

**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 September 6, 2012.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature  
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel  
Tim Laube, Clerk of the Legislature  
Benny Pernice, BRO  
Samuel Chu, Commissioner/Labor Department  
Ben Zwirn, County Executive's Office  
Thomas Melito, Deputy County Executive for Performance Management  
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office  
Maria Barbara, Aide to Leg. Cilmi  
Paul Perillie, Aide to Leg. Gregory  
Lora Gellerstein, Aide to Leg. Spencer  
Amy Keyes, Aide to Leg. Calarco  
Vivian Becker, Habitat for Humanity of Suffolk  
Jill Rosen-Nikoloff  
Paul Caplan, Elwood Taxpayer's Association  
Arthur Sanchez, DSPBA

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

**MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:30 PM\*)

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Everyone please come to the horseshoe. We are going to get started with the Government Operations Committee. If we could all stand for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Romaine.

**SALUTATION**

Thank you. We're going to get started with our Committee here. I have one speaker today, Vivian Becker. Vivian, would you like to come up and address the Committee.

**PUBLIC PORTION**

**MS. BECKER:**

Hi. I don't really need a microphone. I have very strong voice. Thank you, I'm Vivian Becker.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

If you could though, just for the stenographer, they use the microphone, it's all recorded.

**MS. BECKER:**

Okay. Can you hear me? I'm the relatively new Executive Director of Habitat for Humanity of Suffolk and I'm thrilled to be here and I'm thrilled that you're considering transferring properties to us in Mastic Beach; seven properties. We have a very exciting opportunity to both help needy qualified families, many of you probably know about Habitat for Humanity. Many people think we give our houses away; we do not. We sell our houses and we have pretty strict income and other guidelines for people to become habitat homeowners. When I came on board just nine months ago, the board asked me what I plan to do when I became director and I said I was hoping that we could have a greater impact when we're in this high foreclosure, abandoned and foreclosed property environment so that we could fulfill our mission of providing housing, decent safe and affordable housing and also having a great impact on communities.

So we're very grateful to Suffolk County and the 72-h Program for giving us the opportunity to build and for this opportunity to have seven parcels and develop housing in Mastic Beach and be part of a concerted effort to revitalize a community where we have a chance of really turning it around.

And I thank you very much and on behalf of Habitat staff and board and particularly to Jill Rosen-Nikoloff for her support for much of Habitat's work.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Thank you, Vivian. And thank you for the work that Habitat does not just in the Mastic Beach community but North Bellport and many of our other communities. Building homeownership is a great way of building up our communities. Legislator Browning had a question.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, well, I'm looking forward to it also. I know the Village is very excited about this and I didn't get an opportunity to ask you because I know the Village and myself we're both interested in also with returning veterans and focusing on trying to help our returning veterans because many of them are not of the highest income either. Have you been able to -- have you done much work on trying to get the veterans and getting -- attracting them or how doing with that?

**MS. BECKER:**

We've done some. We have one house under construction that is a veteran's house and we're

certainly -- we talked when we met with Jill -- when we first talked to Gail, one of the trustees of Mastic Beach about earmarking some of the houses for veterans. So we could do that. I mean, I think that -- I think the challenge, of course, is always finding people who make the income guidelines, who can afford homeownership, who fall within the Habitat income guidelines, but I think we have enough of an opportunity and they'll be enough houses so that he can certainly work toward that at least on some of them.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, I know that I'd like to work with the Village. In fact, we had an event and -- down by the firehouse for veterans and a young couple come in, she's having a baby and they're renters and he's a veteran. And, you know, I gave him all of the information to reach out to everyone but, you know, I know that there are some that live within the community that we -- would be nice to try and get them also.

But I have to say also that I went to the ribbon counting in Bellport with a new resident and it's amazing the transformation, the change in the homes and how you've -- so many different designs now and I was of shock. I mean, they have beautiful flooring, the kitchens were gorgeous. Air conditioning, which I don't even have in my home, but it was amazing, you know, with the central air and how the home was built. But I have to tell you the new models that you have are definitely very impressive.

**MS. BECKER:**

Yes, and I'm particularly sensitive to that and I know that the Village is sensitive to that and we'll work closely with them to make sure that the architectural design meets with everybody's approval and so that we enhance the way the community looks. I think it's really important.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Great, thank you.

**MS. BECKER:**

Okay, thank you. Anybody else have any questions? So thank you again for your support.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Thank you very much, Vivian.

Okay. I have no other cards. Is there anybody else that would like to address the committee? Seeing none we're going to move onto our presentations and we had asked that Tom Melito from Performance Management come down today and address the committee we had a few questions for you. I know at the last committee Legislator Cilmi had asked that you maybe take a -- have a seat right at the front here, Tom. Make yourself comfortable.

**MR. MELITO:**

Very comfortable.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Legislator Cilmi had done a great job of holding the public hearings so our employees can give us some ideas of ways of making the County more efficient, more cost effective and his office prepared quite a lengthy report out of that and we just had some -- he had some questions on whether you'd taken a look at and any of the things in there popped out to you and said this is a great thing that we can move forward with or not. So maybe you can address that and then -- and maybe I'll let Legislator Cilmi address it to you guys. Yeah, maybe you'll start there.

**MR. MELITO:**

First of all, obviously I think it goes out saying that the effort was a laudable effort and Legislator Cilmi and I have spoken in the past about the importance of having open lines of communication with our employees and with policymakers throughout the County. So I think the effort was great. We certainly did review this when it came out. As you noted in your introduction there are a number of legal, budget, collective bargaining and other regulatory issues that may impact some of them but having said that there are many of these ideas that we have been looking at and are part of our overall agenda. And if you like, I mean, I can just go through a few of those to let you know what those are.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Shaking head yes.

**MR. MELITO:**

One of the things before we even get into that that you had mentioned in your -- one of the things you had mentioned in your preamble was that, you know, the County well -- would do well to increase an open communication channel so this is something we are continually trying to do. Throughout my entire career both in management and as a management consultant, as well as -- I'm bringing that here in Suffolk County is the importance of engaging employees, developing and engendering buy-in for whatever programs it is we're trying to implement and using those experiences to increase and benefit their work-life experiences. So that is definitely part of our Performance Management's agenda. We will be continuing to do that. You know, it's amazing how many times, you know, as a consultant we would be interviewing employees in a given department, in a given organization and they would say, *you know, I've been here 12 years and nobody's really ever asked my opinion about how we can improve our experience here over the course of the day.*

So it's very empowering when you do that and when you give employees the opportunity to increase outcomes, I mean, to affect outcomes associated with policymaking and things that we're doing it's usually very positive and engenders increased performance. So that is something we agree on one hundred percent and we are on there.

You broke your --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Could I just stop you for a second, Tom?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, go ahead.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is that something that you've already begun?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I ran into employee the other day from a department that shall remain nameless and said to that employee if there's anything that we could be doing differently here, that would help the operation run a little bit smoother, please let me know and he looked at me and said, *you know, you're the first person that's ever asked me that question.* So I hope that's something that we're diving into rather than planning to do and that we're actively --

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, let me say this. We have -- we have dived into, if that's the right way to say it, we've had

meetings with many of the largest departments here and that is the message that we have brought. And when I go through my presentational project been working on, one of the department's Probation, is an example of that kind of thing. So we are.

In all candor, you know, we've been working on a lot our first three months on the old budget and then the last three months on the new budget so I would be dishonest to say that that hasn't impeded our ability to get out and do more with the employees. So if anybody says that, you know, gives you that information, by all means give them, you know, tell them to give me a call and we'll see, you know, where they are and how we can make that better. Absolutely.

So returning to your paper, you know, you broke things out into different categories. There were some that were related just to budget, which I won't address directly but recurring prehearing suggestions, the first area and one of the first things was a reevaluate the County car policy. That is something we are looking at, trying to hone in on how to do better with that. Turning off lights and computers when not in use. We already have programs that do that but we're are looking to do more with conservation, energy conservation efforts.

Consolidate, lease out unused offices spaces. Clearly that is something that's on our agenda. We talked last time about restacking the Dennison building. We are in the process of developing a report. As we speak that seeks to look at opportunities across the County, what leases are coming due, what the operational expenses are associated with each of those facilities and seeing how we can maximize the use at a minimum of the Dennison Building and get rid of, you know, excess properties.

