

Budget Hearing Minutes  
Audit & Control Committee  
Thursday, October 5, 2018, 1:30 p.m., Room 331 & 333  
Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Chagnon, Nazzaro, Gould, Muldowney, Niebel

Others: Tampio, Widrig, Agett, Lis, Wendel, Crow, Dennison, Hansen, Borrello, Luka-Conley, Douglas

Chairman Chagnon called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Chairman Chagnon: I appreciate the Department of Social Services coming back because your budget presentation to the Human Services Committee was so detailed and there was so many new things that came up at the end that I had asked the Audit & Control Committee to hold our questions, our detailed financial questions because you're putting in a lot of good programmatic information for the Human Services Committee so appreciate you coming back today to give the Audit & Control Committee an opportunity to ask their detailed questions and I will say for full disclosure that several days ago I took the opportunity to do some emailing with Val who was kind enough to answer my detailed questions so I have very few detailed questions left for today so I will leave it up to the rest of the committee to go through the budget detail and ask any questions that they may have. You brought reinforcements.

Ms. Lis: I did and my program people that could help me explain a few.

Clerk Tampio: Mr. Chairman, if they could all state their names so we could get it on the record.

Barbra Widrig, Social Services Attorney; Leanne Luka-Connelly; Deputy Commissioner; Val Lis, Director of Administrative Services; Wendy Douglas, Director of Patient Services, Bea Agett, Epidemiologist;

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you all for coming. Val appreciates all of the support. O.k., so I don't know how best to proceed, but Chuck, would you like them just to go through the summaries?

Legislator Nazzaro: I think the summaries and the major driver.

Ms. Lis: I think I'll do this so that you have the budget page version of our changes as well as Kathleen's version. I think that I sent you a copy. This is mine so we'd have to make some copies.

Chairman Chagnon: This is the changes.

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: From the budget.

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: I think they want to ask questions about the budget.

Ms. Lis: To begin with?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes, to begin with. The tentative budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: You said it was just the high level summary, I think.

Chairman Chagnon: Jay, are you o.k. with this?

Legislator Gould: Yeah, do you want me ask a question while the rest of you are looking for your questions?

Chairman Chagnon: Sure.

Legislator Gould: O.k., 6010, \$4,000., mileage reimbursement to management. It's been \$11,000, it's gone up – was \$7,000 this year, it's gone up \$30,000. Why the 329% increase?

Ms. Lis: I took a short cut. I am trying of budgeting how much is going to be meals, how much is going to be hotel. It doesn't matter. It's all travel. And how much is going to be managers versus non-mangers. I don't see the importance of that, I don't see how my guesses can put everything properly where it's going to end up in the end, but within the travel area, I put everything in at the top line.

Legislator Gould: So it will fall in mileage whether it's a hotel room or –

Ms. Lis: Yep. Because sitting there and figuring out well, I guess hotel rooms are going to be \$3,000, I guess meals will be \$2,000, who knows? It's just didn't seem sensible to break it down. I don't even know why we have it broken down that much in the general ledger. I know meals you have to treat differently.

Legislator Gould: In another year, that should be about the same.

Ms. Lis: It's a little higher but not much. I wrote a detailed answer to Pierre, he asked that question as well. It's little higher just because we do have a little more – we've been going to more trainings as we have taken on the Jail, as we've taken on the Coroner's, so we're doing a couple of more trainings. There are some that are held once a year and different places across the country. We're always trying to find the closest, cheapest one to go to and we'll send one person. They are a little costly and we just started doing that more this last year because we have certain requirements and certifications that we have to keep up to date and so that will be reflected in there because if we charge them to the Jail, first of all the people or wherever program, the people who are being trained don't entirely work in one place and we get no reimbursement if

we break it out that way. So, we try and make sure we put the cost where we get the best reimbursement, where it's also appropriate.

Legislator Gould: Good, 6110.4590, other contractors. It's up 73%.

Ms. Lis: This is because and this is another question that Pierre did ask me.

Legislator Gould: What are the other contractors and why is it up three quarters percent?

Ms. Lis: That is basically things like, supervised visitation, peer support, all different contracts with outside agencies to take care of our clients. We have been doing some more contracting, more than we used to because we have freed up some money from detention. One of our detention area is for low level detention. We get an allocation. If you don't spend that on that particular thing, you can spend it on other stuff. For years and years, nobody ever spent the money on other stuff so we found that so we have that so that we can use it. So that brought on additional contracts through our SDSJT(?) program. What does that stand for?

Ms. ?: Supervised – not sure the rest.

Ms. Lis: Something to do with juveniles.

Legislator Gould: What would be very handy would be a list of all those acronyms.

Ms. Lis: I had a list of those.

Legislator Gould: We, on the committee, or even your home committee, some of them are going like this, you know, and -

Ms. Lis: It's always o.k. to ask and sometimes I don't remember and we have a lot of them.

Legislator Gould: That might be a good thing to do.

Ms. Lis: O.K., so we have more contracts, we've got some contracts that are new. We have some contracts that are increasing. One of them is our energy and housing contracts. You see more problems, as you have seen with the homeless situation, keeping people in their homes. One of those contracts has been increasing to make sure that we're aren't paying (*inaudible*) keeps them in a hotel. Another thing is, a big piece of that is that, we used to budget much less than we actually contracted for and it made me nervous that we were going to go over that number and then where am I going to find that money so that I can actually I can pay a bill. Some of our contracts are based on how many people come and use those services. Some of them are just a flat amount so there is a variation but I was just not comfortable being that much lower than what we contracted out and actually, legally, signed off that the County would pay this money. So, I have increased my budget from that level now since that has been done. I brought it down. What I had done originally was, budget at 100% of what we had contracted out. I said, o.k., we usually don't really spend that so since that print out I've cut it down to 90%. So I

did bring it down, I can't remember exactly how much I brought it down by but when you do that as well, we've got about a 65% revenue on it, so every dollar that I bring down, that expense, the revenue goes down 65 cents so it's not a direct reduction. But I did cut that to 90% so it has gone down.

Legislator Gould: How about other supplies? That's always a good subject, 6110.4190.

Ms. Lis: 6110? First of all I'm not on that report (*cross talk*).

Legislator Gould: Or 6010, I'm sorry.

Ms. Lis: 6010.4190, did you say?

Legislator Gould: Yes, 4190.

