

**RULES, ENACTMENTS & INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE  
HELD IN ROOM #318  
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING  
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512**

**Members: Chairwoman Addonizio and Legislators Ellner & Nacerino**

**Thursday September 12, 2024  
(Immediately following Protective Mtg. beginning at 6:00pm)**

The meeting was called to order at 6:38pm by Chairwoman Addonizio who requested Legislator Ellner lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call Legislators Ellner and Nacerino and Chairwoman Addonizio were present.

**Item #3 – Approval/ Fund Transfer 24A267/ County Attorney/ Outstanding Legal Services Invoices & Invoices Not Yet Received for Remainder of Year**

First Deputy County Attorney John Cherico stated the County Attorney's office is seeking a \$150,000 fund transfer, which will be used for contractual and personnel disciplinary matters which required the involvement of outside counsel. He stated the Roemer Wallens firm and the Girvin & Ferlazzo firm have served as outside counsel. He stated what really necessitated this transfer at this time is the Arben v. Putnam County litigation. The Harris Beach firm has been retained as outside counsel on this case. He stated a contract was entered into under the previous administration and commenced shortly after the current County Executive took office. He stated this transfer will allow outside counsel to continue working on the County's behalf.

Legislator Ellner stated the Fund Transfer shows the requested \$150,000 coming from contingency. He stated there are some vacancies in the Law Department and questioned why the vacancy savings are not being used for this purpose.

First Deputy County Attorney Cherico stated he is not familiar with where the funds are coming from.

Legislator Sayegh stated year to date \$282,172 has been spent for outside counsel and she clarified that this is another \$150,000 to cover the rest of the year. She stated the amount spent in 2023 for outside counsel was \$383,000 for the whole year.

First Deputy County Attorney Cherico stated that is correct. He stated this year has been unusual with the Arben litigation which has been very time intensive.

Legislator Ellner stated in the memorandum it states that the cost of the Harris Beach law firm is \$27,000 per month and their services could continue through the end of the year. He questioned if this fee is in addition to the requested \$150,000.

First Deputy County Attorney Cherico stated that fee was taken into consideration when making the request.

Legislator Jonke stated in previous years outside counsel has worked on cases involving union contracts and the Arben litigation has been going on for a few years. He in 2023 outside counsel for the Law Department was the most expensive in the department's history, and 2024 will be even more costly. He questioned how many vacancies are currently in the Law Department.

First Deputy County Attorney Cherico stated there are two (2) vacancies, one of those was recently vacated on August 1<sup>st</sup>.

Legislator Jonke questioned if having one or both of those positions filled would reduce the amount of outside counsel work.

First Deputy County Attorney Cherico stated that is tough to say. He stated his background is in litigation and there have been a number of matters that have been handled internally since he has been in the Law Department that may not have been possible prior to his arrival. He stated the matters being handled by outside counsel are ones that require a specific level of expertise. He stated if these cases were to be handled by the attorneys in the Law Department, it could end up costing more when factoring in the learning curve of each case. He stated the County Attorney handles all possible matters in-house.

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

#### **Item #4 – Approval/ Litigation Settlement/ Krivak v. County of Putnam**

At 6:48pm Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss the litigation settlement; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

At 7:20pm Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to come out of Executive Session; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

No action was taken in Executive Session.

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution. There was no second. Motion fails.

#### **Item #5 – Approval/ Local Law to Amend the Charter of Putnam County by Amending Article 8, Section 8.01 Entitled “Department of Law – County Attorney”**

Chairwoman Addonizio stated she does not believe this proposed Charter change necessarily presents a conflict, but because discussion of this item could include a

matter currently before the Board of Ethics, she will recuse herself to avoid even the appearance of impropriety.

Chairwoman Addonizio appointed Legislator Jonke as Chair pro tem for the duration of agenda item #5. By poll vote: All in favor.

Legislator Jonke stated a redlined copy of the proposed changes is included in the agenda.

Legislator Crowley stated it appears the Board has had issues with conflicts and a better job needs to be done of honoring the appearance of impropriety. She stated at the May 16, 2024 Rules, Enactments, & Intergovernmental Relations Committee Legislator Addonizio was asked by a member of the public to expose a conflict and she did not. She stated it is being claimed that this local law has nothing to do with the sitting County Attorney, but if that is the case she questioned why it is being brought forward now. She stated she is calling a spade a spade; there is no way around the origin of this legislation being retaliatory towards the current County Attorney. She stated she understands the concerted effort to sanitize it from the record and to rewrite history but there is no other reason to do it out of the blue because there is no issue that needs correction. She stated this legislation is a non-solution to a non-issue.