Reduce wasteful printing. That is definitely something that will -- the whole issue of printing and uniformity of equipment, etcetera, is something that's on our agenda with regard to the -- our UMS contract, which I'll talk about in a few minutes.

Augment staff and departments that generate revenue. We are always looking to maximize the use of our human resources to the extent that we can.

Unique prehearing.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Can I interrupt for just one second?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Just a quick question cause you were going through printing. We have a County print shop that does most of our official printing. Is that correct?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Do we have a backlog at the print shop?

**MR. MELITO:**

I couldn't tell that you. I was talking more -- I wasn't talking about the County's department at this moment.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay.

**MR. MELITO:**

I'm talking more about our use of printers throughout the organization, which is significant.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Right, but -- I heard that and then I thought of the print shop because I was wondering where we are in terms of the print shop, their work orders, how far behind they are and I also was wondering if the County is working to put more printing jobs at -- privatize more of the printing jobs that the County normally would do.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, I don't at this moment have an answer for you on those.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay, I understand.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah. Sure.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That's great. I'm sure you'll want to come back to this Committee with -- we'll welcome you with open arms to answer a whole variety of questions to help us better understand the operation of County government.

**MR. MELITO:**

Okay.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thank you.

**MR. MELITO:**

Great. There was some unique prehearing suggestions. {Two} parking fee at correctional facilities. We are thinking about parking fees at various facilities. We are looking at that.

Use of inmates for certain jobs. That is something we have discussed for -- particularly with regard to keeping care of the grounds in certain buildings. We are talking about that.

Creating collections department for uncollected fines and fees. We are working to increase our efforts at collecting unpaid fees. And I'll speak more to that when I go through my presentation.

Some of these -- on the salary and employment, Performance Management doesn't really have a lot of say, but eliminating patronage jobs positions that's something we could be involved with. By eliminating unnecessary departments and consolidating where possible, clearly we are looking to consolidate operations throughout the County as we go along.

Part-time positions. That is something that we're always aware of where we might be able to make use instead of laying people off, having a part-time position that might be able to satisfy our needs.

Review emergency housing placement facilities more thoroughly to eliminate abuse and reduce costs. That is something that is on our radar. We are starting to look at that.

You have taxes and fees. There's a section on page six and we are looking at enforcing collection

on old delinquent property taxes. That is one of our initiatives that we have on the table.

Charges for permits. That always an ongoing -- something that we would take a look at.

Efficiency. Hiring employees specifically for applying for grant funds. We are looking at consolidating our grant application process. We do have different segments throughout the County and we're trying to see which -- in what way that organization makes the most sense based on the difference between what -- certain ones would be applying for.

Looking at consolidating office space again. That's something that we have on our list. Avoiding expensive renovation by consolidation and moving as necessary, again, that's part of our stuff.

So, you know, we have a few of those, but long story short many of the suggestions that were on your list are things that are viable and that are and have been on our radar since the beginning.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Good.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. I think what we're going to do, Tom, is I think we have a couple Legislators might have a few questions about that. Let's try to keep it brief. He is going to go into some of the other things that Performance Management's working on for the budget and we want to keep things moving along, but, Legislator Cilmi, we'll let you go first.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, I really don't have any specific questions other than, you know, I'm encouraged by the fact that, you know, you've obviously read through and digested what's there. As I said in the introduction to the document, these are not my ideas, I won't take credit for them. They're our employees ideas. And to the extent that the administration is pursuing some of those ideas I think is a tremendous credit to our employees. So, you know, we've -- I continue to be impressed by the things that you say, Tom, and I just hope that, you know, that these are more than just words. And, for you, I mean, you sort of set the direction but it's not always up to you to implement. You know, you can find all of these different things and sort of point people in a direction, but it's not up to you to make sure that, you know, X,Y,Z department is doing what you suggested.

So, you know, to the extent that -- that you can effect that, the actual implementation of these things, you know, please do and please share with us in the instances that you know that we're already, you know, that we're actually getting somewhere as opposed to talking about getting somewhere. I would be very interested to hear about those.

**MR. MELITO:**

That's great. And, as you know, we've, you know, discussed before my -- I'm always available to talk to you about any of these things.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah.

**MR. MELITO:**

And you're right to suggest that it's not always identifying the opportunity; this is what we have to do and in doing it, there are a lot of things that have to happen in between and get people to buy into it and signoff, etcetera. So you're very, very right. County government is complicated.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, this seems something very simple. I mean, I met with childcare providers in my district just this past week. And obviously funding for them has been reduced and one of the things that they said to me was that *they received the statement of what they're going to receive in the mail* and most of them do everything on the internet and she said, *I can go online and look at the statement*. She said, *you know, tell DSS, she said, save the 44 cents and stop sending it to me*. You know, so I think that's something. It may not be a lot, but every penny counts at this rate. And then to top it off they, you know, she said, *then the check comes*. So that's another 44 cents in an envelope.

So, you know, is there a possibility to start looking at some kind of direct payment, you know, direct debits or something to that effect if they have an account? And again, if they're able to get most of the information online and they can, you know, if they opt, you know, I guess, give them an opportunity to opt out of, you know, having things mailed to them and, you know, everybody gets their paychecks now with direct debit, you know, so maybe we should be looking at that with DSS also.

**MR. MELITO:**

Absolutely. It is -- the answer or the short answer is yes. It is something we can explore. It is on our radar with regard to the strategic source and contract that we are about to have signed and get in place. So it is something that we will be looking at.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And I -- we had Public Safety today and Director Cook had, you know, told us how you've been meeting with them every Tuesday so I know that you're working in Probation.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yep.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And he thinks things are going very well.

**MR. MELITO:**

Good. That's great, that's good to hear.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Great. Okay, Tom, so I guess the next step is the -- things that Performance Management's working on and looking to carry forward into the coming budget.

**MR. MELITO:**

Absolutely. So first of all it's great to be here and what I thought I would do is just I'm not going to give you a rundown on every single thing we're doing, but an overview on some of the larger projects.

As you know, we've been working on developing cost saving opportunities and generating new sources of revenue over the last several months. And as department competes just its fifth month in existence, I'm pleased to provide you with some updates on several of our projects. And then after that we can answer questions or whatever questions anyone has.

But just to go back just a bit, Performance Management began a measured analysis really in early May upon completion of the recent six month budget exercise that we've all been through which resulted unfortunately in the workforce reduction plan. But since then our understanding, and as Legislator Cilmi points out and Legislator Romaine, our understanding of the complexity of the Suffolk County organization has really grown. Operations and management meetings have been held with many departments and interviews of a myriad of a number of employees have taken place.

We also are looking to address organizational inertia and improve the process and product of government decision making.

In addition, as we said earlier, by engendering employee buy-in and showing how we can improve employees work-life experience to get them to really be a part of the cataclysm or the catalyst for making things move forward. And we will and are planning to and have started to provide organizational management and training platforms necessary for success and we have a very strong emphasis on utilizing technology over time as a catalyst to promote efficiencies.

So the last time I was here we talked about a number of projects. One of which was what we call revenue maximization. And basically that's aimed at increasing revenues by 100% within the given area. That it would -- whichever area it is. So at this time I'm pleased to report that we've completed a segment of this. We have developed memoranda of understanding between the Department of Social Services and the Police Department and the Department of Social Services and the District Attorney's relating to child protective services cases and have filed claims for prior years. We project to be reimbursed \$6 million for 2012 and 2013 on this initiative alone. And essentially what it involves is going back and looking at the services of the Police Department and the District Attorney's Office and things that they've actually done with their labor force related to investigations for child protective services cases. It's something that could have been going on a longtime and in the past you could go back several years. New York State has since changed the law so you can only go back eight quarters, but having said that we expect that this initiatives worth about \$6 million. We're waiting for the final okay. The applications been submitted and that's what we're projecting.

On the Red Light Camera Program --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'd rather -- if we could just answer a quick question or two --

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- in the middle otherwise it's sort of gets lost.

**MR. MELITO:**

Sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So you're saying -- who would reimburse us?

