

**Laws & Rules, Governmental Services Committee
Regular Meeting Minutes**

DATE & TIME: February 10, 2021 – 6:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing (646) 558-8656
Meeting ID: 922 7546 1107
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairwoman Bartels
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Jay Mahler, Deputy Clerk
PRESENT: Legislators Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislative Counsel Ragucci & Minority Counsel Pascale, Deputy County Executives Milgrim & Rider, Commissioners Dittus & Quigley and Deputy Commissioners Fuentes & Williams, Deputy Director Wainwright – UC Information Services, Paul Ostrander – MidHudson News

Chairwoman Bartels called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.

Motion No. 1: Moved to APPROVE Minutes & Transcript of the December 10, 2020 Regular and December 14, 2020 Special Meetings

Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: None

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: Minutes APPROVED

Resolutions for the February 16, 2021 Session of the Legislature

Resolution No. 300 of 2020: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 12 Of 2020, A Local Law Amending Local Law No. 4 of 2018, A Local Law Establishing An Ulster County Human Rights Law, To Be Held On Tuesday, March 16, 2021 At 7:00 PM

Resolution Summary: This resolution sets a Public Hearing on Tuesday, March 16, 2021 at 7:00 PM to allow the public to offer comments on Proposed Local Law No. 12 of 2020.

Motion No. 2: Resolution No. 300 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Resolution No. 425: Setting A Public Hearing On Proposed Local Law No. 15 Of 2020, A Local Law Amending Article XXX Of The Ulster County Charter And Article XXX Of The Ulster County Administrative Code To Eliminate The Term Limit Imposed On Commissioners, To Be Held On Monday, January 11, 2021 At 6:05 PM

Resolution Summary: This resolution sets a Public Hearing on Monday, January 11, 2021 at 6:05 PM to allow the public to offer comments on Proposed Local Law No. 15 of 2020.

Motion No. 3: **Resolution No. 425 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 4: **Motion to AMEND Section 3. of Proposed Local Law No. 15 of 2020 to read** “No member of the Commission of Human Rights shall serve more than two ~~three~~ **four** consecutive terms of three years.”

Motion By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED with Proposed Local Law AS AMENDED**

Resolution No. 6: Adopting Proposed Local Law No. 13 Of 2020, A Local Law Amending The Ulster County Charter, (Local Law No. 2 Of 2006), And Amending The Administrative Code For The County Of Ulster, (Local Law No. 10 Of 2008) To Further Clarify Budget Modification After Adoption

Resolution Summary: This resolution adopts Proposed Local Law No. 13 of 2020.

Motion No. 5: **Resolution No. 6 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Motion No. 6: **Motion to AMEND the title and the body of Proposed Local Law No. 13 to read as presented before them**

Motion By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Amendment ADOPTED**

Motion No. 7: **Motion to AMEND the Resolution to strike language adopting the Proposed Local Law and insert language to set a Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law 13 As Amended on March 9, 2021 at 6:15 PM.**

Motion By: Legislator Donaldson
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Heppner

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Amendment ADOPTED**

Legislator Gavaris called the question

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner & Roberts
Voting Against: Legislator Ronk
Votes in Favor: 5
Votes Against: 1
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED AS AMENDED with Proposed Local Law AS AMENDED**

Resolution No. 58: Approving The Execution Of A Contract For \$178,793.00 Entered Into By The County – NTS Data Services LLC – Information Services

Resolution Summary: This Resolution approves the execution of a contract with NTS Data Services LLC in the amount of \$178,793.00 for TEAM Suite Software support and maintenance for 1/1/21 through 12/31/23.

Motion No. 8: **Resolution No. 58 MOVED FOR DISCUSSION**
Motion By: Legislator Heppner
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

Discussion: See attached transcript

Voting In Favor: Legislators Bartels, Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
Voting Against: None
Votes in Favor: 6
Votes Against: 0
Disposition: **Resolution ADOPTED**

Chairwoman Bartels moved on to New Business on the Agenda – Board of Elections Space needs and relocation plan and recognized Board of Elections Commissioners Dittus and Quigley and Deputy Commissioners Fuentes and Williams. See attached transcript.

Chairwoman Bartels moved on to Old Business on the Agenda and advised the members that they have been contacted to schedule a special meeting to continue the discussion of amending Rules of the Legislature. See attached transcript.

Chairwoman Bartels asked if there was any other old or any new business; and hearing none.

Adjournment

Motion Made By: Legislator Ronk
Motion Seconded By: Legislator Donaldson

No. of Votes in Favor: 6
No. of Votes Against: 0

TIME: 7:09 PM

Respectfully submitted: Deputy Clerk Mahler
Minutes Approved: March 15, 2021

**Laws & Rules, Governmental Services Committee
Regular Meeting Transcript**

DATE & TIME: February 10, 2021 – 6:00 PM
LOCATION: Powered by Zoom Meeting by Dialing (646) 558-8656
Meeting ID: 922 7546 1107
PRESIDING OFFICER: Chairwoman Bartels
LEGISLATIVE STAFF: Deputy Clerk Mahler, Deputy Clerk
PRESENT: Legislators Donaldson, Gavaris, Heppner, Roberts & Ronk
ABSENT: None
QUORUM PRESENT: Yes

OTHER ATTENDEES: Legislative Counsel Ragucci & Minority Counsel Pascale, Deputy County Executive’s Milgrim & Rider, Commissioners Dittus & Quigley and Deputy Commissioners Fuentes & Williams, Deputy Director Wainwright – UC Information Services, Paul Ostrander – MidHudson News

Chairwoman Bartels called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.

Chairwoman Bartels

Call the meeting to order. This is the Laws and Rules and Government Services Committee meeting. February 10th. At 6:04PM. Would you please call the roll Clerk Mahler?

Deputy Clerk Mahler

My pleasure. Chairwoman Bartels

Chairwoman Bartels

Present

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Deputy Chair Music, I mean, Roberts

Legislator Roberts

Here

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Legislator Gavaris

Legislator Gavaris

Present

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Legislator Heppner

Legislator Heppner

Here

Deputy Clerk Mahler

and Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk

Present

Deputy Clerk Mahler

Oh, and Chairman Donaldson

Chairman Donaldson

Here

Deputy Clerk Mahler

You have six members present, zero absent.

Chairwoman Bartels

Great, thank you. I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes of December 10th and, which was a special meeting, and December 14th.

Legislator Ronk

I'll make that motion.

Legislator Heppner

Second.

Chairman Donaldson

Seconded

Chairwoman Bartels

Minutes and the transcripts. Hopefully everyone's had a chance to look at them. Are there any comments, questions? Changes proposed? Okay, hearing none. All those in favor of accepting both sets.

Committee Members

Aye

Chairwoman Bartels

Any opposition? Okay, passes unanimously. All right, we're gonna move into resolutions. First resolution for tonight is Resolution Number 300 of 2020. Setting a Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law Number 12 of 2020. A Local Law Amending Local Law Number 4 of 2018 a Local Law Establishing an Ulster County Human Rights Law to be held on Tuesday, March 16 2021 at 7pm.

Legislator Ronk

I'll move for discussion.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you.

Legislator Heppner

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, and that's Legislators Ronk, and Heppner. Okay, on the resolution. All right. This has been on our agenda for some time, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk

Thank you. It has been our agenda for quite some time. I'll defer to the attorneys. But I'm not sure that the County Attorney's office ever responded to our comments.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, Legislative Counsel Ragucci?

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

I'm sorry, I couldn't, I couldn't hear what Ken said. I apologize. Can, could you repeat that?

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes, I can. Legislator Ronk said that he's going to defer to the attorneys. But he wanted to confirm whether or not the County Attorney's office ever responded to our comments.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Yes, I think they're, I think they're okay with them as far as I'm aware.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, Legislator Heppner.

Legislator Heppner

Yeah, on my end, I can say that after going over the changes ...

Legislator Ronk

Nick is that your understanding?

Legislator Heppner

Actually, yeah, I'd like to hear from Counselor Pascal, let him go ahead.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay Legislator Heppner. Counselor Pascale?

Minority Counsel Pascale

Sure. Am I, am I audible?

Chairwoman Bartels

You are

Legislator Ronk

You are

Minority Counsel Pascale

Okay. Terrific. Yeah. Yeah, this has been carried for a couple of Sessions, the committee, I think, in large part for discussion to be carried out. On the sponsor side, we had put our comments in and discussed them with County Attorney late last year, and they were accepted. So as long as, I know, Chris, if there's anything else or Leader Heppner, if there's anything else on your side that you wanted to add in? I think otherwise, we'd probably be able to move ahead with it.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

So yeah, just to echo what Minority Counsel Pascal said. We had a series of meetings. In attendance was the County Attorney as well as the Assistant County Attorney. They had some additional comments. We had a very fruitful and

productive discussion that resulted in unanimous, at least my understanding was unanimous, approval of the amendments as presented today.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Heppner

Legislator Heppner

Yeah, I would just say, after reviewing the changes once more last evening with Counsel Ragucci, I'm very comfortable as it appears before us tonight. I want to commend Counsel Ragucci and Counsel Pascale, I think they took the concerns and thoughts that both Legislator Ronk and I expressed and did a very good job of coming to a conclusion.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk, did I see your hand up?

