

## **COMBINED CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING**

**of the**

### **WAYS AND MEANS, BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEES, and EDUCATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MEETINGS**

The combined Ways and Means, Budget and Finance, and Education and Information Technology Capital Budget Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on Wednesday, May 21, 2014 at 9:30 a.m.

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Lou D'Amaro - Chairman  
Legislator Rob Calarco  
Legislator Sarah Anker  
Legislator Thomas F. Barraga  
Legislator Tom Cilmi  
Legislator Steve Stern  
Legislator Kate Browning  
Legislator John Kennedy  
Legislator Sarah Anker  
Legislator Robert Trotta

#### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Legislator DuWayne Gregory - Presiding Officer  
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Lora Gellerstein - Chief Deputy Clerk - Legislature  
Robert Lipp - Director of Budget Review Office  
Jim Daly - Information Technology/GIS Coordinator  
Barry Paul - Health Department  
Robert Lipp - Budget Review Office/Director  
Doug Miller - Information Technology - Director of Information Management  
Thomas Vaughn - County Executive's Office  
Lisa Santeramo - County Executive's Office  
Ben Zwirn - Suffolk Community College  
Gail Vizzini - Suffolk Community College

#### **TAKEN BY:**

Gabrielle Severs - Court Reporter

**(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:52 a.m.\*)**

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us for this morning's budget hearings. This is a combined meeting of the Ways and Means and Budget and Finance Committees. Please join us for the pledge led by Legislator Anker.

**(\*Salutation\*)**

I'm going to ask everyone to please remain standing and join us in a moment of silence as we keep all our brave men and woman fighting for our freedoms in our thoughts and prayers.

**(\*Moment of Silence Observed\*)**

Thank you.

Thank you for your patience. I apologize for being a few minutes late this morning. We're going to the public portion of our meeting. Welcome, everyone. When your name is called, please come up to the podium. You'll have three minutes to address this joint committee meeting. The first speaker this morning is John Guadagno.

**MR. GUADAGNO:**

Yep.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Good morning, John. Once again, welcome. Please go ahead.

**MR. GUADAGNO:**

Good morning to the legislators and to this committee. We're here today in support -- well, let me introduce myself. My name is John Guadagno. I'm the president elect of Local 25, International Brothers of Electric Workers. We're here today in support of the county capital program because of the significant impact on the local economy of Suffolk County and the workers in our more than 330 trade unions. We are partners with the county and the college and several construction projects. Currently under construction is the William J. Lindsay Life Science Building at the Ammerman Campus Academic Building. Upon completion in September 2014, provide the college with a state-of-the-art academic building outfitted with life sciences and chemistry labs. Currently, the project alone employs 60 building and trades people on a daily basis, not to mention the renewable energy training facilities, which our members even use.

As support is not limited to new construction, the college maintains a significant number of older buildings and supporting infrastructure that requires renovation repairs. We support the college request for a four-year infrastructure to assure that these physical assets that are past their useful life can be replaced, assuring a safe, educational environment in operational savings and efficiencies. The executive proposal for the 2015, 2017 capital budget deletes \$12,910,000 in previously-adopted capital projects funded for the college, all of which currently has a 50 percent matching state aid. Deleting these projects in the 2015 through 2017 capital program will result in a loss of \$6.45 million in state aid, which would be infused into Suffolk County economic and is a boost to the construction job supports by these fundings. For these reasons and many more that other people speak at, we strongly suggest that you put this money back. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you for your testimony. The next speaker this morning is Jim McCarthy.

**MR. MCCARTHY:**

Good morning. My name is Tim McCarthy. I've been a resident of Islip Terrace -- Islip Township all my life with IBW Local 25. I'm a business representative there. I represent the families -- the members and the families of Local 25; and these projects, I can't emphasize enough how important these are to us. Cutting these budgets and not accepting these funds is detrimental. I, myself, went to Suffolk County Community College. It was a prelude to my career. I took electronics. I took robotics. It served me very well. It serves a lot of people of our community very well. It's one of the best community colleges in the and, I argue, in the country. When you can't spend this money when getting matched with the state, I feel it's a big, big mistake, so I urge you not to delete this money out of the budget. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

Okay. The third speaker this morning is Roger Clayman. Good morning.

**MR. CLAYMAN:**

My name is Roger Clayman. I'm the executive director of the Long Island Federation of Labor, and I won't repeat the -- some of the projects that John Guadagno just ran down. We believe the same. I just want to say some things in general, and I'll leave a statement about the importance of the community college to us and the labor movement. It's, on so many levels, Suffolk Community College is a place be proud of. It's where we are sending our sons and daughters. Working people find the community college affordable and, really, the pathway to a better life. We think it's a great institution, and we'd make it better by refurbishing its buildings and building new ones. And that's what we're attempting to do here. We have several bargaining units at the campus faculty and non-faculty. They are -- their relationship to the college is excellent.

The capital budget itself is vital as a lifeline for the economy of Suffolk County and really for Long Island. If it weren't for the capital projects of the county, we would be in much worse shape economically than we are. So keeping those buildings and restoring the funding to this is really an important aspect of moving forward economically and making it the kind of campus where we want to send our kids and that's really super-efficient.

I just would have to add this: that the attitude of the president of the campus toward union labor and what it means to have people with good jobs and good benefit is extraordinary, and we appreciate that very much. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you, Roger. Appreciate your testimony.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, can I just ask Mr. Clayman one quick question?

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Yes, Legislator Kennedy, go ahead.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Roger, thank you for being here again. It's always good to see you. Labor has had a long history of collaboration with the community college; I'm well aware of it. But is another piece or another element -- first of all, let me make sure that I recall properly. Federation of Labor, basically you represent how many tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of folks?

**MR. CLAYMAN:**

Well, I put it in my statement, but I didn't want to brag about it. We have a big labor boat,

250,000 union members on Long Island and their families.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And it's not uncommon for your members to typically have an educated benefit associated with whatever their bargain agreement is so that members and/or their spouses, children, or whatever oftentimes can avail themselves of some tuition reimbursement or something along those lines for higher education, work related, and things similar to that, right?

**MR. CLAYMAN:**

That's correct. I wish it were more common, but it is in play, yes, we have that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So we get that enhanced advantage for folks in the labor movement for folks in the labor movement who are trying climb the wrung, climb the ladder by acquiring those important degrees that help bring them to management and some of the technology types of things, and some employers have actually recognized that importance in helping them make the way.

**MR. CLAYMAN:**

Yeah, I just think we can't overemphasize how important the community college is because the people going to private colleges, young people now, are saddled with this incredible debt.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And the employers are looking for students that have somewhat advanced skillsets these days. You know, back when I got my bachelor's, I think we were still usage abacuses, but today, the curriculums, particularly the ones at the community college, are giving our young people those skills that employers can utilize right away in meeting their missions, right?

**MR. CLAYMAN:**

Yes, and hopefully you'll hear from our friends at the community college that it's not just a good college, but they're out there trying to figure out what business needs; they're asking them and they're tailoring it to what the needs of the future are.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Right. Thank you for being here, Roger.

**MR. CLAYMAN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Roger, appreciate it, and Legislator Kennedy too.

All right. That concludes the public portion. Is there anyone else present that would like to address the committee this morning in our public portion? What I'd like to do is ask -- oh. Yup, come on in.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Sorry. Didn't fill out a card.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

That's all right.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Kevin Peterman, president of the faculty association at Suffolk County Community College. I just want to stand here today and thank you for your past support for the college capital programs. The previous speakers mentioned all the advantages of funding these capital projects, and I can't reiterate enough how important it is, I think, to provide employment for my brothers and sisters in

the building trades. As you know, half the money comes from the State of New York, and, as many of you have told me privately, you're getting the building for half price, and I strongly urge you to consider all of the projects, because we certainly need the buildings; the trades need the work; and it's a win-win for everyone. And I just want to thank you for your continued support of Suffolk County Community College. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Kevin. All right. Would anyone else like to address the committee? What I would like to do is ask the representatives of the college if you would like an opportunity to come up and discuss the capital projects with us this morning? Ben, Gail? Let's do this while they are coming up.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

If it's all right, could --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Would you like to wait?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

-- go first or some of the other departments? He had another speaking engagement.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

That's fine. Yeah. No problem.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Thank you very much.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Do we have IT?

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. So we'll move to the IT portion of the hearing at this point and --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Good morning. For purposes of the record, would you all please state your name and your position.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Lisa Santeramo, County Executive's Office.

**MS. MILLER:**

Doug Miller, director of information management, Department of Information Technology.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Good morning, and thank you for coming to the committee this morning to discuss the capital budget. Would you like to make a presentation, tell us what's on your mind about what's been proposed?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

So Doug is going to get into the programmer's piece and the specific projects, but there was one project that I want to just note. The Microsoft Enterprise Agreement was taken out of the budget on this BRO report, and we are comfortable with it being taken out of the capital budget.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

The Microsoft Enterprise Agreement. We are comfortable with that being taken out of the budget.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

It's not in the proposed budget?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

It is not in the BRO report, and we are comfortable with that change.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

1815, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. So the Budget Office is recommending that project be deleted?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. And what you're saying on behalf of the administration is that you agree with that.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

We agree with it being taken out of capital, correct.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Out of the capital budget. All right. Is there anything else you want to add at this time? Okay. Go ahead, please.

**MR. MILLER:**

Okay. Do you want me to just run through all our different projects, or how do we -- how do you want to proceed on this?

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I want you to do whatever you feel is necessary to address this committee about the capital budgets, what's been proposed, and what's been recommended by the Budget Office. So if you have any comments about -- perhaps you could start with the Budget Review Office's review of those projects and tell us whether you agree or disagree or why not.

**MR. MILLER:**

Okay. Then I'll start with 1726, which is fiber cabling network and WAN technology upgrades. And that project, I agree with the Budget Review Office report of restoring funding to that project, because that project alone with 1729, which is our disaster recovery project, and also 1807, which is the globally-managed network protection and security project are sort of interrelated with dependencies upon each other. It's important that we continue this process going forward to maintain our infrastructure and our wide area network and keep it up-to-date to protect the county from threats and also ensure that we have disaster recovery in both our west end and east end data centers, especially with the advent of us bringing on more and more departments into those two data centers.

One of the main things in 1729, which was the disaster recovery project, were electrical upgrades that we were proposing in 2015 and 2016 for both data centers. If we do not get the electrical upgrades, we cannot bring more servers into those two data centers, and if we can't do that, then we can't promote disaster recovery for the departments that we support.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Each of those projects are existing projects?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And you're indicating that you agree with the Budget Review Office's recommendations for each of those projects?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Go ahead. Any other projects you'd like to address?

**MR. MILLER:**

If this project, which is 1782, IFMS Release 3, we agree with the BRO report on that project as well, but I will mention that we probably will have to request additional funding in 2015 and/or 2016 to continue that project.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Now what is that project for?

**MR. MILLER:**

That's for the upgrade to the current financial system of the county, and it includes the grant management module going forward.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And that was 1782?

**MR. MILLER:**

1782.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. So what is the funding that is presented presently?

**MR. LIPP:**

200,000 in 2015.

**MR. MILLER:**

And it was reduced in 2016, but in reviewing the project and what we'll have to do to accomplish this, we feel we will need \$200,000 again in 2016.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. Let's just think about that for a moment. So this is in Capital Project 1782, right?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And it's showing that in 2015, requested was 200,000 and recommended was 200,000, so that's what you're asking?

**MR. MILLER:**

We requested \$200,000.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And the Budget Office agrees with that. So what additional funding are you talking to?

**MR. MILLER:**

I'm talking about 2016. I'm sorry.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. So in 2016, I see the request has been made, but it has not been suggested in the actual recommended budget.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. And can you explain the reasoning to me why you need the 200,000 in 2015 and again in 2016?

**MR. MILLER:**

Because due to the timeframes of installing the upgrade for the software and then implementing the grants module, we feel as though in 2016, the grants module will be online, and we will be in the position to do more conversion of the existing IFMS system to the new release, and that will require some additional expense with the company that we contract with which is CDI -- CGI, sorry. And the advantage of that, of course, is just to keep it in compliance with all the regulations and IRS rules that we have to support in the integrated financial system as well as program all the different modifications needed to implement the grants lifecycle system.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I see. Now, but, if this is an upgrade or an update of the county's financial management system, why isn't that additional work included within the 200 for 2015?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's sort of a multiyear ongoing project, and so it's going to spill over into '16. It's just the timeframe of implementing the upgrade and also the grants module. It will require additional years to complete.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Can I ask a question?

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

In looking at this project, it looks like you asked for \$684,000 in 2014. We're giving you \$90,000. I'm just trying to figure out how is this going to be a viable project when, you know, you're not getting -- you know, your total request is a million eighty four. We're both, Executive and BRO, we have a \$290,000 investment. So my question is how can you go forward if you don't have the money to do that? And if you can't get the money right away, can you at least start it with the money we're providing you, and then, in the future, build upon that?