**MR. MELITO:**

New York State.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So we're expecting maybe \$6 million to -- that's great.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Keep going. I just wanted to be clear.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, yeah. The last time we spoke about red light cameras we had just gotten the approval legislatively for the additional 50 cameras. We have been negotiating since early August with the ACS, our vendor. And after careful negotiating -- we're almost done with the negotiation process. Will result in a better split of revenue, delinquent collection process and better and more agile movement of cameras based on performance data. That last piece is critical in that for a successful Red Light Camera Program you need to be able to move cameras to places where people are not aware that they're there for so long. What happens is you experience -- once you know a camera's there you pay attention to it. And red light camera programs across the country have that issue. New York City, I think I might have mentioned last time I was here, they put up dummy cameras all throughout the City so that they can so continually move them around.

So that is a big win for us in getting the contract to be able to move the cameras much more quickly going forward. We're expecting an additional \$6 million in revenue as a result of these changes in the contract on top of the 5 million was that previously budgeted for 2013. So we're very confident on that. It isn't signed, sealed and delivered. We are expecting to finish this contract within the next week or two and then we'll be moving forward to get the new cameras up in places where they make sense.

With regard to the Traffic Violations Bureau, last time we spoke it was really the very beginning and we're now developing and establishing the traffic violations entity. We've made significant progress and have completed a lot of the State level discussions and advocacy to obtain passage of the bill and have made significant headway in defining the process. We have identified the physical resource requirements, which are about 13,000 square feet and we're in the process of analyzing three potential spaces, one of which would be in the Dennison building, one of which would be in north campus and we are -- we have had discussions, we're hoping to meet with the State in the next few days, to be honest with you, to talk about out utilizing the space they have in the State office building across the way from the Dennison building. So those are three options available to us. We estimate the capital expenditures necessary to build-out in the Dennison building to be between three and \$4 million. So if we could, you know, find a place like the State building that's already set up and is appropriate for security purposes and, you know, might buy us a little bit of time in the near future to get that started. But we're in the process of looking at those options.

A very critical component of the TVB is the technology platform within in which we operate. And we have had meetings, Don Rodgers from IT has been intimately involved with us. We're had several meetings with the people in Nassau County. We have talked to the software people that provided the system for them. We've also had meetings with a company by the name of SEI who's a -- it's actually owned by an ex judge. He developed software several years and it's actually used by 1150 of the 1250 courts located in New York State. So it's prevalent all over. Most noteworthy on Long Island is the Town of Southampton that uses it and they have about 120,000 transactions a year. So they have a significant operation there. The software's very inexpensive and it's also very easy to set up and you do it very, very quickly. So, you know, to the extent that we can get a software solution set up, that really informs the overall process. Built into it are the steps that you need to keep track of and the interface is necessary to the State systems and whatever other systems that need to be involved with it. So we're very close on that. Part of this RFP that we've had questions about does involve also the provision of technology and we're expecting several technology vendors to respond to that as well.

The RFP, I might as well get into that now, has asked for companies respond to functions relating to either total operations, piece of the operation, a service they can provide relative to the operation, may it be a consulting, would it be technology, would it be privatizing it, etcetera. And I need to be crystal clear, and I'm sure we're going to get questions on this, no decision has been made whatsoever regarding the privatization of any component of this operation. We are simply, really quite honestly, seeking to be as thorough as possible and gage as many ideas as possible before we make our final decisions. If we had had more time I would have put out probably an RFQ, which was a request for qualifications. But we didn't have the time so the RFP I'm also looking at is an opportunity to educate us. When we see what people have to say and how they've set things up elsewhere that will give us additional information from which to make our decision. It should be educational for all of us, that whole process.

On the side of operating protocols, we've also been assessing those. Again, we've met several times with Nassau County, Riverhead, District Court and other stakeholders to learn best practices and opportunities that ensure quality service and efficiency. We're confident that we'll have the operation up and running in advance of the 4/1 deadline and as we're going to need to have at least software up and running shortly after the first of the year to begin scheduling, calendar scheduling activities.

So it's clearly a nontrivial exercise. I think I mentioned last time it took several years for Nassau County to set theirs up and they actually struggled through the first several years after that. Right now they have a system that works. They get it now. In fact, they're notorious because they get it so well. And so we're hoping to capitalize on some of that experience as well.

Strategic sourcing was also, I think we discussed that or we had some questions about that. We did issue the RFP. We did award a contract, well, we've awarded, yeah, I guess that's the way to say it, we've awarded a contract to a company by the name of UMS. We are in the process of getting the final signatures. We've been negotiating with them over the period of the last several weeks. And we -- hopefully we'll have that signed within the next day or two. The contract is no cost up front. And, you know, the areas of opportunity that are involved with that are, you know, we're going to be looking at -- first of all, we haven't sat with them officially so we're going to determine a large list of opportunities in conjunction with them but some of the things we discussed early on were, you know, identifying opportunities renegotiating -- renegotiations of contracts, credit card processing and reduction of fees, energy sales, gas, gasoline, demand response programs, IT and non IT maintenance, IT software licensing, IT architectural review, potentially litigation outsourcing, revenue, fee collections and various kinds, utility audits, telecom, improvements, E-procurement opportunities and the like. So there's going to be a whole bunch of things.

The contract works in such a way as that we identify an opportunity, either we do or they do based on their experiences and ours and then we put a project spec together and then we signoff, we get a baseline for the project, get a baseline and then we signoff on each one of those. The department involved also has to signoff and then we go forward. So we're looking very forward to getting involved with this hopefully by the end of -- the latest the end of September, probably next week and get -- hit the ground running for 2013.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Can I ask a question relevant to that please?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is this the -- is the deal that Legislator Romaine had questioned when we saw one of the those universal notifications?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And we talked about it being for software licensing?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But it sounds like it's much more than that.

**MR. MELITO:**

The potential is much more than that; yes, yes. It's strategic sourcing. That's what the name of the RFP was.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. MELITO:**

You know, software licensing is definitely part of it but to the extent that we can leverage their capabilities with the staff that we have, the better off we can be.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Sure, go ahead.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Let me go if I may --

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

-- Tom, with strategic sourcing. Exactly what does that mean?

**MR. MELITO:**

Other than saying those words over again it's hard for me to say.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay.

**MR. MELITO:**

It means looking for opportunities to reduce expenses and to increase revenues and improve operations. Sources of opportunities for improvement.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And they would be restricted, unrestricted? How are you looking at this RFP unrestricted opportunities?

**MR. MELITO:**

Well, what do you mean unrestricted? It's -- every opportunity has to be --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

*Fire half of your employees, you'll save money, give me my fee now. I mean --*

**MR. MELITO:**

No, it's not like that at all.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That's what I'm trying to say.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

It's not -- it is a restricted thing.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

You're not looking at everything.

**MR. MELITO:**

No.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

You're looking at some things.

**MR. MELITO:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That's what I'm trying to understand. What are the key elements that you're looking at for strategic sourcing?

**MR. MELITO:**

Well, the list I just read through. Contracts, credit card processing, reduction of fees, from which we're paying. Energy contracts including gas, gasoline, demand response programs, IT maintenance, non IT maintenance, software licensing through IT, consolidation of our software licensing, which was a big one that they saved a lot money for New York City. Architectural --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Now, there are licenses out there, we have to pay for every license. Is that not correct?

**MR. MELITO:**

We have to pay for everything but we're paying for a lot more and most likely than we're actually using. That happens often because, you know, we've lost people. Somebody might have a full office suite, they only use one element of it.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, I'm sure when we did a reduction in force, that was one of the considerations that were made when a reduction in force was reposed that people had to vote on, that these people wouldn't be using their desks, their computers and when you put that forward, this is part of the plan. I assume. I would assume that that's what happened.

**MR. MELITO:**

Well, not -- I can't speak for how Budget handled that, that's not my area. But what I can say is --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So Budget, Mr. Chair, than maybe Budget to explain to us how when you have less people you use less resources and how they plan for that. That would be -- that would be, I think, a --

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

I would think, Legislator Romaine, that you and I both know both know that when we -- when the budget process was put together and they talked about the savings generated from the reduction in workforce it was a savings associated with those employees' salaries and benefits and not necessarily the fact that they're no longer using a licensed software operation.

And I think what Mr. Melito was getting to with the licensed software operations is that some of our departments are using licenses that they may not necessarily be actually utilizing anymore, there may be opportunities to acquire a single licensing for our software that can be used across departments instead of having each individual department source that software themselves individually. And I think that's what he's getting at with the sourcing and not just for the software.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Oracle or something of that nature.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, Microsoft.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Microsoft.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That could be licensed across departments.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All right.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, exactly.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And this RFP went out?