Legislator Jonke stated he does not see how this could be retaliatory when it is exempting the current County Attorney. He stated he would like to make an amendment to this proposal so it does not apply to the individual currently occupying the seat of County Attorney at any time.

Legislator Crowley questioned if this change is required to go to permissive referendum and if this has been asked of the Board of Elections or the Law Department.

Legislator Jonke stated this was not run by the Law Department. He stated as of right now, the Legislature does not have special counsel of its choosing.

Legislator Crowley questioned when it would go to permissive referendum.

Legislator Jonke stated the earliest would be 2025.

Legislative Counsel Firriolo stated it would only go to permissive referendum if the voters have enough signatures to include it.

Legislator Ellner questioned if it is still necessary to have this law take effect 1/1/2027 if the current County Attorney is being exempt.

Legislator Jonke stated not necessarily; the reason that date is in there is to run through the current term of the County Executive. He stated he is comfortable leaving that in.

Legislator Nacerino stated there are opinions, conjecture, and speculation here that are not necessarily accurate in her opinion. She stated it was questioned why this is being brought forward to which she responded the County Attorney represents the Legislature and there is nothing wrong with the Legislature believing they should have a voice. She stated, as stated in previous meetings, there is no intent to fire anyone. She stated the version before the Committee this evening should alleviate any doubt that this was the mission.

Legislator Montgomery stated it is obvious that the first iteration of this proposal stemmed from a disagreement between the County Attorney and some members of the Legislature including the Chair and Legislative Counsel. She stated she would like to get to the business of providing services to the people of Putnam County. She stated the County Executive is just that, an executive, not a County Administrator. She stated there is a separation of powers here, an Executive branch and a Legislative branch. She stated this proposal denies the County Executive adequate counsel, requires unnecessary expenditures of taxpayer funds, and would deny the County Executive the unhampered ability to exercise all the powers granted to him under the law. She stated this would severely impede the County Executive's ability to obtain representation of their choosing. She stated the Legislature votes on the County Executive's choice for the position. She stated the ability for the Legislature to remove the County Attorney could leave the County without representation and therefore vulnerable. She stated this precludes the County Executive from ever having the ability to appoint and obtain their own counsel. She stated as the County Charter is chipped away at, the balancing of power may be lost.

Legislator Jonke stated there is a balance of power. He stated the County Attorney works for the Legislature; it is a different relationship than any other department head. He stated if there is a conflict between the Executive and Legislative branch, the County Attorney represents the Legislature and the Legislature should have the right to remove them. He stated this is a fundamental issue; it is an authority the Legislature should have. He stated currently the Charter includes a provision for the Legislature to remove the County Attorney and this proposal looks to broaden the reasoning needed.

Legislator Crowley stated she believes this came from a thin-skinned fight and this proposal is ridiculous. She stated there is obviously a conflict between Chairman Jonke and the County Attorney.

Legislator Jonke stated there is a conflict between the County Attorney and the entire Legislature.

Legislator Crowley stated she does not have a conflict with the County Attorney.

Legislator Jonke stated the County Attorney filed an ethics complaint against Legislative Counsel and a member of this Legislature.

Legislator Nacerino stated each Legislator can cast their vote on this based on how they feel; that is the democratic process. She stated it is her opinion that this does not dilute the power of the County Executive; it increases the power of Legislature. She stated what is obvious is that there was an ethics complaint filed by the County Attorney after the May 16, 2024 Rules Committee Meeting. She stated the conflict was not initiated by the Legislature.

Legislator Montgomery stated good on the County Attorney for filing an ethics complaint. She stated she has been on the Legislature for six (6) years and has witnessed some ethics violations.

Legislator Jonke questioned why Legislator Montgomery never filed an ethics complaint on any of those matters.

Legislator Crowley provided an example of what she believes to be an ethics violation related to Legislator Jonke voting on a matter involving a company she believes he works for.

Legislator Jonke questioned what company Legislator Crowley is referring to.