Ms. Lis: That is where our – the main component of that is computer replacement. That budget comes to us from I.T. They have us all on a rotating schedule of replacing us every five or seven years, I'm not exactly sure right now, but it's just going to be more than likely that we have more replacements coming through than we did the last time. That's the majority. There are some other things in there as well. Some of our – I can't think off the top of my head right now but there are some other - we have some services that we use. For example, there is a TOCS(?) where we can look up people's cases. I don't know exactly what they look for in there but it's used by program integrity (*inaudible*) by PA.

Ms. ?: They check out to see whether or not somebody's employed at the time they have (*inaudible*). It's a computer system that we pay to use each time we check into an individual. It costs like \$2.85 but we do about 80 of them a month.

Ms. Lis: We do more than that because we used to only program integrity and extend it to PA so they could do a better job of making sure people weren't getting benefits who should not or calculating their benefit more correctly. And in the meantime, this is something that is a contract through the State, although it's not a State program but the contract runs through them. The price increased by about a \$1.00 per look up just recently. So that went up. But the main driver of that is what I.T. says they are going to replace.

Legislator Niebel: Because Val, it has increased by \$40,000 or percentage wise 69%.

Ms. Lis: I can go look closer. I have detail of it but not with me.

Legislator Niebel: The look ups, a \$1.00 per look up?

Ms. Lis: They are like \$2.85 now and they were about \$1.85 last year. We do about maybe 150 a month.

Legislator Niebel: Do you anticipate more for 2019?

Ms. Lis: I probably anticipated about the same number of look ups but the price increase was only partially in this year and it's going to be through all of next year. There are a lot of other services in there but that is the one that comes to mind. Those are the two things that I know went up.

Mrs. Dennison: If I could make a comment. Val was talking about reducing the contract utilization from 100% to 90%, that change was not proposed to the committee. So that's not *(inaudible)* ..

Ms. Lis: There are two or three things that we have that are that way.

Mrs. Dennison: The summary that you have in front of you includes only items that were acted upon by the committees. We do have quantification on some of these other items that may be proposed *(inaudible)*....

Ms. Lis: The sheet that I sent around later yesterday had *(inaudible)*.. in it.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. So Kathleen, for the committee the change that was suggested to contracts was how much?

Mrs. Dennison: The change was suggested for contracts would be a reduction –

Ms. Lis: I have it reducing local share by \$134,150. It was a reduction in expenses of \$284,150 and a reduction in revenue of \$150,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: What was that for? Contracts?

Ms. Lis: That was because, it was mainly because I probably was hasty going with 100% of the contract value and brought it back to 90%.

Legislator Niebel: Val, just in general. For every dollar that we decrease Social Services appropriations, just in general because I know your percentages vary, some of it 90%, some 25%, some 50%, but, did you guys say the other day that on the average the reimbursement was approximately 62.5?

Ms. Lis: It's about 65 in general. That may change a little bit. That's the number that most people use. One time, being new to this, fairly new to this, I tore apart a claim and I figured out that that was a reasonable estimate. It may fluctuate a little bit because there are so many different factors. You may have different proportion of different programs every month that you have expenditures in, so that is going to change your overall rate. Also a lot of our cost on the administrative side which is all our payroll which is a big piece of our cost, are allocated to programs, not based on what we're doing but based on random moment studies on the big six largest counties across the State. So, they may be working on stuff that we're not but too bad, that is how are money is getting allocated. So, if they change what they are doing, our whole thing will change. I don't think they change drastically but you just never know. It's just kind of

out of our hands as a certain point, but I did go out and test that. Now you may hear sometimes 62%. I may mix them up sometimes, other people may –

Legislator Niebel: Sixty two twenty five.

Ms. Lis: Yeah. There's a 62% child welfare settlement. What that is, after we spend our child welfare allocations, not for every type of expenditure, but for some within that grouping, if you go over your allocations in the programs, the State will kick in an unlimited 62% reimbursement. That come about 2 years after the fact in a big lump payment. I'm hoping very soon to see the one from 2 years ago. So that is why those two rates are sometimes interchanged.

Legislator Niebel: I think sometimes I forget that a dollar decrease in the Social Services budget is not a dollar decrease in the tax levy because of the revenue. It's only 35 cents and sometimes I have to remember that.

Ms. Lis: Medicaid is 100%, Safety Net is only 29%.

Legislator Niebel: Understood. Your percentages vary.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just a general question. A couple. First, Raise the Age, I see where that is being totally offset to create another department. So I answered by own question.

Ms. Lis: Well let me say that that only has people in it right now because FTE's, we don't want – we figure that we should get the FTE's approved within the proper budget setting, rather than later. Those are only, if we need them, o.k., because we don't know, no one knows, how many kids are going to come through Raise the Age. We have two people. You don't see that in the original but we added two people. There are two people in there for our group, for the Public Defender, for Probation, and a small amount for our Legal Department, the County Legal Department. So, that is what is in there now. Other costs related to those kids will also be reimbursed 100%. We only just put our plan through last week on Friday, I believe and had our first review of it this week, a couple of days ago. They've asked us to revise it a bit and every time we turn around they come up and tell us something different about how they are looking at it. So they are like, oh wait, don't do this and they have said things like that. Raise the Age just started on October 1<sup>st</sup> for the 16 year olds. So when our plan is approved, it has to go through OCFS, Office of Children and Family Services, and I don't know the acronym for whatever the Probation area over seeing body is, but it goes through them, it goes through our group and when they like it, it goes to the State Office of Budget, questions go back and forth, and then it will finally be approved and then we can get reimbursed. Then we will come to you with a resolution to put those other costs in the budget so that we can actually spend that money. But, we don't know – we're going to wait for the approved plan before we do that but we wanted to get the people there.

Legislator Nazzaro: I couldn't help notice and maybe that was talked about and if it was, I can wait to read the minutes but, State Training School. I noticed and of course, that was a big issue, the retroactive settlement which killed us. Not your fault though.

Ms. Lis: They put the rates up yeah, it was terrible.

Legislator Nazzaro: But I noticed that you are budgeting less. What is the rationale behind that?

Ms. Lis: We, specifically Leanna, have been working very hard with OCFS. OCFS, Office of Children and Family Services, these kids are in their custody not ours and they would take these kids and put them in a facilities and mum's the word. We don't know anything about what is going on with them. Most of the time, it went through Probation and (*inaudible*) and the courts rather than through us but it's in our budget that we have to pay for it. So, we have been spending more time – we were fighting, fighting, and fighting, and finally they would tell us what is going on the kids.

Ms. Luka-Connelly: We meet with OCFS monthly about the kids that we still have in their custody and Probation and the County Law Department, we're all on the same page.

Ms. Lis: We have been taking kids out.

Legislator Nazzaro: So how many kids do you have now?

Ms. Luka-Connelly: Six.

