

**FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES  
of the  
Suffolk County Legislature**

**Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Finance & Financial Services Committee was held in the Rose Y. Caraccappa Auditorium at the William Rogers Legislative Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on **April 19, 2001**, at 9:30 P.M.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Chairman  
Legislator Maxine Postal, Vice Chair  
Legislator Martin Haley  
Legislator Cameron Alden  
Legislator William Lindsay

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Paul Sabatino, Legislative Counsel  
Vincent Iaria, Probation Department  
Ben Wright, Department of Public Works  
Terrance Pearsall, Aide to Legislator Lindsay  
Alan R. Otto, Chief of Staff, Sheriff's Department  
Joe Rubacka, Lieutenant, Sheriff's Department  
Todd Johnson, County Executive's Office  
Ken Knappe, County Executive's Budget Office  
Jan Moore, County Executive's Budget Office  
Jim Maggio, Suffolk County Police Department  
Edward Webber, Suffolk County Police Department  
Phil Robilotto, Suffolk County Police Department  
Kathy Ayers Lanzillotta, Quality Consortium of Suffolk County  
Sharon Mullon, Catholic Charities  
Susan Kolmer Rothman, Focus Program  
Bob Ellis, Suffolk County Correction Officers  
Bill Maguire, Suffolk County Correction Officers  
Bill Rohrer, Suffolk County Police Department  
Fred Pollert, Director of Budget Review  
Maryann Wowak, Aide to Legislator Caracciolo  
All Interested Parties

**Minutes taken and transcribed by Irene Kulesa, Legislative Secretary**

***(The meeting came to order at 9:50 a.m.)***

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I call the committee to order. All rise for the Pledge of Allegiance to be led by Legislator Alden.

SALUTATION

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Will the clerk note that Legislator Haley is on his way. He is apparently stuck in traffic and the Chair would like to acknowledge, at this time, the newest member to the Finance Committee, Mr. Lindsay. Welcome aboard, Bill. Okay, I have several cards, several speakers, so we'll start with Susan Rothman. Please come forward. Make yourself comfortable there at the conference table. There's a microphone in front of you. There's a switch on the side.

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

Hello.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's fine. You need to speak into it, unfortunately.

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

Okay. My name is Susan Kolomer Rothman and I'm the Executive Director of the Program called Focus for our Children and Us. And for the last few years, we have been receiving funding from the State Legislature and Mr. Gaffney's Office. I was recently told that we were getting a budget reduction. It's an eighteen hundred-dollar reduction. We received sixty thousand, three hundred and twenty dollars. For that, I have two full time paralegals in Suffolk Family Court helping people establish child support. I am very grateful for the money and I was just wondering if maybe something could be done to get back the eighteen hundred dollars. It's not a huge amount but when you have budgeted for the year, it's monumental. So basically, that's all I'm asking and I would just hope that someone could look into it for us.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

In terms of any dialogue of conversation with the executive branch, could you share those conversations with us?

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

I have none.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Have you attempted to speak to anyone in the Budget Office?

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

No, I just received this on Friday. They said that if I did not agree to this and fax back that I agreed to the 3 percent, my funding would be shaky. I did that immediately and I received my contract with the deduction.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

The Chair acknowledges Legislator Haley's arrival and presence. Mr. Weiss, could you come forward and perhaps share a comment or two with us regarding this contract agency?

**MR. WEISS:**

As you know, during the County Executive's State of the County, the County Executive spoke about financial problems that the County was having and the need to reduce expenditures. We eliminated 10 percent of the funding in supplies, 25 percent of the funding in equipment and travel and we reduced contract agencies 3 percent across the board and 456 is 5 percent and 477 is 5 percent. I'm not familiar with this particular contract and I'm not sure what department that the contract is administered through. But I mean it sounds like the department is complying with the County Executive's directive and they sent a letter to the contract agency.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay that's an ample explanation. Legislator Postal has a question.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Yes, Ken was -- evidently said across the board, so that there was no prioritization or evaluation done with regard to what we're cutting, which agencies?

**MR. WEISS:**

That's correct. It was done similar to the way that the Legislature did with the so-called Caracappa bill in 1997.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Right, which some of us didn't vote for but a --

**MR. WEISS:**

Which did pass the Legislature.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

I know. I don't think the County Executive was happy with it, as I recall.

**MR. WEISS:**

But we did implement it.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

But a -- well, you had no choice. But at any rate, I seem to remember that in the County Executive's State of the County Address, when he spoke about beginning to resolve the issue of the looming deficit, he spoke about prioritization. He spoke about prioritization with regard to filling positions. He spoke about prioritization with regard to programmatic changes and I was just curious, it seems to be an across the board cut. I know that, you know in this case, Focus really probably saved us a tremendous amount of money by helping parents get child support orders who would normally get them, so that they don't have to come to DSS. But I have another question. On our agenda today and I don't that you can answer this Ken, because I think it's a legal question. There's Introductory Resolution 1263, which I believe relates to this reduction. Because I believe that the resolution talks about a 5 percent cut in consultant contracts, 3 percent cut for contract agencies and 3 percent cut for programs, which are not a 100 State or Federally funded. My question is why is this resolution before us?

**MR. WEISS:**

Okay.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Because the County Executive has within his own executive jurisdiction the ability to do all of these things.

**MR. WEISS:**

That's a very good question. All contracts that have not been executed have been cut in accordance with the powers that the County Executive has. Resolutions that have already been executed, because remember the County Executive came out with the State of the County of March 20th, the same day the All Department Head Memo came out. So any contract that was executed between January 1st and March 20th, in order to -- the County Attorney's Office advised us, in order to cut those contracts that were already executed, we needed the resolution because the language, the not appropriation clause in the language has to be instituted by a resolution, or implemented by a resolution.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

So that if we do not approve that resolution that regardless of these letters which are going out to contract agencies telling them that they must agree to this cut, we can't compel them to do that, you're telling me?

**MR. WEISS:**

I don't know if this agency, do you have your contract already?

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

Yes, I just received it this week and this is what I --

**MR. WEISS:**

But you received your contract with the 3 percent taken out?

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

Yes.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

But I think she said, if I understood correctly. I think that they had a contract previously. They received a letter asking -- am I right?

**MR. WEISS:**

No, no.

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

I received a phone call.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Phone call and --

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

They said to me, they would like me to fax over my agreement to the 3 percent. If not, my contract might --

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Did you have a contract prior to that call?

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

Not in my hands, no. It was agreed they had wanted a exhibit of what I was going to have in the --

**MR. WEISS:**

She didn't have an executed contract. That's why --

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

I did not.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Oh, okay. So it's only this resolution will only address those agencies, which as of March 20th, or whatever date you spoke, had an executed contract?

**MR. WEISS:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

And the County Executive is doing -- what he's doing with regard to these other agencies. Another question and I think -- I don't know if there are people here today to address this. But I've heard from agencies, which are receiving State or Federal funding, as well as County funding and they have gotten in writing, I guess, a letter that actually itemizes what the 3 percent, how much the 3 percent cut will mean and what the bottom line is. And I've seen, in at least some of the cases, where there's State and Federal funding, the 3 percent is also including the State and Federal funding. So that the 3 percent cut is not on the County portion of their funding but is on the total amount of funding, which concerns me for a couple of reasons. First of all, we went through this about four years ago.

**MR. WEISS:**

Maybe I can alleviate some of your fears.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Yes.

**MR. WEISS:**

There was a meeting one day last week, Monday. It's been a long week. Monday, when we met with various contract agencies and they brought out this problem. I met with my budget

staff yesterday and we have resolved this problem, in that, what we're doing is we're cutting 3 percent of the contract or 3 percent of the County contribution, whichever is less. So those agencies -- and those particularly applies to these oasis funded, where the State is a pass-through and the County contribution and in some cases, they were getting like a 17, 18 percent cut. We've advised the department of the interpretation that we made, so that problem should be resolved. Nobody should receive more than a 3 percent cut on their County contribution or the contract, whichever is lower.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

All right, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Ken, in anticipation of the resolution before us, 1263? Could you perhaps give the broader issue some context for the members of the committee, particularly Mr. Lindsay, as he is a new member of the committee, where the County stands with respect to finances and this projection of projected deficit? What is the number, as we speak?

**MR. WEISS:**

Okay. Earlier this year, Fred Pollert and myself sat down and reconciled our models in accordance with the legislation that requires us to do a two year budget and at that time, we had a difference of like thirty five million dollars, which sounds like a lot but when you're talking about a one 1.9 billion dollar budget, there's really not a large difference and -- but we both agree that the minimum problem was over a hundred and ten, I think a hundred and fourteen million dollars was the minimum of the problem. We are scheduled to meet again on Monday to update that, because now we got the first quarter sales tax in, which is not really telling because of the problems we had last year with adjustments. We still don't have the year end fund balance, because the books have not been closed and audited yet. So there's some pieces of information that are missing. Based on that, I haven't determined that the problem is anything different than it was before. I haven't really adjusted things because I don't have any information to do that. We're still looking at a deficit or -- I don't want to use the word deficit, a projected shortfall in preparation of a 2002 Budget that would -- that could be as high as a hundred and forty million dollars between the general fund and the police district.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

2001.

**MR. WEISS:**

No, in preparation of the 2002 Budget. I mean, I'm projecting a shortfall at the end of 2001 but when I do the projection forward to the 2002 Budget, there is a gap of some hundred and forty million dollars, which you know with no other -- if cuts weren't made and other revenues weren't brought in, we would have to raise taxes by that amount.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

All things being equal.

**MR. WEISS:**

All things being equal. Well, it's based on projections too. You know we have contracts and binding arbitration, things going on.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Let me ask Mr. Pollert, a question regarding this particular contract agency cutback. You're done, Ma'am.

**MS. ROTHMAN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thank you and others that may be similarly situated by virtue of the executive directive and/or legislative resolutions, or not legislative resolutions but resolutions that come to the

Legislature from the executive to implement this policy. First, from your perspective, in those cases where a member of the Legislature and the Legislature as a whole, may feel that an adjustment should be made on a case by case basis. If that were to be done, what kind of policy direction would you subscribe to?