Legislator Crowley stated there was a property being handled by McGrath & Company.

Legislator Jonke stated McGrath & Company is an appraisal company that he has never worked for.

Legislator Montgomery questioned if Legislator Jonke was in the McGrath & Company office this past weekend.

Legislator Jonke stated he was in the McGrath Realty office.

Legislator Crowley stated an item was considered that went through McGrath & Company.

Legislator Jonke stated McGrath & Company and McGrath Realty are two different businesses.

Legislator Castellano stated they are owned by the same people.

Legislator Jonke stated they are not owned by the same people.

Legislator Montgomery requested that a member of the Committee move to dismiss this Charter change.

Lynne Eckardt, resident of Southeast, questioned why this change would go to permissive referendum rather than mandatory referendum.

Legislative Counsel Firriolo stated this does not fall into the category of mandatory referendum. He stated a mandatory referendum happens when required by State law.

Ms. Eckardt requested clarification on the timeline; she questioned if the Legislature would be able to remove the County Executive's choice of County Attorney once the current term ends by 2/3 vote.

Legislator Jonke stated it is the County Executive's choice who is confirmed by the Legislature. He stated there are many employees that serve at the pleasure of the County Executive. He stated those employees are not going to be removed if they are doing their job.

Ms. Eckardt questioned why this matter is coming up now when it never has before. She questioned if there is something the public may not be aware of that is a problem for the majority of the Legislature.

Legislator Jonke stated he believes a lot of it stems from what took place at the May 16, 2024 Rules Meeting.

Ms. Eckardt stated that could be considered retaliatory.

Legislator Jonke stated after that meeting, he looked at the situation because it has gotten difficult to do business.

Legislator Ellner stated he believes this change does not take anything away from the County Executive. He stated the County Executive still appoints the County Attorney and it is subject to confirmation by the Legislature. He stated this change provides a future Legislature the authority to remove the County Attorney by 2/3 vote if there is an issue. He stated when this was discussed at last month's Rules Meeting, the County Executive was present and stated that if he were a Legislator he would be in favor of this.

Legislator Nacerino stated it is important to recognize that a Legislature could not remove the County Attorney arbitrarily; there would have to be just cause. She stated in its current form today, the Charter allows for removal of the County Attorney by the Legislature for an egregious reason.

Legislator Montgomery stated she believes this change could possibly allow a Legislature to vote based on politics. She stated she believes votes have been taken by her colleagues during her tenure for political reasons. She stated she does not have confidence that this power will be used properly.

Legislator Jonke clarified the amendment being made is that the removal provision shall not affect the person currently in the position.

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

**Item #6 – Approval/ Local Law Granting Voters of Putnam County the Authority to Amend, Modify or Repeal County Legislative Term Limits and Providing for the Increase of the Term of County Legislator from Three (3) to Four (4) Years**

Legislator Nacerino made a motion to waive the rules and accept the revised local law; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

Legislator Jonke stated he has been working with Dan Birmingham, who is a former Legislator and former Deputy County Executive, on strengthening term limits for both the Legislature and County Executive. He introduced Mr. Birmingham to speak to this item and item #7.

Legislator Crowley requested that Legislators have the opportunity to speak on this before the public is invited to speak. She stated in a context where this Board is chasing ghosts and personal vendettas, she finds it perplexing that the Board even thinks it is appropriate to address term limits. She stated this is a non-solution to a non-problem. She stated there is no reason to do this before the court case related to election years is decided; and regardless judges and other offices will still be on odd years. She questioned why they would want to throw themselves into this controversy. She questioned if the County Attorney or Board of Elections was consulted on these proposals.

Legislator Ellner questioned why the Legislature would defer to a County department for authority.

Legislator Montgomery stated it is the Board of Elections. She questioned if the State was contacted.

Legislator Crowley stated the Legislature has not heard feedback from the public requesting this change. She stated this is another item being rushed through. She stated the proposal is designed to extend terms from three (3) to four (4) years, looking at exemptions for transition years, this would allow some Legislators to serve 15+ years instead of 12. She stated these inconsistent outcomes are not appropriate. She questioned if the intent is to get the Legislators' terms on even years, why not change them to two (2) years. She stated the motivations are transparent and she is uncomfortable with this.

