

VETERANS COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE
MINUTES

A meeting of the Veterans 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 March 15, 2016.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Steven H. Stern, Chairperson
Leg. Sarah S. Anker, Vice Chair
Leg. Monica Martinez
Leg. Lou D'Amaro
Leg. Leslie Kennedy

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Leg. Thomas F. Barraga

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel/Legislature
Amy Ellis, Chief Deputy Clerk/Legislature
Andrew Tarantowicz, Budget Review Office
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern
Justin Littell, Aide to Leg. D'Amaro
Tom Ronayne, Director/Veteran's Service Agency
Katie Horst, County Executive's Office
Lisa Santeramo, County Executive's Office
Daniel J. Murphy, Veteran's Grant Advisory Committee
Tim Scherer, Veteran's Grant Advisory Committee
Michelle McNaughton, Veteran's Grant Advisory Committee
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Gabrielle Severs, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:38 AM

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

All right. Good morning everyone and welcome to the Veterans Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature. Please rise and join us in the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Kennedy.

*(*Salutation*)*

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

I ask everybody to please remain standing to join us in a moment of silence as we keep all of our brave men and women fighting for our freedom overseas in our thoughts and prayers.

*(*Moment of Silence Observed*)*

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Thank you. Okay. We do have legislative items on the agenda today. Before we go to those votes, let me invite up Director Ronayne. Good morning, sir.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Good morning. And before we welcome Director Ronayne let me please note for the record that Legislator Barraga is not joining us today, he has an excused absence.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

As always, thank you for your invitation to be here today. I know that there are some items on the agenda, in the interest of the guests that we have in the room and, you know, being able to address your -- your questions and your concerns, I'm happy to take questions at this time if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Anybody have any questions for the Director? Director, on the agenda today is a resolution regarding distribution of the -- of the proceeds from the Suffolk County marathon. Maybe you can speak to the resolution before us today and -- and the process that was involved in determining the many worthy organizations that were selected to receive distribution and how you see that going forward.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Certainly. Yes, we did and we were very, very happy to be able to fulfill our commitment to the community by meeting as a group, as a committee, to make assessments and determinations as to how the fund's -- the proceeds from the Suffolk County marathon and half marathon to support our veterans would be dispersed.

As you know, there was an application process that took place allowing entities within the community to submit for consideration to receive these funds and there's a part of that outlined -- as part of that process the application would have included a number of items including a narrative on what the intended use of the funds would be as well as a -- as a required match or a -- a partial match for the -- for any proceeds that they may have been awarded.

The committee was -- was able to meet. We were able to review all of the applications and created essentially a scoring system where each application was initially assessed on its own merits and each member of the committee assigned a score to that application. Those scores were then averaged by the number of committee members voting and that number was the determination as to whether

or not the application would be further considered or if it would be set into what potentially would have been a come -- become a second-round consideration. There was not able to be a second-round based upon the number of applications that were selected and the allocation of the funds in those 19 who were selected. The scoring system was a zero to 100 formula, 70% was the threshold that we established. Those applications falling below the 70% threshold, as determined by the voting members of the committee, those falling below went into the second group, those above 70% were then identified for further consideration and discussion. Those discussions entailed assessing the value or the amount of the requested support and based upon the amount of the requested support they were determined to be three individual categories and those categories would have received a percentage of their overall ask and the reason for that is quite simply the amount of the funds requested far, far exceeded the amount of funds available. So in the interest of fairness we felt that it was most appropriate to identify those -- those candidates who were successful in the initial vetting to receive at least a portion of their requested funds and that's what we were able to accomplish.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Any questions? Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What was the total amount that was collected and how much was the ask by all the organizations?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

The ask --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean roughly.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

The ask was, I believe, it exceeded \$550,000. I think it was 580? The available funds, the money that we had available to -- to award, and I like to make it clear that I don't believe that we gave any of this money away or necessarily awarded this money, we, per our original commitment, are simply returning this money to the community from which it came, which was always our commitment. The amount of money available to be returned to the community \$160,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Are you confident that all of the organizations that could have applied were appropriately notified and aware that this funding was available?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Again, there were many methods, you know, I'll use the term, marketing, for lack of a better word. The availability of the -- of the applications was well marketed in my -- in my view. Largely word of mouth but it was through the Veterans' Service Organization community, through the running and marathon community, the running clubs, again, veterans organizations, other communities, civics, chambers. So I think that the dissemination of the information as to this -- this process occurring was widely known. Were there entities in the community who may not have been aware; I have no doubt that there may have been.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, what more specifically was done to -- to get the word out when you say civics, chambers, running clubs, veterans organizations. Was there some kind of formal letter or notification sent to all of these clubs by your office or any office that you know?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