**MR. POLLERT:**

When that has happened in the past, the Legislature has either changed broad perimeters, so that they would change the threshold for cuts to agencies that had offsetting aid. So in the past, even with turnover savings, the Legislature has changed the threshold to -- if an agency receives offsetting aid of 75 or 60 percent hold them harmless from the cuts. Or the Legislature has also established policies in the past, where if cuts to a contract agency will negatively impact either the County's finances or some other contract agencies that those cuts not take place. The total impact that Ken is speaking to in this resolution 1263 is approximately 4.2 million dollars. So to the extent that you don't carry through, you're going to be eroding part of the savings of the 4.2 million dollars that Ken has plugged into his budget model to start to close that projected shortfall next year.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Well, that leads to an obvious question to Mr. Weiss then. In total Ken, what amount of money would you anticipate to save by taking these measures? These contract agency 3 percent across the board cuts?

**MR. WEISS:**

The contract agencies, the 456, 477's and 498's, I believe are 4.1 million dollars. There's additional savings for the supplies that were cut, equipment, travel, the hiring, the temporary hiring moratorium. All total the cuts and you know, are going to be somewhere between twenty and thirty million dollars this year. That's our goal.

**LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:**

Okay, if that goal is not met, then how does one make adjustments in the budget next year, in terms of presentation and adoption?

**MR. WEISS:**

Well, I think to the extent, as I'm preparing the 2002 Budget with the County Executive, to the extent the savings aren't sufficient, then we would have to make further cuts in 2002. One thing I might advise the committee, the County Executive sent out the -- what we refer to is the call letter to departments. We sent it out on -- I believe it went out yesterday or maybe Tuesday and we asked the departments in preparing their 2002 Budget to submit a budget with a zero percent increase over the 2001 Adopted Budget. Now that's not the normal call letter we send out. Normally we send out a call letter asking them to submit a budget that's no more than 4 percent above the previous year's budget, 4 percent on the discretionary side of the budget. In this case, we asked the department to send a zero increase budget and we also told them to submit a budget with a 4 percent reduction. And we also mentioned in the letter that if things happened over the course of the year, to make matters worse that we would be contacting them for further reductions. So to the extent that we don't have savings this year, the savings will be, you know a multiplier of what the reductions were this year for next year.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Again, to -- for the benefit of Legislator Lindsay, explain what will transpire between now and the budget presentation in September. And then thereafter, in terms of the presentation, in terms of tax increases and budget caps, just give the committee a quick review, synopsis of the various budget cap laws that the Legislature must deal with?

**MR. WEISS:**

Okay, there's basically two cap laws that the County Executive has to comply with when he submits the budget and you'll see this in the first instance with the Community College Budget, which we'll be submitting sometime in June. There is an expenditure cap, which doesn't apply to the college, by the way. But there's an expenditure cap that requires

expenditures on the discretionary side of the budget that they can't increase more than 4 percent over the prior years adopted budget. There is also a cap called the tax levy tax, which requires that the discretionary side of the budget that the tax levy not be more than 4 percent of the prior year's discretionary tax levy. That's a requirement for the County Executive. Last year, for the County Executive to comply with the caps, he submitted a budget that eliminated 83.5 million dollars of necessary expenses from the budget. With the budget, we submitted a resolution recommending that the Legislature restore the 83.5 million dollars. The Legislature is the only body that has the power to pierce the cap with a super majority that is fourteen votes. The County Executive cannot submit a budget that exceeds the caps and will not.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Fred?

**MR. POLLERT:**

What's very important to have the Legislators understand this here and it's good that this topic has come up, is that the caps apply to the tax levy not the tax warrant. The tax warrant is that the taxpayers actually pay after adjustments for a positive or negative carryover fund balance. So this year, the County Executive can propose a tax warrant increase in excess of a hundred million dollars and still be within the caps. So one of the objectives of the County Executive's Office is to mitigate that property tax warrant increase by proposing a quarter cent sales tax increase. If that sales tax increase does not take place, the County Executive can propose and submit to the Legislature a budget with in excess of a hundred million-dollar property tax impact without being constrained by the 4 percent caps. So the caps this year, in all probability, will not constrain the preparation of a budget but it will force the Legislature to have to address a proposed operating budget that could have more than a hundred million dollar property tax impact, if no remedial actions are taken.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

In order to adopt that budget, would require ten, twelve, fourteen?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Ten votes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Ten votes.

**MR. POLLERT:**

So in the abstract world, the County Executive could, absent having new revenues from sales tax, submit a cost to continue operating budget with more than a hundred million dollar tax increase be within the property tax caps and that could be adopted with a ten vote resolution.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

In terms of percentages, what would the average increase be?

**MR. POLLERT:**

It would, in large part, depend upon what the legislative policy would be with respect to the quarter cent sales tax. It's currently being sent to the Police District Fund 15. If that's brought back to the general fund, then the impact will fall primarily on the police district but overall, you're looking at approximately a one hundred dollar per household property tax impact to two hundred dollars depending upon where the impact falls in either the general fund or in the police district.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

So for residents in the police district, there would be an increase either way depending on which way the budget was adopted. For residents on the East End and districts that I and Legislator Guldi represent, there would only be an impact, an adverse impact that there was - that increase was primarily kept within the general budget.

**MR. POLLERT:**

That's correct. So if we are -- just talking about round numbers. If we are potentially talking about a one hundred million dollar shortfall, that would fall into primarily, the general fund unless approximately fifty million dollars worth of sales tax came back from the police district to the general fund. Ken and myself are going to be updating the numbers on Monday, as he had indicated, there are two positive factors, at this point in time, which we're going to have to discuss on Monday. Number one, we're going to be doing a memo, which we normally do to the Legislators following the number of filled spots. We have notice that there has been a decline in the hiring in the County, which is a positive. It would mean that we would have a greater surplus in the permanent salary accounts and number two, the first quarter sales tax, we had originally projected there to be a decline because last year, the first quarter, we didn't have the clothing exemption. This first quarter, we do have a clothing exemption, therefore, we thought that we would have a decline. It appears we actually have a net increase over the first quarter of the last year. That's also a positive. Those two factors are going to be just a number of the factors that we're going to talking about on Monday, when we try to reconcile the two budget models.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's a good segue then into collective bargaining negotiations. Obviously, we can't discuss those here. But Ken, can you give the Legislature a sense as to which bargaining units are perhaps close to reaching some type of settlement with the County?

**MR. WEISS:**

I really can't get into that. I can say that we had an arbitration with the superior officers on Friday, so that should be -- I would expect -- Fred reminded me that we did settle with the detective investigators, which that resolution would be eligible to be voted on, I believe, the first meeting in May. The superior officers, we had a binding arbitration session this past Friday. I would expect a decision there in a couple of months. We have not begun the binding arbitration for the detectives yet and we're still in negotiation with the AME and correction officers.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Before we go on to the next two speakers, who represent Catholic Charities, are there any questions on any of the topics we've just discussed? Legislator Postal.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Ken, I know that this if the Finance Committee and you're a financial person but we seem to be looking at this purely from a fiscal point of view. And I understand that's your responsibility, in the sense that just with regard to the portion of the resolution that proposes to cut 3 percent from all programs, which are not 100 percent State or Federally aided. As Fred Pollert, just said a little while ago, in the past, you know we've made a determination about 75 percent, 60 percent, where we're making a decision with regard to services. For example, we can save a whole lot of money if we closed our health centers. But you know we recognize that we have a responsibility to provide certain services. That seems not to be playing a part in this whole process.

**MR. WEISS:**

I think it does, because you notice there's a 3 percent cut for contract agencies?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Yes, I do.

**MR. WEISS:**

With a 25 percent cut for department's equipment and a 10 percent cut for the department supplies. And the departments are going to see more than a 3 percent cut in their staffing.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

I do understand that.

**MR. WEISS:**

So the least amount of the cut was directed towards the contract agencies, that 3 percent.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Yes and I, you know I can -- I recognize that but I also recognize that the contract agencies, number one, tend to work on a much slimmer margin. That's why we have a living wage bill before us. Because we recognize that many of the agencies with which we contract pay very low salaries, in some cases, because they can't make ends meet in any other way. But you know, the other issue is we seem to be nickel and dimming everybody to death and maybe what we should be doing instead, is looking at which agencies really fill an important role, really have a vital function that's important to provide services and which may not. And maybe we should be going in a different direction and making larger cuts to agencies that we do business with that don't produce a result for us and leave the agencies that are performing something, a vital service alone.

**MR. WEISS:**

I agree and I think, when we ask the departments to send in prioritization analysis, unfortunately they didn't really get into the kind of details that I had hoped. But I am planning on having the departments prioritize their contract agencies in the forthcoming budget. You know it's kind of hard. There really wasn't the time to do a complete analysis of the contract agencies before we determine which one got a 3 percent cut, which one got a 5 percent cut. But next year, with the departments having sufficient time and sufficient notice that there's going to be a zero percent increase, they are going to have to make some tough decisions, as far as, which contract agencies are cut more than 3 percent and which contract agencies are not cut at all, in order to come out with a zero percent budget. The departments are the only ones that can do, make a determination as to what contract agencies perform for them. And it would be their responsibility to make that determination before we submit our 2002 recommended budget.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Just one last question. The 5 percent cut in the resolution that's proposed for consultants? Does that include the Department of Public Work's consultants to do the planning steps on our road projects? Does it include outside counsel?

**MR. WEISS:**

I would include outside counsel. Anything funded from the Operating Budget, if the Department of Public Works consultant is funded through the Operating Budget yes that would be a 5 percent cut.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Generally it's not. It's funded through the Capital Budget, right?

**MR. WEISS:**

Right. If it's funded through the Capital Budget, you know we haven't addressed the Capital Budget.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Well, you know I'm just suggesting to you that -- I'm only speaking for me. Before I would vote to take a penny from any of the contract agencies under this 3 percent cut, I'd like to see us cutting the enormous amounts of money that we're paying for consultants for planning and design in the Department of Public Works and we're bonding, so we're not only paying an enormous amounts of money, we're borrowing and incurring interest costs to pay those consultants, when for a number of years, the Legislature has included positions in-house, in the budget to do a great deal of that work and I would ask Mr. Pollert, am I understanding those positions have not been filled? Maybe one of them has been filled?

