

# Audit Committee

## Regular Meeting Minutes

**DATE & TIME:** June 14, 2022 – 3:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656, Meeting ID 844 5521 5389  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Tracey A. Bartels, Chair  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Amber Feaster  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr. (arrived at 3:05 PM), John Gavaris, Craig Lopez, and Eve Walter; Comptroller March Gallagher; and Deputy County Executive Marc Rider  
**ABSENT:** None  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes  
**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Sam Sonnenberg, Office of the Comptroller

- Chair Bartels called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM and called the roll.

---

See transcript attached.

---

**New Business:** None

---

**Old Business:** None

---

Chair Bartels asked the members if there was any other business, and hearing none;

### Motion to Adjourn

**Motion Made By:** Legislator Ronk  
**Motion Seconded By:** Legislator Lopez  
**No. of Votes in Favor:** 5  
**No. of Votes Against:** 0

**Time:** 3:50 pm

**Respectfully submitted:** Amber Feaster  
**Minutes Approved:** August 9, 2022

# Audit Committee

## Regular Meeting Minutes

**DATE & TIME:** June 14, 2022 – 3:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Powered by Zoom Meeting by dialing 1-646-558-8656, Meeting ID 844 5521 5389  
**PRESIDING OFFICER:** Tracey A. Bartels, Chair  
**LEGISLATIVE STAFF:** Amber Feaster  
**PRESENT:** Legislators Kenneth J. Ronk, Jr. (arrived at 3:05 PM), John Gavaris, Craig Lopez, and Eve Walter; Comptroller March Gallagher; and Deputy County Executive Marc Rider  
**ABSENT:** None  
**QUORUM PRESENT:** Yes  
**OTHER ATTENDEES:** Deputy Comptroller Alicia DeMarco; Sam Sonnenberg, Office of the Comptroller

- Chair Bartels called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM and called the roll.

---

**Chair Bartels:** So I'd like to.., Thank you Amber. Call this meeting to order. It is 3:03 on Tuesday, June 14th. It's the meeting of the audit committee. Amber, would you mind taking attendance please?

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Bartels.

**Chair Bartels:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Ronk. Gavaris. Here.

**Legislator Gavaris:** Present.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Lopez.

**Legislator Lopez:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Comptroller Gallagher.

**Comptroller Gallagher:** Here.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** And Deputy Executive Rider.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay, thank you. So today we're here to discuss the compensation salary study, which is required by the Ulster County Fair Pay and Salary Equity Policy, which was established

pursuant to Resolution Number 26 of 2022. Everyone has a copy of that Resolution. We're all well versed in its requirements. Everyone also has a copy of the RFP draft compensation salary study, which just for everyone's background, and reminder, has been amended, but began off the basis of the previous RFP that went out, I don't know a couple years ago, what year was that? Do we know, Amber? Well here's Ken.

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** I believe 2019.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay, so in 2019, a compensation salary study went out and that's the basis for the draft that's before us. There have been some modifications to that draft, which I can allow Amber to walk us through, if anyone wants to. You all, you all have looked at it. What would everyone prefer to hear what the, the updates in the draft jar?

**Legislator Ronk:** I mean, I'm fine without going line by line. But if everyone else wants that, I'm fine with that, too.