**MR. MELITO:**

Oh, yeah.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And who has responded to it?

**MR. MELITO:**

Several companies. This is, you know --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And the RFP committee that evaluates the proposals, have they met to start evaluating these proposals?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, sir. It's completed.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay.

**MR. MELITO:**

It's been completed. We made a decision.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Oh.

**MR. MELITO:**

And we're under finalizing the contract.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

I think Mr. Melito had already mentioned they -- UMS, is that the company that you're looking to award the contract to?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. And now let me ask you, UMS, the selection of UMS and their procedures, we all want to see a more efficient cost effective government, but UMS, none of their work will impinge on previous contracts that we have with municipal employees in Suffolk County.

**MR. MELITO:**

Absolutely not.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So this is separate from that.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

They don't have to get involved in negotiating anything with that --

**MR. MELITO:**

No, no.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

-- at all.

**MR. MELITO:**

No, no.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Sounds like a win-win. Thank you very much, sir.

**MR. MELITO:**

All right. Thank you.

On the risk management side, and I just have a couple more, I apologize, I just want to give you guys some sense of the things we're doing.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Please.

**MR. MELITO:**

We -- last time we spoke we said we were going to take a look at the -- in particular worker's compensation program. And we have done that. And basically, you know, we sought to develop -- we want to develop a plan for moving forward. And we obtained operating financial data from existing reports, created new reports and we went through an exhaustive process working with employees, developing information, and including the employees from Risk Management in every level of detail. So we have definitely identified several opportunities. Specific areas for immediate focus between performance management and risk management will include audit and claims, claim files to determine the areas of high financial exposure and assign a consultant, a third party administrator to mitigate and reduce costs. Many of those, if we have to go outside for a third party can probably be funded through the savings that it will accrue from going through those files. We want to review vendor contracts and develop and implement accountability metrics for all the vendor contracts that we're using through there. We're looking to incentivize and make a higher investment in the legal services to improve our overall litigation process in addition to increase in-house legal staff dedicated to the high risk management issues. In particular the 207-c's, which as you guys probably know are the public safety contracts, 207-c claims are very expensive. Probably about 65% of all the 207-c claims come through the police department. We have met with the police department several times, they've been extremely cooperative in trying to work with us and going forward our plan is to work very closely with them to get people off 207-c and into retirement so that gets them off of our payroll.

We want to utilize the Labor Relations Department to implement new loss control and accountability programs to limit the occurrences of people going on workers comp. We expect to save about \$2.6 million in 2013 just by doing these things. We are also considering moving the reporting structure of Risk Management from Civil Service to the County Attorney's Office under the County Attorney who is very well versed in both worker's comp and risk management so that's something that's under consideration.

On the technology side I know that's near and dear to a lot of us. We discussed technology before. Early analysis has uncovered the fact that, Do It, which I'll call our internal department has oversight over 29% of the annual budget dollars and less than one-third of the total County IT staff. With the staff placed Countywide there's no -- not good enough coordination with the commissioner of technology for the purposes of planning, purchasing and/or policy. Much more needs to occur in terms of collaboration and synergies and to begin with what we've come up with is this idea of ingratiating the Do It Department into the middle rather than consolidating all of these outside agencies into one agency what we -- implementing what we call a federated approach. And the federated approach merely places from a reporting point of view central technology into the process for determining, you know, where to buy software, what our priorities, what resources are needed and how in fact can we go share resources across boundaries when most appropriate and most needed. So we're -- we're looking to implement that -- that process for 2013. It will result in, you know, inter and intra agency technological synergies that we're very, very excited about.

The consolidated approach already, just in terms of trying to coordinate some of the hardware purchases has resulted in a savings of \$250,000 with bringing to light the fact that certain equipment wasn't necessary to be purchased because it was already here. So much more will be done on that. We'll be talking to you guys more about that as it progresses, but that's a direction we want to go in.

In terms of inventory management we -- that is one that we brought up last time. We've identified a number of physical space consolidation opportunities, etcetera. Right now we're looking at maintenance, what they call MRO purchases. Maintenance, repair and operations. We're working with a company, Grainger, that does a lot of our ordering and we're developing a process map of current MRO procurement process. We're analyzing the purchase history and the current inventory and we're really trying to move more to a -- an overall just-in-time inventory model where we don't buy things and then store them, but we have a system in place that provides for getting us what we need as quickly as possible within 12 to 24 hours typically.

We begun visiting departments to review excess inventory and determine opportunities for liquidation and possible auction where appropriate. We're working very closely with the departments to exact information regarding what they store, what's excess and what space is used for the -- for holding up of inventory.

We've been also assessing the BOMARC site, which I know we discussed last time. Where the inventory of cars is over 3,000 at this point and there's a tremendous -- in addition to the cars there's lots of potential scrap metal sales there as well.

Meetings have been held. This is -- this is a very complex one, quite frankly, and we've been having meetings with us, County Attorney's Office, the Police Department Counsel, the Commanding Officer of Property from the Police Department and to begin discussions on not only getting rid of the massive inventory that we collect at BOMARC but also to outline a plan to streamline the process whereby we take on less cars and the cars that we do take on we're able to get rid of more quickly. It's a very complex issue. It involves the District Attorney's Office as well. If there are ongoing cases that a car is part of, you can't do anything with it, but we're looking to simplify all of these procedures so that when we do get the opportunity we can get rid of the cars and maybe take less cars on in the first place.

So it's a problem. It's a huge problem. The longer the cars are there the more money we're losing and the more there's an opportunity for them to either be damaged and/or contaminate the property that they're on.

Eventually, you know, this going forward -- sorry, you know, we'd like to assess the BOMARC property or pieces of it for economic development opportunities. I mean, it's a huge piece of property that's really not being utilized properly.

In terms of operational initiatives, we spoke of a few of these last time.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Could I just interrupt for one second.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I know you intend on giving your presentation. The BOMARC property; that has a lot of potential for a lot of different reasons but obviously would have to do massive redevelopment there. What are you going to with the silos? I mean those are concrete silos.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, I haven't -- I don't know.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I mean and they have a lot -- at one time they were full of County junk.

**MR. MELITO:**

I think some of them -- some of them still are.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

You got rid of a typewriter, you got rid of a beat up desk, you sent it out there.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And they just filled up and then our Presiding Officer got some of that junk out of there. I think he got out there Gershow in there to do the metal stuff anyway.

But then you have about several thousand cars that they tell me -- which you've got trees growing through those cars, anyone that's been out there, I'm sure you have, so you know what I'm talking about. What are you going to with those cars? And let me ask you something, has anyone evaluated those cars in terms of the leakage of gas and oil from those cars and the impact that we're having on the groundwater in that area, which is a sensitive recharge area?

**MR. MELITO:**

That's exactly what I just said.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yeah.

**MR. MELITO:**

That's precisely why we want to get them out of there, quite frankly, because the longer they're there the most opportunity there is for them to be damaged or damage the environment.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm not suggesting a vendor but Gershow is a known vendor and I'm sure there's several others that get rid of cars, crush them and sell them.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And maybe you can make some money out of that.

**MR. MELITO:**

Oh absolutely, we --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And some of them are actually, you know, if you fix them up --

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

I think that's exactly what Mr. Melito had just mentioned was that he was working with the Police Department and the appropriate individuals to determine which car is there are ones that we can actually dispose of and the scrap metal value that's there.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Trucks.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

He just mentioned that. So, Tom, if you could go on please.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, and then just a couple more things. Some operational, other operational initiatives that we'll be working on over the course of 2013 is we're reviewing mandated versus non-mandated services. An organizational review to identify functional overlaps and synergies. Review an analysis of standard operating procedures in various areas. Partner on -- we're exploring and looking at ways to enhance our partnership with a non-profit organization to identify concerns of contracting agencies. Having said that, I have two more and then I'll be quiet for a while. We have been working very closely with FRES and the Fire Academy to look for opportunities to increase the training potential and we have engaged our Internal Technology Department on putting together some electronic training courses, which are being used throughout New York State and offer very, very high leveraged opportunities to increase training. So we're working with them on that.