Legislator Nacerino stated she is in the last year of her final term therefore this will not affect her should it come to fruition. She stated she would like to address Legislator Crowley's question about changing the terms to two (2) year terms. She stated when she first moved here a town-wide dump was proposed in the Town of Patterson and it was met with much opposition. She stated she got involved in politics through a

grassroots campaign to stop that consideration. She stated that following November, the majority of the Legislature was voted out of office, leaving the Legislature with rookies with no institutional knowledge. She stated the staggered terms allow for institutional knowledge to remain as new Legislators come on board.

Legislator Crowley stated many other counties do not have staggered terms and all run at once. She stated the staggered terms are a good thing, it provides seniority with institutional knowledge and equal turnover. She stated there is currently no mandate to hold elections on even years.

Legislator Gouldman stated he spoke with the Board of Elections and was told that local elections in Putnam County are not currently being affected. He suggested waiting until a decision is reached in regard to any mandate that may be imposed on the County, and then make a change if necessary. He questioned why this is being done when it is unnecessary at this time.

Legislator Montgomery stated she does not understand why this is being put forward without consulting with the Board of Elections, either our local Commissioners, or on a State level. She stated Putnam County's elections are not being affected. She stated institutional knowledge was discussed, and in this case those with institutional knowledge did not even speak with the experts on this matter so she would like to get rid of the institutional knowledge here. She stated at this time in our Country, people want change; they do not want to extend term limits and the time the same people are in office. She stated this seems like another power grab. She requested the Committee to dismiss this item.

Legislator Nacerino stated she would like to give Dan Birmingham the opportunity to speak to this. She stated this does not have to be moved forward this evening, saying this is being rushed through is speculative.

Dan Birmingham, resident of Southeast, thanked Chairwoman Addonizio and the Committee for having him here this evening. He spoke to both agenda item #6 and item #7. He stated he is here this evening as a citizen from the Town of Southeast. He stated he is a former Legislator and when he was on the Legislature he was skeptical of term limits. He stated since that time, he has seen this Legislature change for the better with new individuals with new ideas, and he has changed his mind and sees the value in term limits. He provided the following information that he got from a not-for-profit out of Washington, DC called US Term Limits:

- 82% of Americans are supportive of term limits
- 76% of Democrats support term limits
- 89% of Republicans support term limits
- 83% of Independents support term limits

He stated term limits are very important, they restore a citizen Legislature that discourages individuals from squatting in office for decades. He stated the framers of our government did not intend for career politicians, rather people from all walks of life who could serve a short time and then continue to live under the laws they created. He



stated term limits demolishes the seniority system and therefore curbs potential corruption. He stated also, most importantly, term limits increase voter turnout because there are more candidates campaigning, which brings out more voters. He stated there are currently term limits in place and he believes more can be done to protect those term limits. He stated the statute currently in place for the County Executive is two (2) four-year terms for a total of eight (8) years. He stated for Legislators it is four (4) three-year terms, not to exceed 12 years in one's life. He stated he believes the best way to safeguard term limits would be to put them to voter referendum, however upon doing further research he found there are very few instances for a county to have anything placed before the voters on a mandatory referendum basis. He encouraged the Committee to consult with Legislative Counsel and the County Attorney on this as well. He stated a revised proposal was submitted to the Committee and he clarified this is only an idea he is submitting. He stated the County Charter only allows the origination of a Charter amendment to come from one of three (3) classes of people: a Legislator, the County Executive, or a legislative body from the towns or villages. He stated he does not fit into any of those categories and he is merely suggesting this. He stated the revised proposal requires any modification or abolishment of term limits for either the Legislature or County Executive to be subject to a unanimous vote of the Legislature and permissive referendum. He stated the revised proposal pertaining to the County Executive term limits includes clarification to what he believes is currently an ambiguity. He stated Section 3.01 of the Charter currently states "He or she shall serve a maximum two (2) consecutive full terms." He stated a previous County Executive served two (2) full terms plus a partial term. He stated the proposal tightens this language by amending it to "His or her service as County Executive shall be limited to a maximum of two (2) terms, whether partial or full, and whether consecutive or not." He stated with the revised proposal before the Committee pertaining to the Legislature does not change the length of the term from three (3) to four (4) years; the only reason it was included in the first draft was to accommodate State laws that may affect Putnam County in the future in regard to holding elections on even years. He stated Putnam County is unique in that the office of County Legislature is a three (3) year term. He stated the possible change could also be accommodated by changing the terms to two (2) years. He stated as Legislator Nacerino mentioned earlier, in 1989 the majority of the Legislature was voted out of office over one issue. He stated the total length of time a Legislator would serve does not change under this proposal, it is still a total of 12 years, except for the transition terms. He stated the reason for the transition terms is to keep the staggered terms in place without penalizing any Legislative seat by not allowing them to serve all 12 years. He reviewed the changes on the redlined copy of the revised proposal for Section 2.02 of the Charter. He stated paragraph E was stricken and replaced with: "Except in the instance where a general or special state law would otherwise necessitate, amending, modifying or repealing the term limit provisions as set forth in this Section 2.02 may only be accomplished by the enactment of a local law adopted by the County Legislature by a unanimous vote of the whole of its number, subject to referendum on petition as provided in the Municipal Home Rule Law." He stated a similarly worded paragraph pertaining to the County Executive has been inserted into Section 3.01 as well. He stated this addition was included in an effort to