**MR. POLLERT:**

They have not been completely filled. The titles that were filled are just starting to come up to speed. That was actually done about two or three years ago. There were a few junior engineers, which were included, however, you're correct the bulk of the consultant work actually does take place through the Capital Program where most of the major highway

projects and the building projects are contracted out with the building design.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

If we were to, again, to Mr. Pollert, just on that same line of thought. If we were to decide that we were going to do all or most of that work in-house, is there a point at which we come out ahead by hiring staff in-house?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That's an excellent question. We have asked the Department of Public Works that a number of times, as well as the Public Works Committee has also followed up on that topic. We really have not gotten a good solid answer from the Department of Public Works. Part of the difficulty is they feel that we would be unable to hire the specialty skills required at County salaries to do some of the mechanical engineering and some of the highly technical air conditioning work, the technical road engineering work. So they feel that irrespective of how they staffed up, they would continue to always require consultant work for specialty projects.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Ken I know we just had the proposed Capital Budget. Can you give me a ballpark figure of how much we budget in the Capital Budget, let's say how much we budgeted last year or how much is proposed this year for those kinds of planning contracts for County road projects?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Tuesday, we had a staff meeting in the Budget Review Office and that's going to be part of the fund end project to our review. We've asked all the analysts to go through, to look at what type of contract costs are included in each of the Capital Projects, so that we can try to present some sort of an overall picture to the Legislators with our review.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Do you remember how much it was last year?

**MR. POLLERT:**

No, I don't.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Okay. Ken I would just suggest that the County Executive push the Department of Public Works and take a look at that. I know that it doesn't affect our Operating Budget for the immediate year but it certainly has an impact that's ongoing and just the volume of these consultant contracts has enormous impact.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Legislator Haley.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

You know, I somewhat agree with Legislator Postal, in that we should look at every nook and cranny. But I really think I'm in agreement with the County Executive, in that we need to go across the board, make sure that everyone accepts the burden. The problem is we get down to start picking and choosing contract agencies, we're going to reduce the amount of savings. We're going to probably politicize some of it, whereas if we just do the right thing right from the beginning and we cut across the board and we ask everyone to bear the burden, even if it is consulting fees that are born through bonding, which I think when you find out, it will be a very, very small amount but that's okay. Well, I think, when you project it to what we've paying out of bonds, you know principle and interest payments over the years, you're going to find it's a very small amount. But regardless, I don't have a problem looking at all of that. But if you're going to get into picking and choosing contract agencies, I think, we're going to have a highly politically charged problem regarding that, whereas that if everyone is expected to carry the burden, it's a lot more acceptable, I think.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred, before we close this topic, rule of thumb, when we talk about Capital Projects, land and design usually accounts for what percentage of the total project cost?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Roughly 10 percent.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's what I thought. With that said, what was the Capital Budget that was adopted by the Legislature?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Roughly one hundred million dollars.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

So you would be talking about ten million dollars?

**MR. POLLERT:**

You'd actually be talking a little less than that because of land acquisitions, which don't include the planning and design phase.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

If you had to put a figure on it, what would it be?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Just as a rough guesstimate probably in the neighborhood of five to seven million dollars.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. So then the question is, in terms of analysis, then maybe the budget office could undertake is to determine whether or not on an ongoing basis, it would be cost effective to have County staff and personnel perform these services at a cost of five to seven million dollars a year or to continue to contract out for these services. It's a very simple question.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Question? One quick question? Are you saying that five to seven million dollars goes purely to consultants?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That would be a number off the top of my head, it's correct.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I'd love to verify that. I know there's planning and there's a lot of planning and stuff that goes on within the department.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Just again, using the rule of thumb, it's approximately ten percent under planning and design. We have approximately a one hundred million-dollar Capital Program but portions of it deal with land acquisitions.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Let's do the homework before we project that.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred and Ken, when could you report back to the committee with that information?

**MR. WEISS:**

Two weeks.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. We'll make sure to include that on the agenda. Okay, speaking of the agenda, I'd like to move things along. We have two speakers that would like to make a presentation on behalf of Catholic Charities on, I believe, 1263. Would they please come forward? Is it two or three individuals? One individual? Okay, both of you come up then. Separate? Okay,

very good. Is this Sharon or Kathleen? Okay.

**MS. MULLON:**

We're on here?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes you are.

**MS. MULLON:**

Good morning, my name is Sharon Mullan. I'm going to deviate a little bit from the prepared testimony because, I think, all of you are well aware of the range of activities of Catholic Charities within Suffolk County. I'd like to talk a little bit about the cuts and what they really mean. Throughout the years, human service providers have been assuming larger and larger subsidies, so that critical services would be available to those in need. Catholic Charities and other Social Service Agencies have contributed millions of dollars to subsidize under-funded government programs. Many dedicated human service providers have sustained severe financial losses resulting from years of flat funding, increased demand for services and ever rising costs. Simply put, the expenditures keep growing while the income shrinks. The proposed Suffolk County contract reductions can only result in disastrous service cuts. Service cuts to real people with real needs and frequently, these are the very people that are too vulnerable to advocate for themselves. With inadequate government funding further reduced, how will Social Service Agencies operate? And who will be left unserved?

At an informational meeting with County representatives on Monday, the issue of lost New York State money was raised by contract agencies and the issue really came down to what did this really mean? Why would Suffolk County choose to balance a budget and return State funds? It doesn't seem to make a lot of sense and actually what you're doing is you're doubling the loss of service dollars to County residents. After this issue was raised at the meeting, the County officials have agreed to explore ways to preserve the State dollars. I believe that this experience exemplifies the values of open dialogue and the potential benefits of constructive problem solving.

In closing, I ask you to consider creating a collaborative partnership with contract agencies, County officials and Legislators to resolve the County's budget shortfall. Secondly, since the complexity of multi-funded contract requires detailed analysis, I urge you to proceed slowly and cautiously. Lastly, before you approve any reductions in contracts, I ask you to remember the most vulnerable, the County residents who lose critical services. The real person with the real need who has no voice but places their hope in you. I thank you for this opportunity to speak to you this morning.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Would you just share with us some of the programs and services that would be affected by these cuts?

**MS. MULLON:**

We have Senior Case Management. We have Meals on Wheels Programs. We have Senior Affordable Housing. We have HIV Aids Treatment Centers. You know there's a multitude of services, Mental Health Clinics.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I guess what I'm really asking you is perhaps, you could prepare for the members of this committee a summary of how in each of those areas you just mentioned, these cuts? What these cuts would really mean? I think, then it gives us a real opportunity to see how it touches people as you described it might? Okay, so if you could do that, I'd appreciate that very much.

**MS. MULLON:**

It just seems to me that when we're talking about this, it's penny wise and pound-foolish. You know to save 4.1 million dollars on contract agencies in the scheme of things, it's a very

small amount of money. When you're also losing corresponding State funds as a result of this, it really doesn't seem to be a sensible approach for balancing the budget.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

I think, we all heard you say that. I think, I also heard you say that as a result of the dialogue that commenced on Monday, there's been acknowledgment by the part of County budget officials that that is not a cost efficient way to proceed and they will attempt to address that and that's as they should do.

**MS. MULLON:**

But that still includes larger subsidies from contract agencies.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Right but I think with the members of the Legislature, not only this committee really need to know is how individually, in terms of the program services you provide, these impacts will be felt and where do these individuals go if they don't receive these services? How does it really affect real people in real ways? That's what I'm asking for, okay? Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Yes, Legislator Lindsay has a question.

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Do I understand you correctly that by cutting the County portion of your budget; you lose a matching amount with the State? Is it dollar for dollar?

**MS. MULLON:**

I'm not sure if it's dollar for dollar in every contract? Because I haven't -- you know, we just found out about this the other day. So I haven't really had time to look at that and I'm not sure that anyone in our agency has actually gone with every single contract that we have, because we have so many and look line by line to see how this is going to affect us? But when that question was raised on Monday, at the informational meeting, I mean it was a real problem and it's a problem for a lot of agencies. It's not just Catholic Charities. I don't come simply to represent charity. I think, it's many human service providers are, you know, put it in the same division.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Legislator Lindsay, let me have Mr. Weiss come up? Perhaps I'll try to address that question. Ken, in terms of the loss of State Aid, should these cuts be implemented, what will be the impact? And is there some way to redress that, so that there would be no loss of State Aid?

**MR. WEISS:**

Well, it depends on the contract. We have a lot of different types of contracts. We have contracts that are reimbursed directly. If you spend a dollar, you get, you know, forty cents, fifty cents, depending on the type of contract. We have contracts that are pass-through Federal and State Aid. Those were the ones that were that if we had cut the way we were going to cut, it would adversely affect the programs more than it should have been. If a contract is 100 percent, then it's excluded from cuts.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Well there's a goal then to exclude 100 percent County funding to meet this 4.1 million dollar objective? I think that's the question.

**MR. WEISS:**

Well, if we just dealt with 100 percent County funded agencies, we wouldn't have any cuts because there aren't any.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, so there are none. So how do you reach this goal of 4.1 million dollars?

**MR. WEISS:**

That's the Net County share of the cuts.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

But in doing so, would the County is then forfeiting some Federal or State Aid? Is that not?

**MR. WEISS:**

It's no different then if we don't hire somebody in Social Services that would be 50 percent aided if we hired them and we don't hire them, we save 50 percent.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay on the flip side of the issue, to take the contract agency perspective, since they provide the services. What's the real impact of real people by making these cuts?

**MR. WEISS:**

Well, maybe we should ask the question what's the impact of not making the cuts?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well that's an issue that the Legislature obviously, has to deal with at some point. And the only way we can deal with it is if we have both sides of the coin.

**MR. WEISS:**

Right. The County Executive is trying to deal with the financial problem early on or it gets --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I respect that. I think, we all respect that. But I think, in respecting that position, Legislators have to know what the other options are, if we don't provide these services. Is there a net cost somewhere down the line to government, to County Government? You know you pay now or you pay later. It seems to me to be something that we always are dealing with in government.

**MR. WEISS:**

And you solve your problem now, or you solve your problem later, like in Nassau County where contract agencies have 20, 30, 40 percent.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

We don't disagree.

**MR. WEISS:**

So we're taking what we feel is a responsible position by doing small cuts now, doing them early in the year, so that as we get to the 2002 Budget, we can restore the County to fiscal stability with the help of the quarter cent sales tax.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I hear what you're saying. I just -- I wish you'd hear what I'm trying to say and that is, what is the real effects of these cuts on real people? You know, because you acknowledge you pay now, you pay later. So if you cut these services, real people are affected in real ways and how do you address that and when do you address that, next year? Like when things get better?

**MR. WEISS:**

Like asking what's the effect of raising taxes by 150 percent. Some people would say --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's really a separate issue and that's a policy issue for the Legislature to consider. Whether to increase revenues or to cut expenditures. What you're attempting to do and what's note worthy is you're trying to, you know, fulfill your responsibilities and cut expenditures. What we're asking is, in doing so, are we doing it in a cost efficient way that is

not just short term but long term positive?