I'm go to go quickly, actually I'm just going to mention a couple. Legislator Browning mentioned Probation. I didn't mean to take up this much of your time. Probation is one of those areas, as I mentioned it, Legislator Cilmi before that, we have reached out to. We had met with them several times and then we actually have an ongoing program with them where we meet every two weeks to go through operating issues. And we've identified issues in conjunction with them, things we're working on with them right now include grants management, contract processing, probation fee collections, technology opportunities to automate things that they're doing by paper right now. Voucher processing. Analysis of some of their programs. The CJCC. Interaction between the department and other departments in the courts. If you take a look at the flowcharts of how things go between Probation, Corrections and the courts it's mind boggling how complex it is. So, I mean, that's a longer term issue but it's something we're looking at. Electronic monitoring and deployment of staff and compliance issue with the State regulations.

I'll leave it at that for the moment. I mean, we are constantly evaluating new opportunities, new ideas. We are always open to any ideas from anybody here, of course, and I'll open it up to questions.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Great. Tom, I'm just going get back to the Traffic Violations Bureau thing for one quick second then we'll move on and let my colleagues ask any questions they have.

In doing the RFP process and I think what it's important here to us is, at least from my perspective, is perhaps I understand trying to bring in somebody who has some expertise, some background in the kind of operation of a Traffic Violations Bureau, certainly something Suffolk has never done before. So if we could get somebody from a neighboring municipality or pretty much anyplace that could give us some expertise; that's a good thing. But doing it inhouse at the end of the day is probably, in my opinion, the best way to go. It gives us an opportunity to not only to do something I think that government does and also, you know, maybe give some of our employees, unfortunately we had to let go this last summer, an opportunity to come back. There'd be quite a few support services in there in terms of clerk typists and account clerks and those likes that certainly would be able to come back to County employment and I think that's a good way of going about this.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, and let me just add to that, I mean, obviously that is one of the issues, you know, one of the options on the table. We have worked with Civil Service. We have reviewed various operations around to identify what Civil Service titles and what actual functions those titles provide. We are pretty confident that we would not have to create any new titles but the titles we do have in existence would suffice. We do have preferred lists so we could do that.

The State legislation says we need to appoint an executive director. We've also done a job analysis -- a job description of that and we've gotten a Civil Service job, whatever you call that, the job description for Civil Service straightened out on that as well. So it is clearly -- honestly, we understand for the most part the Legislature's position on that and it is definitely still on the table.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

And the other thing I'd like you to continue to look at in looking at the Traffic Violations Bureau is also the TLC, the Taxi Limo Commission that we've given -- gained the opportunity to implement and I think we're looking at the same type of thing with that as we're looking at with the TVB in that, you know, not that the State has given it us, we really got to look to put it in place and not let that languish for awhile. And I think that's an opportunity to actually create some synergies and putting those two agencies together as one and being able to use the same employees for some of those functions and certainly even some of the same software when you're talking about the interactions with DMV that both entities would have to have. It's probably an opportunity to do it as one entity maybe as opposed to creating two different new entities.

**MR. MELITO:**

Right. Well, one of the other things that we're looking at, which I didn't get to in the interest of time, is we're looking at the -- also consolidating Consumer Affairs and Labor. And we feel --

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

I was going to ask you about that.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

I've heard some rumors.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yeah, well it's more than a rumor. We are working on that. We think that will provide a lot of synergies. Both of those areas are really hurting for lack of resources, quite frankly, and by combining them we'll be able to leverage the capabilities of each and provide a one point of contact for both sides of that. We believe the TLC would rightly belong in there. Not to cut you off, we are talking about the TLC, we expect a local law to be laid on the table sometime in the very near future. We're also going to set up a committee outside of the -- within the County of maybe the East End, the West End; etcetera, because we have to have a lot of coordination on the TLC with outside towns and whomever else because some towns already do provide licensing for taxis and limousines. So we have to, you know, work out arrangements to work with them. So we're --

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

The TLC's feeling something where we might be able to ease in as well and start with the limo companies who are really getting whacked --

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

-- by Nassau County in terms of their --

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

-- licensing and the reciprocity issue that they are facing.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes, yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

So maybe we'll start with the limos and work our way into the taxis considering that there are multiple towns and villages who are already doing that licensing.

But since you brought it up, I'm going to go into the Labor Department/Consumer Affairs issue. If you were to do this merger as you're proposing, is this something you're going to bring about -- bring to us through the budget process; was that the plan?

**MR. MELITO:**

I believe so, yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

And you're going to put both departments under a single commissioner?

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

How would you handle the issue with the Weights and Measures because I know that the director of Weights and Measures currently is also the the commissioner of Consumer Affairs and the director of Weights and Measures is actually a State position. I think there's some State law that mandates what the person has to be able to comply with in order to hold that title.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

What's your plan or way of going about working with that?

**MR. MELITO:**

I will have to get back to you on that. I know that is an issue and it is being discussed. I don't have the answer for you for that at this moment, but I can easily get back to you on that.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, thank you. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Tom, thank you for that presentation.

**MR. MELITO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You went through a variety of things that you've -- seems like you've already accomplished, things that you're currently working on and things that you plan to work on, which I think is good. Certainly the things that you could be working on are endless and you have to prioritize and, you know, a regular report to the committee on what's been -- what you can check off the list and then, you know, from -- to the extent that you're Performance Management go back and make sure that the things that you put into place are actually doing what you know, you expected is also important.

**MR. MELITO:**

Sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I wanted to ask you specifically about -- first of all, I want to echo what Chairman Calarco said with respect to the Traffic Violations Bureau as you were talking about that, I was thinking the very same things that he articulated so I want to loudly echo exactly what he said.

Second of all, there's an idea that or there's an issue that I think you need explore in an area that you haven't highlighted and that is the mandated defense of folks who are unable to defend themselves in our County, which is accomplished by one of the two ways, A, through legal aid, the Legal Aid Society and B, through the 18b attorneys. And it's my understanding that we could be representing a greater number of people at a much less cost through the Legal Aid Society and be able to manage it from a budgetary perspective a lot easier.

So if you could just look at that issue and report back to us at some point. You know, I recognize that the budget is due out in a couple of weeks and I will be looking for or looking at that issue in the budget to see that we're making the best use of our resources as far as that goes.

**MR. MELITO:**

Okay, I certainly will. It has come up in conversations in the past.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. MELITO:**

And to the extent -- well, you know what, rather than say anything I will look into it and I'll get back to you.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Traffic. Thanks, Tom.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Anyone else? No? Okay. Tom, thank you very much for the comprehensive report.

**MR. MELITO:**

Thank you guys. Appreciate it.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

We appreciate your coming down and I guess in maybe another three or four months we'll ask you to come back and give us an update once again.

**MR. MELITO:**

Okay. All right, sound great. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Great, thank you very much.

**MR. MELITO:**

All right. Take care guys. Bye.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. We're going to move into the agenda now and tabled resolutions.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

**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)** I'm going to make a motion to table.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Second by Legislator Spencer. Mr. Zwirn, if you could come forward please and give us the latest update in this ongoing saga.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned the last time I was here is that the administration has decided to put money in the 2013 budget. I think it's \$25,000 as it stands right now as the Legislature did last year to help the SPCA get insurance as opposed to indemnification. They are very concerned about the liability to the County, the taxpayers of the County in the event that there is an incident. And this not-for-profit, which is the only one that I'm aware of that where there are -- they are peace officers, have peace officer status and I think 30 of them carry firearms and if there's an incident with that then the repercussions could be dramatic.

So the County Attorney's Office has recommended that we go the route that we had done in the past and not go for indemnification, but to do it through insurance and giving them money to get insurance.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, thanks, Mr. Chair. As I recall when -- after we did that, and sometime after we did that, in fact, you know, once these two resolutions came before us, if I'm not mistaken we were either criticized or questioned as to that very policy by the Suffolk County SPCA. If I recall correctly they said to us *we really don't need your money. We need to be indemnified because we're afraid we're not going to be able to get insurance at all in the future.* And I took particular note or made particular note of the fact that how difficult it actually was, my being integrally involved in the process last time, to actually procure that insurance. So I think their fears are well founded, whether or not, you know, it actually, you know, it actually happens that they don't have any market for this insurance, you know, remains to be seen. But I think it's certainly a major concern and the fact remains that they -- they've asserted that they will no longer perform the services that they have performed over the years for us if going forward we don't indemnify them.