**Legislator Walter:** I'm assuming it's just using the language of the resolution?

**Chair Bartels:** Yes.

**Legislator Walter:** I think I'm okay.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. All right. So, I will, I'll open the floor for discussion, in terms of, I'm sure you've all had a chance to review the draft. And just if it, would anyone, does anyone have any issues, concerns, anything they want to share with the committee as a whole? Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah, I'm sorry, if this is going to sound like a derailing. And it's, it's just my opinion, and what I've sort of been processing as a result of our last meeting, and the opinions I am expressing are those of my own. If everyone disagrees that's, I'm used to that. So, the thing that has been unusual to me is this recognition, that the task as articulated in the resolution is humongous. And, and that, and maybe I misheard, but basically, every expectation is that responses to this RFP will show it's an extraordinarily expensive endeavor, as written. And I know for myself, I had many issues with this resolution, asking repeatedly that there should be a price tag attached to it. Because I felt very uncomfortable with not having, having this resolution without it. But, so there's a couple of things I'm concerned about. One, these organizations that would respond to the RFP, like, they'll put a tremendous amount of time and energy and work into this, that they spend, like it costs them people time. And if this is something we know, in our hearts, we would never possibly be able to fund because it is so huge as it's currently written, then they're doing that all for nothing. And that kind of concerns me. The other thing that concerns me is, you know, we always hear this comment, like, well, our team could just do it. And without really asking our team if they think they could just really do it and, and so what I would like, and then the third thing that concerns me is that we have this study that's almost in our hands. And while we can acknowledge that it is not everything we want, it's quite, it's a bit hard yet to know exactly where it's missing until we really have it in our hands. So, I'm not what I would propose is a different approach where one, and I did talk to Amber about this to see how she felt about it, but I would be curious if we started by asking Amber's team to estimate what they think it would really cost, if they did it, including that there might be elements, they need to have an outside entity conduct like, like private comparisons of private salaries, they may have to, you know, sub allocate that. But if they gave us an estimate of how much it would really cost our people to do all this, I think a couple of things would be come from that. One, we would see how expensive this really is. It would certainly create the floor, not the ceiling, because anyone else would charge more than what, you know what our group would do. And it would illustrate the magnitude of this. And it would get rid of this conversation of why don't we just let our people do it when it's

written in such a broad, expansive way. The second is that I would like to see the final report from the Executive's office, knowing that there's gap and to say, So which ones would we want to put out an RFP to fill, so maybe we feel the gaps are governmental comparison so we want to do an RFP to compare these managerial jobs, but do a better cover mental comparison or better internal, you know, but, but, internal and external, governmental. Or maybe we feel like, this is great, but we want to do a private sector comparison so we want to do an RFP just for private sector comparison, which in itself will be very expensive. But I feel like I have a better ability of saying what I'd want this RFP to say, if I knew what we still needed from the other one. So, the two pieces, again, are asking our team to put down on paper, really what the person's power and costs would really be if they did it, again, knowing it's going to be way too much and two waiting for the Executive one and then coming up with what we think would fill the gaps and make that RFP happen. So, that's my proposal.

**Chair Bartels:** I'll open the floor to other members before, I, I have some thoughts, but I'll open the floor to other members first. Does anyone? Go ahead, Legislator Lopez.

**Legislator Lopez:** I guess just questions for Amber. Do you think that you have the resources or the time? And all the staff in order to do, you know, what this, what you're asking, what, what we're asking to be done? Are you able to do it? And I add to it seems like a, like a big ask on our part, and a lot of pressure to put on the staff. And yeah, I think your opinion would be valuable to know whether you think that you're, that the office can handle this.

**Chair Bartels:** Ahead, Amber?

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** Yeah, um, I mean, I, to put together something that says like what the resources would be, and what the time requirements would be, I think is something totally different from taking the project on. Taking the project on I don't think is feasible, just because like, there's so many factors, and there's so much subjectivity involved, and doing a private sector comparison within Ulster County, which is something that I heard was important to committee members, I just don't think is, we have the resources to take on. Now, if we could get a software program or subcontract for certain specific tasks, you know, I think that there are ways to approach it with some in house work, but you know, it is, it is a big task.

**Legislator Walter:** Can I just clarify. So, Legislator Lopez, I'm by no means suggesting they do it. I'm suggesting they map out how expensive and timely and costly it would be. Because I think that it will be proven, shown how extraordinarily expensive it would be knowing also that an outside agency would be even more, but I would never be asking them to do it, but just to sort of lay out how many hours and how much, you know, costs. That's all.