We had done press on this. We had met individually and as groups with the various veterans service organizations with the running clubs, with the running organizations. And then those organizations also within their own respective communities additionally extended the information further into their communities. So it was a lot of leg work, there was a lot of, again, meeting and speaking in public forums, community groups and so forth. We're comfortable that the word was well distributed given the variety of the applications that we received.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But there's no formal procedure for notifying groups or there's no sign up mechanism for groups to put their name on a list so they can be notified when funding is available, it was just really done more informally or by word of mouth.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, but I would say that if anybody had contacted us prior to the process being launched, asking for notification, we would have certainly made that notification as we did with -- with a number of entities.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, you just don't want anybody to get left out.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I completely agree.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So it would seem to me that there should be something a little more formal put in place so that every organization that would qualify at least has an opportunity to make a submission. You know, I'm not -- I don't know what was done or how it was done or, you know, I'm not saying it wasn't done but certainly we just want to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to make that application and be considered.

The other question I had, Director Ronayne, was about the scoring, the criteria. Who developed that scoring and who developed the -- I guess all the members of the committee considered the same questions or considerations when assigning a score. Is that how it worked?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, each member of the committee had a full set of documents that being applications. The scoring system was developed as a group discussion as a committee determination that that would be the most fair process for us to -- to employ and, again, it was a collective decision and a collective process developed by that body.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Were the considerations committed to writing?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, they were.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Could I get a copy of those, please?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And then based on the various questions or considerations for each applicant a score was assigned and you're saying the cutoff was -- the average -- the average of all of those scores was taken and if you achieved a 70% rating or higher then you went onto a next round, so to speak. Is that how it worked?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, what we did -- the initial scoring anybody who was scored at 70 percentile --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

-- or higher was placed in what we viewed to be the first round of consideration. Anybody below the 70 percentile went to a second -- a second group that potentially would have been a second round. There were several applications that were disqualified out of hand. They were for lack of completeness or other disqualifying factors. That was a small number but there were several that were unable to be considered at all. Aside from those few, then the second group that scored below the 70 percentile would have been considered in a second round had there been a second round.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Did any organization receive 100% of the amount requested?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Two, I believe, two did, you know, there were -- the two that were -- that were funded 100% were, I believe, the two smallest application value requests that were made that scored above 70 percentile. They actually were scored very high among that group and they were very small in value. I think one was \$2,500, the other one was about \$3,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So organizations didn't necessarily receive 100% of what their -- the funding request was.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Almost none of them did.

LEG. D'AMARO:

When you came down to a final list, was the funding distributed pro-rata to all of those qualifying organizations or was the committee in a position to use discretion to just grant as much as the committee felt reasonable based on the request? Was it -- what I'm getting at was, you know, if an organization requested \$100,000 and another organization requested \$1000, how was a decision made as to how much to grant each organization, you know, because there has to be an element of fairness injected into this.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, and the amount or the percentage of the original ask was determined by a percentage that was -- it was basically broken down into dollar values of the ask and, you know, the larger the ask the smaller the percentage given the amount of funds that we had available to us.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right so there was -- it was discretion, the committee's discretion determined how much to grant each.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

It was discretion in terms of establishing the percentage. I wouldn't say that each individual organization within that structure -- there wasn't -- there was no subjectivity to it, it was all -- everybody was treated equally, everybody was assessed in the same way and the awards were determined in the same manner for each organization, there was no subjectivity as to whether that percentage would vary from one to the other within -- within that category.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Are you saying that all organizations receive the same percentage of their request?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

There were three funding levels --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Uh-huh.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

-- based on the amount of the ask. Organizations would have fallen into one of those three groups and within those three groups each of the groups would of received the percentage that that group was going to be allocated for.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So if you fell into category or group two, right, you're saying that group might have been allocated to receive 50% funding but then 50% of a higher number is more than 50% of a lower number. Right? So is it always done on percentage basis or was it based on dollar amounts?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