**MR. MILLER:**

We have -- it is a capital project. It's multiyear, and we have some money left over from prior years that we were going to use to start the upgrade process, which is why I think it was reduced in

2014 from the \$684,000 that we requested. And so with the \$350,000 I believe that we have in the free balance from prior years, we're going to use that in connection with the 90,000 that we're asking for in 2014 to enable us to begin the upgrade to 3.10 of IFMS in 2014. That being said, we will need -- ultimately, it's going to cost the same amount of money no matter if you're front-end loaded or if you push it out to future years, and so that's why we will need the additional money in the future.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And what exactly is this going to do for us?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's going to upgrade the current IFMS system that we're all using now from a previous version, which is 3.5, to 3.10, which will allow us to implement the grants lifecycle module in that system.

**LEG. ANKER:**

English? Convert that to English that I can understand.

**MR. MILLER:**

It's the county's integrated financial system, and so it's at an older release level, and what we're trying to do is bring that up to the more current level. Also at the same time, there's a conversion included to go to SQL from Oracle built into this project, and so all of these things are coming together during this upgrade.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And, again, I think the issue with technology is how quickly it changes and, you know, do we invest right now, in one -- you know, one swoop, or do we start it and then continue it and see which way the technology goes? I mean, what's your thoughts on that?

**MR. MILLER:**

That may be true for some systems, but the county is heavily invested in the integrated financial system, and I don't think we can easily change that. It's sort of a mission critical system that all departments are using right now, and it would be a pretty big lift for us to change that at this point.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

So you're talking about additional funding with respect to the second recommendation for the BRO report -- from the BRO report, and I want to ask Dr. Lipp about that. It's on page 128 of your review, and it says, "In light of Suffolk County's current fiscal concerns, BRO recommends the department maintain IFMS on an Oracle 11-G database platform for now so as not to incur the expense of an oracle to SQL migration."

**DR. LIPP:**

Right. So our understanding is that part -- the reason why we didn't recommend the requested 200,000 in 2016 is we're saying just, you know, at least for now, stay with the data platform that we have, Oracle; don't migrate. I guess we could review that in the future, and the idea there is we have lots of financial concerns.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. So we would, then, by doing the upgrade of the financial management system, we'd have the capacity to do that in the future, but you're recommending, given the financial picture of the county at this time, you recommending holding off on that?

**DR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. And so I want to ask, so what is the advantage to implementing that migration at this time as opposed to holding off on that? If we do the initial upgrade, will we be able to function sufficiently? So what is the advantage of doing the additional migration at this time?

**MR. MILLER:**

You're talking about the advantage of doing the migration to SQL from Oracle.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. Is that what you're speaking to?

**MR. MILLER:**

It was one of the components of the upgrade. It was --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

It was one of the components of the additional request.

**MR. MILLER:**

I mean, if you're asking if it's mission critical to bring it up to SQL at the same time we do the upgrade, no; we could stay on Oracle and upgrade the software on the existing platform.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I see. Okay. But was that part of what was included in your additional request?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes, that was the original request that had the \$680,000 additional in 2014.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I see.

**MR. MILLER:**

It included the migration from Oracle to SQL.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. But by doing that -- let's say we decide to do that now. What type of efficiencies are we building in, and how does it benefit the county?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's a different database software. So what efficiencies does it build in? It gives you the ability to use Oracle server, you know, intelligence tools against that instead of using Oracle and using some other business --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. I understand that, but what's the advantage to doing that?

**MR. MILLER:**

I don't think I could say one is better than the other. They're both very good platforms. SQL and Oracle are both --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

So why would you not recommend just staying where we are, then, if one is not better than the other?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's a good question. Let me think about that for a moment.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Fair enough. Sure. Legislator Cilmi, please go ahead.

**LEG. CILMI:**

While you're thinking, not to distract you from thinking, but I think I heard you say one of the benefits was that it avails us of some grant management component that's in the upgrade, so let me just see if I understand this completely. The \$200,000 that's being requested in 2015 will allow us to upgrade to that newer version; and then you're asking for an additional 200,000 in 2016, potentially for -- for what again? For further upgrades to that? Are you anticipating another release of the software at that point, or it's just adding components to the software?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's just a different way of financing the software upgrade over the next several years. We had originally proposed to do it in 2014 with all the money. The money was reduced. It still costs money to do the upgrade.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So the cost of the upgrade exceeds \$200,000.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And so what you're -- basically, what you're -- if we step onto the conveyer belt, then we necessarily have to keep going, otherwise we've thrown away the \$200,000 that we're spending in 2015, correct?

**MR. MILLER:**

There's different modules involved in doing the upgrade. There's a conversion to SQL; that costs some amount of money. There's the upgrade to the new release software, and there's the grants module as well as some services from the company that we bought the software from in order to make this all work with the business rules of Suffolk County, and all these components add up to a certain dollar figure that we feel we'll need the money in 2016 to complete that project.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Are the components useful exclusive of one another?

**MR. MILLER:**

No. You do need to have the upgrade before you can do the grants piece module.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Is the grants piece the more important piece that we're talking about?

**MR. MILLER:**

It depends on your perspective, but from our perspective, the upgrade is the most important piece to get the newest release of the software. The grants piece is a module that adds onto that software.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. The money that we've -- have we appropriated the 2014 money yet?

**MR. MILLER:**

I think we have a resolution pending for that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Will that get us onto that conveyer belt? In other words, will that begin the process of acquiring the necessary upgrades to the software?

**MR. MILLER:**

That will begin the process.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So if we begin that process, if we appropriate that money, begin that process, is it your opinion that we need to move forward, then, with the 200,000 this year and another 200,000 next year in order to take full advantage of the investments that we've made in '14 and '15?

**MR. MILLER:**

If we want to do the whole conversion and get to the grants module, we would need adequate funding.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So the grants module is a key module here, it sounds like. What -- how does installing that grants module help us relative to the way we're managing grants now?

**MR. MILLER:**

It helps us greatly because right now we don't really have an integrated grants tracking system that this will tie together with the financial system. I mean, if you would like to mention it.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Currently, the way -- this is one of the projects I've been working on. Currently, the way the county manages grants is each department has been in a silo approach to, you know, applying for grants. So it's actually put us in the position where sometime you may have -- it may be in the position where sometimes you may have grant departments competing against one another. So this system will, A, get everyone onto the same program where we have a full view of all the grant opportunities out there but also give us to the opportunity to proactively find competitive grants. We saw a demonstration on this component of that software, and we think it actually might help us in identifying additional grant opportunities that we currently are not finding.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So what is it, an interface through the internet and -- I understand a little bit about IT, so as much as you can technically describe to me.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

I am not an IT person, so I don't have enough details, but it does connect with, like, grants.gov and the state system and the federal system and helps identify if you, you know, if you click 'I want to find federal grants,' it'll give you federal grants for the justice department. It'll identify those and actually filter those through to us is my understanding of the program.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So it allows you to connect with other levels of government?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And then sort of searches for grants within some input set of criteria?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

That is my understanding, yes. But more importantly, it also allows us as a county to have a

coordinated approach to applying for grants, which we currently do not have. We're working on a temporary solution to that, but this was ultimate goal.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is there -- it seems to me that there may be something available through cloud computing that would allow us to do this. Does this relate to that or no? It seems like a fairly expensive -- not as far as government-related software goes, unfortunately, but it is a lot of money when you can get down to it, so is there a less expensive solution?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

I don't know the answer to that, no.

**MR. MILLER:**

I'm sorry. If you're asking if we could do the grants portion in a cloud-based system, my first answer would be no because that would open our IFMS system to the internet, and I don't know if we want to do that as a county. Could you do it? Yes, feasibly you could do anything in the cloud, but it's really a business choice, and a policy direction for the county to make that before we just embark on the cloud systems.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. One of the reasons I'm a little bit hesitant here is you're just sort of taking the reigns of the department. Would have loved to have a conversation -- a broader conversations about, you know, the future of IT in Suffolk County before looking to approve hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars on IT infrastructure that, arguably, all have to work together in some way, shape, or form. You said you saw a presentation about this particular software. Was it a long presentation? Was it something that you saw on the internet or somebody came and made a presentation personally? What I'm getting at, is it something I or anyone on the committee could easily go to on the internet and kind of look and see what the benefits are?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Maybe you could send a link to the committee or something like that just so -- or to the full legislature even -- we're all going to be debating this capital budget and program -- just to sort of support your request because I'm not getting a clear idea of what exactly it is that we're going to be, you know, be able to do here based on your description.

**MR. MILLER:**

Okay. That'd be fine.

**LEG. CILMI:**

All right. Thanks very much.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

John, before you go, I just have one quick question just for clarity. The 200,000 that's in the budget and recommended in the budget, that's to upgrade the financial management system to the latest version; is that correct?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes, this project is to do that, exactly.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. And, then, what the department has done has said beyond upgrading the financial management system to the latest version, you also would like to convert to the Microsoft SQL

database platform instead of using Oracle for that system?

**MR. MILLER:**

That was in the project plan, yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. Right, but I'm trying -- forgot the project plan. What is the 200,000 for? Is it just for -- the additional 200,000, is it primarily to bring this financial management system onto a different platform or a database, whatever you call it?

**MR. MILLER:**

There's different components to the upgrade, and each component --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Because it says here that the Oracle Enterprise Edition 11 is an update the county is entitled to. That's what the financial management system runs on now; is that correct?

**MR. MILLER:**

We run on a different version of that. We run on 3.5, I believe, and we're trying to go to 3.10.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right, but what I'm getting at is rather than go with the -- under the Oracle agreement and upgrade that for the financial management system, you want to move that financial management system over to a whole 'nother system or platform?

**MR. MILLER:**

As I said, I mean, yes, that's part of the project --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Look, you know what? If you're going to request 200,000, you're going to have to make this clear, so explain me once again. You're asking for additional funding, and that's fine, but I need to know what is it for, and I need to know what is the advantage for the county for doing it at this time; that's what I need to know. Because, according to Budget Review, and all of us agree, we're having, you know, plenty of financial difficulty to deal with, and it's not that we won't pursue that additional funding, but I need to know that it's going to result in some kind of efficiency or saving. I can't just do it because it would run a little quicker. I mean, I'm really talking laymen's term here. I don't know much about this, but I need a justification to say, Okay, let's put another 200,000 into the project, and it's within the initial scope of the project, but why do we need to do that now, and what efficiencies is that bringing?

**MR. MILLER:**

Well, we wanted to bring the system back up to the current level of software to incorporate some of the required IRS regulation changes; that's one reason.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Sorry. Can you repeat that, please? I apologize.

**MR. MILLER:**

We'd like to bring it up to the current release of the software to incorporate some necessary IRS regulations, incorporate into the new release. We'd also like to take advantage of the new release, some of the newer release functionality that we don't have in the present release, so it gives you --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

How much will it cost if we go to the Microsoft database platform?

**MR. MILLER:**

How much will the SQL conversion cost? It's somewhere around \$40,000.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

So what's the additional 160 for that you're requesting?

**MR. MILLER:**

There are some services involved in converting the business rules that are currently in place in the release that we're running to bring it up to the next release.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. All right. I'm sorry, I interrupted you. Is there anything else you want to add: justification, efficiencies, savings, cost effective?

**MR. MILLER:**

Well, the grants module gives us better tracking of the grants through the process, and it works in conjunction with the budget office and federal and state aid.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And that's something that we would get only by doing the additional portion of this project?

**MR. MILLER:**

Additional grants module.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. Okay. That's what I needed to know. Legislator Kennedy, go ahead, please.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Part of my questions in this go to some of what you talked about with the -- I think it's a twofold type of decision tree that we have associated with IFMS. IFMS is embedded everywhere in the county and has been, probably, for the last 10 or 15 years. That's been our primary operating platform, be it for operating budget, capital budget, procurement, you name it, it's basically, I guess, the platform that we have, and we've gone through probably a couple of upgrades of it from what the first version was when we took delivery.

But this question of migrating from Oracle to SQL, I guess I would ask the director to speak a little bit about, if for no other reason, my own personal experience out in the clerk's office was operating off of an Oracle platform that was, and continues to be, extremely resilient. I guess it really gets down to as a user or consumer, what is it that we value most? And it would seem that the ability to be consistently and constantly operational without interruption, my own laymen's sense is we do better with Oracle. So I guess in the form of a question, do you think that's a fair laymen's assessment?

**MR. MILLER:**

We could remain on Oracle; yes, that's a fair assessment.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Anker, please go ahead.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. So my questions pertain to, again, comparing the two systems, how new is Oracle, and how long is it going to be around versus the SQL?

**MR. MILLER:**

How long will Oracle be around in existence in the county?

**LEG. ANKER:**

Right. In other words, which system do you feel will -- is more highly -- has more -- a higher technical standard? You know, because again, we see these software programs; they're out there and then they disappear, especially some of the older ones. They can't keep up with the current technology. From what I understand, SQL is out there. It's moving forward. Oracle is older and it's not really going anywhere. What's your thoughts on that?

**MR. MILLER:**

Oracle is a well-established database. I guess one of the original reasons that we had a direction to go in to SQL is for cost-savings because Oracle is an expensive alternative, but it is a very good database, and I don't think it's going anywhere; it's sort of the industry standard, and SQL is also gaining ground. It comes down to how much it costs to acquire Oracle and maintain it and license it as opposed to how much it costs to do SQL, maintain it, and license it.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So what's the cost difference to maintain after conversion for the systems?