**Chair Bartels:** Deputy Executive Rider. I'll get to you in one second, I just want to want to add, there's a lot I want to say about what Legislator Walter says but, but I just want to add, you know, we began the discussion surrounding this resolution and this task with both the Comptroller's office and our own financial people and with that ask about doing it internally, and I have to say, you know, I'm grateful to both the Comptroller's office and our financial people in that, in both cases, both of you said, well, we'll do whatever, I'm paraphrasing, we'll do whatever we're asked, you know, we may need outside resources, we'll step up. But I think it was very clear from the start, that it's a tremendous asks for either or both small departments. There was all that anecdotal discussion about, we could do it in house and it won't cost anything. But I think we heard pretty quickly that we can't do it in house. I mean, we, we have two financial analysts. We're headed into the budget cycle, we do, all due respect, you know, I think we all know, we need both Amber and Natalie on task, headed into the budget, not, not off task doing, you know, deep into what a specialty organization does by, you know, for professions at full time, and is going to be, and we know is, and that's the thing, and I appreciate what you're saying Legislator Walter, in that, we know, it's going to be expensive, because

the, the request that went out, which was just a management request, came back in the six figures. And the study that was undertaken by the previous administration, was set to be in the six figures for just management, as I recall. I mean, it was halted. But it was it was an expensive study. Deputy Executive Rider.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** I was just looking at that, I think it was 45,000. But again,

**Chair Bartels:** Okay.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** ...with a huge caveat that was management only. I also don't know that Evergreen was really going to take on a private sector approach. I'd have to go back and look at the contract. One thing I would like to add is that a company that does this all the time, in some ways, will be cheaper or more efficient at this because they have the private sector proprietary information already in their databases, that they can just pull up, whereas internal staff are gonna have to do that and will depend on people optionally, because we can't require them to turn over salary information, we'll have to actually seek all that out. Doing it only with Ulster County might be a little bit difficult, because you're gonna, not find very many employers are size, where, you know, other than the Kingston City School District, which isn't private sector, there isn't very many employers that are 11-12-13 hundred employees. Whichever way you go, my suggestion would be to look at the resolution, while you still have time to do so because I don't think even if you were to put out an RFP next week, you're not going to get a company come back that... I thought the last time I looked at the resolution, it was required to be back by October 2nd and I just don't see how, June 14th without a, you know, an RFP out that anybody could do the study requirements that you're looking for in that amount of time.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. Does anyone else want to respond to Legislator Walter's other points? Okay, so if I may for a second, or did you want to respond to that Legislator Walter?

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah, I mean, I guess what I would say is, it might be a little less, but it's every reason to believe it's the same if not more, only because they're private, and they can pay better, it's still the same person time with the skill. So, and in my mind, Amber may very well estimate it and add three staff members, because in order to pay for it, and even though they have proprietary, they're paying for that software. And so, whether we would have to pay for that software, or we would have to have a company paid for we'd still have those same costs. So, it is not necessarily true, it'd be less.

**Chair Bartels:** So, thank you. Um, so responding to a couple, couple things. One, again, I, you know, to reiterate, I think we began this by looking internally to see if there was a feasible way to handle it internally at low or no cost to the taxpayer, as was being represented when the resolution was before us. And that pretty quickly became apparent that it was, you know, not realistic. I think, waiting to see what comes from the management portion of, that the Executive's Office is undertaking. It, it's, it's reasonable, but again, we're, we're against a certain timeline. We passed a resolution that says we have to do this within this year, which is why I'm supportive of going to the RFP because I think that depending on what comes back, it may cause more Legislators is than just us. And I know that some members of this committee, or at least at least one, I don't, Craig, I don't remember how you voted. But at least one member of this committee, I think voted no on the, on the resolution. Legislator Ronk, were you a no on the resolution?

**Legislator Ronk:** I mean, it's, it's a reasonable possibility.

**Chair Bartels:** All right.

**Legislator Ronk:** I'll have to look back. But, you know, it sounds like me.

**Chair Bartels:** Well, we definitely, we had, regardless, we had a spirited debate. And there were many of us that had, were hesitant, but, and I'll speak for myself, but I believe I voted for it, because that's where we were all going, but I remain skeptical. And now I'm now, I am concerned that what's going to come back is going to be a massive cost to the taxpayers against I'm not sure what the benefit is, but I think we're going to need that in hand to talk to the rest of the body. Because we're, we have now a policy that we have passed, and we need to, we need to take steps toward the next toward, toward a, executing. Legislator Ronk, I'll let you go first since you haven't spoken.

