

proposing to do something like this where there was a factor where they were going to replace public employees already on board that was supposed to be doing the same job or if it was outside of that, it would apply as well, but the agency would have to submit to the Director of Administrative Services the following information, the proposed contract, a review of the long-term actual cost savings, measurable goals for improving the quality of service and an assessment of feasibility of alternatives within the agency to contract for the performance of services. And then there is a requirement that a calculation of a cost savings under that section for the next 12 months as well as the next 60 months or five years ahead. There's a provision that, in effect, it's a cost/benefit ratio type of process that would have to be followed. The Director of Administrative Services would review it and would be required to be sure that the potential economic advantage of contracting is not outweighed by the...is not outweighed by the public interest in having the particular services performed directly by the agency, that the contract does not adversely affect the state's Affirmative Action Program, and, third, that the contract will include adequate control mechanisms to ensure that the services are provided pursuant to the terms of the contract. And then the Director, on any of these contracts that the Director approved or disapproved would have to be delivered to the chairperson of the Appropriations Committee or to the, in effect, to the committee, as a whole, through the Legislature so that those things could be reviewed. The act, as written, would...would not apply to renewal of existing contracts as...but it would if they would expand beyond what was currently involved or any new ones, obviously, would be...obviously, the reason for some of this is not to negate any...some...or some contractual relationship. But I think this does address in that general area that the whole concept does...did, does have a public, in effect, a public announcement by referring these to the Appropriations Committee of any of these contracts that do exist, provides the opportunity for not to review the contract but as a budget matter to review the factors going into these contracts. I think it does establish a procedure. It's my understanding the Governor is in support of the concept and would not object. I've further been also informed on this one that the expansion of this will not add or need an A bill or add any cost, that this, in fact, can be included under the current level of appropriation that we enacted the other day, assuming the Governor doesn't veto it out, but I assume it won't because it's revolving funds as opposed to the General Fund, in any