**MR. MILLER:**

It would be less expensive maintenance-wise if we were in a SQL environment and had SQL servers throughout the county. It would be probably less expensive from a license and maintenance point of view than it is to have the Oracle. However, we also negotiated, at the same time, a very reasonable Oracle agreement, so it's kind of a hard comparison to make between the two.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So, again, we're looking to make the decision of whether or not to give you a million plus dollars for this conversion or stay with what we have. You know, I think we need a little bit more information of why we're going to move forward with this. You know, again, from what I understand, the reason why you're moving towards SQL is because we're going to save money. There's actual cost benefit in the future. If we invest now, we're going to save big bucks down the road, we're going to be able to apply for grants and bring in millions of dollars. That's what I'd like to hear, but I don't know if you could comment on that.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

This is the part where the umpire walks out to the plate. Go ahead, guys.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

This should be great. One of the things I was just speaking with Mr. Miller about is, and I think that Legislator Cilmi brought this up and I think that it's a good point, Doug has just taken over the reins recently, and one of the things we were talking about is collectively all of us can kind of look at that 290 that we're looking at -- the \$90,000 for this year and the \$200,000 for next year -- view that as a good starting point and then continue as Doug is progressing forward as commissioner of IT or the acting commissioner of IT, kind of take a second look at that Oracle versus SQL debate and deal with that as something that we look at in 2016 as opposed to right now.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. We're not necessarily averse to doing it. We just want a justification for doing it, that's all.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And, Mr. Chairman, I think that's certainly fair.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I mean, you guys know every time Microsoft comes up, we ask some questions.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

A hundred percent, and I think that that's also one of the reasons why we -- yes, every time

Microsoft comes up, there's a lot of questions.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And we don't want to be vouchered just by having a conversation here today, right?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Absolutely, 100 percent.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. I appreciate that. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I think my questions were answered because I was getting very confused there. Mr. Miller, you had said that you were comfortable with BRO's recommendations on this project at this time, right?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes, with the -- yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

That was, like, what you lead this whole thing off with, right? I thought that's what I heard, but there's a potential in '16 you're going to be looking for extra money. The money you're getting now is strictly to deal with the IFMS upgrades to make sure that our IFMS system is able to stay with the most current system, is able to be up-to-date with the IRS and other reporting requirements that we might have, kind of like for those of who do Turbo Tax for our taxes, you got to go out and buy Turbo Tax every year because you got to do the upgraded system so you're up and current with all the new laws, right?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. And this question of SQL versus Oracle, Budget Review has said we need to revisit that. You are actually agreeing with us this 200,000 that you're looking for for next year and the 200 you're looking for potentially in '16 have nothing do with that conversion?

**MR. MILLER:**

We can do the SQL conversion at any time during the project.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But my point is that when you're saying you need 200,000 for next year, that 200,000 is not going for that SQL conversion.

**MR. MILLER:**

2015, no.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And 2016, 200,000, would that actually be for that conversion or no?

**MR. MILLER:**

Originally, the plan was to have the conversion done in 2014 with the money but because of the way the money has been timed --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But the 200,000 in '16 you're looking for is strictly to do IFMS upgrades, bring in that grants module, those kind of things.

**MR. MILLER:**

To finalize the conversion and grants, yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So this whole conversation about SQL and Oracle, my understanding is you guys are basically saying, yeah, we're in agreement with Budget Review, we're going to take a second look at that.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

All right. Very good.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Legislator Calarco. Are there any other questions? Acting Commissioner Miller, is there anything else you would like to add?

**MR. MILLER:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Anyone have anything further with respect to the IT portion of the hearing?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes. I've heard, reading the report, there's been a lot of talk about doing more in-house application development, and I just wanted to comment on that if I could.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Sure. Go ahead.

**MR. MILLER:**

So typically, we are a support organization and we listen to departments. They come to us, they ask us for applications, we evaluate the best way to proceed with those application requests. We always look to do things in-house first. Right now, we have approximately 20 programmers working full-time on application support and maintenance for over a hundred plus applications that we run right now. We are pretty much at capacity with taking on new work at this point, so what we've been doing as departments come to us is evaluate whether or not it makes sense for us to try to develop something or if it would be a faster track for the department to acquire that software. And so it's really an individual assessment of everything that comes to us from each department, the way we make that decision.

In order for us to do more, of course, we would have to add more people; that is absolutely true, but not in every case does it make sense for us to program something inhouse, especially large mission-critical applications that require full-time dedicated staff to support them going forward. An example of that would be our payroll system. Of the, say, 20 programmers that we have, we probably have 6 working on that system full time every day. And so it's important to recognize that there's some timing involved when we bring on somebody, it might take us three months to hire somebody, it might take us a few months to analyze the system, and it might take many more months to develop and bring it out there and then maintain and support it going forward. So I just wanted everybody to be aware that it's not an instant gratification type of thing.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right, and that permeates the report -- or the sections of the report dealing with your department. I could certainly understand, you know, don't reinvent the wheel with respect to an application or a

new software or whatever it is that you're bringing into the system as opposed to it might be cheaper, more efficient, and more expertise just to bring a vendor on board, let's say, to do something like that. And, like most departments, I believe that you are operating at capacity. It's a difficult time, and I guess you'll make that decision on a case-by-case basis.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Very good. All right. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

**MR. MILLER:**

I think we're good.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Gentlemen, we're good?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, Mr. Chair, I do. A couple projects, and I'll try to make them quick. We've got a bill signing at 11:00, as a matter of fact, so let me see what I can do to buzz through this. 1807, the virus protection systemwide; I'm going to pose it to you very simply, Doug. You know, in a perfect world, I guess, all of us would drive Cadillacs or Jaguars, but we are in a time where we are very constrained with this capital program and this capital budget. So 210,000, I see, is, I believe, what is the amount that's identified for 2015. The question's real simple: Do we have adequate virus protection now based on McAfee, I guess, or whatever we have that resides in our PCs, or is this something that -- are we at risk or not?

**MR. MILLER:**

No, we are not at risk right now. We have adequate McAfee protection right now for viruses. This goes beyond that, though. This is more firewall protection for the wide area network access control, that kind of protection.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. So maybe I'm trying to make it too simple and what we're really talking about is the two different measures of protection. So the PCs are protected with the software that we have that resides there now. This would be a broader system measure of protection.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes, this is for the wide area network protection. People using VPN access to dial into the network, this provides appliances to safeguard the county's network from that as well as firewall protection and --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

In your opinion, do we need it now or not?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes, this is an ongoing project --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okey doke. That's fine.

**MR. MILLER:**

-- to continue.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. That's fine. Thank you. All right. 1816, the countywide computer replacements. I guess, BRO, what is in there? How much? Is it a million, 1.5 mil?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's one million in 2014 and 1.5 million next year.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

What number is that?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

1816, that's the basic PC replacement program.

I have three more -- two more. I'll make it fast. The PC replacement standard that we use at this point is six years, seven years, five years.

**MR. MILLER:**

So several years ago, the county went to an as-needed replacement program, which hasn't really worked out for us. So reading the report, I do agree with the five-year replacement plan. It gave us better ability to plan for these replacements going forward, and so I think that's a better method to readopt since that's the method we always had in the past.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Could we get -- how to pose this question. This is a terrible way to ask it, but I guess there's only any other way. Could we get away with less in 2015 than what we have in there now?

**MR. MILLER:**

Probably not. The reason that we ask for additional funding with that is because, in the case of the public safety MDC terminals, they're very expensive, and so they have a large body of them that need to be replaced that are aging out, and we weren't able to accommodate them all in this year's purchase of one million dollars, and that's why we ask for the additional money going forward to accommodate more of those police terminals for their cars.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And we also, didn't we have to shift to a different type of terminals to accommodate the new vehicles as well?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yeah, I believe the police department has a different specification for those devices now.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

They're still, nevertheless, they're high-end PCs that are pretty resilient? They're the tough-book style?

**MR. MILLER:**

Tough books plus the mount. It's a rather expensive device.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. 1818, electronic timesheet. I have been doing paper timesheets -- well, I was going to say 28 years. That's one of the few advantages, if any, of being an elected; I don't have to do a timesheet. It's not enough lines on it. You know this comes under, in my opinion, something that is, you know, would be nice to have in a perfect world, but time is being kept at this point, isn't it?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes, time is being kept by all departments in different ways, and I think the spirit of our request on this --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I understand. It's uniformity, and, as a matter of fact, you know, we're a large organization, and there's a desire to go ahead in uniformity across the board, but time is being kept. Okay. Good.

Last one. Let's go to 1819. I see 935,000 for labor department, licensing, software. Do you have any idea about what that's about, any knowledge of it, or can you tell me anything?

**MR. MILLER:**

Just from what I've have had meetings with the performance guys, and actually they have described the project scope to us. It's countywide licensing program that they want to embark upon for taxi and limousine, and consumer affairs.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So it would take into account -- would it be limited solely to the vehicles, or would it also include our occupational licensing and the other things?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Kennedy, the first portion of this, if you notice in BRO's write-up on page 180 -- 148, pardon me, is a 300,000 request that we would be bringing forward this year with an offset; that's the current plan, and that current plan would address the TLC portion of this. From there, after the TLC portion, the plan would be to go forward with bringing those licenses -- bringing that software and integrating it into rest of the office of consumer affairs, and that's the million-dollar portion of the project.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Tom, is this going to be -- let's go to the basic question: Is it an off-the-shelf package, or is this something that's going to be custom written that we would purchase?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

That part, I'm not positive about the answer on, but what I can tell you is this: We did an RFP on this project to determine what a cost would be. It went through the RFP process, I believe in last December, even without the funding attached to it, and it was made quite clear at that time when we went through the RFP process that there was no funding as of yet because even in December of last year, we knew that we were going to be starting up the TLC, and that's the piece of legislation that you have before you in to Gov Ops to establish a taxi and limousine commission.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

It is the opinion of the commissioner of labor, licensing, and consumer affairs that purchasing this \$300,000 piece of equipment will enable him to save on staffing costs to get TLC up and running, so whereas in Nassau County, there's an entire dedicated workforce to the TLC operation, the commissioner does not anticipate hiring additional staffers to accommodate TLC; he plans on using this piece of technology and incorporating it into the current workload of his staff members over there right now.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I think I'd like to have a conversation with Commissioner Chu about that, and I'll see him in the building. Through the Chair, then, can I just ask BRO -- thank you, Tom. I appreciate that. BRO, what's your thoughts on this?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

This is one of the select projects that we identified as, for lack of a better term, commercial off-the-shell software packages, and we said this is a good starting point where we need to, like, put up our hand and say maybe we should start thinking and debating and stopping these practices of borrowing for everything as opposed to paying for things in the operating budget. And we understand why we do that, and that's because we have financial concerns, and we avoid costs upfront, pay for them in the future. Here's a case where we're saying we could hire programmers. We can't do it as fast, perhaps, but maybe we need to say enough is enough, and we need to start moving in that direction, so we're recommending not have having a project like this as part of the capital program.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Robert. Again, through the chair, Tom, what's the implementation date? When does the licensing process begin? When do we have to have operators begin to procure licenses?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

My understanding of the current plan of the program is to start with a somewhat soft rollout of the program in June or July of this year. As soon as we get the bill adopted here and then begin to -- and then have it submitted to the New York Secretary of State.

The other thing that I would just add -- and we understand exactly where BRO is going with this. I think Mr. Miller addressed it at the beginning of his comments on the idea of hiring more programmers. I would say that the decision to hire more programmers, and a good time to start with hiring more programmers might be in November when we have a discussion on the on the operating budget. I think that the idea of bringing some programs in-house are not necessarily the programs that are contained in this capital budget but would be programs going forward in the future. So I understand the desire to put our hands up and say "stop;" we just disagree that this would with the program to do it with.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We'll talk about that, and I appreciate that, but I'm a little curious. Maybe I'll have to talk to Dennis Brown or somebody as far as typically when we commence licensing, it's after a particular date that any individual in that occupation, craft, or trade has to actually come in and obtain a license from us. Are we going to notify these folks?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

The commissioner has been working very carefully -- very closely with the owners of the limousines in terms of coming in and getting them licensed, and it is my understanding that the limousine individuals, or the people who run limousines, are very supportive of our taxi and limousine commission because they need it for competitive advantage.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it. That's the extent of my questions for now.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Trotta, please go ahead.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Getting back to the computers you're buying that last five years, you're bonding them for 18 years.

**MR. LIPP:**

That's a financial question, and the answer is that's typically on average the length of time that we borrow for, yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So we're going to be paying for three different sets of computers 15 years from now.