Now I'm not -- this is not really a -- I'm not advocating one way or the other, although I have for their indemnification, but this is more of a question, I mean, has that issue been resolved with them through the meetings that the administration has had with that agency?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I would agree with you that I don't think they would be -- that's their preference is to get the money for insurance as opposed to indemnification. But I think the fact that they have difficulty getting insurance or have to pay high premiums highlights the problem that we have indemnifying them. I mean, all the not-for-profits that we have insurance. And as far as we're aware don't have the same problems that this organization does. And I think the reason is because of the nature of the work and the nature of the fact that they're carrying sidearms and act as peace officers, can go on peoples' properties, have probable cause. You know, they have training but they do not get exactly the same training that the Suffolk County Police Officers have and the Sheriffs have. So we are concerned about it. Now everybody appreciates the work that they do. I mean, the Legislature here has given them a van, I know that they use a mobile unit that they used in the Manorville fires. They were out there in Riverhead. They were taking pets for people who had to drop them off while they are losing their homes. I mean, there's clearly, in a situation like that, an argument certainly could be made by anybody that they were acting at the direction of the County and that the County would be ultimately responsible for the work that they've done. But I think if a town calls them out or they do something on their own, which the County has not asked them to do, then the County's still going to be liable if we're going to have a blanket indemnification clause and I think that's what the concern is.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, to that point, I think it was the last meeting at which I suggested that some arrangement could be made whereby the County would dispatch calls to the SPCA and in those cases they would necessarily be indemnified by the fact that the County dispatched the calls. Has that idea been explored at all or no?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't believe that has been fully explored. We have discussed, in meetings that I've been at, that, you know, when the County asks them to go out, like the Manorville fires, the County has asked them to respond. I think the County at that point really is taking on a responsibility by asking them to participate and to do the work that the County's asking them to do. It's those other cases that, you know, that we're talking about to make it blanket. But I don't think we fully explored the fact that, you know, if they're at the County's request or that the County would become a dispatching unit for SPCA, I don't think that's what they would really want. I didn't get that. They like to run their own organization, they have their own hierarchy, they have their own titles, I mean, they have their own setup. They do their own fundraising, you know, so I don't know how that really plays into it, but we thought that the way we could accomplish at least to help them through this was to do it with a grant or a -- the money that we spent, it was about -- and this year I think it's for 2013 I asked the Budget Office before I came over here and as of right now it's a \$25,000 contribution. The way that the Legislature, you know, when they take a look at the budget, want to amend that in some way that's certainly the prerogative of the Legislature.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Surely you would agree, the administration would agree, I hope, that it is well within the County's purview and certainly in our best interest to, you know, provide protection for our pets and the animals in Suffolk County. So, you know, to leave that to a non-profit -- a not-for-profit organization that we're only marginally involved with, I'm not sure is the best course of action. I think if we could vigorously pursue some other alternative whereby, you know, maybe even through our 911 system, I don't know what the -- you know, how many calls the SPCA gets but I know we have a 911 system that's functional and works well and maybe through that system or some other system, I only bring -- that's off the top of my head, maybe there's a way that the County could dispatch the calls so that the SPCA knows that they're A, that they're doing the County's work and B, that the County's going to stand behind their work because if not if they're -- if not them who? Is the question. And, you know, they could walk away tomorrow, they're not obligated to provide these services to the County. And if they don't how does it get done and does it get done?

So I haven't spoken with them recently, I don't know what their reaction is to your, you know, to the County Executive's position that you stated here today. But I will speak to them and I will suggest to them that they -- that they approach the administration, you know, with that idea in mind. And I would suggest that you take that back to the County Executive and suggest that, you know, the County Attorney's Office sort of looks into that. I think it may be a good compromise.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I'll certainly bring that back.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Legislator Romaine, did you have something you wanted to add?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes. Having dealt with the SPCA -- one of the sponsors to this legislation that I believe was laid on the table in January and we debated this for some time, the SPCA has said without indemnification they're not going to serve the needs of the County because they put themselves at personal risk. Has the administration at least had the courtesy to call the SPCA and let them know of their decision not to indemnify but instead to offer them \$25,000 of insurance?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I know they've been in the touch with the County Attorney's Office but I don't know if that particular phone call has -- I can't answer that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All right. This is what I would suggest just as a matter of courtesy since they have performed the service of this County for many, many years they've protected abused pets and animals; work that would normally be done by the Suffolk County Police at enormous cost, I would suggest that someone from this administration contact them. I would further suggest that the members of this Committee, the administration be kind enough and, of course, sharing in information collaboratively with both branches of government, that they let this Committee know that --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Okay. I mean, I was just advised that had they -- this -- there has been communication between the SPCA --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

-- and the County Exec's Office.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And what I want to know is because one of the things that they made clear to me in my discussions with them is that without indemnification they did not think they would continue their mission, that they would do a different mission. Okay. Has the administration accounted -- I need to know that answer, I think you guys need to know that answer. Today is what; September 6th? I would suspect in 15 days you're going to be releasing a budget. If you put \$25,000 there for insurance and they don't want to do that, I'm sure all of the people around the horseshoe very quickly will find uses for that \$25,000 without -- without a doubt they'll gobble that up, but then you may be putting in two-and-a-half million dollars or a hundred times that to ensure that there are enough police officers to respond to the 3000 plus calls about animal cruelty that come in in Suffolk County that

have to be investigated to determine if there's been criminal wrongdoing by someone and that someone right now under the Charter if the SPCA doesn't do that is the Suffolk County Police.

So while -- I mean there's a cost benefit analysis to everything that we do. So while we may be a little bit dangerous and we haven't had any problems historically, yes, we only need one big one with the SPCA in the execution of their duties, if they choose to disengage is this administration prepared to properly fund so that animal cruelty cases can be adequately investigated?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

We had discussions with the commissioner of police and the police department is prepared to respond. I mean, because technically if they get a call, 911, the police department is the first responder. There are animal control officers and animal control departments in every town that handle a lot of administrative -- do a lot of the work.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

They don't handle animal cruelty as we know. That's a criminal investigation, there's certain -- some are misdemeanors, felonies.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, they may start an investigation and turn it over to the District Attorney's Office or to the Police Department, but they by and large handle most of the matters that happen with animals.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

They handle loose dogs and cats or lost dogs and cats and they run the animal shelter. That's essentially what a town -- animal control.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, they don't have -- they don't have peace officer status so they're not executing warrants or going onto peoples' properties of probable cause. That they would call the Police Department for and I assume that that would happen more often if the SPCA decided not to do this work. And we're not suggesting --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, it's 3000 calls that come in that have to be looked into and cases that have been started so I assume someone has to it and right now it's the Suffolk County Police. I mean, I got to tell you if someone --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Or the town police on the East End.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And having been a town supervisor for North Hempstead, but living in East Hampton, how likely is it for the East End to add police officers to take on this task? It appears to me very unlikely knowing the different police forces.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I'm not aware of anything in the last 30 some odd years that I've been in East Hampton where the SPCA came into the Town of East Hampton. It doesn't mean that they weren't there I just had --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I am very aware of where they've come into the town of both Southold and Riverhead.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yeah.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So I'm very aware. People are underfeeding their horses, things of that nature, that type of those charges. So I'm just concerned about that, I don't want to occupy your time.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I understand.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

The administration has made a decision. I don't think it's the right decision. I could be proven wrong, but I am concerned because animal cruelty cases are on the rise in Suffolk County and that's a huge concern. And I know the residents of Suffolk County are deeply concerned that animals are treated well, that they're not abused or tortured or hurt or injured. And I know that from one of our Legislators that's no longer with us, Mr. Cooper, cause he did the puppy mill bill. And although if we weren't legally entitled to pursue that, a lot of people in Suffolk County, I got more e-mail on that topic than I got on any other topic in seven years. So do I think that animal cruelty cases have some impact? Absolutely.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

We would agree.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All right, all right.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Thank you, Legislator Romaine. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

So am I hearing it because I said that if there was no resolution to this problem by this meeting, that I would vote to put this out of committee. So I'm being told that there is an agreement with the SPCA and the County to accept the \$25,000 for the insurance. Is that a yes or a no?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

As I stated I don't know that the SPCA would say that they're satisfied with that. I think that the County Executive's Office at this time this is what their position is. Now can the position evolve at some point, they can work out some sort of a contract arrangement as Legislator Cilmi has suggested, I think any -- you know, that's possible. I think but at -- for the present time this is what they're suggesting that they're going to do.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, you know, and I think that, I mean, Legislator Cilmi I know that that was something that you worked on is providing the money for them to get the insurance and they did get insurance. And I think, you know, it's -- you're kind of gambling too if you do indemnify them that they don't get a lawsuit and how much is that lawsuit going to be and being that we're self-insured then we have to bond that. And that's also the scary part especially because we have no money. And, you know, I think if the County is willing to pay for the insurance with this economy and with our budget the way it is, I think at this point in time this is an acceptable offer. And --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

And during the process if the SPCA comes in during the budget process says look, they needed more money for insurance because their premiums had been increased, the Legislature at that time would have an opportunity to make an adjustment with the budget amended in some way if they felt so inclined.

