

**PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN ROOM 318
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512**

Members: Chairwoman Nacerino, Legislators Jonke & Montgomery

Tuesday

November 19, 2019

The meeting was called to order at 10:00PM by Chairwoman Nacerino who requested that Legislator Jonke lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call Legislators Jonke, Montgomery and Chairwoman Nacerino were present.

Item #3 - Approval/ Personnel Committee Meeting Minutes/ September 14, & October 15, 2019

Chairwoman Nacerino stated the minutes were accepted as submitted.

Item #4 - Discussion/ 2020 Budget Request: Proposed - Reclass to Deputy Sheriff Sergeant Position/ Chairwoman Nacerino

Chairwoman Nacerino stated the funding for the reclass to Deputy Sheriff Sergeant Position, during the budget process, was placed in the Sub-Contingency budget line. She stated during the Personnel Budget meeting, two (2) Legislators were absent. She stated additionally there have been some questions raised and there is some trepidation on the part of some of the Legislators regarding moving forward with this request without having the full scope and fiscal impact of the position. She stated she emailed Undersheriff Corrigan on October 17, 2019 on behalf of a colleague questioning if there would be a backfill of the Deputy position, should the promotion be adopted into the 2020 budget. She stated Undersheriff Corrigan replied via email on October 17, 2019. She read his response into the record: "If you are referring to the upgrade of the deputy sheriff position to sergeant in the Youth Aid Bureau, the answer is no. The original request was to upgrade a deputy we already have and not to add another deputy to replace him or her, once they get promoted. To be clear, we are not adding another deputy." She explained that she is appreciative for that clarification, because that was not clear in the original request. She questioned if the proposed new position would have a vehicle. She stated if there would be a vehicle involved, then what is the fiscal impact of the vehicle. She stated that would be in addition to the \$17,000 that the Legislature is looking to approve which is the associated cost of the requested upgraded position. She stated if there is a vehicle attached to this proposed position the Legislature would be considering approving the expenditure for a vehicle as well. She stated there are questions from her colleagues regarding the impact to the School Districts. She questioned if the School Districts been apprised. She stated the School Districts start to prepare their budgets right after the holiday season and their fiscal year begins July 1st. She stated also the question has been presented, since Putnam Valley has decided not to move forward with a Special Patrol Officer (SPO), how crucial is this promotion request, since there has only been an increase of one (1) SPO for the Town of Carmel. She stated when the request came in from the Town of Carmel, it was stated by the Sheriff's Department, that it would not

change the dynamics of oversight in any way. She stated these are just some of the questions that have been asked by my colleagues and myself as we seek to move forward with this request.

Sheriff Langley stated the answer to whether there will be a need to fill a position as a result of the requested upgrade is no. He stated it is only an upgrade. He explained a Deputy would be upgraded to a Sergeant.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated what is not clear is whether the person who is tentatively going to move into this proposed position is currently a School Resource Officer (SRO) who would be receiving a title change or is an employee being taken from the Youth Aid Bureau.

Sheriff Langley stated the candidate to receive the promotion and fill the proposed Sergeant Position needs to be a candidate from the Civil Service List. He stated they will follow the Civil Service Law and Procedure in selecting the candidate.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated she is very familiar with the Civil Service Law and process. She clarified a Deputy will be potentially promoted to the Sergeant position. She stated the question is who fills the position of the Deputy that becomes vacant by this move.

Sheriff Langley stated it will not be back filled. He clarified that the Youth Aid Bureau includes all of the SROs and SPOs. He stated currently there is a Deputy in the Youth Aid Bureau, if that Deputy is not reachable on the Civil Service List, that Deputy will fill the position of the Deputy who does earn the proposed Sergeant Position.

Legislator Montgomery stated that someone will come out of their SRO position to fill the proposed Sergeant Position.

Sheriff Langley stated the Deputy he is referring to who is in the Youth Aid Bureau is not an SRO.

Chairwoman Nacerino questioned the Deputy being referred to currently is assigned to work the Senior Lunches. She questioned who would take over that responsibility if the proposed Sergeant position gets approved.

Sheriff Langley stated the new Sergeant would be tasked with that responsibility.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated that a Sergeant would be paid to go to Senior Luncheons the way that the County is currently paying a Deputy to go to the Senior Luncheons.

