

Government Review & Efficiency Committee Minutes
April 1, 2021 - 4:00 pm.

Present: Chairman Matt Veitch; Committee Members Eric Connolly, Tara N. Gaston, Joe Grasso, Jean Raymond, Jon Schopf; Supervisor Bill Peck; Steve Bulger, County Administrator; Mike Hartnett, County Attorney; Eileen Bennett, IT; Andrew Jarosh, Treasurer.

Chairman Veitch called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

On a motion by Mr. Connolly, seconded by Mr. Grasso the minutes of the March 4, 2021 meeting were approved unanimously.

Subcommittee Updates

Ethics Code

Mr. Veitch said that Mr. Harnett had sent information about the current County Ethics Code. There are two boards set up: the Ethics Advisory Council and the Board of Ethics. There may not be a need for both and he is putting together a proposal for the subcommittee to review.

Records Management

Ms. Raymond reported a tour of the records storage area did occur. Mr. Bulger provided copies of pictures and details of the area that Ms. Raymond had asked the County Historian to take. This area is in need of security, organization and oversight. Mr. Grasso questioned whether this is the correct place to house these records. Ms. Raymond suggested contacting neighboring counties to see how they handle record storage and perhaps tour their facilities.

Budget

Mr. Schopf said he had gotten information from Mr. Bulger but had not had the opportunity to review it. He said he would get the ball rolling on that.

County Organizational Chart

Mr. Veitch said everyone had received the organizational charts. The first chart is the administrative organizational chart. The elected officials should be on the chart but off to the side and not under the administration. Elected officials don't necessarily have to report through the same structure. The second chart is the committee structure. The way it is set up looks like the department's report to the committees. They do in a sense that departments bring their items to the respective committee. Mr. Hartnett said the way it had been relayed to him was the chart showed the flow of resolution requests. Mr. Grasso said when he first looked at the charts he had many questions. He kept going back to them and each time he did he understood them better. He thinks the org charts are workflow more than hierarchy of authority is. He thought the amount of committees seemed excessive and thought consolidated some or making them subcommittees of other committees could be suggested. Ms. Gaston agreed the County should have fewer, tighter and subject oriented committees. Mr. Veitch said it is the charge of the Government Review & Efficiency Committee to review the Rules of the Board. The committees are listed in the Rules so this is something that can be discussed later in the year.

Petty Cash Policy

Mr. Jarosh said the County did not have a petty cash policy even though many departments use it. He did bring this to the Human Resources & Insurance Committee who did support this. The policy he proposed is all accounts would be under the Treasurer's Office. Each department would receive a debit card and pin. This will give the departments the ability to make purchases online or the department head could go to the ATM to receive cash. Departments do need cash on hand for things such as cab fare. This policy gives the Treasurer more oversight to

the spending. He will report at least once a year to Law & Finance. **On a motion by Ms. Gaston, seconded by Mr. Connolly, the policy was accepted as presented to this committee.**

Local Laws

Mr. Veitch said he has been reviewing the local laws. He is up to the 1990's. The committee had discussed last month using a company to accumulate the codes. Mr. Hartnett reached out to E-Code to obtain a quote. The quote was \$5,390 to \$6,485. This would bring the codification of local laws current. Ms. Gaston asked if the committee could receive a copy of the quote. Mr. Hartnett said he would forward it.

County Suggestion Box

Mr. Hartnett said Attorney Hugh Burke, who was the FOIL expert of sorts, took the opportunity to run down research of whether submission to the suggestion box would be subject to FOIL. Mr. Hartnett said as far as they could find no directly applicable cases. It would be a case of first impression. The materials that would be submitted would likely fall in to two categories, those being signed and those being anonymous. This is an important distinction because signed suggestions could potentially qualify under an exception to FOIL which is intra agency. Intra agency is communication exchange between workers who identities are exempted for the purposes of formulating final policy decisions. The other category, which could potentially not be exempt from FOIL, are anonymous suggestions. This may be a case-by-case basis. If a suggestion is truly anonymous it is likely those documents or suggestions would be subject to FOIL. Mr. Veitch asked about intra agency. If a comment was sent naming a person but not signed would that be foilable. Mr. Hartnett said to qualify for intra agency it would require both ends of the conversation be identified. Mr. Hartnett said another consideration is who would be the arbiter of this. He thinks whomever is going to be in receipt of the suggestions need to have certain training on how to handle them. Mr. Veitch said this will require more research and discussions.

On a motion by Ms. Raymond, seconded by Mr. Connolly, the meeting was unanimously adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Wright
Clerk of the Board