So, we recognize the good work that they do, we just have a fiduciary obligation not only to, you

know, to the taxpayers ultimately of this County and to put them at risk is something that the last administration, this administration, are very cautious about that. Not saying that coming down the road they might be able to find a common ground. As I said, Legislator Cilmi's made some suggestions here today that maybe that through dispatch or at least it's cleared through the County before they go. I mean anything is possible, you know, you may think outside the box.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah. Yeah, and I know there's been the incidents like the gas leak that happened in my district and they came, they were called and they responded.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

When the County calls them it's --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

But the issue too is is that do we indemnify them if we do indemnify them do we indemnify them for everything or I know that sometimes maybe the Town of Islip would call or the Town of Brookhaven might call them and why do we indemnify them if we didn't call them. So and that's something that I think needs to be cleared up. So if the \$25,000 is being offered and that's something that can be done, I can accept a tabling motion, but if I hear anything otherwise and that they're not going to do it; we'll be back with this again.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

No, my understanding is, and I spoke with the Budget Office before coming over here today to make sure that that was what I was representing to this Committee was in fact what was being proposed.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Done? Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Ben, I wanted to ask a question with regard to the negotiation. I think that -- I've always been a supporter, and again, as my predecessor was of the SPCA and I've worked with them and, you know, my bill differs from my colleague's in terms of that I said, well, we would pick up the secondary, but I think that when we look at what they do and other groups that volunteer, I'm all for protecting them and I think, you know, we saw with our healthcare centers we had a judgement for a malpractice case that was \$9 million.

So my question is, was it entertained that although they are peace officers that if they were indemnified from the County, would they consider not carrying the firearm, you know, if they were responding or acting on behalf of the County that we could indemnify them with regards to their actions excluding the firearm issues, you know, cause when they go in to have to have a shootout, you know, again the concern is that if they were firing and, you know, the police have very strict protocols and oversight so if a weapon is discharged, a civilian is struck or whatever, that there's review and there's a lot of oversight there, do you know or is this something that could be considered?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I think it was raised and not all of the members of the SPCA are licensed to carry firearms. They may have peace officer status but not everybody, I believe, who has peace officer status also can carry a firearm. I think even of the membership that they have I think they're about 30 or so, 30, 35 members that can carry firearms. I don't think that was a starter. I don't think that's something that they would consider.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay, that would make me feel a lot more comfortable.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yeah, I agree. I think that's one of the real, you know, points it's -- that's a problem.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It's evident to me how silly we are sometimes. You know, we're talking about this issue and has anyone approached them about this and how do they feel about this and that and the other thing and what has the County Executive done, has he called them, has he not called them, you know. Months go by and nothing gets done and, you know, what we should of done is had them here and had the County Attorney here and let's have a discussion and get it done. It's remarkable to me how long this stuff takes and it's really unnecessary. But I want to make sure that I'm clear, a little birdie whispered in your ear a couple of times while you've been at table about what the County Executive has done or not done or heard or not heard or said or not said.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

The conversation was had. Legislator Romaine asked pointedly had they been called and I was advised that that call had been made.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Specifically about the \$25,000 for insurance.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't know about --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is that the case?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

-- the 25 but they would give it --

**LEG. CILMI:**

No conversations have been had. I understand that and I know that but I want to know specifically --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

About not indemnifying them but giving them a cash grant for insurance. Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Has that -- has that specifically?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

My understanding is yes. Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Your understanding is yes.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I didn't make the call myself. So --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is that -- could we ask is that what --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That was the message that was delivered to me. The answer's yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So if we called the S -- who was it, who was it in the SPCA that was -- that that offer was presented to?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

My Counsel has advised me to say to the best of my knowledge. Thank you, Counsel Romaine.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, can we -- I mean, you know, we have all afternoon. Can we make a phone call?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Can we make a phone call and find out why we're still here, who exactly we spoke to at the SPCA?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

If you like I'd have Marie Berkoski give the County Attorney a call.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And, by the way, whether or not they've agreed and they, you know, understand and --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

As I said, I don't think that's what they had in mind.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Nor do I.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

No, I don't think that's what had in mind.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

I think the problem we come across is the fact that this actually has been before this body before. We have voted on Legislator Romaine's exact legislation before it failed before the full Legislature. We had the alternative presented by Legislator Spencer. We had a number of meetings between the administration and the SPCA to see if they could reach some sort of contractual agreement where we could thereby provide the indemnification. Our County Attorney's Office feels that it's still very highly inappropriate and we are back in the same spot again. It's just this vicious circle that we keep going in and I don't know if moving, certainly I don't think moving Legislator Romaine's resolution to the floor is going to solve the problem, perhaps moving Legislator Spencer's that has the caveat that they got to carry insurance at least give us some coverage because at the end of the day, I mean, I sit on Ways and Means and every week it seems like we're approving more and more money to go out the door for a bus claim where a bus driver doesn't work for us has been in some sort of accident that we indemnify so, you know, it's -- end of the day a cost that's going to come back to us potentially that we have to consider.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. But let's vote based -- do you have an answer? I was going to say let's vote based on some, you know, some knowledge rather than, you know, supposition.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

It does seem like every week we're here and it's like we're working on it, we're working on it. And --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, come on.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, I think that's what's been happening. There have been a number of meetings on this and it's a dilemma that's hard to wrestle with. We appreciate the work that they do, but we also have fiduciary obligation to protect the taxpayers of the County in case of, you know, lawsuits that would be quite sizable. So I think it's something that, you know, at first blush you would say well, why not, I mean, if they do such good work why wouldn't we support them. But when you look at it from a legal and a practical standpoint it's not such an easy issue and I think we're wrestling with it and have been wrestling with it for months because it is difficult. I mean, was it last year or the year before where the Legislature at the last minute came up with the money to do it because it was, again, it was an issue that has been a dilemma for more than just this -- the last nine months, it was a problem in the last administration as well because the County Attorney's Office is doing its due diligence and trying to protect the County and also recognize the good work that this organization does. I mean, everything that Legislator Romaine has said to appraise this group, we agree, they've done wonderful work and the County has called them out on numerous occasions to help them when they needed it. But at the same time it's something that they want to deal with very carefully and I think that's part of the problem. So we figured until we can come up with a solution that would work for everybody, at least in the interim we would provide them with some relief to at least get insurance. Now again, as I said during the budget process, if they came to you and said, *look, we need a little more money to be able to cover our increased premiums* then the Legislature at that time is free to make that kind of adjustment in the budgetary process, but right now we're doing what the Legislature had done a year before for next year. If that's -- that's something that the ladies and gentlemen of the Legislature will have to deal with.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So what's the answer? Do we know yet or are we still waiting?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I think that Marie Berkoski has texted the County Attorney to find out, you know, definitively what conversation he had finally with Roy Gross at the end. But I think Mr. Gross, who's their -- the particular head of the SCPA would say that a conversation is still going on for a long-term solution but this is our one for right now. But we're suggesting that we do it this way.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I mean, I just like to hold off voting until we know the answer.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. We'll skip over these two resolutions. We'll move on maybe you could get the answer for us beforehand. I don't want to hold this up any longer, we do have another committee after us that's going to be a long one, we don't want them starting late.

All right. We're going to skip over IR 1340 and IR 1349 for the moment and we're going to go to IR 1470.