Captain Tompkins stated what the Sheriff is stating is that the new Sergeant would be tasked with that responsibility. He stated it may be another member of the Youth Aid Bureau who would be asked to cover the Senior Luncheon or a member from Patrol. He stated if the Sergeant is the only one available, then the Sergeant would provide the coverage. He stated the Community Officer Position will be filled by the new Sergeant. He stated currently the Deputy referenced earlier, is in the position of Community Officer. He stated that position will become

the Sergeant position. He stated the duties of the Community Officer will be either re-deployed to another Deputy in the Youth Aid Bureau or another Deputy from Patrol.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated she sees that additional overtime will be incurred with this proposal. She stated if a Deputy from Road Patrol is pulled to provide coverage then there will be overtime incurred to fill the Road Patrol shift. She stated it has been said there will be no new hires in 2020. She stated that she sees a gap with this proposal that may incur additional overtime. She stated there needs to be clarity on all aspects and that is what the Legislature is trying to ascertain.

Captain Tompkins stated to be clear, it could incur overtime, it traditionally should not, but it could, it depends on the staffing level on the particular day.

Legislator Sullivan stated he is still not clear on what is being requested to be done. He stated the proposal is to make a Deputy position a Sergeant position. He stated so the Deputy position will not be filled.

Sheriff Langley stated that is correct.

Legislator Sullivan stated, as Legislator Nacerino mentioned originally the reason for this request for a Sergeant was in response to an increase in SPOs. He stated that was driving the need for the Sergeant's position. He stated but as it turned out the Town of Carmel is the only municipality that moved forward in 2019 with two (2) part-time SPOs. He stated he is trying to figure out the need for the Sergeant.

Captain Tompkins stated the need arose a while ago. He stated currently one (1) Sergeant is responsible for 10 - SROs , one (1) - Youth and Community Deputy, 13 - SPOs deployed to the schools, two (2) - SPOs deployed to the Carmel Town Hall, three (3) - County SPOs and one (1) - SPO at the County's Department of Motor Vehicle Office (DMV).

Legislator Sullivan stated technically the Town of Carmel SPOs is equal to one (1) employee because the two (2) SPOs only work 4 hours a day. He stated he would like to know the total full-time equivalent.

Captain Tompkins clarified the count for the SPOs: 13 – SPOs in the Schools 1 – SPO in Town of Carmel 3- SPOs in the County and 1 – SPO at the DMV.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated the SPOs assigned to the County are pretty self-efficient.

Sheriff Langley stated that is correct, however supervision is required, otherwise it is a liability to the County.

Captain Tompkins stated the design is to manage the SPOs in the Schools. He stated the 13 SPOs and 10 SROs that are deployed to the Schools are who this proposal is designed for.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated she has mentioned before that she worked in the Schools and she saw first hand that the SROs have full command of the building and they do not need hand holding or babysitting.

She stated with that said, what is the oversight needed by the requested Sergeant Position. She stated the average teacher has 30 students in a class. She stated after the budget meetings some of her colleagues have some trepidation and concerns of whether or not this is something that is really desperately needed. She stated that is why they are back discussing this matter again.

Captain Tompkins stated it has been a problem and they have rolled with the punches, but they are at the point now where they do need the supervision because of the sheer numbers, the span of control that a Supervisor usually has is generally five (5) or six (6) subordinates. He stated they have well exceeded that. He stated as an example, in Dutchess County they have 10 SROs with one (1) Lieutenant and one (1) Sergeant responsible for them. He stated Westchester County has six (6) SROs and they have two (2) Sergeants responsible for them. He stated those are the only ones he has off the top of his head.

Chairwoman Nacerino questioned if the Sergeants in Westchester are solely responsible for the six (6) SROs.

Captain Tompkins stated the management of the SROs would be a large part of their duties. He stated the Putnam County Sheriff's Department do a fabulous job with the coverage in our schools. He stated he is attending a class currently in Dutchess County and to hear what other Counties are facing in the schools, highlights to him the great job that is being done in Putnam County. He stated that we are well ahead of the curve and we need to continue to do that. He stated in the perfect world he would like to maintain the Deputy position in the Youth Aid Bureau and have the Sergeant position. He stated but they are trying to do the best they can while making sacrifices. He stated this is the best solution they have come up with. He stated they want to develop an emergency response plan. He stated it is currently being done in the Brewster School District, he stated that there are five (5) other School Districts they would like to deploy the emergency response plan to so they can get on board.

