CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

----- X

September 25, 2015 Start: 1:59 p.m. Recess: 2:21 p.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E:

HELEN K. ROSENTHAL

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Peter A. Koo Ruben Wills

Costa G. Constantinides

Chaim M. Deutsch Corey D. Johnson I. Daneek Miller

Elizabeth S. Crowley

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

Lisette Camilo Director Mayor's Office of Contract Services City Chief Procurement Officer

Tracey Knuckles

Deputy Commissioner & General Counsel

Department of Cultural Affairs

Christabel Gough
The Society for the Architecture of the City

Maggie Cankar Representing Self

Talia Werber
Policy and Research Manager
Citizens Union

Prudence Katze
Policy and Research Manager
Common Cause New York

Paula Glatzer Representing Self

John O'Reilly Resident of Queens County Representing Self

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

Laura Abel Lawyer Lawyers Alliance for New York

Michelle Jackson
Associate Director
Human Services Council of New York

Ginny Louloudes
Executive Director
Alliance of Resident Theatres

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

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much. Good afternoon. I'm Helen Rosenthal, chair of the Committee on Contracts and I'm calling this hearing to order. [gavel] That was really fun.

So today we're here to discuss concerns regarding the City's management and oversight of executive positions at nonprofit organizations that receive City funds. Both the Department of Investigation and the Comptroller's Office have investigated executives at City-funded nonprofits who engaged in fraud and mismanagement of taxpayer dollars. It is imperative that we do everything we can to ensure that City dollars are going to the intended essential services provided by nonprofits; not directly and illegally into the pockets of those in leadership positions.

Intro No. 288-A, as proposed by my colleague, Council Member Liz Crowley, would require financial disclosures from all persons at nonprofits who are in leadership positions. The purpose of this bill is to provide transparency, giving the Mayor's Office of Contracts, as well as the agency accos [sic] an opportunity to identify potential conflicts of interest of the nonprofits' executives. Currently

2.2

2.3

the City Charter requires that such disclosures from
nonprofits' board of directors but not from their
presidents, CEOs or executive directors. However, as
we know, those in leadership positions have the
responsibility to make decisions regarding
operational allocations and vendor selection. We
must ensure that these individuals are not utilizing
City funds for personal gain and that the City is
aware of any potential conflicts. Intro 288-A
provides the City with transparency to see a possible
red flag upon reviewing a nonprofit contract.

I look forward to a productive hearing where we will delve into examples of past conflicts of interest that occurred at City-funded nonprofits; we'll also discuss this bill in detail and learn about the administration's current practices and safeguards when granting funds to nonprofits. I'd like to open the door to any and all recommendations on how the City can avoid such issues in the future.

Thank you all in advance for providing testimony that is informative and moves us forward in finding an effective solution. And as soon as my colleague Liz Crowley joins us she'll give her statement as well, but for now I'd like to turn it

organizations to submit financial disclosures to the

City. While the administration supports the goals of the present legislation to guard against conflicts of interest in City-funded nonprofits, there are a number of recently enacted provisions of state law and protections at the city level that attend to the concerns this bill seeks to address.

Section 111 of the City Charter was enacted in 1978 and predates -- excuse me -- predates much modern regulation of nonprofits, particularly recently enacted requirements relating to conflicts of interest. In fact, Section 111 has its origins going back much further than 1978, as it reflects policies of the Board of Estimate that apparently date back to the City's 1913 budget. The age of this provision is reflected by its reference to the charitable institutions budget, a section of the budget that has not existed for decades. Given the substantial changes to the legal scheme regulating nonprofits since Section 111 of the Charter was enacted, any effort to address or alter the City's current approach to conflicts of interest at Cityfunded nonprofits must take into account recent developments and enactments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2	Currently, issues related to conflicts of
3	interest for directors, officers and key employees
4	are covered by an extensive scheme in the Not-For-
5	Profit Corporation Law, as amended and strengthened
6	by the Nonprofit Revitalization Act. The important
7	policies reflected in Section 111 are also now
8	addressed in provisions of the Public Authorities
9	Law, as amended by the Public Authorities
10	Accountability Act and the City's Standard Contracts
11	The recent NPRA, which was enacted in
12	2013, made significant changes to state law

The recent NPRA, which was enacted in 2013, made significant changes to state law requirements regarding nonprofit governance, with the State Legislature focusing in particular on integrity and accountability, which were of particular concern. The NPRA notably strengthened provisions related to interested directors by adding important new requirements and procedures relating to what it termed related party transactions; meaning, any transaction, agreement or other arrangement involving the nonprofit in which a person or entity closely related to the nonprofit, including directors, officers, key employees and their relatives, has a financial interest. The NPRA also empowered the Attorney General to enjoin, void or rescind any such

2.2

2.3

transaction that violates the requirements of the law or is otherwise not reasonable or in the best

interest of the nonprofit.

The NPRA further added a requirement that nonprofits must adopt conflict of interest and whistleblower policies and set forth a list of the minimum elements of those conflicts of interest policies which seek to ensure proper disclosure of conflicts and recusal of conflicted persons, as well as requiring written annual disclosures of key information by directors. The NPR further enhanced corporate governance by requiring that only independent directors could serve on the audit committee or oversee the adoption, implementation of or compliance with the conflict of interest or whistleblower policies.

For nonprofits that are affiliated with, sponsored by or created by the City, the Public Authorities Law, as amended by the Public Authorities Accountability Act sets forth its own rigorous requirements related to transparency and accountability. The boards of such nonprofits, which are defined as local authorities by the PAAA, must adopt a whistleblower policy and an ethics policy

2.2

2.3

applicable to each director, officer and employee
that meets standard set forth in the Public Officers
Law. Local authorities must also have a governance
committee and an audit committee, both of which must
include a majority of directors who do not have a
financial interest in a local authority.
Furthermore, directors, officers and employees of
local authorities must receive training on their
fiduciary duties and file annual financial
disclosures with the Conflicts of Interest Board

address the concerns about corporate conflicts and integrity with respect to nonprofits that receive City funds. Following the enactment of the NPRA, the City revised its form, human services and discretionary fund contracts to strengthen existing conflicts provisions. Among the revisions was a mandate that contractors maintain a conflict of interest policy as required by the NPRA that would include, among other things, procedures addressing related party transactions. While related party transactions can be beneficial to nonprofits, our goal is to use the contracting process to hole organizations accountable to state law governing

1
_

these transactions and ensure that all such transactions are conducted in a transparent and appropriate manner. If a nonprofit expends any city contract funds via a related party transaction that does not adhere to the legal requirements, the City may recoup those funds.

I'd like to turn the testimony over to

Tracey Knuckles, Deputy Commissioner and General

Counsel of the Department of Cultural Affairs, to

talk about the DCLA oversight of nonprofit cultural

organizations and then I will finish giving my

testimony.

TRACEY KNUCKLES: Good afternoon Chair Rosenthal and Council Member Crowley.

The Department of Cultural Affairs has procedures for oversight of the cultural institutions receiving City funds. For the 33 institutions on City-owned property, known as the Cultural Institutions Group (CIG), the DCLA commissioner serves as an ex officio member of the CIG Boards of Directors and attends or sends delegates to those board meetings, public programs and community activities. DCLA may also conduct in-depth reviews of specific concerns identified during the course of

2.2

2.3

monitoring of the institution's operations. CIGs are required to submit detailed reports to the agency on an annual basis, known as Obligation Plans and Final Reports, which detail, among other things, the uses slated for City funding, public programming, fundraising goals and activities and attendance numbers.

In addition, in 2007, the Department of Cultural Affairs instituted the Culture Stat

Evaluation Tool to members of the CIG to promote good governance and financial management. Among the requirements of Culture Stat are the existence of a written code of ethics, conflicts of interest policy, whistleblower procedures and document retention schedule. Documentation of responsible budgeting, including timely planning of expense and income projections for upcoming capital projects is also a requirement.

For organizations receiving funding through Cultural Affairs Program Services Unit, the agency requires a grant application with a detailed scope of cultural services to be supported by the City funding and a corresponding budget, along with details about organizational governance and capacity,

2.2

2.3

including term limits for members of the board of directors, the existence of an active committee structure, including the existence of an audit or finance committee and the level of board participation and giving as a percentage of overall operating income.

In addition, as part of its report to the agency on City-funded public services, cultural organizations must certify that no director, officer, employee, subcontractor or outside service provider has any personal interest, direct or indirect, that conflicts with the performance of the City-funded public service.

Finally, Cultural Affairs requires
organizations to be in good standing with respect to
annual filings required by the State Attorney General
and the Internal Revenue Service, thus ensuring that
City-funded organizations are up-to-date with both
state and federal regulatory oversight requirements.

LISETTE CAMILO: There are more than 1400 nonprofit vendors with open human services contracts; the overwhelming majority are organizations that have truly dedicated leadership and staff and perform excellent work on behalf of the City. While there

2	may be a few bad apples, we should not let those bad
3	apples taint the human services sector. The State,
4	through its various laws and the City have done much
5	work to further the aim of ensuring that our
6	nonprofit partners are exercising best practices and
7	governance. MOCS has made significant investments in
8	its oversight of the nonprofit organizations that the
9	City does business with. Since 2007, the Capacity
10	Building and Oversight Unit at MOCS has worked with
11	city and community partners to address concerns about
12	the capacity and integrity of nonprofit
13	organizations. CBO has conducted approximately 500
14	proactive CBO reviews of nonprofits that have
15	significant business with the City. As part of these
16	reviews, CBO examines the organization's bylaws,
17	board structure, audited financial statements, IRS
18	990s and key policies, including the conflict of
19	interest policy and annual disclosure statements.
20	The conflict of interest policies must adhere to
21	State Law, which requires that the policy state the
22	definition of a conflict, procedures for disclosing
23	conflicts, a requirement that conflicted parties
24	recuse themselves from deliberations, documentation
25	of the deliberations and procedures for disclosing,

2.2

addressing and documented related party transactions.
The organizations must also require directors,
officers and key employees to annually disclose
conflicts of interest. Where deficiencies are found,
CBO makes recommendations to the organization to
remedy those deficiencies and follows up to ensure
compliance. For example, if the organization
indicates in the CBO review questionnaire that the
board does not review the CEO's credit card
statements, CBO will recommend that the board adopt
such a policy that requires the board to review their
CEO's credit card statements.

During a recent CBO review, the team discovered, through its review of an organization's IRS 990, that there were improper related party transactions. A 990 is a nonprofit's annual tax return. The IRS requires exempt organizations to disclose related party transactions in their 990, including the names of the related parties and the amounts of the transactions. Through this disclosure, which is legally mandated, CBO discovered an improper transaction and held the organization accountable for their wrongdoing.

During another recent CBO review, the team discovered that an organization that required annual conflict of interest disclosures was not adequately documenting the audit committee's consideration of those disclosures. Through the CBO review process CBO discussed this deficiency with the organization and will ensure the board properly documents its related party transactions going forward.

Some of these reviews have resulted in Department of Investigation referrals; when MOCS has found an instance of self-dealing that affects the integrity of an otherwise high-quality provider, CBO had worked with the agencies, DOI and the organization's leadership to institute corrective measures. One enforcement mechanism is to develop a citywide corrective action plan with a number of conditions and requirements that the nonprofit must abide by in order to continue working with the City. MOCS monitors and oversees compliance throughout the term of the CAP.

In instances where the City has determined that the integrity of a nonprofit vendor requires more drastic actions, the CAP may include

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

terms that require dismissal of key employees or working with DOI and assigned integrity monitor. The most drastic measure can include contract termination and an assignment of the contract to another provider.

CBO also looks at organizations beyond the competitive procurement portfolio, since the clearance of City Council line item awards goes through the unit as well. CBO staff regularly vet more than 2000 community-based organizations for legal compliance and integrity.

CBO regularly offers free trainings for nonprofit board and staff members on the New York State Not-For-Profit Corporations Law, as well as contract requirements and management and governance best practices.

The City Council funds full-day trainings in each borough every year, which are designed and conducted by our office's CBO staff to ensure that community-based organizations understand their legal obligations.

CBO maintains that NYC nonprofits website (www.nyc.gov/nonprofits) with standards and information about compliance and best practices in

## COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

2	nonprofit	management	and gover	nance	and	refers
3	nonprofits	s to capacit	-v-huildin	a reso	urce	q

CBO also operates the New York City
Nonprofits Help Desk, phone and email, and answers
approximately 10,000 requests per year.

When the NPRA was passed and new conflicts of interest requirements for nonprofits became law, CBO ensured a notice went to all profit vendors, notifying them of the change to the law and the City's expectations that they adhere to it.

The de Blasio Administration is committed to strengthening the governance and management capacity of the City's nonprofit partners, supporting the provisions of essential community services and the responsible stewardship of public funds. We look forward to continuing to work with the City Council to find new ways to achieve these goals. At this time I would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Thank you so much, Director Camilo and I just want to welcome

Council Member Koo, Council Member Johnson; thank you so much. And now I'd like to turn it over to Council

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 Member Liz Crowley, who is the lead sponsor on this 3 bill.

I'd like to thank Chair Rosenthal for having the hearing today on this important bill and first I'd like to express my gratitude to the hundreds and thousands of nonprofit organizations that do an overwhelmingly large amount of good work in our city and unfortunately there have been examples in recent years where executives of these City-funded nonprofits have mismanaged taxpayer dollars and used funds for personal use, and these are just ones that we found out about. So the budget, the City allocates hundreds of millions of dollars every single year to these nonprofits and there needs to be a greater transparency on how this money is spent.

A most recent example involved the spending of the former president and CEO of the Queens Public Library, Thomas Galante, who in addition to receiving nearly \$500,000 in salary, he used City funds to pay for hundreds of thousands in personal expenses, including voyages on lavish trips, constructing a personal deck for his office for outdoor smoking -- it was a smoking lounge --

[laughter] [background comment] on top of this, he	
claimed to devote an unreasonably large amount of hi	.S
work week to earning an outside income as a	
consultant. Galante was not the first CEO to	
mismanage tax dollars; in 2013 a former executive	
director of the Bronx Community Pride Center was	
found guilty of pocketing more than \$140,000 in	
charitable assets; the same person used taxpayer	
money for personal trips and personal services. The	<u>,</u>
list is long; year after year more and more of these	ì
types of mismanagement and stealing occurs and we	
need to be more on top of City tax dollars and how	
they're spent. So it's important going forward that	•
we could stop this corruption before it begins and	
this bill would require all persons in leadership	
positions at nonprofit organizations that receive	
City dollars to submit financial disclosures; to	
report certain outside income to the City agency fro	m
which they're receiving funds. The bill expands the	•
disclosure requirement which is already in place for	
board members who do not receive a salary. So for	
the president and the chief executive officers of an	L
organization it should not be such a burden to	

disclose this for transparency; there's no excuse for City funds to be immune to this type of disclosure.

So I'd like to thank all the staff that worked hard on putting this bill together; I look forward to hearing more from the public about how to strengthen the bill. I'd like to ask a few questions; I'm not sure… [background comments] Yeah. Yeah? [background comment] Okay.

So is there any process in place right now to ensure that the law as it currently is, is followed; that board members are disclosing this type of information to the City agencies that are awarding the funds?

required disclosures for nonprofits to be made to other government entities. So there is New York State Nonprofit Revitalization Act, which was passed in 2013 that added a number of... [interpose]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: But just specific to this law that we're looking at amending and expanding, which currently asks for any member on a board of directors to a City-funded nonprofit report to the City agency for which is giving them funds, and we have a representative here from the

2.2

2.3

Department of Cultural Affairs; what measures are in place that we, as a city or in that particular City agency is receiving that information?

section of the City Charter was drafted, as I mentioned in my testimony, in the 70s and since then we don't believe it has been complied with in the manner which it was drafted. Since it's been drafted there have been a number of developments through the State Legislation that essentially mirrors all of the disclosures that is required in the section of the Charter to be made by nonprofit organizations and filed with relevant oversight agencies, which both the City agencies and MOCS in many instances have access to and can review.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right now there is no law in place that would have required somebody like Tom Galante to report outside income to any City agency?

LISETTE CAMILO: For a City agency? No; not to a City agency.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: So for us, where New York Library, Queens Library is receiving nearly 95% of its funds from the City and various other

government agencies, the CEO, who was paid an

,

exorbitant amount of money every year to do his job, was claiming to be working nearly 20 or more hours on some weeks for another organization; there was no measure in place for us to find out that; if we were to pass this bill today, we would know that, and from what I understand from your testimony, you or the Mayor's Office, somebody, doesn't believe that that information or that level of transparency is needed.

we're saying is that those disclosures are already required through other State laws, through other requirements. Agencies have access to that information and we believe that requiring it of the City agencies would be -- because it's already required through a state agency and the Attorney General has oversight over the regulation of such actions, we believe that it is already addressed in the current regulatory structure.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: So you think that the State's doing a good enough job that the City doesn't have to do a job like that... [crosstalk]

LISETTE CAMILO: That's not...

# COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

2	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: then why do we
3	have the Department of Investigation in the City if
4	we don't believe that there's fraud and corruption
5	happening under our watch…? [crosstalk]
6	LISETTE CAMILO: That's not the That's
7	not That's not what I'm saying [interpose]
8	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And you also
9	said that the City has the law, but we're just not
10	following it because it was written in the 70s; so
11	then it's not important…? [crosstalk]
12	LISETTE CAMILO: I can't speak to… I… I
13	can't speak to what happens, you know has happened
14	since 1978, when it was first drafted [interpose]
15	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: But right now
16	[crosstalk]
17	LISETTE CAMILO: Yes.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: there is a law
19	in place that says if you have a nonprofit board and
20	you're receiving funds from the City of New York that
21	anybody that sits on the board must disclose to the
22	City, to that very agency that is giving them money,
23	what the financial disclosure of that particular

person is to avoid any conflict of interest?

That particular section

LISETTE CAMILO:

already required, etc.

of the Charter references a section of the City

Government of the City budget that no longer exists,

so it's unclear where the requirement would be

triggered; that's one of the issues with this

particular bill. What we are trying to communicate

is that most of the things that are required in the

Charter in that section are already required in the

State regulatory requirements over nonprofit

acknowledge the presence of Council Members Deutsch and Constantinides; thanks so much for joining us.

[background comments] I know people have places to go today, so just wanna... So as Council Member

Crowley... until she's ready, can I just ask a very fundamental question. Had this law been in place; tweaked for the correction about referring to the wrong section in the Charter, so tweaked for that; had that been in place, would there have been an opportunity for a red flag to have avoided the... could we have caught the Tom Galante problem earlier?

organizations. So conflict of interest policies are

2	LISETTE CAMILO: I want to preface my
3	answer with; I'm not the expert on what happened in
4	the Queens Public Library; those were not
5	procurements; I know from what I've read in the
6	newspaper what happened; it is unclear whether or not
7	it would have been a red flag. Not all related party
8	transactions are bad; that's one of the things that
9	is required to be disclosed; there can actually be
10	very many there could be beneficial related party
11	transactions and had they disclosed that, it would
12	not necessarily mean that it was a bad thing. We
13	routinely throughout a con and I'm speaking from the
14	procurement perspective; after a contract is awarded
15	and we are reviewing expenditures made related to the
16	funds dispersed; if an inappropriate related party
17	transaction is uncovered during the regular
18	monitoring of the contract and the fiscal management,
19	under our standard human services contract we have
20	the ability to be reimbursed for that or to flat out
21	deny that expenditure, but there protections
22	[crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: So... but those are 24 | City contracts?

## COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

2	LISETT	E CAMILO:	Those	are	City

3 contracts.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: So who is it that oversees... so you have coverage on the City procurement side...

LISETTE CAMILO: Right.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: who is it that's overseeing procurement -- sorry if you're not an expert and you're not the right person -- so who's overseeing procurement on the Queens Library side; that would be the board?

then I think that one of the bigger failures in the Queens Public Library issue is that the board has primary fiduciary duty to govern and oversee the manner in which funds are expended for the organization. So things like these extravagant expenditures should have been caught and I think once that came to light, certainly the Department of Investigation started an investigation; this administration worked very closely with the Queens Borough President to change State law to include much stronger protections to prevent the same things from the public library's perspective and installed new

2.2

2.3

board members, to make sure that there's an alert and
focused governing board.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Right. I just wanna welcome Council Member Wills.

Would it make any sense to shift the public library system procurement oversight over to your office?

would have to think about that a little more. I believe that the Queens Public Library is governed by its own state authorizing statute or at least it's created through a state... [background comments] I'm sorry; I'm getting distracted -- through a state law [background comment] and I'd have to learn a little bit more about that; I'm not sure if the structure -- if it's an appropriate thing for MOCS to provide oversight for.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Great. I wanna kick it back to Council Member Crowley.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: When a charitable organization, nonprofit does work for the City and we give them hundreds of millions of dollars to do that type of work, how do we ensure that

Τ	COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 29
2	there's no conflict of interest in third-party
3	organizations or companies receiving funding?
4	LISETTE CAMILO: So I mentioned that not
5	all related party transactions are bad. When the
6	organization files for reimbursement of expenditures,
7	all of those expenditures are reviewed in order to
8	determine their appropriateness; if an inappropriate
9	transaction is found, then the agency will either, if
10	it has already paid for it, will be reimbursed or if
11	it has not approved that expenditure, will disallow
12	it; will not pay for it.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Who is reviewing
14	the expenditure?
15	LISETTE CAMILO: The contracting
16	agencies.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: So which was the
18	agency that was contracting Queens Library?
19	LISETTE CAMILO: So the Queens Public
20	Library isn't an agency that it's not a nonprofit
21	that does business with the City in the manner that
22	another nonprofit will be providing senior services,
23	etc.; the relationship is different and I can't speak

to what the process is there... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay.

Sometime

_	
2	

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

in the late 1970s, when the City Council amended the City Charter for charitable organizations that receive money from the budget, they knew back then that it was important to get this type of information from boards, but today we're not doing... we're not following that law; the only difference from the 1970s and today is just; we don't put a charitable budget, we just give them part of the expense budget, which is pretty much the same; is part of the City dollars that they're receiving; they should still follow the intent of the law and there's no reason why a City agency such as MOCS, who has oversight over contracts, shouldn't ensure that the law is being followed. Just because the funding comes through the general budget as opposed to a charitable budget, it's still City dollars and we need to as a city ensure that these dollars are not misspent or mismanaged and that there's no conflict of interest between board members. And if we knew that 30 years ago for board members, then what we're doing today is trying to extend that just to CEOs and top management of these types of charitable organizations. So what

2.2

2.3

2 is the harm in getting further disclosure and getting 3 the disclosure that we put into law 30 years ago?

share the goal of increased oversight for nonprofits; that's not being debated. I think what I will say is; since 1978 the regulatory structure for nonprofits has changed dramatically and where in 1978 there might not have been any other requirements for such disclosures related to nonprofits and conflict of interest and requirements for policies, we have a very, very extensive state requirement and oversight process which requires all of these... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right, but as the Council, we vote on the City budget and what we're interested today in is having greater oversight on the City contracts by the City itself. So can you tell me how you feel assured that we're getting a great level of transparency here in the city when we're tracing the City dollars that we're responsible for awarding?

LISETTE CAMILO: So I mentioned in my testimony that it's not only the state regulatory structure that has changed drastically since 1978, but the City contract language itself has changed, so

1	
2	all
3	tha
4	so
5	Non
6	org
7	rev
8	the
9	we
LO	dis
11	tha
L2	tra
L3	
L 4	any
L5	rec
L 6	at
L7	wha
L8	org
L 9	
20	as
	1

2.2

2.3

24

25

all of our human services contracts have baked into that language all of the requirements of the state, so we also require the policies outlined in the Nonprofit Revitalization Act. We, in our reviews of organizations, actually sit through -- for our CBO reviews -- we'll review the actual policies themselves to make sure that they're in compliance; we review all of their fillings that actually require disclosure of conflicts of interest in the 990s and that's how we've been able to find inappropriate transactions as well, so… [interpose]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And is there anywhere in those disclosures where it asks the party receiving the funds, the CEOs and the top management at this nonprofits, to show outside income other than what they are receiving from a particular organization?

LISETTE CAMILO: Give me one second. So as I mentioned, the documents do require disclosure of all related party transactions; there's no disclosure requirement regarding outside income...

[background comment]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you; that's what we're really getting at today; there is

LISETTE CAMILO: I would say about

between 25-35, depending on the year.

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Okay. And how many more do you have to go?

LISETTE CAMILO: It depends on the year, because we require those for community-based organizations or nonprofit organizations that receive over a million dollars worth of City funding.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Okay. You noted in your testimony that CBO discovered an improper transaction and held the organization accountable for the wrongdoing; can you tell me a little bit more about that situation and what does hold accountable mean?

LISETTE CAMILO: So I don't wanna get into any specifics to betray the organization, but in an instance like that, we would work with the board member to -- I'm sorry; we would work with the board, if the inappropriate action was performed by the executive director and we'd present the facts and the documentation and our findings and we have had instances where we've worked with the board to remove executive directors and/or instill completely new processes for reviews of particular transactions and we follow up. Once they're under a correction action plan, we work very closely throughout the term of the

know if a nonprofit is complying with the state laws

that you mentioned, the disclosure laws?

24

Τ	COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 36
2	LISETTE CAMILO: In many instances we
3	have found instances of noncompliance, and I actually
4	wanted to make mention; I have someone from my team
5	just reminded me that there was a recent amendment to
6	the Nonprofit Corporations Law, particularly with
7	regard to the Queens Public Library, I believe any
8	public library I'd have to get back to you on that;
9	that does require disclosure of outside income.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And you do
11	audits to make sure; do you, as a City agency
12	[crosstalk]
13	LISETTE CAMILO: What audits a
14	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: that all of
15	these organizations who are filling out the forms?
16	LISETTE CAMILO: For certainly for the
17	CBO reviews, yes; we actually sit down and read
18	through every single policy that they're required to
19	have under the Nonprofit Corporations Law and where
20	we find instances where they're not in compliance, we
21	make sure that they become in compliance and have
22	their bylaws amended.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: But you just
24	referenced a law that somebody made you more aware

of, but wouldn't... [crosstalk]

1	

2 LISETTE CAMILO: For the Queens Public

3

Library.

4

5

know about this law that's in existence...? [crosstalk]

6

LISETTE CAMILO: That is specific to the

7

public libraries and that's not something that... MOCS

8

does not work with public libraries; we... [interpose]

9

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: How do you work

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: shouldn't MOCS

10

with the Department of Investigation to -- like if

11

you suspect... [interpose]

12

LISETTE CAMILO: Absolutely. We actually

13

work very closely with the Department of

14

Investigation on -- not just limited to nonprofits;

15

any vendor. We deal with agencies and vendors every

16

day; we review documentation and if things come up

17

where we determine that something's not right; we

18

19 compliance or in violation of something bigger; we

actually find actions that are either not in

20

absolutely make referrals; we work with them very

21

closely.

2.2

2.3

24

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And... Yeah.

you're referencing all these state laws, but there's

no City agency that is collecting this information;

LISETTE CAMILO: That collects them?

2.3

24

[sic]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: There is no City agency tasked with collecting this information and reviewing this information?

LISETTE CAMILO: That... I'm sorry?

LISETTE CAMILO: There is no City agency that is tasked with collecting all of those required filings and reviewing them, no.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: 'Kay. Is there anything you'd like to add to your testimony? Okay, I'm gonna start -- thank you very much.

LISETTE CAMILO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: I'm gonna call
the first panel; forgive me if I don't say names
right. Christabel Gough from the Society for the
Archdiocese of the City of New York, I think.

[background comment] Okay; you'll introduce
yourself. Miss Conser [sic, sp?] on behalf of Miss
Delgado; I'm not sure what organization that is, but
you'll introduce yourself. Talia Werber from

2.2

2.3

experiences with libraries in our work.

2.3

We would support increased disclosure from City financed not-for-profit institutions. From the Gotham Gazette, we understand that the proposed legislation is not entirely finalized, but was inspired by recent problems at the Queens Public Library. The blame for irregularities there reported by Comptroller Stringer falls not only on CEO Galante, but equally on the trustees who failed to supervise expenditures and indeed the Comptroller's report notes that some library trustees must have winked at and benefited personally from the improper credit card charges for lavish meals.

regarded as a locale for corruption and indeed the public relations image they cultivate -- and we should remember that they hire public relations consultants -- often invokes childhood memories of severe spinster librarians demanding silence; however, the circumstances of the sale of the Donnell Branch Library by the trustees of the New York Public Library might have been easier to unravel if there had been disclosure requirements for the officers and trustees. Indeed, the loss of that branch; smaller replacement has not yet opened seven years after

2.2

2.3

demolition and the profits made by investors who
bought the site appear to be out of line with the \$59
million sale price. Just the penthouse of the
Baccarat Tower which replaced the library is on the
market for \$60 million and the hotel section of the
tower was recently sold to Chinese investors for \$230
million; these numbers potentially so much larger
than the losses occasioned by the actions of the
Queens Library, were never scrutinized by the City
because [bell] the land that Donnell stood on was not
City-owned. [background comment] Thank you.

[background comments]

MAGGIE CANKAR: Hi; Maggie Cankar [sp?].

I am giving part testimony of the August 18 for a

Brooklyn Borough President hearing. Here is some of
the testimony as delivered by Miss Jane Lee Delgado,
a research scientist and organizational psychologist.

"How did we get here, to the proposed library sale and shrinkage that shouldn't be? Out of 23 trustees who were appointed or elected by their peers, 7 directly involved in banking and real estate and 2 more were connected to real estate interests through a spouse. Five of the current former Bloomberg employees, three have worked and are

2.2

2.3

working now for information tech companies and at

least one of them is officially registered as a

lobbyist in New York City. A small group of fully

compromised library trustees have been planning for

more than five years to offer developers the

opportunity to utilize public assets in order make

8 some money."

Now -- that's the end of Jane's testimony
-- let me point out that the new article at DNA
Information about the Brooklyn Bridge Park board
members, David Offensend, who is the Board of
Trustees in the New York Public Library and Hank
Gutman, who is also Board of Trustees of the Brooklyn
Bridge Park; they are being the first to buy
apartments in development on the Board and were
supposed to oversee and resulting in a conflict of
interest reviewing and associates dirations [sic].

Why should we be concerned? Just as both of these gentlemen are board of trustees of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation pushing for overdevelopment in Brooklyn Heights, they are involved in turning the Brooklyn Heights Library into real estate deals, which includes the Brooklyn Heights Library and the business library. The

2.2

2.3

2	libraries	in	downtown	[bell]	l Thank '	you.
---	-----------	----	----------	--------	-----------	------

[background comment] No, that's pretty good; it's just -- you know -- congratulations, Miss Crowley on bringing this proposal in; I've just been aware of it right now, in reading somebody else's testimony, but I applaud you; what is happening in Brooklyn Heights is a direct result of conflict of interest and of not being able to reveal what their true intentions are. Thank you.

TALIA WERBER: Good afternoon. My name is Talia Werber and I am the Policy and Research Manager for Citizens Union [background comment] of the City of New York, a nonpartisan good government group dedicated to making democracy work for all New Yorkers.

Thank you for holding this hearing today; we commend the Council for working to ensure meaningful oversight of nonprofit organizations accepting payments from New York City by expanding conflict of interest disclosures for leadership of such organizations.

Contractual relationships between New
York City and nonprofit organizations have increased
tremendously in recent years and even though they

2.3

provide agility to extend services to the public, we believe that it's important that there's oversight of these organizations.

Intro 288-A would extend safeguards that are against a defined portion of nonprofit board members engaging in self-dealing and expand who it applies to, to include presidents and chief executive officers of nonprofit organizations accepting payments from the City.

Broadening the definition of organizational leadership to whom these safeguards apply is critical to ensuring that individuals responsible for the management decisions of nonprofits use taxpayer money to benefit their institutions and through them the City, rather than benefiting themselves. For these reasons, Citizens Union supports Intro 288-A and urges its passage to compel leaders of New York City's nonprofit organizations to serve as stewards of their institutional missions and of the public trust.

CHRISTABEL GOUGH: Oh sorry.

PRUDENCE KATZE: Thank you. Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify. My name is Prudence Katze and I am the

2.2

2.3

Research and Policy Manager at Common Cause New York.

We provide a voice for citizens in support of open,

honest and accountable government at all levels. I

am here today to voice Common Cause New York's

support of passing Intro 288-A.

The simple disclosure requirements called for in this bill would only apply to organizations that receive at least half of their funding from New York City public dollars and it is a useful and objective way to determine that our tax dollars are being dispersed in a responsible manner while also diminishing the possibility of undo favoritism or a conflict of interest on the part of the nonprofit. This bill would serve to clarify and strengthen our laws on how our public dollars go to support not-for-profit institutions.

In 2006, this City Council implemented necessary reforms on the discretionary funds allocated to nonprofit and community-based social services. There is no question that council member discretionary spending, along with other New York City contracts and grants to not-for-profit organizations helps to fulfill necessary services in communities throughout our five boroughs.

protocol to ensure

2			Intro	288	would	com	plement	exis	ting
3	conflict	of	inter	est	report	ing	protoco	l to	ensı

that our not-for-profits are spending their publicly 4

5 allocated dollars in the best and most responsible

way possible and would head off potential self-6

7 dealing and conflicts of interest where someone in a

leadership position is putting their own financial 8

interests or those of friends, business associates or

family over the communities that they are charged to 10

11 serve.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The necessary form can be filled out online and is only due on an annual basis. We do not see compliance of this request as burdensome, particularly in light of unfortunate past problems of self-dealing and fraudulent conduct involving charities in New York City. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Thank you very [sic] Council Member. much.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I would like to thank all who came today for your time and your testimony; you know, we are looking for greater transparency in putting this bill together and you know it's clear that there are plenty of conflicts of interest that exist with nonprofit boards and

2.2

2.3

nonprofit heads and we just don't know about it and we can't sit back and watch the state and hope that the state will find out that there are conflicts; we are a city with a nearly \$80 billion budget and we have to watch every single tax dollar in that budget as carefully as possible; it's our responsibility.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Thank you. One last call for Paula Glatzer, Glaser. Oh; do you wanna come up real quick? You can go... thank you.

PRUDENCE KATZE: Thanks.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you.

[background comments]

PAULA GLATZER: Hi; my name is Paula

Glatzer and I'm really here to speak about the New

York Public Library. I'm a member of the Committee

to Save the Library, but I am not speaking for them;

this is all my own, except the... I'm a constituent of

the chair, but she's not responsible either.

On September 19th, the New York Public
Library announced the architects for its \$300 million
renovation of Mid-Manhattan and the 42nd Street
Library. Unfortunately, the news came with complete
lack of transparency in either the selection process
or the renovation plans. Now fully half of the \$300

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

million is from New York City, so the public should be involved and our elected officials should exercise oversight. This is the same public-private partnership that fostered the secret Central Library plan, which was finally rejected by the current administration. But NYPL wasted almost \$20 million on the plans, though some reliable estimates say it was much higher.

Very quickly, watching the Pope before I came here, which is why I was so late, I recalled the plans for the 9/11 Memorial and how they were all displayed in our newspapers and then they were... the models were on view at the World Financial Center and it was open and transparent and made a community and it helped with the healing and the library is our most [bell] important building. Can I... I cut off half my speech because this is like the emperor's new clothes, but I was ending by commending Council Member Crowley for the amendment, but when I talked to your wonderful staff before, like to try to understand it and I said, well would this apply to board members, because a lot of us see all those shenanigans as real estate deals, and they said, well it already applies to board members and I said, oh;

2.2

2.3

it does? Where would I see that? And as you know,
the answer is not forthcoming, so this is really
naïve, but will an amendment work on a law that
isn't… [interpose]

a very good question. Technically it is law; it's just that we don't put funds for nonprofits in a division of the budget that's under charitable, but it's still ultimately the budget and so while that practice has changed somewhere along the line, maybe going back to even when this law became law and was instituted, that nobody was following it, so there was no city agency that was tasked...

PAULA GLATZER: Right. Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I think in amending the law with this bill we will amend the charitable part of the budget, because that's no longer called that; it's just executive budget. So I... [crosstalk]

PAULA GLATZER: Thank... [sic]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: and then it would also extend, of course, to board members.

PAULA GLATZER: Thank you very much, and of course it has to apply -- I mean goes without

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

saying -- to not only the corruption, but to the larger, you know, whether it's misuse of funds or cutting out the public, or cutting out legislator; I don't think my legislators know what's happening at NYPL. I'm sorry; this member left. Thank you very much for everything... [crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Thank you for coming today; get back safely.

I'm gonna call up the next panel --Michelle Jackson from the Human Services Council; Ginny Loulourdes from ART/New York; Laura Abel from the Lawyers Alliance for New York and John D'Reilly [sic]; I'm sorry if I said that wrong, who's representing himself, I believe. [background comment] O'Reilly. Sorry. John O'Reilly? [background comments] Thank you. John; do you wanna get us started? Yeah. Just press the red button on your microphone and introduce yourself.

JOHN O'REILLY: Good afternoon. My name is John O'Reilly; I'm here as a resident of Queens County and an interested person.

The proposal you have before you now is actually a denuded [sic] version of what Council Member Crowley proposed last year, with introduced

Intro 288, that entities receiving more than 50% of
their monies from the City would be covered by the
New York City Conflict of Interest Law. That no
longer exists and the kinds of deficiencies that
Council Member Crowley pointed out in her
questioning; that is, there's no single body
overseeing enforcement of these provisions; there is
nobody doing anything about failure to comply and in
fact, the Queens Public Library, the existing law,
Section 211, requires that the organization have
bylaw provisions requiring disclosure. The Queens
Public Library never had bylaw provisions requiring
disclosure; that went on for years. As a matter of
fact, it still doesn't have bylaw provisions
requiring disclosure, notwithstanding the 2014 State
reform legislation.

The library -- and I would like to point out that the committee report referenced to the Queens Public Library, is inaccurate insofar as it leaves out certain key information. For example, the library board of trustees does not consider Comptroller Stringer's report to be findings; they consider it, in a public statement, to be a political document consisting of mere allegations; there's

2.2

2.3

nobody doing anything about that, and that's the problem, that's why an entity like the library needs to be put under the same body that you folks are under and I can't think of a single reason why they're not under that law; they get approximately this year \$100 million [bell], 85% of their budget from the City and they're completely ignoring, in my opinion, their transgressions and reform of those transgressions that occurred last year.

LAURA ABEL: Hi, I'm Laura Abel; I'm a lawyer with the Lawyers Alliance for New York. We're a nonprofit ourselves and we provide business and transactional legal representation to thousands of nonprofits every year. The nonprofits that we serve are the nonprofits that serve the most vulnerable New Yorkers.

The nonprofits that we serve provide a lot of the City's essential services -- homeless shelters, pre-K, afterschool, charter schools. As with all City contractors, you need to make sure that nonprofits use their City funds efficiently and effectively, but I wanna ask why you're looking only at nonprofit contractors when you have an equal interest in ensuring that for-profit contractors also

2.2

2.3

carry out their City contracts efficiently and effectively. Subjecting nonprofits to regulations that are redundant and duplicative raises their administrative costs and as a result, either they have to charge the City more for their services, which is obviously not desirable, or they have to cut the amount of services that they can provide; that means fewer shelter beds, fewer soup kitchen meals; things like that. I also should add that laws that add more regulations to nonprofits are a real boon for people in my profession; not for me, I work for a nonprofit, but I don't think you want City dollars going to the lawyers either.

Intro 288-A builds on a provision of the City Charter that was adopted in 1978, as people have been discussing. The legislative history of that law has to do with hospitals and money diverted from hospitals; it is not apparent to me that it was applied to all nonprofits receiving City funds; it was a particular budget item in the City because of a particular [bell] scandal. [background comment]

As people have mentioned, the nonprofit law has evolved a lot since 1978 and we've talked about the Nonprofit Revitalization Act, which now is

2.2

2.3

one of the strictest nonprofit regulation laws in the country, but we also have the IRS; since 1978 has gained the ability to tax insider transactions and also has started asking about insider transactions on the annual 990, which we've heard that MOCS finds very helpful. Those disclosures were not available in 1978; certainly not to the public and not to the City.

I just wanna note that Intro 288 is not only about disclosure; it also would require that every single insider transaction involving a nonprofit has to be approved by someone at the City. I don't know is gonna have time to do that; right, there are thousands of nonprofits getting City funds and many many insider transactions; some are bad, I agree, and I counsel my clients against them all the time, but many of them are helpful, right; you have a board member who gives a very below market rent to the nonprofit or a board member who runs a catering company who caters the gala and charges only for the cost of the food; right, not for service. So you know you would have City officials who would have to sit and review every single one of these

2.2

2.3

2 transactions; it's a waste of their time and things
3 would grind to a halt for nonprofits.

MICHELLE JACKSON: Good afternoon, my name's Michelle Jackson; I'm the Associate Director for the Human Services Council of New York; we're a membership organization of about 180 human services nonprofits in New York City. I wanna thank the Committee on Contracts and Council Member Rosenthal for allowing me the opportunity to testify and also to thank Council Member Rosenthal on her partnership with the nonprofit sector on issues that impact us.

When I began at HSC there was a saying, an anecdote, that Laura's also heard, that every piece of paper that nonprofits fill out can be traced to a scandal and Intro 288 fits well into that bill.

Nonprofits are significantly overburdened with paperwork; for every city and state and federal contract we receive a program and a fiscal audit -- I have an organization that has 180 contracts; they have over 350 audits each year that look at their financials and would catch something like an insider trading or inappropriate use of funds; we fill out [sic] Vindex, we have an independent audit or an A133, we have prequalification and accelerator, we

have approved budgets and budget modifications and
then we have state requirements, as people have
explained, especially around, as Laura mentioned,
that strengthen Nonprofit Revitalization Act. If we
worry about want to watch tax dollars, then we need
to watch the tax dollars that go to administrative
overhead and duplicative reporting requirements. I
worry when I look at 288 about who's processing this
information on the City agency side, requiring board
members to list their financial interests, their home
addresses; creates a huge burden on nonprofits who
need board members to be active participants and I do
think would reduce the amount of people who would be
interested in being on boards, which is already an
issue that nonprofits have. Additionally, as Laura
said, who at the City agency is processing this, and
requiring every party transaction to be approved
would grind already delayed payments, contracts;
registration amendments to a halt, and will require a
lot of money and resources on both the nonprofit and
the City agency side in order for this to be
implemented and it's a great concern to the Human
Services Council. We'd rather work with the Council
[bell] on looking at the number of duplicative

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

burdens that nonprofits have in the regulatory scheme and reducing red tape and streamlining so that you can get the information you want in the forms that we already fill out a lot. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: I mean if I could just ask you a question, Miss Jackson, 'cause I know you work with us all the time. It strikes me, having heard the panel for the bill and now hearing the panel opposed, the people for it were focused on the library system and the people who are against it -well I understand what you're saying, so I'm gonna set you aside for one second -- it's more about the human services contracts [background comment] and sort of a different... an oversight mechanism where you have an oversight mechanism that already exists [background comment] and that already captures this information, where in the library side, which none of us are necessarily expert at, there is not that oversight so that you could have those discretions, you know, fall through the cracks.

MICHELLE JACKSON: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: just wanted to ...

24 [interpose]

MICHELLE JACKSON: Yeah and so I think

3	that's we you know, I'm not an expert on the
4	library system and the Queens Public Library is a
5	quasi-governmental agency, so it's set apart and
6	subject to different kind of requirements than human
7	services nonprofits and so from our perspective, when
8	we look at this bill, which would encapsulate us,
9	especially with the change to the charitable budget
10	piece, we are subject to and especially and
11	particularly at the state with the Nonprofit
12	Revitalization Act and while that's not something
13	that the City oversees, your CHAR500 and your audits
14	are required by the state and shared with the City in

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Do you feel that the information asked for in this bill is already being captured somewhere in the city process; not state or attorney general, but city?

order... if you don't have an approved CHAR500, you

cannot contract with the City. So there is a direct

connection there and the Charities Bureau has added

staff and is going a lot of enforcement, on not just

the Nonprofit Revitalization Act, but by disclosure.

24

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 60
2	MICHELLE JACKSON: We don't require
3	there's not a requirement for, you know the full
4	information about boards' financial interests
5	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: The executive
6	directors; not the boards.
7	MICHELLE JACKSON: The executive
8	directors
9	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Okay.
10	MICHELLE JACKSON: it's not; Laura can
11	correct me if I'm wrong, but it's it's asked for in
12	other… go ahead.
13	LAURA ABEL: Yeah, I mean the… There are
14	two different things, right; we're talking about
15	insider transactions is one thing and we're talking
16	about outside work is another. [background comment]
17	The insider transactions that is captured on the 990;
18	again on the CHAR500 and then both of those are
19	provided to the City as part of the contract approval
20	process. So the City has that information; what it
21	the other piece is the outside income piece,
22	[background comment] and that's the piece that I

think is not covered at the moment. [background

comments]

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Right. I mean 3 there were a number of transgressions here; there's 4 outside income, there was mismanagement of the funds, there was a contract where his salary was established with a formula that's inscrutable to me, but I would 6 like to have one, [laughter] the Evergreen contract 7 that, you know, all of which were not being and were 8 in fact being accepted by the Board of Trustees at that time for the Queens Library. So [background 10 11 comment] it's interesting to hear what is covered 12 now.

MICHELLE JACKSON: And I think that's...

the misuse of funds is really what this is about;

that... and when it comes to human services contracts,

all that money... your money is reported, your

executive compensation, all the money that's under

the contract with receipts and a budget and the

budget modifications and [background comments]

amendments on the contract are all asked for...

[crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I don't want to interrupt, but let's take the example of a human services contract for providing shelter to homeless families; the vast majority of the budget for those

2	types of companies that are nonprofit comes from a
3	city entity; may it be city money, state money;
4	federal money, and there are a lot of nonprofit
5	organizations that provide those types of human
6	services that exist basically off contracts from the
7	City, [background comment] so they are not unlike the
8	library in that they are 95% government funded or a
9	quasi-government agency. And interestingly enough,
10	in your testimony you mentioned the lawyers needed
11	may provide more [inaudible], even Tom Galante's
12	attorney fees were being paid for by the library,
13	through his lavish contract. But there is no way of
14	finding out whether your executive director has
15	another job somewhere else and is billing those
16	hours, which Galante was doing for years and nobody
17	seemed to care or know about and that's part of
18	putting this bill through; preventing that from
19	happening again. And in many situations we ask the
20	state to do the job of oversight that we would like.
21	I mean every single day workers' rights are being
22	violated and we're waiting for the State Department
23	of Labor to investigate and work with the Attorney
24	General. We need to have more oversight on issues
25	like that in the City and this would be a basic

1

3

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

transparency bill that became law and it was a law already established for the vast majority of board members, it's just not being followed.

I think if you were to be LAURA ABEL: talking just about disclosure of outside income it would be a different conversation than talking about disclosure and approval of related party transactions, insider transactions, which there's already this whole apparatus, including in City contracts to monitor. [background comment]

JOHN O'REILLY: I would just like to add that there is a value in reporting to outside agencies. Galante's outside employment was known by the then library board; they thought it was perfectly fine that he was in effect working full-time for the Elmont School District; it's this insular environment that these boards and the high-level executives have where this sense of fiduciary responsibility goes away and everybody goes along to get along; there's nobody really overseeing and presenting another set of eyes to what goes on within the organization and that's why there needs to be, instead of this selfreporting, there needs to be an outside agency like the New York City Conflict of Interest Board that

2.2

2.3

300,000 City employees are under; members of the City Council are under, to have an outsider's view of all this.

[background comments]

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: I don't have my thing on. Thank you. [background comments] Yeah, it's fine. Get yourself settled. And then Ginny, if you could just make sure the red light is on on the microphone so that we can hear you, introduce yourself and give us your testimony. Thank you.

GINNY LOULOUDES: Good afternoon. My name is Ginny Louloudes; I am the Executive Director of the Alliance of Resident Theatres, the leadership and advocacy organization for 350 nonprofit theatres in all five boroughs.

Given the fact that I only have three minutes and you've been sitting here hearing a lot of probably redundant remarks, I'm gonna try to keep my remarks short and go to the high points, and I've attached a lot of information that you can use afterwards.

Point number one is that I find that -well as executive director of ART/New York, I'm
respectfully opposing this proposed legislature for

2.2

the following reasons. My concerns are twofold;
first, I've attached with my testimony something that
you should all become aware of if you're not; the New
York State Nonprofit Revitalization Act of 2013.
This requires almost everything that you've already
put in this law and it even has greater definitions
and stronger definitions in some areas. So we are
already following this and we have to follow this or
we can't get funding from the New York State Council
in the Arts; you can't get funding from any agency of
the State of New York without this, so I guarantee
you that most of the people getting funding from the
City are following the Nonprofit Revitalization Act.

Number two, I have concerns about Section 111.2, which states that -- one of the questions is; do you see a contract as a donation that would be made; if I get a grant from the Doris Duke Charitable Trust; would that be something that would have to be registered with the agency that oversees ART/New York, which is probably in our case, the Department of Cultural Affairs?

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The City doesn't give out grants blindly, they ask for a service to be provided for the money that they give and it's up to

subcontracts who would be... [interpose]

and I will be brief, in Section 111.3 you require

GINNY LOULOUDES: Thank you. Finally,

2.3

24

no.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Here's a main question that as we've been going through this hearing; identifying the information that is possibly not captured by the City is; as an executive director... [interpose]

GINNY LOULOUDES: Uhm-hm.

budgets of under \$500,000.

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2	

4

1

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: your job is to do X and you're making X amount of money; if in addition to that you had another job, would that information be collected by any of the forms that you're filling in [sic]... [interpose]

No.

And let me tell

GINNY LOULOUDES:

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

6

you why I don't think you should worry about that with respect to the nonprofit theatre movement. don't have a second job; I'm paid well, but I have a board member who makes probably \$10,000 from her theatre company; she has what's called a survival job at the Tenement Museum where she works in the business office; many of my members' survivor jobs involve teaching at universities, being nannies,

16

17

18

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: This is just for executive directors; it will not be... [crosstalk]

being tutors, waiters, waitresses... [crosstalk]

19

20

or artistic directors, but they have so little money

GINNY LOULOUDES: they're the executive

21

for their companies, they get \$5,000 from DCA,

\$10,000 from NYSCA, they get money from their

2.2 2.3

families and friends, they do a kick-starter campaign

24

to do a show... [interpose]

1	COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS 70	
2	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: I think we're I	
3	think we're missing the gist of what this who this	
4	law is directed toward	
5	GINNY LOULOUDES: Right.	
6	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: so maybe we	
7	should take this conversation [interpose]	
8	GINNY LOULOUDES: Yes.	
9	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: offline. But I	
10	appreciate you coming here… [crosstalk]	
11	GINNY LOULOUDES: Because I would say	
12	that half of the DCA grant recipients have survival	
13	jobs and their programs are nonprofits, their	
14	programs are doing good work, but they don't pay	
15	themselves, so they do other jobs so that they can	
16	pay the artists.	
17	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Got it. Alright,	
18	thank… thank you very much and… [crosstalk]	
19	GINNY LOULOUDES: Thank you very much	
20	[crosstalk]	
21	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Here's a	
22	question	
23	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Sure.	

25 making a little money or a lot of money, whether it's

24

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: whether they're

## COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

	COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS /1
2	a survival job or a job that would help contribute
3	towards a very lucrative income; whatever it is,
4	couldn't there be a conflict of interest somewhere,
5	even if there is only \$10,000 or \$20,000… [crosstalk]
6	GINNY LOULOUDES: We all sign conflict of
7	interest… possib… [crosstalk]
8	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: could there be?
9	GINNY LOULOUDES: I mean I don't know
10	that there could be a conflict of interest if I'm a
11	waitress, unless my restaurant caters an event as a
12	donation to my organization, which happens a lot, but
13	[inaudible] according to the… [crosstalk]
14	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: But this would
15	be a donation, most of the catered events get paid
16	for… [crosstalk]
17	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Actually, it
18	would be that you're the executive director of your
19	organization and in addition to that you're getting a
20	consulting fee from one of the artist companies
21	[crosstalk]
22	GINNY LOULOUDES: I would not be allowed
23	to accept that
24	CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: that would be the

situation.

$\neg$	$\circ$
- /	/

## COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

GINNY LOULOUDES: and let me explain why.
According to the Nonprofit Revitalization Act we have
to have a conflict of interest policy; it would state
in the conflict of interest policy that I'm not
allowed to accept money for helping my members; if
I'm ever paid a fee to serve on a panel, I donate
that fee to ART/New York.

CHAIRPERSON ROSENTHAL: Okay. I'm gonna call this hearing to a close and I wanna thank everyone for their testimony today; we're definitely going to be doing a lot of follow-up. I wanna thank Council Member Crowley for [background comment] bringing this bill to our committee and call this meeting adjourned.

[gavel]

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 October 4, 2015