**Legislator Ronk:** Thanks, I just, I, I might suggest that before we put out an RFP that it's going to come back very expensive, and then possibly engage a company that is going to come back with recommendations that are conceivably very expensive, that maybe we would like to revisit the policy. Perhaps that's the first place that we go rather than, you know, like, I mean, like Legislator Walter said, I'm less, I'm less concerned than then she seems to be about the cost to these companies in responding to the RFP as I am with the cost to the county in both executing and implementing. But before we, before we do cause companies to, you know, put a lot of time and effort into that. And then, you know, potentially, you know, spend a lot of the taxpayers money on it, we should see, you know, it, A) is this the right policy and, B) are we even, as Marc said, going to be able to deliver on on, you know, what we intend to do in the first place because of timeframes? You know, I mean, how many times did we extend the Solid Waste Management Improvement Commission's, you know, I mean, that was, that was something that was, I think, a six-month deadline that was extended for two to three years. You know, I don't know, I just, you know, I think I think sometimes the best of intentions, when you're creating a policy like that can create the worst outcomes.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. Legislator Lopez, did you have your hand raised? Okay. Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah. I mean, I support the idea of changing the policy as opposed to the, engaging in a practice that we know is futile. You know, I mean, you know, it's, I think it just doesn't sit well, this idea of, of doing something that we know we're never going to want to pay for, and with the risk that it might become a problem for us to say we don't want to pay for it if we actually proceed with it. But I don't know. I, I definitely would support the idea of adjusting the policy, even if it's at this point, connecting it to or not to the Executive's study, because the policy, well, let me also ask this in terms of protocol. He, if I recall, in debate, it was this could be our people, this could be the Executive's office, this could be the Comptroller, this could be outside. So, isn't the Executive office doing it? And wouldn't that fulfill the October expectation? Because it has to be an RFP?

**Chair Bartels:** No, the Executive's office is only looking at management. The policy says we have to look at every single job line across the organization.

**Legislator Walter:** Okay.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** And we were left off. Just for the record, we were left off the resolution. It includes the financial analyst. It includes, it says in house by Legislative financial analysts, Ulster County Comptroller or contracted by a third party.

**Legislator Walter:** Then I'll take that one back, but I will return back to my, I'm totally supportive of changing the policy. I just, you know, like it doesn't, I never felt good with it. I don't think I said yes.

**Chair Bartels:** You didn't.

**Legislator Walter:** I always had an issue with it being so a, massive, and yeah, I think that...

**Chair Bartels:** So, the noes, just to interrupt, the noes were Legislator Walter and Legislator Nolan. There-, Otherwise, everyone was a yes.

**Legislator Walter:** Mark my words for future noes. I'm right.

**Chair Bartels:** Comptroller Gallagher. And then let's see where we're all at.

**Comptroller Gallagher:** So, I hate to say it, but we violate our policies all the time. You know, we're over our fund balance policy by \$54 million right now, and, you know, the investment report was late, that's a violation of policy. I'm not suggesting that that's a good idea. But I do think that if we're charging down a road where information is going to change radically, which it will, when the Executive's report comes out, there's gonna be a big chunk of information that, if was, if that was made available to people responding to the RFP, they would probably file a different response. And they probably would analyze different sets of data, and maybe even you know, not include the management portion. So, I just, you know, I urge you to wait until you have that report in hand, even if it means adopting a modification to the policy. And I can tell you right now that my office is tied up on a whole bunch of internal control stuff, and it would be very, very, very challenging. I would be right back at your doorstep begging you for consulting dollars to farm this out.

**Chair Bartels:** Can I ask Deputy Executive Rider, remind us what the, what the timeline is on the report being finalized?

**Deputy Executive Rider:** I think they are looking to have some kind of draft report that at least Ken can look at by the end of this month. And I think we said last week that we thought that it would be ready in mid-July or early August. If I could just add, so when we started the Evergreen study back in 19, I think it was and again, this was a management only study, it was \$45,000 for that. I think that study was six plus months into it and was only on gathering job duties and titles had not even started a comparison of looking at other governments, other sources. So, I think in order to do a study like this, right, you're looking at nine months plus. I think, if you were to just tweak this policy that said, instead of having it due before the budget cycle for the 23 budget, have it due before the 24 budget cycle and then actually add money in to contract for it after the RFP comes back in the 23 budget. I think that would make sense.