Ms. Lis: There is different levels of custody there. If you are in an OCFS facility, you are charged three different rates, depending on your security. There is also electronic monitoring after care which they are still in their custody but that's great, yea, get them in there. So we have a few kids in there. We have some kids who are in OCFS custody but in non-OCFS facility. They are cheaper, we pay for them as if more of a Foster Care more of a situation (*cross talk*).

Ms. Luke-Connelly: It's like a step down facility. From a secure facility into a step down which is more like a Foster Care type of situation and then eventually they will come into a community and it could be an electronic home monitoring. They also provide after care and what we're trying to do is prevent a kid from going back. A lot of times the environment doesn't change at all at home, so we're really trying to be more proactive. Knowing when kids are returning to the community to be prepared for them. It's been a work in progress.

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't even believe I'm asking this – so you are comfortable lowering the number?

Ms. Lis: I am because I never used to get anything at all. I just assume, oh, there are three kids in there. To me, three kids, that is no big deal, but, each one cost like a \$1,000 a day, it's terrible. So, I get a report every quarter from OCFS. This is an amazing opening of a door. They were so mum, it was ridiculous and we have been working on this. (*Inaudible*) has worked on this, we've worked on it, I know that Christine and the County Executive just recently talked to them about their rate. I only recently got them. (?), got them as ahold of the fiscal people to tell us how many days of care do you have countywide because that is how they figure out the rates.

We got that from them so we know that our rates for 2017 which we will be billed for next year, should not change much from (*cross talk*).

Legislator Nazzaro: I was going to ask, is there any risk and I see our esteem County Executive. Speaking of that, great work by the way holding them accountable.

Ms. Luka-Connelly: It hasn't been easy.

Ms. Lis: It's been rough.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know that we have – isn't it Mr. Carpenter from the State Comptroller's office and again, just briefly, because of the retroactive payment we had to make going to what, 2015, was it?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Did we ever get any further explanation on how they did that or are they just now cooperating with us to try and pacify us?

County Executive Borrello: We got an explanation as good as you are going to get out of a bunch of bureaucrats is all I can say. We had a very lengthy phone call. I will say this. The action that we took to push the Comptroller's office, did get a response. A very detailed response. We had a conference call and Pierre, were you on that call, I can't remember?

Chairman Chagnon: No, I wasn't.

County Executive Borrello: And they gave us a rundown but in addition to explaining how we got to where we were, which is still a little murky, they did commit to some serious reforms going forward and also give us some good detailed information on the data that they had. So, it's made the budgeting for this a lot more confident as that was my first question to Christine after was, is our meeting confident now after hearing this that is was budgeted properly, and she said yes. They have some work to do there. The thing that I challenged them on was, they are saying that there are a lot of them across the State that bring these kids so I said, well then, supply and demand. If there is more open spaces, we should be paying less, not more. They are working on it but –

Legislator Nazzaro: So we never really got and I appreciate your comments so they are going to be more cooperative going forward with transparency going forth.

County Executive Borrello: Yes, better communication.

Legislator Nazzaro: Going back to that settlement, their still being sort of secretive or not disclosing exactly how they came up to that calculation? I mean, was there any type – I know when I get retroactive adjustments, part of my training, I make sure that I go back and say, this is how they determined the cost, this is how they determined your share.

Ms. Lis: I want to say, it wasn't really a retroactive adjustment. It's just because we don't pay the bill for two years and we didn't know what we were going to have to pay when the bill came.

*(Cross talk)...*

Legislator Nazzaro: So they did double the rate which I won't go down that path but I still think they were coming up with a way they needed to have additional funding on the State side and they went after the counties to fill that gap. We'll move on.

Ms. Lis: I can tell you that there is a \$55 million dollar cap to what they can charge us. That cap is only approved every year in the budget. It's not permanent so we have to hope it's stays. Then that's pretty much divided between the care date so the fewer kids that are in there and between 16 and 17, they lost about 14,000 care days, I can't remember, something like that. So, each care day get more expensive because people are getting out of that racket because it costs too much. In the meantime, we happen to be using it more. So as people are getting out of OCFS custody because they know that it's not effective and it's expensive, the rest of us our footing the bill because they are going – they are spending twice as much as that cap and they can only charge us up to that cap. Then they are going to say, how many care days did we have, divide it out, here is our rate and whatever you actually used, that is what you are going to pay. Mainly because of the decrease in usage, I believe, that a lot of that rate went up.

Ms. Luka-Connelly: Trying to sustain the facilities on the ones that are using them.

Ms. Lis: They have been trying to protect their phone baloney jobs.

County Executive Borrello: Well said.

Ms. Lis: The State Comptroller's office knows this because I sat with a lady ? last January and I believe she was from the Comptroller's office and she was muttering under her breath about how they are just trying to keep their facilities open and keeping their staff up and doing it on the backs of the counties. I think they knew it and when we started talking to them, they – *(cross talk)*.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., I agree with you and my background says I still want to pursue *(inaudible)*, but hold them accountable like they hold us accountable but that may be for another day Mr. Chairman. Not holding you accountable, holding the State. I know you're all on the same page. Just a couple of high level questions. Another one of my favorite topics. Safety Net. I want to thumb through the book and not be distracted because – your budget has a slight increase over the 2018 adopted budget, if I am reading this right. If I go local share, which is really what matters, it's a very slight increase, 2 ½% . So how are we trending now.

Ms. Lis: Let me say, not anymore.

Legislator Nazzaro: Not anymore what?

Ms. Lis: We're adjusting. We budget Safety Net based on trends because that is all we have and my trending goes back to 2010 so I'm watching it had been going up and up and it's start to trend down a little bit. Then what happened to us was, over the past couple of years, our homeless situation kind of got out of hand not because of us but all of a sudden we had so many people housed and we're housing them in hotels because that's all we've got.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because of the new laws that the Governor signed.

Ms. Lis: We can't give them enough in their stipend to pay rent because they can't find affordable places in Dunkirk that they can get a place for that amount of money. Which surprises the heck out of me but that is what I am told. So we were putting them up on the hotels instead and really kind of keeping the hotel in business. We put a lot of people in there and hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Legislator Nazzaro: As long as you don't put them in the new hotel in Celoron.

Ms. Lis: I don't think that we can spend that much. But we're not paying a special rate. There is no way that we're going to get them to contract with us because it's not in their best interest so we're charged the regular rate, more on weekends, just like anybody.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is that because of the temperature thing, the 32 degrees?

Ms. Lis: No, not yet because they haven't had that much activity with that and that's funded at a different rate in a different program. Safety Net is what I am talking about now. Safety Net, when I looked at the bills for the hotels and they are – they were hundreds of thousands of dollars a month, they were huge, they were ridiculously huge. The vast majority of that money was being charged to Safety Net. They were Safety Net clients, depending on their eligibility, that's where they fell. So Safety Net, rather than continue a (*inaudible*) trend started to go up a little bit. Now, just recently we've cracked that nut, we got the number of people in those hotels down. We've found places for them and our hotel bills and the information that Diane Anderson from TA presents in her monthly or bi-monthly, whenever she does that, she showed the amount we were spending has been going down. So when I was doing my budgeting for Safety Net this year, I didn't - we haven't seen the exact effect of that cut back yet because they are behind in billing us. So when I was looking at it and trending it out, what we spent so far this year and what I thought was going to happen, I was working with higher numbers thinking higher than I needed to because we're not going to have those big hotel bills anymore. We're going to have a much smaller one. So, I had trended I think a little slightly up but since then, we have one adjustment down of \$200,000 in expense that has been approved by the Committee and I have a further one of another \$200,000 that is not yet approved. So we are, I think we've trended down a little. I don't have it in front of me or on the right page at this second.

Mrs. Dennison: A 142,000 local share is reduced during the committee.

Ms. Lis: Right and it's another \$142,000 to come. So, on my Safety Net updated page –

Legislator Nazzaro: The one that you just handed out?

Chairman Chagnon: She didn't hand it out.

Ms. Lis: We are now – we had \$7.8 million actual 2017, we budgeted \$7.7 for 2018 and are budgeting \$7.6 for 2019. So I'm actually going down a little bit in my budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: So this has changed –

Ms. Lis: It was \$8 million and I have it down to \$7.6. Now, when we do that we only get a 29% revenue on that so that was a nice one. So for every \$200,000 I took out, I got \$142,000 in local share. So I did that twice.

Legislator Nazzaro: Taking the big scope of things, are there any open settlements that we should be made aware of, of any of the programs. You talked about –

Ms. Lis: For (*inaudible*)?

Legislator Nazzaro: For anything like, how the rates can change, any other open settlements that we should be concerned we have coming. I know we talked about State Training School but I mean, we've seen how in the past, I'm trying to think what program may come in –

Ms. Lis: The Block grant sometimes changes. The Child Care block grant, Pierre saw something (*inaudible*) ours is going down but we actually have a nice sizable carryover from prior years so that is not going to affect us for a while and our costs for Child Care are going down. Foster Care block grant, it's hard to say. It's a Federal program and who knows what they are going to do. But, I've trended along and what they have been doing but we're not going to know what we get. Those things come in allocations, separate blocks of allocations, working on a separate fiscal year rather than a calendar year so you kind of have to build our calendar year budget based on what has happened before. You may have half of your allocation already for the first half of the year but not the second half. So, they could change. I don't expect them, I hope they won't change a huge amount.

Legislator Nazzaro: But nothing huge that you can see.

Ms. Lis: Not that I can think of.

Legislator Nazzaro: So overall based on this, your local share and I know that there is some adjustments but roll it all up, the local share of Social Services area, department, is going down.

Ms. Lis: Yes, definitely.

Legislator Nazzaro: By about 2%.

Ms. Lis: We've got it down even further than that. I'm not sure what – I think the percentage didn't change I believe, which surprised me, but, we were originally – I don't know

what our original number was actually but it's down, we're decreasing by \$1.4 million now from year to year after everything that's to come.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just had high level questions Mr. Chairman. I'll leave the questions on the other.

Chairman Chagnon: I don't think that they were that high level but I'm just speaking for Kevin.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because this is such a complicated area.

Chairman Chagnon: You didn't have the benefit of sitting through the three hour budget presentation. We didn't get into the detailed questions either.

Legislator Nazzaro: (*Cross talk*), back to you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Chagnon: Oh, my detailed questions are all fine so this is for you and Kevin and Jay and Terry. Jay has already asked some real good ones so I'm waiting for Terry to chime in here.

Legislator Niebel: I'm fine.

Chairman Chagnon: Oh boy, he's tired.

Legislator Niebel: It's been a long day.

Legislator Nazzaro: They get us at the end of the week when we've been here all week.

Chairman Chagnon: Jay, anything more? Kevin?

Legislator Muldowney: Nope. Well, just an overall. Any idea what's really attributing to the 2% decrease? The economy?

Ms. Lis: There are many different factors because of the so many different programs. A nice chunk of it is going to be our State Training School. We are having decreased costs in our Child Care, the day care programs but I will tell you that, that OCFS training, that State school really is a big deal.

Legislator Muldowney: And that is determined by the courts basically?

Ms. Lis: Yeah, I would say it supports (*cross talk*)...

Ms. ?: We always look at (*inaudible*) we have to do (*inaudible*) because – I mean, not more harm on the child – its traumatic to place them in a setting like that. So we look at trying to keep kids in the community. If we can't do that then the next setting would be Foster Care. We're still struggling with not a lot of Foster Care parents out there especially for adolescents.

Then it would be residential and then you keep (*inaudible*). But I mean, our goal is to always keep it at a minimum because there is no good outcomes out there for kids going into these facilities. I haven't found any yet.

Ms. Lis: As we have been growing and taking on different things and rearranging our staffing to cover different programs differently and our philosophy over the last few years may not have changed but we're actually getting to act upon it. More preventive, all those good things. I think that we are running a better ship, slightly tighter ship, it's an expensive program. All together when (*inaudible*) together, we don't have a lot of control about who's coming in our door but we do our best to maintain reasonable budget and keep things under control. I think that some of those things, people in the hotels, that took us a while to crack to find some places.

Legislator Muldowney: That was my next question. So you were able to find affordable housing?

Ms. Lis: Well, some of the people went to the shelter. There is a men's shelter in Jamestown and I'm not sure where (*inaudible*)...

Ms. ?: I would say there has been a lot of community conversations at many different levels. I even went to a community conversation last night about the Gateway Lofts.

Ms. Lis: So there is more to come that's not been put into place yet.

Ms. ?: Right and it really does come back to making sure that people have the support that they need in these different environments and that it's safe and affordable and that's really the quality that people can afford on a public assistance voucher. It's ridiculous. I mean, you are picking infested bed bug residence, cracked windows, holes in the walls, it's sad but I'm hoping that some of the community conversation and the things that are being put in place from STEL and Gateway that those things will help with the wraparound services to give people a little bit of an uplift to keep them housed and bathed.

Legislator Nazzaro: People are going to be – like you just said, more discussions and collaborations between different partners, public and private.

