

Interview Date: 3/7/06

Subject: Al DeMarco; Deputy Director, Governor's Office of Employee Relations, (GOER), ? ; Assistant Director, GOER, ; Operational Services Unit, GOER, ; Narcotic and Addiction Control Commission, GOER, 1970-1978 ?; Human Resources, Department of State, 1968-1969; Employment Interviewer and Counselor, NYS Labor Department, 1965-1967?.

Al Demarco, a long-time State employee, shared insights about his work for the Governor's Office of Employee Relations (GOER) as well as his relationship with CSEA during that time. In his interview, DeMarco revealed what it was like being involved in contract negotiations and provided great detail about the bargaining table. He also mentioned the innovation of contracts with regard to day care issues, workplace quality and safety standards, training programs, and the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).

When DeMarco described the dynamics between CSEA and GOER, he stated the two demonstrated characteristics such as humility and the willingness to compromise and find solutions to problems. He also stated the two shared common goals associated with achieving equity and tackling big issues, not only small problems. DeMarco specifically mentioned the efficiency of collective bargaining efforts between GOER and CSEA that resulted in time and attendance procedures as well as the Triage process, which was used to clean up backlogs of grievances. He also spoke in detail about the PEF challenge with CSEA for the PS&T unit.

DeMarco mentioned the State's desire for consistency in state contracts and how CSEA pioneered for better workplace conditions which the State then brought to other units. He talked about the significance of the Public Employee Safety and Health (PESH) Act, which also resulted in state agencies having professionals to deal with safety and health issues, whereas before PESH, less qualified staff would have dealt with the problems. DeMarco also briefly mentioned the difference between how Governor Cuomo and Governor Pataki's administration's approached employee relations.

DeMarco spoke about former CSEA Presidents, Bill McGowan and Joe McDermott, as well CSEA President, Danny Donohue, and former CSEA statewide secretary, Irene Carr. DeMarco attributed CSEA's longevity to their solid staff and willingness to work and resolve problems. He also stated, "They deliver and aren't afraid to take on an issue."

Key Words

AFSCME

Coalition Bargaining

Collective Bargaining

Contract Negotiations

DeGraff Foy

Department of Transportation (DOT)

OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration)

Pataki Administration

PESH Act (Public Employee Safety and Health Act)

PS&T Unit (Professional, Scientific, and Technical Unit)

PEF (Public Employees Federation)

Roemer Featherstonhaugh

Taylor Law

Triage Process

Unit Bargaining

Worker's Compensation

Key People

Kevin Barry

Paul Birch

Joseph Bress

Governor Hugh Carey

Nels Carlson

Irene Carr

Pauline Consella

Governor Mario Cuomo

Dick Dautner

Danny Donohue

John Egan

Meyer "Sandy" Frusher

Thomas Gibbs
James Gill
Ross Hannah
William Howard
Joe McDermott
Bill McGowan
James Natoli
John Norder?
James Northrup
Jeffrey Selchek?
Dr. Ted Wenzel

CSEA HISTORY PROJECT

AL DeMARCO INTERVIEW

March 7, 2006

INTERVIEWER: For the record, this is Tuesday, March the 7th, 2006 and we're speaking with Al DeMarco and, Al, I think your title was -- you were Deputy Director of the Governor's Office of Employee Relations?

MR. DeMARCO: My last assignment.

INTERVIEWER: And I know that you worked with the State for what, over 30 years?

MR. DeMARCO: Thirty-five, m-m h-m-m.

INTERVIEWER: Thirty-five years. Pretty remarkable history. I wonder if you could maybe start by telling us a little bit about how you came into State -- into State service.

MR. DeMARCO: Okay. I -- when I got out of college I had nothing lined up. I was I guess you could say a marginal student in college. And anyway I wanted to stay -- come back to Albany. I had gone to school in New Jersey at Ryder College and I came back to Albany.

I took a couple State tests, and the first place that called me was the Labor Department as an employment interviewer and so I

went there in -- well, actually I had just gotten out of the Army in '65 and I went to the Labor Department and started in Syracuse. I was there temporary for about four months and then I got a chance to come to Albany and -- for a permanent job.

That was the beginning of what I did, and I stayed with the Labor Department as an employment interviewer and employment counselor for about three years and then I decided I wanted -- always wanted to be in personnel, as they called it then, human resources today, in personnel.

So I actually took a demotion and went to work for the Department of State right across the street here. At the time it was at 162 Washington, and that's where I started. I was there for about two years or less. I'd have to really think about it, but it doesn't matter, and I went to -- it was the Narcotic and Addiction Control Commission which was an up and coming operation then.

There was -- the Rockefeller drug laws were in place and things of that nature and a

lot of stuff they're trying to change now went into effect about then and it was a real bustling, terrific -- probably one of the best jobs I ever had, minus some of the ones I had at OAR.

But anyway I -- that's when I first became involved with CSEA as a member. I joined because I wanted the -- I had gotten married and I wanted to get the accident insurance and the (laughter) and that stuff, and at that time there was no collective bargaining agreement. In fact I remember in '60...it had to be in '67, the first time I really paid attention to it when Ted Wenzel was meeting with the Governor to kind of decide what State employees were gonna get and that's the way things were done, I guess, then before the Taylor Law.

But anyway I was -- I became a member of CSEA and then later on in my career I figured that wasn't the right thing to do, so I no longer was a member. But anyway I was at the Narcotic Addiction Control Commission for -- well, really from that point on to 1979 when I was asked to go down to the Governor's Office of

Employee Relations by Jim Northrup who was the -- actually, the Acting (inaudible) Director at that time, because Governor Carey was the Governor.

And I had been involved in negotiating teams and, you know, involved in the labor relations process. It was really -- was in infantile stages even then, and I was supposed to go down to OER for about -- they figured about nine months. It was a rotational assignment.

I was gonna work on the Security unit negotiations and the Security negotiations concluded but then Council 82, who represented the Security employees at the time, struck in 1979, May of 1979. It was about a two-week strike and as a result of that there was so much to do after the strike, well, getting out of the strike. And then after the strike, they said will you stay and I stayed until I retired and moved through a variety of different jobs there.

At first it became -- do you want me to just keep talkin', Steve?

INTERVIEWER: Sure. Absolutely. I'll

jump in as appropriate.

MR. DeMARCO: I first really became involved with CSEA from the Governor's Office for Employee Relations point of view in 198... about 1980. Prior to that I was an Agency person. I had a lot of dealings with -- I could start tickin' off names like Kevin Barry and some of these old guys that were around years ago as field reps and as an Agency person handling grievances and that kind of stuff.

In fact, I remember meeting Pauline Kinsellf who was with Roemer Featherstonough then. She was just a new attorney and it must have been probably '76 or '77 when I really started gettin' involved with the labor relations stuff and then went I went to OER I was working in the Security unit stuff, as I said, and I forgot what happened.

There were some changes, people left, something occurred and they said we want you to take over the negotiations with the Operations Services Unit, of which I had limited involvement because I was always in the Security related stuff.

And that's when I first met Nels Carlson and he's actually become a friend of mine, but he's a treat in a lot of different ways and we had a lot of fun in government, a lot of good things along that time.

INTERVIEWER: Let me just go back for a minute because you said when you were first in State service, of course this is sort of pre-Taylor Law, the CSEA at that time really represented everybody and a lot -- we've heard from other people that the main reason that they had a point of contact with the union was that everybody wanted to join to get the insurance.

MR. DeMARCO: That's -- there's no -- that's exactly why I joined. I mean I was a young guy and I didn't have -- I didn't have any money so -- I know one of the other things a lot of people talked about was there were all these trips. CSEA had trips planned and, you know, various -- back then it was bus tours and stuff like that, but on a trip, couple trips to Europe, I remember a couple ladies I knew went on.

But I really joined for the insurance,

8

which was -- I think maybe I might -- I'm really

gettin' old, but I think that my first payroll deduction was like 17 cents or somethin' like that for accidental death benefit or somethin'.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

MR. DeMARCO: But that was my reason for doin' it and I -- you know, I didn't really know exactly how raises and those things came about because there was no collective bargaining agreement. I knew about the attendance rules because I had to administer that; you know, those rules, but there were a lot of things in the attendance rules which eventually wound themselves into the contract as a result of the first contract.

INTERVIEWER: Did somebody come around to sign you up and it was sort of like common knowledge, this is a great deal. You want to sign up for the insurance?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, I -- actually, I got to know the person who was the chapter president, they called 'em then. It wasn't local president or stewards or anything like that. It was chapter president. I think it was

at a picnic I think we had, and CSEA always,

because they represented basically everybody, including management people, were kind of -- were involved because there wasn't any labor and management per se, as noted.

And I think it was at a picnic and this very nice lady whose name I've completely forgotten now said, you know, you're a young guy. You oughta get into some of these insurances and stuff that CSEA has to offer so I said, well, give me the material.

So I talked to my father about it, as you would do in those days when you were young, and he said, oh, yeah, geez, a good deal. Go ahead. I mean I don't have any of that stuff. Go get it, you know, so I -- that's exactly how it happened.

INTERVIEWER: Sure. Sure. So you said then, when you went to the Governor's Office of Employee Relations, by that point there was at least already something of a framework in place in terms of how negotiations might work. When you took over the operational services --

10

MR. DeMARCO: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- unit. What was

unique to that unit?

MR. DeMARCO: If you don't mind me
backin' up for a second?

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

MR. DeMARCO: By that -- by the time I
went to OER I think we might have been in about
the third or fourth contract and I had been,
because I was in Narcotics Addiction Control
Commission, we had a lot of Professional,
Scientific and Technical employees and that was
about the time that CSEA was bein' challenged by
what eventually turned out to be PEF for
representation of PS&T unit.

I remember being involved in a lot of
the -- well, we couldn't get involved, you know,
in the union activities as such, but people
would come to me and say, what do you think
about this? And, you know, do you think we
should be, you know, I don't know anything about
this. I like Paul Burch. I remember one person
to me, I like Paul Burch. Why are they trying
to do this? Paul was the representative of that

11

unit at the time.

But anyway, so I did have some

dealings with CSEA, but when I went down -- it was really from the PS&T -- we used to call it PS&T perspective, so I really didn't know anything about the operation of services --

INTERVIEWER: Go back to that, though, when you're on that subject about the PEF challenge. There were actually a couple of challenges. I mean were they nasty affairs?

MR. DeMARCO: Yes, they were. Not -- you have to understand, Steve. I have immense respect for CSEA; not that I'm talkin' to you or -- I mean over the years I've gained tremendous respect for it, so I don't want to make my comments sound like I'm biased towards CSEA --

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

MR. DeMARCO: -- but CSEA was always very gentlemanly, if I could use that term; very professional in the way it did. The other folks, they were -- they were sort of the renegades and I remember in the Agency when I was in -- at that time it was called Drug Abuse,

12

I think. The people that gravitated to the new entity, if you will, whatever that was, and I know it was an amalgamation of different unions,

were the malcontents. People who either couldn't find a way in the traditional organization or felt that they had been disenfranchised in some way, so they came on very strong, whereas CSEA was very professional.

And, you know, even myself looking back, maybe if things had been different the way CSEA approached it and was more attacking to their adversaries as they were being attacked, it might have turned out to be a different situation because I think, at least in the initial stages, it was all about greed for the people who were representing that group of people.

INTERVIEWER: And so how -- you said as a management person you had to kind of stay hands off. What -- how did the thing manifest itself in the work site?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, we -- well, we had to make sure that, you know, that there were no Taylor Law violations in terms of what things

13

were posted, and there was a lot of that stuff. You know, I'd get calls or my boss would get calls. I worked for Tom Gibbs at the time, who

you may know.

We would get calls and such-and-so went up on the bulletin -- we had a lot of facilities so they were in the hinterlands. Something went up on the board. Can we leave it up on the board or should we take it off? People are ripping stuff off the board that's on the board, and it was that kind of conflict in the workplace.

And so we were trying to advise our management folks to, you know, stay out of it, but here are the rules in terms of what political campaigns, unit political campaigns can be, and how you make sure you want to be -- treat them fairly and there were accusations that we were more -- we were biased towards CSEA, which was not the case.

We were trying to be very -- stick very close to it because we didn't want to get involved in an issue that would ultimately -- at the time there was no Governor's Office of

14

Employee Relations, so all this stuff came out of -- the guidance came out of the Governor's Office itself and there was not a lot of guidance.

I mean most of the agencies were pretty much on their own to make sure they didn't do -- well, actually, that's not true. In '79 the Governor's Office of Employee Relations was there, but it seems like we had -- we were pretty much on our own. In other words, don't make a mistake. If you make a mistake, I guess we'll be there to help ya, but there was -- unlike the way the Governor's Office of Employee Relations is now, which is more what I would say a corporate kind of a labor relations entity.

Back then it was a bunch of little operations going on and things were happening here and there and everywhere that were different. There was really no commonality. No way for us to go to our counterparts in another agency and find out what they were doing.

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m.

MR. DeMARCO: But what we tried to do

15

was be fair and square and not be biased to it and to be honest with you, I was surprised when CSEA lost, as an individual as much as a -- as a professional because I thought that they always

had been there when people needed them.

At that time it wasn't Roemer Featherstonough. It was their predecessor, whose name I can't recall, I think, that was handling --

INTERVIEWER: DeGraff Foy.

MR. DeMARCO: Yes, right, and there were several groups of attorneys there that were very -- very much advocates. I mentioned while I was getting involved with Pauline in a lot of cases, a very strong advocacy, and I really understood why, you know, people felt so strongly but, you know, you can -- any kind of political campaign you can tell people what they want to hear and that's what these guys were doing.

INTERVIEWER: So one of the upshots, of course, of the PEF challenge and the breakaway was that CSEA became part of AFSCME. Did you see any change in the organization after

16

that?

MR. DeMARCO: No, I thought that was a pretty smart thing for them to do, to tell you the truth. The raiding that was going on -- in fact the Operational Services Unit was

continually identified as potentially ripe for be...for picking. I remember being told several times, you know, don't screw around with us because they were com...they were tryin' to get us, you know? We can't let that happen and so forth.

Really didn't see any change in the way CSEA operated. I mean I think all of us were maturing at this time, Steve. I mean in terms of the labor relations field, CSEA had gotten -- come a long way from just the insurance provider and a trip planner and that sort of thing to being a -- you know, what I think was a bona fide labor relations entity and union representative group.

And I don't know -- I don't know if I can really say I saw a big difference when they became affiliated except that that was -- we were very much aware of that and I think from

17

the point of view of stability for the State, I remember us saying that was a good thing, because one thing, when the State set up the bargaining units way back in the late sixties, they really marginalized as much as possible.

I mean considering a player as large as the State was then, to only have five bargaining units or six bargaining units, that was quite incredible that you were able to mold everybody into that and that's probably one of the reasons why the PS&T unit had the problems they did because it was such a homogenized group of people but with very diverse interests. The nurses versus engineers versus mental hygiene workers. It was not -- they were professional, scientific and technical but they definitely had different needs and it was very hard to address those needs.

INTERVIEWER: So to talk then a little bit about the State contracts, because CSEA has three main units and it's pretty much a master contract with some nuances and it's a very complex document, obviously grown up over multiple years of collective bargaining, but

18

take us through a little bit about how the State used that document, what does it do in terms of providing some consistency in dealings with the work force and how do you approach bringing about change in that document?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, changing it today

would be -- is gonna be impossible if not -- you know, it's what it is. And I've always said, once it gets in the contract it's probably not gonna change. Even if the language is obsolete, sometime people are afraid to take it out because it might have an impact and meaning in some way, just the mere fact that it's been removed.

So that's -- and both sides have to be mindful of that, but the State was very, as long as I remember, even back in the days before I was at the Governor's Office of Employee Relations, very concerned about not having a variety of different approaches to things, trying to be more consistent. You used that word consistent before.

We were lookin' for as much consistency in the agreements as possible,

19

particularly on the key issues of salary -- health insurance was not the kind of issue it is today. I mean health insurance may be the biggest issue today as opposed to -- even as opposed to salary because of its complications and impact.

But the main things, we didn't want a separate disciplinary process, we didn't want a separate salary arrangement, we didn't want different -- different salary schedules, all that kind of stuff, because that causes difficulties. So we would strive to do that and some -- I don't even know when this occurred, Steve. I think it was in the seventies before I got in OER.

The State and CSEA came up with this idea of coalition bargaining as well as unit bargaining, and at that time and even when I got involved in 1980, the units -- the unit negotiations were still very significant. I think nowadays they're actually less significant. Most of the issues have been addressed.

There's tinkering and adjustments and

20

stuff like that that might occur or new things being introduced in the workplace that would cause need for negotiations around that issue. Back then things like seniority which was -- it was just getting to the point where it meant something and the unions were really beginning to push for it having some relevance.

The State was very concerned that we not be all over the place, just in terms of operations. Oh, wait a second, Steve. You're in Operations Services. I'm an institutional. What's it mean, how do you apply it, and it was -- we were trying to avoid as much confusion and be as consistent as we could, but the way that the State and CSEA approached this, and it was even true when CSEA represented the PS&T Unit, was to do unit negotiations first and try to get the things that were unique to those units negotiated and then move into coalition.

So you would agree on here's the issues that we think will be coalition-type issues and I have mentioned some of the key ones and there were some others as well. Those things which are not really boilerplate, but

21

they apply to all employees similarly, would be dealt with at a main table where everybody would be there. There would still be representation of all of the units and -- but at least we'd be dealing with that issue unto itself with the whole group as opposed to, you know, pieces of it.

So the way we approached negotiations was we would start negotiations with the units, try to get those things out of the way, and maybe that would go on for a month or two months and then move into the real things, you know.

INTERVIEWER: I think in recent years, at least on CSEA's part, there's been an attempt to streamline what we call the negotiating teams, but there's still quite a large number of individuals from the rank and file or certainly the activist rank who sit there at the table and a large number of management personnel, but certainly in the old days there were a whole lot more people who --

MR. DeMARCO: There must have been -- there must have been a hundred people or more on the CSEA side. I remember going into a few

22

negotiations where there may be five or six managing representatives and I'm not exaggerating, I don't think, when I say a hundred. There were probably 35 to 40 people on each negotiating unit, so that would be well over a hundred and they all had their game faces on, you know?

INTERVIEWER: How do you work in that

kind of an environment?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, that was my first experience with the OSU in 1980 when we were -- I remember we were up at the Thruway House, which is now gone, and there were probably 25 people on the -- I'll take a stab at -- on the Operation Services Unit, none of whom I knew. In fact, I hardly knew Nels Carlson, because it was one of those things, I started just before negotiations started.

INTERVIEWER: It was basically the collective bargaining specialists --

MR. DeMARCO: He was the collective bargaining specialist and Nels is out of the school of toughness. At least he was then. I think he's changed a lot, and we all change as

23

we get older, but he was -- he believed to bein' in your face and he started that with me.

And goin' back to your question, and it sort of gets to the point I was gonna try to make anyways, is how you deal with that is you try to work the crowd. You try to be sensitive, understanding, responsive and honest, and that's what I tried to do and that's sort of what I'm

made of anyway, I think, is I -- if somebody had an issue, I was willin' to tackle that issue. If they didn't have the issue I wanted to tell 'em why and why we weren't gonna do it so they understood, even if they didn't agree.

But it's -- when you're dealin' with that number of people, there's a whole bunch of personalities and, you know, there were times I would say to Nels, and even Ross Hannah, in the contemporary days, you know, this guy, Steve, you've gotta quiet him down. I'm not gonna deal with what he's doin' at the table and some people would -- I mean they'd throw stuff and we'd have ground rules, you know, I and either Nels or anybody, John Norder (phonetic) when I worked with him, he was a wonderful guy. You

24

know, we'll be the spokesperson.

Well, you can't shut some people up and they can't understand the dynamics and they feel very emotional about their issues and then conversely, on my side, I've got people who, you know, want to go for the jugular too. I mean, and they know this particular person to be not the person they admire, let me put it that way. They don't think that much of 'im. They're a

problem in the workplace and so forth and they also happen to be union representatives. So you got those dynamics to work with.

One of the things that Nels and I did in the beginning is we said, Nels, look, I don't want to do -- I'm not gonna do this midnight hour stuff. When it comes time to do negotiations, you know, at midnight or in the middle of the night, that's fine, but not as a rule because that's the way -- some people always start -- you had to go late in order to make -- look like you were involved in negotiations.

I said I'd just as soon start at 8 o'clock or 8:30 and we'll knock off at

25

5 o'clock and come back the next day and do the same thing and then it comes time for us to -- and he said I like that and the reason I like that is I don't want any -- I don't want people leaving for lunch because his concern was, as some people are, you go out for lunch, yeah, maybe you're on some sort of a vacation if you're -- I'm gonna be very candid.