Legislator Jonke questioned if this new position will include a take home vehicle.

Captain Tompkins stated that is at the discretion of the Sheriff. He stated for the record, typically, a supervisor does have a take home vehicle.

Legislator Jonke stated his daughter attends the George Fisher Middle School and the SRO, Deputy Johnson is assigned to that school and he does a tremendous job.

Legislator Nacerino stated all of the SROs she worked with over the years and the people involved have all done a great job. She stated they all have such command and control and they are so proactive in everything that they do. She stated they do not need to be checked on every day, they are very well equipped and good at what they do. She stated when looking at this proposed position, what constitutes this job description. She stated this requested position has a very specific purpose.

Sheriff Langley stated if the current Sergeant, who manages the entire Youth Aid Bureau, is out on vacation, personal day, etc. that is a challenge. He stated there needs to be a Supervisor who can be dedicated to that position.

Legislator Nacerino questioned what has been done in the past years to address that.

Sheriff Langley stated this need has been present for a long time. He stated it has not been properly addressed. He stated they want to assure that there is proper supervision for the division. He stated proper supervision would reduce liability to the County.

Legislator Nacerino questioned again when the current Sergeant of the Youth Aid Bureau is out, who fills in.

Sheriff Langley stated whatever Sergeant who happens to be working provides the coverage. He stated, but the Sergeant filling in does not fulfill all of duties that need to be fulfilled in that division. He stated the Sergeant providing the coverage also has his/her responsibilities in the supervision of the Patrol Division.

Legislator Montgomery stated she has understood all of this issues presented by the Sheriff's Department from the very beginning, when this request came to the Legislature. She stated she completely advocates for this. She stated 28 SROs/SPOs to one (1) Supervisor is not capable of providing the support to the SROs/SPOs that they need. She stated the job they do is very difficult. She stated she does not believe there will be any babysitting or watching over of the SROs/SPOs. She stated her three (3) children have gone through the school system and she knows how stressful it is. She stated she has understood this request from when it was first presented. She supports the need presented and has from the beginning. She is disappointed that this request is still going on. She stated the SROs/SPOs need support. She stated they are much more than a Police Officer in a school. She stated they serve in so many capacities at the schools and attend many of the school events. She stated she finds it unfair that they do not have the supervisory capacity to have the support that they need.

Legislator Nacerino stated she whole heartedly agrees with everything that Legislator Montgomery said. She stated but we, as Legislators, are doing our due diligence in the consideration of this request. She stated some of the Legislators have stated they have questions they want answered before consideration is given to this request. She stated that is why we are all here tonight.

Legislator Jonke stated that he wanted to respond to comments made by Legislator Montgomery. He stated this has been going on a lot longer than this past year. He stated about a year ago at the Protective Services meeting, when the SPO was approved that would be assigned to the Town of Carmel, a discussion ensued, which maybe there was some confusion at the time, he was under the impression that there would not be a need for more supervision. He stated he is in favor of this program, but to say this topic has been being discussed since Legislator Montgomery joined the Legislature is not accurate, there is more to this matter than what was revealed and discussed in 2019.

Legislator Montgomery stated that she is even more disappointed that it is not done.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated the question was asked in 2018 at the Protective Services meeting if the increase of the SPO to the Town of Carmel would result in any additional expense to the County or a change in personnel and the answer was no. She stated that is the discussion Legislator Jonke is referencing.

Legislator Montgomery stated that seems common in every department. She stated the Legislature recently approved an added position to the County's recently formed Tourism Department. She stated for some reason public safety is in question.

Legislator Sullivan requested clarification that the person taking the new proposed Sergeant position will be coming from Road Patrol.

Captain Tompkins stated that question cannot be answered at this time, because the position would be filled with one (1) of the top three (3) candidates from the test list.

Legislator Sullivan stated if the candidate is a Deputy from the Road Patrol, then there would be a vacant position in the Road Patrol which would need to be filled.

Sheriff Langley stated if a Deputy from Road Patrol is promoted to the Sergeant position in the Youth Aid Bureau, the vacancy would be filled with the Deputy who is currently in the Youth Aid Bureau.

Legislator Sullivan stated he would like to revisit the point Legislator Jonke brought up regarding whether there would be a take home vehicle connected to this proposed position. He stated the cost of the vehicle would be in addition to the increase in the salary of the proposed Sergeant position. He stated that the approximate cost for a vehicle would be \$12,000 - \$15,000. He stated there is no mention of a vehicle. He requested confirmation if it would be a part of this request.

Personnel Director Eldridge stated that he believes since the other Sergeants in the Department have a take home vehicle, a grievance would need to be submitted.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated the total fiscal consideration of this request changes. She stated the Legislature needs to be apprised of that.

Sheriff Langley stated that there is a liability being left wide open because of the lack of supervision.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated that the Legislature needs to be clear on what is being requested for approval. She stated we need to be clear of the full scope of the fiscal impact that will be considered for approval. She stated that is why this discussion is occurring. She stated we are not debating the legitimacy of the request. She questioned if the Schools have been apprised and is there any impact to their budgets.

Captain Tompkins stated the schools have not and there would be no impact to their budgets. He stated there has not been any discussion, and it is probably a discussion he should have with Commissioner of Finance Carlin, if the approval is granted, he would discuss if the administrative costs could be absorbed by the Schools.

Chairwoman Nacerino requested that Commissioner Carlin speak to that proposal.

Commissioner Carlin stated that the same administrative charge of \$4,000 per officer has been in place since the program started and it has never been increased. He stated it is a policy decision that needs to be decided by the Legislature Board, the Sheriff and the Schools.

Legislator Gouldman questioned what is the national recommendation of how many Officers a Supervisor should have reporting to them.

Captain Tompkins stated the guru on the Supervision of Police Personnel, author Nathan Iannone, recommends six (6) – seven (7) subordinates to one (1) Supervisor.

Legislator Castellano stated he wants to understand the financials a little better. He stated now he understands whoever gets the promotion a Deputy from the Youth Aid Bureau will be transferred to the position that becomes vacant. He understands the School Districts cover some of the administrative costs. He questioned if there a risk that an SRO would be taken from a school.

Sheriff Langley stated there is not a risk of that. He stated the Deputy who is in the Youth Aid Bureau if he is not the one who gets the promotion will fill the vacancy wherever it is of the Deputy who does get the promotion.

Fiscal Manager Kristin Van Tassel stated she would like to provide some clarification to clear up some of the confusion. She stated most of the people assigned to the Youth Aid Bureau are assigned to Schools as SROs. She stated there is a Deputy in the Youth Aid Bureau who is not assigned to a school contractually that is the position that will be able to shuffle.

Commissioner Carlin stated for the record when a new SRO is moved in the contract needs be recalculated with the salary and benefits of the newly assigned Deputy. He stated he would prefer that an SRO serve the year, which is June 30th. He stated also if the Administrative Charges are going to be revisited it would be in the contract for the 7/1/19 through 6/30/2020 year. He stated it would be best for the County to decide by February who will be filling the promotion, because that is when the Schools work on their budgets.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated that she believes that is an important time frame to stick to, February. She believes the County should afford them the courtesy and time to make the adjustments in their budgets.

Legislator Sullivan stated the take home vehicle is of concern to him. He stated that there are a lot of take home cars, which is a point of concern and has been discussed with the Sheriff. He stated adding another on now is mind blowing. He questioned what is the purpose, just because

someone becomes a Sergeant. He stated for him it is a deal killer. He stated at vehicle being a part of the proposal was never brought up. He stated given the little bit of man power increase that occurred with the SPOs he does not see this request as being a necessary position.

Legislator Sayegh stated she appreciates the conversation that has occurred and the fact that they are all in one room discussing it and understanding one another. She stated the transparency, transaction and addressing other issues is exactly what many of the Legislators wanted. She stated the Legislators need to know exactly where the money is going to go. She stated she appreciates the SROs. She stated that her children have attended the Mahopac High School and she knows the SROs and they are amazing. She stated she believes it is a fantastic program. She stated she is thankful Sheriff Langley and Captain Tompkins came back to revisit this issue in an effort to create a clear and mutual understanding of where we are both coming from.

