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TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT
ONEIDA COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE, NEW YORK

I. BACKGROUND OF THE ASSIGNMENT

On September 24, 1998 a report was prepared by United States Magistrate Judge David N. Hurd, recommending habeas corpus relief in the 1992 case of Durrell Dow. The main thrust of Magistrate Hurd's analysis was that the petitioner had received ineffective assistance of counsel by the Oneida County Public Defender office, in violation of his Sixth Amendment rights under the United States Constitution.

Although, his ultimate legal recommendation was rejected by Federal Judge McAvoy of the United States District Court, his factual findings into the operation of the office at that time were insightful and troubling.

As a result of this decision, the Oneida County Bar Association established a committee to review the operation of the Defender Office and to consider whether some form of "vertical" representation should be utilized, instead of the present "horizontal" type of representation. To assist the Bar Committee in its work, Frank Nebush, the Public Defender of Oneida County made a formal request to American University's Courts Technical Assistance Program, and to the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, for a consultant knowledgeable in Public Defender management and the accepted national standards for the operation of indigent defense systems. His mission was to look at the office, review its case management practices, and organization, and to make suggestions to improve the effective representation of the indigent accused in Oneida County.

A consultant was selected who had both prior experience as the former Chief Public Defender of a county and had worked on the national level.\(^1\) He visited Oneida County on July 8th and 9th, 1999, and conducted interviews with key actors in the County Criminal Justice System. In addition, extensive time was spent with the Public Defender and his staff to both identify the

\(^1\)The consultant--Marshall J. Hartman; of Chicago, Illinois-- selected jointly by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association and American University had been Chief Public Defender of Lake County, Illinois, Director of a federally funded Neighborhood Defender Program with six offices in Cook County, and had served as a consultant to the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. He served as co-drafter of the Standards for Indigent Defense Systems adopted by the Commission. He is also a former director of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. Mr. Hartman currently serves as the Director of the Capital Litigation Division of the Illinois Appellate Defender’s Office.
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problems impeding effective legal representation by the office, and to come up with possible solutions. (See Appendix A for list of all interviewees and individuals consulted and Appendix B for the on-site agenda.)

II. PATTERNS OF REPRESENTATION BY THE ONEIDA COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE IDENTIFIED BY THE FEDERAL COURT

In reviewing the representation provided by the Oneida County Public Defender Office to the petitioner, Magistrate Hurd identified several key areas in which he found continuity and effective representation lacking.

- The first problem area noted was the fact that in the course of representation of the defendant during the criminal process, no less than four different public defenders represented defendant Dow.

- These different public defender lawyers did not seem to communicate with each other relative to the facts of the case, plea offers, plea agreements, sentences, etc.

- Moreover, these lawyers failed to communicate with the client at key points in the process.

- Where the Assistant Public Defenders did communicate with the client, they failed to maintain a paper record of these conversations and the decisions reached with the client.

- Specifically, according to Magistrate Hurd, there was one public defender assigned to the case within 24 hours of arrest (PD1). Then a second public defender (PD2) appeared for the defendant at Arraignment. That same public defender (PD2) represented the defendant at a pre-trial conference. Then public defender (PD1) appeared to take the plea. Thereafter, a third Public Defender (PD3) appeared for sentencing in 1992, and a fourth Public Defender at re-sentencing in 1993 (PD 4).

- As a result of the multiplicity of defense counsel, the Magistrate found that PD1, who was not present at the pretrial conference where the plea agreement was offered, had a mistaken view of the terms of the plea offer when he advised the client to accept the offer. In addition, since there was no notation on the file as to PD1's discussion with the defendant about the plea offer, what occurred during this important pre-plea conference with the defendant was not clear.