It was done on a percentage basis based on the dollar amount. If you're -- if you're ask exceeded a certain threshold then you would fall into one category and there would be a percentage assigned for that category.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Uh-huh.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

If you were below that threshold but above the next lower threshold you would of been in that second category and then the lower of the three would have been the third and that would have been the larger so the smaller the ask the larger the percentage.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How many committee members were there?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Ten.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And it was set by the Legislature.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

It was set by the Legislature.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Represented in the committee were members of the -- representative of the Presiding Officer's Office --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

-- of Legislator Stern's office and of Legislator McCaffrey's office.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. Did any of the -- did any funding go to an organization of which a committee member was a member of that organization?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I would say yes but there were disclosures made and individual members did recuse themselves from specific votes or from certain votes so that was a matter that was addressed.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So it was disclosed and then recusal --

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- of those votes. Okay. All right, thank you for answering my questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Legislator Kennedy and then Legislator Martinez.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good morning, Tom.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Good morning.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I know you worked very hard and your organization worked very hard on divvying this up. I don't have the list in front of me. Does the department monitor how this money is spent once it's given to the organizations?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Each application included a narrative as to how the money would be expended so when the organizations are funded, not to use a term that doesn't apply, but this will be administered, I guess, largely as member items had been where the justification for the funding will have to match the actual use of the funds. So part of the determination as to why somebody would be funded was drawn from the actual narrative what the intended use of the money was.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, as long as it's monitored. With what we read the last couple weeks in the paper about an organization having to remove their top members, a veteran's organization, I am concerned not just

with veterans with every dollar that we give out of County money that it's monitored, but, thank you.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Good morning, Tom.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Good morning.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Good morning, Tom. Just quick question and the only reason I'm asking is because I had two organizations contact me. I'm not sure what time -- what was the time frame from when you sent the letters out to when the applications were due? And the reason why I'm asking is because the two that felt to me that it was too short a period of time for them to compile all the information needed for the application.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I'm sorry to hear that. I will tell you that 49 applicants did not have that problem. I understand that each organization has its own structure and the ability to compile data sometimes from one organization to another would differ. But, you know, the time frame we believe was adequate but it was also necessary in our belief to move this process along and to have extended the process very much further would have among other things delayed our ability to bring this to this body during this Legislative cycle, which would have resulted in an additional delay in expending these funds. We are asking all of these organizations, all of the recipient organizations, to expend those funds in calendar year 2016. So by the time our process was able to work through, bring this to the Legislature, move through the Legislature and then hopefully advancing to the full body, we were hoping to do this as expeditiously, though responsibly, as possible to allow these organizations the ability to access these funds and still have time to responsibly spend them in the calendar year.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

And that's understood. But what was the actual time frame from the time that the paperwork went out to the time that the application was due?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

It was about four weeks.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay. And then, well, that's plenty of time.

And then my other question, I also had the question of them having difficulty in filling out the applications even though 49 of them probably did not have that problem, but these two organizations that I was dealing with have never filled or asked for grants along these lines so they had difficulty, which was why theirs wasn't even considered. Was there a process or a way that they could have contacted someone to get assistance on the application or no?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

We received a number of calls with a variety of questions concerning the applications. I would think for obvious reasons we were not able to provide direct assistance in filling out the applications but we were able to provide general guidance in how something should be completed, what type of information should be contained so I would say that a call to our office should have resulted in some degree of assistance.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Tom, as a result of the application process and based on experience, I mean, this was -- first of all, a thank you to you and to, you know, members of the administration and, of course, all of those that participated in the process because this was essentially a startup endeavor, a big undertaking in a relatively short period of time and so congratulations to all.

I'm wondering if, as a result of this initial process, if there were anything -- if there was anything procedurally that you or other committee members identified as maybe needing to be addressed going forward into the future and any changes that you might anticipate in the process next year.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Well, I think interestingly to Legislator Martinez's point, one of the things that we are hopeful is that in the next round of this, after next year's -- after this year's marathon that we would be able to get applications out and allow perhaps more time. One of the things, as you say, this was a, you know, this was a launch, this was a first time effort and we believe that we did a good job, we like to think that we did, but we also believe that, you know, the opportunity is here to refine the process and improve it to the extent possible in a way that would ensure the fairness of all of the applicants. But really what we're hoping is to successfully administer this program again after our next marathon but also to have the -- the applicants have had an opportunity to have more time and I think now that we have a process in place we won't be developing something as we -- as we are working through the process, the process is now in place so I think that that would be one improvement that, you know, by, you know, just by the maturing, the maturing of the program has already occurred.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Do you see then the application process opening up earlier?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I would hope so.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

When -- take me back about a year ago when you were in the planning process was there -- was there ever any kind of a -- even a loose estimate placed on the amount of proceeds that you were budgeting that you were anticipating might be coming in as a result that would be available for distribution?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

It was an unknown and, I think, in fairness we were very cautious not to -- not to project estimates because we just -- we had no way of knowing going in just what the number of registrants in the race, the levels of sponsorship, there were so many variables and on a first time venture I would have been reluctant to hazard an estimate.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Yeah, so there was never really an estimate that was put out there for consideration.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I think what we consistently said was that we would return the proceeds from the race, whatever they may be.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

All right. Now there is a baseline in year one. Okay.

Anybody else for the Director? Yeah, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm looking at the -- the print out of the organizations that received the funding and it looks reasonable to me that you, I mean, obviously there was a lot of consideration that went into this. Some organizations were asking for as much as \$80,000. And that was substantially reduced, but again, the organization seeking \$80,000 gets 23,000 whereas another one that's only asking for 25,000 gets 9800. But I would assume what the committee was doing was also looking at the services that are being provided and the cost of those services.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, and there was also --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean -- because an organization, you know, if you're running an organization it's just in your interest and the higher you ask for it seems like the more funding you get so I would hope that part of the consideration that the committee would look at is the actual cost of services and how reasonable the request is.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

And we also, and I think one of the, I won't call it a hazard, but one of the -- one of the practical realities of a larger ask is that there was a requirement for the organization to provide a match. There was a -- they had to have funds committed to -- to whatever their purpose was going to be so if they were funded in a large amount their contribution to the funding would have been more significant as well and I think that probably was a limiting factor for a number of applicants. So the larger the ask the larger match would have been expected to be.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's a good way to leverage the funding, yeah, okay. Very good, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STERN:

Okay. Anybody else for the Director? Director, anything else?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Thank you and if I could I'd just like to say on the record that, you know, this -- this effort it was quite undertaking and I think a very successful one but, you know, for my role, my role was relatively small in the grand scheme. The people who really, you know, beyond the County Executive, the people who really made this thing happen were Ryan McGarry, Lisa Santeramo and Katie Horst who put in just an incredible amount of time and effort and, you know, they're largely the unseen faces of this type of an effort but the amount of work and effort that they contributed here was without them we wouldn't be sitting here having this discussion today.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

And, Director, the -- the resolution before us today is -- procedurally is accepting the proceeds and then authorizing their distribution to the various organizations. So given that the process has now been completed the work of the committee making the allocations is done, we believe that this is ready to go.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Thank you. And I would also like to thank while we have in attendance today, three of the

committee members, Mr. Dan Murphy, Mr. Tim Scherer and Mrs. Michelle McNaughton are also here with us today and each of the three were very active members of the committee and I thank them for their assistance and their service.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Well, I'm sure I speak for my colleagues when I say congratulations to all of them and to thank them for not just their service to this effort but their ongoing service on behalf of so many in Suffolk County and throughout our great nation and I know for me personally having them participate in this process I'm sure made it not just that much more successful but that much more meaningful as well. All right.

Thank you, Director, and as you mentioned Mr. Murphy is with us today and, Mr. Murphy, let me invite you up, sir.

MR. MURPHY:

A member of the committee, I just thought I'd follow up with what Tom said and that is I believe there were 13 of us who were voting and scored each of these programs. The advantage on that was that most of them were actively involved in veterans' organizations so there was a lot of give and take. Tim and Michelle knew a lot of the programs that these people were involved in and what would work and what wouldn't work. I can tell you the final breakdown was really any organization that scored more than 90 received 45% of the proceeds, those who scored 80 received 35 and those who scored in the 70's received 20. Before we began we pulled out two of the 47 because they specifically affected active duty personnel, one being the Blue Star Mothers who were sending care packages over to our troops in Afghanistan and in Iraq and the other active duty was the Coast Guard who -- in Fire Island who wanted to -- who wanted to renovate the playground for their dependents. Because that was considered a capital improvement the Coast Guards were rejected, the Blue Star Mothers were funded for 50% of what they requested, they asked for four and they received 2000. There were only three organizations that scored in the 90's and received 45% of what they requested.

It was an active discussion. I think next year it'll be a lot easier, as you were indicating, the process now more people will know about it. Each of the Legislative Offices was notified as were most of the veterans organizations by Tom that being American Legion and the others so that the word got out it's just that the process was so short, there was really I think five to six weeks in order to get it done to get the proceeds out within this physical year.

That's about it. I think next year it'll be a lot easier and a lot better. Those who had a direct interest abstained during the vote. I thought it laid out pretty well with regard to programs that seemed to work and those programs that didn't. To give you an example, there was one program that sought money but they were -- they just incorporated in January of 2016. We thought without a history that that probably wasn't an organization we really wanted to fund yet until we could see what they were doing for next year.

Any organization that requested a capital improvement was automatically rejected. I'm not too thrilled about that. I would much rather have the committee look at those rather than just reject them because, like I said, the Coast Guardsmen, over in Fire Island, were talking about a renovation project that everybody thought was a capital improvement, I was kind of -- thought that they -- we probably should have funded that since it was active duty but the other committee -- the other committee members decided that because it was a capital improvement it wouldn't be done. So that the only capital improvements the committee considered were those involving making matters handicapped accessible.

So that's it. Unless anyone has any further questions, I'm done.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Thank you. Okay. Is there anybody else with us today that would like to address the committee? All right, seeing none, we'll go to the agenda beginning with tabled resolutions.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1007 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to provide designated parking for veterans at County facilities. (Muratore) This was before us in public hearing, which is closed, and this is now eligible for a vote.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Motion to table by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

This is an extremely important resolution. We just received the financial impact statement this morning. We have not heard back to see what funding is available. While the cost is significantly reduced we need some time to find a specific funding source so we will table this one cycle.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Okay. And my understanding is that the sponsor is looking to receive that information as well and so there is a motion to table before us with a second. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **IR 1007 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Leg. Barraga.)**

Introductory Resolutions

IR 1241 - A resolution to accept net proceeds from the 2015 Suffolk County Marathon into the General Fund and to amend the 2016 Operating Budget to appropriate the net proceeds for certain not-for-profit veterans organizations. (Co. Exec.) I'll make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Anker. Okay. We heard from the Director, okay, we heard from Mr. Murphy and members of the administration are here. Everybody is good? Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just, through the Chair, Tom, if you know, were there minutes taken at the discussions when the funding was discussed?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, there were.

LEG. D'AMARO:

There were.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yes, there were.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And when an organization received funding and one of the members recused, was that member also not part of the discussion leading up to the vote, do you know?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yeah, no, they -- when someone was identified as having an affiliation with an organization requesting funding --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

-- they were recused from the process involving that organization.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, what does that mean?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

That means that they would not of been a part of the --

LEG. D'AMARO:

They left the room?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

They did not leave the room, no.

LEG. D'AMARO:

They didn't leave the room --

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

They did not leave the room.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- but did not participate in the discussion.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

They did not.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Well, who's the keeper of the minutes of these meetings?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

The keeper of the minutes -- the recorder was Michelle Marter from my office. I have the minutes, the minutes are in my office at this time. They have not yet been distributed by they -- they have been completed.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Are they in a format right now where they can be released?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I believe so, yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You do?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I'll check.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Can you send them to me?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I'll check when I get back. I know that I have them in paper form, I'm sure they exist electronically, but I'll verify that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, whatever you have as long as they're in a form that you feel it's appropriate to release them at least to me, I would like to read them.

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON STERN:

Okay. Anybody else? Okay. We have a motion and a second, I'll call the vote. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? IR 1241 is approved and, again, thank you to the director and to members of the administration to all those that participated. We really thank you for all of your efforts. Okay.

All right. There being no other business before the Committee, we are adjourned.

THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10:13 A.M.

{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY