CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

----- X

August 19, 2014 Start: 1:25 p.m. Recess: 3:15 p.m.

HELD AT: City Hall

Committee Room

B E F O R E: Daniel Dromm

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Vincent J. Gentile
Daniel R. Garodnick
Margaret S. Chin
Stephen T. Levin
Deborah L. Rose
Mark S. Weprin

Jumaane D. Williams

Andy L. King Inez D. Barron Chaim M. Deutsch

Mark Levine
Alan N. Maisel
Antonio Reynoso
Mark Treyger
Robert Cornegy
Mathieu Eugene

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito

Maria Torres-Springer Small Business Services

Elizabeth Rose Department of Education

Chris Berner Representing Commissioner Robert Lindt

Michael Cordiello Amalgamated Transit Union 1181

Carter Pate MV Transportation

Earnest Pierre Reliant School Bus Driver

Arcadio Fret Amalgamated Transit Union Bus Driver

Kelly D'Coursey Local 1181 Bus Driver

Kennedy Zomilus Bus driver

2	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Well, because my
3	gavel is not here, I am going to knock us into order,
4	and the reason why we have the furniture the way that
5	it is is because we did not expect to have this in
6	here. We were originally scheduled in the other
7	room, but to accommodate the crowd is why we moved it
8	into the chambers. So I just want to thank
9	everybody. Welcome everybody. Here's the gavel,
10	because I may need that. Thank you. And to say that
11	we're here today to hear the proposed intro calling
12	for a Local Law to establish a program in relation to
13	the employment of school bus drivers, attendants,
14	dispatchers and mechanics by qualified employees.
15	This pre-considered legislation would establish a
16	grant program in relation to the employment of school
17	bus drivers, attendants, dispatchers and mechanics by
18	qualified employers. Bill Section One contains a
19	definitional provision in the first subdivision. This
20	section would allow the Department of Small Business
21	Services, SBS, to establish a program that would
22	provide grants to employers that provide
23	transportation services for children in grades
24	Kindergarten through 12 for the 2014-15 pursuant to

request for bids, Number B2321, if such employers

2	hire certain school bus drivers, attendants,
3	dispatchers or mechanics that fall into two
4	categories. First, eligible workers or school bus
5	drivers, attendants, dispatchers and mechanics who
6	one, are residents of New York City; two, were
7	employed by June 30 th , 2014 by entities that had a
8	contract expiring June 30 th , 2014 with the Department
9	of Education to provide transportation services for
10	children in grades Kindergarten through 12, or had a
11	subcontract with the company that had such a contract
12	with the DOE and are paid an hourly rate in the 2014-
13	15 school year that is less than what they were paid
14	in the 2013-14 school year. The second category of
15	eligible workers are school bus drivers, attendants,
16	dispatchers and mechanics who are residents of New
17	York City, were on or eligible to be on the Master
18	Seniority List as of June 30 th , 2014, and are paid a
19	lower hourly rate in the 2014-15 school year than
20	they were paid dating to the placement on Master
21	Seniority lists. Pursuant to the provisions of the
22	bill, the grant that SBS would provide to a qualified
23	employer that hires a worker from either group would
24	make up the difference between the hourly rate the
25	worker was paid in 2013-14 and the hourly rate the

25

2 worker is paid in 2014-15 multiplied by the worker's hours in 2014-15, and the difference in cost to 3 maintain employer contributions for employee's health 4 and retirement benefits received in 2013-14. Other components of the grant would include costs 6 7 associated with payroll taxes and worker's compensation insurance. Pursuant to the bill's 8 provisions, the bill would condition the award of the 9 grant upon the qualified employer providing 10 11 retirement and health benefits to each 2014 qualified 12 employee from the same health and retirement funds 13 from which such employee received retirement and 14 health benefits during the 2013-14 school year, 15 provided that such employee is represented by the 16 same employee organization during the 2013-14 and 17 2014-15 school years, 39 weeks of employment during 18 the school year to each qualified employee, and a customary work day of eight hours to each qualified 19 20 employee, to the extent the work day of such employee was eight hours during the 2013-14 school year. 2.1 2.2 bill also provides that to be eligible for an award 23 of a grant, qualified employers must agree that following the effective date of this local law, they 24

will hire workers from the Master Seniority list in

2	the order of their seniority. However, this
3	requirement does not apply to hiring by qualified
4	employers that occurs prior to the effective date of
5	this local law. Further, the bill provides that SBS
6	makes monthly installments of the grant only after
7	receiving satisfactory proof from the qualified
8	employer that the qualified employer has paid the
9	required portions of the grant to the qualified
10	employee. The legislation would establish a cap of
11	42 million dollars per grants authorized by this
12	legislation. The bill would authorize SBS to
13	promulgate rules to implement this Local Law. Bill
14	Section Two provides that this bill will take
15	effective immediately and would sunset on December
16	31 st , 2015. I just want to say how proud I am today
17	to sit here to Chair this hearing, because I was
18	around in 2013, in January 2013, when I do not
19	believe that this committee at that time was told the
20	whole truth about the employee protection provisions
21	that were provided in the DOE contract, and so today,
22	what we're doing here is again an attempt to clean
23	up, I think, what was not done right and did not
24	treat our city employees the way that they should be
25	treated in a fair and equitable manner.

[applause]

3	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. I have
4	to ask though, for no applause, but I do appreciate
5	it. And is another example of something that was
6	left behind from the previous Administration that we
7	as a council and as a city are trying to correct.
8	And with that, I want to acknowledge that we have
9	been joined by the Speaker of the Council, Melissa
10	Mark-Viverito. We've been joined by my colleagues.
11	I'm going to start over here, Mark Treyger, Chaim
12	Deutsch, Alan Maisel, Antonio Reynoso, Andy King,
13	Inez Dickens, Inez Barron, excuse me, Margaret Chin,
14	Dan Garodnick, Daneek Miller, the bill's sponsor, and
15	the co-sponsor of the bill, Mathieu Eugene as well
16	and Robert Corney who just came in. Can't miss him,
17	he's the tall guy in the back. Yep, and I want to
18	yep, want to say that we're also hearing the Proposed
19	Resolution calling on the New York State Legislature
20	and for the Governor to sign, legislation that would
21	mandate employee safeguards for experienced bus
22	drivers, attendants, dispatchers and mechanics as
23	part of all current and future bus contracts. This
24	is a very important component to the legislation that
25	we're addressing today as well, because it will

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

require some state action on that level. I believe that we do have opening statement from the bill's sponsor and let me start with Council Member Daneek Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Good afternoon.

Thank you, Chairman Dromm for your leadership on this issue. Madam Speaker, thank you so much for allowing us to have this hearing today. Council Member Dromm has just said a mouthful, so I'm not going to be redundant and go over the intent of the legislation, but I just want to say that for those who don't know, as he so eloquently put it, we're trying to make just what was unjust by the past Administration. And so in Civil Service and Labor over the winter we had a hearing in the committee and Labor was heard, parents, students, school boards, employees and members of the union and their organizers who testified as to the damages the EPP removal has done. Students have missed classes. Seniority workers have been disregarded and highly experienced and skill unionized and largely female workforce has been devastated since the EPP's removal, and at that moment, we urged our colleagues to pass the resolution asking on the State to pass and the

2.2

Governor to sign resolution guaranteeing the employee protection provision. Because that did not happen, we are here today, and so we again, along with this latest intro, we still stand by the reso and the latest intro which will guarantee that these things will occur. So I just want to again say that these-not having the EPP has had a devastating impact on the workers, the communities that they live in and represent, but most importantly, the parent and our children. Our children need this, and I'm asking the members here to pass this, stand with me in passing this resolution today, and I thank you, Councilman Dromm for your leadership on this issue. Thank you.

[applause]

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you, Council Member Miller, and again, please, no applause.

Council Member Mathieu Eugene, the co-sponsor, also wanted to make an opening statement.

COUNCIL MEMBER EUGENE: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm going to be very, very brief. I just want to commend the Speaker for her leadership and also Council Member Dromm, the Chair, for bringing this very critical and important issue to the hearing to be voted. This is a wonderful

moment, a wonderful day that I've been waitng for,
and this is a wonderful moment that I know many of,
all of our hardworking drivers, hardworking people
and the advocate, we all have been waiting for, we
have been fighting to see this moment. Because this
was not fair. It was not acceptable that the great
City, in the great City of New York that people have
been working so hard to protect our children, our
student, to drive them safely to school and back
home, to see that they have been deprived for what
they have worked so hard to own. And I want to
commend this Administration, and I want to commend
all of you who have been fighting for so long to make
sure that this day happened. At the moment, when we
are trying to improve the quality of life to increase
the minimum wage and to vote for paid sick leave, it
is not fair, it is not acceptable that our
hardworking drivers can be deprived of the benefit
that they have been working so hard to own. They
deserve the EPP. They deserve benefits, and I
commend all of you who have been working to make this
happen. This is a good step. This is a giant step,
and we are going to continue to keep the momentum and

to lobby the state of New York to make sure they reinstate EPP. Thank you very much.

[applause]

I will ask for silence in the chambers, please. Now, we'd like to introduce our witnesses who are here to testify, Maria Torres-Springer from Small Business Services, Elizabeth Rose from the Department of Education and Chris Berner representing Commissioner Robert Linn. And Commissioner Springer, would you like to start? Who's going? Okay, yep, alright. We'll start there in the center.

Mark-Viverito, Chairman Dromm and members of the

Education Committee. My name is Chris Berner, and I
am the Chief of Staff in the Mayor's Office of Labor
Relations. Regrettably, Commissioner Bob Linn is
traveling today. He's returning from a vacation
outside of the United States, and therefore, he is
not able to testify in person. I'd like to thank--

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: [interposing] Okay, just before we go on, I did forget something. I do swear everybody in at the Education Committee hearing, so I'd like to ask you to please raise your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2.2

23

24

25

right hand, and do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and to answer Council Member questions honestly?

CHRIS BERNER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you.

CHRIS BERNER: I'd like to thank all of

you for the opportunity to testify today on this important legislation that will ensure the stability in the delivery of public school bus services for the upcoming school year and will promote fair wages and benefits for experienced, reliable school bus workers. I understand that you have copies of the bill and a memorandum summarizing key elements of the bill, and I believe some or all of that memorandum was shared in your remarks earlier. So I'd like to focus now on two topics to try to first give an explanation of the key events that give rise to the bill and explain how the bill fits into a long-term strategy to provide reliable and cost-effective school bus services, while ensuring that experienced bus workers who provide such important services can earn decent wages and benefits. This is a one year city grant program capped at 42 million dollars, designed to ensure the uninterrupted delivery of a

2	vital service for city residents, school bus
3	transportation for school kids in the upcoming school
4	year. In 2011, following a decision by the New York
5	State Court of Appeals, known by its caption as L&M
6	Bus Corporation versus the New York City Department
7	of Education, the DOE started a process of putting
8	out to bid school bus contracts for K-12 students,
9	including special education students without
10	longstanding employee protection provisions. These
11	provisions had been in place in the contract for
12	school bus services since 1979, and similar
13	provisions were in place before that. In 2012, the
14	DOE put out to bid about 17 percent of its routes,
15	commencing for the school year September in 2013.
16	Then, in 2013, the DOE put out about 21 percentput
17	out to bid 21 percent of its routes for the school
18	year commencing in September 2014, and these routes
19	were awarded to 16 companies. In 2014, the DOE put
20	out earlier this year, I should add, the DOE put out
21	to bid around 62 percent, the balance of its routes
22	commencing for the school year starting next
23	September, September 2015 and these bids are still
24	open. Following the release in 2012 of a first round
25	of bids without the employee protection provisions,

the school bus workers represented by local 1181 of
the ATU went on strike in January and February of
2013. Earlier this year, Mayor de Blasio explained
the need for high quality uninterrupted bus service
in the flowing way: "I would have preferred if, as a
result of the election, the previous Administration
would have suspended its efforts to give us a chance
to reset the situation according to the values that I
put forward and that were ratified by the people."
And just yesterday, in response to a question about
this bill, Mayor de Blasio explained, and I quote,
"Well, think about what they do. And I speak as a
parent as well as a Mayor here. These bus drivers and
matrons take care of our children, and in many cases,
our special Ed kids who have real challenges. You
know my children used to ride the school bus and
every parent knows that feeling when you give your
child over to a school bus driver and the matron, and
you need experienced folks who know what they are
doing, and preferably who know the children, the
community, know the routes well. And so that action
is taken to make sure we have experienced veteran
drivers and matrons who know how to keep our kids
safe. That's what we're getting back for." This

2	bill is the initial part of an overall strategy to
3	reset the framework for the upcoming school year to
4	pay better wages and benefits to employees with prior
5	experience in the industry. In doing so, this bill
6	ensures smooth services for the year and gives the
7	city time in the next several months to seek state
8	legislation to solicit school bus contracts that
9	include provisions related to the retention or
10	preference in hiring for experienced workers on a
11	seniority basis and the preservation of wages, health
12	benefits and retirement benefits. This state
13	legislation will address the legal issues raised in
14	the 2011 Court of Appeals decision and will authorize
15	reopening and renegotiating existing bus contracts
16	for the K-12 students. Now that's the context in
17	which this bill is offered, and with your permission
18	I can give a brief summary of how the bill works. At
19	its core, the key elements are straight forward. The
20	bill establishes a grant program for the benefit of
21	certain bus workers. The program is for the upcoming
22	school year, September 2014 through June of '15. The
23	total amount of all the grants paid out is at 42
24	million dollars. The Department of Small Business
25	Services will administer the grant program. To

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

receive the grant, both the company and the worker must be eligible as it's defined in the bill. only 16 companies are eligible. These are the 16 companies that have already been awarded new school bus contracts for the upcoming September 2014 school year, which is shortly upon us. The employees of these 16 companies are eligible if they worked for a company that had a contract to provide school bus services that ended on June 30th, essentially ended with the previous year, or they worked for a company that used to provide school bus services and were something in the industry known as the Master Seniority List or were eligible to be on the Master Seniority List. To be eligible, the employees must also demonstrate that they are earning a lower regular rate of pay in the new September 2014 school year than they did when they last worked for a school Employees who are truly new to the bus contractor. industry are not eligible for the grant. Employees who as of the new school year will be earning a higher regular rate of pay are not eligible for the grant. Now, assuming that the employer is one of the 16 companies with contracts starting this September, and assuming that the employee meets the eligibility

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

requirements, then SBS can pay the grant to the company once the satisfies SBS that it has paid the employees and the money is actually passed through to the employee. An employee can receive a grant even if she has already been hired by one of the 16 companies prior to the law's enactment. After this bill is passed into law, to take advantage of the grant program, the companies must hire for the Master Seniority List in order of seniority. In this way, the bill encourages hiring experienced workers, but doesn't disrupt any previous job offers that have been made. The employer must also attest to the fact that it is maintaining an eight hour work day and a 39 week work year, which are industry standards. Now, in general terms, the size of the grant for each eligible employee is what the employee earned in wages or benefits when he or she last worked for a bus company with the school bus contract minus what the employee earns in wages and benefits working for one of the 16 eligible country--sorry--companies with contracts for the September 2014 school year. grant is meant to make up for what the employee lost in terms of compensation in the new upcoming school year, and the grant is ultimately passed through to

2	the employee and is treated as income and is taxed as
3	such. This part of the grant is paid to the company
4	once it affirms that it has already paid the
5	equivalent in salary and cash compensation to the
6	eligible employee. In terms of retirement and health
7	benefits, the size of the grant is the difference
8	between what the company is actually paying on behalf
9	of the eligible employee and what the company would
10	have paid for the eligible employee, but for the
11	grant program. This portion of the grant is not
12	passed on per say to the employee directly in terms
13	of salary or cash, but is paid to the company once
14	the company confirms to SBS's satisfaction that it
15	has actually paid for the benefits in question. The
16	grant also includes cost that the company pays in the
17	form of additional payroll taxes, associated with the
18	monies that are being passed onto the eligible
19	employee. The grants are paid on a monthly basis in
20	arrears, meaning that the company has to submit
21	paperwork confirming that the money was actually
22	paid, and SBS will then pay the grant out. An
23	eligible company is entitled to receive a grant if it
24	hires only one eligible employee for that employee or
25	several eligible employees or hundreds of eligible

Thank you, Mr.

employees. And with the help of DOE and OLR, SBS will establish procedures through an implementation committee of those agencies I just mentioned for confirming and calculating the grant amounts and paying the grants on a monthly basis to the eligible companies. And with that, I think I have done my best to summarize how the bill works, and I'll either take questions or give it over to the commissioner.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay. So now I'd like to ask Speaker Mark-Viverito to ask some questions.

SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO:

Chair and Mr. Berner for the testimony. I definitely want to add my sentiments to what I've been expressed by my colleagues in terms of being supportive of this legislation. Obviously, there's a couple of issues that I would like to raise, though, just in terms of questions. One is that there is a sunset to this legislation, right, the end of next year, and it is the hope and the expectation that the State

Legislature will act in order to correct what many of us consider a mistake by the Bloomberg Administration in terms of requesting the Governor to veto a legislation that provided for EPP protections.

2.2

Understanding that there is a sunset, you know, what
is the expectation, right? Not only, I guess, this
is a question for you, but obviously there's other
players in this game so to speak, you know, to ensure
that that does happen. We have our Reso. We're very
clear and explicit as to what it is that we would
like to see done at the state level, but we have to
obviously rely on the actors in Albany to get it
done. So, what has been the thought process behind
that?

Administration is fully committed to see the passage of State Legislation that would solve the problem created by the 2011 Court of Appeals decision and is ready to commit whatever resources are required to make sure that legislation gets passed. The State Legislation is part of the long term solution. This grant program is the short term one year solution to give us time to get the State Legislation that we need.

SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO: And I get that, and we're supportive; I'm supportive of it, right?

And my colleagues that spoke before are as well. I guess I like to-- I'm not a negative person, I just

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 22
2	like to think of different scenarios and be ready, s
3	to speak. Has there been any thought process if the
4	State refuses to act and we have this legislation
5	which sunset, what's going to happen?
6	CHRIS BERNER: Right now, we're very
7	confident that we will get that
8	SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO: [interposing]
9	Okay.
10	CHRIS BERNER: State Legislation.
11	SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO: Okay. I mean,
12	that's the response? Okay. I appreciate that. The
13	other thing is when you read all of the guidelines a
14	to the grant program and who is eligible and how it
15	would implemented, I mean, the concern that comes to
16	mind is one, this is a voluntary grant program. Is
17	it or is not?
18	CHRIS BERNER: It is voluntary.
19	SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO: Okay. So it is
20	administratively in reading it may seem somewhat
21	burdensome. What is being done to facilitate and
22	really incentivize and encourage the bus companies t
23	sign up for this grant program and ensure that

they're hiring experienced workers? I mean, that's

ultimately what we're interested in. I know we

24

25

2	
3	

4 5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

> 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

2.2

23

24 25

definitely will do what we can to put pressure and make it known to these companies that it is in their best interest to sign up for this grant program, but there's a lot of different guidelines here in terms of how it would be administered, and I want to feel confident that SBS has the ability to fully implement it and make sure that they're giving the proper assistance to the company so that they do sign up for this, and we could speak to that a little bit.

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So SBS is--

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: [interposing] Please identify yourself.

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: Maria Torres-Springer, I'm the Commissioner of the Department of Small Business Services. So SBS will be responsible for the administration of the grant program. intend to work very closely with our colleagues in the Department of Education as well as OLR to ensure that as we formulate the specific policies associated with the implementation of the program that they are clear and will ensure the full participation of the companies who are eligible. So in doing that, we have previous experience in administering comparable

2	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 23

24

25

grant of incentive programs, and we work every day closely with businesses to ensure that we're providing the services and the resources they need to retain a qualified workforce. We intend to do the same here, issue very clear procedures for how it works, ensure that all of the relevant companies are aware of the particular program and then run a process that allows us all to ensure that we are accomplishing the specific goals of the program.

SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO: That's--and obviously that's important because ultimately what we want to do is ensure that everyone is signing up and that workers are being protected, so that's an important aspect of it. The Administration, is--I mean, we're talking about this is starting shortly, right? So are you--have already--has SBS already started delineating the grant program and all the details of how it would, the reporting requirements etcetera?

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: Yes, we have, we've thought through a number of the details. will continue to work, though, with our colleagues who are, my colleagues who are here today to ensure

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

that the program is effective and seamless and

3 | efficient as possible.

That's where--SPEAKER MARK-VIVERITO: there's other questions I know my colleagues have as well. I just want to say that I appreciate. I know there's a lot of members here that are represented by the union that represents the workers. I want to thank them for their service, and I know that in terms of having experienced workforce is critically important, and it is a shame that this Administration, the prior Administration did not take into account the change in sentiment that the election demonstrated and continued to steamroll ahead with a decision that it was clear was not supported by this Council at the time and that was not supported by the incoming Mayor, and that is really a disservice to our families and to our children. So, in the meantime, I think we have a responsibility to see what measures we can play, but let's be clear, you know, there is a role now that the State Legislature has to play and we, it is incumbent upon all of us with the unions and everyone involved to ensure that our representatives at the State level are doing right by our workers and by our

2.2

children, and that's what I hope will happen. Thank you very much.

[applause]

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do--before I allow my colleagues to ask questions, I have a question in terms of the DOE. The DOE will be putting out the money for SBS to distribute. Am I correct in that assumption? Okay, and can I ask you to identify yourself also?

ELIZABETH ROSE: Certainly. I'm Elizabeth Rose, Chief of Staff the Division of Operations for the Department of Education. So, the DOE will be temporarily funding the needs of the grant program this fall, and as we get a better sense of what the actual cost of the program, the size of the program will be, we will then consider whether there needs to be a longer term, more permanent approach. But we certainly in our budget have the funding for unforeseen contingencies that we can use on a temporary basis for this.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: And this would come out of a transportation line within the DOE budget?

2	
_	

4

ELIZABETH ROSE: It will come out of the Office of Pupil Transportation. There is not a specific line.

5

6

would be coming out of the budget would be how much?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: And the amount that ELIZABETH ROSE: Well, the total program

is capped at 42 million, but we will need to assess what the actual demand for the program is in the first few months, and that will give us a--

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: [interposing] As you move along?

ELIZABETH ROSE: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, so I guess the first question that we have will be from Council Member Robert Cornegy, who is also the Chair of the Small Business Committee in the City Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you, Chairman Dromm. I want to first start by saying I really appreciate my colleagues, the sponsors of the bill, who continue to set a standard for protection of workers within the workforce and I really appreciate that. And I am going to say in advance, do not mistake my concern for support of the bill, because I do support the bill, but I do have concerns

2	that I'd like to state. So, although I'm not a
3	member of the Education Committee, I'm participating
4	today as the Chair of the Committee which oversees
5	the Department of Small Business Services, which this
6	legislation sets out as the agency that will
7	administer the grant program it seeks to establish.
8	On thatin that role, I appreciate Council Member
9	Dromm giving me the opportunity to pose a few
10	questions to Commissioner Springer. Commissioner,
11	this bill will require SBS to administer a grant
12	program that potentially totals 42 million over the
13	course of only 15 months. My first question is, do
14	you have any concerns about your department's
15	capacity to carry out this work? Of course, I'm
16	concerned that it not impede the Departments
17	commitment to other initiatives such as the role out
18	of Small Business First, which we had a very healthy
19	discussion about earlier. That's question number
20	one. And do you contemplate that you'll have to add
21	staff to manage this program, and if so, how many and
22	on what timeline?

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: Thank you,

Council Member. I am very confident that we will be

able to administer this program effectively. As I

mentioned before, it is part of our core mission to
work with business owners to ensure that they can
retain a qualified workforce. We have run similar
program in the past, in particular a program called
the energy cost savings program as well as our
customized training program. While they're not
identical, they are similar in that we have to
maintain close oversight and ensure eligibility and
do the proper audits when necessary to ensure the
integrity of those programs and the volume of those
programs over the last several years we have deployed
tens of millions of dollars in those programs. So
this is ait's a scale that we are accustomed to. In
terms of this specific program and ensuring that we
have the capacity, we'll work very closely with
colleagues in government to the extent that we need
additional resources. We will make sure that we have
that and we have them in a timely fashion. As we're
scoping the specific demand for the program, we will
make that determination, but in any of that we'll
make sure that we can run it effectively. And
lastly, the other initiatives that the Small Business
Services runs, whether it's Small Business First or
our continued work to ensure that we're helping bring

1
_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

23

24

25

relief to Sandy impacted businesses, I can assure that those programs will not suffer because of this. In fact, it's part of a larger mission that we have to ensure that businesses across the city and their work force are taken care of.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you. Notoriously, I have not used my three minutes time in the past. Today, that won't be the case. Would SBS deduct an administrative fee from the grant amount as it does from council initiatives that flow through SBS?

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: That is -- that's a possibility, and as we figure out specifically what the administrative costs are we will fine tune exactly how that's going to work.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: And regarding rule-making of the bill, when would you predict the draft rules will be produced and how long will that public comment period be? Will there be a public comment and how long with the comment period be?

CHRIS BERNER: I'll take a stab at that. I actually don't believe this requires rule-making. This is similar to the processes the SBS already has in place for working with small employers. The city

Ü

SBS would need to produce a set of guidelines or procedures for the small universe of eligible companies to submit the necessary information so that it can be confirmed, evaluated, if necessary audited by SBS and that checks can be cut and the grants can be delivered.

with that in just saying in closing that I believe administering this program will be challenging for SBS. Our full confidence in Commissioner Torres brings ability to get the job done should this law be enacted, but please do not let us--please let us know if it requires more resources or create capacity problems that you anticipate because this has come up quickly and I'm deeply supportive of projects you're already working on, as you know, and don't want to see these priorities fall by the wayside. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you very much. Council Member Garodnick followed by Council Member Barron.

much, Mr. Chairman, and I just want to share my colleague's feeling that many of were disturbed about the sudden reduction of pay or loss of jobs in the

2	industry here and I think that we all want to protect
3	employees. My substantive questions relate to how we
4	can both protect worker wages while also allowing for
5	fair competition to bids for school bus contracts.
6	Like for example, whether these workers should be
7	entitled to a prevailing wage in this context, and
8	whether that's something we should be considering
9	here. It's also not clear to me that the Council
10	should necessarily be injecting itself in its way in
11	a collective bargaining agreement. It may set a bad
12	precedent and also a direct allocation of this type
13	might be barred by the State Constitution. So I have
14	a few questions that I wanted to address with you.
15	Mr. Berner, the first is as it relates to the
16	Constitutional question, Article Eight, Section One
17	of the New York State Constitution says, and I'll
18	just paraphrase, that no city shall give money
19	directly to in aid of an individual or private
20	corporation or undertaking. We have an existing RFP
21	in place with contracts that have been awarded and
22	for these 16, how would this proposed law comply with
23	that provision of the State Constitution?
24	CHRIS BERNER: Sure. I'm not immediately

familiar with the provision you're quoting, but we're

confident that this bill is, does not run a fell [sic] of any procurement law, doesn't run a fell of any labor law preemption issue. It is fundamentally a city program designed to ensure the smooth delivery of an important service for the next school year, and the State Legislation Initiative will address the Constitutional and procurement issues that I think you're alluding to and that the Court of Appeals addressed in the L&M decision.

with respect, I'm not sure that it does, but the question for us here as a Council in approving a grant program which would allow for a direct allocation of money to private enterprises, to me, looks like it is barred by the State Constitution, putting aside local procurement rules or preemption issues with state law on a labor context. So I do think that we should ensure that we have clarity as a committee and as a council on that point before we move forward. As to your comments in your testimony, I just wanted to follow up. You just said again to ensure smooth services and uninterrupted delivery was something that you had mentioned in your testimony.

What are you referring to when you say that?

2.1

2.2

CHRIS BERNER: What I'm referring to is our analysis of the effective of the bidding out of the routes in the 2012 bidding out process and the 2013 bidding out process. We know that the elimination of the EPP's was the main source of a strike about 18 months ago in January and February of 2013, and it is important to the city that as we solve at a state level the problems associated with employee safeguards, that we create the best environment possible for the continued operation of school bus services for this school year.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So forgive me, what do you mean by the best environment possible?

Is this about safety? Is it about concern that there will be another strike on the horizon? What are you referring to when you say that?

CHRIS BERNER: Well, I'm not pre--I'm not going to predict what two private parties are going to do in their collective bargaining, but I do know that the absence of the EPP has been a source of discussion among those private parties and their collective bargaining. The city is unable to address employee safeguards on its own initiative without the state's help. So, in order to essentially give us

,

the time to solve that problem at a state level, this bill will create opportunities for employers, the 16 companies, to take advantage of this grant program if they choose to. They're not required to, if they choose to.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: The 16

companies that will be starting their operations for the school year in the next few weeks, do they have—

do you know that they have vacancies to be filled?

Do we know that there is an actual opportunity here for them to avail themselves of this grant program that we're talking about here?

that in two ways. The bill defines an eligible employee in two ways. It's an employee who's experienced a loss in pay who either was essentially laid off and was just working for a company whose contract ended in June 30th of this year, or who had been laid off and lost a job at some time in the past. Either employee would be eligible if they're picked up by one of the 16 eligible companies. With respect to your hiring, I think all of the 16 companies are well along their way in hiring for the opening of school year, not fully, not 100 percent,

2.1

2.2

but they're comfortably along their way. So, the companies could take advantage of the hiring they've already done, if the employees fall into one of the two definitions and going forward, if the law is enacted, the companies can take advantage of this bill for the new hiring that they do, but that new hiring would have to be in order of seniority according to the Master Seniority List. So, yes, there's an opportunity for both future and prior hiring actions.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right, but we don't know precisely where things fall at this moment in time as to how many vacancies there are, how many people have been retained for continuation of services that could take advantage of this. We just don't know that. Is that fair?

CHRIS BERNER: So, I think, on a two part answer, I think essentially what you're asking is yes, we don't know precisely, but I know the DOE Office of School Transportation tracks on a daily basis how the companies are hiring. So the DOE has a very good sense of how many people hired, but we don't have a sense of whether those employees are actually eligible within the definition of the law.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, just a 3 couple more quick questions and I appreciate the 4 Chairman for his indulging here. So there are three 5 batches of contracts here as you spelled out in your 6 testimony, the ones that started in 2013, the ones 7 that are starting now, and then the ones that will be starting in 2015. It looks like the vast majority of 8 them are starting actually in 2015. So, that if 9 10 there is a change to state law, there will be the ability to affect the vast majority of these 11 12 contracts, but in response to the Speaker's question 13 about the likelihood of achieving state law change 14 you expressed a fair amount of confidence that we 15 would be successful in doing that, but if we are not 16 successful here, should we anticipate that the 17 Administration will be coming back to the Council 18 with a request for an additional grant program much like what we are talking about for the 2014 19

CHRIS BERNER: I think it's too soon to speculate what we will need if in fact a state solution isn't forthcoming, and right now we have every plan to get that state bill.

24

20

21

2.2

23

contracts?

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And how much would it—how much will it cost the city if the—if you will—if we are able to state law change here and the addition of the reintroduction of the EPP's back into place?

the data to answer that question, and I think it would be somewhat speculative. What the advantage of restoring the safeguards for employees does is, is it may result in both savings and efficiencies to the city. It's not necessarily a zero sum game, but to answer your specific question, I don't have that information.

think that's worth our knowing the answer to since one of the issues here is a resolution asking for the state to reinstate the EPPs, and also I would observe, and this is not specifically a beef with anybody at the witness table, but a program that has 42 million dollar price tag six week after we passed the budget appears to me to be something that we probably should have been talking about in the context of our budget negotiations, so I just wanted to make that point here, too. So, Mr. Chairman, I do

^

2.2

appreciate the time. I have more questions, but I don't want to take all the time for this committee. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: I'd like to ask the DOE, is there more concerns to the DOE above and beyond just austerity and saving of dollars? And in terms of providing quality care to students who are transported back and forth, and doesn't that often times cost a little bit more money than just looking at things from a purely budget way of thinking?

ELIZABETH ROSE: Mr. Chair, safety of the students has always been and will always be our first and primary concern in providing transportation and in contacting with vendors to provide transportation, and we would never take actions that would knowingly hurt or compromise the safety for our students. All drivers are certified drivers. Attendants need to be certified attendants. All the bus representatives need to be trained. Those things are critically important to us and will continue to be.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: I hear what you're saying. I do believe, though, when you cut driver's salaries basically in half that there's a concern there that you decrease motivation, you deflate the

2.2

benefits that they've gained, and I think that also in some ways impacts upon performance, and I am trying to make the point that money is not the only issue that we should be looking at here, that we should definitely be looking at the issue of safety and of experience in terms of the people who are driving our buses, and often times as in other forms of employment and business example you have to often times pay for that experience, and I just like to highlight that at this point as well. So, thank you.

[applause]

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Council Member, thank you. We have to say, no applause again, but Council Member Barron?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you, Mr.

Chair. Thank you for calling for this hearing on
this important matter and our thanks to the sponsors
of this bill who are seeking to correct what I see
was a grave injustice. I see the actions that were
taken by this previous Administration as a threat to
what unions have worked so hard to do, which is to
protect their workers by established provisions in
their contracts and I'm glad that we're taking steps
now to correct that. Now, you indicate that there

_

are 16 companies that this would impact. Have you had any conversation with those companies? Have they been involved? Do they know this is coming and what has been their response?

CHRIS BERNER: We have had those conversations. They've been at a very high level and a very general level, but our sense is that the companies are very interested in the opportunity created by this grant program.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So, you have the sense that they would be willing to participate? Of the 16 companies, do you have an idea of how many would be willing to participate in this?

CHRIS BERNER: Not for every one of the 16, but generally, based upon the feedback that we've received, there's an interest in taking advantage of this grant program.

that haven't expressed an interest, is there any way beyond appealing to their sense of what is just and fair? Is there any other kind of incentive they may feel that it would be an undue burden on their accounting department or whatever department would have to produce those records, so is there any type

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2	of	incentive	to	pull	them	in	to	participating	ir
3	th:	is?							

2.2

CHRIS BERNER: Well, I think there might be three incentives. I don't know whether they're carrots or sticks, but first I know this

Administration is ready to use the bully [sic] pulpit so to speak to convince that taking advantage of this grant is the right thing to do and the just thing to do. The grant also is pretty straight forward in its application and I don't think that there are very high barriers to access for participation, and based upon my experience with SBS is that they're very good at making it as easy and straight forward as possible for companies to take advantage of city programs.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you. Well,
I again, want to lend my voice to those who have
already spoken in favor of this and I look forward to
being able to cast my vote in the affirmative. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So I'd like to ask why you chose to do the reimbursement system rather than just a direct payment?

CHRIS BERNER: I'm not sure I'm able to answer that question. I know it was advice that we

2.2

2	received form the law department that this was the
3	smartest way to do it, and I know the companies were
4	in the best position in our view to essentially
5	deliver the money. They have pay processes that we
6	can essentially take advantage of, and I know from
7	through the administrative point of view, direct
8	grants to possibly hundreds or thousands of
9	individuals who are not city employees posed a big
10	practical problem, whereas the SBS has the experience
11	in paying companies for doing similar things.

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: And the one thing I'll add is that the--

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: [interposing] Just identify yourself again.

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: Maria TorresSpringer at SBS. The other advantage of using a
reimbursement method is that we are able to then
verify because we will require some documentation
that in fact the payments that employers are required
to workers were in fact paid and not just the wages,
but other whether retirement benefits, health
benefits, payments, also taxes and unemployment
insurance to the extent that they're required to do

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

that. We're able to see that that actually happened and then provide reimbursement to do that.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: And what will that documentation of payment include? Would it be pay stubs?

MARIA TORRES-SPRINGER: So we are right now working on specifically what that documentation will look like, and it is our intent to make sure that it is thorough, but at the same time reasonable given the operational needs of businesses.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. Council Member Miller?

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Thank you, Council Member Dromm. DOE, I have a question about we talk basically, we're talking about how do we kind of restore savings that were achieved. How is the savings achieved in the 40 or 42 million dollars that the DOE saved on the elimination of the Employee Protection Provision? What is the relationship and what are those numbers?

CHRIS BERNER: Councilman Miller, if I can respond to that question with your permission. don't have the exact figures with me, but it was our analysis the savings that it were achieved in in the

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2	round one and the round two bargaining was largely
3	through reductions in individual workers salary and
4	benefit structures.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: So, essentially what we're saying that that savings is basically done on through the compensation wages and/or on the backs of workers.

CHRIS BERNER: All is a big term. I don't know if it was all, but--

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: [interposing] Majority.

CHRIS BERNER: a majority was, and certainly to a degree larger than this Administration wants to manage its contracting.

question, not just obviously for OLR and DOE and for all agencies moving forward as we engage in procurement process that we would like to see that we consider something as the Chairman said, something other than dollars and cents savings and us awarding contracts as we move forward. Certainly lowest responsible bid does not give the city the bang for the buck and really achieve its responsibility in providing the safe and affordable services to our

citizen. So certainly something that we would like to, as we move forward, be able to address that we're not just looking at dollars and cents. And so I have anything further, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Well, thank you,

Council Member Miller, and I guess my feeling on it

is that cheap is not always the best. I mean, you

could take anybody's salary, cut it in half and think

that you're going to get a good job out of them, but

we actually know from experience that experience does

count, and again, I don't think cheapest is always

best. So, thank you. Council Member Chin?

and thank you to the sponsor of the bill, Council

Member Miller for taking leadership on this. My

question is that, I mean, DOE do you save money with

the bidding of these so-called contracts? Has DOE,

does DOE ever did any audits of the company to

determine whether DOE is really getting what they pay

for? And also, how big of profit margin do you think

that these company ought to be able to make as the

middle man to the system?

CHRIS BERNER: As--I'm sorry, I'll give that a go. I do know that as part of the bidding

3

4

J

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2.2

23

24

25

process, the Office of Pupil Transportation takes a very long and hard look at the companies who are bidding for work and have in the past denied, decided not to even consider a bid because they don't think that the company can deliver what it is promising to do, and the company does -- sorry, the OPT does reserve the right to sort of take a hard look at the company and make sure that it is honest about what it's saying. With respect to the profit margin, I don't believe the OPT has access to that kind of level of information, but consistent with Councilman Miller's remarks and my response to his question, what we're looking for is a different way to structure our contracts so that we get good services, reliable services, safe services and uninterrupted services.

getting those services are important, but also making sure that we're, you know, that we protect good quality paying jobs. The fact that these company, you know, they got the bid, but then they're hiring people at so much, you know, less than what people were making; something is wrong there. I know that this legislation, we're trying to--

[applause]

2	
_	
	Ш

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

legislation and this grant program, I think, you know the Mayor and I think with the City Council we wanted

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: And with this

going forward, I think even with future bidding, we

to fix and correct the mistake that was made, but

really need to take a look at how do we ensure that

we get all those quality services that you're talking

about, right, good service, safety, but at the same

time that we can guarantee good paying jobs. So and

 ${\tt I'm}$ glad that you're confident that the State

Legislature is going to pass the legislation and

we're going to work with you to make sure it happens,

but I think going forward with future bidding, we got

to really figure out a way, the best way to preserve

good quality paying jobs so that we don't have to go

down this road again.

CHRIS BERNER: We agree and that's why
the State Legislation is an important part of this
solution, because without that State Legislation--let
me put it differently. We need that State
Legislation to address those concerns that you've
expressed and that we share.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: But I think definitely the question that I raise about auditing

2.2

to really get down to find out are we really getting the value of the services, because even some company, how do you make sure that they are doing the right thing? So down the road, you know, with bidding of these contracts we also have to put in provision to really keep on checking to make sure that we are getting the value.

with you that in my experience of working with the very hardworking employees of OPT, they are extraordinarily vigilant about the level of service that the companies are delivering and they are very responsive to information provided by parents and students, and they follow up on all of the complaints and they watch the companies very, very closely.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Okay. Thank you.

Thank--

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you, Council

Member Chin, and I share your concern also that often

times when we look to have cost savings we assume

that, wrongfully I believe, that the best way to do

that is by cutting the workforce or cutting back on

our workforce, and that's something certainly that

I've always been opposed to and something that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

motivated me actually to run for the City Council that we don't always look to the worker to be the first area that we cut for cost savings. But with that in mind, had the DOE looked at re-routing buses as a possibility for cost saving?

ELIZABETH ROSE: So, routing is something that we focus on very carefully and it's an extremely complicated job. One of the issues that we run up against in re-routing as a solution to reduce the number of buses is that schools typically have very similar start and end times. And so we do try to route more than one school on the same bus route, but to do that we need schools that are in reasonable proximity, but that have different, sufficiently different start times so that we don't have students arriving at one school long before the beginning of the school day or waiting for a very long time after the end of the school day to be picked up. focusing on routing efficiency is something that we do very carefully. We have also built into the current contracts greater flexibility in our bus units. So we have buses with flexible seating that allow the bus to change its configuration to accommodate the different children's needs and that

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2	has	also	helped	reduce	the	number	of	buses	that	are
3	real	ıired	and hel	In save	mone	7				

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So I'm curious to know also how this grant program may impact future bidding and what that would like. When are future bids due, etcetera? Can you give us an idea of that?

ELIZABETH ROSE: So we do have a round of bids for contracts beginning September 2015 out currently. Those bids are currently due in October and we are considering what the potential options are for that round of bids in light of the city's seeking of new state legislation.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Would the determination of those bids also be dependent upon legislation on a state level being passed?

ELIZABETH ROSE: Yes, I believe that would be the case.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Are there any bus companies that where you have a greater benefit than others by virtue of the action this legislation would enact, would propose?

ELIZABETH ROSE: Well, I think the benefit is to works, and to the extent that a bus company is able to hire more experienced workers that

would be a greater benefit. Chris, do you want to add to that?

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: There's been some concern expressed by some of my colleagues that this bill set a precedent for other unions who feel that they are due something in the past. How do you react to that, how do you respond to this setting of precedent for other contracts?

CHRIS BERNER: We're confident that it doesn't set a precedent because it's based on such an unusual set of circumstances and an unusual conversion of events. There is nothing like the Employee Protection Provision that was the subject of the rebidding. These workers provide a very unique service, transporting kids, and I should emphasize that they're engaged in the care and the transport of our special education students on a very special population that relies on the experience of the workers who know the routes and who know the stops and who know the parents and who know the kids. So I'm confident that it would be difficult for any other situation to match that set of facts.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay. And before I allow Council Member Garodnick to question again, I

1		
ш	Ш	

_

2.2

just want to--this legislation is going to cover 2014, but there are other contract years that are in question as well, I think 2013, obviously 2015 moving forward. What's happening with the other contracts in the other years? Is there anything going on with that?

CHRIS BERNER: Well, we talked about the 2015 contracts.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Right.

CHRIS BERNER: This bill is aimed at the companies for the 2014 new contracts. With respect to the 2013 contracts, workers adversely affected by that process might still be eligible if they've been rehired by one of the 16 companies.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, Council Member Garodnick?

again, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to just ask a few more questions about precedent here. Do we know of any other municipality that has a requirement on successor contractors that they retain employees who were laid off when a previous contractor lost a bid, keep them at the same salary and benefit levels, do

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 54
2	we know are thereis there precedent for this in
3	over cities?
4	CHRIS BERNER: I'm not familiar with the
5	details, but I would offer a precedent or an analog
6	in this city.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
8	CHRIS BERNER: There is a law in the
9	books, the building service workers displacement law,
LO	or something like that, and it imposes requirements
L1	on a company that successfully obtained a bid to
L2	provide building services or security services. And
L3	I don't want to speculate on the details, but I do
L 4	think there is that bill, although structured to keep
L5	is a transaction between two private parties does
L 6	imposed additional requirements on the successor to
L7	offer work to the adversely affected workers of the
L8	predecessor.
L 9	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: It's the
20	building service workers replacement
21	CHRIS BERNER: [interposing] I know it
22	as the Building Service Worker's Protection Law.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, and

that's a city or state law?

23

24

CHRIS BERNER: My understanding is that it's a city ordinance.

take a look at that. Also, do you think that there are any limitations on the Council as to what we could do to supplement the incomes of other workers through grant programs here? And we're talking about school bus drivers today, but do you think if there were any limitations on us and our ability to do this in other industries?

CHRIS BERNER: I'll give you a two part answer. First part, yes, I do think there are limitations. The second part is I think there are people more qualified than me who could provide a much more detailed answer and that would be the law department, but I do think there are rules that we have to follow in that respect.

agree. Okay, we will follow up with that. Let me cover two or three last issues. The Court of Appeals and their decision back in 2011, they questioned the legality of the EPPs because of cost inflation. They also suggested that they discourage or prevent new bidders from coming in to try to compete with long

2.2

term contract holders because a vendor's bid would have to reflect not only the known cost of paying their own employees, but the unknown cost of paying the former employees or whoever they're competing against. If there were in fact a state law enable EPP's in this context, do you think that it could still be vulnerable to a legal argument that it is anticompetitive and that it does not allow somebody to break in here, because they wouldn't know exactly how much they would have to pay because they don't have access to the information about existing workforce that is in place?

Vulnerable to that challenge. I would be interested in hearing an opposing view, obviously, but I think the state legislation that the city is pursuing is tailored to address the very specific issues raised by the L&M decision. And the L&M decision said, if I recall, is resolving a question of law under state procurement rules, and it didn't say that EPP's were on their face illegal, but that they—the— we didn't meet a standard, a burden of proof. We didn't meet a strict scrutiny for why they are necessary. So the state legislation would address that and would change

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2	the	law	to	make	something	like	employee	safeguards
3	perr	nissi	ible	ے ۔				

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. The last question for you is, the companies that bid on that last RPF, of the 16 that are relevant—

CHRIS BERNER: [interposing] More than

16.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: I'm sorry. Okay, right. The 16 resulting bidders, the successful ones, tell me why this is how I'm thinking about this issue and tell me if this is wrong. folks who were the successful ones were successful on the basis at least in part that they were the low bidders, because the city has an obligation to accept lowest bids under local law, state law, etcetera. Presumably, these were the winning bids because they were anticipating paying less to their workers. we authorize a grant program here for those companies, that one on the basis of being the lowest bidders, are we not penalizing the folks who were bidding and intending to keep their senior workforce and their highest paid workers in place?

CHRIS BERNER: I don't believe, because fundamentally this is a city program addressing a

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2.2

city interest in ensuring uninterrupted delivery and
smooth services until we have a state solution. It is
not a DOE program. It's not a DOE contracting
process.

haven't answered my specific question as why I'm thinking about it, why I'm thinking about it wrong. Because it seems to me that the folks who were the winners were the ones who said, well, I have an opportunity to bid less and pay less to my workers. There were people who were shut out who were willing to pay more and keep their senior employees in place. We are supplementing the low bidders here and leaving the high bidders out in the cold. Are we not?

CHRIS BERNER: No, I think ultimately it's a decision of every company or eligible company whether it wants to take advantage, and again, it's a city program. It's not a DOE program, but I understand the point you're making.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Let me ask also, what is the total value of the contract for the 16 companies?

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 59
2	CHRIS BERNER: We may have that
3	information at hand if you can give us a moment.
4	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Because we need that
5	before we can vote on this.
6	ELIZABETH ROSE: Let me get back to you
7	with that.
8	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Yeah, and also the
9	percentage for salaries and the total cost of
10	benefits as well. And the names of the 16 bus
11	companies. You'll provide us with that?
12	ELIZABETH ROSE: So we would not have the
13	specific detail on the total, the salaries and
14	benefits and those are individual to each company and
15	they are effectively private agreements between those
16	companies and their unions or workers, but I can get
17	the value of the contracts.
18	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Sorry, I couldn't
19	hear you. I'm sorry.
20	ELIZABETH ROSE: We actually don't have
21	the specific values of wages and benefits for each of
22	those companies. They are private relationships
23	between the companies and their unions or their
24	workers, but I can get the value of the total

contracts.

Williams, who also has questions.

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr.

Chair, and thank you for testifying. I missed--I missed quite a few testimonies, so I'm probably going to repeat some questions. Please feel free to repeat some answer. So I think I'm generally in a supportive mode. I do have a lot of concerns, though. One, I think obviously this is a -- to me, this is a unique situation and I think it was particularly egregious what happened, and particularly intentional, and that doesn't always in occur in the proper combination. But I do have some concerns. One, I know you may have answered this, but the 42 million dollars, I'm just concerned as a Council Member that we found that money. So are you saying that there's going to be no cuts to any programs, no cuts to anything and we're still going to be able to have the 42 million dollars?

going to disrupt any service to any students. We will continue to provide all of our services to students as they are needed. We will-- we don't know that it will be the full 42 million dollars of cost. That is the maximum possible cost, but it could be less dependent upon how many employees of these 16

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

2	companies	are	eligible	and	what	their	wage	rates	or
3	wage diffe	erent	-ials are						

2.2

apparently I have a lot of time. So you could have 42 million dollars, but it sounds like that money was just lying there for you to take up, and the Council didn't know anything about it when we passed the budget. So I need to understand where that money is coming from.

ELIZABETH ROSE: So, as we said earlier, on a temporary short term basis we have sufficient money to cover through the fall, the first couple of months as we see what the potential size of the ultimate program would be.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay, how much-

ELIZABETH ROSE: [interposing] And we'll work with the city.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: potential short time money do you have right now?

ELIZABETH ROSE: Well, the transportation budget in total is over a billion dollars, so we always have the ability to cover unforeseen circumstances for a short period of time.

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 63
2	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So if the
3	Council, if we recognize some other programs that
4	have shortfalls, we can come to you for the short
5	term money that can equal up to one billion dollars?
6	ELIZABETH ROSE: No, we plan to use our
7	funds to provide our services to students. Thank you.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So what is the
9	difference with this short term, 42 million dollars
10	and other programs we may recognize that need
11	additional funding and would like to tap into that
12	short term money?
13	CHRIS BERNER: If I may, I think the
14	difference here is we're addressing an immediate need
15	on a short time frame. The school year is about to
16	start, and the DOE budget is large enough to
17	facilitate an intra-city transfer, certainly in the
18	first months of this grant program, and once we have
19	a better sense of what the school year cost is going
20	to be, we can figure out a more permanent funding
21	solution.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Just so I'm

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Just so I'm clear, so then what it sounds like we have this money that's available and pliable to fill gaps, but the

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

10

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2 23

24

25

only thing that we think that it should be used for now is the 42 million dollars in this bill.

CHRIS BERNER: That's certainly what we're proposing that--that's certainly the funds we're proposing to cover the initial cost for this 42 million dollars upwards of 42 million dollar program.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I just want to say for the record, I am very concerned that we passed the budget and it seems that there might be a billing of that that is more pliable than we understood. There are other programs that we might be able to use funding for. So that concerns me a little bit forward and something I need to keep in my head as we pass the budget. I do also want to make sure I state that I am also concerned that when we, and if this passes, we are clear of the uniqueness of the situation, because I'm also concerned of a door being opened that this can happen to everybody. I also want to share some of the sentiments of my colleague Dan Garodnick that there are--we are in essence rewarding some bad actors. There might not be a way to fix that right now, so I understand we have to fix what we can fix, but I just want to make sure I'm on record of just being a little concerned

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: [interposing] Yes.

24

ELIZABETH ROSE: that were rewarded for September 14, the new contracts in fiscal year '15 total 179.1 million dollars, and over a five year period, 933.8 million dollars.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay. Okay, thank you. We appreciate it, and that will be it for this panel. We appreciate you coming in to explain this and thank you very, very much. Now I'd like to ask Michael Cordiello from the ATU 1181 President to come up. Okay, Mr. Cordiello, welcome, and if you'd like to begin.

MICHAEL CORDIELLO: Good afternoon,

Chairman Dromm, members of the committee, and I'd

like to thank Speaker Mark-Viverito for earlier

coming to this hearing. I'd like to thank you for

holding this important hearing, for this opportunity

to testify before you. My name is Michael Cordiello

and I am the President of Local 1181 of the

Amalgamated Transit Union. I am appearing before you

today on behalf of 12,000 men and women of Local 1181

to urge you to support the two reconsidered items on

today's agenda, a Local Law that would create an

employment program to incentivize the rehiring and

retention of qualified, experienced and skilled

2	school bus employees laid off at the end of last
3	school year, the resolution calling upon the Governor
4	and legislature to require that all future school bus
5	transportation contracts include the Employee
6	Protection Provision. At the outset of my testimony
7	I want to express my gratitude the Mayor, Mayor de
8	Blasio, Speaker Mark-Viverito and Council Member
9	Miller for their commitment to our city school
10	children who we in the school bus industry refer to
11	as our most precious cargo, and for their commitment
12	to our city school's bus employees which commitment
13	was critical to the development of the items on
14	today's agenda. Before former Mayor Bloomberg began
15	his assault nearly two years ago on the hardworking
16	and dedicated and experienced men and women who
17	safely transport our city school children for
18	decades, Local 1181 represented some 9,000 members,
19	approximately 75 to 80 percent of the industry who
20	worked in New York City K-12 school bud industry,
21	including special education transportation. As a
22	result of a his actions, we have since lost
23	approximately 3,000 members, almost all whom have
24	worked with students with special needs. Because
25	they have lost their jobs in addition those workers

2 who have been lucky enough to keep their jobs, 3 thousands have been forced to accept severe pay cuts. The result of such drastic loss of members and cuts 4 5 in pay have been challenging for our union. But the impact has also been felt all around the city, as 90 6 7 percent of our members are New York residents. The economic ripple effect of people out of work and 8 making less than they need to support their families 9 can be devastating for working families and 10 communities. Just as troubling, the loss of jobs by 11 12 these thousands of individuals demonstrates the loss 13 of qualified, experienced and skilled workforce to 14 whom we entrust the safe transportation of our 15 children. As many of the parents of children who are 16 transported by local 1181 members have expressed to 17 you in prior council hearings, and as many I'm sure 18 will express again today, it is bad policy to allow what traditionally has been a very qualified 19 20 experienced and skilled workforce in the school bus industry to replace by a non-skilled, inexperienced 21 2.2 and transient workforce. I commend the Mayor and 23 Council for their recognition of that, which is 24 demonstrated by the proposal to create a school bus 25 employment program. This program will encourage

2 employers to rehire school bus employees who would 3 work during the 2013-2014 school year but have since lost their jobs, and to prevent a reduction in pay 4 5 for those employees. While the success of the program ultimately depends on the employer's 6 7 willingness to hire eligible employees who are laid off after the end of school year, we are confident 8 that this program will not only provide much needed 9 financial relief to people who would otherwise be 10 struggling to make ends meet. We are also confident 11 12 that this program will signal a reversal of the race 13 to the bottom that was set in motion by the former 14 Mayor Bloomberg. This bill also demonstrates a 15 commitment as a part of the Mayor and Council to 16 working people, a commitment which the Mayor, the 17 Speaker and many Council Members have expressed over 18 and over again, and a commitment which New Yorkers appreciate and care about. We take great comfort in 19 20 knowing that those are not empty promises as evidence by the legislation under consideration today. While 21 2.2 we recognize that the legislative authority of the 23 city to affect change in this area is limited, the proposed Employment Program is worthy and laudable 24 exercise of that authority. We also commend Council 25

2	Members Miller and Eugene for the companion
3	resolution that calls up on the Governor and
4	legislation, legislature to reintroduce the EPP into
5	all future busing contracts in conjunction with the
6	employment program. The amendment to the New York
7	State Law referenced in that resolution would promote
8	the retention of hardworking, qualified, experienced
9	and skilled workforce throughout the entire school
10	bus industry. Local 1181 has been calling upon the
11	governor and legislature to enact such legislation
12	for several legislative sessions now. Indeed, as the
13	resolution indicates, the legislature did support the
14	legislation in the past, and it was untimely defeated
15	at the request of Mayor Bloomberg. We thank the
16	Speaker and those Council Members who signed a letter
17	of support earlier this year, asking that the
18	legislatorasking the legislature to pass and the
19	Governor to sign A9499S7233 introduced by O'Donald
20	[sic] and Delan [sp?], which would have made the
21	inclusion of the Employment Protection Provision
22	mandatory in school bus contracts. We look forward
23	to working together on this issue in the next
24	legislative session. I'll now be happy to answer
25	questions you may have.

J

state level?

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you very much.

I guess my question is how confident are you that
we're going to be able to take care of this at the

MICHAEL CORDIELLO: Well, I believe that we'd have this support of the Assembly and the Senate over the last few years, and as my statement read, it was untimely that Mayor Bloomberg who at one point supported EPPs decided that he didn't support EPPs once we got it to the level of the Governor's office. So I believe working together, we should be able to convince the legislature to carry on what they've already started.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you. And Council Member Miller?

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Good afternoon,

Mr. President. Glad to see you again. I just want
to digress and talk about one of the questions that
was asked to the last panel in terms of achieving
savings. And one of the things that was mentioned was
routing and I know in my past life a union president
in transportation, I was directly involved in the
operations and planning which was not limited to
route planning, but certainly there were many areas

Eugene?

Miller.

where you sat down and discussed potential savings through efficiencies and so forth. Have you in fact, sat down with the companies and/or with the DOE to discuss potential savings outside of wage reductions?

in that discussion. We'd be willing to participate in any discussion. We do have ideas about or would like to discuss ideas about how we can achieve more efficient service and the use of different, you know, possibly different vehicles, but no one has engaged us in that discussion.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Okay, thank you.

And thank you for your efforts and for the record, I concur with what you said about potential legislation in Albany based on my experience and discussions with some of the leadership up there and knowing that it had passed both houses on several occasions. I don't see any reason why it shouldn't do the same and why the Governor should not sign this as we move forward. So, thank you.

MICHAEL CORDIELLO: Thank you, Councilman

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Council Member

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

19

18

20

2122

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER EUGENE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair and Mr. Cordiello. Let me take the opportunity one more time to commend you and all your members and all my colleagues from government also who will stick together and continue to fight to get to this point. This is a wonderful day, as I said before, and you can count on us, we members of the City Council. We will continue to work together with you and to make sure that the hardworking people, they get back their EPP, as I usually said. But having said that, after passing this legislation and also sending the Reso to Albany, is there any other advice what you could tell us we from the City Council we can do together? Is there any other thing you would like to ask us to do or any detail in short [sic] and are we going to work together to move forward toward the installation of the EPP?

MICHAEL CORDIELLO: I mean, I think as things unfold and as we see the response that we get from state legislators, we would then come back to you for any kind of help that we may need. At this juncture I think this first step and we know this is not the cure, this is the band aid, but I think at this first step, we need to get over this hurdle, and

2.2

then we certainly will have open doors with City
Council and the Mayor's Office to bring forth any
ideas we think that would promote legislature in this
state and/or any other opportunities we might have to
get our agenda done.

COUNCIL MEMBER EUGENE: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, and Mr.

President, I was wondering if you might have any
comments on Council Member Garodnick's concerns
regarding rewarding these 16 low bidders, whereas
those who may have may a little bit higher were
outbidded on this? It seems to him and maybe to some
of the members of the committee as well that we may
in fact be rewarding those who did the most harm to
some of our workers.

MICHAEL CORDIELLO: Well, I think that goes right to the heart of taking the EPP out. Had the EPP been in that bid, people would have been bidding at a fair, on a playing field that's fair for everyone, knowing what labor would cost, they would bid appropriately on how much and how efficient they want to run their business then. And I think that there's some credibility to what he said, but we're

2	not in that position right now. We're in a different
3	position and I think, you know, to address his
4	question, to do nothing now would be wrong, and there
5	is some credibility to the fact that EPP should have
6	been in and it wouldn't have been an issue.
7	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Well, I just want to

thank you for coming in, and you know, I was a union activist for 25 years as well, and seniority is always been held up as, you know, an obligation that we have to reward workers who have been satisfactorily rated and performed well on their job, and I deeply believe that it's something we should still continue to honor and to abide by, and that's why we're here today to try to fix this terrible situation that we found ourselves in with the previous administration. So, I thank you for you coming in.

MICHAEL CORDIELLO: Thank you very much, and thank you very much for all the help that you are lending to myself and my members.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you.

[applause]

2.2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

1516

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, Carter Pote?

Pate, I'm sorry, with MV Transportation. Mr. Pate,

if you'd like to begin?

CARTER PATE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education. Thank you for holding this important hearing on the preconsidered bill and resolution. My name is Carter Pate. I am the Chief Executive Officer of MV Transportation. We employ more than 16,000 dedicated transit professionals who provide transportation services in approximately 27 states and Canada. MV first began providing school bus services in New York City in 2011 when we purchased the asset of a bankrupt school bus operator, USA United Fleet Incorporated. MV student transportation subsidiary, Reliant Transportation, assumed the existing bus fleet and four New York City Department of Education contracts at that time. assets of the bankrupt company were in complete disarray. The company was dark. There were no employees. MV sent a team of employees to New York City who worked 24 hours a day to ensure that the school buses would be running for the 2011-2012 year. Because of the hard work of this time, Reliant

2 operated more than 500 bus routes with approximately 3 600 vehicles for that school year with approximately three weeks of preparation in order to salvage this--4 these bus routes. MV will be providing bus services in New York City this school year. MV's first 6 priority is to ensure that school children are transported safely and efficiently to and from school 8 every day, and we consider our employees and the 9 Department of Education our partners and have always 10 worked closely with them to achieve this goal. MV 11 12 supports the preconsidered bill being heard today, 13 which would provide grants to school bus companies to 14 provide salaries, health and retirement benefits to 15 bus drivers, attendants, dispatchers and mechanics equal to the salaries health and retirement benefits 16 that such employees would have received under 17 18 contracts with the EPP. We thank the Mayor's Office, The Department of Ed, and local 1181 for working with 19 20 us on this preconsidered bill. This is a good 2.1 solution to a difficult problem and will support some 2.2 stability for next school year. MV also supports 23 the resolution calling upon the State Legislature to enact and the Governor to sign into law legislation 24 that would mandate EPP's in school bus contracts. As 25

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

with any employer, we operate better as a company when our employee are happy and paid good wages with good benefits. Although the removal of EPP clearly hurt school bus company employees, most people do not realize that it also hurt the school bus companies because the removal of the EPP required us and the others to assume the liabilities for deficiencies in the labor union's pension fund even after the contracts have long expired. This is because without EPP there is no certainty a successor contractor will step in and assume these obligations. EPP's provide that when a school bus contract expires, the company that wins the new contract assumes the liability for the pensions. MV is committed to working once again with our partners, the city, our employees to support a state law reinstating EPP's. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the Education Committee for giving me this opportunity to support this preconsidered bill and resolution.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Pate, for coming in. I certainly hope we have more bus company owners like you that will also support this. And I appreciate the point that you made in terms of the difficulties that companies will

2.2

have regarding the retirement plan for people if in fact this situation is not corrected, and it's something that we had not heard about previously in the testimony that was given, but I think that you make a good point of why this legislation is so important as well. Any questions? No? Okay. I would like to thank you for coming in and I would like to thank you for your support.

CARTER PATE: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Now we're going to hear from some bus drivers themselves, Earnst Pierre [sp?] school bus driver at Reliant, Arcadio Fret [sp?], Jr., ATU 1181 bus driver and Kelly D'Coursey [sp?] Local 1181, a driver as well. If there's anybody else who wanted to give testimony, you'd have to fill out a form that the Sergeant at Arms has, otherwise, this will be our last panel. Okay, and who would like to start? Okay.

ARCADIO FRET: Good afternoon, Chairman,
City Councilmen. I've been a bus driver for about 10
years. I love my job. I love what I do. The
situation with the EPP really basically destroyed my
livelihood. I'm right now forced to go to another
company that's going to pay half my wages, no medical

2.1

2.2

benefits and no pension. Living in New York City is very tough. I have two children, rent or pay [sic] those to take care of. And basically I'm just urging the City Council to pass this grant. So, you know, help us get back on our feet. It's a difficult situation, you know, so I just want to appreciate you guys and thank you very much for helping us, because we do need your help. It's a tough battle, but with your help we could overcome. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. Next please?

KELLY D'COURSEY: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Kelly D'Coursey. I've been a school bus driver for 20 year. I was laid off last year for seven months, and I was able to pick back into a company that still had the EPP. I was lucky enough for that. It's, I think that the children are the ones that are going to suffer the most from all this. Over the summer, I'll just give you a little example, I had a little child on the bus. She was autistic, severely, and her mother used to have to give us a harness. We used to have to harness her in, and she used to cry a lot, scream a lot, bit herself, and it's really heartbreaking when you see this. And she

2 told me, the previous bus driver used to threaten to call the police on her child every day if she didn't 3 do something with her. They don't understand the disabilities that these children have. You don't 5 just call the police because a child cries. It's 6 7 inhuman the way they act, and I'm afraid of what's going to happen for these kids. At the end of the 8 school year, at the end of the summer, the child for 9 the first time looked me in the eye and it was very 10 hard for her to do, and she hugged me before she got 11 12 off that bus, and I can't even tell you the feeling that that is, to know that I made a difference in a 13 14 small way, but in a big way to the parent who was so 15 appreciative of it, and she said, "Thank you so much. 16 I hope that we can get you next year." and I mean, I 17 hope I could too, or someone as experienced as I am 18 also. The parents, they trust us. We have their children. It's very hard for them as a parent to give 19 20 their child to us, and we're transporting them safely and we're doing the right thing, but to have somebody 21 2.2 tell you, "Oh, I'm going to call the police on your 23 child because your child is ill." That's--it's not right. And who knows, you know, who knows what can 24 25 happen then. Thank you.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you very much.

3 Next please?

EARNEST PIERRE: Good afternoon. My name is Earnest Pierre and I have been in this industry for the past 14 years and a driver as well. In the last 18 months, we have been suffered the most hardship that anyone in any industry could ever suffer. I have friends, co-workers, even family members in which their livelihood has been distraught. They're not able to pay their bill. They're not able to support their family. Some of them in which they even get evicted from their houses. I, myself, I have two children, one on the way, with a girlfriend, wife, a partner who's been in this industry and been laid off. Without the EPP we do not know what's going to happen. Without the support of this bill we do not know how many lives that's going to be destroyed. Recently, we are about to have 1,200 other members who's going to be added on the Seniority Master List. If the City Council do not urge the companies to hire people from the Master List, it's going to be a disaster again, open [sic] disaster. So I'm plea--I'm begging the City Council, the members and the Mayor to do the right thing by

supporting this bill, by passing it so that at least we can see the light at the end. We're doing this for passion. We love what we do. Once those kids get on the bus, they are our children. It's our job to protect them from the time that the parents escorted them into the bus, it's the drivers and the matron who will be sweating tears day and night to protect those children. So, please do what's best for us. Thank you very much.

[applause]

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Council Member

Eugene?

2.2

also the other drivers, I just want to commend you for your dedication and your love in helping students, and I know what you—I got an idea of what you went through because I remember in my office so many of bus drivers and matron came to my office and stated they couldn't, you know, pay their bill. They were going to be evicted. They couldn't maintain the family. I know what you went through, and that's the reason I stood with you. That's the reason I will continue to stand with you, because you have done what you are supposed to do, helping the children

with dedication and love. You know what you have bee	n
doing. You have been doing it for so many years.	
You didn't deserve to go through that. You didn't	
deserve to go through that, and you can be ensured	
that we on the City Council, we are going to do	
anything in our power to make sure as anyone working	•
hard in the New York City, you will be provided also	1
with the benefit and the support that you need.	
Because, as I said, we in the City Council we are	
doing any effort that we can do to make sure we	
improve the quality of life of the hardworking peopl	е
in New York City. We voted to increase the minimum	
wages, and we are making all the effort. As a matte	r
of fact, we've passed legislation for paid sick	
leave, and we should do the same for you. You also	
receive respect, equity and justice. And we in this	
City Council, we are determined to do everything tha	.t
we can do for you to have your benefit back. Thank	
you.	

EARNEST PIERRE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Well, thank you

Council Member Eugene, and before I let this panel

go, I'd like to say I was a New York City public

school teacher for 25 years until I got elected to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

the City Council in 2009, and I actually taught up until two months before coming into the council. So I've only been away from the schools for the last four and a half years or so, and I know as a teacher how important our bus drivers and our matrons are to the educational process, because you pick those kids up first thing in the morning. You set the tone and the mood in the bus for them before they get to school. You pick them up in the afternoon. You take them home safely to their parents. You take us on the school trips. You take us there safely. You accomplish all of those things, and I just want to say how grateful I was personally as a teacher to have competent good bus drivers making sure that our children arrived and left school safely on a daily basis, and I want to say thank you all for coming and giving your testimony. Thank you very much.

EARNEST PIERRE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

ARCADIO FRET: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: We do have one more who would like to speak and his name is Kennedy, and I can hardly read the last name. I think it's Zomilus [sp?] Okay, and would you like to begin?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 KENNEDY ZOMILUS: Thank you, Mr.

Since we was in strat [sic], you was Chairman. promise. Your promise was you would will be behind Until today, we realize it. You're still behind us. My wife been in the, that job for 15 years. I've been on the job for five years, but I've been out of job since February, and many of us been out. kids going to college. I got kids now supposed to pay for their school. Until now, I don't know yet how I going to pay. All my bill is behind, and I believe by giving that money--open your eyes on what hands that money going to, because some companies, other people without experience while we still outside? The money that you going to give them, be sure they use that money the proper way. Thank you for your support. Thank you Dr. [sic] Eugene, because I know you fight a lot for us, and all the Council Member, Chairman, we--you are on our heart [sic], because since we was outside, we knows who look for us, and we are New Yorkers. We will stand behind you 1181, we not going to back up. We'll be behind you and support you on everything. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you very much and I'm very honored and touched by that and I

remember those cold January days standing out on the picket lines fighting for justice for our bus drivers and hopefully this is the first step in the right direction of correcting what was a horrible situation and I thank you very much for coming in. I thank everybody for joining us today and I want to say that this meeting is now adjourned at—let me see—3:15 in the afternoon. Thank you very much everyone.

[gavel]

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date _____August 23, 2014