I mean if you're a rep, some people

look at this as I'm away from the job. Let me go have a good time, so I'll go have a few pops at lunchtime or more than a few pops and come back and be a problem and I was always very sensitive whether -- to the union representative, whether it would be a collective bargaining specialist or somebody at the local level because they gotta control their people much or more than we do.

On the management side you can pretty much say this is the way it's gonna be because this is our position, whereas I know on the union side that's not always -- when you're dealing with a democracy you gotta be more delicate than that and I was always very

26

sensitive.

So anyway Nels says I don't wanna break for lunch. I said that's fine. My people are sayin', what, are you crazy? You know, we wanna take our hour and a half or two-hour lunch, you know, and so we started with -- we started an arrangement like that the first time we got started and we -- it was those little things that I think began to make him see that, at least in my case and the people that were

with me, we were willing to deal with the issues.

And once people see -- feel that, that you're not in their face and you're not disrespectful and that sort of thing, it seemed to work and that's the way I approach, getting back to your point, of how you deal with that number.

INTERVIEWER: So when you're doing a big negotiation like this and there are a lot of people sitting there at the table, is there -- I mean you're kind of suggesting that there's a degree of posturing and political theater that is taking place, so how much of it is actually

27

settled there at the table and how much of it is somewhat orchestrated behind the scenes and played out at the table?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, there is definitely some things that are addressed at the table and need to be addressed at the table. I think what you wanna use the table for is getting the issue out, getting it aired, hearing everybody's point of view, showing a sensitivity to it or letting people know that it's not

something that you're really concerned about or gonna be able to address.

How it resolves itself usually takes place with discussion between you and I about how can we resolve this thing, because if I as a negotiator for the State would come out and say, you know, how about this or how about that, it has a different -- it becomes almost gospel or, well, he said -- I think he said so and so. Well, no, he didn't say that.

What he said was perhaps we could go in this direction. Perhaps we could do that, whereas people grab onto that stuff, so it's a lot easier to, you know, sort of thrash out an

28

issue and then talk about it afterwards and determine how you're gonna get to closure.

Sometimes we knew, like when I'm talkin' to you, Steve, we know how we're gonna resolve this. We know what the bottom line and the ending is. How you get there is as important as what it is because Ross or Nels or John Naughter or anybody else I ever dealt with would say, you know, don't give me that now. Don't hit me with that yet. We gotta -- we gotta do a little bit more jockeying. We gotta

-- you've gotta explain your position more. I don't have -- my people aren't with me.

And what I would do, particularly in what we call coalition negotiating, I would be looking at the crowd, and I know -- prior to the introduction, we do the same thing on the management side. Prior to the introduction of people to the negotiation process and say to them, look, don't voice expressions, don't smile, don't nod yes at the person, you know, your adversary is talking, but people do that. I mean just naturally do that, so I would be kind of scanning the crowd.

29

As I'm talkin' to you I'm lookin' at the people behind you, and you can begin to tell who's with you and who's not with you, and you know who you have to get to or who you're never gonna get to and you know who, if you keep goin' in the direction you're goin', you're gonna have people in that group who are gonna come to your aid in the back room.

I used to -- one of the expressions I used to have, and I believe it's true, I remember saying this to Nels and he said what

the hell do ya mean by that? I said you're lookin' at your best friend because if I could be convinced or if I felt there was an issue, I was willing to take it and carry it back to where I had to go.

And I have many, many arguments and discussions with my superiors and my co-workers about an issue as to how it ought to be handled, why we oughta do something with it or go back to an agency and say -- I remember one of the things in DOT was the snow and ice stuff, which I think has pretty well settled down now, but back then DOT -- and this was one of the first

30

things I got involved in when you ask what kind of things did we face.

DOT was in the process of shifting their snow and ice removal. Heretofore they had -- everybody was on days, payin' a phenomenal amount of overtime. A lot of people didn't want to come in at night. They'd get a call, come on out, get your snowplow, at 12 o'clock. No, I'm -- I had a few six-packs; I can't come in, and they were having trouble getting people in, so they were gonna go to shifting, which was an absolute no-no by

everybody who was -- nobody wanted to do that.

I mean I don't want to be on nights in the middle of the winter or on weekends in the middle of the winter, whatever, and that was a real, real hard issue to address and trying to grapple with that was a tough thing for the union. I forgot exactly what connection I was trying to make to what you'd asked, but I think it -- looking at how you deal with the numbers of people again is trying to get to see who the people are on -- that's the other side, who might be with you, trying to see who you're

31

gonna have trouble with and hoping you convince those folks because when they go into their caucuses, and I know this used to happen, they'd go into their caucuses and one of the other negotiators would say to me, I'm havin' trouble with Joe Smith. You know, he's a problem and I'm gonna need you to even whack him a little bit.

And so I'm a very spontaneous -- I don't act -- as a negotiator I would never have had the ability to just be fire and brimstone in an act -- and pretending in an act. When I got

mad it was an emotional reaction and even though I didn't plan it that way, I think it maybe was more effective than if you're that way as a matter of course, you know.

So if I got inflamed at somethin', it came up, I mean I moved to the end of my seat, the whole thing that I did, but it was -- it was almost involuntary and I remember Ross sayin', you know, do that again. I said what did I do?

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m.

MR. DeMARCO: You know, I'm not sure what I even did. He said that was good. I said

32

-- I needed that at that point in time. I said okay, so it's those kind of dynamics that go around and even though people -- I know some of the activists particularly would get upset if -- nobody told me this, but I could tell. If, let's say, Nels and I or Ross and I would talk about something or go off together, you know, you're in cahoots with that guy. You're in bed with 'im.

In fact when I retired CSEA, one of my prized possessions, gave me a plaque that says, "With enemies like Al DeMarco we don't need friends." And that's -- people used to accuse

me of that; that, you know, why are you so sensitive to what they say? Well, I think the issue -- the issue merits attention and that's the way I looked at it.

And I think that having those private conversations or the ability to talk, when John Naughter and I used to call each other at night because he didn't want to, he didn't feel comfortable talking to me off, you know, with anybody in view, so I'd call him at his house or he'd call me and we'd just kind of talk about

33

how we gonna deal with this thing tomorrow?

And I would let him know, and I think this is another thing you can do behind the scenes. When you have proposals -- it's changing now because, again, I don't think there's as many proposals as there used to be because things are -- pretty much iron themselves out, but back then there were things that were important and there were things that were less important, and we would tell each other, you know, I would say, what do you have to have with this thing? What do you really have to have?

And any one of those guys would say, if I don't get something here, I don't think we can settle and eventually -- and I say this with the utmost of sincerity, everyone I dealt with I could respect in that. Sometime somebody would say to somebody, and they'd give you a jibe -- jab. I never felt that way. I always felt that I was getting a square shot, and even if I wasn't, I knew what we could do and what we would try to do anyway.

And something -- I would conversely --

34

I would tell 'em, look, this is something we have to fix from our point of view, so this negotiation isn't gonna be over until we do.

INTERVIEWER: Aside from the bargaining table itself, what are the dynamics of the relationship between CSEA and GOER on, say, a day-to-day basis?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, oddly enough that you ask that, but aside from the bargaining table it's probably the least significant of -- whatever relationship you have going into negotiations, that relationship allows you to do the things, and I'm gonna be very candid here. I'll use PEF as an example, even if somebody

were to see this.

