

**GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING
& CONSUMER PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A meeting of the Government Operations, Personnel, Housing & Consumer Protection Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on June 14, 2012.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Robert Calarco, Chairman
Legislator William Spencer, Vice Chair
Legislator Kate M. Browning
Legislator Thomas Cilmi
Legislator Edward P. Romaine

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Tim Laube, Clerk of the Legislature
Barbara LoMoriello, Chief Deputy Clerk
Joe Muncey, Budget Review Office
Benny Pernice, Budget Review Office
Greg Moran, Aide to Legislator Nowick
Ben Zwirn, County Executive's Office
Rebecca Sanin, County Executive's Office
Tom Melito, County Executive's Office, Performance Management Team
Richard Meyer, AME
Brendan Chamberlain, Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Chris DeLuca, Aide to Legislator Cilmi
Paul Perillie, Aide to Legislator Gregory
Lora Gellerstein, Aide to Legislator Spencer
Chris DeLuca, Aide to Legislator Cilmi
Charles Gardner, Consumer Affairs
Kevin Rooney, Oil Heat Institute of Long Island
Susan L. Odell-Pepe, Health Services
Paul Caplan

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary
Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:30 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, we're going to get started pretty soon here. Can we get all the Legislators to the horseshoe, please?

Okay, we're going to get started with the Government Operations Committee. And we're going to start with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Browning.

Salutation

Good afternoon. I do not have any cards. Is there anybody in the audience that would like to speak to address the Committee?

Okay, seeing none, I have at the request of Legislator Cilmi, invited Mr. Melito to come to speak to us today. Tom, if you could come up and have a seat at the front table here and -- you've now been with the County for a couple months, two or three months, and I'm sure have been busy working over at the Dennison Building trying to find ways to save us some money by doing government more efficiently, more effectively. And what we would like, if you could for us today, is just kind of give us a brief rundown or overview of some of the projects that you think are going to really be able to help us out with us moving forward here, maybe with some of the things that you're just working on.

MR. MELITO:

Sure, absolutely. That's on? There it is. Okay.

It's a pleasure to be here. Thank you, guys. I was asked to spend a few minutes and I'm happy to do that. I have a couple of opening remarks and then I have some projects that we're working on. I'd like to run through those and then open it to questions. And if there's anything, you know, ultimately that people want to get into in much more detail, I'm happy to schedule a follow-up meeting where we can really get into some of the nuts and bolts of whatever it is that people are interested in.

But I was last here in March. I believe, it was actually my first week here. And at that time we discussed what our long term mission was. And at the risk of boring you for two or three seconds, I just want to run through that.

Basically was to make Suffolk County government accessible, constituent-friendly operation that delivers cost effective, high quality and timely services using transparent, outcome driven measures that compel accountability and maximize efficiency. We want to introduce and develop and implement a program of evidence-based decision-making, rethinking and reframing operating assumptions, evaluating and improving government services, garnering quality performance results and improved financial outcomes. We intend to use data-driven decision analysis to reconfigure roles, streamline operations and innovate.

And, finally to provide organizational management and training platforms necessary for success by utilizing technology as a catalyst to promote efficiencies, communication and accessibility. And this continues to be our steadfast beacon of the operation of the Performance Management crew.

Also at that time we discussed the idea of pursuing a bifurcated approach to what our goals were. And that was, as we encountered the financial situation of Suffolk County, as we all know with the six-month budget, looking what we can do short-term to either increase revenues or reduce expenses; and then continuing to have our eye on the long-term goals of developing the things consistent with our mission in terms of the data-driven decision making, training and just

implementing a better goal-oriented management accountability program for the entire County.

I might add that we've spent the majority of our first two months quite candidly working with the departments to help identify layoff lists and help identify operational situations that can be done to accommodate those layoffs. We -- as you know, we have three of our people from our group embedded in DSS, the Health Department and DPW, and they have spent significant amount of time in the weeds within the context of those departments' operations.

We have -- at this point we're actively engaged in about 20 separate initiatives for enhancing revenues, reducing expenses and improving efficiencies. And on the horizon we have about another 15 or so initiatives that we are putting together strategic plans for and hope to have initiated within the next three or four months, if you will.

We have begun, as part of our overall long-term goals, the process of meeting now that we're moving into the post-layoff era, if you will, we have started to have our serious Department head meetings. And we've had meetings with Probation, Human Services, DPW, DSS and the Health Department and we're continuing that process. And through that process, you know, what we're doing is we are really looking at how they operate, strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats, etcetera. And we've -- what we do is when we have the meetings, we get together and then we as a group convene afterwards, we put together our list of questions, ideas. We give that back to the Department. They come back and address those issues. And then ultimately the goal is to develop actual project plans for each Department over the next of months as we're going. So we're heavy into that process as we speak.

I thought I'd just give you a few highlights of a few of the initiatives we're working on, which includes -- we'll start with Workers' Compensation. That was identified as one of the overall goals to our mission. And looking for ways to effectively reduce the amount of outlays we have on a day-to-day basis. We've gone through the 2012 Budget Review. We have already started drafting in conjunction with the Risk Management Department, and together with a couple of us, we've started drafting new standard operating procedures that we've identified as having the potential to increase efficiencies.

We do have a consultant working with us to do a very detailed analysis of the operations. And we hope to have some information on that later, I'd say within the next couple of weeks quite frankly. And then we'll be able to develop a strategy for moving forward.

Red Light Camera Program, as you all know, we have been granted additional 50 locations. We have been very actively involved in discussions -- preliminary discussion, I guess, is the way to say it, with ACS, the current contractor whose contract was -- what's the word I'm looking for, elongated, if you will, just prior to us coming into office, or just after coming into office before I got here. And so we have had detailed discussions with them as well as other vendors. We have identified a series of opportunities for increasing both the efficiency of the program that we have now, as well as the ways in which we distribute the monies associated with the program. As we all know, it's primarily a safety-related thing. But we have -- what we believe is to be a very good strategy for moving forward. We hope to have a recommendation on what direction to go within the next two weeks on that as well.

From an inventory management point of view, we have been working throughout the -- working with most of the major departments throughout Suffolk County to identify what types of inventories of unproductive and productive materials we have, trying to assess what the cost associated -- what the cost is associated with both housing those materials and seeing if there's any way to monetize any of those assets that we still have with us.

We have -- our MRO purchases, for those who don't know, that's Maintenance, Repairs and

Operational purchases, granger supplies, the majority of that throughout Suffolk County. And as part of their ongoing work, they have offered to do with -- in conjunction with us a study for free that analyzes all those purchases, our inventory procedures and protocols for, you know, when we make orders, when we don't make orders, etcetera.

So, we have been working with them for the last, I'd say, four weeks in identifying what data elements they need in order to make a rational appraisal of our system. We've been working with IT, Technology Department, to cultivate -- to first of all capture that information, cultivate it and put it in forms that they can use. We are at -- have done that. They have that information now. And the next steps are that we're going to work with them to develop process maps of how the process works, analyze the purchase history, current inventories. And we believe that there are significant improvement opportunities to save money with regard to a better management of that MRO aspect of our inventories.

I know some of you have mentioned the ideas associated with better utilizing the real estate assets that we have here in Suffolk County. We are looking at -- well, first of all, we are analyzing and codifying all the real estate holdings that we do have. In the short term we are identifying opportunities that we think exists to consolidate either the facilities -- well, let me step back. Depending on what the lease status is, what we're paying in leases, what the timeframes are, what the conditions of the building are, what the maintenance costs on an annual basis are, we are identifying a short list of either departments and/or agencies that might better be relocated elsewhere in particular to the Dennison Building.

The Dennison Building, as it turns out from a utilization point of view with regard to the private sector, is well underutilized. I don't think that comes as any surprise to anybody here. So what we want to do is try to -- it's an asset that we have. We want to try to maximize the use of that. So we, again, will be -- so on the short term we'll be making some recommendations of departments, we think, can be consolidated here based on those elements I mentioned.

And then at the longer term, we really have to analyze, from a longer term strategic point of view, what is it that we want to do with the Dennison Building, how we're going to maintain it going forward, and what other opportunities exist throughout the whole of the organization to make improvements.

Strategic sourcing is another initiative that I'm very excited about. I know a couple of you -- I think maybe it was Mr. Cilmi had asked me questions about that when we issued the RFP. We have gotten responses in regard to a no-cost to us RFP, whereupon we have -- I think it's five responses; very, very detailed excellent responses. One of the -- we hope to make a decision by Monday quite frankly. We're getting together with the Committee to make a recommendation. And two of the big areas that stand out that I think we're going to be able to avail ourselves of is the idea of maximizing our software licensing.