It is to the Public Defender's credit that he was sufficiently concerned about the problems outlined by the Magistrate's decision to seek additional resources to remedy these problems. The Magistrate's preoccupation with continuity of counsel is consistent with nationally recognized standards for the operation of any public defender office or assigned counsel system. It is important
for three reasons: (1) the perception to the public defender client that he is represented by a single lawyer assigned to his case, instead of a cold impersonal system where he is on a "conveyor belt going from Court to Court and counsel to counsel"; (2) continuity of counsel avoids costly duplication of effort, e.g. re-interviewing and gaining a rapport with the defendant by different lawyers at various stages of the proceeding; and (3) avoidance of mistakes, mis-communication, and unnecessary court delay.

In order to see what could be done in Oneida County to remedy this problem, first it is important to understand the current criminal justice system in Oneida County, specifically as it pertains to the indigent defendant, and then to tailor a solution to these perceived problems, which will work in that setting, consistent with recognized national standards for the operation of public defender offices.

III. THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN ONEIDA COUNTY

Oneida County has a population of approximately 230,000. It used to be a much more homogeneous county composed largely of residents of Italian, German, Polish, and Irish descent. More recently, however, several thousand refugees from Eastern Europe, as well as Hispanic and Black residents have moved into the county. As a result in Utica today, there are approximately 19 different languages spoken by students in the public school system.

The Court system includes three city courts in Utica, Rome, and Sherrill, two county felony courts located in Utica, and approximately thirty-six outlying courts, known as Justice Courts, which are in session at various times.

Indigent defendants are represented in one of two ways: the Assigned Counsel system, and the Public Defender Office. The Assigned Counsel program was budgeted for $486,000 in fiscal 1999 and handles conflict of interest and multiple defendant cases, declared by the Public Defender Office. It also handles cases in Family Court. Appointed counsel is paid $40.00 per hour for in-court time and $25.00 per hour for out of court time, with caps.

The Public Defender office has a budget of $960,432. Currently the office has 10 lawyers in addition to the Public Defender. Eight of those lawyers are assigned to the various courts, and two to the Appellate Division. In addition, there are two investigators and four clerical and administrative staff.

In 1998 that staff handled over 5,000 criminal cases. This included 984 felonies and 4188 misdemeanors in addition to 610 traffic cases, and 191 others. This is in addition to the responsibility of traveling to the various prisons in New York to interview over 60 prisoners a year accused of crimes committed in prison. What is even more significant than the number of cases the office represents in a year, is the number of courts that must be covered on a continuous basis.
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The current deployment of lawyers in these courts is as follows- two lawyers in the Utica City Courts where there are three judges, and six lawyers in the felony courts. Of course, one of these "felony lawyers" also covers the City Court in Rome. In addition, these lawyers must cover grand jury proceedings, all of the outlying courts, and the prisons.

The assignment of counsel and the procedures in the city misdemeanor courts and the county felony courts are different. In the Utica City Court there are three judges assigned. These judges rotate assignments every four weeks through three cycles. However, the defendants follow the judge they first appeared before. Therefore, since there are only two public defenders assigned to the Utica City Court, it is possible under the present public defender assignment system for a defendant to have three different lawyers representing him in the City Court as the defendant follows the judge, wherever he is sitting. The defendant may be represented by one public defender in the Traffic Court term, then a second public defender in Criminal Court term, and a third public defender in the Jury or Trial term. (In addition to misdemeanor and traffic cases, the City Court also conducts felony examinations (or preliminary hearings) in felony cases).

Judge Anthony Garramone, Chief Judge of the Utica City Court, is a strong believer in the necessity of "continuity of representation" for public defender clients. In his estimation, this could be achieved in the Utica City Courts, which deal with about 5,000 cases per year, (80% of which are public defender cases), if the Public Defender could assign one additional lawyer to the Utica City Courts. If there were three assistant defenders there, instead of two, each public defender could be assigned to one of the three judges permanently. That way, if a defendant is represented by one public defender in the Traffic Court before Judge Garramone, and the case is continued as Judge Garramone moves into the Criminal Court after four weeks, the same public defender as well as the defendant would follow the Judge. Then, if the case were continued for sentencing, and Judge Garramone moved into the Jury or Trial term, again the defender would follow him. That would change the culture in the Utica City Court from a "horizontal" type of representation where a defendant could be represented by as many as three lawyers to a "vertical" type system, where the defendant would be represented by a single lawyer as he appeared before the single Judge in whichever courtroom the Judge was presiding that day.