Dealing with CSEA, and some of the other unions as well, the State Police union is a very solid -- dealing with some of the folks in PEF now, you can't trust 'em, and I don't mean -- I'm not picking any individual but you couldn't -- you couldn't have that -- that trust and honesty factor was missing and so in a day-to-day relationship it wasn't there.

If I said, you know, let's -- how

35

about if we resolve it this way and you say, yeah, I think that I can do that and you begin to put the pieces in place to try to make it happen and then you have a person say, well, you know, I really -- I don't think we can do that or I never really -- I never really said what I said, you know, in terms of doing it and sometimes you have to back away from something.

I remember one time I remember Ross, I had to back away from somethin' I told him I thought we could do. I don't even remember the issue, and he was very mad. He said you bagged me on this. I said, no, Ross. I'm comin' to you now tellin' you I can't do that. What I can

do is this, and here's why I can't do what it was, and I thought I'd remember it but I can't now.

But at first he was very upset with me 'cause you double dealt me, and I said, no, I didn't. I said, all you gotta do is look back on all these other things we've talked about so, you know, your question about relationship on a day-to-day basis, that's what makes the rest of it work, and if I can call you up and say, I

36

need to have something fixed here. What can you do?

And I just was doin' a thing for Cornell and I use this -- humility is one of my things about this field, that you need to have humility. And by that -- what I mean by that is that you have to be able to say, in a situation -- you call me and say can you fix this for me or can you look into this thing and can you do? It requires me stickin' my neck out on your behalf with no reward to it at all. There's no -- nothing to gain for me to do it except the goodwill with you. That means a tremendous amount.

Or in a situation where we fix

something and you say to me, I really need to take the credit for that, no problem. Credit doesn't matter. It's sort of the humility factor, if you will. It doesn't really matter as long as the matter is resolved, as long as it's closed, and to me that builds equity with your adversary and that's the thing about CSEA.

And there are people here who I don't think were as good as others, I'll put it that

37

way, but I think the thing with CSEA is you always could do that to build equity and that equity allowed you then to deal with -- tackle the huge problems, the big issues, not the chicken feed crap that happens every day, which -- but that chicken feed stuff is the stuff that allows you then to have the credibility to deal with the bigger things.

And then there were so many issues that -- one of the things I'm doing now is I'm a time and attendance umpire for the State CSEA contract, one of them, and that particular provision is indicative of the relationship between CSEA and the State. That is such an advanced approach to things.

Triage, the other grievance resolution item. That came -- I can tell you how that evolved actually in a second, but the time and attendance procedure is a good example.

We came to CSEA and said we just cannot deal with the way disciplines are being handled. We got 800, 900, 1000 backup disciplines because you can't deal with them or you don't have enough attorneys or whatever it

38

is the problem was on this side, getting cases scheduled and adjudicated.

We need a different process so let's take the time and attendance issues out of it, which will take out about 5- or 600 disciplines and put 'em in a different process, an expedited process, one that allows a quicker resolution to a problem, assuming the person is guilty of something that they're being charged with.

Nobody else would ever agree on anything like that. We tried that with PEF, we tried it with Council 82. Because the issues are the same. I mean there's probably more attendance issues for lower level folks for a host of social reasons more than anything else, but working with CSEA we negotiated that. It

would never have worked if we didn't have a relationship on a day-to-day basis to make it -- to really put it into practice.

And another -- I was gonna mention three actually if you want me to keep goin'.

INTERVIEWER: Absolutely.

MR. DeMARCO: There are so many things. I could take that contract and tell ya

39

there are so many innovative things and I'm digressing just a little bit, but to get back to the point, I used to get tremendously annoyed when people attacked public service. Not because I happened to be in public service and even though you folks are in the union you're still affiliated with public service obviously.

I used to get real -- very upset because we've so far advanced in terms of the collective bargaining process, in terms of dealing with problems like the triage process, like the time and attendance expedited process, like a whole host of other things that we've done that if people would take a look at what's been done in State government, it's actually pretty efficient. It's been very good for --

from the, quote, taxpayer point of view.

But the triage thing's a good example. That was when Joe McDermott was president. We had a tremendous backlog of grievances, much like the time and attendance problem that was -- which was a State problem. The State wanted to get these disciplines adjudicated, either get rid of the employees or penalize 'em.

40

In the case of pre-triage discussion there was a huge, huge backload of Step 3 grievances, which are the grievances that are handled at the OER level and with the CSEA collective bargaining specialist and a host of grievances that were then proceeded to arbitration that were either with Counsel's Office here or were with Counsel's Office here and with the agency's legal or labor relations staff, numbering probably in the thousands.

And I remember this was one time when we sort of got blind-sided and I said to Ross, why the hell didn't you tell me this? He said, well, I intimated it but I wasn't able to tell you. Back then -- you mentioned Governor Cuomo. He used to have breakfast every once in a while with -- particularly with CSEA and this one time

Joe McDermott lost -- I'm not sure if Jim Rumble was there or not. I think he was still around then.

We went over to the mansion for a breakfast and during the breakfast Joe says -- Joe McDermott says, you know, Governor, we gotta -- and Joe Bress was director of OER then, and

41

Joe had been previous General Counsel and so forth. He'd been around a long, long time. And I was there with Joe 'cause I was the CSEA chief negotiator, I guess you could say.

And so McDermott, out of the blue says, you know, Governor, you people here are droppin' the ball on these grievances. We got over 1000, 1200 grievances in the hopper and you're not takin' care of 'em. Of course, the Governor says, what about that, Joe? And Joe is like squirming in his -- this is Joe Bress -- is squirming in the seats.

So it was kind of a -- well, fortunately we got out of it with the Governor by saying we'll go back and take a look at it. There's a host of reasons for it, but we'll be willin' to work with the union on it and, you

know, I had a -- this is where I said to Ross, you had to give me a heads up on that. You know, you should have, and I was -- for a while I was mad at him for that.

But out of that discussion came this concept of triage where let's put together some kind of expedited process to clean up the

42

backlog and then once we clean up the backlog, then maybe have a process in place that allows us to deal with this on a, you know, on a regular basis and we tried that.

Just to finish the thought, the net result of it is clean up all the backlog, and as far as I know there is zero backlog now and things are sort of bein' adjudicated before they get to arbitration because arbitration can be very costly. It's time consuming if not, you know -- I do arbitrations now and I know how much I get paid for a case. It's a lot of money to pay when you don't have to pay it, you know?

So we also tried this, once it came into being with CSEA. We actually tried it on a pilot in mid-contract. It didn't -- wasn't something that required ratification, which is one of those things you gotta -- you can't

really -- it's very unusual that you'd make a change that would require ratification during a contract because of all the implications of the ratification process, particularly on the union side; not so much on our side.

If it involved money we might need a

43

piece of legislation, but that's a little bit easier than going through a whole ratification, but this didn't require ratification so we were able to enter into a basically labor-management understanding. We put this in place mid-contract and then we just negotiated its inclusion in the agreement, in the next contract because it was -- actually turned out to be very, very successful.