**MR. LIPP:**

That would be one way to look at it.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Legislator Calarco, you have the floor.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you, Legislator D'Amaro. This is to Doug, and I guess if you need to bring up any of your staff, I kind of want to walk through these three projects that Budget Review is recommending that we zero out a little bit more because they do bring up an important issue of discussion, and we had this a little bit with Commissioner Anderson of DPW regarding engineers and trying to do more engineering inhouse as opposed to contracting out those services, and so what it really comes down to is a discussion about whether or not we can bring -- when bringing that staff onboard, which I think a lot of us would feel is a good thing to do when we can when that would be able to accomplish the task at hand and how important and how critical are these three projects that Budget Review has suggested that we not move forward with in favor of trying to bring people on board so they can do that work here.

So I guess the first one we can start with here is 1818, and that's the timesheets portion, and I know that we are -- I think there's another capital program in here that talks about upgrading our payroll, correct?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And that's one where Budget Review has agreed with the executives recommendation, I think, correct?

**MR. MILLER:**

Correct.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Does this project, 1818, in any way interrelate with that payroll system upgrade? Why should we be doing this now? And I guess John -- Legislator Kennedy tried to get to that a little bit. Is there a critical need for this now? Can we put it off, and can we actually program it in-house, or is this something that's more appropriate to look for an off-the-shelf type of system?

**MR. MILLER:**

1818, the electronic timesheet, we originally did begin that project as an in-house application, and we do have electronic timesheet that we had developed for Dewitt (ph) as a pilot. We also have a time and activity system. And so the spirit of this one, this electronic timesheet was to sort of marry the two together and have one system to track people's time as well as integrate their time and activity function into one application rather than have them enter information into two separate applications.

It does tie into the payroll system at the end of the day after you have entered all your time, but that payroll project is a separate and distinct project to convert the payroll system.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I understand they're separate projects, but this leads into that project or comes out of that project in a sense; is that accurate?

**MR MILLER:**

Some of the information comes from the payroll system into the timesheet program.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And so what do we gain out of this project? Is it better management of our employees, a better idea of what they're doing and what they're working on, when they're at work or out of work? Is there a benefit to it other than just having electronic system versus a paper system, as Mr. Kennedy likes.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yeah, we think there's a benefit to it. Like I said, it eliminates one additional step for employees to enter their time into a time and activity system as well as into a timesheet, whether it's paper or a one-off that was developed by a department into a -- one county standard timesheet.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I think I used to keep the electric timesheet when I used to work in Aging.

**MR. MILLER:**

You may have. It depends on which version. There's Excel versions out there; there's Microsoft Access versions out there; I hear there's a Mapper version out there floating around; and there is the paper versions out there. This would incorporate all the rules of the bargaining units into that timesheet, so it's a more accurate representation of people's time.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So this will give us ability for -- to cover all of our various bargaining units as well. So let me ask you this question, then: Do we have a situation in the police department where the various bargaining units are using different timesheets or time systems in order to keep their -- you know, do we have to have the people who are in charge of personnel over there looking at two and three different systems because you have AME employees and PBA employees and SDA employees?

**MR. MILLER:**

They do have to track different bargaining units in the police department and other public safety departments as well. This, the beginnings of this, when we're starting with just AME, two bargaining units, two and six. The next phase that we're going to roll into it into 21, which is management, and then to other departments going forward and that's where the future year is expensed from it.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

If we wanted to develop this in-house, how long would it take? Say you had all the manpower in the world; how long would it take?

**MR. MILLER:**

I would defer to our applications lead over there, but it's probably in about a year.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

About a year? Okay. So if we were to bring somebody on to help us do this, you're talking a couple years out between lead time of bringing them on, if we can even get them into the budget.

**MR. MILLER:**

And it's an ongoing process because rules change for bargaining units as contracts are adopted.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

If we buy this system, will that give us -- would that company be responsible for helping us maintain those upgrades?

**MR. MILLER:**

It's one of those programs that's like a custom, off-the-shelf that we get to then program and customize going forward once we have --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So our in-house programmer will be able to customize it as we move forward?

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Thank you. Let's move to the next one. This is the licensing program. It sounds like you're not completely familiar with that. We had gotten into it a little bit yesterday at the government operations committee, but my understanding is this is something that we need to get in place rather quickly in order to have the TLC be able to go operational.

**MR. MILLER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Would you be able to get a system developed rather quickly so we could get the TLC operational?

**MR. MILLER:**

We would have to first get the staff in place, analyze the system, design it, and program it. It could take us between six months and a year after we have staff in place and trained. There's a bit of a lag time in bringing on new people and developing and rolling out a new system. I don't think -- it wouldn't happen this summer, if that was sort of the question.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. I guess that answers that question as fully as needed. There's one other project that is in the list here. Legislator Kennedy didn't actually bring it up. It's a little further on into the book. This is in regards to a GIS system for the health department. Environmental quality, graphic information database management system. This is another one. I'm sorry, guys. It's 4081. It's on page 23 of BRO's book. This is another one where it was requested that we, instead of expending these funds, look at hiring more programmers and doing this system in-house. So I guess the question is is that something that's doable, or what's your take on this? Again, if you've got people in the audience that are here -- I see that you've got a lot of staff here with you -- that are more appropriate to answer the questions on this program, please let me know.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Calarco, would you mind if we brought up Deputy Commission Barry Paul from the Health Department and Jim Daly, who is our GIS --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Through the Chair, it's okay with me, yeah.

**MR. PAUL:**

Good morning. Can you hear me?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yep. Good morning.

**MR. PAUL:**

Just some background, I think, is necessary for this particular project, certainly in terms of trying to describe its urgency. This is the same project -- with some modifications as time goes forward because, as has been mentioned here, technology changes -- that was in front of the legislature in December for an appropriation vote and was defeated. Some background, just to remind some folks, in environmental and health data management -- and that's really what this is about. The GIS component is a piece of it, but this is really about how the data is managed for environmental and health programs in the county. The county has multiple and outdated environmental and health databases. When we do inspections, when we review engineering plans, data is captured on paper and is done -- and is loaded into a database by clerks and other staff as necessary to just track what's going on. Never mind analyze or do computations with it. We have a paper filing system. We review documents on microfiche. Data, when we do have it input into a system, is only available via extracts currently and specialized reporting, and all this manual activity to manage and capture data transactions is really impeding the ability to improve services to the constituents and the health department.

Our objectives for a new system is to create an enterprise data model, so not just different offices and DHS can share the data and manage its business with the data but also other departments in the county could manage their business with the health department information. Key to the new system would be to communicate online, to improve efficiency and transparency to the public. You know, some of the systems you've been talking about today are about internal support systems, payroll, timekeeping. This is about providing services to the constituents of the county that do business with the health department. We need to improve those things. A new system is also intended to add capability without adding staffing and to improve the workflow and productivity of the existing staff.

I'll just really briefly run through a list of the programs that we intend to be managed by this program. Community and non-community bottled water supply plant inspection data, private well inspection and sampling data, groundwater pollution investigations and sampling, well drilling certification program, backflow prevention device plan review, community water supply plan review, bathing beaches program, swimming pools program, individual water and sewer construction plan review, state pollutant discharge elimination system program, wastewater management applications and engineering plan review, petroleum bulk storage tank plan review, enforcing toxics and hazardous materials storage regulations, which involve plan review, inspection and permitting of commercial industrial facilities, sampling of marine and surface waters for chemical, bacteriological, and algae quality environmental remediation, public environmental health laboratory information management system data integration with water quality databases; they don't speak to each other. And of course state environmental quality reviews and, you know, our activity and health department for time, activity, performance measured reporting to state DOH and for Article 6 aid reimbursement requirements.

So this isn't a simple project we're looking to deploy. It's very technical, and there are also standards out there that have been established in other municipalities, and those are being supported by commercial off-the-shelf products. So whether to build or to buy is an individual project-by-project decision, but I wanted to point out the complexity and urgency of this program to the health department and that it's very important for us to be with best practices throughout the country and to take advantage of what's already been adopted in standards in some of these systems that already are available. So, again, you know, there needs to be a business plan put together for this project, but in order for us to plan for this to be imminent, we need at least to have it in the capital budget. If a decision comes from another direction about appropriations, you have another pass at that. But we need to plan for the future for this because this is a service that we want to provide to the constituents.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So in doing this project, how exactly do you plan on carrying this out? And I think that's

part in part of the question, right, is whether we're going to contract this out, we're going to go out and find somebody to do this for us, are we going to build it in-house, which is obviously what BRO is recommending. What is the process here? What are we going to do? It sounds like you're saying we have to develop a business plan first. Is that accurate?

**MR. PAUL:**

That's correct. We're going to put an RFI out, request for information, that calls for requirements to meet the program needs that I just described. Then we're going to go out the community at large, the IT community at large that services other health departments and other municipalities around the country and see what is the best practice and what the standards are. Certainly, it also goes to the county IT department for them to review what our requirements are and we would rely on the county IT department to identify the best path to take. But certainly, if we don't have the capital budget for this project, we've lost the ability to do an off-the-shelf implementation, and we're only going to be either delayed or relying on fitting our requirement in with our projects that can be done by inhouse staff when we get to the point. That's very problematic, and we're very anxious to get this project moving forward.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So it sounds to me you're saying that there's actually a benefit to going and bringing somebody in from outside to take a look at this.

**MR. PAUL:**

Yeah. This isn't our core mission in county IT to develop environmental health data management systems. That is a core mission of outside commercial vendors who produce this for other large municipalities with health department issues similar to ours. So, yeah, we would have to basically train any programmers on what our job is and how we want to do the job as opposed to if you went out to a vendor who's already implemented, and that's really our hope: find an already implemented program that produces the same type of service results we're looking for that's already been tested and the bugs have been worked out, and, you know, we'd do with some minimal customization. We'd adapt it to Suffolk County and we roll this program out.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah, Mr. Daly.

**MR. DALY:**

Yes, if I may. The BRO report, I've read it. I somewhat disagree with the approach that BRO has recommended -- by the way, my name is James Daly. I'm the GIS coordinator, and I work in the Department of Information Technology. I've been working on a GIS crusade, if you will, for the last 10 years in Suffolk County trying to work with all the departments and bring a lot of their geospatial data sets into an enterprise design. In doing so, we've made some great strides over the last 10 years. We've been able to put together some great web-based applications, and the reason that's been able to come about as a result of working with the departments, going and seeing the problems they have with their data sets, specifically their spatial data sets.

So what we've noticed with the health department is in trying to bring them up to speed in the 21 century and bring a lot of their permitting processes and other processes in line is that we've realized there's a lot of problems with the data and how they store it and how they retrieve it and how they access it. In my business, in GIS, we look at spatially enabling that data, bringing them out of the silos, and putting them into an enterprise platform. When we're able to do that, we gain a lot of efficiencies, that being that we've identified the data set as it having a certain amount of rules, and those who actually have the responsibility to that data. When that happens, we're able to leverage the data across many different platforms and applications, so by doing this project with a business plan in mind first, we're assuring ourselves a greater chance of success.

If I could use the analogy of renovating your house. This is a major overhaul for the health department. I've seen this. I've been involved with them for the last 10 years. If you look at it this way, if you're going to renovate your house, and you're going to take a single-story house and then make it a three-story, you know, smart, intelligent home of the 21 century, I wouldn't just go out and hire a bunch of swinging hammers to come up onsite and say, Hey, build me that house. What I would do first is I would hire a very good architect and I would have that architect come in, understand exactly what needs to be done and use the system that we have in place already. We have a very high-end GIS platform, ready to be taken advantage of, so I would urge that the legislature approve this capital project because it is very much needed.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Great. Thank you. I just have one other question on this, and then I will relinquish, and I thank my colleagues for putting up with me for so long. Is this -- would this actually give us some ability to actually communicate with other municipalities as well, the towns, and especially when you're talking about the health department processes and permitting application process and how we can try to improve business applications and, you know, make it a little easier for the folks out there to trying to do development or redevelopments of areas? Would this allow us to get our data in a sense that makes it more readily available to the towns so we can have some collaboration with them in the future?

**MR. PAUL:**

Absolutely, that is the intent, yes. We in the health department, as everyone knows, we're at the last step in the approval process of permits and engineering plans. We think it would greatly improve our productivity if we can get all the data that's relevant to building in Suffolk County in an online environment accessible by, you know, people who are approved to have access to it, but accessible way upfront in the project, even before they go to the towns to ascertain whether something's buildable or not.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Legislator Calarco. Next is Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Following up on Legislator Calarco's questions with reference to this project specifically, could one of you describe maybe two or three practical applications and how the processes would work if we implement this system?

**MR. PAUL:**

One of the major improvements would be mobile inspection and realtime data transfer. We send inspectors out in a variety of environmental health and public health missions. Today, it's a paper-driven process. You go out with your clipboard report. You do your inspection. There's no inspection report until you come back to the office and write it up and give to a data clerk to do data entry. This application would realtime data to be loaded into the system, so that an inspector is doing a report at 10:00. By 10:05, or whenever the report's done, it's uploaded into the system for use by the county, by other inspectors, by other agencies, wherever that's required. Not only is the data there, but we just saved all that time and all that effort to get it into the system, so there's two benefits.

**LEG. CILMI:**

There would be an equipment component to that; is that included in this project?

**MR. PAUL:**

Yes. There'd be mobile devices that'd be included in the project, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's great. Give me another example.

**MR. PAUL:**

Let's go to plan review, application review. Paper-based has to be given to us, hand-delivered, mailed, whatever. We want the permitting and application face of the county to be online, to be realtime, to have the same type of online capability that people enjoy when they're buying something on the internet today.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's something that's been in progress for some time now.

**MR. PAUL:**

It's been in progress but isolated to the office of wastewater management and residential only. It is much more going on in permitting and plan review in the office of wastewater management and in the other offices that exist in DEQ and public health protection. So that constant open line of communication with where is my business with the county, what's the status of my business, and where can I expect it to be completed, that needs to be in an online environment, not something that's, you know, simply 9:00 to 4:30 every day.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So, again, from a practical point of view, I know presently residential applicants -- I thought that we were at the stage where commercial applicants could do it as well, but at least residential applicants could go online and complete an application online. There are certain documents that are necessary sometimes that we don't have the capability to accept online or potentially the applicants don't have the ability to, you know, to get online but -- so that's something that we have now. So how would this, from a practical point of view, how would this apply?

**MR. PAUL:**

As you said, it's residential only. It is not commercial, and it's open to -- right now it runs on a platform that's not integrated with all the other data platforms and DEQ. So again, something comes in off the SST as an application, it has to be loaded to the other databases that are relevant to the system. In an enterprise environment, like the one we're hoping to acquire, there's no wrong door of entry to the data set; however it gets into the county, it's going to be in everybody's database. So it will go to water resources, it'll go to pollution control, it'll go wherever it needs to go in the first pass. So what you're referring to is the application built for the Office of Wastewater Management on the county webpage right now. That's not an enterprise database environment.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So presently when a commercial applicant is looking to build something, let's say, or expand something and they may have to go to southwest sewer school district to complete some sort of an application there and then that goes to the health department and they have to go to the health department as well, and the two of them don't really communicate very well, that will be addressed by this system.

**MR. PAUL:**

Exactly.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I mean, that's worth a million dollars in and of itself, to be perfectly honest with you.

**MR. PAUL:**

-- about automating the into the data set that we currently have. That's a DPW data set. Up until about a month ago, it was a paper process. There's no reason for that. In an enterprise application like this, you go to the southwest sewer district, you present an application to hookup;

the minute you do that, wastewater management will know you did it. There's no reason not to have that capability nowadays.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah. So if this eliminates the kink in the pipeline, the system pipeline that exists between health and DPW with respect to those commercial applications and thereby can speed up, make more efficient, make less costly the process of commercial application approval, I mean that alone is probably worth the value of this project. Yes, go ahead. It looks like you're --

**MR. DALY:**

Yes. I just wanted to comment on that. It's exactly already what's happening right now as a result of the wastewater application that we've built, inhouse, by the way. We are able to, then, put in other data sets for wastewater review to look at. The efficiencies gained in that application that they're seeing today is that when they have to look at sewer infrastructure data that DPW sanitation is keeping track of, I'm also making sure that that enterprise data is available for wastewater review as well. So if somebody in wastewater needs to know if there's already infrastructure there, with a click of a button, they can actually see DPW sanitation data come right up and say, Okay. Same goes for any other type of spatial data set. If it should be in the enterprise data system -- and, again, what I'm talking about here is putting all of us on the same sheet of music so that we can leverage these data sets efficiently and across the enterprise; that's what's key here. And with a department as large as Health, it's imperative that we start here and use it as another example of how we can enterprise our GIS data, any data really, but specifically our GIS spatial data.

My other concern here is that as this becomes more of a trend, we're seeing a lot of departments coming to us looking for geospatial support. They're looking to see their data in a web-based environment and see it geographically. We have limited staff in IT, as Doug just said to you earlier. This is a growing concern for me, so we want to hire the programmers; yes, I agree with that in the BRO report, but I think we need to hire those programmers after we have the business plan in place. They're going to be needed. There's no question about it, and if you can find somebody that has web-based programming skills, has an understanding of the geospatial disciplines, and also understands relational database management system, I want to talk to them because I need them. These are the people, these are the technically-skilled people that we need in Suffolk County government.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I agree. Thank you. Why was this voted down when we addressed it last time? You guys weren't there. Barry was? Had I heard this, I mean I would've -- not that I -- but, you know. This is exciting. I mean, this is exciting stuff. I really appreciate your presentation.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I think our presentation previously failed to live up to the excitement levels of the one just presented to you.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Regardless of the fact that Tom brought the big books and did the Vanna White routine.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks. Thanks, guys.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. Legislator Trotta, please go ahead.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I'm sitting here listening to all these things, and I keep reading the operating impact, and it says this would cost a million dollars, the first year would cost \$78,000 in interest, and it'll cost over 1.629 million in 18 years. Then I go back to the other one where it's two million and it's going to end up costing three million. So just adding those numbers up in the interest, it more than pays for hiring someone to do it. So this makes no logical sense that we're going to finance this for 18 years, when in just two projects I came with \$220,000. Now, I'm assuming we can hire two people for that, and there's a book full of projects here that we're doing this to, so it makes no logical sense not to hire people to do this if the interest is far beyond what we would be paying in their salaries. So why would we ever vote for this? Why wouldn't we just hire the people, because the interest is going to be more? I think you guys would agree, the programmer person, you can get someone for a hundred grand. So I just picked two projects, and that's over 200 grand right there. So how many guys would you need?

**MR. DALY:**

The difficulty there would be to find those people you need for this project. As I said earlier, the idea of just bringing in programmers to renovate a system as large as this, these programmers that you would seek to hire in the report, they don't have the capabilities and the strengths and the expertise to do the -- the analysis of the work flow process that's involved with all these disparate legacy data systems and data sets that have to be brought forward, they have to be converted from the old process into the a new, what I call, the GIS functionality process, so that has to be converted. To find somebody in the county or a programmer and to think they could come in and analyze that whole workflow process and then convert that into a digital workflow process, I don't think that's the setup we need for the success of this project.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, clearly, someone can do that because we're paying someone to bring it in, so there's someone in this universe who can do that. So why don't we find those people and hire them?

**MR. DALY:**

Well, if we looked to the civil service code and try to hire those people with those skillsets, I can tell you right now, they're not only in short supply, but they also demand a far greater salary than a GIS technician 3 or a basic programmer. So I think, and I clearly will tell you this in my professional opinion, if you can find those people, please let me know about them.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, you can't find them if you're not looking for them.

**MR. DALY:**

I assure you, sir, I'm looking for them, should I get the green light for a SCIN form to hire them.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, I suggest you start looking for them.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Mr. Chair, can I ask Legislator Trotta a question?

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

A quick question, sure. We have a few more people on the list, but go ahead.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Sure. So just in reference to your question, you mentioned \$200,000 or so of interest expense relative to this particular project.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, this one is -- my finger moved, so I lost the page. I think this one was --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Page 223 and 224, I think.

**MR. LIPP:**

If you will, then --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This one, the interest on the first year is 78,227.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the first year?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes. And then on the last one, which I was going ask my second question, how many people does it do the countywide electronic timesheet? The interest on that is 143,000 on the first year. So we're looking at \$250,000 in interest on the first year --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Annually.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes; then it goes on every year.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. Okay. I just wanted to make sure we were talking about --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This is just two projects. I don't know -- my fingers can only hold two things, but clearly there's more.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Legislator Trotta, are you finished?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah. I think what I just wanted to add, and it's to the point that Legislator Trotta is trying to get at, and I don't necessarily think it's off-base; I just think it's a different conversation. What I'm hearing the folks say, especially specific to this project is that we need somebody with specialties that we don't have in-house that is very difficult to get in-house and may not necessarily be somebody that we necessarily need to keep in-house on a permanent long-term basis, so that's why you might want to bring somebody in to do this one specific task. It's kind of like bringing in a surgeon to do a specific surgery instead of having just your general practitioner doing a surgery.

Now, having said that, I think the conversation that we could be having, and it may be an appropriate conversation, still kind of gets to the crux of this and that's whether or not it's appropriate to even be doing that to the capital project as opposed to doing it to the operating budget and whether or not we should be paying for that consultant to come in on the operating

budget and paying for that cash so we won't be borrowing long term for that. But that's two different conversations as opposed to whether or not we need somebody to come in and do some special task for us versus whether or not we should be paying for that person, how we pay for that person.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

If I may, the interesting thing is every five years, as we've seen, it switches. So those people will have upgrades and new things to do because we just talked about upgrading your -- whatever it was -- the financial situation that you need an upgrade, so if those people are there, so now we're paying for that upgrade for 18 years and five years from now, we're changing it around --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Again, I think you're confusing things, because the upgrade for IFMS is not talking about paying anybody to do that upgrade; it's just simply buying the software.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Maybe we can do it ourselves.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I think our IFMS software is an existing, longstanding software program that we can't exactly develop in-house.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to see if we get can a breakdown of what the numbers here represent. The overall cost of the project is \$1.1 million, correct?

**MR. PAUL:**

That's the budget request, yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

And it's broken down into \$900,000 in 2015 and \$200,000 in 2016. So the suggestion here, the project includes the purchase and implementation of an off the shelf -- I'm reading from BRO's report here -- an off-the-shelf environmental health information management system. So given these numbers that are in the request, if you can break it down for me, how much of it, in your opinion, could represent the purchase of the actual system, and how much of that goes to personnel training and otherwise implementation of the system?

**MR. PAUL:**

To be, you know, exact about it, that's the purpose of the RFI to break that number down, but essentially you're talking about buying licenses for the software, doing the data integration, which will be the majority of the cost to take data that is in some format that is unusable to us now or undesirable to us now and putting it in this new format, and then the training of personnel, and our constituent base to use the system is a significant portion. The out-year portion is to bring in other departments of the modules. We talked about the DPW linkage. There's also an absolute linkage with the planning department here to do TDR analysis, TDR mapping, so that data's out there and available to builders and residents when they try to build something new. So that's kind of the breakdown, but we don't have a detailed price list now because this is very much in the planning stage.

**LEG. STERN:**

Sure. Are you familiar with other municipalities and the systems that they have in place? And without going into any specific one for obvious reasons, but this is not necessarily all brand new.

I'm sure you've had some experience in speaking with your colleagues, whether they be local or across the country and the systems that they utilize and how they utilize them.

**MR. PAUL:**

Yes. Just recently -- I'll mention two examples -- Los Angeles County bought a COTS environment for its entire environmental health environment, and Miami-Dade County also did. So this is not a standard in-house capability that most governments maintain. This is specialized to industry norms, and that's the direction two major municipalities went. They did not build; they bought.

**LEG. STERN:**

And I heard and appreciate your comments about the level of expertise that's required, and we don't presently have that in-house nor is it likely that we're going to obtain that expertise in the near future, and I appreciate those comments. Could you tell me if there was a desire to go in that direction and bring that type of expertise in-house, would that be, even if you had someone, even if you had a few people who were on the board who possess those qualifications, is that a one-person spot; is that two people; is that three people; how many of those potential professionals that we could possibly hire would it take to -- with all those qualifications, how many of them would we need?

**MR. DALY:**

Well, the idea of it would be that they would reside in IT. To give you an example, I currently had a staff member that I had to recruit from Governor, New York, which is about two hours north of Syracuse. I was fortunate enough to recruit him and bring him downstate, and he's worked out tremendously well. He had those talents that I spoke of earlier. To find these people, we can. We just have to look a little bit, you know, wider and broader for those people. I believe they're out there. Could we bring them in under the current pay salaries? That's another question I would have to look at, but if it were to be known that we're hiring or looking to hire these people, I think that, you know, there would be an handful of people required more in IT because of what I said earlier: the growing demand from all departments. I'm supporting applications right now, geospatial web applications from numerous departments that include real property, police, DPW, planning; the list goes on. I could certainly use more of these people; there's no question about it.

As Doug stated earlier, we have to gauge these requests for applications on a need-by-need basis and see whether or not we can accommodate that. It's my opinion that we be able to accommodate more of these types of applications should we have those people on staff with those types of talents. That's not to say we can't find them. We just have to look a little bit broader, maybe outside of the state even if we had to, but I'm confident we could find them. I'm not so confident that we could offer the salaries that they'd be looking for because these are people, like I said, with specialized skills. They have skillsets that are in high demand. We know of contract agencies or consultants that pick these bright people out, and they hire them, pay them the better salaries, and then they contract with the municipalities to use those talents and skills back to the municipality. That's what I have seen. So we can do it, but we just have to commit to it is my belief.

**LEG. STERN:**

Notwithstanding the pressures from within IT and elsewhere throughout the county, and I appreciate all of those comments and Doug's comments as well, but how many people -- how many professionals with these types of highly specialized skills would it take, if we were to do it in-house, to implement this specific project?

**MR. DALY:**

Well, first, as Barry mentioned, we would have to get the plans set up. That's critical to the success of this project. There's a business model. There's a data model that's key to this. The data model basically just stipulates on how all the different data that's going to be required in all these applications are going to be arranged, where they will sit, and all the rules associated with them.

That's really what you're paying for too; that's a big chunk of the expense because you have to go in and you have to find out where all this data is, reorganize it, get it set in an environment that's going to work in an enterprise fashion. That's a big crux to this project.

Once we get that accomplished and then all those rules with all the data in place such that they can be used across multiple platforms and applications, then we have to look at supporting that going forward. The short answer to that right now is we really can't tell until we get that data model and that business process in place. Then we'll be able to ascertain whether or not we need three or four of those people or 10 of those people.

**LEG. STERN:**

So at this point, difficult to say without an actual plan in place on how to proceed.

**MR. PAUL:**

It's definitely not one.

**LEG. STERN:**

Well, that's my question.

**MR. PAUL:**

To agree with Jim, it's 5 to 10.

**LEG. STERN:**

That's 5 to 10 for implementation of this specific project along with all of things that you would want this system to provide going forward.

**MR. DALY:**

Yes, but also remember this: When they come to work for IT, they'll also be able to be leveraged across many other different applications and requests for support, specifically geospatial support. When we hire these people, we're not just hiring them for health, and I'd ask that you keep that in mind because these people can be used in many different ways for specifically --

**LEG. STERN:**

Well, I'm mindful of that, but that goes to BRO's argument, really, is for doing it in-house. If you can find people with the qualifications, you're going to need them for ongoing support purposes, not just to implement this specific but ongoing, and that tends to be what BRO is saying.

*(The following was taken by Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer and transcribed by Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary)*

**MR. DALY:**

I'm in agreement with BRO that we need programmers. There's no question about that, but the initial setup of this project, the understanding, the analysis of what needs to be done here, these are skills that are -- we actually have professional GIS analysts that come in and interpret what's being done and interpret what's being done on a paper-based process, if you will, and again, the wastewater application is a great example of that. We had to interpret that whole process from a paper-based and integrate it into the GIS digital function that you see today, so yes it can be done; it's just going to require people going forward. But initially, we're going to need other people with other skillsets that we will not always need going forward after that fact.

**LEG. STERN:**

What it sounds to me like, then, is that although we're going to need personnel who have certain types of skill set at a very high level, what you're saying, for ongoing purposes. I understand that the specific purpose, specific project implementation, but it sounds like once the -- once this program is implemented and it's up and running, you're still going to need additional personnel and

there's still going to be additional personnel that have a relatively specific skill set, some kind of knowledge with this kind of software, this kind of program in mind.

**MR. DALY:**

I can tell you I'm going to need those people regardless of this project or not.

**LEG. STERN:**

That's what I'm hearing.

**MR. DALY:**

Yeah, because of the growing trend. Like I said, I'm supporting many departments, Police being one of them, Real Property another. I mean, these are big applications that require a lot of attention. We're moving into a new design here. GIS in an enterprise fashion is relatively new in Suffolk County, and with this new design and the tremendous platform that Doug's network team has put together here, we're able to move and scale faster than ever before. Setting up test environments is a lot easier now because of this. We're able to do a lot -- more better things here in IT because of what's already been built and what's in place right now. What we want to do is, you know, really harness that capability right now, and this is just another project that exemplifies that.

**LEG. STERN:**

Well, I think in looking, for me, anyway, in looking at BRO's report and analysis of this particular project, perhaps at least a cursory glance, it might have been presented as an either/or, but as we're continuing the discussion, that sounds like that's not necessarily the case. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Stern. Are there any other questions?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Just for the Office of Budget Review, can you have, like, a summary of the interest payments of people that, you know -- you know what I'm saying, right?

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes. Really, there's a couple of things here. If you don't mind a little prequel to that. So part of the purpose of what we added in terms of our review is to start a debate, okay. So by specifically saying Budget Review Office said in the review you're 100% right, but now that we're debating it, you know, there needs to be added a little meat to the bones. You know, that we can't anticipate what every question will be when we're writing a few paragraphs up.

So the idea in terms of hiring new programmers, for instance, really is generalists, not specific really high skilled people that you perhaps wouldn't want to hire full-time because they may be too expensive, and that's true with some of the engineering stuff, for instance, with DPW planning. That being said, there are still a couple of ways to do this.

Number one, there are three projects we were referring to. The other two, forgetting about the timing or the utility of it, are projects that we feel pretty strongly you could -- you could do that with generalist type computer programmers. Here, we admit that we don't have the full understanding that Jim Daly is bringing to the table here. By the way, he used to be a very good third baseman back in the day. So what we will say about that was our intent is that the database portion of that could be done by a generalist. The GIS portion I deferred to him on, if that's a much greater skill.

Now, you could do that in two ways also, however, though. Even if you're hiring a highly skilled person -- I take that back. Not hiring, but contracting for a highly skilled person, you could do that through the Operating Budget, too. You don't have to do it through the Capital Program. So that that could still be done through the Operating Budget if you -- if you choose to do that. And, you

know, we make choices on a daily basis. We could forego other things and do this. It's totally up to you on an individual basis.

Getting back to the debt service, 48.1% is the sort of rule of thumb number that we're using in calculating the total debt service on a project. So if you want you could add 50% rounding up. So a million dollar project would translate to a million-and-a-half in terms of debt service over 18 years.

So we're not necessarily disagreeing with them. We have problems with the way the County funds things and structurally kicks the can down the road.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. Thank you. That concludes, finally, this portion of the IT discussion with respect to the Capital Budget. I want to thank everyone for their appearance here today. I appreciate it very much, and we'll take all of your comments under advisement. Thank you. Welcome.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

He's not going to make it. This is like a day/night doubleheader and you guys are pitching both games.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

We can call IT back up if you like, go a couple of more rounds.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

We're okay? Well, welcome to all of you. We're discussing the recommended Capital Budget and Program for 2015-2017. At this portion of the hearing we'll address the College capital projects, those that are existing and any new projects that may be included, and I'd like to offer you an opportunity to go ahead and tell us what your reaction may be to the Budget Review Office recommendations and also the current status of each of those projects.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Mr. Chairman, if you'd like, I could just give just a brief introduction and then we can go through it project by project or answer any questions. We have a team from the College here that can address just about we think everything that you might have. We also thank you for your patience, because this is a -- I've been around for about ten years and this is really the most intense process on the Capital Budget hearings that I've witnessed in that period of time. I think everybody is to be commended for that. I think that's what the public demands and what you're doing is educational, because I listen back at the office when I'm not here and I found it very educational.

We'd like to thank the Legislature for their past support and continued support of the College capital projects. We'd like to thank the Budget Review Office for their review and overall support of our capital projects. I know yesterday Benny and Robert were asked questions about the College, about State funding, and I want to commend them and thank them for their fairness and accuracy as they answered questions of the Legislature. And also thank Legislator Anker to say can we just wait a second until the College has a chance to appear before the Capital Budget Hearings. So I thank you for that.

We are in agreement with Budget Review Office in their recommendations to restore the four projects that were deleted in the County Executive's proposed Capital Program. Those projects are the renovations to the Sagtikos Building, renovations to Kreiling Hall, Plant Operations Building on the Grant Campus and the warehouse on the Eastern Campus. We agree with Budget Review Office's recommendations to include two of our new requests, one the updated master plan and year

four of the infrastructure. By putting them in the Capital Budget we will be allowed to go up to the State and ask for matching funds.

The way the system works is that the local sponsor, which is the County, has to propose the project in their budget before we can go and ask for State aid.

We differ with Budget Review Office in terms of their recommendations to defer funding for the Renewable Energy and STEM Building. Because of your support, the County support, the project is now included in the newly adopted State budget, and this was no easy feat. When the Governor presented his budget, this was not included. The only capital projects he included for community colleges was critical infrastructure. We had to go up and advocate before the State Senate and the State Assembly. There were about a dozen projects that were left out for community colleges across the state. This was a huge one for us. It was restored in the budget and it would not have happened without your initial support.

Delaying funding to subsequent years other than 2015 would alter the support that was the basis of New York State including it in the budget. It does not demonstrate an equal and tangible commitment from the County, and that puts the associated funds at risk. This is a competitive process across the State right now, and the State is feeling the same kinds of fiscal constraints as other municipalities and they are fighting. Community colleges in different parts of the State are fighting for this funding. There isn't a five year plan anymore, it's going year to year, and if we don't show the commitment to start building in 2015, we are at risk of losing this money. And it's \$10 million. We'll talk about the project itself. The County Executive included it and we would ask you to leave it in place as it was in the original budget.

The County Executive's proposal in the capital -- deleted the four existing college projects totaled about \$12.9 million. All four of those projects were funded in the County's 2014-2016 Adopted Capital Program and are included in the current New York State budget with the requisite 50% share, which would be almost six-and-a-half million dollars. And we would lose that money if those projects are delayed.

The College requests your support for the restoration of the four existing projects and the inclusion of the two new requests, year four infrastructure money at 10.3 million, and \$500,000 for the updated master plan for capital facilities. Inclusion of the two new projects will allow us to go back to the State next year and ask them for a matching share.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Ben, those two projects, renewable energy and STEM?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

What are the capital project numbers on those, please, if you have them handy. The BRO report doesn't have a sufficient table of contents. I can't find anything.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

The four ones that we are asking to be restored that BRO has in their report is the new plant operations on the Grant Campus is CP 2144; the warehouse building for the Eastern Campus is CP 2145; infrastructure, one of the new projects, is CP 2149; and the master plan update --

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Not on there.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

There's no number on that one yet.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

This Sagtikos project, what's the capital project number?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Twenty-one eighteen.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And what's the Kreiling Hall?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Kreiling Hall is 2114.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And plant operations?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Plant operations is at 2144.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. I apologize for interrupting. I can't find anything.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I also would like to thank the representative of Labor that were here today to speak out on behalf of the Capital Program and the College program. The College, when they do a project, there are PLA agreements, union scale is paid. I mean, these are well paid jobs for well-trained individuals, and it has a tremendous impact economically by creating jobs, investing in the infrastructure of the County. The nice thing about it is that we also get -- it's 50 cents on the dollar, so whatever -- the County owns the buildings when they're done, the State contributes half the cost, and we have a building that can be used for generations of students and residents of Suffolk County going forward, which is, in this economy, is -- it would be almost criminal to be able to pass up that kind of revenue from the State, especially after we had to fight so hard to get it.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. So let's start with the four projects that you're requesting restoration, which is Sagtikos, Kreiling, plant operations and warehouse. Right? And those four projects have been zeroed out in the recommended budget?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

They were, but the County Executive has expressed support for the Capital Program and he has been putting projects in that the College has requested. There'll be two more that will be before the Education Committee on Tuesday. That would leave only two left.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I'm sorry, Ben. I got interrupted. Can you please just repeat that?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Sure. We expect that we would have, you know, after discussions with the County Exec's Office, that we will have -- there will be support for the Capital Program going forward. And he's demonstrated that by putting in projects that we had scheduled for 2014. The biggest one was the Health and Wellness Facility in the Eastern Campus, which you -- we were grateful that you supported and appropriated the construction money. So we'll be having a groundbreaking, a very joyous groundbreaking in September on that. So I expect the County Executive will be supportive of these projects even though he didn't put them in.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. So the Sagtikos building is on the Grant Campus. It's a renovation. This has been in the Capital Budget in the past.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And it has been supported by the Legislature in the past. And just give us a quick status on that project.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, it's going to be before -- the design money will be before the -- has been laid on the table before the Education Committee and hopefully up for a vote at the Legislature at the June third meeting. And, Jon, you just want to give a description?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

Absolutely. Good morning. This renovates the space that will be vacated when the new Learning Resource Center is completed on the Grant Campus. We've reviewed that space with the various stakeholders, the Grant Campus, and that space will be utilized for much needed science and graphic arts space. Particularly some of the campus is excited about is the addition of another chemistry lab, because they're really overwhelmed with demands in that area. So this will be an academic renovation of an existing space, primarily in the sciences and arts.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Now, do you agree about with the reprogramming of funding as recommended by BRO?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

BRO has added the project back in, but has delayed the construction funding until 2016.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

That's correct.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

We'd like to see it in 2015 as requested with the design funding. Assuming the design funding is adopted this year, that allows us to continue development of the RFP, get it on the street, hire a consultant this year. We estimate between a nine and 12 month design period, which would put us in line to start to bid for construction in '15. Given that we have to line-up the appropriating resolution and go through the process in that year, it's to our benefit to have those funds ready to go in that year.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Well, what the Budget Office says is that based on the estimated completion date of the Learning Resource Center, the funding should be moved back to 2016. So -- but you would expect to appropriate this funding in -- a year before, in 2015?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

That's correct. The LRC is tracking for the second half of 2015 for completion. But once that happens, the space in the Sagtikos Building would be emptied. The time to start construction is immediately following that. If it's moved --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

That wouldn't be construction, though. I mean, that would be construction, but you'd have to go first through the whole design phase and all of that.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

Correct, but we plan on starting that this year.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I'm sorry? You're starting that this year?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

I see. Okay. Legislator Stern, do you have a question?

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you. The -- I see that the 50% has been approved by the State on this particular project, but I also see in BRO's notes that ultimately that we receive it on what is quoted here as a first come, first serve basis. So if the funding is approved for 2015, my question to you would be at what point do we either make the request and/or receive approval and actual funding from New York State in that interim? How does that process go and what is the time period on it?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

It's a similar process to what's done at the County level. Is in the State's budget much like it is in the County's budget here. To get those funds, quote unquote, appropriated, and they would look at that as to get financing applications approved, you need to show that local sponsor support is either existing or in a budget year. So by example using this project, if we demonstrate to the State with an adopted program that 2015 being the budget year for this cycle maintains construction for the Sagtikos project, we can, in fact, use that program as proof of local sponsor support and get financing for the project the year before. They have extended us that courtesy just given the track record of when Suffolk County says you have support, you have support. Normally, they would require a full appropriating resolution before we got to the financing stage, but they have in the past extended us that courtesy, again, because of the track record of support.

**LEG. STERN:**

I guess this question goes for this particular project as well as any other. When we see the notation here that the 50% New York State has been approved for a particular project, that that is something regardless of the timing, and we appreciate those courtesies being extended from a timing perspective, but when they say they're committed, they're committed. And once we commit, whether it is through our budget process or an appropriating resolution if the courtesy is extended, that that is indeed something that we can count on.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

Yes, it is. Those projects and this project in particular is in the State budget, yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. Thank you, Legislator Stern. Moving to the next, very briefly, the Ammerman Campus renovation of Kreiling Hall. This has already gone through the design phase?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

The RFP for that is underway. Programming for that has been established, again, as an academic renovation.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

We're devoid of classroom space on the Ammerman Campus, we need more, so that's primarily going to be traditional classroom space.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

And the -- I'm sorry, the 300,000 that's been appropriated, that was this year and that was for design?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

The \$300,000 is for design. I believe it was appropriated back in 2011. However, the construction funding had been delayed a few times since 2011 with -- it had been scheduled in 2015. Again, given the design window for a renovation of this size, a year is more than adequate. So to hire a consultant now lines the project up for construction as it was funded in last year's adopted program.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. And the Budget Office agrees with your request.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Legislator Stern?

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The indication here from BRO is that this is a project that is particularly vulnerable to a rescission of State aid, because it has been a project that has been delayed so frequently. So, I guess, let me ask the reverse of my prior question. State aid has been approved here; because there has been delay after delay, perhaps there is a rescission that is possible. At what point would we receive some type of notice from the State as to whether or not that would truly be the case?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

So you are correct in regards to Kreiling, that project's been around a while. And because of its delays, at least in the construction phase, the money was at risk of being lost. What we did as a, sort of a preemptive strike, if you will, is requested it again as a new appropriation in I believe it was last year's State budget. And we got it, which then took money that was, as you suggest, old and made it new because we were worried about losing it. So we were very happy to have obtained it in a recent budget. That said, it is still the Kreiling Hall renovation. The State's been aware of the project for a while. The title has not changed. They realize it's been around a while, so we still consider it a risky project to delay.

**LEG. STERN:**

It does not necessarily start the clock over, all over again for our purposes.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

I think we'd have to ask the State that specific question.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Based on my discussions with Jon, once the County and, you know, the reasons that the Kreiling was re-appropriated is because it fell out of or was removed from the County's plan. So once you push projects beyond the initial year that you -- we told the State that the money was included or, you know, better even yet is the appropriating resolution, but once you push it out too far it sends a message that there's an absence of sponsor commitment.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So again, I'm looking at the reports, and it looks like in it, it says "justification, maintain safe use of a facility," so what type of shape is this building in? Because, again, our highest priority, of course, is the safety of the building.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

Kreiling Hall has a lot of tradition, and by that I mean it's quite old. I believe it was constructed in the early 1930's. It has had renovations, by that I mean if some system critically fails in the middle of a semester, we obviously have to fix it. It needs a new roof. The building envelope is failing, so there are water leaks not only through the roof but through the sides of the building. The HVAC system is quite dated and inefficient. One of the benefits not only of the renovation will be improved use of the building, but energy efficient use of the building, because we'll be modernizing those systems. Of all the buildings we currently have, again, this one is in need of a serious renovation.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. Thank you. And the next two, plan operations, 2144, and warehouse, 2145, are addressed in the Budget Review report, and the requested amounts from the College on both of those projects match the BRO recommendation, and you're asking for restoration of both of those projects as well. Are either one of those moving forward in the sense of design or any appropriations yet?

**MR. DEMAIO:**

The Eastern Campus warehouse funds have been appropriated. Design of an RFP, programming of the warehouse, locating the building, the utilities, has already begun. We expect that to go out shortly.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**MR. DEMAIO:**

And in so far as Plant Operation Buildings, Grant Campus, that resolution is -- has been forwarded. I believe it also goes to committee next week and would come for a full vote on June third.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. So let's take a look at the projects that the Budget Review Office now is recommending to defer funding on. I think, Ben, you had mentioned Renewable Energy and the STEM Building?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

The STEM Building is the very centerpiece of our Capital Program. I mean, it is --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

What's the project number on that?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Twenty-one forty-one.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

This was the one that we have letters of support from just about everyone on Long Island, from the

President of Stony Brook University to Brookhaven National Lab, Legislator Anker, the Presiding Officer, the Deputy Presiding Officer, the former Presiding Officer and Deputy Presiding Officer, Kevin Law, Stuart Rabinowitz. I mean, we have about 40 letters of support, and it has -- it has been a pet project and a model for the State. We would be working with Stony Brook if the project is done. It will be training our students to go out into the fields now which require this kind of training. And as many of you are familiar, the Jobs Linkage Program at the College has done an outstanding job of placing individuals who are from the College into the business community, working with the business community.

*(The following was transcribed by Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer, and transcribed by Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary)*

And John Lombardo is here to talk about how this STEM program will benefit our residents and taxpayers going forward, if you'd like to hear. John? And why we don't think it should be delayed, to put this out.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Well, if I'm correct, the Budget Office is really not disagreeing with the benefits of the center. It's really all about dollars and cents and a concern about the debt that is presently existing and coming down the line with respect to the College. So it's more of a financial analysis from the Budget Office.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

And I understand that. And, look, we're very supportive of Budget Review putting back projects that had been taken out, and so we're grateful for that. But this one is a -- this was very hard to get State funding this year.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Well, it's included in the State's five year program?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

It was State's this year's Capital Program. I don't know about going forward. It was not in the Governor's original budget, even though he talked about giving out numerous STEM scholarships to SUNY students.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

There was a tremendous move for STEM research and education. But we had -- the State Senate, Senator LaValle has written a letter of support and it was included. And he was -- he supported it on the Senate side. It was put in. Then we had to go back to the Assembly side and they eventually did put it in, so it's there now.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Well, just so it's clear, if we went with the BRO recommendation, and deferred funding on this, how would that affect the State and their view of this project or their funding of this project or commitment to this project?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I think they'll look at it and wonder how strong the commitment is for the local sponsor, the County. And there are other community colleges and other State Legislators who would love to see, you know, \$9.75 million go to projects in their community. As I said, it's competitive.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. So the Budget Office is recommending to really defer it all to subsequent years but for the 900,000 -- 900,000 is in this year.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Right, which you approved it at the last General Meeting.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. And the two thousand -- last year's budget the Legislature did approve the funding for 2015, so you're just seeking to restore it back to where it was.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Where the County Executive has put it in his proposed Capital Budget.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right, which is same as what was adopted.

**LEG. ZWIRN:**

And your demonstration of support and the letters of support that we have from the Legislature as well and local leaders was the reason we were able to get it into the State budget to be funded.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. And, Dr. Lipp, can you give us an explanation or elaborate a little bit on your concern with respect to the debt, the projects, the prioritization and the funding -- the service of that debt out of the Operating Budget.

**MR. LIPP:**

Sure. So basically the general theme of the review, big picture looking at it, is that we need to take a step back and look at all our priorities. We're not looking specifically at the college, but we're questioning everything. You know, all economic development, you know, roads, anything. Computers we spoke about earlier today. And we're observing that we're actually incurring costs that are beyond our means. Does this project have merit? Absolutely. Are there a lot of people out there that are supporting it? Absolutely. Are those people paying for it? Absolutely not. We are. So we have to ask the question what can we afford. And we even state literally in our review that we're frustrated because we're even recommending increases.

That being said, we're observing that the College budget is likely to result in -- a Capital Program likely to result in increasing debt service costs to the County over the next few years --

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right, and we sit in October and have those discussions -- October, September, with the Operating Budget, with respect to crafting the Operating Budget, and we see the severe impacts we are having on the Operating Budget with respect to debt service and a lot of other things that go into that. So your review with the Capital Budget, and with these projects in particular, has to take in mind what's the impact when with get into the fall and start looking at our Operating Budget.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes. So it's not meant to be a disagreement. It's sort of like making you stop and look and say we have a lot of expenses here, it's not clear how we're paying for it. You know, when -- what choices do you make, okay? Maybe this is more laudable than other choices, but the bottom line is we don't seem to have the fund.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

But isn't it also the fact that if we put these funds back to where they are requested and recommended by the County Executive, we would still -- can make that decision on an appropriating

resolution basis.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes. Of course, if you're going to put it in the adopted program you're implicitly saying that you're, in all -- very, very, very high probability that you're going to authorize it next year.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. All right.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

All I can add, Mr. Chairman, is that, you know, when the College has a -- when the County invests in the College Capital Program, it comes back to pay big dividends. I mean, we look at the Grant Campus and the Field House that we have there, this year it's hosting a jobs exposition this week that will take up the entire Field House. We have the International Badminton Tournament coming in July, which is going to generate hundreds of thousands of dollars of economic development and revenue to the County. We use the facilities not just for college, but for the entire community. And many Legislators don't know how the constituents make use of it and how the College is a partner. And these are assets of the County.

Sometimes I say there is good debt and bad debt. These are investments in the infrastructure and the future education and jobs development for the people who live and pay taxes in this County. There is no, in my opinion, of course I'm maybe biased, but I don't think there's any better investment that you can make than in education and these particular projects. I don't mean to be presumptuous.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Yeah, I tend to agree with you and the STEM Center is certainly one of them. We've had at length hearings about it and the benefits and aware of all the support for it, and I think we all agree as to the benefits, but I think it is important also to just, you know, take a look at --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

-- what is the impact, because then when we sit in the fall and look at the Operating Budget and we realize that even with projections, you know, things are not rosy. So we have to just be mindful of that. But I would certainly not be adverse to putting this project back in.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I have, having sat on the other side and a member of the Legislature in the past, I know during tough economic times, maybe not as tough as these, but they were pretty bad in the early 90's. It not an easy job that you have.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Right. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We talk worthwhile investments, like anything else, and particularly around here these days we have to also consider the cost benefit analysis and whether or not at the end of the day an investment was a wise one. The way you do that is by being able to quantify the results, and when we're talking the infrastructure here to serve an important purpose, and I'm well aware of the support. The support is important, the support is widespread, and I am one of those supporters.

My question to you is does the College have, and I'm sure it's premature, but have you at least started to have the conversation about how you're best going to be able to quantify the success of our students coming out of this particular program that's offered, the programs that are going to be offered within the infrastructure that we're making the investment in, how are you going to be able to quantify that going forward so that we can see -- we can see the results.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I'd ask John Lombardo to talk about but it's a good question that you ask, and quite frankly, we just had meetings with Middle States, an evaluation, who wanted to find out how the College sounds like it's very successful, but how do you quantify the success. And I can't say much more than that, but I'm smiling. So we'll let John talk about the STEM building.

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

We do have systems and procedures in place to track jobs data and job placement. This particular building is really a center for innovation and technology. It will be meeting the needs of a vibrantly growing pharmaceutical industry. It will also be -- we have anchor projects that -- with companies that will be instituted and implemented in this building for energy efficiency, for studying the use of supplements to air-conditioning to reduce air-conditioning costs by 27%. These projects will be in this building and the student environment, the learning environment, will be integrated into the research and development. That is unprecedented at a community college level, that the heating, ventilation, air-conditioning, the projects under the Power Grant, these trained individuals will be working hand and hand with industry to develop products that provide energy efficiency, and then go out in the field with experience at the College to work in this environment. So it's totally integrated.

**LEG. STERN:**

It is much needed, it is innovative. My hope, and I'm sure my colleagues would agree with me, my request is that how we track job placement and the success of our students on having gone through the programs and making use of the infrastructure that we as a County are making an investment in, that that be as important and as innovative going forward.

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

We are currently involved through some REDC funding from the State in partnership with Stony Brook, Suffolk County Community College and the DAPT in a data tracking program over the next year that will be used exactly for this reason. Not just in manufacturing, but job related placement in energy and other fields that run through our training programs.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

John, before you sit down, I just also wanted to, again, ask you about the component of what we're going to provide for Long Island relating to STEM. You know, we have Stony Brook, we have high level educational institutions that are producing engineers and physicists and, you know, mathematical geniuses. And then we're going to take that -- take those minds and place them in a business. We're missing a component of, I think, what the STEM Center will do with Suffolk Community College. In other words, we need those people to fill in, you know, to create those manufacturing jobs, to be there for the manufacturing jobs.

Can you talk a little bit about how the STEM Center will fill that void that we have here on Long Island? And again, this is part of the brain drain, because if we're educating these kids, they're leaving Long Island. We're trying to get jobs here, you know, companies here, they don't have the

workforce. From what I understand, that's what you're focusing on through your Workforce Development Center?

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

We've been focussing on job retention and workplace efficiencies for a long, long time. What the addition of this building does is it takes the scientific environment, create -- that students create projects and programs in a scientific environment, STEM environment, if you will, but immediately have the opportunity for product development through our 3D labs and our infrastructure labs to test the manufacture ability of those products.

If you attend one STEM graduation, and you see the projects that these students complete on oak tag and take that environment and enable it within a 3D printer and prototyping environment, there's no telling how many products we can develop. The brain drain, if you will, and I hate that word, this minimizes or eliminates it because it provides industry with leading projects to be globally competitive. That'll keep our students on Long Island.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And as far as with this component missing, I would think it might create a vacuum of people leaving Long Island or companies going to other states looking for that specific component of, you know, that part that fills in their business and creates that -- those jobs that they need. Because, again, if we don't have that, the whole system will collapse. We can produce the best physicist, the best engineers, but unless we turn those minds into manufacturing, into jobs, Long Island is not going to survive, you know, as an economic base with manufacturing.

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

You made an investment as a Legislative group years ago in the Workforce Develop Training Academy that the premise was we need this to fill the skill gaps. Well, we've done that. Grumman is leaving and is gone, and yet our manufacturing industry has survived by diversification into other product lines. And the companies that are here that don't get the notoriety are the ones that are making investments in educational opportunities within the company.

Most recently, a huge company by the airport that I can't mention, is running a job fair June 9th, which I will invite you when I have the details, which is investing in training within the company to keep those workers here, to subsidize their education and their movement within the career ladder. Many more companies like that exist on Long Island right now. We only hear about the ones that are leaving, and over the last 30 years we've lost companies and gained companies. So I would dispute the fact. We need this because it's the future in an emerging technology environment.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you. All right. And Kara, please go ahead. Legislator Hahn. I apologize.

**LEG. HAHN:**

John, I'm excited by all that you do there. Your program is phenomenal. You know, I've also been hoping that the College will recognize and replicate it in the software development side of things. Recently Newsday had in the Sunday Business -- Saturday or Sunday Business section talked about jobs on Long Island and growing jobs on Long Island and one of the areas were software developers. And they talked about companies that were paying folks \$25,000 to relocate here to Suffolk County because we don't have the skilled workforce in software coding and etcetera. And I think there's a real -- there's a real need in that area that we can retrain. You know, a company needs "X" number of CAD developers or "X" number of folks certified in a certain software. And it fits right into that whole STEM Center idea, and I'm hoping that -- I know I've been in talks with the Community College on Two Plus Two Programs and other articulation agreements with Stony Brook University in

this area, but I really think getting a plan together, maybe at the STEM Center building and maybe at another building that we can start planning now, but --

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

Just to address that for a moment. The entry level requirement for IT departments within this region is a Bachelor's at a minimum, a Masters preferred. We, in this case, provide an Associate's Degree that is the foundation. We have had discussions with Legislator Kennedy about reaching out and providing internships within the County IT Department and those discussions are moving forward. But bear in mind that the requirements, and there are requirements regionally, for companies in the IT area, they are going to prefer Masters Degrees and they will pay a \$25,000 stipend to bring them here.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes, and --

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

But developmentally we need to know they really don't want entry level. Like in manufacturing and other areas they'll take an entry level student in machining or welding or manufacturing processes and bring them in and train them to bring them up to the next skill level and pay for future education. I have not personally seen that within the County in terms company IT needs.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes, and the four year degree is paying \$87,000 a year. That's a much better wage than a lot of things we've been paying IDA thing, you know, benefits for. We need to be training our Associate's level students in these programs and making sure that they fit and we can continue them on so there's a pipeline of folks skilled in the software development field. And if there are folks who need to come back for newer level, you know, the technology is changing every three months, you know, of what the latest, greatest program is out there, we may -- there's certainly a need. I've talked to CEO's of companies on -- in Suffolk County. There's certainly a need for different types of training in that field. And there are -- there's even private sector training that's popping up because of such a need that there is. Anyways, I'm excited about the STEM Center and I look forward to supporting it, continue to support it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

One last piece with this group.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

John, you've talked about all of the great things that you're doing with workforce training, the benefits that we can have with STEM. Maybe you did speak about this piece, I apologize, I was outside in the front. If not, a subset to that is your specific focus with working our returning vets.

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And I would imagine that the skills that they bring from their time in the military help to mesh or meld with the academic curriculum you can work them through and they should be moving pretty successfully into our workforce.

**MR. LOMBARDO:**

Well, I mean, our President certainly has a major commitment throughout all three campuses to focus on support of returning military and has recently appointed a college level individual to be in

charge of coordinating the three campuses. And we offer our programs both in a non-credit and a credit application for returning military and work with them in support of their post 9/11 GI Bill.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you. I have a question, and this is more for Gail and perhaps Ben. It's a little bit more of just a general overlook of what we're doing here with the College, and this has nothing to do with the STEM Center, which I think is a fabulous project, or anything the College does. You have a great institution. When I have high school kids that are graduating that tell me that they're going to the community college, and they usually say it with a little bit of a huff, and I say no, that's a really good choice to take, it's a very smart choice to take, I often tell them.

But it's more of just the amount that we're looking at here. I mean, we're talking about a big dollar figure for '15. I did some quick math and it looks like we're looking at around \$40 million worth of construction projects requested from the College. I know that breaks down to only 20 million in County spending, but it's still a pretty substantial amount of money, especially coming on the back of building a library and building a science building, and now we are in the middle of building a gymnasium. We are building a lot of stuff at the College and we're spending a lot of money there.

In just looking at Budget Review's analysis, if we did all these projects you're requesting in 2015, we're coming out to be around \$1.5 million in that first year of payments. That could reduce tuition if we were to apply that to the Operating Budget and instead apply it to the College's tuition rates in our contribution towards your operating end of things. It could reduce tuition for a lot of students by a pretty substantial amount and make it even more affordable to them to even attend the College in the first place.

And I guess what I'm getting at here is, the question is it's clear that the Administration has decided \$20 million in '15 is just more than we can afford and so he's chosen certain projects to pull out of there. Budget Review seems to really be echoing what the Administration is saying. Twenty million dollars is just more than we can afford in one year. They've just changed the dynamic in terms of what projects should be moving forward or are more important than others. But it seems like they're both saying the same exact thing. It's a lot of money to spend in one year on the back of everything else we've already spent.

And so the question to you is, is if we, the Legislature, are feeling the same way, do you have recommendations in terms of what projects you really do feel are more important than others to move forward with, or are you saying no, we don't care that all of the budget people are saying this is more than we can afford, we want you to spend the money anyway.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, I think the County Executive will be supportive of these projects if they're put back. The STEM and renewable energy project he had in his --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I don't think the County Executive feels any differently than we do about the projects and that they're good projects. I think he's -- what he's saying is we can't afford them.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, it's a dangerous slope because we have -- part of the problem is that the Health and Wellness facility in the Eastern Campus and the Learning Resource Center there was kicked down the road by

a previous administration. Not the Legislature, but the previous administration. These were planned to go in a more timely manner, but got pushed back and now they're ready. The campuses are pretty much built out. There's not much room left. There's some room on the Grant Campus, but by and large the Eastern Campus is in the Pine Barrens, so they are done for the most part. We have to go to the Pine Barrens Commission to get anything built there. I don't think we're going back any time in the near future, if ever again, because we are built within the perimeter road there. On the Selden Campus, we are pretty much built out. I mean, we renovate buildings from time to time, but there's no room. There's 60 acres adjacent to the College there and maybe the County will give some of that land to the College. We've asked for it.

But at the present time, these project are timely. We have gotten the support. I'm going to give it to Gail in a second. But I understand. As I said, I understand the situation that you face, but I think these projects are so important that such a big investment in the County and its young people and, you know, the non-traditional students that we take care of at the College as well, returning veterans. I think these are really -- as I say, there's good debt and there's some stuff that you don't really get much bang for your buck. Here you get enormous bang for your buck, not just in one year, but for a generation going forward. But let me ask Gail to speak to the finances.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

The only thing I would add is that your \$42 million total is actually 21.5 million in terms of County. Remember, the State is sharing the cost and sharing the debt services.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No, I understand that. And it's still 1.5 million if we did all of these in cost to the County upfront according to Budget Review's numbers, give or take. I did some quick, you know, common core math.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

All right. Are there any other questions? We do have a late request going back to the public portion. Richard O'Kane. Richard, come on up. You have to stay there. Don't go anywhere.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I have a two second question.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Yes, go ahead.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All I read about and all I hear about, and my wife is a school teacher, she teaches kindergarten. There used to be 400 kids in the entering kindergarten class. Now there's 200 kids. I'm reading articles here online about how all the population's going down, down, down, okay. So there's going to be a lot -- no matter how you look at it, the pool of people coming to Suffolk is drastically reducing. So I don't want to see us building all this stuff and then they are sitting here empty in five years because it's in half.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

If I might. You have people who have already gone through high school, it's not the high schools. We have, you know, the average age is much higher than your normal, you know, going to a four year school. You had the largest graduating class in the history of the college. Over 4,000 students graduated at the last commencement. I mean, they're coming -- we have students -- the new member of the Board of Trustees from the student den is from Nassau County. You've got a STEM building like this, you are going to be pulling people in from other parts --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm not talking about the STEM building in particular. I'm talking about all --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

But I'm just saying. But this kind of facility, you are saying that we're going to have --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

You hit the nail on the head. It was the largest class. Maybe you'll get one more and then what's going to happen. It's going to start going down because the high schools are putting out a third and a half as many people as they were. It's just a matter of -- it's just a numbers game. It doesn't take a brain surgeon to figure out that enrollment's going to go down, because if enrollment's going down in all the high schools, they're mostly fed by the high schools here, it's going to go down. I realize that's going to happen.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I think it's cyclical. Just anecdotally, when I lived in Nassau County, we closed a school in our school district. We closed an elementary school. Five years later, we built a new one. I mean, just saying. I mean, there's -- we didn't have the students, then we got the students.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Where I went in Commack they tore down my elementary school, they tore down my junior high school, and now they're closing more. So it's not -- it's not going to go up. It's going to go down. It's a mathematical equation. I'm reading online all these surveys all about Long Island schools, out of 126, 95 of them or something are going down in enrollment, substantially. So that's something you got to think about, that five years from now or ten years from now, when you guys are retired, the school's empty or, you know, a third full. Something to think about.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Okay. We'll save that debate for another day. We have been going quite some time here. Thank you, Legislator Trotta. I'm sorry, was -- yes, Richard.

**MR. O'KANE:**

I apologize for being late.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

That's okay.

**MR. O'KANE:**

I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I'll be brief. I'm sure you heard a lot of what I'm going to say.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**MR. O'KANE:**

I'm the President of the Nassau/Suffolk Building Trades and we have an almost 60,000 member strong organization. I heard them talking about bringing in and paying people \$25,000 to come here because we don't have the facilities to educate. Well, that's simply my point why I'm here. Suffolk Community College has 26,000 enrollment, with the largest in New York State, as I understand, and the largest campus. I'd like to see that number at 52,000, because we are losing people in droves. I just became aware today at a meeting that since 2000, since the Year 2000 we've lost 30,000 people. This past year we lost 1500 construction jobs, and the reason is that people are coming here, are doing our work and whatever.

But we don't -- we would like to see the budget stay intact regarding Suffolk County Community College. I drove past there the other day and it was amazing at 7:00 in the morning to see the parking lot full. And we want to pursue the buildings. Dr. McKay is interested in bringing in new technologies and being available to train people to be able to do these new jobs that require

training. It's a great idea, and if you cut these building or, you know, we're in the process of doing the Life Science Building right now. We have a partnership with Suffolk County Community College, and it's working and we need to have these jobs as well because then we'll only be losing more people.

We can provide any aspect of building that you need and are more than capable of doing it. There's people that come here and do the construction and they're not licensed, they don't have certificates or anything like that, but that's not the point. We want these buildings to be built. Our members need the work, and the reason why they need it is that they are still suffering from Hurricane Sandy. And we want to see the County grow by having more students come in here to take advantage of a fine institution and make it grow and be a name by which all others are measured. And it's just simple.

And waiting three more years to produce these buildings that will provide the technology is not a smart idea. We want the people to stay here today because they'll be leaving pretty quick, you know, graduating and no place to go. We got to provide the buildings and the jobs and the technologies that will allow them to do that. So I am imploring you to not cut the money out of the budget that would help to provide these jobs. We don't want to lose the State aid, either. That's a big boost and that -- it will pay dividends, I think, if, you know, keep this budget intact. So thank you very much for giving me the time. I really do appreciate it. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Not a problem. Thank you for coming down. Appreciate it. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think there's any further business before this joint committee on our Capital Budget this morning. I want to thank everyone for their patience and their cooperation and participation, and we are adjourned. Thank you.

*(\*The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m. \*)*