And for example -- and in two fronts. Often times municipalities, because -- and we'll talk about that in a second, the nature of technology in a large County like this is kind of fragmented. So people tend to buy software and products that they need without a thought to the overall bigger picture, which we're trying to address in general. But what happens is, you end up having software licenses for all kinds of software that maybe 30 percent of it gets used on a day-to-day basis type of thing.

So, one company in particular, I can't say too much about it until we make a decision, but did a similar analysis for New York City. They have specific software tools to evaluate what software's out there, how much it's being utilized and, then, evaluating what's being paid for it. And this one firm saved New York City \$50 million just on Microsoft. And we have a lot other software here besides just Microsoft. Obviously, we're not the size of New York City, but you can scale it down.

The opportunity is there. It exists.

They also -- one of these firms has software for analyzing hardware utilization, how we might maximize the use of servers that we do have, etcetera. So, without going through all the details, there's a panoply of different opportunities there. And we're going to be starting with those very shortly, and as I said, making a recommendation, hopefully by the end of Monday.

Revenue maximization through reimbursements, a really quick hit area that we've identified is where DSS Services are being provided in conjunction with other departments. And we aren't fully getting reimbursements we deserve from New York State. Part of that is because it's not -- on the face of it, it's not as clear that -- for example, when the Police Department does an investigation or Probation or the DA does some work on a case that's related to something going on in DSS, that those cases are related.

So, the first step is identifying those opportunities, which we have done. The second step is developing Memorandums Of Understanding with the different departments that says "we are working on this process in conjunction with a case that's going on in DSS," New York State has to take a look at those MOUs, they approve them and then we're able to get reimbursed for whatever percentage that service is entitled to for those services. We're able to go back eight quarters, which is two years, plus the current year. So, theoretically if we can get this done the next couple of months, we'll be able to collect reimbursements for three years of services that have not been collected thus far.

And that's just one example, but that's a very quick hit, easy one, doesn't have any impact on operations. That's really a matter of identifying costs, how they flow. And that's the other hard -- not hard part about it, but the part that requires a little work, is identifying how the flows of funds work, what activities are happening and then setting up a system so that on an ongoing basis, we can capture that information and then put it right in the report that gets sent up to the State for reimbursements. So, that's what we're doing.

As you all know, there has been legislation proposed for creation of a Traffic Violations Bureau, that depending on -- it's really not my area of expertise but depending on who you talk to, we're either about to have it or we already have it. I'm not sure. But we have been doing extensive amount of homework on figuring out what has to be done once that legislation is passed and we have it to set up this operation.

Suffice it to say, it's clearly nontrivial. It involves physical plant, it involves technology, it involves procedures. It involves legal agreements, flows of funds, software that accounts for what it is we're doing, etcetera. So, we have visited operations throughout Long Island. We have had discussions with experts in the area. We have spoken to New York City about their operation as well. And so we're in the process of creating what we think makes the most sense in the near term, and then which also creates the best platform for us going long-term. So that's also something we're working on.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, we have started our in depth detailed operational assessments within the departments. I mentioned the departments that we have met with. And we're looking, you know, without, you know, going back over it, operations in relation to the mission, shared services, consolidations, mandated versus non-mandated services, performance metrics, just bringing the idea to the departments of what it means to ask the question, how do we know if we're doing a good job, what data elements do we need and what information do we need? Data elements are great, but then you have to put them into formats that give us actual information.

So that process is underway. We are working on that. And I would say in line with LEAN practices

and LEAN principles, performance management in that context is a process. It's not an endpoint. It's something that we will continue to do in perpetuity. And each thing you do, you build upon that to the next step.

And then the one last thing I'll mention at this point is the -- what we're trying to do with the Technology Department. As you all know, who have been here, Technology is very fragmented throughout the County. And we want to make sure that we are leveraging the resources that we do have, number one; and that, number two, we really understand what resources we have that we can break down the information-based silos throughout the County and that we can provide tools that make the most sense, while taking advantage of resources we have internally as well as what products might be best suited for us on what we call COTS, customized or off the shelves types of software.

So, that is an ongoing process. We've lost, as you guys know, you know, better than anyone else, about 26% of the staff in the technology department so it's becoming even more important that we identify resources throughout the County that can participate in the development of the technology program throughout Suffolk County. And so we're dealing with a whole bunch of other smaller issues. And then I'll open it up to questions if you guys have any. But that's my broad brush of some of the things that we're working on over the last couple of months.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Tom, it's good to see that you're keeping busy.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Cilmi, you have a question?

LEG. CILMI:

Tom, thank you very much for that presentation.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

I have to say that I'm very pleased with the breadth of your presentation. The priorities seem to be very good. And I have some questions on each of the things or some of the things that you mentioned. With respect to Workers' Comp, the contractor or the consultant that we're using to look at that issue, can you share who that is?

MR. MELITO:

Yeah, I guess -- sure. It's Brady -- Brady Risk Management.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

Yeah. In fact he recently did a project for the Town of Islip.

LEG. CILMI:

That's what I thought.

MR. MELITO:

Yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

Now I recall hearing somewhere, I'm not sure where I heard it but -- that when they look back at what Brady did for the Town of Islip, while it was effective, I heard that it could have been done by the insurance companies at no cost. How does that statement play into our situation? And who is it that is supposed to be managing the Workers' Comp Program without the consultant?

MR. MELITO:

Okay, you mean from the County Executive's side?

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

MR. MELITO:

From the Dennison Building? It falls under Paul Margiotta.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

And the only thing I can say is we have Brady at a very -- as you may or may not know, his fee is \$10,000. So, it's a very minimal fee. We analyzed and looked at a lot of options of what we can do in the near term. And felt based on his capabilities to get something quick, that would make the most sense. So it just represents a first step, quite frankly.

LEG. CILMI:

Sure.

MR. MELITO:

An overview. And then that would give us some direction on where to move from there. And we would look at other things like you suggest.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. I think in this regard we're self-insured, isn't that right?

MR. MELITO:

Yes, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So it's not as if we would have necessarily an insurance company who is providing us with the coverage to look to for their guidance --

MR. MELITO:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

-- in trying to mitigate some of these expenses.

MR. MELITO:

That's correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. With regard to the Red Light Camera Program --

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

-- the additional 50 intersections that we authorized, are we locked into using ACS for that? For those 50 or are we exploring other vendors for those 50?

MR. MELITO:

We are not locked into them at all. Kind of inherent in my comments were that we're evaluating what makes the most sense to go forward.

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

There are lots of issues. We recently, you know, extended their contract. They have all of the software in place. When you get a Red Light ticket, you send it into them. They do the process. They send out the information. So, one of the issues is really do we want to have one vendor who's already under contract through the middle of 2015 operating with another vendor with a whole separate set of software procedures, processes? I can get two tickets, God forbid, but I could. And then I would have to send one ticket to one place, one ticket to another place. And, in addition, speed of getting the program up to the next level is also a factor. So those are issues exactly -- when I say we're in discussions, those are the things exactly what we're talking about.

LEG. CILMI:

Now, how does that tie in with the notion of a Traffic Violations Bureau? Because I would assume that if we were to establish such a bureau here, I think based on the budgetary numbers in the County Executive's initial Deficit Mitigation Plan, it seemed as if we can get this going relatively quickly. If we're tied into ACS or any other vendor, you know, past the point at which we can theoretically have a TVB up and running, does that deprive us of some revenue that we might otherwise get? And so can we take that into consideration when we're deciding what to do with these additional intersections?

MR. MELITO:

We are definitely taking into consideration the operations of the Red Light Camera Program with a TVB. As near as we can tell thus far, it's kind of independent. And whatever we do with Red Lights would fold in through the TVB. And that we would still probably have ACS or whatever vendor we had do their processing, but it would flow through the TVB. And that's kind of the way they do it in Nassau County as well.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. With regard to inventory management, there's -- and I haven't been out there personally, and I should go, but I certainly heard about it and seen it over the -- over Goggle Maps, our Bomarc set up, and there's, I don't know how many, thousands, I guess, of vehicles out there and I know there are the silos with a variety of different things in there. I would think that that's going to be a significant portion of your work at that facility?

MR. MELITO:

Let me say it this way: We have definitely had -- I personally haven't been there. Vinny Falkowski has gone twice with Phil Berdolt. They've analyzed it, they've looked at it, yes, there are loads of cars there. To the extent that we can find things that we can turn into money, we are definitely

looking to do that.

LEG. CILMI:

Just in the way -- I mean --

MR. MELITO:

Go ahead.

LEG. CILMI:

Just in the way of scrap metal, if you can't do anything else with the vehicles --

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:

But I would imagine there's a significant amount of revenue that could be admittedly a one-shot, but nevertheless, you know, find these things and it's useless to have this stuff sitting out there.