And a lot of it's attributable to the people involved and I don't -- the more I was involved, I don't mean me, I mean on this side and I think that without certain kind of people involved it couldn't have worked because you need somebody that has the guts enough to say, you're right. This grievance doesn't have merit or, yeah, that's a reasonable resolution to this particular case without goin' to arbitration.

And what we did, we found Jeffrey Selchek (phonetic) who's a man among men in terms of arbitrators, isn't he, because he's so acceptable to both sides and he's so fair, that he was able to add credibility to that process so that if we -- Ross and I and Dick Dautner

44

(phonetic) who was doing it with OER couldn't come to some understanding, Jeffrey was in a position because he knew a little bit of background of the contracts because he had done it so well, plus he had been at OER years ago, and to be able to say, guys, if this has to go to arbitration, here's the narrowness of the focus we put on it and here's what I think the likely outcome is.

I mean you, CSEA, you're gonna take the tubes on it, you know, so why don't we find -- State, you're gonna wind up swallowing this. Why don't we find a way out of it? We tried this with -- once again, I don't mean to bash PEF, but I'll say it. We tried the process with PEF. Different triage arbitrator was -- Michael Windowski (phonetic) who is a good guy but not as strong as Jeffrey is or not as -- with not as much credibility, I think, with -- at least with

the other side.

And it lasted maybe year and a half, two years. We probably didn't get through, I don't know, maybe 30, 40 cases, and very few were resolved in that process, so it takes a

45

special, unique approach to things and, you know, I've grown to really like Ross Hannah, for example, as a friend and this even before I retired because -- not only because he's just a decent guy, besides a good person, but he was a guy that had guts and he had a willingness to try to find a way out of it.

And if you don't have that dynamic, and that's -- I'm only going back to your previous question, Steve. That kind of stuff, first of all, takes that quality in an individual, but it also takes that working relationship on a day-to-day basis to make these difficult things become a reality.

If we didn't have that, I remember when the Pataki Administration came in, oh God, his name just went right out of my head, who was a gen...who was a General Counsel to Pataki right off the bat. God, I'll think of his name

afterwards.

The guy who came in to be the acting director of the GOER, Jim Gill --

INTERVIEWER: Jim Gill.

MR. DeMARCO: -- and I went over to

46

this guy's -- it's on the tip of my tongue.

INTERVIEWER: Brad Race, you're thinking of?

MR. DeMARCO: Not Brad Race. He was a -- he was the secretary. This was a counsel, Irish name. God, nice guy, too. Geez, he was a good guy. And I was from the other side; I mean I was still the holdover from the Cuomo Administration, even though I'm really apolitical. I've never been enrolled or anything but fortunately I was able to stay, fortunately for me.

But anyway I remember telling him. He said you guys screwed PEF. You GOER screwed PEF for a bunch of years. And I said, well, what do you mean by -- I mean what do you mean? Well, they have less leave credits, they have this, they have that, they have -- their salary schedule's different.

So I finally said, that came out of

negotiations. We didn't screw anybody. We, for example, using the leave accruals, that was when the time and attendance procedure went in for CSEA. We said take the time and attendance

47

procedure and -- no, we don't want the time -- we'll take a reduction in leave credits not to take that time and attendance procedures. Okay.

Then -- it's gonna have to be somethin' because we're -- time and attendance was our issue that year and go in with sort of a mantra every year, going into negotiations we got an issue. That was our issue. They negotiated that. We didn't force 'em to take that. We gave 'em options. The easy way out for them would have been the time and attendance procedure. They took -- and then they cried about it.

Salary schedule, I remember they wanted more employee organization leave, and I'm just -- and again, I don't mean to bash them. I think it's a dynamic of negotiations. They wanted more employee organization leave when the new administration came in to represent PS&T right after the challenge and the successful

takeaway from CSEA. They wanted more employee organization leave. We said, well, it has a value to it. They said, okay. We'll take less money in our salary.

48

That was when CSEA got 8-8-8 or actually 10-10-10. They took 8-8-8 to get more employee organization leave. Of course they didn't tell their members that because that was a union thing, not members -- what did members -- members don't care whether you have employee organization leave or not. They care about how much money's in their pocket.

Well, anyway, so I'm sayin' to this guy, you know, it all happened in negotiations and I said to him, what you're gonna find before you leave here, because I'm figurin' I'm gonna get fired, you know, as soon as I leave this room. I said, you know, before you leave this Administration you're gonna find that CSEA is the outfit that you can deal with and that's -- and then when we went on a little bit further in that negotiation, that was in '95 -- pardon me.

I remember Jim Gill saying, well, the Administration wants to settle with PEF first. I said PEF will never settle first. If it

wasn't for CSEA I don't think we ever would have settled a contract because they're the only ones willin' to settle first. You know, I mean,

49

yeah, they're -- and I remember Joe or Danny sayin', you know, I'm very nervous here. Don't screw me because I'm comin' out first on this thing, and we said we won't and we didn't at any time.

Because you can't, if you're gonna get anybody to go first, you can't screw the person that goes first, so I said PEF is not gonna do it, and I remember, we went down to the Crowne Plaza and we had a meeting with myself and Jess Gill, meeting with Jim Sheedy was the president of -- who's a nice guy actually, a real good guy -- meeting with them to kind of talk about how we could wrap this thing up.

And we weren't even close to wrapping up but what would it take to wrap it up, 'cause this guy Gill said I'm here for 90 days and I'm outa here. I said you're crazy; we're not gonna do this in 90 days and we actually did. But anyway, he came out of that meeting saying, get me -- let's have dinner with Danny and Ross

Hannah and see what we can do and he instantly realized, after talking to Danny -- while Dan... I don't wanna say Danny didn't have issues

50

'cause he did, but there was a willingness to try.

So they said we'll get DeMarco and Hannah together and see whether they can't hammer out some rough -- rough elements and, you know, and we went and then sold it to the Governor, but that's what I mean about CSEA and I think I've been around now -- been around about 40 years in State service or around State service and if it wasn't for CSEA's willingness to negotiate fair stuff, I don't think CSEA ever gave anything away. I think they always were willing to compromise, though, on what they did. And the result, a lot of difficult things were settled.

I mentioned the snow and ice in DOT. I mean I can go into a long story about that in the -- I think that was in the '82 negotiations.

INTERVIEWER: Well, let me ask you this, though, because you've kind of -- you touched on it a little bit.

MR. DeMARCO: I'm kinda jumpin'

around.

INTERVIEWER: You're tellin' a story

51

about the Pataki Administration coming in and sort of being new to, you know, new as the Administration and having to kind of learn some of the lay of the land of labor relations, but you served under three separate -- or I guess more than three Governors.

Did you see a difference philosophically in how they approached employee relations?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, the first one was Carey and Carey was goin' -- kind of goin' out the door, so I really didn't see too much of that, but certainly Cuomo had his concerns about what to do with the unions, but he was sensitive to the unions and, of course, Meyer Fruscher (phonetic) was his first director of OER and, you know, I'm sure you know Sandy Fruscher, you even talked to Sandy.

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

MR. DeMARCO: He's an amazing person in so many ways, but very sensitive to labor issues, very sensitive to social concerns and

that. On the other hand, that sounds like I'm gonna say the Pataki Administration folks

52

weren't.

They -- what they thought was, and it was political, quite candidly from my -- where I sit. I mean I really -- I'm not even qualified to comment on this, but from where I sit their concerns were directed not towards the work force or what the work force should get or what their issues should be, but against CSEA because CSEA was a Cuomo-backing entity. And so when they came in, they already had a notion that that no-good outfit tried to screw us. We're gonna take care of them.

As time progressed and the relationship matured, I think they began to see pretty readily that that was -- yeah, that was true. They were on the other side of the fence and that sort of thing and -- but they're willing to deal and that came within months of the beginning of the Administration when we settled the first contract.

I think the Gov...and I don't know Governor Pataki any more than I know two people walkin' down the street. I may have been in

rooms with him. I've been in discussions with

53

him. I've talked to him, but he doesn't know me from Adam, but I will say he was a very caring guy that -- about employees.

You know, despite the budget stuff and things like that, I always felt that there was a -- and the people that -- Jim Natoli and Bill Howard, some of the people that we had to deal with in the Governor's Office to get things done, they were very sensitive to it. Now there are political entities as well and there's also the political dynamics to this stuff.

But if you brought them an issue that had merits, or at least you could make a good argument on it, they were willing to let you try and do it.

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m. You were bringing up some of the issues before of some of the innovations in the State contracts. I know CSEA looks at things like the employee assistance program and some of the day care issues in the eighties, labor-management committees as ways to address issues.

Can you talk a little bit about those

issues and maybe some others?

54

MR. DeMARCO: Yeah. The -- this whole notion of quality work life kind of emerged in -- I think in 1982 negotiations. That was the first time we started talkin' about that stuff and that was also at the time that training of State employees was being done by Department of Civil Service and there was at least a notion by Sandy Fruscher that -- and I think in talkin' to Jim Roma (phonetic) who was sort of the chief negotiator for CSEA at the time, that it really wasn't workin' for the membership.

There were a lot of management-related things being developed and I'm probably doin' a gloss job on this, but the nuts and bolts is that the CSEA rank and file were really not being served the way they should, and how better could that be done.

And the emergence of employee development and training and what is now the partnership, I believe, has matured to where CSEA and the State actually administer funding for it, that was the precursor in 1982 of what we now have and a lot of things have changed over the years, but this whole notion of -- we

had a discussion of the time and attendance issue, for example.

Child care was brought up. Single parents. A lot of people with mental health/mental retardation. At that time had maybe 40-, 50,000 employees, nothing like they have today. Child care and family responsibilities and these kind of things were major league issues and so this whole notion of, well, maybe we can help the process by creating this day care concept together and that -- sort of the baseline of all of this stuff was let's do it together. We don't know the right way. We just know, and "we" could be either CSEA or us, we don't know the right way but we know it's an issue we need to address. Let's address it collectively.

Safety in the workplace was also involved in that. That was -- I mean if you go back to 1982, that was to me sort of like the hallmark for what we now see in terms of the relationship in labor-management, and it all emulated -- or emanated, rather, from the CSEA/State relationship.

Day care, EAP considerations, all

workplace quality, work life things, training, safety, the apprenticeship program which is something I worked on in the Operations Services Unit at the time. It's falling apart now mainly because the work force has shrunk considerably and the needs aren't there the way they were but back then that was a -- that program which was supported strongly by people like John Egan who had OGS and who needed these -- needed trained people, it was a win/win situation.

And that's the way our stuff kind of matured, is it really was a win/win stuff. Now if the State hadn't put up money, and fortunately in '82 that's when the 10-10-10s went in, there was a lot of money. After that there has never been a lot of money, I don't think, but we've always managed to maintain those things so you had all those quality work life issues and then you had such things as I mentioned before.

The time and attendance, expedited disciplinary process, the eventual triage thing and some of these big things that addressed -- address really monumental problems. I keep

coming back to this, so I might as well say something about it.

In the Operations Services Unit the Department of Transportation was the key entity at that time and may still be in terms of numbers and this whole issue of snow and ice was a problem. Well, rather than simply say we're goin' to a shift operation which we think we had a right to do and we were gonna do, we said, all right. What's the impact on employees? How do we get people to report to work for overtime? How do we -- what kind -- can we work on any incentives for people to want to come in on these things?

And a lot of stuff that's in the contract today, like how shifting occurs, the bidding process, the fact that there's a shift pay differential. The people actually get -- when they go to shift they actually get money to go to that shift. I mean that was like an unheard of kind of a thing and I remember us tryin' to sell it to Budget sayin' it's the right thing to do. We're asking people to uproot their lives for part of the year.

It's not -- we're not talkin' about you're on a night shift now and you may never get off it. This is a thing that we're -- the whole operation is shifting at a point in time and it's gonna stop, so for that period of time let's give these people the equivalent of what they would get if they were in a shift situation.

The call-out response. If you come out for so many call-outs, if you're called, if you come out for this many you get this much money. If you come out for more than that you get this much money, so there's an incentive for a person, gee, I can make another 400 bucks and it'd be in a separate check so I don't have to tell my wife and all the rest of that stuff.

So these innovative kind of things came out of that era, I would say, from '82 to '85 or '88 maybe.

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m. You know, we have been looking over the past few months at the whole issue of safety and health because we just passed 25 years of having the Public Employee Safety and Health Act in place. What

do you remember about that particular issue and how did that come to the bargaining table?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, that was one of the things that Nels Carlson really championed. He was very big into safety and health because it primarily was the blue collar worker who -- not so much just the blue collar but certainly institution services worker as well, you know, who was faced with that sort of thing.

And again, our way from a management point of view, we get into some of these issues. We try to defuse them rather than have them take on a life of their own, so one of our -- let's form a statewide committee. We never had something like that before, and let's have some money associated with it so we can do some things, address some issues and get the agencies thinking more about safety and health.

And I think what came out of CSEA's effort really 25 years ago that the State embraced together with them was now you see in State agencies safety and health professionals, people whose responsibility it is to deal with it.

The Governor's Office of Employee Relations has a safety and health expert on staff in the collective bargaining unit which you never had before. People like I would have to do it, so what did I know about safety, you know, except that it doesn't look safe to me, you know? Or it does.

And so I think that because of coming forward on that, generally the workplace -- the sensitivity to safety-related issues is greater. That combined with the State's quest, and this was where the State's interest was, as much as it was in safety which it was, was Workers' Compensation.

People would get hurt on the job, I mean, you lose people, it costs money, so forth and so on, so our -- it was in our best interest to have people have as safe a work environment as we possibly can. The problem over the years, and it still probably continues to be, is I remember getting involved heavily in the early days with ergonomics in the workplace. You know, the computers were just coming into being then and carpal tunnel syndrome and all the

stuff, vision problems, that's how we wound up actually with the vision plan, allowing -- if you work on -- if you worked on a terminal in those days they called it, then you got a second pair of glasses, you know.