**MR. WEISS:**

We think we are, otherwise we wouldn't proceed in this course.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay and I guess that's where the debate will begin. Because obviously, there will be those who will feel otherwise and the challenge really is to those agencies, as I mentioned before, to provide us with the information, so that we can make proper evaluation. Thank you.

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes, Legislator Lindsay.

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Yes, so we really don't know the 4.1 million dollars, because of the matching number? I mean, does it wind up six million as a shortfall to the -- we don't know that number yet?

**MR. WEISS:**

I could probably find out what that number is but it's a -- the County savings --

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Is four point one but we don't know what the net effect is to the contracting agencies because of the matching numbers?

**MR. WEISS:**

No, as we don't know what the difference is in cutting the supplies and the equipment and the travel and the --

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

No, I'm not talking about that. I'm just talking to the not for profit agencies that are contracted with the County by cutting the 4.1 million dollars and by losing matching State funds, what's the net effect on human services?

**MR. WEISS:**

Well, it's no more than the 3 percent cut to any contract agency.

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

That is what I'm asking. I wanted to know if we know the dollar amount of what the effect would be on the agency that provides the service for the residents of Suffolk County?

**MR. WEISS:**

All I can say is, if you're cutting 3 percent and that's all you're cutting, then the effect cannot be more than 3 percent.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

What's the dollar amount?

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Is anybody doing the analysis of what the net cuts will be to the residents of Suffolk County?

**MR. WEISS:**

I haven't done it but I can do that.

**LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:**

Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

So we will add that to your presentation in two weeks?

**MR. WEISS:**

I don't think I'm going to be here then but a --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Or someone from the office?

**MR. WEISS:**

I'll have somebody make it.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, all right. Yes, Legislator Postal.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

You spoke about increasing the sales tax by a quarter percent. If we were to do that and is it realistic to do that for September? Or are we looking at December? What is your read on when that could be actually implemented?

**MR. WEISS:**

We're looking at June.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

So that we could do it as quickly as June. Is it realistic?

**MR. WEISS:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

And if we did that, what would the -- what additional revenue do you project would be generated, which would have what impact on the projected deficit?

**MR. WEISS:**

I have a schedule that Fred's office prepared, which indicated that if we were able to get the sales tax in June 1st, we would receive twenty nine million dollars for this year. July would be twenty-four. August would be twenty. September 16, October 11. You know if we have to wait until December, it's only four million dollars. We were including in our projections of July 1st, start date. Now we're trying to get a June 1st, start date. These are included. In other words, with the sales tax starting June and July, having it available for all next year, with the cuts, then we're down to a, you know, just a double digit tax increase in the police district instead of a triple digit tax increase in the general fund on top of a double digit tax increase in the police district.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

I heard the County Executive in the State of the County talking about his plans for deficit reduction and he addressed the elimination of sales tax on clothing items under a hundred and ten dollars indicating it was in contention to continue that exempt, that sales tax exemption. How much money do you project that generates in a year?

**MR. WEISS:**

I still don't know. I'm waiting for the State to determine how much Suffolk County lost. I believe it's in excess of forty million dollars, although I don't have anything that --

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Over the period that it's been in effect?

**MR. WEISS:**

I'd say one year.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Yes.

**MR. WEISS:**

It's been in effect for one year.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Right.

**MR. WEISS:**

So I'm talking about on annual basis.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Right. Well okay, go ahead; I'm sorry, Ken. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

**MR. WEISS:**

The County Executive, I think, he mentioned in the State of the County that we have the option on March 1st, of each year to restore the sales tax on clothing with a 90-day notice. Since the timing of the problem was such, we couldn't wait until March 1st, next year. That would be insufficient to solve the problem. That's why he opted to go with the increase quarter.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Well, that's not what he said in the State of the County. He spoke about economic benefits to merchants and businesses in Suffolk County. But you know we're looking at a deficit going into the next year. So that planning ahead, you know, I think that that I think, it's not just out of the question that that could have been an alternative. And I'm just suggesting that whether we accept the forty million dollar figure or not, I certainly think, that at the very least, that should have been weighed as an alternative to cutting human services contract agencies.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, what I'd like to do at this time since the meeting is beginning to run long and we still have one more public speaker is to refrain, if we can, from further questions related to these issues. We'll have plenty of opportunity to do so. We obviously need more information from both sides before we can make some choices and decisions. So I would urge that the members of the committee refrain from pursuing this line of questioning until a later date and have those who we invited from Probation, Sheriff's Department and the Police Department make presentations as to where we stand with overtime accounts, year to date. So we'll have -- thank you very much, Sharon. And Kathleen, is it Lanzillotta?

**MS. LANZILLOTTA:**

Kathleen Ayers Lanzillotta, a long last name, the Lanzillotta name. I'm Kathy Ayers Lanzillotta. I work for Catholic Charities. I'm the administrator of our alcohol and substance services and I'd be happy to answer the question that you raised before about how specifically, this would impact on people, especially the fifty, fifty State Funded Programs. But in the interest of time, I could do that later, if you would like.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well, I would appreciate -- we would appreciate it if you did that in writing.

**MR. LANZILLOTTA:**

I will. I'm here today though as the President of the Suffolk County Quality Consortium. The Quality Consortium is a member organization representing twenty-four of the voluntary not for profit providers in Suffolk County providing alcohol and substance abuse treatment services, specifically. We were at the meeting on Monday and we really appreciate the efforts that the County has made now to consider how that 3 percent cut is going to be imposed and I have copies of testimony here. I don't know if you want to --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes, we'll have copies.

**MR. LANZILLOTA:**

In keeping with what we've heard today that the 3 percent cut would only be on the County contribution. We looked at the resolution and we'd like to, as you see in the first sentence, recommend a possible amendment to the resolution to assure that the cut is only on the County contributory funding. I don't know that I need to read it all but if you just read that except for mandated appropriations contained in volume two of the 2001 Adopted Budget and those portions of budgets, which are funded by non-County sources shall be reduced as follows: That would assure that it's only on the County contribution.

On April 5th, the majority of our twenty-four agencies were instructed to cut their budgets by 3 percent. We were initially told that the 3 percent cut was to be calculated on our total budget, which includes State funding. In some cases, the majority of the funding is from State sources and many of our contract agencies, 80 to 85 percent of the funding is State funding. The resulting 3 percent of the total budget was then to be applied as a cut only to the County portion of our funding and some of our smallest agencies would be hit the hardest. The result would be a significant reduction in County support for drug and alcohol treatment and prevention services. The cuts in County contributions for these services would have ranged and we understand that this may not be the case now, from 18 percent to 50 percent. We've recently learned that the way this 3 percent cut is to be calculated is being further reviewed.

The amendment we are suggesting would ensure that these cuts are only made to the County portion of the funding. The reduction on the County side of six member agency budgets may call for a corresponding reduction of the funding the County receives from the State for support of treatment and prevention services. We feel this is penny wise and pound-foolish. Strategies to be considered to prevent the loss of State funds and we've begun to meet and will meet with the State on specific contracts, different State agencies have different rules on how we may be able to prevent some of that State funding reduction. But I don't know that there's a way to prevent all of it.

This entire process begs the question what are the priorities and values of the County Executive's Office? Is everything to be sacrificed to support law enforcement in the County? Budget cuts to the treatment agencies have a direct correlation to the criminal justice system. If the State reforms the Rockefeller Drug Laws this year, how will our County handle the treatment caseload? In addition, consistent long term research has shown the most efficient and affective way to address our drug use problems is through treatment and prevention services. We, therefore, urge you to consider our recommendation to amend this resolution to assure that the impact of the County cuts to our chemical dependency treatment and prevention services is minimized. I'd also like to add, if I may, in hearing the conversations thus far that I don't know if it would appropriate but if there could be something in the resolution that might say pursuant to the elimination of the projected shortfall, the Suffolk County contributory funding cuts will be rescinded. If there's any way --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's an issue, you'd have to take up with the County Executive's staff.

**MS. LANZILLOTTA:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

The question I have for Budget Review, Fred, the State has projected anywhere depending on which chamber estimate you choose to believe, anywhere from a one to three billion dollar State surplus. Is that not correct?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Yes. I believe that those are the numbers.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

And historically, as one looks back, the surplus usually that is generated is somewhere between the high and the low figure, so if that were to be assumed to be the case again, one would assume that the State's surplus for their -- is it their present FY or previous?

**MR. POLLERT:**

It would be for the previous, as well as the current.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay.

**MR. POLLERT:**

So it would be the total amount of funds available.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

From 2000, 2001. So that would be about 1.7 billion dollars. Has anyone at the County level, Mr. Weiss or Mr. Pollert aware of how the State intends, when it finally adopts its budget late again, by months and probably July or August, how they, at this early stage, are planning to divvy up that surplus?

**MR. POLLERT:**

The most detailed type of analysis we have done relates to the Community College where there's a proposal to increase the FTE Aid. We're factoring that in on a college model. With respect to the County as a whole, as far as the Budget Review Office is concerned, we are not anticipating that we are going to receive a windfall from the State Operating Budget through enhanced revenues. In fact, it appears that in one or two areas, the County may be losing some funds, in particular, related to how adjustments are made for nursing home reimbursements and things of that sort. It should shift from the nursing home to the general fund but there could still be a loss of some revenues.

**MR. WEISS:**

I think, there's a lot of progress has not been made on the State Budget. So we really don't know which way it's going.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

All right. I appreciate your comments. I'd like to get on with the rest of our agenda. There will be plenty of opportunity to continue this discussion and dialog. Thank you for attending.

**MS. LANZILOTTA:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, at this time I'd like to have representatives of Probation, Sheriff's and the Police Department come forward. If we can make some room at the table for them? If Budget Review and maybe Fred and Lance can slide around, make some room up there; we can get through these presentations in very short order. Mr. Iaria, Chief Otto, Chief Robolitto. Mr. Iaria, why don't you lead off while everyone else gets comfortable.

**MR. IARIA:**

I don't know how detailed you want to get but we can go into individual appropriations, whether you want the big picture.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well, we'd like to have the big picture in light of the final adoption, the final Legislature of an approval for a new juvenile detention center and what positive effects that may have, in terms of future overtime expenditures?

**MR. IARIO:**

Well, you know we're still far away from --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I understand.

**MR. IARIO:**

The actual detention center but we did open up a non-secure group home and that will help. Basically, the bottom line is we looked at our first quarter 2001 and we spent a hundred and ninety thousand, sixty-four dollars and we're basically, right on projections for the year 2001, which we expect to spend nine thousand -- nine hundred thousand -- nine hundred fifteen thousand dollars.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Was that the amount budgeted?

**MR. IARIO:**

That was the amount budgeted. So we're running -- right, a little bit below but we expect that the first quarter is usually low because the cold weather, the detention is used less. The kids start getting a little wilder. The detention starts increasing. Our April figures are showing that detention-housing juveniles is gone up. So we expect to be right on target for this year.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well one, any content with a projection of being on target but I am not. Is there some way that we can plan and implement programs to reduce the overtime? Obviously, you've heard from the Budget Offices where the County stands financially. Let me finish.

**MR. IARIO:**

Yes sir.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

It's incumbent upon every department, including those in law enforcement to attempt to share to the extent possible and a realistic program --

**MR. IARIO:**

Well, a lot of this is beyond our control. We have a 7 percent, about 7 percent vacancies in our -- so we have like twenty-eight vacancies.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

We're talking now about staff personnel vacancies. Is that what you're referring to?

**MR. IARIO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. What are the plans of filling those vacancies to cut down on some of the overtime?

**MR. IARIO:**

At this point, we don't have any instructions to fill any of our vacancies.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That begs the question, is it cost effective not to fill vacancies? If there is a long term need for staffing, would it not be prudent and let me have Budget Review answer this question. From your perspective, which is more cost effective, in terms of probation and their mission, when it comes to staffing? To have more staffing than they presently have or to attempt to accomplish what they are required to by law with minimum staffing and increased overtime expenditures?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Within the Probation Department, their caseloads have always run relatively high. Because they have almost a continuous demand for overtime on a by-weekly payroll period, much like the nursing home, we had always recommended in the past that they be granted their request for additional probation officers. So we have always been very supportive within the Probation Department of their requests for additional staff and personnel. When the

department does put in those requests, they do reduce their requests for overtime as well.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

So at what point level Fred, should there be increased personnel staffing in Probation that you would recommend on a continual long-term basis from where they are today?

**MR. POLLERT:**

I would really have to sit down and discuss the matter with the analyst to review the Probation Department. I can't really give you a number at this point in time of the, you know, what the proper mix of new probation officers would be.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Could you do that for the Chair? And I will consider sponsoring a resolution to provide that additional personnel if there is and only if there is going to be a net cost savings to County Government. Fred, did you hear the last part? Only if there is going to be a continual net cost savings to County Government.

**MR. IARIA:**

I should add that we did -- we are seven hundred and eighty thousand dollars lower than last year, in terms of that money was taken out of our overtime budget based on the fact that we were opening a new twelve bed non-secured detention center.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay.

**MR. IARIA:**

So, you know we are much lower already even than last year.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I can appreciate your position that you're a department head. You have to take direction from above and that's understood. Our job is to try to provide the most cost efficient services to County residents at the most affordable cost and if it's more cost effective to provide you with some additional staff, on an ongoing basis and Budget Review will let us know if that's the case, then we should add staffing to your department and I don't think you would object if that were to be the case?

**MR. IARIA:**

No, I wouldn't.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. Fred?

**MR. IARIA:**

I'll go on record.

**MR. POLLERT:**

The cost savings would be in the long term. In the short term, it would be more expensive because when you hire probation officer trainees, it's a period of time before they become productive and can start to reduce what the overtime costs are. So that coming out of the box, you could not add one or two new sponsors or even five new sponsors, whatever the number is to the Probation Department, using the overtime as an offset. Because it would be a lead-time before they become productive and can impact what the overtime in the department will be.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Right. Also I think what has to be acknowledged is that within the department, there has been recently anyhow, some significant turnover where personnel leave probation and go to other law enforcement positions in County Government or elsewhere. Is that not the case?

**MR. IARIA:**

More likely, people retire. There's been a few people that have gone to corrections but --

and there are a bunch of people on the police test, police lists. So we may lose people that way. They're also, you know to be fair, there are positions, there's overtime that we won't be able to control. For instance, when we have a -- we get notified that someone has been picked up on a warrant in the evening, in another jurisdiction. In our jurisdiction, we have to send out a team to respond and you know and that adding more staff might not impact in that area.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

In terms of this new and I know Legislator Alden, has a question and maybe this and I hope I'm not stealing his thunder but you mentioned in passing a new -- you referred to it as a group home that has been opened?

**MR. IARIA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, could you provide for us where that location is?

**MR. IARIA:**

That's on the grounds of Brunswick Hospital and you have a 12-bed facility.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. In terms of the long term cost savings by having more of these juveniles retained within the confines of the County of Suffolk, as opposed to being transported and housed elsewhere. This year what would you expect to be the savings?

**MR. IARIA:**

Well, right now we received seven hundred and eighty thousand dollars. We're just right in the overtime and you have the exact --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes.

**MR. IARIA:**

Yes that's it.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay.

**MR. IARIA:**

Just so you know, there's two levels of security, one is that non-secure. That doesn't -- that impacts somewhat. Because it's a judicial discretion to determine whether or not that person is going to be housed in a non-secure or secured. The judge orders secure, we're going to have to transport to Nassau County or beyond and we're still making trips to Syracuse and Albany for secured detention purposes and that's why we desperately need to build our own facility.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

And finally, on the new facility. What is the expectation as to what it will be on line?

**MR. IARIA:**

Well right now, my understanding is DPW has an RFP out for an architect and that's returnable April 27th but I haven't been able to verify that that's the return date yet.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Do you know what the timetable for construction is?

**MR. IARIA:**

Well, my timetable is two years but I don't know whether that's --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That can be met?

**MR. IARIA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. Legislator Alden.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

You mentioned before that -- how many officers are you down?

**MR. IARIA:**

I don't have that figure but I'm down twenty-seven, twenty-eight people.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Okay. Those unfilled positions are they included in your budget? Are you budgeted for the salaries of those?

**MR. IARIA:**

Yes.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Okay, thanks.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Are there any other questions for probation? Okay, then we'll move along from my right to my left and that should be the Police Department, Chief Robilotto.

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

I promise, I won't be that long. We have a small problem and we believe it to be a blip that we anticipated. Currently, we're about a million dollars, a million and a half over where we were last year. As we said last time, the class does us no good until we can actually get them out on the street. We talked about instituting the program where we accelerated the field training that that looks like it's going to give us some fruition in the early part of next month. We are projected to be very, very close to the budget, plus or minus 1 or 2 percent. At this point and again, caveat would be absent extreme circumstances. We lucked out with the snowstorm that really didn't materialize; that hit on a day when the DARE officers were released from school. They were working, so we didn't have to backfill too much with that. Generally speaking, we anticipate being well within the budget.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well that's some good news for a change. Speaking of DARE, since that issue is influx, the Legislature, as you know is in the process of retaining consultants for a study and pending that study, I guess, a determination will be made at a later date by the Legislature as to whether or not to continue that program. That said, from the department's perspective, if DARE were to be -- the assignment of DARE personnel were to be reassigned, what function would they be reassigned to?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

The DARE personnel would be left in the COPE units.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. What effects positive or negative would that have on departmental effectiveness and our expenditures?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

Well there's approximately thirty-four officers assigned full time to the DARE Program. They

work basically, with the school year, which is 180 days. That's a phenomenal amount of manpower available to us to utilize, particularly, it gives us the advantage of being able to spread their vacations out over the entire year and not lose their services for the summer months, which is when we need them the most.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Chief, I think that type of analysis would be very beneficial if we can reduce it to write in for members of the Legislature understand, in terms of not only the resource but with that resource really means, in terms of providing front line services to the people of Suffolk County.

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

The Commissioner has already worked on that. It's done.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Could I have a copy of that and could you make a copy of that available to members of the Legislature?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

I believe he's coming with it.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

He may be coming to Public Safety but I'm requesting it as a member.

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

I'm sure he would.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Make sure that we all --

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

I can't really speak for him but I see no reason why he wouldn't.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, because I think that's very important information. And finally, in terms of personnel in the department, where do we stand year over year, manpower wise from a year ago and are we beginning to experience an exodus of senior officers who have perhaps not maxed out, in terms of service credits but who just overall -- what's the experience showing this year?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

As we said last time, we lost 90 officers in 2000. Approximately 50 percent of those took advantage of the military buy-back bill. This year it's running about the same. By -- as we speak, by July of 2001, sixty-six people have signed up to leave the department, roughly thirty-three or thirty-two of those are going on the military buy-back bill.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Manpower, where do we stand from a year?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

When the class gets out, we'll be roughly even.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

And what is that number?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

As we speak, it's about twenty five hundred and ninety three or four.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's all sworn personnel?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

All sworn.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. Thank you. Any questions?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Just a quick. We're talking about a class started when?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

The class that's currently in training?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

That was just -- right.

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

September 18th.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Right. That's what I wanted to ask. That's what I thought. Because originally, I think, we had budgeted for another class to be sworn in March and then that seemed to get postponed and the rumor was that the recruits were going to be sworn in this month. Do we have any information about when that new class is going to go in?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

We're currently working on several problems that we have with the class section, fifty hearings, people who wouldn't decline and we don't want to hire them. We anticipate being able to clear that entire legal issue up by the middle of the month of May and we would hire at that point. The County Exec's Office has already given us permission to hire everyone that's eligible.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

So it's that rather than budgetary reasons that's delaying the hiring of a new class?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

It's the legal issues. It's not budget.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

What's the size of the class, Chief?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

A hundred and forty.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

County, one forty?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

Yes, the County Exec's Office has agreed to give us the class of a hundred and forty, partially because the date got moved forward and we submitted a plan to alter the way we hire for 2002, which I believe was embraced by the County Exec also.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Could you share us what that plan is?

**CHIEF ROBILOTTO:**

Well, we looked at the way we hire and realize that the problem that we have is by putting these huge influx in. It's a huge burden on our field training people, our academy people, our candidate investigation units and we're forced to go through virtually ten to twelve

candidates for every one we hire causing us to spend a tremendous amount of money in overtime and staff levels in those units. And by putting the entire hiring process on a wheel of approximately fifty, there was an analysis done and the process is most effective at that level. We made that presentation to the County Exec's Office and they embraced it.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Very good. Any other questions for the Police Department? Okay, Chief Otto and members of the Sheriff's Department, welcome.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Good morning.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Everybody has been issued an information package and our information or invitation asked us to put together three parts. So you have full packages there. Part one is Fiscal Year 2000, year-end overtime figures. Part two is Fiscal Year 2000, overtime for the first seven pay periods. Part three is Fiscal Year 2001, overtime projections for the entire year. And what I'd like to do, it's a lot of information, I'd just like to say a few things about the first couple of charts. If you open up your package, on the top right hand corner, you'll see a number that's highlighted. I'll go to chart number one. Chart number one deals with the department's total salary accounts, end of the Year 2000, with a surplus of a hundred and twenty eight thousand dollars.

If you flip the page over, chart number two; reveals all but two of department seven appropriations ended 2000 with a surplus. The two appropriations that had shortfalls were both on the mandated side, 3150 and 3162. The reason why this occurred was due to the late hiring of the Correction Officers. Flip the chart over to chart number three, in the bottom right hand column, total overtime. It reveals that the department spent fourteen point four five million dollars in overtime in 2000. This was approximately four point nine million more than what was adopted. The shortfall, however, was taken from the salary accounts, which was caused by late hiring, more importantly by not filling vacancies. So in other words, we stayed within our budget but we just took it from the salary accounts. If you flip over to chart four, this just supports the surplus figure of a hundred and twenty eight thousand dollars and actually shows you where it came from, which appropriation.

Okay, if you flip it over to chart five, what we did in chart five and chart six, we actually broke up the appropriations because Legislator Caracciolo had asked us at previous meetings to do this. So we did it ahead of time. We listed the discretionary appropriations and the mandated appropriations. Chart five shows that in the discretionary appropriations, we had a surplus of two thousand of one point five million dollars. Chart six, the mandated appropriations revealed a shortfall of one point four million dollars. Okay that takes care of the Year 2000.

If you flip over to find chart number seven, okay that's a chart that shows overtime for the first seven pay periods of 2001, as compared to the entire last year's overtime. You can see we're well below and a matter of fact, we're revealing a 27 percent reduction in department overtime over the 2000 levels. You open it up to chart number eight, it breaks down the appropriations showing what's, you know plus or minus the percentage and then the totals in the right hand column shows you the 27 percent deduction, a decrease in overtime.

Okay, chart number nine, which reflects Deputy Sheriff and most civilian overtime, shows that like in pay period number seven, there was an increase in 2001 and that increase was based on the Deputy Sheriffs receiving a new contract and their new salaries. In other words, when our original projections were done, we were directed not to forecast the Deputy

Sheriff's getting a contract. There was no raise. So they got a raise and that's what occurred. Chart number ten, Correction Officer overtime, also shows you the effect of hiring the seventy two Correction Officers is what occurred, a substantial decrease in overtime. If we flip it over, we're going into the year end projections; this is very important. Chart number eleven and chart number twelve. Okay, chart number eleven forecasted, okay that although nine point eight million overtime was adopted for 2001, a shortfall will exist of approximately one point three million dollars, as it stands right now. And more importantly, we will not be able to go to the 110 accounts to bail out the overtime accounts. The reason for this is based upon; we have thirty-three vacancies, which have not been filled for Deputy Sheriffs. We are anticipating there's up to eleven Deputy Sheriffs that will be leaving for the Suffolk County Police Department. I don't know how many Correction Officers will be leaving and in addition to that, there's three to five Deputy Sheriffs that will be retiring this year. And due to the signing of the last two bills, the Hart bill and the disability bill, there could be some more movement in that retirements.

So whereas, we only get a short window of opportunity to hire Deputy Sheriffs because they have to attend the Police Academy, there's only going to be one Police Academy class this year, I've been told. If we don't hire Deputy Sheriffs and I've been told we're not, by latest officials, we're not hiring them. You can't hire any Deputy Sheriffs in all of 2001 and all of 2002. So overtime on that end is going to increase. Your one point three million dollars that you're going to be short for 2001, is going to have to come from someplace else. It's not in our budget. We don't have the one salary accounts.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well, we have a question Chief, from Legislator Haley.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Concerning Deputies, I know the big difference between Deputies, maybe I'm wrong. The difference between Deputies and Corrections is a lot of times the positions are mandated, well not really mandated. I would imagine the New York State comes down and requires that certain positions be filled or manned throughout the jail? Is that correct on the Correction Officers?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Yes, what happens is basically the a -- rather the Sheriff's Department really should be a fully mandated department but you can't have that, they say. The State Commissioner of Corrections comes down and tells us, mandates us and says these are the positions that you need to fill. That's why, you know we put in for our budget.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

That's on the Correction Officer's side?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

That's right.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

What about on a Deputy Sheriff's side?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

On the Deputy Sheriff side, nobody comes down and mandates these positions but the positions that we have, do mandated jobs. Transporting the prisoners, civil work. That's all mandated and part of the Deputy's appropriation, district court is mandated. So you mix.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Right and correct me if I'm wrong. Sometimes depending on what's happening in the courts will depend on what you may get a thrust of overtime because there's a lot of transportation that has to take place based on what a judge may or may want to do on any particular day.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Absolutely.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Plus a major role of that.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Absolutely. It's also sometimes seasonal for Deputies. Many of the East End Towns and Villages request police assistance. We, in the past, were able to send them out there to do that. Now because of how short we are, all our vacancies and overtime problems concern that's not happening and it's already causing some problems. We have been asked by many departments to supply people. We haven't been able to send them.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

What type of assistance?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

It could be assistance say for the 4th of July ceremonies that they have out there. The Town Police Department and the Village Police Department don't have enough people, so they ask us to send some people to assist crowd control.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Does the department keep internally documents, as to the deployment of personnel on an annual basis?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Could you provide this committee with a copy of that information for the last three years?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

I'll look at that for three years.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

I'd like to see what the experience has been and what the expectation has been and is this historical? How far back does this relationship go?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

As far as I can remember.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Because a lot of those East End Departments have seasonal police officers to deal with those events specifically.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

They don't go, you know on every call or anything like that. They go on special events. When we had the sunrise fire, when we had the riots out east.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

The sunrise fire really was a County imperative and not just an East End --

**CHIEF OTTO:**

I'm just lumping all the special events in together. You know we've had a demonstration out east and we had the hospital strikes. We had the problems associated with -- one would say the St. Patrick's Day Parade out east, where they had that large contingent of people coming from the city and the East End Departments asked us for assistance. It's just special events but it does impact on our overtime and we aren't able to do this anymore.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I'd be curious as to what the policy perspective should be because you know for Peconic County there, we should be a little bit more considerate. I mean, they are not paying into the police district funds and you know they usually get a buy on taxes lately. Legislator Caracciolo and Legislator Cooper --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Ninety percent reduction in the last seven years.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

That's right. So you guys do pretty well and maybe it's time we started charging back some of those services we provide from the Sheriff's Department.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

But they don't come out of the police district. They come out of general fund expenditures.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I know that.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Chief, getting back to your presentation and your chart on page eleven. You mentioned that the expectation for increasing expenditures is related to the decision not to hire additional Deputy Sheriffs, correct?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

As it stands now, it could even increase more.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Okay. Mr. Weiss, could you share with us, from your perspective what the thinking is, in terms of holding back on Deputy Sheriff hiring?

**MR. WEISS:**

As was stated several times, we have a budget problem. We have to ensure we have sufficient appropriations in the Sheriff's Office. We had the contract that was passed this year. We also have to -- we're going to have to fund the additional retirement expenses. We're doing an analysis right now on the Sheriff's Office to see how much we're going to have to take from the contingency fund. But our position right now is that we're not releasing the Deputy Sheriff positions.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Is that cost effective? Again, not short term but long term, is that a cost-effective policy?

**MR. WEISS:**

We believe it is.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Fred, would you comment?

**MR. POLLERT:**

You could probably defer the class this year because there was enhancements with the Deputy Sheriffs giving up on half of their lunch hour. However, I was not aware of the fact that there's a possibility that eleven Deputy Sheriffs may be moving to the Police Department in the new police class. So I was not aware of that. We'd really have to factor that in again. It would appear that if nothing else that would exceed the amount of savings that were negotiated in the last contract.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Well, to give that some context, I mean obviously, when you're negotiating a contract, you

don't know what individuals are on the hiring list. And what timetable they may or may not hired.

**MR. POLLERT:**

What was negotiated in the last contract is that the Deputy Sheriffs gave up one half of their lunch hour. You should have a productivity improvement translating to approximately twenty new officers.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Right.

**MR. POLLERT:**

So you should be able to cover a portion of the new titles that were included in the budget because we never anticipated that, that give back would be included in the contract negotiations.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I guess that begs the question Chief Otto, of the eleven individuals you say are on the police list. How many of them will be hired in the next police recruit class? Do you know?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

We won't know and nobody will know until a), they get contacted and they make the decisions. And also, don't forget too that there's that -- the other factor would be the people who would be retiring. Okay there's, I think, five people are eligible. I believe that I'm guessing or estimating that three would be leaving and then there's an additional amount of people that probably will be retiring in regard to the two bills that were past, the disability and the heart bill. So there's some factors we won't know until it happens. But those eleven people are reachable and I would say, my guess would be approximately, eight to nine would probably take the job.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. In terms of the two pieces of legislation you referred to now twice. First the disability retirement. These officers presently enjoy a disability retirement benefit.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

You could get the three-quarters, until this was past.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I understand that. So why would they, if they are disabled, have waited until there was an additional benefit to apply for disability retirement? If you're disabled, you're disabled.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Some people realize that maybe they can't afford to retire and get 33 percent. But now, the 75% legislation have gone through and they might rethink their -- you know it's --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, now you're familiar that this legislation was adopted by the County, as by virtue of State enabling legislation and the recognition by the State of New York and its State Legislature that officers in this capacity, should enjoy the same benefits as other law enforcement, sworn officers. And therefore, for someone to stretch that, now we're going to see an influx of retirements for individuals who are injured in the line of duty because this additional benefit is absurd. If they're injured, they're disabled and the State Retirement System deems them permanently disabled, they are eligible for this benefit. No one should presume and rush to judgment that just by virtue of this new State legislation the County has adopted, we're going to see an exodus of people. They have to qualify for the benefit and if they qualify, they deserve the benefit.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

I'm absolutely 100 percent in agreement with you and also it's my responsibility to let you know that there is a possibility that people will exodus the department and I'm estimating

approximately three people this year under that.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

And do you know the nature of their disabilities? Of the three individuals you speak of? What type of disabilities that these officers --

**CHIEF OTTO:**

We have a list of people who are on a medical evaluation list, okay and it's just a long list and I'm just taking an educated guess that we're going to have people vacating the department. Not a lot, three but I thought you should know that.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I appreciate that.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

When I'm looking at thirty three vacancies, okay for Deputy Sheriffs and I know that, you know we're going to lose a great deal to the Police Department. I don't even know how many Correction Officers we're going to lose who are on that list. It's a concern that I'm obligated to bring to your attention. Also, in regards to any savings in the past, but if we were to not hire somebody, the savings would automatically go into a shortfall for it to pay in overtime. That's not going to happen in this case. That won't occur. Do we know what turnover savings?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

You're not familiar then with the officers who are on the police list, where they are, in terms of position on the police list, whether or not --

**CHIEF OTTO:**

They're all reachable. In other words, if they asked if the Police Department asked them, they're reachable. They are in the first group.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, so they could be hired as early as this summer or fall?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Or May, as we just heard a few minutes ago. Okay. That brings me back to Budget Review and a request for another analysis to determine before the year is out, whether or not the Legislature should consider back-filling positions that may be vacated by existing incumbents who may leave for the Police Department.

**MR. POLLERT:**

You can establish a policy but it's ultimately up to the County Executive to release the 167's. What my point was, was you can cover a portion of the current vacancies due to the productivity improvements. You pick up about twenty-two additional staff or so, however, clearly people that would separate going to the Police Department would not be factored into that type of analysis. But irrespective of what other policy you proposed would be up to the County Executive to actually implement it through the 167 process.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I understand that and I think that historic relationship between the Legislature and the Executive, when it comes to dealing with difficult budgetary issues as we move forward, consideration may be given in that regard. Okay, any other questions? Legislator Lindsay, Haley.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Yes, I have one quick question. Chief Otto, page 12?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Okay.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I just want to go across because I'm looking, I'm trying to understand your chart here.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Um-um.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

When we look at -- under 2001, where you have the first box, the average pay period 2001 to date?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Okay, at the top left corner? Or in the middle?

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

The top box, the section where it says average pay period 2001 to date. The average, I guess, overtime worked, you figured it out on a per pay period basis?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

All right. In other words, the far writing column numbers three hundred and eleven thousand and change.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Would you just give me a quick definition of the categories; administration and I guess that's investigations? Is that what that first appropriation is?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Yes.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

3110.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

3110?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

That's the administration. Most of the Deputy Sheriffs, most civil department --

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

So there are -- most of them -- there are Deputies in that section, okay.

**CHIEF OTTO:**

It also has CO's in it too. There's some CO's in there. A lot of them are mixed. But most of the Deputy Sheriffs are located in 3110.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I would imagine Deputies would be in 3115?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Yes, they are.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Okay and in 3150, most of that would be CO's?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

Most of them, yes.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Okay, cooks are obvious. District Court, most of those would be Deputies?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

All right. DWI facility that's low. And minimum-security facility are mostly CO's?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

All right. That's all. I just wanted to be able to -- thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Legislator Alden. Okay, is there anything you'd like to add to your presentation Chief?

**CHIEF OTTO:**

I think we covered everything.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. Obviously, we'll need some additional time to digest this very substantial presentation. I appreciate you and your staff for putting it together and we look forward to seeing you back here in a couple of months. Thank you. Fred or Ken, any comments regarding these presentations made by the three departments?

**MR. WEISS:**

Just a -- I think, with the exception of the police, most of the overtime across the County seems to be down and I think that the police overtime will be resolved once that class comes out. So I think it's a -- I think we're moving in the right direction, as far as overtime is concerned.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred.

**MR. POLLERT:**

I had just wanted to know that on April 12th, we issued a memo to all the Legislators with respect to the W-2 reports, which we do on an annual basis. For last year, for active employees, the total amount of overtime paid out was approximately forty seven million dollars, which accounted for about 7.7 percent of the total remuneration. That's found in table one of that report. Clearly, the bulk of the overtime goes to both the Police Department and the Sheriff's Department. So the bulk of the overtime tends to be related to public safety types of functions.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

The information is always good; it's useful. But in the abstract, it doesn't tell you very much. So what does that forty seven million dollars really relate to, not in the abstract, but in terms of policy and policy direction?

**MR. POLLERT:**

With respect to policy and policy direction, if you want to control overtime or if you want to really review overtime, the focus has to be placed upon the Public Safety Departments, as you have done here today. The total remuneration on an average basis with respect to overtime is the highest for the Sheriff's Department. They do have a chronic problem with overtime. The chronic problem continues. The total amount of overtime on a per capita basis is approximately thirteen thousand, eight hundred and fifty dollars in the Sheriff's Department. That means on an average basis, approximately 20 percent of the total remuneration of employees in that department is made up of overtime. So clearly, there continues to be a chronic problem within the Sheriff's Department. The next largest amount of overtime --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Wait; wait before you go on. What actions, what steps should the County take, given this information? And that leads back to my previous remark about information is useful, but unless you do something with that information, that's all it is. It's information that's nice to have but what do you do with it?

**MR. POLLERT:**

What was done with it is the Legislature included new positions for both Deputy Sheriffs and Correction Officers and as was represented by the Sheriff's Department here, there has been a positive impact on the amount of overtime. You have saved more than a dollar in overtime for every dollar that you have invested in new titles in the Sheriff's Department. So they have been doing a good job with making sure that the overtime costs have been going down.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay but now, as we heard a few moments ago, if there is a reluctance on the part of the Executive to approve 167's for the department, we will once again revert back to an increase in overtime expenditures. My question then and again now is, is that a wise choice to make?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That was a request which you asked us to look at and we will have the report to you with respect to whether or not the policy should be to fill additional Deputy Sheriff spots as they become vacant.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

How about Correction Officer's positions?

**MR. POLLERT:**

We can include that as well.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thank you. Legislator Haley.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

There's other factors, I think that are involved. One of the things I'm concerned with is when we talk about mandates. Fred, in your view, when the Corrections Commission comes down, isn't that really recommendations that aren't really mandates for those particular positions?

**MR. POLLERT:**

It's kind of a gray area. To make them a mandated portion of the budget, we have to assume that the County has no discretion with filling those titles. For the most part, the Sheriff's Department does backfill each of the posts that are required to be filled on overtime. Occasionally --

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

That's where I want to go. They are required to be manned. Where does that requirement come from? And is it, in fact, set in stone that we have to man those positions, from a

mandatory perspective?

**MR. POLLERT:**

We're supposed to be doing that. Whether or not we man 100 percent of the positions that we're supposed to all the time; that is not the case. But just we take it to be a mandate. That's the reason it's on the mandated side of the budget. So there is no -- there is far less discretion with having to man the title versus something like the Department of Social Services coming down saying that there needs to be child protective services, reports done in a certain timeframe but they don't tell us the number of child protective service workers that we actually need to carry out the function. If they did, that would also be considered to be a mandated cost. The only area of the budget, which is truly mandated is the Correction Officers and Deputy Sheriffs where the Department of Corrections comes down and says that we are mandated to fill those spots.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I think we need to look at those because I think that some of that overtime may or may not relate to those actual mandated. I think we should also look from a policy perspective what the Corrections Commission may be doing to us, relative to the number of prisoners we maintain, policy changes within the State with maintaining prisoners, you know versus ten years ago, five years ago, today. And then when we look at all the other things that we've done to attempt to reduce overtime, such as medical evaluation, I think you have to lump all of that in, not just, you know I don't think it's that simple.

**MR. POLLERT:**

The County was proactive the last time the Department of Corrections came down. The County did object to the number of posts, which they said, which we had to maintain and there was some negotiation and the total number of posts was actually reduced.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred, what positive effects will the State ready court ordered settlement have, in terms of the budget, in terms of these expenditures and the transfer of State ready prisoners on a more timely basis?

**MR. POLLERT:**

The check was received in March. We checked with the Treasurer's Office. It was properly posted. The number of State ready prisoners is down substantially. We clearly had represented to the court that there was an incremental cost associated with keeping the prisoners in the County. But you won't really notice a large decrease in costs because enrollment -- just because a total number of prisoner population has remained more or less constant despite the fact that there has been a decrease in State ready group. We're not going to close any of the tiers just because we're taking our State ready prisoners in a more timely fashion.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

But there should be a positive impact, a financial impact by virtue of the State reimbursing the County for those.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Yes, that is correct.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, so how does that factor into the total equation here of overtime cost? Again, looking out the next year or two?

**MR. POLLERT:**

We are currently forecasting that we should have an additional claim for approximately nine hundred thousand dollars from the State ready prisoners, which were not included in the budget. So that's another savings about nine hundred thousand dollars.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. That should not be glossed over. That's quite a bit of money.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Can, I guess, our counsel tells us with the agreement that was reached? Was there a certain provision with regard to parole violators? Wasn't there some --

**MR. SABATINO:**

There was a dispute with regard to the parole violators versus the State ready prisoners and the language was clarified to treat everybody on the same basis.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

So that -- what would -- I ask because of the specific situation that came to my attention with an individual who has been in Riverhead since September and the State has -- he's got to go before the parole board on a parole violation and they are in no rush to do this because he stays with us. So is there anything in the stipulation that would -- because that seems like a way to get around any kind of fair agreement.

**MR. SABATINO:**

Well, I think the important thing that came out of that aspect of litigation is that the State knows that Suffolk County knows how to do the cost formula. In fact, really has precise calculations and was willing to go, you know to the mat. So I think that's being reflected in the number since last July that there's been a reduction because they know that it's for real. So with regard to the parole violators, I think they have the same attitude. In some respects that's outside their control because it still comes down to the judge making the final adjudication. But there's a final adjudication, they now know they have to pay real money.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

That might be something for the Public Safety Committee Chair to address. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. Will the members of the committee -- thank you, Fred. Thank you Ken. Turn to today's agenda. I have a motion on Tabled Resolution Prime 1256. Is there a motion? 1256.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

I make a motion.

**LEGISLATOR ALDEN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Counsel, just a brief explanation?

**MR. SABATINO:**

Okay, this is a proposed Charter Law that's going to require contract agencies to annually disclose on an itemized basis, the categories of spending that they incur. And it's also going to require that they list the employees and the salaries that are paid. The threshold is going to be -- those contract agencies that have total employee compensation, which is, at least -- which is more than I should say, more than 50 percent of the total funding. So if a contract agency spends more than 50 percent salaries, they'll have to come within this provision and then Audit and Control is going to be obligated to conduct what they call management audits on an annual basis evaluating those agencies including the salaries. So it's two fold. It's to

get the information on an itemized basis and also to get the audit, so --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. Approved.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS:**

**I.R. No. 1256 (P) A Charter Law to require annual expenditure disclosure for contract agency funding. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Legislator Angie Carpenter)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Sense Resolution 15-2001. Is it counsel, because there really hasn't been a reconciliation bill yet, has there?