MR. MELITO:

One hundred percent, you're absolutely right. The Bomarc facility itself, we're a little bit concerned with the environmental condition of it quite frankly and what we might be able to do with it, either, you know, getting rid of it, selling it or whatever. So we're in the process of looking at that. But it is definitely in the mix, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

We're looking for ways that we can generate recurring revenue --

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

And certainly, as I said, there's a one-shot opportunity there, I think; but then also to the extent that we can take some of the things that are there that are, you know, the County has to maintain for whatever reason, if there are such items there, and move them to other locations, there's a significant piece of real estate there that we may be able to do something with, whether it's put back on the tax rolls or whatever, and that could be significant recurring revenue to the County and to the, you know, to the Town.

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely. I agree with you 100%.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. I'm glad that you spoke briefly about real estate assets. Do you have any cursory estimation as to how many employees could fit effectively on each floor of the Dennison Building if it was mapped out correctly?

MR. MELITO:

We don't have it per floor, but we think easily we could fit another three to 500 employees in this building.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

We haven't -- to do it by floor would be a much more involved process depending on what areas we decided to put on whatever floors that might be.

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

But we're looking at that. I can say this: Based on our cursory analysis, and we haven't -- we're not at the point where I can say this to you guys directly, but we've identified maybe six different groups that might be able to come into the Dennison Building, which could potentially save us two to two-and-a-half million dollars a year in operations and leases and other maintenance types of cost. So, we're looking at it. You know, one of the things is, you know, the TVB, you know, do we want to put that in this building? Do we want to put it on the North Complex? You know, so there's a couple pieces up in the air at this moment, but, yeah, we are looking at that.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. Did we -- did we follow through with the plan to move some of the Health Department Offices to Great River?

MR. MELITO:

That is happening. That is in process.

LEG. CILMI:

It is happening.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. And I guess the last question I have with respect to your overview, and I'd love to hear, you said there was about 20 different ongoing projects. I'd love to see a summary of all of them. But with regard to the real performance efficiency stuff that we've talked about at length, I seem to recall -- either it was a private conversation or here at our meeting, you talking about -- and maybe it was after you started working but before you were actually -- well, I guess we didn't confirm you, really, right?

MR. MELITO:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

You were just an appointee. So, in any event, you had talked about the process of mapping out some of the processes in the Health Department, that that had already begun.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Can you talk to us a little bit -- in more detail about that process?

MR. MELITO:

I don't have a lot more detail, but there are certain -- what happened was, because of the layoff situation, we started looking at specific areas that were being affected by the layoffs. And the permitting process has occupied a lot time at this point. And we think we have some alternative plans to make sure that those waiting periods don't get extended too much. But that's all I can really say about it at this moment.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Again, I'm very pleased at the priorities as you've outlined and what you're looking at. And I'd be very interested in a continuing discussion with you particularly with respect to the efficiencies that we talked about that are important. And, you know, I really appreciate you coming down --

MR. MELITO:

Great.

LEG. CILMI:

-- taking the time to make a presentation. It was obviously well prepared and well thought out and congratulations.

MR. MELITO:

Great. Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, thank you for being here. I understand you're part of the County Exec's Economic Development Team.

MR. MELITO:

No, Performance Management.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Performance Management.

MR. MELITO:

Yeah, yeah.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And he has decided to abed people that -- in performance management at various departments --

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

-- to gain efficiencies.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And that many of these people have great qualifications and listen to you. Obviously you have a wide berth that you -- wide net that you've cast looking for potential savings.

MR. MELITO:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. Having said that, I raise the question because a couple of weeks ago I saw that the County had put out an RFP looking for a private vendor to come in to examine potential savings and offering the private vendor a percentage of the savings that he was able to recommend and save the County. And I'm saying "why are we doing an RFP for this if we've embedded all these people who are supposed to be producing these savings, who work for the County? Obviously why we are going out for an RFP for a private vendor who will get a percentage?" I mean, I'll call in as a private vendor and say "cut 15% of your staff, give my what percentage I saved and I'll walk away."

I mean, you know -- I don't know what a private vendor is going to do that's going to be comprehensive in depth that the County can benefit from that yourself and people that are embedded in these departments can't do. Maybe you could enlighten me on that; because that kind of struck me --

MR. MELITO:

Oh, I'd be happy to.

LEG. ROMAINE:

-- yeah -- as odd.

MR. MELITO:

First of all, the numbers of people that we're talking about is three people embedded in departments, number one.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. Do you feel the need for help of a private vendor to determine savings?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Tom? Tom, if you could speak into the microphone.

MR. MELITO:

Oh, sorry. So, I guess you didn't -- when I was talking about strategic sourcing, that's the RFP we're talking about. And that's where we're looking for specific expertise in two areas that is just not generally there. And one of which is the --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

-- licensing of the software.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

So we hope to secure significant reductions in the cost of our licensing. So, it's silly, quite frankly, there are three of us in the Dennison Building.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

And three embedded in departments.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

We have a County of 10,000 employees that's taken about --

LEG. ROMAINE:

More or less these days.

MR. MELITO:

All right. That's taken about 20 years to get to the point where we're at.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

So, in all candor, it's really silly, right, to not take advantage of specific areas of expertise that someone might have at no cost upfront to us unless they --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. So, software licenses is one thing that they're taking a look at.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

What would the second thing be?

MR. MELITO:

Hardware utilization.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Hardware utilization.

MR. MELITO:

Hardware.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

How we are splitting up our servers, to what degree a particular piece of a server is being used versus another. Can we upgrade software systems that we have to make them run more efficiently; things of that nature.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

Very specific.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm glad you told me because, by the way, I think those are two very legitimate areas to look at. What I question is why are we laying off 26% of the staff at IT, who probably have knowledge of all the software licenses we have, because all software licenses and hardware components work through IT. All of them, for all departments.

MR. MELITO:

They do but that expertise typically doesn't reside in-house. New York City has got a DOIT. The DOIT for New York City is huge. It's one of the best in the country. And this one particular company came in and did it for them and found \$50 million of savings that they were not aware of.

LEG. ROMAINE:

When would we know the outcome of the work of this vendor?

MR. MELITO:

Well, we have not selected a vendor yet or two.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

We're going to do that Monday hopefully.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That is a timeline that you have selected --

MR. MELITO:

Then we will have --

LEG. ROMAINE:

-- the vendor on Monday.

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely. And then we will have --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Enter into a contract.

MR. MELITO:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And at some point, maybe, the next time you come back to this Committee in the next couple of months, if there's a return visit, you could give us a progress report on that.

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Because I'd be very interested in that, understanding how Microsoft or anyone else we have a license with is not going to be that generous about saying "you want to use that machine, you have

to have a license for it."

MR. MELITO:

Yeah.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Having dealt with this issue as County Clerk --

MR. MELITO:

Yeah.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And when we moved over to Imaging and everything became based on the computer, I mean we had to license all of those. And I had to work with IT on that. If you have a way of getting around that, I'm going to be very interested. I mean, if you can give us a progress report on that --

MR. MELITO:

Sure.

LEG. ROMAINE:

-- maybe towards the Fall and let us know how that's going, I'd be very interested in that.

MR. MELITO:

Sure. I'd be happy to. Absolutely.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. You indicated that there were 20 different initiatives that you're already in the process of implementing, and 15 more that are coming along.

MR. MELITO:

That we hope to initiate in the next few months.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Could you forward a list of those 20? Not the 15 you're planning on, but the 20 that you're implementing now, could you forward a list to every member of this Committee?

MR. MELITO:

Sure.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Of the 20 initiatives that you're doing right now?

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'd appreciate that. Ask let me ask you also about the Memorandums Of Understanding in which you're trying to get reimbursement visa vie the State through the Department of Social Services. Have you estimates of what those revenues might be? Savings we might project?

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

You do. I won't ask you what they are, but what I would ask, because it's far more interesting to me, is are those revenues going to be projected as potential revenues in the 2013 Operating Budget that the County Executive will submit, I guess, about two or three months?

MR. MELITO:

Again, first of all, I have not gotten into the budget process so I can't really give you a definitive answer.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

But I can say depending on how far we get with the MOUs and get them signed, I would think yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. What I'm going to ask also when you return to us, whenever that may be, hopefully in the next two or three months, maybe August, September, that you can give me a progress report or give the Committee a progress report on where you are with the Memorandums Of Understanding and the projected savings; and whether those projected savings are going to be incorporated as revenue for the 2013 Budget.

MR. MELITO:

Yep.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'd like to also mention Red Light Camera, something that I had an interest in. I did not feel, and I think the minutes will bear me out, that we were getting the best deal with the current contractor. And I know you indicated that you felt that it would be difficult if we did two separate -- had two separate contractors, one for the first 50 and another for the second 50. I don't feel -- I don't feel the same compunction and let me tell you why: Because I happen to read Newsday. And I happen to read the revenue projections that Suffolk County got from the deal that it cut versus the revenue projections that Nassau County got.

Nassau County did considerably better on the revenue projections because they ran the system. We gave half of that money to the contractor. I think the contractor was getting about 48, 49 percent of those revenues. To me, that's a lousy deal, particularly when the County immediately to the west of us is getting a great deal more revenue from the Red Lights.

So, I would ask you to go back and read the Newsday article and take a look at the revenue projections and compare Nassau County to Suffolk County and then make a decision. Because I'm going to watch that very carefully. I am going to be on top of that Red Light Camera contract, as I was the first time in saying that we were not cutting the best deal. And I had said that repeatedly, and it turned out to be so, that Nassau County cut a much better deal, got much better revenue utilization than we did. Because we gave the contractor almost 48 -- almost half of the revenues that were collected went to the contractor.

MR. MELITO:

Yes, we're well aware of that. And I'll do you one better. We've actually had several meetings with Nassau County looking at their deal and how it's arranged. So, as I said here, we haven't made a decision on which way to go. Those are issues, as far as the revenue split, as far as making the system more efficient so you get not only a bigger percentage, but you get a bigger percentage of more.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. MELITO:

And there are inherent differences between Nassau County and Suffolk County, which we can talk about in detail later. So we're well aware of it. We share your -- we're the ones working on it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

When you read an article like that --

MR. MELITO:

Yeah.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And I had said from the beginning that the -- that we made the wrong deal with the the Red Light Cameras. And then you see that, in fact, facts tend to bear that out, that we could have optimized our revenue in other ways, you wonder. Because if we're going to do 50 more, and let's be honest, this Red Light Camera, the reason that people supported this around this horseshoe is for safety reasons. There's no question that it does cut down on accidents. We're concerned, of course, that we make sure that safety remains the focus and that the times the yellow light doesn't turn that quickly, that people just aren't penalized, that people don't feel that we're just grabbing their money, that this is safety first. But money is, nevertheless, a secondary consideration. And we should have the best contract in terms of the return value for the County.

And lastly I'd like to talk about the buildings. I guess as of July 1st, we will probably have 1400 less employees than we had 8 years ago. We've lost 1400 employees in the County of Suffolk. And yet now we occupy more lease than owned space than we did 8 years ago with 1400 less employees. I know the County has a real estate consultant, Jack O'Connor, and he's -- his firm has made numerous recommendations which have not -- presented to the Legislature sometime ago, they haven't been fully vetted. We haven't seen a plan from this Administration on re-stacking the buildings, which leases should we cancel, which buildings should we sell? Is sale leaseback an option on any of these? We haven't seen that. We haven't seen a master plan come forward on how we're going to reutilize the space. And here we are with more space and 1400 less employees. And I'm scratching my head saying "what's wrong with this picture?"

Well, this is your six month that the new Administration is in office. I know they want to make several changes. And you don't change the ship of state on a dime. It takes some time to turn it around. But I would hope certainly by August -- I believe we meet the end of July, we have another meeting in mid-August, I would hope by that time we could have a plan of this Administration on how they're going to reutilize space. I know we have a Space Management Committee, which people have said to me in the past, it's always seemed oxymoronic, the name of that Committee, because of some of the things that I just mentioned. We have more space and less employees, how did that happen? So that Committee obviously hasn't been focused on better utilization of space.

What we need is a general plan for the Administration laying out how we're going to utilize the space, how we're going to better utilize this space and which buildings we're going to get rid of, which leases we're going to terminate, which buildings might be suitable for sale leaseback. I would hope that we would have a master plan before us by the middle of August. I think that's a fair expectation considering from the very get-go, when I talked in a rare moment to our County Executive, one of the things that I raised with him, and he was very interested in it, but it just seemed to peter out and probably because of all the other problems. But, nevertheless, I think it's something that we should definitely, if you're into efficiency, and I know you are, be concentrating on. And we really -- this Legislature should see a master plan of where the Administration wants to go in terms of space utilization considering the wasteful use of space that currently exists in the

County. Thank you very much.

MR. MELITO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you, Legislator Calarco.

Thank you for the presentation. And I have some questions with regards to performance management in general. And I'm just trying to appreciate historical trend when you talk about contracted services versus in-house services. And I think that -- I noticed during the '80's that there were a lot of services that were contracted out. And you saw a lot of municipalities purposefully bring those services in-house for several reasons: One, when you're talking about contract services, if you were in the business to provide a particular service, then you're going to generate a marketplace for that service.

And now what I'm seeing is kind of the reverse of that trend where we are taking services in-house and we're going back to contract services. And in terms of some of the discussions that I've heard, one being the benefits ratio with regards to providing -- with regards to in-house employees, things of that sort, but I am scratching my head -- I'm asking for you to give me a brief sort of analysis, how do we save money contracting out services? And the reason, what I hear as a Legislator, as we are looking at some of the layoffs from different departments, there's testimony after testimony of people coming in and saying "yes, you can contract out my job. But one, I know the job; I'm able to perform it more efficiently; I can do the job better perhaps than two or three people who are not familiar with my job on a daily basis."

And this makes sense. This is why I saw that -- not just Suffolk County, a lot of municipalities did this, I guess, 20, 25 years ago. So it seems that -- how does Performance Management decide when do you contract out something, when do you keep it in-house? And the short answer that I understood was that you contract out something when it's specialized enough to where you don't necessarily have the resources to maintain the equipment that you need, or the expertise that you need, on a regular basis. But we're contracting out services that are, you know, basically security services, and things like that, for instance. So, if you can comment on that, I'd be very appreciative.

MR. MELITO:

Sure, sure. First of all, it's -- I guess it's not the right way to say it -- it's an old issue. I got involved with government in 1988. And it was something we were doing -- looking at at that time with regard to solid waste management. I think Legislator Romaine was actually on the Suffolk County Legislature around 1988 when we had the 1990 Landfill Law. Is that correct? Were you here then?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I was in the Legislature in 1988. Landfill Law was the State Landfill, right.

MR. MELITO:

But I remember actually having discussions with you about plans we were going to make. I didn't mean to bring it up but --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Hopefully that wasn't the ash fill.

MR. MELITO:

One of them was -- (Laughter)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Absolutely an opponent of that.

MR. MELITO:

Somehow I remember that. So my point was, you know, solid waste services, that was a big issue at that point, you know, do we spend \$170 million, for example, in the Town of Babylon, building a new system? Or do we contract with somebody like Waste Management to just take it away from us and not have to bother with it?

There are pluses and minuses associated with all of these things. Obviously government was set up originally to do things for people that they're not capable of doing for themselves. That's one of the reasons -- I don't know if I ever -- okay, I don't want to take all your time, but I fell in love with government, quite frankly, after three weeks of working with Supervisor Arthur Pitts in the Town of Babylon by working on this 1990 landfill law. And I realized at that time -- actually Wayne was around in those days. I said, "oh, my God, we're about to spend \$170 million to develop a Solid Waste Management Program for our community. And, God, if we do a good job, and we do it right, we're going to have a great positive impact on our community. And if we do a bad job, we're going to have a very negative impact." I was coming from Wall Street where nobody really cared about community, you know, it was about making money. And to me that was very intrinsically satisfying quite frankly. And from that day on, I was hooked by government.

And so getting back, you know, we could about this for hours, but getting back to your question, it's an age-old question. There are pluses and minuses. I mean, to the extent that a governmental organization can become very close to its constituency, can understand its needs and its desires, that's a plus for having something in-house.

Unfortunately -- and to make those evaluations, you have to have a standard, you have to have what our priorities are, what is our goal. And typically it's to provide a service for others that we can do in the best way possible as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Over the least several years, the thing -- the equation has been twisted around a bit because everything is *what is the bottom line?* There is no money to pay for things. Unfortunately, in many cases, public employees per employee are more expensive in large part because of the benefit packages associated with those. So, if you're asking -- I don't have a clear-cut answer to privatize, don't privatize. We have to deal with the situation we're in. We have to make decisions based on what the exigencies of the moment are.

