

**AUDIT & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN
ROOM #318 OF THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512**

Members: Chairman Castellano, Legislators Gouldman & Sayegh

Monday **6:30pm** **February 24, 2020**

The meeting was called to order at 6:32p.m. by Chairman Castellano who requested that Legislator Addonizio lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call Legislator Sayegh and Chairman Castellano were present. Legislator Gouldman was absent. Chairman Castellano stated Legislator Addonizio would sit on the Committee in Legislator Gouldman's absence.

Item #3 - Approval of Minutes – January 23, 2020

The minutes were approved as submitted.

Item #4 - Correspondence/County Auditor
a. Sales Tax Report

Chairman Castellano stated the sales tax report for January 2020 is the highest it has been in over 10 years.

- b. Board In Revenue Report – Duly Noted**
- c. Transfer/Revenue Report – Duly Noted**
- d. 2019 Contingency/Sub-Contingency Report – Duly Noted**
- e. 2020 Contingency/Sub-Contingency Report – Duly Noted**

Item #5 - Correspondence/Commissioner of Finance
a. Overtime/Temporary Report

Commissioner of Finance William Carlin stated new columns have been added to show the percentage of overtime used prorated on a monthly basis.

Legislator Sullivan requested an explanation of each column.

Commissioner Carlin stated the columns show the original and revised budgets. He stated the actual budget column shows the amount to date. He stated the distributed column is based on payroll. He stated the table then shows the amount available and the percentage used.

Legislator Sayegh clarified that the 2020 percentage shown is year to date. She stated Highway-Administration has already used 33% of their annual budget.

Commissioner Carlin stated that is correct. He stated if a department needs additional revenue for overtime, they are required to come before the Legislature to submit the request and explain why it is needed. He stated the request could be approved, or if it is not approved the department will need to adjust the way they operate.

Chairman Castellano stated the table also shows the Department of Social Services – Family First Transit has used 52% of their overtime budget.

Commissioner Carlin stated that is part of a grant and their budget, which was originally \$0, will be modified by that grant.

Legislator Addonizio questioned what the total amount of the grant was.

Commissioner Carlin stated it was \$3,800 and he believes they have another grant that will adjust it further.

Legislator Sullivan requested further clarification on the “Org Description” column.

Commissioner Carlin stated that column shows the department from the uniform chart of accounts through MUNIS.

Legislator Sullivan questioned what the Sheriff-Youth line is used for.

Commissioner Carlin stated that line covers Youth Officers and SROs (School Resource Officers). He stated SPOs (Special Patrol Officers) are included in this budget line as well, however they do not get overtime.

Legislator Nacerino clarified that the distributed budget is the amount that has been spent thus far.

Commissioner Carlin stated that is correct, it is based on payroll periods rather than by month.

Legislator Sullivan questioned why this table does not include road patrol.

Commissioner Carlin stated the road patrol overtime has not met the percentage of overtime used to be included on the report.

Legislator Addonizio questioned what percentage needs to be used to be included on the report.

Commissioner Carlin stated once 1/12, or a month’s worth, has been used, it goes on the report.

Legislator Sayegh stated the new format of this report is very helpful.

b. Approval/ Budgetary Amendment 19A097/ Finance/ Year End Journal Entry #2

Commissioner Carlin stated they are in the process of closing the books right now. He stated these year end journal entries adjust the books to reflect actuals. He stated he anticipates having year end journal entry #3 next month, which should reflect the CSEA ratification as long as it is approved.

Chairman Castellano made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Item #6 - Discussion/ Putnam County Code Section 5.1(A)(3)/ Memorandum from Legislator Nacerino/ Fund Transfers 19T480 & 20T005A (Items #7 & #8)/ “Authorized for Legislative Consideration”

Chairman Castellano made a motion to waive the rules and accept the additional; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Legislator Nacerino stated she was taken aback when seeing the wording “Authorized for Legislative Consideration” on Fund Transfers 19T480 and 20T005A. She stated this wording has never been on these forms before, nor was it discussed beforehand. She stated it seems redundant in its intent because the County Executive would authorize a fund transfer and then the Legislature would ultimately approve or disapprove the fund transfer. She read the following portion of the memorandum she sent to County Executive Odell: “The procedure requires that the fund transfer be initiated by the Commissioner of Finance, authorized by the County Executive, and approved by the Audit & Administration Committee. There is no provision in the Code for a conditional approval by the County Executive ‘for Legislative Consideration’.” She stated a memorandum was received from the County Attorney as well with her interpretation, but it still begs the question as to why this change was made. She stated the change seems meaningless because it does not change the dynamics of the process. She stated the County Executive’s signature stands as approval, therefore she is unaware what the intent of this change was.