**MR. SABATINO:**

I mean mootness is in the eye of the beholder. The Senate has a different version. The House has a different version. Bush has a different version. There's no reconciliation, so there's at least three versions out there right now.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Motion to approve.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

On the motion?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

On the motion to approve, Legislator Postal.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

I mean obviously, have we had any kind of evaluation done here on the impact of enacting this plan?

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

It has Bush's new line and that's good enough for me.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

That's good enough for you. Well, it's not good enough for me. I mean, we've just come through eight previous years where we've used surpluses for deficit reduction. We saw the impact on our economy. We saw the impact on interest rates. I mean, I don't think there's anybody who could argue about what's happened in the past and now we're proposing to do something that's dramatically different.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Excuse me.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

I know, I know.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

I'll change my motion to a motion to table in the interest of moving things along.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Great thank you.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Is that okay? Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

There's a motion to table by Legislator Haley, second by whom?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Seconded by Legislator Postal. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled.

**TABLED SENSE:**

-  
**Sense No. 15-2001 (P) Memorializing resolution requesting United States Congress to enact Bush Tax Cut Plan. ASSIGNED TO FINANCIAL & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Legislator Allan Binder)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. 1261, is there a motion?

**MR. SABATINO:**

A public hearing, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Motion to table 1261 pending public hearing, second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled.

**INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS - PRIME:**

-  
**I.R. NO. 1261 Adopting Local Law No. -2001, A Charter Law to stabilize real property taxes by optimizing use of the tax stabilization reserve fund. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED PENDING PUBLIC HEARING**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1262, same motion, same second, same vote.

**I.R. NO. 1262 Adopting Local Law No. -2001, A Charter Law to streamline Suffolk County 5-25-5 debt policy. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1263 motion to approve.

**LEGISLATOR HALEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Second by Legislator Haley. On the motion.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

On the motion? You know, we discussed this at length over, earlier in this meeting and all I have to say is I now have some information, which tells me that in the Year 2000, we approved appropriations for consultants for planning steps in the amount of eight million, one hundred and sixty one dollars -- one hundred and sixty one thousand, seven hundred

dollars. So that, you know as long as we've been putting in positions to do this work in-house, I would just bet that if we filled two million dollars worth of in-house positions, we could do all of this work that these consultants are doing. We could save ourselves at least six million dollars. We wouldn't have to be cutting contract agencies to save four million dollars a year without considering the impact on services. I think that if we move ahead with this, we had a number of questions that we asked of these contract agencies, one of which, I think, was a very, very important question, Legislator Lindsay asked having to do with the impact on Suffolk County by cutting 3 percent from County funding. What is that going to mean, in terms of reduction in services to Suffolk? What is it going to mean, in terms of matching funds that will not be coming from the State, will not be coming from the federal government? And I would suggest that to act on this now is precipitous and the other issue has to do with not cutting consultant contracts that include those funded out of the Capital Program. So I would make a motion to table this.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

On the motion to table. When can you -- I knew that was coming, March. How quickly can you Ken and Fred, provide the committee with that information that we discussed previously with the contract agencies, in terms of what the real impacts would be to State, the net impacts? You'll have that in two weeks?

**MR. WEISS:**

I'll have that ready by Tuesday.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Ready by Tuesday, okay. So we have a motion to table. A motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Opposed, three opposed. The motion is defeated. I resubmit my motion to approve, second by Legislator Haley. All in favor? Opposed? Two opposed. Approved.

**I.R. NO. 1263 Reducing certain appropriations in the 2001 Adopted Operating Budget. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 3-2-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1264 motion. Explanation, Ken?

**MR. WEISS:**

Does this require a public hearing, Paul? This one?

**MR. SABATINO:**

No, this one does not. I think the purpose of it was just to basically conform the code to what we're doing in the Operating Budget each year. I think that's what the intent was but it was a little bit unclear to me. I wasn't certain so --

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Why don't we table it?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Postal. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved tabled.

**I.R. NO. 1264 Amending Section 719-6 of the Suffolk County Code. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1272 motion to approve by the Chair, seconded by Legislator Postal. You have a question?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Place on consent calendar.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Place on consent calendar, okay. So we have 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275, 6, 7, I'm sorry 1285, 1286. A motion to approve and place on the consent calendar, second by Legislator Postal. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Those resolutions are now approved and placed on the consent calendar.

**I.R. NO. 1272 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature Control #670-2001. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**I.R. NO. 1273 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction of errors/County Treasure by: County Legislature #11121. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**I.R. NO. 1274 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature #122 ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**I.R. NO. 1275 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature #123. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**I.R. NO. 1276 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature #124. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**I.R. NO. 1285 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature #125. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**I.R. NO. 1286 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer By: County Legislature #125. ASSIGNED TO FIANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACED ON CONSENT CALENDAR**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I.R. Non-Prime 1304. Motion by Legislator Postal, second by the Chair to approve. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

**INTRODUCTORY - NON PRIME:**

**I.R. NO. 1304 Accepting and appropriating 100% reimbursable funds in the Youth Bureau to continue a Youth Development Program during non-school hours. ASSIGNED TO EDUCATION AND YOUTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Motion to approve 1307, 1308, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1316, 1333, 1334 by the Chair, second by Legislator Postal. Are there any questions on any of these resolutions?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

You have a question?

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Yes, I would rather not second the motion to approve of them. I would just approve 1307, 1308, 1309.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1309 all right. So we'll do 1307, 1308, 1309. Motion by the Chair, second by Legislator Postal. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

**I.R. NO. 1307 Accepting and appropriating a 100% reimbursed grant from the U. S. Department and authorizing the County Executive to execute agreements. ASSIGNED TO WAYS & MEANS AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**I.R. NO. 1308 Accepting and appropriating a 100% reimbursed grant from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for an Emergency Shelter Grants Program and authorizing the County Executive to execute an agreement. ASSIGNED TO SOCIAL SERVICES AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**I.R. NO. 1309 Accepting and appropriating a 100% reimbursed grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for a Home Investment Partnerships Program and authorizing the County Executive to execute agreements. ASSIGNED TO WAYS & MEANS AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1310 same motion, same second. Motion by the Chair, second by Legislator Haley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

**I.R. NO. 1310 Appropriating funds in connection with the renovations to Building 50, Hauppauge (Capital Program Number 1765) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1311 same motion, same second, same vote.

**I.R. NO. 1311 Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of a prisoner transport bus, Suffolk County Police Department (C.P. 3175) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1312 same motion, same second, same vote.

**I.R. NO. 1312 Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase and installation of equipment under the Federal Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement ACT (CALEA) (C.P. 3201) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1316 same motion. 1316 motion to approve.

**LEGISLATOR POSTAL:**

Okay, there's a motion. I just have a question?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Question, Mr. Wright, could you come forward? Legislator Postal would appreciate a brief explanation.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

This is an ongoing project, where we have at least a hundred units of equipment that are mobile equipment in the Sanitation Division and annually, we replace some of them. They get a lot of wear and tear. Everything from falling sludge from the various plants to construction equipment. So on an annual basis, we replenish that equipment or we support the functions that we have.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thank you Ben. While you're there, the issue came up in previous conversations here regarding consultant services in the department. Based on your many, many years of what I would consider expertise and experience, would you have a comment or two that you would like to make regarding that issue?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Well, I can comment, I guess, on sanitation. Generally, use of consultants and their fees is based on as an association of civil engineers that has a curve and it's pretty close to what type of fees are used for consultants and it's probably in the vicinity of 5 to 7 percent. It depends on the complexity of the project and the amount. Usually the larger project, the percent goes down. I know within my Capital Budget for the next three years, there's proposals of probably a hundred and twenty million dollars worth of work and a majority of it would be for using consultants and I was thinking about it when the discussion was going on and I'm probably in that ballpark with around 6 or 7 percent. But we did do two projects on our own, large projects, Kings Park, which has a grant, which is about a nine or ten million dollar project we're designing in-house. And the only difficulty that I can see there is that with the staff, you can't always dedicate them to designing this particular project. So they may have to be taken off to do other things that, you know whether it's the Legislature or the County Executive or the Commissioner is requesting. So that schedules sometimes get impeded by things that are looked to be a little higher priority because they might be short term as compared to a twelve or eighteen month design period. So you'd have to have staff

that were dedicated to that function only and not being taken off to do other things.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

So at the end of the day, it would be your position based on your years of experience that it may not be cost efficient to just have dedicated staff within the department because it can be pulled and tugged in different directions for different assignments.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

I guess, there are just two other comments that I would make along those lines is on a granted project, there's a certain schedule that you have to meet and you wouldn't want to jeopardize funding because of that. And the other thing is that there is a multiplier that is associated with County staff and it's not just the salary of the staff, it's the other overhead factors that go into it. No profit, but there's still other costs that have to be added to that labor.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Has your division or the department as a whole, previously done a study to determine whether or not -- which method would be more cost effective?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Well again, I'm just more familiar with the Sanitation Division and we looked at that and I -- you know we've tried. I think you get a certain amount of satisfaction and it's good for experience to do that kind of work and we just do as much as we can but you'd get to the limit where, for example, we had an electrical engineer that just left us that we can't finish the project now because we need assistance with that regard because he went to work for the railroad. You know the salaries are a little bit higher in some of the private sectors.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay, thank you. Yes. We're well beyond the public portion. 1316 is there a motion to approve? I made the motion, second by Legislator Haley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

**I.R. NO. 1316 Amending the 2001 Adopted Operating Budget and the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of sewer facility maintenance equipment (CP 8164) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

1333 same motion, same second, same vote.

**I.R. NO. 1333 Appropriating funds in connection with the Public Health Nursing Patient Records System (CP 4065) ASSIGNED TO HEALTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

1334 same motion, same second, same vote.

**I.R. NO. 1334 Appropriating funds in connection with the Patient Care Health Clinic Information System (CP 4061) ASSIGNED TO HEALTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)**

**VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Am I missing a page? That's it? Okay. Very good. That concludes the committee meeting. Thank you.

***(The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.)***