But what you look at, yes, you mention, you know, to the extent I know that's constituency, that's a plus for having something in-house. On the other hand, if it can't be supported, if it can't be done, we have to look for opportunities to minimize costs associated with providing services as best we can. Is the private sector incapable of providing good human quality services? Of course not. They're capable of doing it. Are they more capable of doing simple repetitive tasks like, you know, collecting garbage, that's one of the things we wanted to do in Babylon, sure. But the times are such that they're dictating to us -- if you asked me when I came in here, and Legislator Cilmi and I have spoken about this, you know, my first -- my priority, my vision for what we were going to be doing in Performance Management was looking long-term how do we get -- breakdown the silos involved in government, as everybody knows they are, how do we get people to work together to feel that we're working for one organization and we share resources. That was my dream. That's my goal. That's what it's all about. I live for that kind of stuff.

But before we can even get to that, we're dealing with how we're going to make this budget? And so that's where we are. I don't have a definitive answer for you. We have to look at it case by

case, but that's the way it is.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you. I agree with that. And, again, my big concern here is that when you look at the crisis that we're in and you assess some of our contracts that we have with our unions and we look at our employees, and we say "well, we can provide this service privately and someone will come and say -- well, you know, we're spending 50 million but someone comes in and says 'well, we can provide this for you for \$45 million.'"

Well, the issue in my mind is that you'll get someone that will respond to that RFP coming through the door. And maybe that contract may be for a year or five years, whatever, but it's kind of like the teaser that gets you into the car dealership. And then you watch those contract costs go up as they realize that they can't provide the service. And it's sometimes frustrating because some of the people that have given us kind of their sweat and tears and have dedicated themselves to a job that they believe in, that we'll take it and we'll contract it out. I'm not saying I have a better solution, but I don't want to be a pennywise and pound foolish as we go through this and we lay off people that have, you know, really dedicated their lives to serving us. So, thank you.

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely. I don't take anything you say lightly. I agree with you 100%. And that's one of the reasons I and others of the Administration work to get the original list of 477 down as much as we could. But I'm with you.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I was happy when you talked about TVB and possibly moving it to the Dennison Building, because I know that when it was discussed a couple of years ago, we looked at a startup cost of probably about \$3 million. And being that the Dennison Building is a former courthouse, it just seems to make sense. How much have you actually done as far as considering moving the TVB to the Dennison Building? What your startup costs would be, staffing and that kind of stuff? Have you looked at that?

MR. MELITO:

Oh, yes, we've -- yes. The answer is yes. Startup costs remain around 3 to \$4 million, depending on how you want to do it. There are numbers of options of how we could set that up initially. And we're looking at all those -- I really don't want to say them right now publicly because we haven't made a full decision on that, but capability exists without question to house that in this building, yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

What about staffing? Are you going to have to bring in some new staff obviously to run this?

MR. MELITO:

That's the -- that is the question. And in line with our conversation -- I mean there are options. We can hire staff. We can enter into an intermunicipal agreement with someone else who's already doing some of that back office part of the work, or we could privatize it. And those are three things that are done around the country. So, those are the things we're looking at.

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, again, I think going back to what Dr. Spencer said, sometimes to be careful about, you know,

sometimes it's not necessarily about saving the money, it's about the quality.

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely. I hear you.

LEG. BROWNING:

And, for example, going back to the security guards, my position on that issue is, is you might save money, but in the long term are we really going to save money? For many, many reasons, which I explained my position the other day, and how they have saved possibly the number of police calls to DSS centers, and I worry about potential possible lawsuits that the private company may not respond as well as the County workers have.

There was sometime ago we have had some conversations, and I appreciate the, you know, some of the information, some of the things that you have looked at. You had mentioned sometime ago with me about some pilot programs that you were looking at in certain departments. Can you speak on some of that?

MR. MELITO:

Sure. That is part and parcel of our first phase of the departmental meetings that we're undergoing now. And I mentioned DSS, Health, Probation, Human Services, etcetera. So, what our goal is, you know, we've had the preliminary meetings. We've come up with ideas and questions. We're having follow-up meetings to address some of those. Ultimately at the end of the day, we do want to have a project plan for each department, but we're looking to do something as quickly as we can with a specific department to make it a showcase project, yes. So that is still in our thinking. We haven't decided which department yet.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

But we will be doing that very shortly.

LEG. BROWNING:

So maybe in a couple of months, I guess, when you come back --

MR. MELITO:

Oh, definitely within the next couple months, absolutely. Yes. Yep.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- you'll be able to give us more specifics. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Horsley, you had a quick question for Mr. Melito?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Hey, Tom. I just wanted to -- do you know the square footage in which you're going to need for the Traffic Violations Bureau?

MR. MELITO:

Oh, God. I know Nassau County, I believe, has 12 to 15,000 square feet for theirs. So, that's a range. It's a ballpark.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You would anticipate that ours would be busier because of the physical size of the County or --

MR. MELITO:

I anticipate that ours might be less busy.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Less busy?

MR. MELITO:

And the reason for that is that Nassau County is much more urban than Suffolk County. And -- for example, that's one of the reasons their Red Light Camera Program is very productive. They have much more density of traffic. We have loads of roads that do not have a lot of density. So -- but it's hard to say because Nassau County -- I mean, again --

LEG. HORSLEY:

So in the range of 12,000 square foot?

MR. MELITO:

Something like that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I just wanted a ballpark anyway.

MR. MELITO:

Yeah, yeah.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks for the indulgence, Chairman. This was not my original question. I'll get to that in a second. But just to piggyback on what Legislator Horsley was asking about, with regard to the Traffic Violations Bureau, if that were to pass, would we handle traffic violations for the entire County or just within the Police District?

MR. MELITO:

In the Police District.

LEG. CILMI:

Just within the Police District?

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

And to piggyback off of what the good Doctor was asking, this is something that's concerned me for

a couple of years and I haven't quite figured out how to get at it. But we spend an awful lot of money with contract agencies, a hundred million dollars, something like that. And I've often thought that there's tremendous duplication of -- at least administration within, you know, that expense.

So, for example, you know, maybe you have multiple, you know, child care agencies, maybe you have multiple, you know -- any number of services that we fund, that may be provide by a multitude of different contract agencies that may all be doing the same thing. And, you know, you may need the quantity of service that's provided by those agencies, but do you need to have, you know, three Executive Directors, three payroll systems, three this, three that, three the other thing.

If there's a way to look at that, I think it might be -- it might be productive for the County to look at that. The -- a quick number, and, you know, you can spin anything any way you want, but -- but I had a report prepared that indicated that there are roughly 50 not-for-profit agencies that we fund to some extent through the County, that pay salaries, administrative salaries in excess of \$150,000 per person.

So, when you add up -- for those 50 agencies that we provide some funding to, when you add up the funding for those agencies, it adds up to about \$74 million of funding. When you add up the salaries that exceed \$150,000 annually for those same agencies, it adds up to \$38 million of salary. Now, I'm not begrudging the salaries. But, as I said, I think there's an opportunity for some consolidation because that's an awful lot of money to spend on administrative salaries. Now, grant it, the money that we're providing may not be going directly to pay, you know, the \$600,000-a-year salary of the CEO of March of Dimes. But, you know, to the extent that we could save money by looking at those agencies and those services that are provided, to the extent that we may, in fact, be able to administer some of those programs in-house, it seems to me that we don't have very many people working for the County that are earning greater than \$150,000 a year. So, it seems to me there's an opportunity there for savings. And it should be something that you put on your list of priorities given the amount of money that we spend on the aggregate on an annual basis for these agencies.

MR. MELITO:

Good point. We are looking in general at the topic and did that -- do you have a copy that you might be able to forward to me? That you referred to, the report?

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, I can e-mail you. I can e-mail you a copy.

MR. MELITO:

That's super. Okay, Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, getting back about financial savings, I've just been informed that the County has hired Thomas Stokes, a member of the Nassau Financial Control Board. Apparently he's resigning from that Board on Friday and being hired by the County as a part-time advisor to the County Executive for \$125,000 a year. Would you happen to know if this hiring -- is this -- is he going to be an employee? Is there a title in the Budget that was vacant that he filled, or if he's going to be hired as a consultant or contractor? Was an RFP done?

If there was an RFP done, I certainly wasn't notified of it. As you know, there's a law requiring Legislators be notified of RFPs. I don't recall that. And if it was done by waiver, I haven't got the

report of the Waiver Committee yet. So I would ask, and I don't expect to put you on the spot here, because that would be terribly unfair, but I would like to know some of those answers to those questions as our County struggles with our payrolls.

We just added someone for \$125,000 as a part-time consultant. And I'm saying how do you hire without an RFP or at least the Waiver Committee giving a waiver? And I don't recall this. And apparently he's resigning from the Nassau Control Board to take this job effective Friday. And I'm saying, "wow, I don't remember seeing that RFP or that waiver come through."