Ms. ?: I was going to say that some of those individuals that were living in the Days Inn, some of those were parents who may be struggling with recovery type issues. We have their children in Foster Care so it's very difficult to get a family to, where they are in recovery doing well and then kids return home to them in an apartment type of setting, not back to a hotel. So there is so many different levels to this that really gets in the way and to me, it costs the County more because of all of the other things that are delaying the process of these kids (*inaudible*) coming (*inaudible*) sustaining themselves.

Ms. Lis: Some other areas that are effecting the budget is we're not being charged for occupancy anymore but we still get revenue on it.

Legislator Nazzaro: How much is that occupancy?

Mrs. Dennison: One point two five million.

Legislator Nazzaro: For theirs?

Ms. Lis: But we still get to get revenue on that and we also have the benefits have decreased a little bit across the board probably because of the people switching over to the high deductible plan.

Legislator Nazzaro: You were going to tell me about that occupancy. I've heard this all week. You just said, Chuck is falling asleep here. One point two million.

Mrs. Dennison: Across all of the Social Services and Health Department.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., Kevin, are you all set?

Legislator Muldowney: I'm good.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., for the benefit of the Committee, there were several changes proposed and approved by Human Services Committee to the budget that we just talked about. Some of those changes we've already talked about but I'm going to ask Kathleen to describe those changes and I will point out that not all of these changes were unanimously approved by Human Services Committee so I would still like some discussion about the Coroner's expense. So when we get done with the changes that have been approved by Human Services to this budget, the tentative budget, then we'll go back to Coroner's.

Mrs. Dennison: I'm going to go through the sheet that I handed out and describe the changes. The sheet that you have has the changes all broken down into the individual account classifications where the change takes place. So when we amend the budget, we'll have to amend at all these different levels. I think that it probably would be instructive if I just give you an overall change for each of the different programs that changed, if that is o.k. with you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Chagnon: Sure.

Mrs. Dennison: Rather than go through each line item. The first major area of change was in the Coroner's and Medical Directors. This change would increase the salary for Medical Examiners, increase their benefits. It would decrease compensation for the position that oversees the Jail, it would increase compensation for Coroner's and decrease contractual (*inaudible*) Coroner's. So all of those items together have a local share effect of an increase in local share of \$31,919.

Ms. Lis: There is also a decrease in DSS payroll because we gave away one FTE to offset the additional for medical records, well, increase in the medical records that we already had,

Mrs. Dennison: It's too bad that we don't have colored printer in Finance because otherwise you would have color coding on your changes here so we could more easily see but we

don't have that downstairs. So Coroner's that whole change, like I said, will increase the local share of \$31,919. The second change was to remove the cooperative agreement Probation and Social Services for a Juvenile Services Team. In the budget currently we were allocating two Probation Officers, two Social Services. Social Services was planning reimbursement for their work so we will return the Probation Officers to Probation, take them out of the Social Services budget and also take out the revenue that would have come from that program and that change results in an increase in local share of \$100,000.

Ms. Lis: Not just ours though.

Mrs. Dennison: That is Countywide. There was a decrease in local share in Social Services and an increase in local share in Probation. The next program is the change to the Fly Car program. The *(inaudible)* includes an allocation of 25% for paramedics from the Fly Car program to Social Services along with mileage coming over to Social Services, so Social Services will claim reimbursement for the work of Paramedics to be doing well visits for Medicaid recipients. So there is increase to expenditures in Social Services, there is a decrease in personnel costs in the Fly Car program but there is also a decrease in revenue for the Fly Car because more revenue was included than we now know will be achieved so there is a decrease in revenue in Fly Car and an increase in revenue in Social Services because Social Services *(inaudible)*. So the overall effect of that change is increased in local share of \$131,161.

Ms. Lis: That is all on the Emergency Services side.

Mrs. Dennison: In the Public Safety Committee today there was a motion to reduce the benefit costs of Paramedics and EMT's so Director Griffith proposed that he could reduce his employee benefits by \$131,161.

Legislator Nazzaro: Don't we have *(inaudible)* requirements on here?

Mrs. Dennison: Sorry.

Legislator Nazzaro: You said the health insurance benefits he's going to –

Mrs. Dennison: He proposed to change the number of positions from full time to part time so they would not have to provide health insurance.

Legislator Nazzaro: So they would be working 30 or whatever hours to not have health insurance. Twenty hours, I thought *(inaudible)* was 30.

Ms. Crow: That's if you're working over 30 and *(cross talk)*. Our policy is, if you are less than 50% of full time.

Legislator Nazzaro: I remember him talking about health insurance.

Ms. Lis: I don't know how he's going to hire people, but not my thing to discuss.

Legislator Nazzaro: The County Executive will essentially going to be – no, P.J., no it's going to be Christine now. We just pass this thing all around.

Ms. Lis: It's not that we're not going to hire these people, we're just going to take part of their time and have them – Medicaid said to us, hey, we've got these, what we call frequent flyers going into the emergency rooms for reasons they don't need to be in an emergency room and what can you do to help us cut these costs? So they came to us. We've partnered with them in other programs to cut Medicaid costs such as our Veteran's agreement where they go out and get the Veterans Federal benefits from Veterans Services rather than Medicaid. So, what we're thinking about is having the Paramedics go visit these people because we know who they are and check on them. Saying, how are you doing today, drop in and check on them and then we can charge that off to Medicaid admin.

Chairman Chagnon: I think part of the discomfort on this side of the table about this, I just point out that the arrangement is that you'll get 25% of four Paramedics, doesn't mean which Paramedics. It might be four full time existing Paramedics.

Ms. Lis: That is how we booked it. It's only \$68,000 total including the mileage. So what we'll do is, they will charge us for their time and it will be more specific than that. It may not be perfectly 25% because it has to be specific and so it's just an idea to help us and help them. It will hopefully see benefits later.

Chairman Chagnon: It will help the community.

Ms. Lis: Yes and we'll also hopefully see benefits later with weekly (*inaudible*) may go down if our costs are going down in Medicaid. Who knows what it could do for everybody. We have of course have to get approval by the State but they are the ones (*inaudible*) and they are the ones who said, hey, what can you do about this? So, we're kind of confident that they will say sure. We may hopefully expand it later. OFA might get involved, we might go talk to people who aren't quite the frequent flyers or on the verge but that is the general idea of what we're trying to do.

Chairman Chagnon: Kathleen, did you have more?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. Next topic would be Safety Net. My apologies, these are kind of – well, they are in the order, they are kind of in account number order. It's a little bit random as far as the Committee. Safety Net, the Committee did accept upon recommendation of Val and Christine, reduction in Safety Net costs of \$200,000 and then there is an offsetting reduction in revenue so that change reduced local share by \$142,000. The Public Facilities Committee declined to fund Forestry property taxes from the capital projects for Parks improvements so they removed \$11,000 in revenue from the budget so that is an increase to local share of \$11,000. Then this morning the Public Safety Committee accepted a change in the Sheriff's budget. He has a new grant so he's adding revenue but also adding a Sheriff Deputy (*inaudible*) from the Governor's Traffic Safety Committee. That will result in a reduction of local share of \$3,347. So all of the changes that had been advanced in Committee result in a new local share reduction of

\$89,274. There are a number of other amendments that have been proposed outside of the Committees and have not been adopted. I can run through those if you would like.

Chairman Chagnon: Sure.

Mrs. Dennison: The first pertains to the Board of Elections and it's voting machines. Mr. Nazzaro and Mr. Chagnon (*inaudible*) point out that we have funded that twice in the budget. So, we can either remove it from the operation appropriations or we can remove it from the transfer to capital. Either way we'd be reducing appropriations by another thousand dollars.

Chairman Chagnon: That would reduce local share either way.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. Or potentially you might want to reduce the reserve funding but in general it's a \$100,000 reduction to local share.

Chairman Chagnon: So if we don't change the reserve funding though.

Mrs. Dennison: That would be a \$100,000 reduction.

Chairman Chagnon: Local share or we could reduce the amount of – reduction in the appropriation from the reserve.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. Also under the capital projects area, the split between bridges and roads and the \$7 million dollar capital project, was skewed too much to bridges so after speaking with Director Bentley, we're proposing that the bridge appropriations be reduced \$223,553 and the road appropriation be increased by the same amount so that would have no effect on local share. As we talked about, Social Services is proposing to reduce contract utilization 100% to 90% and that would have an effective of \$131,000 reduction in local share.

Chairman Chagnon: How much was that?

Ms. Lis: I have it as \$134,150.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. Social Services is proposing an additional reduction of \$200,000 in Safety Net, includes the results in addition (*inaudible*) local share of \$142,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: Didn't we already have that?

Ms. Lis: I've done it twice.

Mrs. Dennison: There was two. One was advanced in Committee and Val is proposing a second one.

Chairman Chagnon: You are explaining the detail in contractual.

Ms. Lis: No.

Mrs. Dennison: Additional changes in –

Legislator Nazzaro: Based on we're doing what Val talked about.

Ms. Lis: Remember where I sent that email and told you (*inaudible*) meeting that we're going to decrease contracts and do another \$200,000 in Safety Net. We had already done \$200,000 in the Safety Net.

Chairman Chagnon: That is where you lost me. I thought that you were referring to the one that was already done.

Ms. Lis: No, we're doing another one.

Chairman Chagnon: This is like Christmas and Easter.

Mrs. Dennison: These last two items have no effect on local share but would change appropriations between classifications. Social Services would like to add two positions to Raise the Age so we propose to increase the personnel, employee benefits appropriations in Raise the Age but also increase the revenue a commensurate amount.

Ms. Lis: Again, only if we need them.

Legislator Nazzaro: That will bring up the total to how many now?

Ms. Lis: Four Raise the Age itself?

Mrs. Dennison: (*Cross talk*) it's now 6.25. The last change based on questions of Chairman Chagnon, we realized the medical malpractice insurance was coded to the wrong department so we would like to increase insurance expense in the Jail and decrease the contractual expense - I'm sorry, increase in the Jail Clinic Department and decrease in the Jail itself. Again, that would just be a transfer (*cross talk*).... That's all.

Chairman Chagnon: So, if we could then talk a little bit about the Coroners wages. There was a discussion at the Human Services that frankly didn't translate over well into the outside of the room but, could you explain to us what is being proposed to the Coroners compensation.

Ms. Lis: O.k., we're going to, and I'm sure Brea will be helpful, I'm sure but I will tell you my part. We'll see how badly I do. We are hoping – with the Coroners right now they are on call all the time. They share amongst themselves and they get a per case rate but if they don't get any cases, why would you be a Coroner. So what we're trying to do is say, maybe we could have a stipend to start with and then a per case on top of that. We have decreased the number of cased they go to because they are not going to deaths in a nursing home or someone in Hospice and things they really don't need to investigate any longer so the caseload has gone down by large amounts.

Ms. Agett: I believe that we were around 900, I believe in prior years and I think that we're looking around 300.

Ms. Lis: Right, so as we're paying – being paid by case before and they had a lot of cases, you know, it's a decent job to be a Coroner to make it worth your while to be on call at least and as we have reduced that so much, it's really kind of a hard sell. So what we thought was, we were going to make a change so that the Coroners would have a base pay, depending – there is one who is going to be kind a coordinator and some that will be on more so we had one – a base pay of \$20,000, two at \$10,000 and two at \$5,000.

Legislator Niebel: We're budgeted for up to six.

Ms. Agett: We can have up to six but we have four.

Ms. Lis: But we have five in the budget. But that is where we are right now. So originally our budget for Coroner wages was \$80,000 just like it was last year. By doing this the Coroners part of our adjustment we're doing, it's kind of over (*inaudible*) adjustment, we're only increasing Coroners wages to \$99,500. Which isn't too bad. We're sending them off for – they are spending more time with training with us, HIPPA, all these different trainings they need to go to. We're going to have them starting using the electronic systems for all of their information that they didn't use to do and there is training on that as well.

Ms. Agett: Are we talking wages now or do you want to know about the supplies?

Chairman Chagnon: Wages.

Ms. Agett: O.k., so right now I want to add, because we're on a per case rate, it complicates things a little bit because they are required training like Val was saying, that needs to be done. There is some administrative work that needs to be done. We want to make sure that Coroners are paid appropriately and that they are doing their jobs safely and they are doing it well. So we want to make sure they are doing things like (*inaudible*) entry, HIPPA training, (*inaudible*) training so that when they are out in their field doing things appropriately and safely, and then we want to make sure that they want to stay with this job. We want people who like their job that know what they are doing and they are going to do the best job that they can for the County. Because we rely on that data from a public health perspective. We want to make sure that they know what they are doing by putting the right cause of death on the death certificate and we can react to that appropriately as a County and as a State.

Ms. Lis: So we're asking a little more of them and we want to have qualified people and we want to fairly compensate them.

Chairman Chagnon: I understand that there were some other changes too in terms of senior Coroners and junior Coroners.

Ms. Lis: I don't know – I've never heard those terms used but what we're having is, we're having Medical Directors.

Ms. Agett: Are you talking about the \$20,000 rate.

Ms. Lis: Maybe, I don't know that we –

Chairman Chagnon: Supervisors or –

Ms. Agett: Yeah, so what we're hoping is that, at this point, the Coroner who's been around for a year, there has been a lot of transition but, he's doing a very good job for us and we'd like him to carry somewhat of an administrative role so that he would take care of the on-call schedule for the Coroners, that he would handle any reporting that comes in from the State. We're very frequently requested to provide some additional information to the State so we're hoping that he could do some of that as he's the most appropriate person to date to do that.

Chairman Chagnon: Do you receive compensation for (*cross talk*)...

Ms. Lis: Right and that's why I had those different rates in the beginning. I just hadn't heard (*cross talk*)..

Legislator Niebel: Twenty thousand dollars for him and then \$10,000 for two other Coroners and then \$5,000 for the other two. What about the sixth one?

Ms. Lis: We're not budgeting for six.

Legislator Nazzaro: (*Cross talk*) lower number of calls. If cases went up, then they would have to –

Ms. Agett: The only thing that I will add is that, that \$5,000 position, one of our Coroners currently works full time in one of the hospitals and he's not as available as the other Coroners so he is not on the on-call schedule quite as much and that is why that is a lower rate. A lower stipend.

Chairman Chagnon: So the stipend would be \$20,000 for the supervisor, \$10,000 for two of the seniors-or the ones who are getting a lot of the- (*cross-talk*) and \$5,000 for the other two.

Ms. Lis: Right. Right.

Chairman Chagnon: This is all helpful because I heard pieces of this before but I never got the whole picture. Now, currently they are being paid on a per call basis?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: And how much is that per call?

Ms. Lis: I think it is a \$150. We aren't changing that.

Chairman Chagnon: So, it's \$150 per call. The call volume has decreased? You indicated about 60%? So, if they were getting 350 cases a year it would be \$52,500 for all of them?

Ms. ?: I trust your math; I don't have a calculator in front of me.

Chairman Chagnon: I trust our financial analysts math. So, what you are saying is that today at the call volume that we are experiencing- which we expect to basically continue the same level into 2019- today we are spending \$52,500 and you're suggesting we increase it to \$99,500?

Ms. Lis: Well, we are spending a lot less- these people are- Chris has explained to them what she is hoping to do. I think they are staying with us. I don't think they are really- they are not pleased with what has happened to their pay by us bringing down the number of cases. They are patiently hoping and waiting to hear what happens about new plan.

Ms. Agett: I will also add that-

Clerk Tampio: \$99,500 includes those stipends?

*(Cross-talk)*

Chairman Chagnon: Yes, it includes the stipends. I am saying that today, if we did nothing different than what we are doing today, with the call volume that we are seeing, we would expect to pay them next year a total of \$52,500. With your plan, with the changes to stipends and so forth its \$99,500.

Ms. Agett: It is actually going to be a little bit more than what that \$52,500 that you're projecting is because- so, they charge \$150 per case for each body that they go out and respond when there is a death- on top of that, they're charging for a case in certain situations where we are asking them to do things like trainings or follow up on reporting that hasn't been done in the past and needed to be responded to. It is actually more than that \$52,500 that you are projecting because that case volume has gone down but we don't expect them to work for free. Do you know what I mean?

Legislator Nazzaro: For a budgetary- Pierre's point- I like how you are thinking, but I think you need to tweak this.

Ms. Lis: I think we are getting away with something right now.

Legislator Nazzaro: No. From a budgetary standpoint- Pierre's math is always right- I mean, we are lowering, which is right- there are a lot of cases where they do not need to go to like you just pointed out. I would think you- what you're trying to do is come up with a salary-compensation that a portion is fixed and a portion is variable?

Ms. Agett: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: I like that concept so you can attract and maintain the coroners, however I think you need to look at what you are- I'm not- it's a big increase. I think maybe the

\$150 you almost have to say, OK, that needs to be tiered or adjusted down because you are increasing the budget amount by a lot. I think you need to adjust that to either a step system or have a fixed portion and then so much per case. I am not comfortable with it going up to almost \$100,000.

Legislator Niebel: Chuck, my concern is that just last year we were paying the coroners \$80 per day. They might have had three or four cases per day. Alright, now that has been changed to \$150 per case. I realize the cases have gone down from 900 to 360 or whatever it is, but I'm a little concerned about these stipends. \$20,000 for one, \$10,000 for two and \$5,000 for the other ones. I think those are a little high. Let me ask you, we have had some vacancies in the coroners positions recently- have we had applications? Have we had any trouble filling those positions?

Ms. Agett: I wouldn't- Kathy might actually know more about that?

Chairman Wendel: Well, we have had resignations, we've had one person volunteer and that person has since left, not realizing the time constraints (*inaudible.*) We did have another gentleman that has come on board and he seems to be working out quite well. One of the things, Pierre, getting into the- that I need to add is, we have a current situation that was brought to our attention. I'm not going to elaborate more, but right now we are looking at nearly a total of \$14,000 of back-pay that we are going to have to pay to fill cases that have to be reconciled from previous years. That is a significant number to add to that \$52,000. There is- if we are talking about going back and finishing cases that weren't completed or things that have been unfortunately overlooked, now you are looking at those figures and the rough figures we are looking at is \$14,250-

Legislator Nazzaro: That would be a onetime expense in 2018, wouldn't it?

Chairman Wendel: Yeah, it would. But it's also- without that oversight of the office that happened. 95 cases in four years is a significant amount of things to have gone by without –

Clerk Tampio: If I could add something. Just this year alone, we have seen five coroners leave. When a coroner leaves their official position as coroner, many times they have casefiles that are open and that is a lot because an autopsy has not been completed- sometimes we don't get autopsy reports from Erie County for six months or more. So, there are all these open cases. Now that coroner that was the coroner cannot close those out and finish the report. That has to be done by an existing coroner for the County. While you paid for a case for the first coroner, now you are paying for the case for the other coroner to close out the file when they get to it.

Chairman Wendel: To add to that, keep in the mind that the resignations we had have all been as a result of lack of compensation in the position. I'm not saying that we need to do that because of this, but I know that one of things that I talked about with Christine when we looked at this, in fact I've talked about it with Kathy, is that looking to create a base salary because I

know we increased the number dramatically with- Chuck was saying about adjusting the per case-that is something to be looked at but I think concern we've had is the retention. We haven't lost anybody now, but the position is if the demands are there with the electronic filing- there are a lot more demands that haven't been placed on coroners in years past that are now being placed on the coroners from the State that we are going to be in that same position of- we are not going to do this and then we are back to behind the eight ball.