So there were things we tried to do to make the workplace better together and I think the togetherness, as hokey as that might sound, was something that made this thing work and CSEA, no doubt, spearheaded it. We took a lot of the things that we did with CSEA that evolved and tried to bring them to the other units and in first call, it's -- the other units, it's resentment.

Well, you know, we gotta take -- we don't wanna take what they got. Well, this is something we dealt with with them on it and we're willing to do it with you as well. Well, we don't want to do it exactly the same way. Okay. As long as it's not too far afield, we can talk about what it means to you. I mean obviously the Corrections Department is different than DOT and maybe you have to do different things there.

But I think that -- I didn't realize it was 25 years but, yeah. I think there's been a lot of maturation there. I've been out right now from actual State government operations now for probably five or six years, but I think things are a lot different. As I say, there are professionals in the agencies now generally who have the assignment of dealing with safety-related issues.

The OSHA regulations and the penalties associated with it alone force you to have to address some of these issues, so I think it's been a very positive thing.

INTERVIEWER: That's great. Let's talk a little bit about some of the, you know, you mentioned certainly Ross Hannah and Nels Carlson but tell me about some of the other personalities that you dealt with and let's start with Bill McGowan.

MR. DeMARCO: Oh, Bill McGowan was a classic. I mean that he was -- for me he would be my grandfather, you know, even though I'm older now, but he was older than me and you know what I loved about McGowan is he was a real

person. He was -- what you saw is what you got.

He wasn't a lot of fluff. If he had an issue, while he wasn't the most articulate guy in expressing his issue, he got right to the thrust of it. He was a guy that you could really respect and he was smart. And by that I mean he was really wily. He might not have been the most educated guy. I know he was in plant operations or something like that at Buffalo, and Buffalo wanted the institutions, but he was a very smart person, albeit not professionally educated, but he was a guy that engendered a lot of respect.

I betcha Cuomo had some good things to say about him because he was the kind of guy you couldn't help likin' him, you know? And when he raised an issue it was -- I remember, Al, you know I mean -- are we on the third floor?

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

MR. DeMARCO: I remember being in his office there. Al, we gotta take care of this problem, and he'd -- I'd say, Bill, we'll look into it and you just -- you wanted to try to address it because he was -- he was just a nice,

solid man, okay?

INTERVIEWER: How about Joe McDermott?

MR. DeMARCO: Joe McDermott was an entirely different person. He was a little bit more aloof, I think. I think I had a good relationship with him. I respected him, definitely. He was a little bit more -- a little less involved, I think, in the meat and potatoes.

Where Bill would take a member's issue and want to make it his, you know, Joe was more of a delegator, I think. Someone who would, you know, pass off the -- he didn't have the depth on an issue sometimes as Bill did because Bill would get so much into the person's emotional issue that he would be right -- Joe was -- aloof is not the -- I don't mean it in a negative sense. I mean he didn't get into the detail as much.

However, he had a good grasp on the overall. I remember walkin' one time up with the -- this had to be in the early nineties because we had gone, I think, about 18 months without a contract; it was comin' up on two

years. And myself and Brest and Ross and Joe

McDermott took a walk around the block. It was a nice summer day. We went up and got an ice cream at the -- and basically how the hell are we gonna get out of it?

Joe says, let's -- I mean how about we just go over and take a walk and get an ice cream cone. I don't know where that came from, but I called Ross and said take a walk --

(End of Side A of tape.)

MR. DeMARCO: (Continuing) -- standin' right out -- I think it was right out here at the corner of Dove and Washington, and Joe -- Joe Bress says, Joe, the contract -- you look right down. The answer to this contract is right down there, he says. Joe says if you say that again, that's where your ice cream cone is goin' or words to that effect.

But Joe was -- Joe was just a different kind of a person than Bill and -- but I think a good strong leader. I always admired him.

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m. Did you ever have dealings with Irene Carr?

66

MR. DeMARCO: Oh, wonderful lady. Oh,

just a tremendous woman. In fact, after she retired I talked to her a couple times when she was in -- down in Oneonta. She's just a -- she was a jewel. She and I worked very closely together on the child care committee. She was very instrumental in moving that thing along.

She cared very much about the ASU type worker, I would say. Not that she didn't care about everybody, but I know she was very concerned about that. She was very -- just a very dedicated, solid lady; just a -- just a wonderful person and very good to work with and you could talk to her. You could say things to her that she wouldn't be offended by, you know, when you approached her on an issue, but I enjoyed working with her. She was -- she was a very nice person.

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m. And, of course, Danny Donohue.

MR. DeMARCO: Well, Danny -- well, Danny -- Danny is unique in his own way. Just the fact that -- just his longevity tells you about Danny, I think. You know, he's a good,

67

solid guy. He's politically astute. He's -- I remember Jim Gill saying, this is a real guy. I

think those were his exact -- this is a real guy and after we had that dinner down at the -- forgot where we went. Oh, we went over to Befs. Well, it used to be Befs, the Ice House.

I remember we went to the Ice House for dinner and Jim says, the guy's a real guy, and I know he got to like him -- Gill got to like him so much that he put him on the GHI board of directors, which Jim was president of.

You know, Danny, just immense respect for him. Another guy who, you know, didn't have the formal education, he wasn't an attorney or somethin' like that, but really, really knew the issues and I just admired him totally.

INTERVIEWER: M-m h-m-m. I've asked this of everybody. Why do you think CSEA has been around for close to a hundred years now?

MR. DeMARCO: Well, you know, I think the first thing that comes to my mind is they deliver and I think that CSEA's not afraid to take on an issue. It's also not afraid to support something if it's necessary, but

68

moreover than that, it's willing to work. The willingness to work and resolve problems.

I just think it's gained its respect by doing, in my opinion, and I think that -- I mean certainly the affiliation with AFSCME didn't hurt in terms of securing its position. I mean I think that was a smart move to prolong the existence of the organization. I mean who knows what would have happened if there had been raiding all over the place, you know?

Not that I think CSEA would have lost a lot of the stuff but, I mean, you might think the landscape would have -- might have been different, so that was a good mover and that solidified its position.

But I think it's also politically astute. I think they've always had good lobbyists, present people included especially and, you know, they knew -- they know how to deal and I think they had good legal advice along the way, even though I know you have in-house now and fine operation, I think in its time the Roemer Featherstonaugh group was really solid and did a lot to help CSEA and their

69

predecessors as well.

I think it's just a question of being professional and being able and willing to

resolve problems, and I think the other part of it is who you had in place here to do some of the things. I think that the staff was always solid, always willing to work things out and some of the earlier guys, you know, were good guys but maybe not as involved, but they still were -- if they had an issue, they were willing to work on it to get rid of it.

I would term it in those -- some of the -- some people want to get rid of an issue, they want to resolve it to get rid of it but get rid of it in a positive way.

INTERVIEWER: Well, I think that that covers a whole lot of territory and, Al, we thank you very much --

MR. DeMARCO: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: -- for taking the time and speaking with us.

MR. DeMARCO: Thank you as well.

(Conclusion of interview of Al DeMarco.)