In felony cases, there are various stages of the proceeding which require counsel. These include an arraignment in City Court, a felony examination (preliminary hearing) in City Court, then either a state's attorney's information is filed or an appearance before the Grand Jury is scheduled, followed by a second arraignment in County Court, a pre-trial conference at which time a plea offer may be made, the report date where counsel notifies the court and state whether or not the client has agreed to accept the pre-trial offer, then, either a plea of guilty is entered, or pre-trial motions are heard (e.g. suppression motions), and a trial is held. Finally, the Court sentences the defendant if he is convicted.

Given his present resources, the Public Defender assigns a felony attorney to a felony case within 24 hours of arrest. However, that felony defender is not present at the arraignment in City Court, nor does he or she handle any proceedings related to that case in City Court (except in
murder cases where the felony lawyer will handle the case in City Court as well as County Court. Moreover, when the case reaches the County Court, although the assigned felony lawyer may confer with the lawyer (PDb) who will handle the arraignment, he usually is not present in court. Nor will he necessarily represent the defendant at other stages of the proceeding in court. Naturally, the assigned felony lawyer attempts to be involved in the case as much as possible, i.e., he confers with the prosecutor with respect to a possible plea offer prior to the pre-trial conference, and he attempts to confer with the client in jail with respect to the plea bargain. However, more likely than not, a different public defender (PDo) will be at the pre-trial conference, and yet another public defender (PDd) will be present at the report date. Naturally the assigned felony lawyer (PDa) will try the case if there's a trial, but for the most part the defendant will have had at least two or three different public defenders in the same case.

In order to meet the demands of the various courts, including the City Court in Rome (which handles over 1,000 cases a year), the required interviews in penitentiaries sometimes as far as 400 miles away, the demands of the Grand Jury, and the numerous Justice Courts, the Public Defender holds staff meetings every morning at 8:30 AM and every afternoon at 4:00 PM to try to assign his staff to meet the daily crises of the Court Call.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The Goal: Continuity of Counsel

The Consultant met extensively with the Public Defender and his staff, and also met with the two County Court Judges, the Utica City Judge, the District Attorney (who has 17 staff lawyers), the Assigned Counsel Administrator, the County Executive, and with members of the Oneida County Bar Association to try to work out an organizational table which would maximize the opportunity for the same lawyer to represent the defendant through all proceedings in misdemeanor or felony court.

If that could be accomplished, not only would the client feel that he has just one lawyer from the Public Defender's office assigned to his case, instead of a different lawyer at each proceeding, but other efficiencies would be achieved as well. For example, time which is now wasted with each new lawyer learning the file, interviewing the defendant at each stage, and preparing for that stage, would be eliminated. The possibility of the lawyer advising the defendant with respect to the plea, misunderstanding the terms of the offer (which was suggested by the Magistrate in the Dow case), would be eliminated. Moreover, the rapport which can be developed with a client by a single defender can lead to greater trust and more efficient disposition of the case, whether it be a trial or plea. These are all benefits to be derived from the "vertical" model of representation.

The importance of "continuity of counsel" has been recognized by the National Study Commission on Defense Services, which was funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice, to promulgate standards for the efficient
and effective operation of Defender offices. See Standard 5.11 of the National Study Commission, which states in pertinent part, "Defender offices should provide for continuous and uninterrupted representation of eligible clients from initial appearance through sentencing, ... by the same individual attorney." (NLADA, 1976).

B. Specific Recommendations

In order to achieve the goals outlined above, the Public Defender office will need some additional resources, the cooperation of the Clerk's office, the Criminal Court Judges, and the District Attorney, as well as the other components of the criminal justice system in the County. It will also require reorganization of the way the Defender office makes courtroom assignments.