**1470, Imposing a Moratorium on Wage Increases for County Management Personnel (Excluding Employees at the Suffolk County Community College and the Board of Elections). (County Executive)** I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Seconded by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1470 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1479, Authorizing a Voluntary Lag Payroll for Elected Officials in 2013. (Barraga)** I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Seconded by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Resolution -- IR 14 --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Wait, wait IR 1479, please list me in opposition to tabling.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

He have we have four in favor and one opposed to tabling. **IR 1479 stands tabled. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine)**

**IR 1492, Implementing a Scale for Health Insurance Contributions by Exempt Employees. (Romaine)** I've think we've covered this with the -- the Presiding Officer's resolution.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, you have. Would the Clerk please withdraw 1492.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Romaine. **IR 1492 is withdrawn.**

**IR 1522, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, a Local Law to Enhance Provisions for Enforcement of Certain Consumer Protection Laws (County Executive)** I'm going to make a motion to table. I think the County Executive's still working on this one. The public hearing is still open on this. Can I have a second on that?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1522 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1580, Authorizing elected officials to make immediate contribution for health insurance. (Cilmi)** I'm going to make a motion to table. Touched base with the Comptroller's Office again just today. I could give you a little more information if you're looking for it.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, I spoke to the Comptroller's Office today as well.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I spoke to the Comptroller today.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Did you get the same that we got? I'd hope.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Actually I'll ask Counsel to amend this bill and authorize that voluntary contribution to health insurance effective January first of next year.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Farm this out.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Perhaps.

**(LAUGHTER)**

**LEG. CILMI:**

And I know how distraught you are, Legislator.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Don't get too far out of yourself, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But let me ask Counsel, with that change, is this something that we could discharge today then and vote on next Thursday?

**MR. NOLAN:**

We're passed the amended filing deadline. So we can't vote on it this cycle. No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, so then I will second the Chairman's motion to table and hopefully we can get this out of committee at our next meeting.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Very good. Sounds good. Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. Okay, I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1580 stands tabled (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1698, Adopting a Local Law No. -2012, A Local Law to amend post-employment restrictions. (Schneiderman)** The public hearing is still open. I have a motion by Legislator Spencer to table for public hearing, I'll will second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1698 is tabled. **TABLED for PUBLIC HEARING (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1756, Approving the criteria for the County's Pet Store Rating Program. (Spencer)**

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Motion by Legislator Spencer, I will second the motion. I know Legislator Spencer was looking to have Mr. Meguin here, I did shoot him an e-mail, perhaps he's on vacation because I have not heard back from him Legislator. Legislator Spencer, sure, go ahead.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

On the motion, again, I think that -- want to be very clear that the voluntary rating program -- this legislation is nothing new, it's just complying with the law of resolution 1894 of 2011 that had three components. It established and was approved by the -- the -- establishing a voluntary rating program establishing the Rating Criteria Committee. And also it required that this Legislature actually approve the rating criteria.

So since I've been in office the committee has worked on these criteria. So all we're doing is just approving the criteria that's come out of this committee, we're not establishing anything that's not already not in place from the previous legislation. And so the criteria is included. Now what it does, it looks at four different areas; housing, store operations, sourcing of animals and we've had the representatives from the major, I guess, entities representing animals and also the professional care with veterinarian on this particular board. The commissioner did assign someone from the Consumer Affairs Department to work to establish these criteria. Since the last meeting I have reached out to the commissioner multiple times through e-mails and phone calls and at this particular point I passed out a letter also that indicates -- oh, Lora hasn't passed out the letter, it's coming out.

But, in any case we're ready to move forward with this. It only allows us to comply with the law that we've already passed.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So what is the -- did the resolution specify what the criteria was or is?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Yeah, you get -- it piles up.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

What we tried to do is try to make it as minimally subjective as possible and so the rating standards are pretty much yes, no, automatic dire, needs improvement. And we kept to very concrete things where we would try to eliminate subjective variability where if there was someone that didn't care for a particular pet store, whatever, that they could be influenced, it's fairly straightforward, concrete criteria as much possible. Is there the appropriate amount of food, is the animal in good physical condition? Are the owners -- is there an appropriate number of employees to care for the pets that are in the stores? Items such as that.

Again, with any criteria such as these there is always some subjectivity and that's what taken several months is to try to get rid of as much subjectivity as possible and keep it objective. And I think they've done a great job, they've worked very hard on this criteria and I suggest that we move forward. The Consumer Affairs Office has been represented throughout this process.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And does that office, I mean, this is almost a laughable question at this point, but the question is, alright, let me change the question, how is the office going to -- going to enforce or apply this law?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, the agreement, and again, with the original legislation, was to make it voluntary. And so the compliance is going to be that those stores that are running reputable businesses will want to

participate and part of it. So they will get some sort of designation in their window so consumers can look and say *wow, these guys have, you know --*

**LEG. CILMI:**

But who actually gets to -- who actually gets to give them the rating?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

The rating board that was established in the previous legislation and the rating board consist of a member from the Consumer Affairs Office, a representative from the Suffolk County Society for Prevention and Cruelty to animals, a representative from the Long Island based Animal Welfare Organization, a retired veterinarian and a representative from the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So any one of those members could go into a pet shop and come to a conclusion and issue a rating or does there need to be consensus or is there a meeting that they present their findings and they come to the rating based on that meeting or how does that work exactly?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

The board will codify their own procedures but it -- there's a meeting process, it's not an individual process that they will bring the findings and then the board will review those findings. But what's established in the legislation is that the board will codify a standard procedure but the criteria had to be approved by this body.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So this actually goes to my resolution, 1702, which remains in committee, the public hearing's not closed yet, it will be at our Thursday meeting, that requires these types of rules to be sort of put out there for public comment and for our awareness prior to being put into place officially so that we know what it is that -- because we've authorized them apparently to come up with some system by which this rating takes place, but then unless we get another look we don't really know or -- I mean, they could put in a system that we find offensive or oppressive or whatever. So just keep that in mind when we get to IR 1702 at some point hopefully in the future, in the near future and this is a good example of how that would apply.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I would love to work together with you.

**LEG. CILMI:**

All right, very good. Looking forward to it.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Very good. Okay, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
**IR 1756 approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1803, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Local Law to eliminate item pricing fee. (Cilmi)**

**LEG. CILMI:**

Public hearing's still open on this so motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. So motion to table by Legislator Cilmi, I'll second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1803 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1815, Establishing County Policy to maximize savings through Early Retirement**

**Incentive Program. (Kennedy)**

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

The sponsor has asked me to have this tabled. He's working on some revisions to this resolution so I'll make a motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, we have a motion by Legislator Romaine and a second by Legislator Cilmi to table. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1815 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1830, Authorizing health benefit cost sharing. (County Executive)** I will make a motion to table.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Second by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1830 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

Ben, do we have an answer on our SPCA issues?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yes. The individual had the conversation with Mr. Gross from the SPCA is here. Tom Vaughn from IR and he can answer your questions. He had the conversation personally.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, Tom, you're in the hot seat now.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Thanks. Yeah, I did speak with Mr. Gross from the SPCA probably sometime last week. We told him that it was our desire at this point in time to put the money into the budget. He said he would take that back to his board, which he apparently did. We also told him that we will continue talking to them about the issue of indemnification because that's what they ultimately want and they were okay. I don't want to characterize it as happy but they were okay with putting the money into the budget for the insurance for this year as somewhat of a stopgap measure as long as we agreed to continue talking about their desire to ultimately become indemnified.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. When you say "apparently brought" he's apparently brought it before his board. Why do you say that?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Because I wasn't in the room when he brought it to the board.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, no. Well --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

He conveyed to me that he had --

**LEG. CILMI:**

That he would.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

-- brought it to his board and that he would --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, that he brought; past tense.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

-- call me. That he would -- yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

That he would bring the proposal to the board. He didn't give me an answer during the first phone call that we had with him. He gave me a call back and said that he had brought it to his board.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Gotcha. Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. So I have a motion and a second on IR 1340. Does that answer all of our questions? For the moment; I guess. All those in favor? Motion by myself to table, seconded by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Opposed.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'll oppose the tabling.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

**IR 1340's tabled. (VOTE: 3-2-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine and Legislator Cilmi)**

**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:**

Motion to table by Legislator Spencer, I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Opposed.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

**Resolution is tabled. (VOTE: 3-2-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine and Legislator Cilmi)**

We have one resolution left here in introductory resolutions.

## INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

**IR 1848, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Village of Mastic Beach for Affordable Housing purposes. (County Executive) Legislator**  
Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**  
Motion to approve, I'll second the motion. I see that Vivian is still here. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1848 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)** Vivian, congratulations and thank you for the hard work that you do for everyone.

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**  
Okay. I have no other items on the agenda. We are -- stand adjourned. Thank you.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 2:08 PM**

**{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**