Legislator Ronk

No, but, you know, hearing, hearing the explanation from both Nick and Chris, and Legislator Heppner's comments, now, I'd be comfortable moving forward on these changes. Again, you know, to echo what John said, I really appreciate the hard work that Nick and Chris put into this. I think that, you know, it was, it was a challenge to begin with because this sort of came to us as a surprise. But I think that we were able to work together to, you know, address some of the County Attorney's concerns, while still not, you know, eliminating the intent of the Human Rights Commission. So with that said, I'd be, I'd be comfortable moving forward.

Chairwoman Bartels

Deputy Executive Rider

Deputy Executive Rider

Yeah, I just wanted to clarify one thing, just to make sure we're all on the same page. In the first section, when we say "but shall not exercise any powers duties or obligations outside of General Municipal Law 12 D, or the Ulster County Human Rights Protection Act of 2018," that we are encompassing anything else. Otherwise, in this law, I mean, so the original law had set forth that only 12 D, that, that the Human Rights Commission could not deal with anything outside of 12 D. But had otherwise added in other areas that the Commission could deal with. And now we're just kind of, so there was some recommendations by the County Attorney to, to change that a little bit more drastically. Now, it looks like we're saying can be outside of 12 D or this law, and as long as everybody's on the same page with that, then I'm good.

Legislator Ronk

So if I could jump in madam chair?

Chairwoman Bartels

Um, yeah, you may. [inaudible]

Commissioner Quigley

They're playing [inaudible]

Legislator Ronk

So just to, to answer Marc's point on that. It was my understanding, and the attorneys can, you know, correct me if I'm wrong, but it was my understanding that that was written very specifically that the Commissioners, the Human Rights Commission, could not exercise powers outside of 12 D. But that's why we created, that's why we created the Administrative Hearing Officer, which would handle the non 12 D portions, including fines and whatnot. That was what I understand. And, and we sort of came to an agreement, I thought with the County Attorney's office on that.

Minority Counsel Pascale

Yeah. If I can interject Ken? I can just give you my recollection of that. Yeah, it's that that language was, I believe, proposed by the Assistant County Attorney that was handling this issue at the time. We all, I think, unanimously approved it. And the intent is, is exactly as Ken described. Which is to permit the commission to function as it's intended to function. And to have whatever other authority might need to be delegated to the ALJ or to the commission, frankly, that's outlined in this law to be to be exercised, and not beyond that. So I think that's, that's the intent. And that's how it's currently worded.

Chairwoman Bartels

Counselor Ragucci? Did you want to add anything?

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

No, my recollection is exactly as reflected by Minority Counsel and Leader Ronk.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, so it appears that there's comfort, it appears that there's comfort all around. I can say, I'd like to echo Legislator Heppner's comments, and thank both Counsel Ragucci and Counsel Pascale for their work with the County Attorney's office. I am also comfortable moving forward with this now. So does anyone have any other comments?

Legislator Ronk

Um, I, I've got ...

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk

... just one comment, and then we can discuss it. You know, I know that Legislator Donaldson has a local law in as well. Would it make sense for us to try to incorporate what he has into this? Or would it be easier just to do them both separately? It doesn't matter to me. I just wanted to put that as a point of discussion.

Chairwoman Bartels

I'm just going to respond to that. And then I'll open it to other comments, but because it's before us as two separate resolutions, I'd be inclined, I think the most expeditious would be to move them forward separately. If that's the way we're going to go rather than try to consolidate right before us actively in a meeting, but I'll open it to the floor. Chair Donaldson

Chairman Donaldson

Well, let's ask Counsel. Would that be a problem? Because I think if you could combine them that it becomes one combined human rights law. So I don't, you know. It may be a little easier way to deal with it, but I don't know what it, I'd like to defer to you know, Nick and Chris?

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

I think, I'm sorry.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah, I'll let Legislative Counsel answer. I mean, I think it will be one law regardless whether it's amended in two separate portions, but I'll let, I'll let Legislative Counsel answer.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

So that is my understanding, too. I mean, if we do amend it in a subsequent law, it would be part and parcel of the same law itself. But with that said, you could make an amendment to this law, obviously, we'd have to ensure the formatting and numbers and, and the paragraphs made sense. And comported with the current number sequence, as set forth in the, in the present local law before us. So I think we could do it either way, we could do it in two parts, or we could amend it now and then have it all as one.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Heppner?

Legislator Heppner

I'd just say, I totally understand the question. It doesn't really matter one way or the other to me, I just think administratively, and for tonight's purposes, it may just be easier to pass this as is, and then work off the next local law. And just like Counselor Ragucci said, and then we start getting into sections and subsections. And I think administratively would just be easier.

Chairwoman Bartels

Deputy ...

Legislator Ronk

I'm fine with that, I was just, you know, I was just posing the question. I'm comfortable either way, it doesn't matter to me.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, Deputy Executive Rider.

Deputy Executive Rider

My only concern is, I mean, as long as the other piece of legislation has support. I think what's in front of us right now has strong support from both caucuses to move forward. And the County Attorney's office has seen this worked, we've worked months now on it, I just would not want to jeopardize passage of this by adding in something. But I don't, we don't care either way Really?

Chairman Donaldson

Well we, I think maybe we should bring, I don't know if you bring that up with the resolution that the second resolution? If we can have a discussion on that quickly. I mean, does that make sense? Or we could still do it all separate? That's fine, too. I'm, I'm fine with that. I just thought it might be cleaner, if you have one Law put out. But having said that, sometimes, sometimes we get a little dirty.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah, I mean, I'm gonna say I think it would be cleaner not to hold two public hearings. I just don't, I don't know how effectively we're going to be able to do it right now, during this meeting. If Counsel thinks that by the end of this meeting, they can give us one document that has everything, with everything contained in it. I'm totally comfortable passing it as one. I can also just say that personally, I would like to see both of these off our agenda tonight. I would like to move both of these tonight. They've been here a long time. So I want to do that in the way that's most effective and expeditious. I don't want to spend a lot of time trying to do, consolidate if that can be done easily I'm good with it.

Legislator Ronk

Let's just move them separately.

Legislator Heppner

I concur

Chairman Donaldson

Let's move this first one and then let's go into the other one. And then if we feel that it works, maybe Counsel can take a look at it. And if we feel it works, we could always come back. So I would say let's move this one first.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. On the resolution then. Resolution Number 300 of 2020. All in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed? Passes unanimously. Okay, moving on. Resolution Number 425 of 2020. Setting a Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law Number 15 of 2020. A Local Law Amending Article XXX of the Ulster County Charter and ArticleXXX of the Ulster County Administrative Code to eliminate the term limit imposed on commissioners to be held on Tuesday, March 16, 2021. At 7:05pm.

Legislator Ronk

I'm move it for discussion.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you

Legislator Heppner

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

That was Ronk and Heppner. Chair Donaldson

Chairman Donaldson

Yes, I'd like to make a, a compromise amendment in that it would be instead of removing totally changing it to four consecutive three year terms.

Legislator Heppner

I'll move it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, so that will, that was ...

Legislator Heppner

Second it, sorry.

Chairwoman Bartels

Moved by Donaldson, seconded by Heppner. So on the amendment now. Maybe Jay can we put that up just to see exactly where what the language, proposed language is? We'd have to change the title too. So would, it would no longer be to eliminate the term limits. It would be to extend the term?

Chairman Donaldson

Or change it

Legislator Heppner

Can we just say amend?

Chairwoman Bartels

Amend? That's fine.

Chairman Donaldson

Yeah. It works

Chairwoman Bartels

Amend the term limit imposed on commissioners. So Jay, we would change, eliminate to amend. Good suggestion, Legislator Heppner, and we scroll down. Okay, so that, read in Section 2, Article B, where the last line is stricken, it would change to no member of the commission of human rights shall serve more than four consecutive terms of three years. Is that, is that the proposal? Chair Donaldson?

Legislator Ronk

Correct

Chairman Donaldson

Yes. Yes.

Chairwoman Bartels

Two changes to four. Jay, do you have that?

Chairman Donaldson

That way it corresponds with us and the Executive.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Any comments on this amendment? And, and, and the resolution? Well, let's do the amendment. First. Any comments on the amendment?

Legislator Heppner

Totally good with it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Member Ronk

Legislator Ronk

Thanks. I just wanted to commend Legislator Donaldson, for coming to the table was what I think is a really good compromise. I think it leaves intact the intention of the, of the, you know, human rights taskforce, you know, and allows folks to serve a little bit longer if they need to. So I just want to thank Dave for being willing to compromise.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, seeing no other comments on the amendment. All in favor?

Committee Members

Aye

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed? Passes unanimously. Okay, so on the resolution, as amended. Comments?

Chairman Donaldson

Move it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Donaldson moves it.

Legislator Ronk

It's already been moved and seconded. We just need to vote.

Chairman Donaldson

That's true. That's true.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. All in favor of the Resolution as amended?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed? Passes unanimously. Okay. Now, would the, if the Attorneys think so, would that be easy to amend the others? Since it's both they both have the unanimous support and do as one public hearing?

Legislator Ronk

I think having two public hearings now that we've passed them both separately is the wise way to go.

Legislator Heppner

Yeah. And aren't they stacked on top of, essentially on top of each other? Correct?

Chairman Donaldson

Okay, that's fine with me

Deputy Executive Rider

One amends the Charter and the Administrative Code and the other one that just amends the Human Rights Law as well

Legislator Heppner

Yeah, it's cleaner to have two.

Chairman Donaldson

Okay, I'm good.

Chairwoman Bartels

Leave it as is. It took a long time to get here. So thank you all for that.

Chairman Donaldson

I don't want to screw, I don't want to screw it up.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, so moving on. Resolution Number 6, Adopting Proposed Local Law number 13 of 2020 A Local Law amending the Ulster County Charter, Local Law Number 2 of 2006. And amending the Administrative Code for the county of Ulster Local Law Number 10 of 2008 To further clarify, departmental agency office or unit estimates. Can I have a ...

Legislator Ronk

I'll move it for discussion

Chairwoman Bartels

Moved by Ronk

Legislator Heppner

Second

Chairwoman Bartels

Seconded by Heppner. Okay, on, on the resolution Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk

Thanks, this was postponed in Ways and Means I believe it's going to be postponed again, to a special meeting. I think that this committee should postpone it until our next meeting or take no action. If that's the best legal route to go. I will tell you that I've got serious concerns about the transfer tax. I think that you know, people pay a mortgage tax when they buy their house, they pay mortgage tax when they refinance, their house ...

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk

... they pay property taxes.

Chairwoman Bartels

We're not talking about the transfer tax. I don't know if ...

Legislator Ronk

Oh. Sorry

Legislator Heppner

We're talking about the budget estimate.

Chairwoman Bartels

... budget estimates

Legislator Ronk

As you can see, I'm driving I apologize This was also postponed in Ways and Means that's why I got confused. It's the postponement committee in Ways and Means sometimes but you know, I, I think that we should postpone this one. Because I think that we should give the County Attorney's office a chance to come to the table with their concerns. I know that the Deputy County Executives have given us, they've given us some verbal, you know, concerns that they have legally about it, but I've not seen anything from the County Attorney. I know that my Counsel does not necessarily agree with the arguments have been made. And I would like to see what the County Attorney has to say on it before we move forward, personally.

Chairwoman Bartels

Does anyone else want to ...

Legislator Ronk

This was also postponed in Ways and Means

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes. Chair Donaldson

Chairman Donaldson

Yeah, I think also the idea that we, we need to consider the idea of making this cleaner with a another public hearing because of the, you know, the way it was titled, and I think we need to make sure that that's clean.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes, so I agree with that. I've had some conversation with Counsel today. I also spoke with the Legislative Clerk's office on this. What I, what I would like to propose is, and I think it might satisfy some of Legislator Ronk's concerns in terms of allowing the Executive's Office time, and the County Attorney's office time to, to prepare responses is to effectively allow for another public hearing. Which would be advertised with the correct title. And I'm going to ask Legislative Counsel to discuss how we would go about doing that. I know that both councils had discussion today.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Sure. So obviously, you know, while we don't believe necessarily that the title issue would require a second public hearing, out of an abundance of caution, we can simply amend the title to, to incorporate the new title as set forth in our package. And we can also amend the cover resolution, striking out the current language and submitting language that basically sets March 9th, at 6:15, as a public hearing date for the local law, as amended tonight. We would then be permitted to submit under a normal resolution with the amended local law before the deadline at the end of the month, this local law for consideration next session. Subsequent, of course, to the public hearing on the 9th.

Chairwoman Bartels

So for clarification, we'd be amending this resolution to be setting the public hearing for March 9 at 6:15. And the, the, we would we would submit the identical resolution that's contained, the local law that's contained in this packet for consideration next month. I saw Chair Donaldson's hand.

Chairman Donaldson

Yes, I mean, I think that solves all the problems. And we move forward. We have a public hearing, and we'll have that discussion at that point. And I think making it a little cleaner, I realized that the, the attorneys feel that we can get away with, shall we say, and I don't like to use that terminology. But that's what popped into my head, by having the title a little wrong. But I think, you know, I think common sense tells us maybe we should make sure the title is right, and then just move forward on that. It makes it a lot cleaner. So I would support that. I would support moving into a new public hearing that also deals with Legislator Ronk's position that like a postponement, they have a full month to deal with whatever they want and be able to present that and actually present it at the public hearing, or present before us.

Chairwoman Bartels

I saw Clerk Mahler, did you have your finger up there?

Deputy Clerk Mahler

It when, when, if and when there's a motion to amend the resolution to reflect the public hearing language, if someone could just please also include the language to adopt the, with the local law as amended as presented.

[multiple speakers]

Chairwoman Bartels

You mean change the title to setting a public hearing to ...

Deputy Clerk Mahler

The title of the actual local, proposed local law

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes. Oh, okay. Yes. Okay. So let's, let's first things. First things first. Can I have a motion to amend the title of the local law, as presented here to further ... Is it still

Chairman Donaldson

I'll make that, I'll make that motion

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah, to further clarify departmental agency, office, or unit estimates

Legislator Heppner

Second.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, on the amendment. For the title, this is just, we're just talking about amending the title at this point of the local law. Any, any comment? Legislative Counsel I think has a comment

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Sorry to interject there is, there is a second amendment just to reflect a, Clerk of the Legislature under Section 1. I think it's said Clerk of the County originally, so we would like to make that amendment as well.

Chairman Donaldson

I made that amendment.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. So we'll make it all one amendment. Okay. Okay, so withdraw the first the second amendment is to include both changes as reflected in the document. Any, any other comments on the amendment before us right now? All in favor of the amendment before us? Aye?

Committee Members

Aye

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed? Okay. So now, the second amendment we would be considering would be changing this to setting a public hearing on did you say March 9th at 6:15?

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

That's correct.

Chairman Donaldson

I'll make that amendment.

Legislator Heppner

I'll second.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Discussion on that Legislative Counsel.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

If I could just add pursuant to Clerk Mahler's suggestion, and it was a good one. We should note that in the title, the local law would be as amended.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Correct? All right.

Chairman Donaldson

Well, that's a technical amendment. I don't think we need to do it. But if you want I'll make that amendment.

Legislator Heppner

I say we do it.

Chairwoman Bartels

I say we do it.

Chairman Donaldson

Alright, I'll make that amendment.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Thank you. Do I, and I have a second from Heppner? I'll get you. I'll get you Legislator Ronk, let's just make this other technical amendment to include, as amended. All in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk

Thanks, you know, on changing this to setting a public hearing from March, you know, I don't know why we would take that step and put this back to the public again, before we hear from the County Attorney's office. If this needs referendum, as the County Executive's office has asserted, then we would need another public hearing after this one, if we need to insert a referendum. So I don't know why we wouldn't postpone this for a month. And then, you know, get the County Attorney's opinion that our attorneys can dissect and agree or disagree with and discuss with them, and then send it to public hearing. I'll be right back. As you guys ponder that for a moment.

Chairwoman Bartels

Any, any comments on that I actually do have a comment, even though Ken has left the virtual room for, for a moment. So if no one else has a comment, I can say that speaking personally, I do not feel comfortable postponing this indefinitely. This passed unanimously, moving it to a public hearing. The Executive's office definitely knew what was in the packet. We've been discussing this for months. So there was every and ample opportunity to bring concerns to the floor. And I expect we're finally we are going to see those concerns potentially in writing. But the fact that we haven't seen them in writing up until this point, to me is not a reason to, to wait many additional months. So speaking to the to the members of the committee, I feel very comfortable. Allowing for, as the Chair said, the opportunity for any member of the public and as Deputy Executive Rider pointed out at the meeting last night, any member of the public who might have only read the title rather than reading the full document and thereby missed a chance to comment.

I feel comfortable righting, righting that error. And taking the time even though we're being told by counsel, we do not need to, taking the time to have a second hearing on the same, on the same law. But I personally do not feel comfortable pushing this off for what could very well be three months. If we wait a month and then next, next month, set a public hearing and then set another public hearing. This discussion has been on the table, in fact, for my entire legislative career, so I don't, I don't know how everybody else feels.

Chairman Donaldson

I'm good with that.

Legislator Heppner

I'm good with it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Where is Ken? I think he's coming back.

Legislator Ronk

I'm back.

Chairwoman Bartels

I don't know if you heard anything we said. Or if you have any other comments?

Legislator Ronk

I did. You know, and this is with all due respect to you Madam Chair. I and my phone just fell.

Chairwoman Bartels

We can still hear you

Legislator Ronk

Hold on. Okay. Well I will tell you this. I mean, we have pushed off local laws that I have sponsored for years, after years. And, you know, and, you know, mostly because of, you know, concerns from yourself and, and others on the Democratic side, you know, I, I'm going to vote no tonight, and I'll vote no on the floor. If it turns out that we're going to move forward with a public hearing on this that, again, is not, you know, is not going to be the final public hearing. I don't believe that the County Attorney's concerns are going to be allayed with changing the title. I think that that is the most ridiculous argument I've ever heard from the Executive's office and from the County Attorney's office since I've been a Legislator. That the, that, that there was a type, there was a clerical error in the title of the resolution, nothing else was wrong, nothing, you know, and, and the body of the local law was, was correct. You know, I think that changing that and going back to a public hearing, when that's the, the most minor of all of the concerns that have been levied against the law, I think is is malpractice on the part of the Legislature.

Chairwoman Bartels

I have Legislator Heppner and then Counsel Ragucci.

Legislator Heppner

Yeah, I mean, I'm just gonna say that I'm comfortable with it. If the Executive, I mean, this change of title was clearly requested by the Executive's office in Ways and Means, you know, this, you know, to try and play fair, you know, and, you know, go through the whole process again, you know, I'm okay with it, because I just want to get it done. Because, again, this passed unanimously in June, the Executive had a chance then to veto it, especially if they thought that it had to go to referendum. But, you know, I'm confident, I totally understand Ken's frustration. But again, I'm just confident with it move, moving forward.

Chairwoman Bartels

Counsel Ragucci.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Sure, and I won't speak to Legislator Ronk's point, other than with respect to the referendum issue. You know, I've looked into this since we had our discussions yesterday, where the Deputy County Executive made mention of their concern. I've also reviewed Charter Section C-33, along with other sections relevant to the analysis. And I don't think in my opinion, that it's even close. There is no referendum needed, nor is there a transfer of power.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

And I think all we need to refer to Section C-33, where it makes plain that the information we are seeking is, and are, public records. There is no transfer of power, when we are seeking what the public is already entitled to see in plain reading. So I don't think it's even close to be honest.

Chairwoman Bartels

I have Deputy Executive Rider and then Legislator Ronk, I see your hand.

Deputy Executive Rider

I just want to raise that. Yes, we did raise the title issue yesterday. But I think that Deputy Milgrim also raised other issues that we have with the local law. One of which is we do believe this changes, shifts the power from the Executive to have the department's give the Executive the estimates in the form and shape that they request, and then us submit them in our budget. This law is actually saying that we have to do that by July. And so for, to say that, that that's not shifting power. I, I would fully disagree.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

Can I respond?

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, and then I have Legislator Ronk.

Legislative Counsel Ragucci

And I, certainly understand the Deputy's point. However, again, C-33 makes plain there is no timetable established by the charter. I as a private citizen of the county can file a FOIL request today and demand these records, whether they exist or not at the time is irrelevant. I can request them, and I'm entitled to see them. I could commence an article 78 and cite Section C-33. And a judge would say yes, give him the records. For the Legislature to be precluded or in some way restricted. It would be, would be, you know, not based upon a sound reading of the charter

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Can I respond to that, please?

Chairwoman Bartels

I have Legislator Ronk next and then, then I see you Deputy Executive Milgrim. You're after Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk

Milgrim can go first, I'm fine with that. If you're fine with it, Chairwoman.

Chairwoman Bartels

If you, if you want to defer. Deputy Executive Milgrim, you may go.

Legislator Ronk

I'll defer to Deputy Executive because it's probably about that issue. So I don't want to, I don't want to confuse issues.

Deputy Executive Milgrim

I'll be brief on the FOIL issue, there is case law directly on point to this pretty much exact question. That will be part of the analysis that's provided by the County Attorney, which will reflect pretty much everything we've been saying for the last couple of hearings. I also want to put on record during this, that what was passed unanimously was a move to put this before a public hearing, not to the merits of what's actually contained in the law. So there was some commentary that this was passed unanimously. What was passed unanimously was to bring this measure before the public to allow them to have their say on this, but not want it to be abundantly clear. It was not passed unanimously that the merits were supported by the Legislature. By the county government.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, thank you. Legislator Ronk. Legislator Ronk, you might be frozen.

Legislator Heppner

He appears frozen.

Legislator Ronk

How about now?

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah, you're back.

Legislator Ronk

Good. All right. Sorry. I just want to go on record agreeing with everything that Counsel Ragucci said. I, I do not believe whatsoever this is a transfer of power. You know, I don't believe it needs a referendum. I personally, would be more apt [inaudible]

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk. We're having some connectivity issues. [inaudible] Legislator Ronk. We lost you

Legislator Ronk

... budget estimates that are given by the department to the County Executive. How about now?

Chairwoman Bartels

No, you, you have to back up. We can hear you now. But we, we did not, we were not able to understand anything you said. We did ...

Legislator Ronk

Can you hear me now?

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes. And I can tell you that we heard you, that you agreed with Counselor Ragucci that you don't believe it's a transfer of power. But then everything else was, became very...

Legislator Ronk

I don't believe it, I don't. I agree there's not a transfer of power. I don't think that it needs a referendum. And, you know, I, I just again, I don't support moving forward with a public hearing when it's entirely possible, we're going to need another public hearing afterwards. I think that, you know, these things are, it's an important issue. And I think that we should move forward on it. You know, without confute, without further confusing the public. Let's just say that if the County Executive's office is correct, in that we may have confused the public with the original public hearing, why are we then going to go through another public hearing with just the title changed, if there are substantive changes that might happen? It doesn't make any earthly sense to me.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, I can tell, if I don't see any other hands, I spoke with the sponsor. The sponsor is, you know, among other things, is concerned about the timeliness of this and about the need to move this forward in a timely manner. I would echo that concern in terms of the budget cycle. And if we delay this, waiting for the next, waiting a month and then waiting a month to set a public hearing, we're looking at three or four months. I'm perfectly comfortable moving forward with this. We, we have been discussing this for an extended period of time and the Executive's office has had the opportunity to put its concerns in writing for months before this and hasn't, so I'm expecting we're going to see something in writing but I'm comfortable with moving this forward as presented. I have Chair Donaldson, Legislator Gavaris, and then did I see Deputy Executive Milgrim, or no, Legislator Ronk?

Chairman Donaldson

Let Legislator Gavaris go first. he hasn't spoken yet.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris

Thank you. I, this is I guess, through the Chair to Legislator Ronk. I'm guessing I'm losing my, the thought here because I thought your objection was that this potentially would require referendum, but now you're conceding that it won't. What substantive change would happen, that would require an additional public hearing? I, maybe I missed it, or I'm not following you.

Legislator Ronk

Can I answer that, madam Chair?

Chairwoman Bartels

You may.

Legislator Gavaris

My concern is that this would need another ref, what would, if this needs a referendum, as the County Attorney's, as the County Attorney's office, allegedly is going to put in writing for us, then we would need to go back to public hearing again. So if let's say, let's say the County Attorney's office brings sufficient evidence that it needs a referendum, it would then need another public hearing after the following public hearing, which would completely you know, you know, eliminate the sponsor's concern of timeliness and speediness. Because then we would be another extra month behind.

Legislator Gavaris

Correct me if I'm wrong, but keeping the public hearing for next month, the worst that happens is we open it, we there's no, no, nothing going to happen. Because it's, it's, it's irrelevant at that point, because it does require a referendum. And then we just move forward with the second public hearing, like you're saying, to create a referendum. We didn't lose anything by doing it that way.

Legislator Ronk

You lose a month, because we're now going to set in February, we're going to set a public hearing for March. Right. We have the public hearing. The next resolution deadline is for April. In April, we would pass the resolution creating another public hearing for May.

Legislator Gavaris

Why would we do that? Why wouldn't the referendum be discovered? Well, before March? Why wouldn't we discover it before the March public hearing?

Legislator Ronk

I mean, the County Attorney's office doesn't have to give us documents until they, you know, until they want to, or you know, and, and sometimes these legal opinions, take a while to craft and then we need time for our attorneys to go through precedent. And look at the opinions. It's, it's not an overnight thing. With deadlines, noticing, and deadlines for you know introducing legislation, it could very well be that we're not passing a new pub, a new resolution to create a public hearing until April.

Legislator Gavaris

That makes zero sense. We literally have a month, over a month before we would need to, the resolution deadline. They're over a month away.

Chairman Donaldson

And we already asked ...

Legislator Ronk

Incorrect

Chairwoman Bartels

Wait, let's not have, I don't know about this back and forth. So Legislator Gavaris, did you want to finish? Okay, Chair Donaldson.

Chairman Donaldson

Yeah, I mean, I'm not. I, like Legislator Gavaris, I'm not quite following you on this Ken because if we postpone this as is, and without a public hearing, we're still postponing it a month. And if we put, instead we do this tonight and make a public hearing with the fix, which we all agree should not have been written that way. And we may agree that that did, was not egregious enough to throw it out. But it could be if it goes before a court. And somebody says, well, you had this listed on it, but that really wasn't the law. So I mean, so we could address that. And we address your issue of postponing by postponing, but actually postponing it to a public hearing with the fix written in it. I think that certainly makes sense. Because then you're not using up time. You're doing the exact same thing that you're requesting with a postponement, but you're actually having a public hearing and cleaning up this little piece.

Chairwoman Bartels

I have Legislator Ronk but I just saw Legislator Roberts' hand go up. Ken, I'm gonna let him go if that's okay Legislator Ronk, since he hasn't spoken yet?

Legislator Ronk

At your pleasure, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you.

Legislator Roberts

Thank you, Legislator Ronk. I agree that a referendum is not needed. That seems like the majority of people here agree on that point. I don't know if this is a compromise or not, but can't we pass this tonight and maybe push back the public hearing date a couple of weeks to give the County Attorney a chance to look at it?

Chairman Donaldson

They've had ample time.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah

Legislator Roberts

I agree with that, too.

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah, I mean, we did have, I mean, that's another thing I want to bring up. We did have a public hearing on this. I mean, I haven't heard that the county the Deputy County Executive mentioned the error in the title as being a hindrance particularly to the public but I'm assuming that the County Executive's office read the resolutions and read and knew that this was before us during our last public hearing and, and yet we didn't get anything in writing or any concerns expressly written from the County Executive's office. I know that concerns have been voiced consistently since this has been brought up over, you know, the course of many months.

Chairwoman Bartels

But we had a public hearing on this and didn't, didn't receive anything in writing from the Executive's office. So I too, am struggling with how, I think this compromise of change, of setting another public hearing to correct the title allows the time to get responses in writing from the Executive's office, should they choose to do so. And to anyone from the public who may have missed the opportunity. It also allows us the opportunity to move it forward. Should there be nothing compelling, brought forward next, at the next caucus? So now I have Legislator Gavaris and then Deputy Executive Milgrim.

Legislator Gavaris

Madam Chairwoman do correct me if I'm wrong, but last night, my recollection was that the deputies had asserted that the County Attorneys felt that this was a challenge to the powers of the Executive. And so if that determination has been verbally made, my I'm assuming that was made based on them reading the Resolution, and what was in the law. So they made that verbal statement, the party investigated, then they can turn that verbal answer into a written one, and send it back to us. I don't see where a month is going to be needed for something that it sounds like they've already done.

Chairman Donaldson

You're gonna get a [inaudible]

Chairwoman Bartels

It's a fair point I'm sorry, Deputy Executive Milgrim. I jumped the line for Legislator Ronk who had taken his turn and given it to Legislator Roberts. Legislator Ronk, and then I'll come back to you Deputy Executive Milgrim.

Legislator Ronk

Yeah, thanks. I mean, just to Legislator Gavaris' point. You know, I've served in the Legislature for too long to believe that they're going to give us an opinion in the next couple of days. It's not been my experience, I don't understand how anybody who served in the Legislature, you know, for as long as either Dave or Tracey or myself or Kevin has, believes that the County Attorney's office is going to be able to turn a I think that it needs a referendum into and here's the precedent showing you that you need a referendum and a couple of days. Especially when I don't believe set precedent exists. So they're gonna have to look pretty hard.

You know, and I just I want to go back to what, you know, what the Chairwoman Bartels said a couple of times and, and, and, you know, talked about Legislator Archer, who is a sponsor desiring to move fast on this, you know, it's been a real concern of mine over the last three years, that it seems like every time there's a member of the Democratic Caucus, who has a local law that they want moved, there is some sort of unseen or un, you know, like unexpected urgency that comes with it, you know, whereas when Republicans, members of the Republican Caucus, have put in local laws, you know, over the years, you know, we we have lots of concerns and questions, and we really need to vet them. I'm really getting sick and tired of the double standard that exists with, with respect to urgency when folks have questions or concerns. You know, it's been it's been really prevalent over the last couple of years, and I just, I feel the need, on behalf of my members to voice that I see a really pronounced double standard with respect to urgency when folks have questions or concerns.

Chairwoman Bartels

And before I go to Deputy Executive Milgrim, I'm going to have to respond to that and say, terms of the urgency to this issue. It has to do with the budget cycle, not partisan politics. I respectfully disagree with your comments. But ...

Legislator Ronk

I expected you to

Chairwoman Bartels

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Yes. Hi, thank you. Again, respectfully to put on record however, we have from the Executive's office, both myself and Deputy Executive Ryder repeatedly expressed concerns about this legislation expressed concerns about it, transferring power from the Executive to the Legislature. Expressed concerns about it's, frankly, the read of the charter that is being conducted by the sponsor of the legislation. We have expressed it succinctly we've done it clearly we've, you know, if you want specific sites of law, happy to do that. But our expressions verbally, are not conducted in a vacuum. They are conducted with the background of multiple years in government as well as consultations with the County Attorney's office.

So some reference to nothing coming from the County Attorney to this point, I think is a little miss, misleading, and, frankly, insulting when it's the County Deputy Executive's who are expressing the position of, frankly, the county Executive's office. Nobody has asked for backup documentation from the County Attorney on this at this point. I'm hearing it now we're happy to provide it, I can assure you, it will reflect exactly what I've been saying and exactly what Deputy county Executive Marc Rider's has been saying. But to say that nothing has come from the County Attorney, while we have repeatedly been expressing our concerns over this proposal is, frankly, insulting to us.

Chairwoman Bartels

And if I can respond, since I'm the one who probably said the comments that you are insulted by, I mean, no insult, the matter of fact is we had a public hearing. And if, if there were concerns that were to be expressed by the County Attorney's office at some point between that public hearing, and this point, or at some point from introduction to the public hearing, it would have been nice to have received any concerns from the County Attorney's office in a format that our attorneys could respond to it. Now we're talking about holding off this for potentially what's being raised by one member is holding it off for another month to wait for written responses from the County Attorney's office, which the County Attorney this has been on, this has been on our agenda now for several months. So on the, the week before passage to suggest that now we have to wait another month. I just think, I think is insulting. I now have Legislator Ronk, Legislator Roberts, Legislator, Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Ronk

Thanks. Just in response to Deputy Executive Milgrim. You know, again, I don't think anybody's intending to be insulting or to hurt anybody's feelings here. My comments about written opinions are that, that is how legal opinions are delivered in, you know, legislative Executive disputes over things is that the County Attorney puts their concerns in writing, citing, you know, relevant state statute and precedent. And then our attorneys have an opportunity to research said precedent and find out it's A validity, and B applicability. And that hasn't been afforded to our attorneys thus far. So far, you know, due respect to you and Deputy Executive Rider, everything that you said is conjecture until the attorneys weigh in with, with, with specificity.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Roberts and then Chair Donaldson.

Legislator Roberts

Yes, through the Chair to Deputy Executive Milgrim. How long will it take the County Attorney to put their thoughts, thoughts into writing?

Deputy Executive Milgrim

I will work with the County Attorney's office to try to get you an answer on that pretty quickly. I know they're a little short staffed and, frankly, overwhelmed with a couple of current matters. But I would imagine. Well, just for conversations sake, if I may, Madam Chair. Is it, I mean, we can go ahead with a public hearing if let's say because March 9 is, what, two weeks, three weeks away? If I can assure that it's there before the next legislative session will that suffice?

Chairman Donaldson

Four weeks

Chairwoman Bartels

March 9 is a month away Deputy Milgrim.

Deputy Executive Milgrim

I can push them to try to get that done. If the next legislative session ends up being, like let's say, a week before the next Legislative, well, that would be March 9, right?

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes. It would need to be before the Legislative Session because any comments considered would be considered the intent would be that the comments [inaudible] during that and if nothing, so the sooner the better. Because again, this is, I have Legislator, so Legislator Roberts, are you?

Legislator Roberts

I'm good with that.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Chair Donaldson.

Chairman Donaldson

Well, I mean, we've had two public hearing. And I understand that, you know, the Deputy Executive's have voiced their opinions on it, but like Legislator Ronk points out. They are, they're nice to hear and gives us thought. But we can operate on that. We have to be, we operate on the written word, because that's what, that's how it works. And yet the argument comes after the written word, but there's been ample time and putting a public hearing in March 9, gives even more ample time. So to me, it's if they don't want to put it in writing, it's to their own peril. The way I kind of look at it. I don't like it, you know, I mean to that aspect, but I don't want to make it an us and them thing. But I believe that we feel that this information should be shared. And that's about all there is to it. And in order to do that, it should be done in a manner that makes sense in the matter, then the title should be cleaned. So there is no ifs ands or buts about it.

Because I believe you would have a suit if you don't go before it. And you say, hey, you did a public hearing. And it this is what it said the title, but this is what it actually did. Well, I mean, you have to have some, you have a legal argument there. So to me lets clean it up, have a new public airing, that's also postponing it at the same time. And it gives ample time to get whatever information and then if we need to have another one, then we'd have another one. I mean, that's if we need to postpone longer then we knew that. But if we don't need to, we won't have to have so I mean, I just think that this is the best route, makes the most sense. We can still could continue discussing it. And it begins to move forward and we get this off our plate.

Chairwoman Bartels

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Sure if I may. Yes, I'm, I'm happy to get a memo from County Attorney to this, to this legislation. And to get it to you in writing. I think it's just the date matter. I don't think the 9th should be a problem. Does it work if it's like within, like that week right before the 9th or do we need it, I'm just hesitant ...

Legislator Ronk

Not to go to that public hearing it doesn't

Deputy Executive Milgrim

... to go to public hearing.

Chairman Donaldson

It doesn't, it doesn't matter. It's really up to you if that's what you want to do.

Chairwoman Bartels

I would say the sooner the better. I mean, the sooner the better.

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Alright, fair enough.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Roberts.

Legislator Roberts

Yeah, I'd like to see that written report by February 16. That's what we have Session. So we could postpone if we have to the public hearing, or put it, postpone it. That will give, that would give pretty much one week to get their written report.

Deputy Executive Milgrim

Actually, two days one day. It's a floater holiday on Friday, it's a holiday on Monday.

Chairwoman Bartels

Is that what you were gonna say? Deputy Executive Rider?

Deputy Executive Rider

No. But, you know, I just want to bring up one point. I mean, so John and I are here on behalf of the Executive's office. We've made a lot of arguments. The arguments that we've made are a lot of times policy based. You don't need a County Attorney's opinion to listen to policy based arguments. We're happy to get legal arguments from the County Attorney. I know in years past, the County Attorney has been criticized for weighing in too heavily on policy arguments. I think John and I have said many times that too, not only from a legal standpoint, but from a policy standpoint, just thinking about the voters and bringing in a Charter form of government that has the county Executive as the Chief Budgetary Officer and and having the budget process be in that Chief Budgetary Officer's hands that, that doing this from a policy perspective is mistaken, we believe. but we're happy to follow up with further legal arguments from the County Attorney as well.

Chairwoman Bartels

But, and Legislator Gavaris I see you, but again, I just want to clarify that, I think the main argument that we've been discussing is the transfers of power which is a, that's a legal argument. Legislator Gavaris and then Legislator Roberts

Legislator Heppner

Legislator Ronk has his hand up also, but it was blending in with a ceiling light.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Gavaris

Legislator Gavaris

That was my point exactly Legislator Bartels. Is that there's two issues here. The comments that have been offered by the deputies over, since meeting last night and today. Those comments are one thing, but the argument whether or not this violates the Charter is other, and that's the one we're specifically talking about now getting the opinion from the attorney. The rest of your arguments are perfectly valid and we understand them, we will take them into consideration. However, that's not a legal argument. So that's the ones that I'm more concerned with. And in terms of the timing goes, I guess I understand what Legislator Roberts was trying to do is to get it in before the Session.

Legislator Gavaris

But if we have the public hearing on in March, we just don't do anything there. If it turns out they hand to us March 2nd, and they say that, you know the County Attorneys say that it's, is a violation of the Charter, and then we have to have a referendum. It would just, you know, just take no action at all.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Roberts and then Legislator Ronk

Legislator Roberts

Yeah, I think the reason to have a public hearing approved today at a later date, it is a budgetary issue. It's only \$300. But \$300 is, you know, still \$300. And also I agree that, you know, as Deputy Executive Rider saying, I'm going to disagree that, you know, we're not arguing about the policy right now. We're arguing about the referendum, whether it's needed or not, and we all feel it's not needed. And in the past, with the previous administration, either county Executive Hein, or one of his Deputy Executive's would have made that argument to me on the phone, why I shouldn't be voting for this resolution. Instead of, you know, today at the meeting when we're all set to vote, and pass this Resolution.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you, Legislator Ronk.

Legislator Ronk

Yeah, thanks. Policy, policy concerns aside, I agree with everything that's been said about, about the the main concern right here being a legal one. My issue with holding this public hearing is that the most minor, and I think, bordering on the ridiculous, arguments of the Executive's office is the one that we're looking to fix, and then have another public hearing. There, there are much deeper, you know, founding document concerns that they've levied. Again, you know, I'm not going to change anybody's mind, I guess tonight, I I will not be supporting having another public hearing. I've seen this happen too many times. due respect to what you said about this being a budgetary issue for timeliness, and not a political issue. I'm sure that you don't see it as a political issue, Legislator Bartels.

But I can tell you that I, I believe with all of my, with all of my soul, that if this was a Republican issue, and the same concerns were being levied, we would need more information, and we would be postponing. But because this is a Legislator Archer resolution, we're going to rush into another public hearing. And fix and most minor bordering on the ridiculous concerns, and have another public hearing, waste more of the public's time, waste more of the public's money, and then end up with facing the same concerns the county Executive is already county Executive's office has already raised.

Chairwoman Bartels

Chair Donaldson

Chairman Donaldson

Ken, I really don't get your argument, it seems like a, kind of like pretzel logic here. Because you want to postpone it. So we aren't going to postpone it. But we're going to actually fix a minor problem that we think is minor, they think is major. But it makes things much more transparent, because we are fixing the title. But people do look at the title. Before they come in and they see a title, they may not read the rest of it. So I mean, I believe it's a minor argument. But it is a valid minor argument. And we can fix that with a public hearing. And we can fix the postponement, we're doing the exact same thing. So we're taking care of that postponement. And we're also fixing that minor situation. And we're also giving them ample time to weigh in on what their major issues were, in writing for us so we could address from that angle.

I mean, I don't understand your argument on that, or why you're so adamant about it. I understand you're, you know, you're frustrated when people postpone things that maybe the Republicans put up, but this thing has been postponed and postponed, and postponed also. And there is a budgetary issue with it. So I mean, to me, it makes sense.

Chairman Donaldson

Just do what we got to do and move on. And then, you know, get the information. And if we need to, we adjust, we readjust, but I don't know. I'm confused with your argument.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, Legislator...

Legislator Ronk

I don't know Dave, and I'm ...

Chairwoman Bartels

... wrapping this up soon. Legislator Ronk, go ahead.

Legislator Ronk

Yeah, thanks. I know that you're confused. Dave. I don't, I don't agree that this solves timeline issues better than a postponement would because we can fix all the problems if we if we [inaudible]. If not, we're gonna fix this problem that the county Executive's office has raised, and they have more. There may be Legislators who have things that they want changed, and then we're going to have to fix those afterwards and then have another public hearing. I, I'm a big proponent of fixing everything at once, rather than rather, rather than doing it in several public hearings. We've had one public hearing, we're going to have now if we do this another public hearing in March, we could end up with another public hearing in March, in April. And then, you know, I just I don't agree with doing it in this piecemeal setting, you may agree with it. And that's perfectly fine. I you know, whatever.

Chairman Donaldson

I don't, I don't agree that this is piecemeal. This unanimously passed the body. And it passed the body under the understanding of what was in the law, not what was in the title. So fixing the title certainly makes sense. And we do that while we are making a postponement. It just to me it kills two birds with one stone, we're still giving time, we're still doing that, which then, we're fixing a small piece that, I think and you know, I mean, can be a legal challenge ...

Legislator Ronk

No it can't

Chairman Donaldson

... because when you put a title up, I think that could be a legal challenge.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, Legislator Heppner. Thank you, Chair Donaldson. Thank you, Legislator Ronk. Go ahead Legislator Heppner.

Legislator Heppner

Yeah, I think, I mean, I understand parts of Legislator Ronk's statements regarding the public hearing, but you know, we already are, I think, I just personally don't agree that we should not have a public hearing. I think that we are 1. we're already having multiple public hearings that evening, and the format in which we're doing them is already going to be occurring. So I'm not worried about the budgetary cost. Since they are already occurring. I also, I do just want to state that there's nothing political about this. Nor has been any intention to purposely hold up members of the Republican caucus' legislation. I just flat out reject that. Right now, this month, the two bills that were postponed ...