Legislator Addonizio stated at the last meeting she did support this request and she still supports it. She stated that she believes there is definitely a need for this position. She stated that the Legislature did not have all of the facts the last time and she believes that was the problem.

Legislator Albano stated the concept sounds right, he can see supporting the request. He stated the concern is the Legislature is looking for ways to save money. He stated he believes that can be accomplished by making changes in other areas, as an example rather than have a Deputy at the Legislature Meetings have an SPO assigned to them.

Sheriff Langley stated for clarification, there is no overtime incurred with the Deputies that are at the Full Legislature meeting. He explained a member from Road Patrol has it assigned as part of their shift.

Captain Tompkins stated that he agrees with Legislator Albano and believes there are areas where they can identify savings. He stated in his opinion this request is not the area to look for a savings.

Legislator Montgomery requested clarification, when can this matter be moved.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated it was on the evening's agenda as a discussion item, in order to shed clarity on the outstanding questions that were brought forward to her as Chair of the Personnel Committee. She stated at the budget meeting, she stated that she would support this request. She stated when there were some concerns and questions raised she believed it was necessary to have this dialogue. She stated it is not a debate of will, it is about understanding what the Legislature is being asked to vote on. She stated again she hopes the Sheriff and the members of his department respect the work that the Legislators have to do.

Legislator Montgomery stated then this will be at the December Personnel meeting.

Commissioner Carlin stated no action can be taken on this matter until 2020. He stated the 2020 budget cannot be amended until the fiscal year of 2020 begins.

Legislator Nacerino stated the money is in sub – contingency, but as Commissioner Carlin stated no action can be taken until 2020.

Legislator Addonizio requested that the Schools be contacted and discuss a potential increase to their Administrative costs.

Chairwoman Nacerino requested that she be notified of the outcome to that meeting. She stated the outcome to that meeting will have a direct effect on the costs that the County will be responsible for with this request.

Captain Tompkins stated he is confused.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated the money is in the 2020 sub-contingency budget line. She stated it was approved out of the Personnel Committee Budget Meeting. She stated however there were two (2) Legislators absent, there were questions, and the Legislators wanted to weigh in on the matter. She stated the purpose of tonight’s discussion was to get full clarity of the situation. She stated as Commissioner Carlin stated we cannot alter the 2020 budget in 2019. She stated no action can be taken until 2020. She stated the vote presented in 2020 would be to take the money out of sub-contingency.

Item #5 - Approval/ Local Law Establishing the 2020 Salary of Certain Elected Officials Serving For Fixed Terms

Legislator Montgomery stated that it is unfortunate that all of these salaries are lumped together. She stated she does not approve of some of the increases. She stated for that reason she will not vote in favor of this local law, and the same applies for agenda Item #6. She stated that she understands it is part of the Municipal Home Rule Law. She repeated her reason for not voting in favor of agenda item#5 & #6, she supports the raises of only some of the employees on the list. She stated that she hopes when it comes time to revising the County Charter this will be changed. She stated she does not agree to have elected officials lumped in with the County Employees.

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to approve Local Law Establishing the 2020 Salary of certain Elected Officials Serving For Fixed Terms; Seconded by Legislator Jonke.

One Nay – Legislator Montgomery
Motion Passes

Item #6 - Approval/ Local Law Establishing the 2020 Salaries of Certain Appointed Officers Serving for Fixed Terms

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to waive the rules and accept the additional; Seconded by Legislator Jonke. All in favor.

Legislator Montgomery stated for the reason stated during the discussion of agenda item #5 and reasons described during the budget process, she will not be voting in support of this local law.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated for clarity there was a 2.5% increase across the board for every non-union personnel.

Legislator Montgomery stated she understands that. She stated as she understands the County Executive was elected at an anticipated compensation amount. She stated nothing has changed, the performance has not changed. She stated in fact she has an entire folder of unanswered memos. She stated she is being stonewalled. She stated a raise is based on performance and a cost of living. She has action items she has sent to the County Executive that are not being answered, they are being ignored. She continued to explain her position on this matter.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated Legislator Montgomery has every right to her opinion. She stated that the barometer for approval is the voters of Putnam County.

Legislator Montgomery stated per the reasons she mentioned during the budget process, work has been eliminated from the responsibilities of one of the employees on this list of “Appointed Officers” and an approval to increase the employee’s salary makes no sense to her. She stated that she believes some of the salaries are inflated in relation to the size of Putnam County in relation to surrounding counties. She stated to decrease the workload and increase the salary she cannot support that. She stated while we are trying to hire people who do boots on the ground work for the people to keep the residents safe.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated again Legislator Montgomery has the prerogative to feel the way she does and to express her opinion, but she does not believe there are many people who would agree with her rationale.

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to approve Local Law Establishing the 2020 Salaries of Certain Appointed Officers Serving for Fixed Terms; Seconded by Legislator Jonke.
One Nay – Legislator Montgomery
Motion Passes

Item #7 - Approval/ 2020 Salaries for Officers and Employees Paid from County Funds

Legislator Montgomery requested again that there be a way to separate these via the County Charter, she would like that to be considered. She stated this is not a reflection of the hard working employees it is more about her opinion of the imbalance of work done by the different employees of the County. She stated this mass list approach does not allow her as a Legislator to approve the salaries she does support. She stated she will have to vote no.

Legislator Castellano stated Legislator Montgomery can address her opinion on salaries of individual employees during the budget process.

Legislator Montgomery stated she did address this during the budget process and she is explaining her position again tonight, because she is placing a vote.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated she does not believe the work done by Putnam County’s Executive or Commissioner of Health should be disparaged, this is a yes or no vote.

Legislator Montgomery stated this is not a yes or no vote. She stated this is a representative democracy and the people have a right to know why she is voting the way she is. She stated this is not personal and requested that Chairwoman Nacerino not make it personal. She stated she is voting no based on the performance she has seen.

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to approve Local Law Establishing the 2020 Salaries for Officers and Employees Paid from County Funds; Seconded by Legislator Jonke.
One Nay – Legislator Montgomery
Motion Passes

Item #8 - Approval/ Financial Disclosure List For the Year 2020 Filing Recommended by the Putnam County Personnel Director Pursuant To Code Section 55-7/ Personnel Director Eldridge

Chairwoman Nacerino confirmed with Personnel Director Eldridge that this is the annual list that gets approved each year, and there have not been any revisions and or edits that need to be discussed.

Personnel Director Eldridge stated that is correct.

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to approve the Financial Disclosure List For the Year 2020 Filing Recommended by the Putnam County Personnel Director Pursuant To Code Section 55-7; Seconded by Legislator Montgomery. All in favor.

Item #9 - Approval/ Fund Transfer (19T365)/ Cover overages in Overtime Canine Stipend and Temporary Budget Lines/ Sheriff Langley (also reviewed at Protective Svcs. 11/19/19 Mtg.)

Chairwoman Nacerino stated this matter was discussed earlier this evening and supported by the Protective Services Committee.

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to approve Fund Transfer (19T365)/ Cover overages in Overtime Canine Stipend and Temporary Budget Lines; Seconded by Legislator Jonke. All in favor.

Item #10 - Discussion/ Approval - Memorializing Resolution “911 Saves Act” - Reclassify Public Safety Telecommunicators From: Office and Administrative Support Occupations To: Protective Service Occupations/ Legislator Montgomery (also reviewed at Protective Svcs. 11/19/19 Mtg.)

Chairwoman Nacerino stated this matter was discussed earlier this evening and supported by the Protective Services Committee. She stated it is a positive overture to send our New York State Elected Officials documentation that shows Putnam County’s support of this initiative.

Legislator Montgomery stated she would like to thank Cindy Jacobsen for all of her work on this. She stated additionally she would like to thank all of the dispatchers.

Legislator Jonke stated he would like to thank Bureau of Emergency Services Commissioner Ken Clair for working with him on this, to make sure these folks are recognized for the work they do.

Chairwoman Nacerino stated she too would like to thank Commissioner Clair, who was on top of this for several months now.

Chairwoman Nacerino made a motion to approve the Memorializing Resolution “911 Saves Act” - Reclassify Public Safety Telecommunicators From: Office and Administrative Support Occupations To: Protective Service Occupations; Seconded by Legislator Jonke. All in favor.

Item #11 - FYI/ 2019 Accident Report – Duly Noted

Item #12 - Other Business- None

Item #13 - Adjournment

There being no further business at 10:55 PM Chairman Nacerino made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Jonke. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Deputy Clerk Diane Trabulsy.