**Chair Bartels:** Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** I just also want to add, if we do, do any amendments, or you know, to the policy, it's also saying every five years we have to go through something.

**Chair Bartels:** Four.

**Legislator Walter:** Four. So whenever we fix now will fix for a longer term, but makes it all the more important to fix it. Because it's not just now it can, it's gonna....

**Chair Bartels:** Well, I would, I would recommend fixing that too.

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah, that's what I'm saying is that, but also if we find a better way of approaching it now, that would have long term implications as well.

**Chair Bartels:** Yeah, I mean, the every four years is something that now concerns me also. You know, in thinking about it, realistically, I just, I don't think we need an omnibus study every four

years. So, that would be something I would want to change as well. So, what does everyone, I think both Legislator Walter and Legislator Ronk have been clear where they're in, you know, what they'd like to see happen. Legislators Gavaris and Lopez, what are your thoughts? Go ahead, Legislator Gavaris.

**Legislator Gavaris:** I agree one hundred percent with Legislator Walter, this is one of those things that sounded good at the time, but without having an actual dollar amount how do you move forward? In terms of you know, our staff doing it, I think, I'll go back to something I said again a couple of years ago, is there's really four phases to this kind of study, the scoping, which is partially spelled out for us because it's in the resolution, but there's a little more fine tuning that needs to be done that would need to be done if we were gonna do this in house by the legislative financial analysts. The second part is going to do data collection. That's where having maybe additional departments help with actual data collection because it's simply just calling the private sector, calling, you know, other counties, getting the information and then you have the data analysis and then reporting and those are things that are going to be time consuming in the end, but we're never going to get it done for this year. For the budget. It's just, I don't see that happening at all. It's virtually impossible. So, I'm fine with that. I think Legislator Walter's right. We got to, just amend the requirement, that policy and maybe we get this done for 2023.

**Chair Bartels:** Legislator Lopez.

**Legislator Lopez:** Yeah, no, I agree with all that. You know, if you don't have a, if you don't have a number, then, you know, it's, it'll be an issue. I think, ultimately, if you can, you know, do that in house study, and if we could possibly piecemeal this together, you know, yeah, send an RFP out for certain things that we can't, you know, do in house and what we can do in house, I think, is probably the way to go. So, it'll be more most cost effective for the taxpayers and something that I would be comfortable, you know, going back and, you know, that explaining a situation to my, to my constituency. I think that that's probably the best way. So yeah, no, I agree with everybody.

**Chair Bartels:** And again, in terms of the directive of the policy, it's to, it's to compare like job titles across the county. So, I guess looking to see if someone in one job title is being paid more in one department than another against three neighboring counties, against the private sector. So, you know, where things are, the directive is on multi-level. Like, that's not, when you talk about management, that's not even the management study, as previously contemplated, and as currently contemplated, as Deputy Executive Rider said, is not as expansive, was not looking at the private sector. I don't, I'm sure it's looking at some regional comps. But I don't know how much is looking at title against title across the whole organization. Deputy Executive Rider.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** Yeah, I mean as far as management, we are, we are doing that. We're, as I said, last week, we're doing internal, so like secretaries, comparing them to union and other management secretaries. That kind of thing. We, I think it was five or six counties, including one to the south and one to the north, I will just add that I don't see anything in the last result, which kind of highlights the scope of the study that compares anything to the private sector. So, if that's something you're really looking at, you might want to add that in, or you leave it as it is, and it becomes a public sector study. But, but that last result says that we're studying internal, throughout the county, with the same titles, and then those of at least three surrounding counties. I do think the management study for management meets that requirement. But you know, that's only 400 of 1100 employees.

**Chair Bartels:** Yeah, I don't know, if I can just say, just for clarification, I think I always read the within and throughout, the within portion meaning within county government and throughout meaning throughout the county, including private sector. I don't know if that's what was meant, but that's, that's where I thought the private sector was contained. Same title within and throughout the



county. Within being internal. Throughout being external, but in the county. K. Legislator Walter, then Legislator Gavaris.