So, if he could look in to see how that hiring was accomplished and maybe get back to us --

MR. MELITO:

Yeah, sure. No, I can tell you right now.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

It was a couple of months ago actually. He resigned a couple of months ago from the NYPA Board.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Apparently his resignation takes effect this Friday according to the new reports that I'm reading.

MR. MELITO:

Yeah, that's -- that was this Friday about two months ago, I believe.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. MELITO:

But, yes, it was done by waiver. And because of his specialized capabilities, experiences, he was the Budget Director in Nassau County prior to that, was selected for the NYPA board because his skills. His contract -- he is a consultant. He does not receive benefits. And that contract is not to exceed and also would be used to accommodate anybody else that he felt was necessary in a particular area.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Is he at work now in Suffolk County?

MR. MELITO:

Is he -- I'm sorry?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Is he working now for Suffolk County?

MR. MELITO:

Yes, he has done a little -- he has done some work for us, yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

He has. He is. Okay. Thank you for being, you know, forthright.

MR. MELITO:

Sure.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And thank you for your presentation. Very informative.

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely, absolutely.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Look forward to working with you. Thank you.

MR. MELITO:

Yeah, absolutely. It's home week for us. Because my first three weeks in government in 1988 I was having this -- different topic, conversation with you, the same way (laughter). We started off the same way.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Very good. Thank you, Mr. Melito. And I just had a couple quick comments of my own. Regarding the Traffic Violations Bureau, I know we're still waiting for Albany to make their final go-ahead.

MR. MELITO:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Perhaps, you know, we're all hopeful that they're going to do that. And if so, maybe we'll have you come back later in August to kind of update us on --

MR. MELITO:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- where you think you are. I know the goal here is to make sure that, you know, should we get the permission that we're anticipating, we're going to be ready to run with it as opposed to waiting one or two or three years to get it up and running.

MR. MELITO:

Oh, yeah, oh, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And just to jump on some of the conversation that Legislator Spencer had about consultant services, I can tell you it's one of my pet peeves. We really need to make sure that when we can, we're utilizing our employees to do the work in-house. And I really -- it nags me when we're putting out bonds to hire people to come and do engineer work in the County when we have engineers who can do it or we're hiring people to develop software for us when we have the tech people in-house to do the work. So, I just want to make sure that you're making that a priority to use the folks that we have here to maximize the skills sets that we have here, make sure there are people -- you know, they can do the work. We just got to make sure they have the ability to do it.

MR. MELITO:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So -- and I know there's a lot of requests for follow-ups so maybe in September, later in the year --

MR. MELITO:

Great.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- we'll have you come back and --

MR. MELITO:

I'll be happy to.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- can update us on all this great work you're working on.

MR. MELITO:

I'd be happy to.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you very much.

MR. MELITO:

Thank you, guys. Good to see you. Take care.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, we're going to move on to the agenda.

I've been told **IR 1015 failed** in Committee at the last Committee and, therefore, it was erroneously put on the agenda so we're going to skip over that item.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1019, Directing the Planning Department to conduct a feasibility study on incorporating LEAN Government Principles in Suffolk County. (Cilmi)

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

We have a motion to table. I'll second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Motion's tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

IR 1290, Establishing County Police to Utilize Employees Separated from County Service. (Spencer)

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion to approve by Legislator Spencer, seconded by Legislator Browning.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Isn't this something that the County Executive has already committed to somehow? Or is this something different?

LEG. SPENCER:

What this does, it just allows the -- directs that as the layoffs do go through July 1st, in situations where they're looking at contract services, if there are County employees that are qualified to provide those services, that they be given first consideration. So, I had held off and we've been tabling it because of the negotiations between the Executive's Office and the unions, but this is the last cycle that we could do it before these layoffs go into effect. We do have their consent to move forward. It seems reasonable. Legislator Browning and I, we're working together, actually out of this Committee. And we felt that these employees should be at least looked at before outside contract agencies were --

LEG. CILMI:

Oh, it makes absolute sense. I wonder if the County Executive's Office could opine on this and -- because I thought this was a policy that the County Executive has already announced.

MR. ZWIRN:

Through the Chair, the answer is yes, Legislator Cilmi, the County Exec's Office is doing this. This just codifies it. I mean, there are certain -- it authorizes it, it codifies it. It was similar to the well drilling bill that Legislator Romaine had. We're looking to drill wells in the Pine Barrens. There's no harm in it. It codifies it and let's us know that the Legislature's supportive and so there is -- we concur with the legislation.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It was move that was insignificant because the Executive was there before us. We're just codifying it as an after fact.

MR. ZWIRN:

It also gives us -- is a sense of the Legislature that we're all on the same page, which is productive.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you, Ben. I have a motion and a second. Any other comments before we move on? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you, Ben. Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate it. And ladies.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

IR 1340, Designating Individual Agents of the Suffolk County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals as Volunteers of the County of Suffolk for the Purposes of Indemnification. (Romaine)

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to table. And I'm going make a motion to table the next one also. I have some updated information.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion to table by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Legislator Spencer said he had some updated information. I'd like to hear it.

LEG. SPENCER:

I do. I think that the SPCA has been working with the Executive's Office. And I've gotten feedback from the Executive's Office as recently a few hours ago, that they are working with them to -- some of the -- the concern is to, one, really specify where the indemnification will be provided. And that if there are specific services that are being provided to the County, working out a contract for those services. So, that the indemnification will be very specific to services being provided to the County. They support providing them with indemnification when they are performing a County service. But it is on a volunteer basis right now. So, there could be indemnification. And if there is a refusal or -- which I'm not saying that they would do that, but they would like to have an agreement in place.

LEG. CILMI:

Through the Chair, if Mr. Zwirn could confirm and elaborate on exactly how those conversations are proceeding and --

MR. ZWIRN:

Sure. Again, through the Chair, there was a meeting with the SPCA last week or two weeks ago. And what Legislator Spencer has indicated is the case, often the Police Department will ask the SPCA to go out and perform a task. And in situations like that, they are really acting on behalf of the County. And that's a very different situation than if they go off on their own when they're just volunteers.

The County Executive would like to have something in place. Because they are volunteers, the Police Department or somebody in the County could ask them to go out and perform a task or take care of a, you know, animals that have been dealt with unfairly. And they don't have to show up. There's no obligation on their part because they are volunteers. So, in that case, it's kind of nebulous and a gray area.

They have agreed to all sit down and try to come up with a plan, especially in the case where the County has asked them to perform the services and they do, then, we think it would be fair at that point that there should be indemnification because they're doing a service on behalf of the County. And, therefore, the county should stand behind them. Without that, we really continue to be in a gray area.

LEG. CILMI:

So, how would this agreement be manifested? Would it be a contractual agreement of some sort?

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes yes.

LEG. CILMI:

In working those details out, how closely are you working with the SPCA? I mean, are you sitting together --

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

-- and ironing out the details together as opposed to -- I'd just hate to have a situation where it's the County Executive's Office, the County Attorney's Office, preparing something, submitting it to the SPCA, then, you know, having issues with it or whatever, sending it back and we're wasting month after month after month; when if all sat down together, we might be able to iron it out, you know, much more quickly, so.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes. The negotiations are in good faith to try to resolve this. Not a situation where we make it so prohibitive that they're going to walk away and not do it. We want them to continue to do the service. And under the circumstances where we have some sort of agreement, then, I think the County would support -- the County Executive's Office would support an indemnification.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. ZWIRN:

Because then it would -- it would ultimately be very fair at that point. And it is -- even in this case, if we asked them to go out and perform a service on behalf of the County even now, I mean, if somebody has an argument against them, the County's going to wind up, whether rightly or wrongly, in the lawsuit anyway. Because they're going to say, "look, the only reason we went there, is the County of Suffolk asked us today to go there."

So, legally, you know, that's another -- another argument. But I think they're going to reach an agreement. And at that point we'll be able to move forward on one of these two bills that Legislator Spencer has or Legislator Romaine, or they can co-sponsor one and we can bill map it or -- we'll come up with something that'll work. The language will reflect an agreement between the two parties that we should have support on from all sides.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And I think -- I think -- I'll get to you in just a second, Legislator Romaine, but the -- I think the reason the original resolution failed that Legislator Romaine had submitted, and the reason these bills have been bottled up for so long is that many of us including myself have had that very issue at hand, is how can we indemnify the SPCA without having some sort of a contract, some sort of a legal arrangement in place in terms of what we're indemnifying them for and how it connects to the services that the County's supposed to be providing. And I think it's prudent to make sure that that agreement is in place, certainly an agreement with the SPCA, before we actually move forward and grant that in indemnification. Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. And as you draft these agreements, while I think the SPCA is a wonderful organization, my primary concern in drafting this resolution was to ensure that cases of animal cruelty, cruelty to animals, and you really have to be a very low person to be cruel to an innocent animal, to torture them, to inflict pain on them, to starve them, to beat them, to kill them, that those be dealt with.

As you said that, one of the things I want you to reflect as you negotiate this settlement, these are volunteers. I'd like the County to come forward and tell me what the Police Department response is to these crimes. What is the Police Department doing? Because, again, you make a very good point. We cannot depend on volunteers because even if we think there's a serious case that may be pending or we've had complaints of cruelty to animals, or we find kittens slaughtered and dumped in the woods, that they may not have the staff, they may not have the desire. They're volunteers.

They could say yes or no. What is the Police Department response for animal cruelty?

Now, I'm not on Public Safety. But I will ask someone from the Administration at our next Committee Meeting what is the Police Department -- because while the SPCA is a volunteer, as you've stressed, organization and can accept, not accept, do, not do, the Police Department has no such discretion. They have a mandatory obligation to enforce and investigate cases of animal cruelty.

From what I'm told, just from the reported cases that were investigated, there were over 3,000 cases of animal cruelty in this County. To me and to a lot of other people that happen to love animals, that's a serious matter. And I would ask, since we're not going to depend purely on volunteers, and whatever agreement you have with them, with the SPCA, as you've stated, you're not going to leave it to them because they're simply volunteers, I want to know how much resources of the Police Department, how much time, money, effort and manpower are going to be committed to this cause?

So maybe at the next meeting if we can get answers about that or have someone from the Police Department answer that, because I think Dr. Spencer and I would agree, yes, they are a volunteer organization. Yes, we can't mandate them. Yes, it is the primary obligation of our Police Department -- and by the way, sadly enough, the five other Town Police Departments and the nine other Village Police Departments to investigate these cases. And, yes, they are a volunteer organization and they've done an excellent job. But you make a very good point. Should our only resource be based on volunteers? So, let's hear what those who are actually charged and mandated to do are doing. I'd like to hear that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you, Legislator Romaine. And perhaps it would also behoove us to seek some assistance from the five East End Towns who receive services from the SPCA to cover the indemnification while they are providing their services on the East End.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We have to bring that up with the five Town Boards and the nine Villages.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

I know you have a very close relationship with many of them. So, if we have no other comments here, let's take the vote. We have a motion to table and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed. **(VOTE: 4-1-0-0)**

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion is tabled.

IR 1349, Designating Individual Agents of the Suffolk County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals as Volunteers of the County of Suffolk for the Purposes of Providing Reasonable Indemnification. (Spencer)

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

I have a motion to table. I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Resolution's tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

IR 1453, Authorizing Retirement Incentive for All County Bargaining Units. (Kennedy)

We'll make a motion to table subject to call. It seems this has been addressed through an agreement that was reached between the bargaining -- between AME and the County Executive.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Point of information, John Kennedy's resolution deals with all bargaining units. Have all bargaining units been included in the County Executive's benevolence on this matter?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

If we could direct to Counsel, is there not some changes that were made to that resolution?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, it excluded -- the change that was made excluded the Probation Officers and Correction Officers from the terms of the resolution. I don't know who that leaves because there was already an agreement with PBA, SOA and SDA. This excludes --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Deputy Sheriffs, Deputy Service Investigators, the DA Detective Investigators, a whole host of other people that are bargaining units in this County that would be covered by Legislator Kennedy's resolution. Were there agreements raised with all the bargaining units of the County absent the Probation and the Corrections?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

That's a valid point. And I would encourage those unions if they're seeking this benefit to sit down with the County Executive's Office awfully quick to try to work out those arrangements. AME has and the other PBA's but --

LEG. ROMAINE:

We have an opportunity to do it for them, to put these -- this offer, the same benefit to all employees regardless of their representation except for Corrections and Probation. So, this is our opportunity to say, "you know what, that's not a bad idea, let's put this forward."

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

And as you know and as we have discussed sitting here at this Committee on this resolution and this issue previously, it is not within the purview of the powers of the body to unilaterally offer an early retirement incentive. It is something that must be negotiated through the Executive's Office and the bargaining units. We've said this time and time again in passing this resolution, as Counsel has opined once before, it does not carry the force of law putting it into place. It's simply says that the Legislature approves doing their retirement incentive, but it still needs to be bargained through the bargaining units and the County Executive's Office and is really a moot point.

LEG. CILMI:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you. It seems Legislator Romaine asked a question, but I don't think he got an answer. Maybe he can direct it through the Chair to the County Executive's Office. Has there been discussions with these other bargaining units? Have there been agreements with the other bargaining units?

MR. ZWIRN:

Through the Chair, the answer is -- the only ones that I'm aware of that we negotiated was with AME. And the reason that we put legislation forward with respect to the exempts on certain bills is because they do not have a bargaining unit. So, we do that unilaterally.

But the answer is no. And I think some of the debate the Committee had in the past was that the Correction Officers right now we're probably understaffed on Correction Officers. If these all take -- many of them take early retirement for one reason or another, they're going to have to be replaced immediately. I'm just saying with some of the other bargaining units. But I think -- they have to be replaced whether we'd have to do it by resolution, we would have to do it practically speaking because we need the ones that we have.

When we had the early retirements incentives in the past, and the last one we had, I think, was -- was it 2010 we had a big one and we didn't let the Foley people go, we didn't let Probation people go, we didn't let law enforcement at that time go because we were short-staff. And those departments and that -- we would have had to replace them immediately anyway. So the cost savings, even though we were going to limit it to 20 percent, backfill in law enforcement, it would have been much higher because we just needed the personnel.

So that's why when you do all the bargaining units, they'd have to be negotiated anyway, as the Chairman stated. So, I think that we've done it with AME, we did it through negotiation. And we'll see what the results are with that very shortly.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you, Ben. So, I have a motion. I do not have a second.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Seconded by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion's tabled subject to call. **(VOTE: 3-2-0-0)**

IR 1470, Imposing a Moratorium on Wage Increases for County Management Personnel (Excluding Employees at the Suffolk County Community College and Board of Elections). (County Executive)

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chairman, if we could have this tabled? We want to amend this bill so that it is clear that -- that it's clear -- we had an issue that we want to make sure that whatever agreements are reached with the unions are reflected in what we deal with with the exempts. So we want to make that change because it's not clear as to what we intended, but it's not clear in the language. And if we do it now, we will do it shortly, it will not be eligible for a vote at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay.

MR. ZWIRN:

So we are going to change that to make it -- there was a question, I think, Legislator Cilmi raised the last time we had a vote, was it clear what was the intent. We want to make sure it is absolutely crystal clear in this language so that there was no -- there's no -- any chance for not being right on point.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Very good. Thanks, Ben. I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Resolution's table.
(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

IR 1472, Adopting Local Law No. 2012, A Local Law to Ensure Honesty in Gas Price Advertising. (Presiding Officer) I'll make a motion to table at the request of the sponsor, second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Resolution stands tabled. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1479, Authorizing a Voluntary Lag Payroll for Elected Offices in 2013. (Barraga) I will make a motion to table.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Why would we do that? I mean, is there a reason that, you know, you think this should be tabled?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Do we need to rush into it at this point in time? We could do this during the budget process for next year.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. That's a fair comment. But I don't think that you could do it during the budget process. There's a State constitution provision that prevents you from --

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

This is for a volunteer lag payroll.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

This is not a -- imposing payroll.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So we could during the budgetary process, as we did --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Do a voluntary.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

For this very year I think almost all of us are likely to be participating in, we could do it at that time. So that's the purpose of the tabling motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion's tabled. **(VOTE: 3-2-0-0)**

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

1492, implementing a scale for health insurance contributions by exempt employees. (Romaine) I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Browning.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Discussion?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Sure, Legislator.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah, very briefly this resolutions would simply ensure that before we impose health insurance contributions on exempt employees, that they would not go into effect. Because usually in the past, as a matter of past practices, we waited until the AME contract was settled. And whatever AME got, the exempt employees got. Because as you mentioned, they don't have a bargaining unit.

Same thing with the health contributions. This resolution would do the exact same thing. It would say whatever AME is taking as a -- if they're taking any as a health contribution, that that's the exact same contribution that the exempts would take. It's kind of a standard that we've had in this County for many, many years, that the exempts, since they don't have a bargaining unit, follow whatever was decided regarding AME. I think it's a fair thing. It says to the exempts we're not going to ask you to pay health insurance at any rate unless it's agreed to by AME and only at the rate agreed to by AME.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So basically rescinds the resolution we passed earlier this year? Or nullifies it in effect?