not lock a Legislature in to crafting a solution to get onto the even years should State law mandate Putnam County do so.

Legislator Crowley clarified that even if the State Legislature enacts the law pertaining to even year elections, Putnam County will not be affected by it.

Mr. Birmingham stated right now, it would not apply to Putnam County.

Legislator Crowley questioned if this would have to go through the New York State Assembly twice if it were to go to referendum before taking effect.

Mr. Birmingham stated it would have to pass both houses in separate Legislative sessions.

Legislator Crowley stated this could take years.

Mr. Birmingham stated that is why it is not in the draft being considered by the Committee.

Legislator Ellner stated it is bad government to be reactive. He stated this is an eloquent solution that provides for a smooth transition in the future if necessary.

Legislator Jonke stated the overwhelming opinion of the population is favorable to term limits. He stated as it stands right now, six (6) people in Putnam County could abolish term limits for this Legislative body and the County Executive. He stated this proposal requires a unanimous vote of all nine (9) Legislators and a permissive referendum.

Legislator Gouldman stated it is not broken; let's not try to change it. He stated he is in favor of unanimous approval and suggested changing only that at this time.

Legislator Jonke stated that is what is in front of the Committee.

Legislator Gouldman stated the proposal is changing the terms from three (3) to four (4) years.

Legislator Jonke stated a revised proposal has been submitted to and accepted by the Committee.

Legislator Gouldman stated that revision was provided right before the meeting began.

Mr. Birmingham stated the revision does not change the length of the term from three (3) to four (4) years. He stated it simply changes, as Legislator Gouldman suggested, the power to amend, modify, or abolish term limits from a supermajority vote of six (6) Legislators to a unanimous vote of nine (9) Legislators. He stated after a discussion with a County Elected Official, he realized that changing the length of the term could

detract from the main point of solidifying and protecting the term limit provisions. He stated he believes this is worthy of a discussion this evening.

Legislator Addonizio agreed that it is important to preserve term limits and this proposal safeguards what is currently in place.

Legislator Crowley stated if there is no rush on this, it should go through the Charter Review Commission.

Mr. Birmingham stated the Charter Review Commission officially meets every 10 years. He stated he is enthusiastic about this and he believes it is worthy to protect term limits. He stated why put off until tomorrow what can be done today. He reviewed the changes that would be necessary to implement this into the Charter. He acknowledged that this is a lot to take in.

Legislator Crowley stated she would like to hear from the voters.

Mr. Birmingham agreed and stated that was his original goal, but a County is only allowed to put things to mandatory referendum under a specific provision.

Legislator Crowley stated a public hearing could be held.

Legislator Jonke stated anyone he has spoken with during his tenure on the Legislature are firmly supportive of term limits. He stated that he believes there should be term limits on the State and Federal level as well. He stated our job is to act on behalf of the public, and the public is in favor of term limits.

Legislator Gouldman stated the revision was provided right before the meeting this evening. He suggested reviewing this further and bringing it back to Committee at a future meeting to be tweaked if necessary. He stated this should not be voted on this evening; it should be tabled to allow the Legislators time to review it thoroughly.

Legislator Nacerino stated she is a strong proponent of term limits. She stated we have seen how dysfunctional the State operates and she would not want to see complacency in our County government. She stated if the Committee believes more time is needed to review this, she would be supportive of tabling this to another meeting, however she believes this can be reviewed between this evening and the October 1, 2024 Full Legislative Meeting.

Legislator Gouldman stated he also agrees with term limits, that is not the issue here. He stated he would like the opportunity to read and understand the revision that was provided.

Legislator Nacerino stated if this were passed tonight, it would not be voted on by the Full Legislature until October 1, 2024 which allows time to review.

Legislator Montgomery stated next month the Legislature will be reviewing the 2025 County Budget, therefore regular Committee Meetings are not scheduled. She thanked Mr. Birmingham for his presentation. She stated she wishes this were more transparent because these revisions are not on the website.

Mr. Birmingham stated he would be happy to attend a Special Rules Committee Meeting if the Committee chose to schedule one.

Legislator Nacerino stated there is ample time to review this before the Full Legislative Meeting.

Ms. Eckardt stated this is so disorganized. She stated she believes tabling this item makes the most sense because these revisions are being discussed for the first time. She stated it is premature to discuss term extensions and she believes the Board of Elections should have been contacted. She stated she understands the revision is now about the unanimous vote and encouraged the Committee to table this item.

Legislator Nacerino stated there is no harm in tabling this to the November Rules Committee Meeting. She stated to Legislator Montgomery's point, the public has not seen the revision and what is on the agenda and posted on the website is extending the term limits. She stated time is not of the essence here.

Legislator Jonke stated because this change pertains only to the unanimous vote, it should be done sooner rather than later.

Mr. Birmingham suggested a Special Rules Committee Meeting be held and the revised proposal be posted on the website.

Legislator Crowley agreed with Legislator Nacerino's suggestion of tabling this to November.

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to move the local law to a Special Rules Committee Meeting; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.  
(The date of September 23, 2024 was discussed at the meeting, however due to scheduling issues the Special Rules Committee Meeting was scheduled for October 8, 2024.)

**Item #7 – Approval/ Local Law Granting Voters of Putnam County the Authority to Amend, Modify or Repeal County Executive Term Limits**

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to move the local law to a Special Rules Committee Meeting; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.  
(The date of September 23, 2024 was discussed at the meeting, however due to scheduling issues the Special Rules Committee Meeting was scheduled for October 8, 2024.)

## **Item #8 – Other Business**

### **a. Approval/ Appointment of Outside Counsel for the Legislature**

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to waive the rules and accept the Other Business; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

Legislator Jonke stated the Legislature finds itself in a position without counsel on several different matters where the Law Department and Legislative Counsel have actual or potential conflicts of interest. He stated as Chairman of the Legislature he is putting forward the appointment of Keane & Beane, PC, Attorneys at Law as counsel for the Legislature.

Legislator Montgomery questioned what outside counsel is needed for.

Legislator Jonke stated there are issues that involve potential conflict for the County Attorney's Office, the Legislature, and Legislative Counsel.

Legislator Montgomery stated this is an unnecessary expenditure of taxpayer funds.

Legislator Jonke stated a budgetary amendment was approved earlier this evening for an additional \$150,000 to the County Attorney's Office and Legislator Montgomery did not have an issue with that.

Legislator Crowley questioned what the conflicts are.

Legislator Jonke stated one is that the County Attorney's brother submitted a FOIL request to the Legislative Office for information that may be considered attorney-client privileged, but the Legislature does not have anyone to make that determination.

Legislator Castellano questioned what the other conflicts are.

Legislator Nacerino stated the County Attorney assigned legal counsel to the Legislature; it is our prerogative to choose our own representation.

Legislator Crowley stated she does not believe it works that way. She stated this petty conflict is turning into a minutia of Charter changes and expenses to the taxpayers.

Legislator Sayegh stated the County Attorney has assigned outside counsel to the Legislature, which is an expense. She stated the Legislature should be able to choose their representation.

Legislator Jonke stated there was no objection earlier when the Committee considered the \$150,000 fund transfer for the County Attorney.

Legislator Montgomery stated this outside counsel is being obtained to defend the Legislature; not to provide any services to the public. She stated other Legislatures

have counsel for their minority leader and majority, so maybe she should have her own counsel as well.

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

**Item #9 – Adjournment**

There being no further business at 8:34pm, Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Ellner. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Assistant Beth Robinson.