Commissioner Carlin stated Legislator Nacerino is correct in that it does not change the function of the process, but it came to their attention that when the County Executive authorizes the fund transfers, it may appear that she is approving or endorsing the fund transfer, which may not ultimately be the case. He stated the addition of the wording “Authorized for Legislative Consideration” was done so in an attempt to make it more clear that the signature does not represent the County Executive’s approval.

Legislator Nacerino stated she would argue that it is the County Executive’s decision to approve or disapprove a fund transfer, and if she did not approve of it she does not need to sign it.

Commissioner Carlin stated if she has not yet made her final decision, she may sign it and hear what the Legislature thinks and see what further information may come out at a Legislative Committee meeting. He stated the County Executive then has an opportunity to make a final decision when the Legislative resolution is presented to her.

County Attorney Jennifer Bumgarner stated in this case, the question arose from a fund transfer that will require a resolution by the Legislature. She stated in many instances a resolution is not required for a fund transfer, and therefore would not require signing or vetoing by the County Executive. She stated the Code states that the County Executive can authorize the fund transfer and it is then sent to the Audit & Administration Committee for consideration and if approved without requiring a resolution, it is signed by the Chairman.

Legislator Nacerino stated that has always been the process.

Commissioner Carlin stated this wording makes the County Executive's job in the process more transparent. He stated he does not want her signature to be misinterpreted as approval.

Legislator Nacerino stated she tends to disagree with that logic. She stated the Legislature only approves a fund transfer once it has been approved by the County Executive to be sent to the Legislature. She believes this process is less transparent because it does not lend the County Executive's position to anyone.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated under the section of the Code that is being referenced, the County Executive authorizes the fund transfer to be approved by the Legislature.

Legislator Nacerino stated a fund transfer cannot get to the Legislature without the County Executive's authorization.

Chairman Castellano stated after the Legislature acts on a fund transfer, it could possibly be vetoed by the County Executive, therefore the original authorization does not represent approval.

Legislator Nacerino stated the wording on the form seems meaningless because it really has not changed anything.

Commissioner Carlin stated the wording was meant to change the intent of the County Executive. He stated the same intention could have been sent in a form letter with each fund transfer that states that although the fund transfer is authorized, it is not necessarily approved. He stated they thought adding "Authorized for Legislative Consideration" directly to the fund transfer would take care of it.

Legislator Sullivan stated he was always under the impression that the County Executive's signature was an approval.

Commissioner Carlin stated that is what they intended to clear up by adding this wording.

Legislator Nacerino stated this conversation should have been had before this change was executed. She stated she was taken aback by how the change occurred without any Legislative input. She stated at the end of the day it does not mean much as the County Executive has the power to veto any resolution.

Commissioner Carlin stated he would take his share of the blame for not coming to the Legislature before the change was made. He stated none of the powers have changed, the wording was added to make the process more transparent.

Legislator Sullivan questioned if the form said “approve” before it was changed.

Commissioner Carlin stated the form said “authorize” but people took that as approval. He questioned what the best way to clearly indicate that this is a ministerial step by the County Executive.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated it is important to point out the distinction between “authorize” and “approve.” She stated if the County Executive had to approve the fund transfers before they are sent to the Legislature, she would have unilateral authority to decide what gets transferred and what does not.

Legislator Montgomery stated as she understands it, the County Executive’s authorization is not for the monetary transfer itself, but for the Commissioner of Finance to initiate the transfer.

Commissioner Carlin stated as the Chief Fiscal Officer, he answers to both the County Executive and the Legislature. He stated for example, in terms of borrowing, he answers to the Legislature. He stated he can authorize transfers between \$0-\$5,000 and they do not need to go to the County Executive, but they need to be signed by the Chairman of the Audit & Administration Committee.

Legislator Nacerino stated this conversation should have been had before the change occurred and she believes it created more confusion rather than alleviating confusion. She stated she does not believe this verbiage lends more clarity.

Chairman Castellano stated he is glad this conversation was held as it cleared up some confusion. He stated he believes the language on the fund transfer is appropriate and does not believe the Committee needs to do anything to change the form.

Legislator Nacerino stated the language has not changed the process.

Chairman Castellano questioned if the Legislature needs to approve this change.

Legislative Counsel Robert Firriolo if a distinction is going to be made between “approval” and “authorization” then all four (4) lines on the form should be made consistent. He stated currently, the form has “authorize” for the Audit & Administration Committee, although it was just discussed that the Committee approves, not authorizes.

Legislator Sullivan suggested having both “authorization” and “approve” on each line and upon signing, the individual can clarify which one the signature represents.

Legislative Counsel Firriolo stated he believes the last two (2) lines should say “approval”.

County Attorney Bumgarner suggested having a different fund transfer request form for each monetary category. She gave the example of Commissioner Carlin approving an amount between \$0-\$5,000, however if it is over that amount he is not approving it therefore neither “approve” or “authorize” would not be appropriate on that line. She stated it would depend on the specific transfer amount.

County Auditor Michele Alfano-Sharkey stated the authorization amounts are cumulative, not per fund transfer.

Commissioner Carlin stated from an administrative viewpoint, having four (4) different forms would not be ideal.

Chairman Castellano stated it seems the form as it stands is correct.

Commissioner Carlin stated he would change the last two (2) lines to “approval”.

Chairman Castellano reviewed the changes to be made to the form.

Legislator Sayegh questioned if the wording used on the form comes directly from the Code and if so, if the Code needs to be amended to reflect these changes.

Legislative Counsel Firriolo stated the terms “authorize” and “approve” are both in the Code.

Legislator Montgomery questioned if the proper word would be “appropriate”.

Legislative Counsel Firriolo stated this whole process is “appropriations”, but the mechanism is a fund transfer and the Code speaks to the approval of a fund transfer. He stated it is correct the way it is in its current form.

Legislator Nacerino stated this conversation was necessary to have, although she would have preferred to have it before these changes were implemented.

Chairman Castellano requested that the amended form be emailed to the Legislature before being implemented.

Legislator Montgomery stated suppose a fund transfer was authorized by the County Executive, initiated by Commissioner Carlin, then approved by the Legislature. She questioned if it could expire if the County Executive sits on it, as it may in Congress.

Commissioner Carlin stated if a resolution was unsigned by the County Executive, it would become law. He stated however most fund transfers do not require resolution, and those would not expire unless they lapse at the end of the year.

Chairman Castellano stated if the County Executive did not move an item forward, a department could approach the Legislature directly during the budget process to have funds for the specific purpose included in the following year's budget.

Commissioner Carlin stated that is correct.

Item #7 - Approval/ Fund Transfer 19T480/ Dept. of Social Services/ Reallocate Funds to Cover 2019 CSE & OCFS Placements (Also reviewed in Health)

Chairman Castellano made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Addonizio. All in favor.

Item #8 - Approval/ Fund Transfer 20T005A/ Sheriff's Dept./ Deputy Sheriff Upgrade to Sergeant Position in Youth Aid Bureau (Also reviewed in Personnel)

a. Update/ Sheriff's Department Notification Schedule of School Districts Participating in SRO/SPO Program/ Memorandum from Legislator Castellano to Sheriff Langley

Chairman Castellano stated the SRO/SPO program is great. He stated his kids were in elementary school when the district placed an officer in their school, which was a shock at first but as his kids got older he realized what a great program it really is. He stated the presence of an officer provides safety to the school and the students have a chance to connect with the officer and build respect for law enforcement. He stated his concern has always been if the school districts are aware what their share of the costs are. He stated school districts are currently working on their budgets and he questioned if any responses have been received from the school districts regarding this upgrade.

Captain Harry Tompkins stated he contacted the superintendents of the five (5) school districts that SROs and SPOs are currently provided to via email, which he provided the Committee a copy of.

Chairman Castellano made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Addonizio. All in favor.

Captain Tompkins stated the Sheriff's Department has a great relationship with the superintendents and they are very supportive of the program. He stated he explained what the Sheriff's Department was looking to do with this upgrade and what the position would be and all superintendents universally supported it. He stated as far as cost, the

school districts need to speak to the Board of Education, and the Board of Education would negotiate with the County Law Department to reach a contract. He stated at this time, he has not provided numbers to the school districts because he did not want to provide any inaccurate information. He stated he spoke with Commissioner Carlin and the Sheriff's Department Fiscal Manager to identify a realistic number for upcoming budget discussions.

Chairman Castellano questioned the second sergeant position. He stated it is his understanding that each school, based on the SRO, pays a \$4,700 administrative cost. He questioned if this cost goes towards the sergeant's salary.

Captain Tompkins stated the administrative costs have been a procedure that has been followed for years, prior to this Sheriff's Department administration coming into office. He stated the administrative costs currently go toward uniforms, training, and equipment. He stated with another supervisor for the program, he believes it would be best to have a separate line item for it rather than add on to the administrative costs. He stated this is something that would need to be addressed at the time of contract with the schools. He stated the best way to distribute the cost would be to base it on the number of SPOs and SROs deployed at each district. He stated for example, the cost may be higher for the Mahopac School District because they have more officers deployed to their schools and the cost would be lower for Putnam Valley School District or Haldane Central School District because they have a lower number of officers.

Chairman Castellano stated as he understands it, currently the administrative cost is \$4,700 per SRO.

Captain Tompkins stated the SPOs are billed separately and have their own contract with their own administrative costs. He stated this would be for the sergeant assigned to the schools. He explained how they arrived at \$17,962. He stated a 4th Step Deputy could become Sergeant, therefore they took the difference of the two salaries, which is \$17,962.

Chairman Castellano requested clarification on the amount of \$4,700 and \$17,962

Captain Tompkins stated \$17,962 is the difference of the reclassification to sergeant. He stated the Deputy position is being eliminated, therefore the cost of the upgrade is the difference of the salaries, which is \$17,962.

Chairman Castellano stated year to year, the salary of the SRO can increase. He questioned if this is reflected in the school district's 50% portion of the bill.

Captain Tompkins stated yes, it should be included in the contract.

Legislator Sayegh questioned if the salaries of the SROs are currently being split 50% by the school districts.

Captain Tompkins stated no, it is not currently being split 50% by the school districts.

Legislator Sayegh questioned if this position is dedicated to the schools, should the salary be split 50% with the schools, including this reclassification resulting in an additional \$17,962.

Captain Tompkins stated the SRO position is not just for the schools, they cover community events as well.

Legislator Sayegh questioned if the sergeant upgrade resulting in the \$17,962 is for just the schools.

Captain Tompkins stated yes, the sergeant would be just for the schools.

Legislator Sayegh stated she spoke with Mahopac School District Superintendent Anthony DiCarlo today and he was unaware of any additional cost. She stated Superintendent DiCarlo stated he is happy to split the cost as this is a great program, however he did not know how much that might be. She stated as Chairman Castellano stated earlier, the schools districts are currently preparing their budgets and they are unaware of what they are going to be faced with.

Captain Tompkins stated that is a fair statement. He stated he did have multiple conversations with Superintendent DiCarlo about the intention of this, however no costs were discussed because they were unknown as it needs to be negotiated in the contract.

Legislator Sullivan questioned if the position left vacant by this sergeant upgrade would be filled.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated the vacant position would not be filled, the duties of that position would be assumed by the current and new sergeant.

Legislator Nacerino questioned how to provide school districts with an estimate so they can include it in their budgets. She stated by this time of year, the budgets are mostly completed and they will be preparing to unveil them to be voted on in May. She stated in all fairness to the districts, they need some ballpark figure to be able to realistically budget.

Captain Tompkins agreed. He stated they are coming up with the best way to provide the school districts with a number because all parties involved will have a say. He stated the County is looking to have the schools burden some of this cost. He stated the number, right now, is based on the \$17,962, and would be split among all school districts based on the number of SROs they have.

Legislator Nacerino questioned when the Sheriff's Department intends to have concrete numbers to present to the school districts.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated the Sheriff's Department is working with the Finance Department to develop a schedule.

Legislator Nacerino questioned who the new sergeant will be.

Captain Tompkins stated they do not know who will be filling the position yet. He stated they are still conducting interviews.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated they need to utilize the list from Personnel, but they are unable to get the list until the budgetary is approved.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated working with the Commissioner of Finance, a spreadsheet will be created for each school district and will be sent to them, then the school district and Law Department will negotiate terms of a new contract based on the deputies assigned to their schools. She stated it is important to understand that there are executed contracts for this school year, therefore if the upgraded position goes through and begins now, the County will be paying the full cost for the remainder of the term of the contract. She stated otherwise, the County could wait to implement this upgrade until July 1st when the new contracts become effective. She stated the County could request that the schools contribute toward the cost of the upgrade before the new contracts are in effect, however the school districts are under no obligation to do so. She stated if this position is to be added without additional cost to the County, it could not be added until July 1st.

Chairman Castellano stated that makes sense.

Legislator Sullivan stated it is already the end of February and there are about three (3) more months left in the school year.

Legislator Nacerino stated there is not a candidate yet, which will take time.

Captain Tompkins stated there are plenty of candidates.

Legislator Sullivan stated he does not see any issue with waiting until July 1st.

Chairman Castellano stated the County offers the school districts two (2) SROs at 50% cost to the schools. He stated four (4) school districts have taken that offer and Brewster has requested an additional two (2) officers, one (1) that they cover for 10 months and one (1) they cover for 12 months. He questioned if it is County policy to cover 50% for the first two (2) officers.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated yes, when school shootings were becoming a big issue it was determined that the most at risk schools were the middle and high schools, therefore she believes that is how it was decided to split the cost of two (2) officers, one for each school. She stated she is not quite sure how the 50% split was determined.

Commissioner Carlin stated the SRO program began under a COPS FAST Grant where the Federal Government covered the cost with a three (3) year phase out. He stated once it was phased out, the County and school districts split the cost 50%-50%. He stated at that time there were three (3) or four (4) officers.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated he would like to follow up on Legislator Sullivan's comment regarding waiting to implement this upgrade. He stated waiting until July 1st would prolong this another four (4) months. He stated this issue has been ongoing and there is only one (1) Sergeant supervising 30 staff members in the schools. He stated the cost to the County to implement this upgrade now rather than in July would not be the full \$17,000; it would be about \$5,000-\$6,000.

Legislator Montgomery stated the point of this program all along has been public safety. She stated there is a great need for this and she believes it is incumbent on the Legislators to speak to the school districts in each area because the Legislature is the body allocating funds. She stated the Legislature does need this information, however this has been ongoing since she has been on the Legislature. She stated the main point is public safety. She stated she would vote to move this along if it goes before the Full Legislature because there is a need for it.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated another important point to make, and something the school districts will need to consider in terms of increased costs of the contract, is that she is very cautiously hopeful that before the end of this SRO contract, we may have a PBA agreement. She stated if that happens, the contracts with the school districts provide that those costs will be adjusted based upon the increased salaries as negotiated by the collective bargaining agreement. She stated therefore, once the agreement is in place the school districts will be receiving a bill from the County.

Chairman Castellano questioned if that includes retro payment.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated not necessarily for years back, but it would definitely be included for this years' adjustment.

Legislator Sayegh stated if the County renegotiates and sends the increased bill to the school districts, they could decide that the program is too costly and make the decision to cut some of their officers, which would bring down the total number being supervised.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated they have to go under the assumption that the program is going to continue. He stated the school districts have not indicated that they are interested in cutting back.

Legislator Montgomery questioned if there is a way to make the schools districts aware of what County Attorney Bumgarner has communicated.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated there is a provision in the contract with the school districts.

Commissioner Carlin stated the effect of the PBA will not be as great because the County provides an estimate so the school districts can be prepared. He stated the County would then pay the difference of what was budgeted and what the final agreement might be.

Legislator Montgomery stated she would like to understand that better so she can speak with the schools in her Legislative district. She stated when the program began there was State grant funding available, which she believes Haldane Central School District received. She questioned if this State aid is still available.

Commissioner Carlin stated he does not believe the funding is still available. He stated although he is unaware of what Haldane Central School District procured at that time, it may have been a one-time grant.

Legislator Sullivan stated in reference to Legislator Sayegh's comment, one of the things that is happening in the schools is that enrollment is decreasing and the graduating classes compared to the incoming classes are sometimes half. He questioned what happens to the officers if there is less of a need for SROs or SPOs.

Captain Tompkins stated there quite a few members that may be seeking retirement if the contract goes through. He stated it is something that would need to be accounted for.

Legislator Sullivan questioned what happens to an officer if a school district decides to reduce the number of SROs or SPOs.

Captain Tompkins stated the officer would be re-deployed within the Sheriff's Department, which has not been at full staff in quite some time. He stated just last year, Carmel added three (3) SPOs, Mahopac added two (2) SPOs, Haldane added one (1) SPO, and Brewster added one (1) SPO and one (1) SRO. He stated he is not seeing a decrease in this program.

Chairman Castellano clarified that an SRO could transition into road patrol, but an officer on road patrol cannot transition into an SRO due to the additional training required.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated that is correct.

Chairman Castellano stated so an SRO could easily go back to road patrol if necessary. He stated also, the SPO program is a great option as it is more cost effective than having an SRO.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated the SPOs not civil service protected and are part time employees.

Legislator Nacerino stated this is a great program and she does not anticipate the school districts scaling back. She questioned the timeline of this process moving forward; when the Sheriff's Department will receive the list of eligible candidates, when interviews will be conducted, and ultimately, when an individual will be named for the position.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated after the position is funded, they can request the certified list from the Personnel Department.

Legislator Nacerino questioned if this were to be approved at the March Full Legislative Meeting, if they would receive the list in March and proceed with that process.

Captain Tompkins stated yes, it would take just a few days.

Legislator Sullivan stated in terms of potentially placing an SRO back on road patrol, the County would then be paying their full salary and losing the 50% that the school district was paying.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated the Sheriff's Department currently has two (2) funded deputy positions that are vacant. He stated if a school district decided to cut back on their SROs, those officers could fill these vacant positions.

Chairman Castellano stated that may actually result in a savings because the County would no longer be paying 50% of the SRO salary.

Legislator Sayegh requested further clarification on the additional cost this upgrade would create; she questioned if it would be in addition to the \$17,962 mentioned earlier.

Captain Tompkins stated \$17,962 was the number they arrived at after calculating the difference in the salaries. He stated factoring in an additional 2% because they have been without an increase since 2016 brings it to about \$20,000.

Commissioner Carlin stated the increased cost would come out to about \$2,000 per officer.

Captain Tompkins stated the if total amount was shared among the SPOs and SROs, it would come out to about \$843 per officer.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated these are estimates only.

Chairman Castellano questioned if these amounts would be added to the administrative cost.

Captain Tompkins stated the administrative cost is a separate number. He stated the administrative cost has not increased since 2013 and will increase a few hundred dollars. He stated he believes keeping the administrative cost and the cost for this upgrade separate would be best.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated the cost could also be folded into the administrative costs, that would need to be decided.

Captain Tompkins stated he would like the costs to be kept separate.

Chairman Castellano agreed.

Legislator Sayegh clarified that these costs would be included in next year's contract. She stated the school districts could potentially decline these increases.

Captain Tompkins stated that would be done through the negotiation process.

Legislator Sullivan stated it would make sense to have the approval of the school districts before asking them to pay increased costs.

Legislator Sayegh questioned if it is feasible for the County to provide a number to the school districts in time for them to make their budget public on April 1st.

Captain Tompkins stated he does not believe it will be difficult to arrive at an actual number.

Legislator Sullivan stated if it will not be difficult to have a number, that number should be given to the school districts so the County knows if they are willing or able to pay the increased cost.

County Attorney Bumgarner stated between the Finance Department, Law Department, and Sheriff's Department, spreadsheets are developed each year when the contracts are up for renewal. She stated the Sheriff's Department would need to provide verification of specific assignments per school district to ensure the correct salaries are documented and the cost of this increase. She stated they can then take the new cost and allocate it based on the number of SROs or SPOs per district and provide those numbers to the school districts. She stated the only thing she would want to wait on until the middle or end of March is the salary because of contract negotiations.

Chairman Castellano stated the schools will be done with their budgets by then, but there must be a contingency.

Legislator Sayegh stated she is in favor of this program and the supervision is needed. She stated it is important to have full disclosure from the schools so the County knows what they are willing or unwilling to pay for.

Legislator Addonizio questioned if there is a way to find this out quickly.

Undersheriff Cheverko stated the funding for this position is budgeted in sub-contingency. He stated this has been discussed for almost a year and he would like to see this moved forward.

Chairman Castellano stated it is important to review all the information and take into consideration both the County and school district budgets. He stated he reached out to the Superintendent of Brewster Central School District and he recommended that all Legislators do the same for their local school district to make sure everyone is on the same page. He stated this is a great program that should continue. He stated this increased cost should be partially paid for the schools, and the County is doing their due diligence.

Legislator Sayegh questioned if it is possible to move this out of Committee and have a solid number by the March 5, 2020 Full Legislative Meeting so the Legislators can make an informed decision.

Legislator Nacerino stated apprising the school districts is certainly an important factor, but it should not prevent the Legislature from making a decision. She stated this has been discussed many times and all questions have been exhausted. She stated this is being belabored for the fear that the schools will decrease their number of SROs, which she believes is a far-fetched scenario. She stated school safety is paramount for everyone. She stated to not move forward with this would be foolhardy of the part of the Legislature.

Legislator Sullivan stated this has been delayed because there have been continual questions. He questioned a clear answer has not been received about a vehicle.

Legislator Nacerino stated the vehicle will be from the existing fleet, therefore there would be no fiscal impact for the vehicle.

Legislator Sullivan stated looking at the auto use policy in the Code, the position does not meet the criteria to have a vehicle. He stated it is not an emergency position and does not require a 24/7 vehicle. He stated he does not believe the actual need of the vehicle has been specifically addressed. He stated he does not have a problem with the employee utilizing a Sheriff's Department vehicle during their shift. He questioned if this position would have a 24/7 vehicle. He stated he believes this has not been fully vetted.

Captain Tompkins thanked Legislator Nacerino for her comments. He stated the Sheriff's Department has come before the Legislature many times and have answered numerous questions about this upgrade. He stated the same questions that have already been answered are being asked again. He stated to answer the question; yes, the Sergeant would be entitled to a 24/7 vehicle. He reminded the Committee that the individual who gets this position could very well be a Putnam County resident. He stated he feels as though we are back to square one and he would like to see this move forward.

Legislator Nacerino stated at the Personnel Committee Meeting Personnel Director Paul Eldridge spoke to what dictates the need for a vehicle. She stated Director Eldridge sought a second opinion and found that if the sergeants are entitled to a vehicle, this would be no different. She stated if the Legislature chooses to not have a vehicle with this position, it is something the Sheriff's Department could grieve, and they would win.

Chairman Castellano stated the matter of the vehicle is not up for discussion tonight.

Legislator Montgomery thanked the Sheriff's Department for all the information they have provided over this whole process. She stated although some questions cannot be fully answered until approvals are in place, she does not believe it is the responsibility of the Sheriff's Department to have all the answers. She stated the Legislators can collect information from their local school districts; the job of the Sheriff's Department is public safety. She stated she will be happy to move this forward.

Legislator Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Item #9 - Approval/ Fund Transfer 20T036/ Finance/ Allocate Cost of Vehicle Leasing to Approved Departments/ Enterprise Fleet Management (Also reviewed in Physical)

Chairman Castellano made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Addonizio. All in favor.

Item #10 - Approval/ Putnam County's Request to Extend the 1% Increased County Sales Tax for an Additional 3 Years

Legislator Montgomery questioned how many times the County has submitted this request.

Commissioner Carlin stated he would guess this began about 20 years ago. He stated it used to an extension for two (2) years, it was just the last time in 2017 that it was changed to three (3) years.

Legislator Montgomery questioned if the 1% is being used for anything specific.

Commissioner Carlin stated it is used for the State mandates and to balance the budget. He stated the 1% comes out to over \$16 million and is vital to the operation of the County.

Legislator Montgomery stated the County keeps doing better with sales tax and she would like to see the towns benefit from this as well.

Commissioner Carlin stated the towns benefit from this through things such as rising election costs that the County pays, in taxes guaranteed by the County, and community college costs the are paid by the County.

Chairman Castellano stated now with extended voting the costs increase even more and this year there will be multiple elections. He stated hopefully the State will grant this 1%. He stated anyone spending money within Putnam County, residents and visitors, contribute to the sales tax.

Commissioner Carlin stated without the extra sales tax, property taxes would be increased to cover the costs.

Chairman Castellano made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Item #11 - FYI/ County's Deposit & Investment Policies/ 4th Quarter Ended December 31, 2019 – Duly Noted

Item #12 - Other Business – None

Item #13 - Adjournment

There being no further business, at 7:52pm Chairman Castellano made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Assistant, Beth Green.