Vertical Representation Procedures

1. In the Utica City Court, an assistant Public Defender should be assigned to each of the three Judges. That would allow a single defender to follow the Judge to whom he is assigned through the Judge's various assignments. That way he could also follow the misdemeanor cases to which he was initially assigned through Traffic Court, Criminal Court, and Jury or Trial Court. Instead of a possibility of three public defenders, the client would have a single public defender responsible for his case. The judiciary has also noted to the consultant the beneficial effect on case processing efficiency and the image of justice in this high volume Municipal Court that would accrue from implementation of this allocation of public defender attorneys. Implementation of this recommendation would require the hiring of one additional misdemeanor attorney for the office, a specific recommendation for which is made in # 5, below.

2. With respect to the felony courts, the Public Defender should continue to assign a lawyer to a felony case within 24 hours of arrest. This is an excellent practice and in line with nationally accepted standards for the operation of public defender offices. See Standard 1.2 of the National Study Commission on Defense Services, "Effective representation should be available for every eligible person as soon as the person is arrested or detained." (NLADA, 1976)

3. The clerk's office should be notified which lawyer has been assigned to each case, so that it can schedule the felony arraignment of that defendant before a county felony judge when the felony public defender will be appearing before him. The Public Defender should meet with the Chief Clerk to insure the cooperation of the Clerk's office. (Initial inquiries by the Public Defender have indicated that the Clerk will cooperate with this program if the requested information is supplied by the Public Defender.)
4. Each felony lawyer should be assigned to a specific county felony Judge for a specific day of the week. For example, on Mondays, Kevin Blaney could be scheduled to appear before Judge Donalty. On Tuesdays Mr. Blaney could be scheduled to appear before Judge Dwyer, while Peter Bereskin would be scheduled to appear before Judge Donalty, etc.

The value of these pre-scheduled assignments is that if Defendant Smith has been assigned to Kevin Blaney, and he is to be arraigned before Judge Dwyer, the clerk's office can insure that Smith is scheduled to appear before Judge Dwyer on a Tuesday. Now, Judge Dwyer has before him the lawyer assigned to the defendant. Judge Dwyer can set his pretrial conference on a Tuesday, or can even conduct the pretrial the same day and set the return day on a Tuesday. He can also admonish the attorney to make sure that he confers with the defendant in the County Jail, before the return date, so that the lawyer can intelligently discuss the plea offer with the client and ascertain whether the client will accept the plea offer or refuse it and request a trial. This pre-scheduling procedure should benefit the Judiciary as well as the Public Defender office and the clients. The Judge and the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case will know in advance which defender is responsible for which case, and can expedite the efficient handling of the case. To achieve this goal, the Public Defender should seek the cooperation of the County Court Judiciary and the District Attorney.

If this plan is implemented, the client can have "vertical representation" in the County Court, including arraignment, pre-trial conference, return date, motion practice, plea or trial date, and sentencing.

Resource/Capacity Needs

5. An additional lawyer should be hired for the Utica City Court. As noted in recommendation #1, the implementation of continuity of representation in the Utica City Court requires the assignment of one attorney to each of the three municipal court judges. The caseload in that court, approximately 2,500 cases annually handled by the two attorneys currently assigned, also warrants the augmentation of public defender coverage there.

6. An additional lawyer must be hired for the City Court in Rome. Last year that court handled over 1,000 public defender cases. Up to now, one of the felony lawyers has been trying to cover that call as well as maintaining a felony caseload. This situation is totally out of compliance with national caseload standards, and can only result in ineffective representation or lawyer burnout in a very short time. National Advisory Commission standards with respect to caseload call for a maximum misdemeanor caseload of 400 cases per lawyer per year. See Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Ch. 13, 1973. Based
on the number of cases now being assigned to the Public Defender from that Court, at the very least, one full-time lawyer is needed there, as opposed to the present half-time lawyer.

7. The Public Defender should be authorized to hire an additional lawyer, the cost of which would be reimbursed by state funds, whose main task would be to travel to the state prisons and interview those prisoners accused of committing crimes in the institutions, prepare their cases, and represent them in Court.

The deployment of felony lawyers to visit the prisons to interview inmates accused of crime against other inmates is a tremendous drain on the resources of the office. An entire day is usually spent on a prison visit by a felony lawyer, exclusive of preparation, research, and court time, and interferes with the orderly preparation and processing of the lawyer's regular felony case load. In addition, under the present system, the prisoner will not necessarily have the same assistant Public Defender represent him in Court as conferred with him in Prison.

The cost of the legal services for the approximately 60 cases per year involving inmate defendants is reimbursable by the State under Section 606 of the New York Corrections Code. The Public Defender estimates that he could hire a full-time lawyer, whose salary would be wholly covered by State reimbursement. The hiring of such a lawyer, whose main job would be representing these prisoners, (and who could also help out with some of the outlying Justice Courts) would allow the current felony lawyers to be scheduled regularly before the felony County Judges. Since the lawyer who would interview these accused prison inmates would then also prepare their cases and represent them in Court, vertical representation would be implemented in these cases as well.

8. One of the current assistant public defenders should be upgraded to the position of Chief Trial Counsel for the purpose of assisting in the supervision of the trial division and be given responsibility for orientation and in-service training of the staff. He or she would also assure that continuing legal education is available to the Public Defender staff lawyers on the local, state, or national levels in order to meet their professional requirements.

In reviewing the staffing structure of the Public Defender office, the only supervisor of the misdemeanor, felony, appellate, investigative, and administrative staff is the Public Defender himself. Allowing for a position of Chief Trial Counsel with the responsibility of assisting the Public Defender in the review of cases, and allowing that person a reduced caseload would pay off in increased efficiency and effectiveness of the trial staff.

In addition, New York State now requires 22 hours of Continuing Legal Education credit for all lawyers over a two year period. That means that the office will have to arrange for specialized training for its staff. The office is also out of compliance with
national standards in that it does not have an in-service training program. See, e.g. Standard 5.7 of the National Study Commission on Defense Services, "The training of defenders should be systematic, comprehensive, and .... every defender office should have an orientation program for new staff attorneys.... In-service training programs for defender attorneys should be provided at the state and local level so that all attorneys are kept abreast of developments in criminal law, criminal procedure, and the forensic sciences." (NLADA, 1976)

The Public Defender is aware of this deficiency and would like to have a staff lawyer in the office be assigned to that function. The proposed Chief Trial Counsel could take on that function as well as reviewing the cases which are set for trial. He could also "second chair" a number of the trial cases, so that he could train the newer lawyers "on the job" in improving their representation and trial technique.

9. **At least one more investigator should be hired.** Currently, the office has two investigators for ten lawyers, however, one of the present investigators is assigned to eligibility determinations, leaving really only one criminal investigator to interview witnesses for all cases, take statements, photograph the crime scene, and investigate necessary leads in these cases. Even though it appears that the Chief Investigator for the office is highly qualified, it is impossible for one investigator to adequately perform the investigative function, given the size of the caseload. An additional investigator would insure that lawyers would be more effective in their representation, speed their readiness for trial or for plea negotiation, without delay attributable to the failure of the investigator to complete his work on the case. The addition of another investigator to the Public Defender staff also would bring the office into closer compliance with the national standards. See the National Study Commission on Defense Services (NLADA, 1976), which provides in pertinent part, "A minimum of one investigator should be employed for every three staff attorneys in an office."

10. The consultant was also asked to look at the case management information system of the office. The Public Defender has developed a computerized version of the AMICUS management information system which was developed by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association for the needs of Defender offices. In the consultant's opinion, the Public Defender is on the cutting edge of computerized information systems and has done an excellent job in keeping track of relevant information concerning his office. With this system he is able to track each case that he opens or closes, the disposition of the case, which lawyers handled which cases and with what result, and in which court each case arises, etc.

In addition, there are case-logs for the lawyers to fill out and note results of court hearings and what was said during interviews. (These forms properly filled out by the lawyers deal with the potential problem of mis-communication noted by Magistrate Hurd in the Dow case.) He also has closing forms so that the disposition of each case can be noted and documented.
However, not to rest on his laurels, at the Public Defender's request, the Consultant met with Anthony Milograno, the Director of Central Services for Oneida County. The Director explained that they were going to upgrade the present public defender information system and improve it even further as they have for other county departments like the Sheriff's office etc. They are going to switch to Microsoft Access, which is a relational data system. This database will maintain history information pertaining to defendant identifiers, criminal history, court actions, and dispositions. On demand the Public Defender will be able to generate reports, court schedules, tracking, and statistical information for case management. Moreover, since the office will utilize Microsoft Word 97 for its word processing, the information from its word processing program can be integrated with its data information system to produce routine motions, notices of appeal, and other information for use in memoranda of law, appellate briefs, etc.

The Public Defender should be praised for his forward looking efforts and achievements in the area of case management, and our recommendation would be to support the present joint efforts of the Public Defender office and Oneida County's Department of Central Services to work together to upgrade and improve the office's computerized case management information system.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This is an excellent defender office with a forward looking public defender who stays on top of the latest management techniques for operating public defender agencies, and who wants to provide the finest service for the indigent accused in Oneida County. However, there is a lack of resources which make it difficult to accomplish this mission the way the Public Defender and his staff would like to do it. Our report suggests the addition of several lawyers and an investigator, and the upgrading of one lawyer position to Chief Trial Counsel.

On behalf of American University and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, we express our sincere thanks to Oneida County for the opportunity of reviewing its public defender agency, and submitting these modest proposals which would bring the office into substantial compliance with national standards for the operation of defender offices. Moreover, we think the infusion of these resources and the concomitant changes in the case assignment system of the Public Defender office would improve the delivery of legal services to the indigent accused of Oneida County.

In addition, we would like to express our appreciation to everyone who reserved their time to meet with the Consultant during this technical assistance visit. Each one was extremely gracious and expressed a real interest in seeing how they or their agencies could cooperate in improving the legal representation for the poor in Oneida County.
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LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Hon. Anthony J. Garramone, Chief Judge, Utica City Court

Hon. Barry M. Donalty, County Judge

Hon. Frank Dwyer, County Judge

Frank Nebush, Jr., Public Defender

Ralph J. Eannace Jr., County Executive

Michael A. Arcuri, District Attorney

Hon. Matthew S. Ogonowski, City Court Judge, Ret. and member of the Oneida Bar Association Committee to review the Public Defender Office.

Peter M. Hobaica, member of the Oneida Bar Association Committee

Aniela Carl, Chief Attorney for Oneida County Social Services, Administrator, Assigned Counsel (18B) Program

Anthony Milograno, Director of Central Services

James J. Laribee, Chief Investigator, Public Defender Office

Patricia A. Graziano, Confidential Secretary, PD Office

Frederick C. Ebert, Assistant Public Defender

Esther Cohen Lee, Chief Appellate Counsel, PD office

The consultant also met with most of the felony lawyers who assisted in identifying the problems and inadequate resources of the office, and helped formulate some of the chief recommendations in this report.
**APPENDIX B**

**ON-SITE AGENDA**

**Thursday, July 8th**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
<td>Senior Staff Attorneys</td>
<td>Public Defender’s Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Hon. Ralph J. Eannace, Jr. Oneida County Executive</td>
<td>Public Defender’s Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Anthony Milograno, Director Central Services Re: New public defender database and computer access</td>
<td>Public Defender’s Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Hon. Anthony J. Garramone Chief Judge, Utica City Court</td>
<td>Oneida County Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Hon. Barry M. Donal ty Oneida County Judge</td>
<td>Oneida County Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
<td>Bar Association Committee Peter M. Hobaica, Esq. Hage &amp; Hobaica, LLP Utica, New York</td>
<td>Public Defender’s Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Matthew S. Ogonowski Judge, Utica City Court (retired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Policelli, Esq. Utica, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday, July 9th** 8:30 a.m.: Evaluation and review of office procedures. Lunch tentatively planned with the Sheriff and Undersheriff for 1 p.m.

---

*Tentative agenda for Marshall Hartman, CCTAP consultant.
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