LEG. ROMAINE:

It nullifies that effect until -- because I was assured by the County Executive that all unions would contribute the same. I actually want to put the PBA in there for jokes, but we haven't followed the PBA, we've always followed AME as far as the exempts are concerned. So I stuck with the historic relationship that was between the exempts and AME and that's why I wrote it in that fashion.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

I understand. And it nullifies the resolution that we passed and that it makes it so that these employees will no longer be --

LEG. ROMAINE:

It carries out the County --

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- required to until such time that AME passes --agrees to, and, you know.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It carries out the County Exec's promise that the exempts would not be treated in a separate and unfair manner from other bargaining units in the County of Suffolk; specifically AME.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Very good.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's what he said to me.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

It's been, I guess, a couple of months or a couple of meetings at least since we passed that bill that authorized the contribution by exempt employees for their health insurance. I just would like a comprehensive report on exactly where we stand with the implementation?

MR. ZWIRN:

If I may, through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Sure.

MR. ZWIRN:

The negotiations are going on as far as I know and this is on the table. I noticed --

LEG. CILMI:

Forgive me for interrupting, I don't mean a comprehensive report on your negotiations with the unions. I mean a comprehensive report in terms of the implementation of the resolution that was passed.

MR. ZWIRN:

Oh, you mean -- goes into effect November first. Right.

LEG. CILMI:

I mean, have you established any guidelines for how --

MR. ZWIRN:

The Comptroller's Office is handling that as far as I know.

LEG. CILMI:

Really?

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We'll have to call Joe.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZWIRN:

If I might just add.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Sure, go ahead.

MR. ZWIRN:

Just one thing, when we passed the last resolution that Legislator Romaine supported, and we're glad that he did, it's either leading from the front or leading from the rear. In the past the exempts got what the AME and other unions negotiated. They got a 2% raise or a 3% raise. The exempts didn't get any more than that. They didn't benefit any more than what AME. This is really not a benefit. This is something that's a giveback. This will be changing.

So, you know, we're setting the example by saying that the exempts, which we can decide on unilaterally, are setting an example that we're not going to ask the union and the civil service employees to make a sacrifice that the exempts wouldn't themselves make and are setting the standard. And if you notice, just recently I understand in Westchester County, for the first time, I think it's the correction officers up there are now paying 15% of their medical benefits. And, I think and that's setting the stage for what's going to happen across the State of New York, you saw what happened in Wisconsin, there was pushback there when the governor, you know, made some statements. There is a movement, I think, where are people are going to try once they stop, you know, banging heads they're all going to see we're all in this together and there's going to be some compromises made. And I think this was just to set an example where we could, that we weren't going get -- ask the union members to do more than what we would ask the exempts to do and that was the theory behind it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I heard that and I listened to the County Executive and that's why I supported that, but the County Executive also assured me that the exempts would not be paying any different than what other unions, and I didn't push him because I didn't bring up the PBA and then make that a sore point, but AME, because usually the two are connected on benefits and since this is a giveback I figured the same principle would apply and that's why I wrote this resolution to simply codify what I was told regarding that. So that's what I was told and that's what I'm basing it on and I understand where the County Exec's going and that's why I supported that but he also told me *don't worry, the exempts aren't going to singled out and won't be paying any different than any of the other unions.*

MR. ZWIRN:
And that's correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:
Thank you. So I have a motion and a second. Do I have second? Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 3-2-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine & Legislator Cilmi)**

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Opposed.

IR 1522, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, a Local Law to Enhance Provisions for Enforcement of Certain Consumer Protection Laws. (County Executive) I believe that this public hearing is still open on this so I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:
Seconded by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Motion is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)** Moving onto introductory resolutions.

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

IR 1480, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, a Local Law Establishing Registration Requirement for Health Department Expeditors. (Browning)

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion to table; public hearing.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:
Motion is tabled, still in public hearing. I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Resolution's tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1579, Amending Resolution No. 366-2012, requiring health insurance contributions by exempt employees. (Cilmi)

LEG. CILMI:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:
Motion to approve by Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. SPENCER:
Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:
Seconded by Legislator Spencer. I believe if I'm not mistaken this is adding in the County Executive

who erroneously was left out of the previous resolution.

LEG. CILMI:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Fair enough.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Oversight.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

A mild oversight. Okay. I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? That is bipartisanship right there.

Approved (VOTE: 5-0)

IR 1580, Authorizing elected officials to make immediate contribution for health insurance. (Cilmi) I will make a motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion to approve by Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second to the table by Legislator Browning. Any other motions?

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Sure, go ahead. And then I can give you a background why I'm making the motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:

You're welcome to.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

I'd love to know. I mean, this is --

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

No, I understand. And it's my understanding, at least it's been brought to my attention, that in developing how this will actually be implemented over at the Comptroller's Office, they are not prepared at this point in time to make it go live and they're asking for a little bit of time so they can continue -- so they can bring in the numbers from the health plan in terms of the actual -- how the cost numbers will breakdown specifically and they're going to implement it in their payroll system. And so I think that's the reason we're looking to table it just to give them more time to get themselves up and running given that this was kind of thrown in their lap.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I certainly appreciate that, and as much as my main problem with the bill that was passed was that there was really no direction in terms of its implementation. And if you're saying that you agree in principle that elected officials should have the opportunity to contribute immediately, once the Comptroller develops some guidelines, then I'll withdraw my motion to approve and agree with the motion to table for the time being.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Good, thank you. I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
The resolution's tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)

IR 1581, Amending the Suffolk County Classification and Salary Plan in connection with a new position title in the Board of Ethics: Executive Director of the Suffolk County Board of Ethics. (Presiding Officer).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

A motion to approve by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Romaine. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Resolution is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1599, Approving the appointment of a relative of an Acting Supreme Court Judge in the Suffolk County Treasurer's Office (Emily E. Hudson). (Presiding Officer)

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'll make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion by Legislator Romaine.

LEG. BROWNING:

Question?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Seconded by Legislator Spencer. We have a -- on the question, Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I want to make sure being that we have layoffs and we're approving the salary of a -- of hiring somebody, is this full-time or is this an internship or what is this?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

BRO?

MR. PERNICE:

Legislator Browning, I spoke to the Treasurer's Office. She's going to be a summer intern as she has been for the last few years. The funds are already included in their temporary salary lines for

the position.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you, Benny. Okay. I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Resolution carries. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1602, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Local Law to update and strengthen the County's Responsible Bidder Statute. (Spencer)

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to table for public hearing.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion to table by Legislator Spencer, I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Resolution's tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1603, Establishing a Voluntary Wage Freeze Program for elected officials. (Horsley)

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Motion by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Seconded by Legislator Browning.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

On the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

Just a question to Counsel. Is this necessary?

MR. NOLAN:

I think -- this has come up in prior meetings. Ben, if a County Legislator wants to forego a pay raise, they can do it without the benefit of a resolution. They can file paperwork with the Comptroller, if they'd like to.

LEG. CILMI:

So it's unnecessary?

MR. NOLAN:

For the purpose of freezing your salary, it is not necessary. Legislators can do that on their own.

LEG. CILMI:

As I have done. So my question, I guess, to the sponsor would be what's the point?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

The point is, and if I may quote the eminent Ben Zwirn, that you either want to lead from behind or you want to lead from the front. And we want, as a Legislature, to lead from the front. And that's the reason why this was put in. And we feel that the Legislature is taking a stand, that if we are going to be laying off people in Suffolk County, we have to feel part of this pain as well. And we want to be out front. And by the way, I salute you, Legislator Cilmi, for your past actions and congratulate you on that. Again, this is voluntary.

LEG. CILMI:

I was going to say without calling anybody out, I mean, you know, if you want to lead, then lead; there's no need to pass a resolution to allow -- I mean, I'll support the resolution. I've already done it, but you don't need the resolution. It seems to me pointless.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

That is the role of the Legislature, to use its bully pulpit to lead into the future and we're making a statement as a group.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, I'd like to ask Ben Zwirn if the County Executive supports this resolution?

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes, he does.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. I had received information to the contrary. But I'm glad you cleared that up for the record, that the County Executive supports this resolution. Thank you.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

By the way, you may recall -- if I may, through the Chair -- that this legislation originally came over from the County Executive. And I felt as Deputy Presiding Officer that what we should do -- that should not be dictated or led by the County Executive; it should be led from the Legislature. That is our role and that is the reason why we changed it. They withdrew it graciously and we put it into our name as *from the Legislature*.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Abstentions? The resolution carries. **Approved (VOTE: 4-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine)**

And we are adjourned before the start of the next committee for the first time this year. Thank you very much, everyone.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 2:09 P.M.)
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY