriff Convery stated the Town of Carmel Police has authority in that area.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated she has always communicated with the Putnam County Sheriff's Department for complaints about these unregulated taxis. She stated running an illegal taxi operation without the proper licensing is breaking the law.

Undersheriff Convery stated he has no criminal complaint.

Legislator Castellano requested that Undersheriff Convery send a letter in response to if there is a State regulation on whether a taxi operator can have an out of state driver's license.

Undersheriff Convery stated in the 15 years that he has been Undersheriff he cannot recall the last issue that has come up regarding the operation of taxis.

Mr. Lichtenberger stated he understands Ms. Ayala-Quezada's frustration. He stated based on the fact that there is no real authority regulation, the taxi or limousine operators look to the police to assist when there is an illegal operator. He stated companies, such as Uber, are not legitimate and are illegal in New York State. He stated Uber is operating in NYC, however they have the proper TLC permits to do so. He stated it is his understanding that drivers must maintain a license in the State in which they live with the proper class validation. He stated Ms. Ayala-Quezada's frustration is that she is trying to do the right thing by the public by reporting these illegal taxis, however she is receiving no response. He stated Undersheriff Convery has pointed out that there are other policy agencies to contact in regards to this matter. He stated the Westchester TLC is happy to take license plate numbers of illegal cars, whether they are in Westchester or not.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated it has also been discussed that having a County wide TLC will be implementing another layer of government, and therefore being an expensive endeavor. She stated a TLC generates revenue, which is why the Village of Brewster is not willing to surrender their authority to the County. She stated the revenue is generated from permits and fines. She stated there are 23 taxi companies with a total of 134 taxi cabs in Putnam County. She stated she did some math to show the potential revenue of a TLC. She stated if a \$300 base fee was charged to each

company, the County would receive \$6,900. She stated if \$150 per vehicle was charged, the County would receive \$20,100. She stated there are 150 drivers; if the County charged \$75 for a driver's permit, the revenue would be \$11,250. She stated those fees alone add up to \$38,250.

Chairwoman LoBue stated that is not enough revenue to justify creating another level of government. She stated she appreciates the work done by Ms. Ayala-Quezada. She stated a TLC is more suited for a Town rather than a County. She questioned if the Village of Brewster had a Taxi & Limousine Commission. She also questioned what type of Commission was created in Dutchess County.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated the Village of Brewster only regulates taxis.

Legislator Castellano stated the Commission passed in Dutchess County is a Taxi & Limousine Commission.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated in the letter she sent to the Legislature, she did outline that the commission could be for just taxis. She stated the limousine service within the County is very low volume as limousine customers are looking to be transported outside of the County. She stated about 60% of her revenue is Medicaid transportation. She stated there is a taxi company operating out of Peekskill who has bids for the Brewster and Mahopac area for Medicaid transportation.

Ms. Fanizzi stated Ms. Ayala-Quezada sent a complaint to the Putnam County Sheriff's Department via their Facebook account. She questioned how filing a complaint works when it is done via Facebook.

Undersheriff Convery stated he will look into this issue. He stated he will also contact the MTA Police as they have the legal authority.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the question is in regards to the process of filing a complaint via Facebook.

Undersheriff Convery stated an official complaint will still need to be filed. He stated a Facebook message is not an official complaint.

Legislator Nacerino questioned if the Facebook message was acknowledged.

Undersheriff Convery stated he will check into the situation.

Ms. Ayala-Quezada stated she received a reply that the complaint will be passed along. She stated she has attempted to contact the MTA Police and their phone system is on a loop.

Ms. Ballantine questioned how services such as Uber or Lyft would be legally able to operate within Putnam County.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the approval would need to come from the State.

Item #11 - Discussion/ Propose Amendment to Legislative Manual/ Rule 24 – Change of the Rules (Requested by Chairwoman Nacerino)

Legislator Albano stated the ideal situation is to move on all subjects in a productive manor. He stated when material is presented at a meeting that is lengthy and the Legislators do not have an opportunity to properly review it, it is logical not to accept the material at that time. However, simple information that comes in that can be helpful to an item on the agenda should be accepted to not hold any items up. He stated at times, accepting the additional correspondence prevents the Committee from revisiting the same topic twice. He stated there are nine (9) Legislators and under this rule, it would only take one (1) Legislator to vote no in regards to accepting additional. He stated he does not believe this is the most productive procedure. He stated if the majority agrees, the topic could be delayed due to one (1) “no” vote. He stated the end result of the item will be the same, and not accepting a piece of additional that could solve an issue utilizes more time.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the additional submitted to tonight’s Meeting was multiple pages.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated in some cases, too much information is presented at the last minute. She stated the information she had to offer earlier tonight would have provided answers to the topic. She stated she does not believe the acceptance of additional should be unanimous. She suggested having a majority vote instead.

Legislator Wright stated a piece of additional or other business should be distributed to each Legislator with explanation as to why the rules should be waived for that material. He stated a requirement from the Executive Branch states that last-minute items are to be accompanied by a memorandum of necessity. He stated these are well developed principles of legislative governmental process. He stated on the State level, when a time sensitive matter needs to be addressed, they are presented with letters of necessity. He stated this allows for the possibility that there are important, time sensitive matters that must be addressed with nobody at fault for failure to have been able to give it the appropriate timing process. He stated it is not just a question of what is fair to fellow Legislators, but it is the thousands of residents that the Legislators represent. He stated if an explanation of urgency and necessity is delivered along with the material, the rules allow for the Legislature to consider and accept the matters. He stated the orderly process of government falls apart when there is not that kind of clear, understanding of emergency or necessity and when rules are dismantled. He stated he has sincerely given this a lot of thought and he cannot think of any language to put into Rule 24 that would speak to the seriousness of the item. He stated the urgency is in the eye of the beholder and therefore must be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. He compared this proposed change to the one made on the naming of County facilities. He stated in his opinion, changing the rules in ways that allow the majority to always

procedurally rule, it tramples on the minority points of view and representative government falls apart. He urged the Committee not to amend Rule 24. He also urged his colleagues to use their legislative and diplomatic skills to get any time sensitive and important information into the hands of fellow Legislators with an explanation as to why it has to go through Committee without notice and opportunity to be heard. He stated as has happened, at least in the past 2½ years that he has been on the Legislature, 95% of the time, there have been untold numbers of waivers for last minute items that have come before and been approved by the Legislature. He stated some items are so obvious and self-evident that it would be a waste of time to even innumerate them. He stated others are debatable, but even in reference to those, 90-95% of them have carried the day. He stated someone who may not agree with the proposal do not allow their personal misgivings to hold up the determination. He stated when there are matters that have been hotly contested and vigorously opposed on all sides he believes it is wrong for other Legislators to take out their frustrations on the Legislative staff or one another when those last minute things cannot be heard. He stated these are the rules the Legislators signed up for and they are the rules the Legislature should stick to. He stated the Legislature has never prevented a truly important proposal from going through. He stated when all is said and done, even in the instance of the most recalcitrant Legislator, the power of the Chair to convene an emergency special meeting is always at hand. He stated he is genuinely not speaking about any current Legislators; however the day may come when there is a Legislator who may vote “no” to everything to hold up the process. He stated even in that situation, the Legislature is never more than 48 hours away from convening a special meeting to address the matter.

Chairwoman LoBue agreed with Legislator Wright. She stated the Legislature establishes policy for the County and that policy should hold true regardless of who the County Executive or Legislators are. She stated currently, there are many 5:4 votes and the rationale for the unanimous vote to accept additional material is that each Legislator has the same amount of power. She stated another component of this rule is transparency to the public. She stated presenting material at a Full Legislative Meeting without addressing it at the Committee level is not fair to the public because the public would not have a chance to see that it will be addressed or the ability to voice their opinion. She stated a common goal among the Legislators is open and transparent government. She stated many laws have been changed on a case-by-case basis and they are not viewed positively by the constituents. She read a letter sent from Chairwoman of the Legislature Ginny Nacerino to County Executive MaryEllen Odell in January 2016 regarding the seven (7) day rule for placement of items on a Legislative Committee agenda.

Legislator Nacerino stated the seven (7) day rule applies to each Committee and is therefore subject to the decision of the Chairperson of each Committee to include it on the agenda or not. She stated she does not believe that Rule 24 should be abolished. She stated she disagrees with Legislator Wright from the standpoint that the Legislators work in a democratic process, which is the majority of the Board. She stated there is an ineffectiveness and counter productiveness that is beginning to take place. She stated

she would like to amend this rule to have a supermajority approval rather than unanimous. She stated at the end of the day, it is the decision of the majority of the Legislature how things move forward. She stated she questions the motivation for some of the rules that are on the books. She stated specifically, the rule that stated an individual needed to be deceased for five (5) years before a facility could be named after them. She stated Legislative Counsel Van Ross told her that the reason why that rule was enacted was because one (1) elected official was running and did not want the competition of a living individual to have the ability to run.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated what he had told Legislator Nacerino was that the building was named in the individual's honor before he ran and the other person was offended that he was running against somebody who had a building named after him.

Legislator Wright stated rules are set and then seem to be changed for convenience. He stated it speaks to a government who states "We won't do this...unless we want to." He stated specifically to the suggested amendment of Rule 24, the Legislature will not hear any matters that are not properly noticed on the agenda, unless they want to.

Legislator Nacerino stated the Legislators flip-flop all the time.

Legislator Wright stated these rules are not about the specific individuals who are currently Legislators. He stated the Legislature changes and once the rule is passed, it is on the books. He stated he submits that he is probably the only person in the room who has ever worked with a moving majority. He stated if a moving majority ever has something other than Rule 24, it would be instantaneous chaos. He stated that type of combination in a divided government, which one day will no doubt come to Putnam County, will end poorly. He stated decisions must not only be made thinking about the present time, but how those decisions may affect the Legislative body going forward. He stated the inherent disrespect for the Legislature's own processes and procedures that will be invited with such an amendment will result in the Legislature being the subject of emergency consideration of matters of grave importance. He stated in the future the Legislature, whether the current one or its successors are going to get rolled because there are basically no rules for presentation of matters in an orderly fashion. He stated Legislator Albano mentioned earlier that he is used to reviewing documents quickly and forming a decision. He stated he does that himself from time to time, as it is what executives do. However, he stated in this role, they are Legislators and the material is supposed to lay on the table and the constituents are supposed to be able to understand what is before the Legislature. He stated that is how, in his view, Legislative government works.

Legislator Nacerino stated in her view, one (1) Legislator should not have the ability to dictate if the will of the Board, eight (8) other Legislators, feel differently. She stated each Legislator makes an independent decision on each situation and that should prevail. She stated she does not find it effective when one (1) Legislator can take down the whole Board. She stated she requested that this topic be discussed because she wanted to hear the opinions of her colleagues. She stated she believes the Legislature

should follow the democratic process and go with the will of the majority, which is in essence what is done in every case.

Legislator Castellano stated the Legislature handles a lot of material all month long. He stated last week, an email was received that could not be addressed because one (1) Legislator believed there was not enough time to review it. He stated if an abundance of material is handed out the night of a meeting, he has no problem holding off on the item until the next month; however he does not understand why it cannot be discussed. He stated one (1) Legislator can halt a discussion from taking place. He stated that person should have the right to say more time is needed, but a supermajority vote should be the deciding factor.

Legislator Wright questioned how a supermajority vote would work in a Committee Meeting.

Legislator Castellano stated two (2) of the three (3) Committee members would have to vote in favor.

Legislator Wright stated that is the same vote for anything to carry through Committee.

Chairwoman LoBue stated in order to change the Charter, a supermajority vote is needed, which is at least six (6) votes out of nine (9).

Legislator Castellano stated 90% of the time additional material is accepted because it is easy to read through and for a decision to be made. He stated the problem occurs when one (1) Legislator votes down the acceptance because they are unwilling to read a document that may be simple. He stated if necessary, a special meeting can be called with 48 hours' notice to address a topic that may not have been accepted at a regular Committee Meeting. He stated while he does not mind attending an extra meeting, it involves many other components and the additional meeting could be avoided if the material was addressed in the regular Committee meeting.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the issue is not only if the Legislators have had the opportunity to review a document, it is also that the public is unaware that it will be addressed. She stated when she became Chairwoman of this Committee, she made the statement that she would not entertain additional material. She stated tonight, there was additional material in relation to the litigation settlement on the agenda and she was told that it was dire and therefore she was willing to accept it. She referenced the comments made earlier in regards to the personal nature of the votes when accepting additional as far as one (1) Legislator having the ability to hold up the process and stated that everyone is entitled to their own opinion.

Legislator Nacerino clarified that she did not say the vote was personal; she stated one (1) person has the ability to dictate the action.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the additional material in relation to the litigation settlement has no explanation because the Law Department was not represented at the Meeting.

Legislator Nacerino stated the Legislature should assess the acceptance of additional material on a case-by-case basis. She stated perhaps if someone from the related department was present, they would be able to demonstrate the necessity of the additional material and a decision could be made at that point. She restated that the decision made should come from the Board and not one (1) individual Legislator.

Legislator Castellano stated the litigation settlement is not dire and can wait. He stated if a time sensitive item came in and it needed to be addressed at the Full Legislative Meeting in order to comply with the time restraints, and one (1) Legislator, for whatever reason, did not want that specific item to go forward, they could vote no and stall the process for another month.

Chairwoman LoBue stated no grant has been lost because a Legislator would not accept additional. She stated Rule 24 is a very important one because it comes up at almost every meeting, where the Committee is being asked to accept material at the last minute. She stated perhaps if the seven (7) day rule was respected and enforced, the Legislature would not be at the point where it is now. She stated the additional material presented to the Legislature is someone else's interpretation of an emergency. She stated rules have been changed along the way and it has not been productive. She stated the Legislature needs to be careful when the process is being tailored because someone was not happy with an outcome. She questioned the harm of putting an item off to another meeting, especially because there are so many Legislative meetings throughout the month.

Legislator Nacerino stated the Legislature needs to operate efficiently.

Legislator Wright suggested that his colleagues not speak in regards to Rule 24 as it has related to specific instances. He stated the specific instances are value laden with each Legislator's own views.

Ms. Fanizzi stated she depends on the agenda and the backup in order to assess whether or not she will attend the Meeting. She stated she would like to share an incident that occurred on the town level when she checked the agenda for the meeting that was posted and she decided not to attend the meeting. However, something was introduced at that meeting that was pertinent to her and to the residents of that particular town. She stated this did a great disservice to the people of that community. She stated she respects the County Government and she believes the Legislature is the most important branch. She stated the Legislature represents the residents of Putnam County. She stated according to the Constitution, the Legislature is a deliberative body and it meant to discuss items. She stated just because a document may be one (1) page does not mean that it is simple. She stated complicated matters are not measured in terms of volume of paper. She read a quote by former Speaker of the United States House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi in reference to Obamacare, "We have to pass

the bill so that you can find out what is in it.” She stated Obamacare was passed by a supermajority. She stated the democrats in that congress had full control and they used that control. She stated rules are not stumbling blocks; they are there to prevent chaos, confusion, and lack of predictability. She urged the Committee to very carefully consider any change to Rule 24 and/or the Charter in general.

Legislator Nacerino stated conversely, one (1) piece of paper could also offer clarity or resolve to a situation.

Legislator Wright questioned why at times pieces of additional are presented by a Legislator without it first being disseminated to all members of the Legislature.

Legislator Nacerino stated the earlier correspondence was going to be read into the record. She stated she believes the rule is being abused because it is not being used to its full intent.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the Committee and Legislature convenes to deliberate as a body with the opportunity for public comment. She stated there is a process on the books in regards to additional material. She stated any additional that a Legislator wishes to present should first submit it to the Clerk of the Legislature.

At 9:15pm Chairwoman LoBue made a motion to recess the meeting; Seconded by Legislator Castellano. All in favor.

At 9:20pm Legislator Castellano made a motion to reconvene the meeting; Seconded by Chairwoman LoBue. All in favor.

Legislator Castellano suggested formulating a compromise. He stated if a brand new topic is presented to the Committee and did not make the seven (7) day rule for being included on the agenda; he supports Rule 24 the way it is currently written. He stated when a topic is already on the agenda and additional information is received, a supermajority vote should decide if it will be accepted.

Legislator Nacerino stated most of the material that comes in as additional pertains to the matters on the agenda.

Legislator Wright stated changing one (1) word can affect the conceptual fabric of a 40 page document. He stated once the Legislature is on the slippery slope of allowing the vote of a supermajority, everything becomes a question to the decisions of six (6) people.

Legislator Nacerino stated ultimately, the outcome is the same. She stated she does not believe the whole Board should be crippled as the result of one (1) person.

Legislator Wright stated the Board is not crippled when someone seeks to violate the Legislature’s rules and procedures.

Legislator Castellano stated 90% of the time the additional is approved without issue. He stated the rest of the time it should be deliberated.

Legislator Wright questioned if Legislator Castellano is suggesting that when additional is presented, discussion of its necessity should ensue and then a vote should be taken. He stated he sees nothing wrong with healthy persuasion; however if at the end of the day, the person seeking to bend the rules does not prevail after being given the opportunity to persuade the unanimous vote in their favor, then it is addressed in the regular course of business.

Legislator Scuccimarra agreed with Legislator Castellano. She stated the additional material for tonight's meeting relating to the litigation settlement is difficult to read through at the last minute. She stated however, another piece of other business for tonight's meeting is an award of a grant that was previously discussed in Committee. She stated there is no reason not to accept the grant award as additional. She stated the additional material that she wanted to bring forward earlier would have brought clarity to the topic at hand. She stated one (1) person should not have the ability to halt the process and it has happened on multiple occasions.

Legislator Castellano stated this needs to be looked at moving into the future as well. He stated in the future, there may be a Legislator who will always vote no on specific things happening in the community. He stated for one (1) Legislator to have the ability to object without having a conversation could cause issues. He stated a discussion should be had regarding the additional and then a supermajority vote should decide if it will be accepted. He stated an item may be discussed in Committee and a Department Head or member of the public may listen to the discussion and realize they have helpful information regarding that item. He stated if that information is sent to the Legislature for the Full Legislative Meeting, one (1) person can stop all the Legislators from addressing it. He stated he would like to have a discussion about it, and then go to a supermajority vote.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross clarified the seven (7) day rule. He stated for something to be placed on the agenda, it must be submitted to the Clerk of the Legislature seven (7) days before the meeting and the Clerk distributes the agenda five (5) days before the meeting. He stated if there is a change in that procedure, a unanimous vote is needed.

Legislator Castellano stated that is not the procedure they are looking to change. He stated if a topic is in Committee for over a month, and a small change is submitted as additional, one (1) Legislator can stall the process by voting not to accept it.

Legislator Nacerino stated a Special Meeting can be called 48 hours later and the same topic would be revisited. She stated this does not speak to the efficiency of the Board.

Legislator Wright stated he is more concerned with items that require a Legislative resolution.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned how many votes are needed in order to call a Special Full Legislative Meeting.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated five (5) votes are needed; the Chairperson and four (4) Legislators.

Ms. Fanizzi suggested requiring a supermajority vote to call a Special Full Legislative Meeting.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated at one point, the Chair of the Legislature could call a Special meeting on their own.

Legislator Nacerino stated that speaks to her point that nothing is set in stone in the Charter and it can be reassessed.

Item #12 - Approval/ Creation of the Position “Deputy Director of IT/GIS”

Chairwoman LoBue stated the salary of the previous position was \$54,601 and the Deputy Director of IT/GIS salary would be \$65,000. She questioned what the next step is.