Legislator Ronk

I'm sure you do

Legislator Heppner

Yes, I do Legislator Ronk, I just said so. And I can point to this month alone, two, the two resolution, the one resolution, the one local law that was postponed this month were both Democratic sponsors.

Legislator Heppner

Chairman Ronk, I mean, Chairman Donaldson, has had multiple recent resolutions and local laws postponed, and throughout the caucus, I often get yelled at by caucus members sometimes because they don't want things postponed. But that's just a reality. And I think people's efforts to ensure that there's support, and also that there's that the quality that people seek in the final result. So that's my statement.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Legislator Ronk. And then I'd really like to wrap up this conversation so we can get on, we do have guests here tonight.

Legislator Gavaris

Oh, well, forget it, then. If we want to wrap up the conversation, forget it.

Chairwoman Bartels

No, I said Legislator Ronk. And then I'd like to move toward wrapping up. Your hand was up. Go ahead, Legislator Ronk, I called on you.

Legislator Ronk

Alright, thanks. I appreciate it. You know, it's, and I totally respect Legislator Heppner's point of view on, you know, saying that he doesn't see anything political about it. But it's easy to not see anything political about it, when it's your pieces of legislation that are not being postponed over and over again, for concerns like this. And, you know, it's our caucus members, pieces of legislation that are being postponed. So I, I respect the fact that you don't see anything political about it. But it's hard to take that deep look inside, on what gets postponed and what doesn't. That having been said, you've got the majority, you're gonna do what you want to do.

Chairwoman Bartels

Would anyone else like to speak on this? Is that your hand Chair Donaldson?

Chairman Donaldson

Yes. I'm not, not sure. What are the specifics that he's talking about? I know, I don't know what was being postponed by Republicans put up and we kept postponing. I'm a little unsure of what they are.

Chairwoman Bartels

Is that a question to Legislator Ronk?

Chairman Donaldson

Yes. Yes. If Ken could give me those, I mean, I'd like to work with them to un-postpone them if that's the case. I mean, if it's a valid resolution...

Legislator Ronk

It's been a [inaudible]

Chairman Donaldson

... everybody knows I've voiced my opinion many times, I get very frustrated with postponements. I think we need to wrap things up and move on to the next so we can take care of other things. So I'd like to work with anybody to help that out. I mean, if that's the case.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk

Legislator Ronk

Yeah. I, I don't have an exhaustive list with me right now Legislator Donaldson, but I'd be more than happy to provide you with a list of resolutions that I've had questions or concerns about that your caucus, Legislator Bartels in particular, has worked very hard to push through over my objections, over my questions. And then I will provide you with a list of resolutions that I've wanted to move forward that have not been moved forward under your leadership and Legislator Bartels leadership, when when, you know, they've had questions, and I've wanted to move forward on them, or my caucus members, were comfortable with them, and your caucus members had questions on them. And, I'm, you know, again, I'll provide you that list if that, if that's actually going to accomplish anything. But, you know, again, you know, I feel like we're just twisting in the wind here. You know, Legislator Bartels is interested in moving is moving on this and not having any more discussion. So pretty much done.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk, the floor is still open. I have Legislator Gavaris and Legislator Roberts...

Chairman Donaldson

We've discussed it for over an hour. So I'm not sure ...

Chairwoman Bartels

I'm aware of it. And if Legislators still want to talk about it ...

Chairman Donaldson

No. I know that. I'm not sure how you consider we are rushing it.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Gavaris, the floor is yours.

Legislator Gavaris

Thank you. I'd like to make a motion to close debate and call the previous question.

Chairwoman Bartels

Respectfully, may I, I would like to just confirm that Legislator Roberts doesn't have anything else to add to the discussion.

Legislator Roberts

I do not have anything to add. But I'd like to make a note that I just received the text from Commissioner Quigley. He has to leave at 7:30.

Chairwoman Bartels

Oh, thank you. That's important information. Okay. All right. So on the previous question, then on the resolution, all those in favor of moving it as amended ...

Chairman Donaldson

And that is to a, that's into a public hearing?

Chairwoman Bartels

Yes. Setting a public hearing on March 9 at 6:15. And the changes that were also, the title change and the technical changes pointed out by Clerk Mahler.

Chairman Donaldson

Okay.

Chairwoman Bartels

All in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed?

Legislator Ronk

I'm opposed.

Chairwoman Bartels

Legislator Ronk opposed. Okay, Legislator, I mean, we have 15 minutes for Deputy, I mean, Commissioner Quigley. But let me see Resolution Number 58 Approving the execution of a contract for \$178,793 entered into by the county NTS data services, Information Services. Can I get someone to move it?

Legislator Heppner

I'll move it.

Chairman Donaldson

Second it

Chairwoman Bartels

Again, okay. And we have I see Karla Wainwright from Information Services here.

Karla Wainwright

Hello

Chairwoman Bartels

Hello, how are you?

Karla Wainwright

I'm well, how are you?

Chairwoman Bartels

I'm, we're doing well. Thank you for bearing with us.

Karla Wainwright

No problem.

Chairwoman Bartels

I don't know if anyone has any questions on the resolution. Maybe you could just give a couple minute like, take a minute or two just to quickly give everyone an explanation. And if there are no questions, then we'll move through it very quickly.

Karla Wainwright

Sure, so this is [inaudible] Board of Elections by Information Services, it's a three year agreement with NTS data services for the maintenance and support of their TEAM suite Voter Registration System. It's, it picks up where prior contract 2019-96 left off at the end of 2020. So it's effective date is the beginning of 2021. That's basically it. I think this new contract includes a new module that BOE will be participating in a beta program with the vendor for the

Karla Wainright (cont.)

petition module. They can probably speak to that in a little more detail. I don't know a lot about it. There, there, in exchange for their participation in the beta program, it's at no cost to the county.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, thank you. Maybe I'll hand it over to the Commissioners. If you want to talk about the beta program at all.

Commissioner Quigley

Yes, I can just build off of what Karla was talking about where, this is a three year contract. The beta program that we're entering into is in regards to the candidates' petition process. It will allow us to streamline and be able to post this information in a publicly available way so that individuals can track their information. Seeing that we are taking part in this program is also going to give us the opportunity to jump the queue, so to speak, when we have concerns with NTS over the functionality of some of the programs. So we will be able to get quicker response and be on top of things. On a more rapid method. I would like to say I'm not the most favorable toward NTS. And I, I think Ashley may voice same concerns, we may consider shopping for a new provider in three years at the end of this contract if things don't go too well. But that being said, they're crucial to right now and what we're doing, and for us to get through what we're doing in our cybersecurity grant, which is upgrading our server, etc. This is going to allow us to simply streamline things and stay in continuity, and in three years time, we'll be able to reevaluate how successful this has been.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. Commissioner Dittus, did you want to add to that?

Commissioner Dittus

I agree with everything that Commissioner Quigley said. I would just add that we'll be, part of the beta program is that we get new releases across the board on the suite platform, which is the module that we use with NTS. So we're excited to be first in line for those and to give the feedback. Whereas sometimes it's hard. They power all of upstate New York's voter registration server software. And we are going to be looking because there's a few new vendors that are going up for state certification this year, so they wouldn't have been available to us if we wanted them. But this will give us the time to feel those out, test them. And then maybe we will leave or we'll, we'll continue we'll see in three years. But NTS, we've been, we've been working with NTS since 1999. So it's been with us a long time, we're used to it as an office, I wouldn't want to change anything now. Because there's a lot of legislation in the works that might alter the way that we do a lot of these processes. So it's good for now. And we'll see how it goes.

Chairwoman Bartels

Does anyone have any questions for the commissioners or for Miss Wainwright? Legislator Gavaris.

Legislator Gavaris

So I'm understanding correctly that so we didn't shop any other products for this at this time? We just, we're essentially renewing an agreement with an existing vendor. Correct?

Commissioner Dittus

Correct. There's only two vendors for this kind of service in the state. And the other one is ES&S, they're Emergency Systems & Software. They use, they work with voting, they're voting systems, too. So, um, that would be sort of a difficult shift for us. So we just went with what we knew.

Chairwoman Bartels

Any other questions or comments? Okay, so on the resolution, all those in favor?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

Opposed? Passes unanimously. Okay, now I'm going to, we're at the end of our resolutions, I'm going to hand the floor over to Commissioner Dittus to talk about the space needs and the relocation plan and also touch on their annual report, which was shared with the entire committee, entire Legislature, but Clerk Mahler submitted it again to this committee today. The floor is yours.

Commissioner Quigley

Ashley, would you like to chime in about the annual report first?

Commissioner Dittus

Sure. We'll just get out of the way. Everybody should have received their copy if they don't have it, I think Jay has it, she could send it around. Our report is something that we do every year. It's our annual report that is provided to the State Board of Elections. They have us answer a variety of data points, of which we collect in the office. And then with that we put together a narrative based off of our experience. And obviously 2020 was difficult for all government entities, especially those of us that are public facing. But what we do in particular, was face, we faced unprecedented challenges. And it required us to come up with creative solutions to unforeseen problems. And you really relied on our full time and part time staff to get everything done. We never anticipated that, in addition to having a huge presidential election, we would also be dealing with a global pandemic and everything that resulted from that. That put our department in a scenario where we were asked to serve the public at a greater level. At any point in our departments history.

We're really proud of the work that we did. I think that the support demonstrates that we broke every record that we've ever tracked. As far as enrollment, absentee requests, our general election turnout was the highest it's ever been. With your help, we were able to install the equipment in the form of our absentee ballot counter, which worked wonderfully, wonderfully for us during that process. It also was able to independently audit our voting systems, which made that process go a lot quicker, especially helpful to us when we were involved in two lawsuits for the Senate districts. We were able to use grant funding for that. We also use existing grant funding for Poll Worker training that helped us to create our videos for election inspectors, to help us with social distancing. So we're going to expand on that in 2021.

We did take the advice of this committee, and we surveyed all of our over the counter absentee voters, I believe that was Legislator Gavaris' idea at the meeting that we had in November. So we had very good response from that, that is also included in the report. We got a lot of positive feedback on that. We plan on doing more of those in 2021 to get reactions from the public how they are interacting with our services. 2021 as far as legislation in Albany is concern is shaping up to be another transformative year for the board, which we anticipate we talked about that a little bit in our report. Not just locally with our space issues, which we'll talk about next. But there could be changes to the way absentee ballots, how those are recorded. There's likely to be two ballot referendums at least that come down from the state. So we're excited to see how that all goes.

And I'm excited to work with my new counterpart. We're creating community outreach programs, one that we're really excited about is with our high schools, creating a contest for us to produce I Voted stickers. So the artwork coming from high school students. So if anybody has any questions about the report, I know it's a lot of information, we're happy to talk about any of those things, or we could shift to the space [inaudible].

Commissioner Quigley

So the space needs really were exhausted during this past election cycle, where we saw a record number of grants that we receive, that led to the contribution of acquiring new equipment, needing to use certain space during certain times. And it came to the point where we had to buy new equipment for polling locations, for absentee drop boxes, which now take up a lot of storage space. We've had to bring in a lot of part time help, which, unfortunately, throughout COVID, didn't allow us to stay in complete compliance with COVID protocol to stay six feet away. But we had an election to run and we had no other options, we were not going to fail, we were going to get through it. And we did.

Commissioner Quigley

But we exhausted our resources, by having a lot of our part time help almost lined up to work in all space that we wouldn't traditionally use. We had to count ballots in two separate rooms almost on top of each other during a pandemic, where we had individuals who wanted to come in and watch the ballot opening process. And we were able to do this all very effectively in our, in our current space. But our space is ever evolving and ever growing and are, we currently occupy 2000 square feet of office space 5500 square feet of storage space. And if we were to map out our current space, you would see that everything is pretty much bundled up on top of each other. And Ashley and I basically came, had a conversation and came to the conclusion that if we had our dream space, what would our dream space look like? And we actually went and looked at potential space that would, that would meet the growing demand that we are seeing. And we want to use it as not only an example but hopefully a possible solution that the Legislature can consider going forward for a new office as well as new storage space. There's a lot of variables that are going to come into play regarding how to move us, when to move us, and where, where to move us.

I would just like to stress the importance that after we had a conversation with the Executive's office Marc could probably even attest to this, we had made strong opinions that we should be moving in either July, or January, because that will be the least impactful on our day to day operations, and will allow us to run a successful election, especially in a local election year. And, the, Marc and us came to the conclusion that it would almost be better off to be in July rather than January. And things may change that may alter that. But if it is, in fact, July, this is a very time pressing issue that we need to consider how we can move forward as quickly as possible and in an effective manner. We've been very fortunate with IS that they're ready and able to help us whenever we need and whenever these decisions are made. And so the space that we looked at and the spacing requirements that we're going to submit to you, if you don't have them already, we'll be emailing them to you, will basically outline that we are hoping, with a goal to reach 3000 square feet of office space. And to reach 6500 to 7500 square feet of storage space. We had a very nice visit at the old Daily Freeman building space that is opening up. And were able to map out all of our equipment needs.

And I'd love to provide all the equipment needs as well for any of the scenarios that you guys as Legislators may be considering as locations where to put us so that we can take the time and map out where all of our equipment would fit in these solutions. And with that, I'll just I'll take a moment to stop there and see if there are any questions, concerns? And we'll go from there.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you, Commissioners. Do we have any questions? Does anyone have any questions from the committee? Okay, I don't see, I don't see any questions right now. I'm going to ask Commissioner Quigley just mentioned that you're going to be providing us with the space analysis in the coming weeks. Is that correct?

Commissioner Quigley

We can send it to you tomorrow.

Chairwoman Bartels

Oh, fabulous. Okay. Great. I would agree, if we're talking about the potential of July, it's it's pressing, though. Something I think that this committee, along with the Public Works Committee, and the Executive's office is going to have to be ready to advocate for and work on together to come to a solution in a short manner of time. I also see, see no one else's hands up, I want to take the time to to thank both Commissioners and their Deputies and the entire staff of the BOE for an amazing job during the last election cycle. I know that you went above and beyond and worked incredibly long hours to make a very difficult election happen and you did it, by all accounts, pretty flawlessly, and that does not go unnoticed. Commissioner Dittus you said that you're very proud of the work, and I could say that we're very proud of both of you and the offices of the BOEE and all those that work there as well. So thank you for all that you do.

Commissioner Dittus

Thank you.

Commissioner Quigley

No problem. Before I before I jump off, I'd also just like to invite any of the Legislators who are interested in touring either our current space, or the potential space that we have had the opportunity to visit to see if it is something of interest to any of our Legislators.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you. I definitely will take you up on both of them. I'd like, I'd like to see, I'd like to see all of the spaces. So maybe through Clerk Mahler we can send the invitation to all the members of this committee. And if you want to extend it beyond this committee, we can go beyond this committee. Depending on how many tours you can handle in your off time.

Commissioner Dittus

That sounds great. And I think you'll, you'll see when we send the architectural draft, just how many pieces of equipment we have. And really how we've sort of been working with a lot of, a lot of things that have not made our jobs as easy as they could be. And if anybody has any questions, once they digest that information our doors are always open. We're at the office all the time. So anytime you want to stop by, let us know.

Chairwoman Bartels

Great, thank you. Legislator Roberts.

Legislator Roberts

Yeah, I'd like to segue to something else, Madam Chair, if you don't mind.

Chairwoman Bartels

No, go ahead

Legislator Roberts

We assured our colleagues that the issue we had last year with the extended comp time and the payoff, payouts. we did last month, a month before, wouldn't happen again. And we were gonna get some kind of analysis on how to prevent that from happening, whether it's, you know, hiring additional staff or part time full time. Do we have any progress on that?

Commissioner Quigley

I can quickly comment that in our annual review, you will see that we spent an additional 100 and roughly \$120,000, in part time help that wouldn't have been traditionally spent. And we can get breakdowns to that and include that and go a bit further and specific analysis on that, if you'd like?

Chairwoman Bartels

Yeah, that would be great. Because to follow on Legislator Roberts' comments, I think that we would like to, we did make the assurance to our colleagues that we'd be working with you to make sure that this didn't happen again. And that's going to involve the kind of staffing analysis that you're talking about. And also, we'd like to do that well ahead of both the budget cycle, and any, any timeframe where you're going to start to see the crunch again. So the sooner we can start to work on that and forecasting those issues and finding a way to mitigate them in advance. That would be great.

Commissioner Dittus

Absolutely.

Chairwoman Bartels

Does anyone have anyone else have any questions? All right, thank you so much for your patience. Waiting to the end of the meeting.

Chairwoman Bartels

Normally, I would have pushed to the front, I thought that the business was not gonna, I did not realize it was long for so long, so I appreciate your time. I'm glad Commissioner Quigley was able to be with us the whole time.

Commissioner Quigley

Thank you very much.

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you.

Commissioner Dittus

Thank you.

Legislator Roberts

Thank you

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay, so now, we are moving on to old business, under old business. We have rules of the Legislature, Clerk Mahler sent around a request for the possibilities of people's availability for an additional special meeting. So if everyone can look at that, and maybe, maybe Clerk Mahler can recirculate that. And we can set a time to have a special rules meeting to try to move through that, ideally, sooner than later. And does anyone have any other old business that they'd like to bring up?

Legislator Ronk

I move we adjourn.

Chairwoman Bartels

Okay. Do I have a second?

Chairman Donaldson

I'll second that

Chairwoman Bartels

Thank you all in favor of adjournment?

Committee Members

Aye.

Chairwoman Bartels

All right. meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

Legislator Roberts

Thank you.

Chairwoman Bartels

Have a great night.