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah, I mean, I think it, for that it's a matter of interpretation. It could go either way but Deputy Executive Rider, did you guys create an internal, internal operating budget, estimating how much it costs you to do the management study, in terms of person time? And I mean, it, it's interesting, I mean, that we often don't do that. But obviously, you put people's time into this, and they get salaries. And so that's what they put their time and energy into plus anything else you had to do. It. I'm not saying we hold off or wait. But you know, I think, in general, and in relation to this, having these internal operation budgets are important, because it does show us how much certain activities, truly costs that are beyond your everyday type of activities. And it's just useful to know but I also think it would be interesting to know what it truly cost our county for you to do this managerial budget so that we have, even again, it's more of a floor because it's just managerial and it may not be as comprehensive as one might want it to be. But it does have a cost to us, so it'll be interesting to know.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** I'm sure we can figure out how many hours each individual who worked on it, spent working on it. So I'll have Ken work that up as part of the kind of introduction to the report as well.

**Chair Bartels:** Thank you. Legislator Gavaris.

**Legislator Gavaris:** As we were reflecting back on when we had these discussions. Private sector was certainly mentioned and discussed because I remember about the scenario that happened in Wawarsing where the highway department was so highly paid, that they actually were pricing themselves out of the market where we would have been required to contract the service for highway out, because the hourly rate was well beyond what any other Highway Department was getting. So, they froze their wages for several years to be able to bring it back in line. So private sector comparison was definitely something that was talked about, what when this was coming up.

**Chair Bartels:** So again, I mean, I'll defer to the group. I actually, I don't feel so terrible about, about putting out an RFP to get a baseline number on what this is going to cost. I think it gives us kind of proof of point to our, to our members of what, of what the full detail of this would actually entail. But if it's the will of the committee, instead to amend the policy, potentially even as suggested by Deputy Executive Rider pushing it out, including pushing it out a year. I mean, that's what would be, among other things, we would want to look at the detail that we're asking, but we'd also need to push the timeline without a doubt. Because I do think it's reasonable for everyone to agree that this is likely not to happen before this budget cycle, in terms of the complexity of what we're requesting, so I will, I'll leave it, you know, I'll leave it to all of you. And if, if all of you are in agreement, I suppose we go back to members with proposed amendment. Is that the will of the group?

Okay, so let's clarify these amendments. And then we'll, we'll come back, we'll meet again with what the amendments would be. And that would be, one: to amend the timeline for the next budget cycle. So if you could make sure you're taking notes, Amber, one to amend the timeline for the next budget cycle. Two: to be clear that we're including comparison with the private sector, and like Amber put in this draft, we can ask that that be itemized, so if that that's too expensive of a of a work product, we can opt to remove it, but at least we'd have it there to consider. Three: to include the Executive's office in terms of in-house definition, so we will, we'll be able to utilize the report that comes from the Executive's office, both in, in the outreach and in internal discussions. And is there anything else that...? Go ahead Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** One was, you're suggesting taking it off the four years. But back to what I had requested before. I'll amend that request. Originally it was that Amber came up, I would like it to have a price tag on it. I think it should have an amount that we think it's going to be so that people can vote on whether that's something that, I mean, yeah. So, my suggestion of having an, our Legislature or Legislative body understand potential price. If, if we don't want to ask Amber to sort of work up, we could take, we could utilize as a soft and, you know, estimate a combination of what the Executive's office operational cost was for, there's assumed this would be more than that. And Amber had spoken to someone, you know, an organization that does stuff, does the private sector analysis and maybe get a cost for what that private sector analysis piece would cost. I just feel, I you know, my problem from this, was this from the very beginning was really, that we did not have a sense. And this is like back to why you're, you're supporting sending this out. It should have, it should have, there should be some sense that this is what this kind of thing costs, so that people understand that when they're thinking about these policies in general. So, I think we could do a rough estimate of what we think it might be.

**Chair Bartels:** The problem, I mean, I'm going to say not, I've just been on record with this over all kinds of RFPs, my problem with putting in a cost is it forecasts the people bidding what we're really what we're willing to pay. So, when we say it's going to cost \$600,000 or 4,000 or whatever, we're telling people that that's what we're approving paying. I like these to be, to be nondescript, which is why I'd prefer, I mean, again, I would support full out going out to RFP and coming back with a number and if we have sticker shock at the number, then we have sticker shock. I understand the want to amend this, and I think that's reasonable. But I definitely am concerned about attaching a number to the resolution, a specific number that's been worked up.

**Legislator Walter:** But, so sorry, to that point. I mean, I understand on an RFP, not having a specific number, but all the time we have projects like in our capital plan and other places where we have an estimate of how much we think it's going to cost. And so that's normal practice. So that we have a sense of like, Are we okay, with these bridge constructions? Are we okay with it? Because we have a sense of what the cost would be. So, it is totally normal for us to document on a resolution, the expected costs, I definitely understand why on an RFP itself, we wouldn't want to have them. Yes. Anyone who prides who, who does, we had, I just had several that are RFPs. And each of them had an estimate cost in our resolution. So, people can always look up our resolutions, I suppose. But it's totally common practice, I would never been able to put through the re-entry one or others without saying like, this is how much I think it would cost us. So, I just, I feel like that. We have to do that. But.

**Chair Bartels:** Deputy Executive Rider and then Legislator Gavaris.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** I think if you looked at the Evergreen study, and you know, it was three years ago now pre-pandemic, so add maybe 10 to 15% on that, but then it's not quite triple, because there's titles that are similar titles. My guess is that it's somewhere around two to two and a half times that study. So you're probably going to be 100, 125,000. That's what my expectation would be of this RFP.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. Legislator Gavaris.

**Chairman Gavaris:** I was gonna say, looking at the resolution, it was listed as up to \$100,000 in cost. That's what we were told when that was presented. So.

**Chair Bartels:** Go ahead Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** Marc, when you say 125 are you including private sector?

**Deputy Executive Rider:** I mean, again, they oftentimes have the proprietary software to just include that. You know, and maybe so maybe it's a little bit more.

**Legislator Walter:** Because they will charge us on that proprietary software. I mean.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** Sure. So, it might be a little bit more doing it that way.

**Legislator Walter:** Yeah. I mean, I just think that, just so that we really have that comparison. And yeah.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay, um, go ahead, Legislator Ronk.

**Legislator Ronk:** I just, I tend to agree with you, Chairwoman. I think that putting, putting a number, estimate on it. You know, I, you know, I hesitate to say that the capital program is estimates, a lot of those are closer to guesses. You know, to put a number down. That's one of the reasons that we're amending the capital program all the time to add money, including last month, when we added money to the Veterans Cemetery. You know, based on the estimate that was there, it could be a lot higher than that. It can be a lot lower than that. And that's, that's the way it always is with our capital program. It's, it's one of the reasons, one of the same reasons why, you know, when Legislators have wanted to put, you know, money in contingency or something like that for union contracts, you know, I've been against that, because it amounts to negotiating in bad faith. I tend to agree that if we put, you know, even, uh, you know, like, because we're not asking for, like a rough estimate, we're asking for, like, a pretty precise estimate. You know, or sounds like that's what you're asking for, you know, if we were going to say, okay, you know, we expect that this is going to cost \$125,000 or \$100,000, then I'm okay with that. You know, and then it could come in 150. It could come in 75. But if Amber's going to come up with a real-world estimate, I feel like Tracey is right, and then we're going to be bidding against ourselves.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay, any other thoughts? Oh, go ahead. Deputy Executive Rider.

**Deputy Executive Rider:** Sorry, one last, one last thing. I mean, there's, there's really no reason not to RFP it prior to, like adding in the money in the budget for 24. Like let them know that this, we're, sorry 23, that the work it will be budgeted for in the twenty-three cycle, go out to RFP to actually get the amount that it's going to cost instead of forecasting something, and then you actually know how much money needs to be added to the budget.

**Chair Bartels:** Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** I mean, my issue is less of that. And more that we have said repeatedly, this is going to be a very expensive endeavor as written. And I feel like, you can't, we can't just say that without evidence, and that having some clarity of what do we mean by an expensive endeavor to do? If it's truly a \$100,000? Is it a \$200,000? I just think it's, it's important for us to be able to recognize what we think it is. I mean, the whole idea of putting it out to RFP was specifically so we could say, look how expensive it is. I'm proposing we could get to that place a little bit more reasonably, without involving other organizations by saying, Look, this is how expensive it will likely be. Whether we even document it. I don't, you know, it's less of my concern. It's more than that, making this kind of decision of whether, because first of all, this is us, so other people may disagree. They may say no, I like this every four-years. And no, I, you know, so I think that making an informed decision, without knowing how much this would actually cost at this magnitude is impossible. And then it might lead to discussions of a smaller version or something that is more efficient, or, or how

often it should be, but it's so hard to make that kind of decision without having any sense of what the process would be. At least to me.

**Chair Bartels:** Legislator Lopez.

**Legislator Lopez:** Do we have neighbors that we can reach out to? Like neighboring counties, ones that have done a similar RFP that way? We're not just speculating on what cost would be. I'm sure that governments have to be very similar and what they're looking for, you know, Dutchess, or anybody who may have done, you know, the same type for me, just, just so we can compare, like, apples to apples.

**Chair Bartels:** Is that something that you could maybe look into Amber? Salary studies of neighboring counties that were undertaken?

**Deputy Clerk Feaster:** I can, and I can tell you that in 2018, and 2019, I had done quite a bit of research on these and had drafted a scope and the, there was a proposal that I had gathered from Gallagher, which was 98,500. And that was for all positions within the county and that was back then. But it was for all positions and it also included a comprehensive job classification analysis, which we're not discussing or talking about right now.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. I mean, I think we can reasonably go back to members and say that given that we're not, we're not looking at doing this in house or set, or, or segmenting it in, in meaningful way in house other than to see the Executive's in-house management study, which would have to be expanded, that we could reasonably expect this to cost over \$100,000. I mean, when matter of fact that four years ago was close to \$100,000. Even though I think, I think that's, so, so the question is Do, Do we speak to members and ask whether or not they want to move forward at that price? We passed a resolution that allowed for up to 100, that, that basically said this is going to cost zero to \$100,000. The legislature said yes to that. I still maintain I don't want to, I don't want to transmit a very detailed estimate of real costs prior to going out to RFP.

**Legislator Ronk:** I think that we go back to our members and figure out if there's a will to amend but that's just that's my inclination right now.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. Yes, Legislator Walter.

**Legislator Walter:** That's fine. And I just, I mean, I think since we are bipartisan here, we're going back to our members, as long as we're sharing, this is what we're thinking the price would potentially really be where, to me what I'm hearing is at a minimum 150,000 because we had the 125, but without the private sector, that and it was stated a little bit, you know, but I don't need, I don't personally need it documented. I just would like it to be a part of the conversation. I mean, it will be because there's minutes, so it's kind of hard to have to compensate. If somebody really wanted to know what we're thinking they could just listen to our, or, you know, look at our transcript. But yes, I'm less concerned about it officially going in there and more interested that our fellow Legislators know what it would be realistically.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay, so what I'm going to suggest, then, if that's the sentiment of all, which it seems to be, generally is that we adjourn the meeting without taking action. We, we speak to members and we can do that in caucuses or collectively. Ken, I'm happy to, to come to your caucus as well, although I'm sure you're fully able to do it on your own, but we can do it in a bipartisan manner, you can come to our, it doesn't matter. However, we want to do this. I think we just need to we need to reach out to our caucuses, talk through where we're at. And that may mean that we need to have another meeting in the next couple of weeks.

**Legislator Ronk:** Okay, so I mean, my caucus tonight is has been postponed, or postponed or canceled. I'm not sure how it's gonna work. But you know, we'd be happy to talk next week in person.

**Chair Bartels:** Okay. All right. Great. Is everybody okay with that? Yes? Okay. It looks like you were frozen. Ken is frozen. But everybody else I wasn't so sure. Okay. He's back. All right. So, um, is there any new business or old business that anyone else wants to bring up? Okay, so I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

**Legislator Ronk:** So moved.

**Chair Bartels:** Second.

**Legislator Lopez:** Second.

**Chair Bartels:** Great. All in favor.

**Group:** Aye.

**Chair Bartels:** Great. Thank you. Thank you all. Meeting adjourned.

---

**Time:** 3:50 pm

**Respectfully submitted:** Amber Feaster  
**Minutes Approved:** August 9, 2022