Legislator Nacerino stated the position with the salary of \$54,601 has been vacant for a few months, which has resulted in a savings for 2016.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated the Legislature would need to set the salary of the new position at \$65,000. He stated if this position is going to be created; it should be created with the salary that has been set.

Legislator Castellano questioned if the salary is set by the State because it is a CSEA position.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated the salary is set by the County. He stated as per the Charter, the Legislature sets all salaries for all positions.

Chairwoman LoBue stated there are no educational or work experience requirements included in the description.

Legislator Nacerino stated the requirements speak to the fact that the individual will need a technical background. She stated the person will not be qualified to sit for the test if they do not have the proper credentials and skill set.

Chairwoman LoBue questioned how that is established.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated there are qualifications in the Code for most positions.

Chairwoman LoBue stated since this is a new position, there must be qualifications that accompany it.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated there should at least be minimum qualifications. He stated usually, the Personnel Department will recommend what the qualifications should be and the Legislature can tweak it. He stated in this case, no such recommendation has been made.

Legislator Nacerino stated the requirements and responsibilities are listed. She stated the individual cannot sit for the test without the criteria and prerequisites in place.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated the criteria are usually set from the requirements.

Legislator Nacerino agreed that it should be fine-tuned.

Chairwoman LoBue stated this information will be requested.

Legislator Nacerino stated the expertise speaks for itself in reading through the responsibilities of the position.

Chairwoman LoBue stated this is a brand new position and the Legislature needs to see the requirements before moving forward.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated this item can be sent to the Audit & Administration Committee Meeting and the information can be requested to be received prior to that meeting.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to move Approval/ Creation of the Position "Deputy Director of IT/GIS" to the Audit & Administration Committee; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Ms. Fanizzi questioned who sets the requirements.

Chairwoman LoBue stated the Personnel Department sets the requirements.

Item #14 - FYI/ Local Law Amending Chapter 95 of the Putnam County Code by Creating the Putnam County Animal Cruelty Registry Law (Tabled at August 15, 2016 Rules Meeting) – Duly Noted

Item #15 - FYI/ Input from County Departments/ NYSAC/ Resolution Calling on all State and County Officials, Residents, and Business Owners to Adopt the "Think Differently" Initiative to Assist Individuals with Special Needs and their Families – Duly Noted

Item #16 - FYI/ Input from County Department Heads/ Naming of County Facilities
(Also Reviewed in Physical Services) – Duly Noted

Item #17 - FYI/ Litigation Report – Duly Noted

Item #4 - Approval/ Litigation Settlement/ Partenza-Mahoney v. County of Putnam

Chairwoman LoBue stated since no representatives from the County Law Department are present at the meeting, there will be no action taken on this item.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to move Litigation Settlement/ Partenza-Mahoney v. County of Putnam to the Audit & Administration Committee; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Item #18 - Other Business

a. Approval/ Grant Award/ Putnam County Respiratory Protection Program/ Law Department/ Safety Committee

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated the Legislature approved the grant application and the grant has been received. He stated based on the grant, the Safety Committee prepared a policy to be adopted by the Legislature.

Legislator Nacerino questioned if this Other Business would be accepted.

Legislator Wright stated if he were voting, he would vote to accept this as other business.

Legislator Castellano stated this would be the example of receiving an item at the last minute. He stated he would approve to accept this as well; however if another Committee Member wanted more time to review it, he would understand. He stated his recommendation is to move forward with this policy. He stated this item can be moved to the Audit & Administration Committee so a representative can be invited to discuss it.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to waive the rules and accept the Other Business; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Legislator Castellano made a motion to move Approval/ Grant Award/ Putnam County Respiratory Protection Program/ Law Department/ Safety Committee to the Audit & Administration Committee; Seconded by Chairwoman LoBue. All in favor.

Item #19 – Adjournment

There being no further business at 9:57p.m. Legislator Castellano made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Assistant Beth Green.