Legislator Nazzaro: So what is the total amount we- if what you're proposing went through, I'm not saying it will, but what- how many cases are running?

Ms. Agett: 350-360.

Legislator Nazzaro: If you say 350-

Legislator Niebel: About 60% of what it was-

Legislator Nazzaro: Times it by \$150, right?

Ms. Agett: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: And then you are saying you are adding in- I'm just going to take the salary piece which is \$58,757-

Ms. Agett: But it is actually going to be more than that 350 because they are doing more work-

Legislator Nazzaro: Yeah, but I'm just saying the number of cases-

Ms. Lis: The flat rate is \$50,000. \$50,000 is the base.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then what is the \$58,700-

Mrs. Dennison: That includes the portion of the medical director (*inaudible*) that is allocated to the coroners-

Legislator Nazzaro: So, 150 times 350 plus a base of- so it's- so now we are paying- I understand everything you have said. I think- additional training, HIPPA- now we are paying almost \$300 a case. So to Terry's point, I'm looking at it from strictly what this committee is for, is financial. We have gone from \$80 a day to almost \$300 a case.

Ms. Agett: Now that's \$80 a day. So like you were saying, that could be three or four cases a day-

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, I understand-

Ms. Agett: But they may work on a case or one part of case over five days and charge for five days which is well over the \$300 which you are-

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Chairman, I think I am- you're in charge here, I think we- I am not comfortable just going with this as presented. I think there is a lot of merit to what you are saying, but I think a little more thought- I'm not saying you haven't put a lot of thought-

Chairman Chagnon: Let's continue. There is more discussion to be had-

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm not going to propose anything other than I think-

Chairman Chagnon: More discussion is in order.

Ms. Lis: I also believe we have more professional medical people in these positions versus funeral directors. So, that is-

Chairman Chagnon: PJ, you have something to add?

Chairman Wendel: That is one of the things we are looking at is a medical director to be on call to act as a physician- a coroner physician which we have never had in Chautauqua County. With that, doctors are less likely to sign death certificates- as we have found and Christine has found increasingly over the last year. It used to be a doctor would sign- \$15 and they would sign off on it if I agree. Our Coroners have had great relationships-doctors are less and less likely to do that. So, what this does is by bringing that coroner physician on board, it now has the oversight from a medical director that we don't have to worry about going to those outside people. Now we have a physician and we run this through and recommend is Dr. Faulk who is eager to be part of this as- I believe part of it was with emergency services as well,-

Ms. Lis: And the Sheriff.

Chairman Wendel: And the sheriff. These guys are hands on. They don't sit back. With talking with Dr. Faulk already, he is looking at QI QA. Looking at what was done, how was it done, how could we improve this? These are all things that the State has asked to do, unfortunately it comes at a time and I guess- maybe making it a little bit simpler is, we haven't done much with this program in 25 years. That would be no different than looking at our DPF and not doing anything with equipment for 25 years and all of a sudden, we have to bring ourselves up to the modern times. In the DPF you are looking at millions. Here, it is not really millions. Bringing ourselves up compliant with what was going on or what has transpired in New York State. It's concerning. I understand, but being involved in this for the last year it is something that realistically shifts the liability a little less from the County by having these people trained, by having a coroner physician on staff and not relying on outside people. For example, contracts with Erie County Medical Center and such. We have a little bit better grasp of what is required of that position and also keeping liability to the County at a minimum.

Ms. Lis: When I was mentioning physicians and nurses and people like that, what I meant was those are going to be our coroners now, not just funeral directors. I think we are getting a higher quality of coroner, as well.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is the job description going to reflect that? I always believe if you are going to create- I never believe in making a salary to fit a person. I believe you create the position and then you set the salary.

Ms. Agett: We actually created a job description that didn't actually exist before.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, if it is going to put that requirement on there- you know, if you are going to pay more to get more, then I just want to make sure the job- the people we are filling it with that we have a job description that says you need to have this background, this competency-

Ms. Agett: So, yes, definitely. We are not requiring everybody to have a medical background. One of our coroners at this point is a registered nurse and the other three are funeral directors. It is nice to have a balance there between a medical side and that relationship with individuals at the time of death. There is a lot of traits that the funeral directors bring as well.

Ms. Lis: Transportation.

Ms. Agett: Transportation as well as convenience and the ability to be available in the middle of the night.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. This was an opportunity for the Audit and Control Committee to ask questions and get more information, and I will get to you in just a moment Jay. Bear in mind that we are not going to make any decisions until we meet by ourselves after this session is adjourned. No positions need to be taken at this point. This is an opportunity to ask questions and learn more. Jay?

Legislator Gould: I agree with Chuck. I think we are getting there too fast. I think this ought to be done in a couple years and not in one year. I also feel that \$10,000 more for the lead coroner is too much. I think \$5,000 would be fine.

Ms. Lis: I believe that Christine won't do this. These people will not stay and Christine will not do this.

Ms. Agett: We are utilizing the-

Legislator Gould: The one that you are talking about making \$20,000, he will stay for \$15,000. I have no doubts about that. He is the best one we have had in quite a while.

Ms. Agett: We have used him to the max. This person has gone above and beyond.

Legislator Gould: That is right.

Ms. Agett: Especially during the time when we have had nobody to respond to calls and we are very fortunate to have him and we want to make sure that he is appropriately compensated. Our hope is that he is going to be going out to the hospitals, to medical providers, to nursing homes to help get them to where they need to be. Making sure that they are doing what they need to do when it comes to completion of death certificates and the electronic-

Legislator Gould: You could give them \$5,000 this year and \$5,000 another year.

Legislator Niebel: Val, where you indicating that they wouldn't stay unless they had these stipends?

Ms. Lis: I haven't spoken with them myself, but that is what I am feeling. They have been- not promised, because we can't promise, but they know that we are trying to do something to make this more fair because right now it is not fair what we are doing right now.

Legislator Niebel: But where did these numbers come from? They are not coming from the Coroners. They are coming from you?

Ms. Lis: They are coming from Christine's conversations with the Coroners. I believe.

Ms. Agett: Our conversations with the Coroners and we have also taken a look at the other counties and how they are reimbursing coroners.

Legislator Niebel: OK, but these numbers are being suggested by the coroners?

Ms. Agett: We are suggesting them.

*(Cross-talk)*

Ms. ?: We have reached out to many different counties to see how they do things and we feel strongly that this is the best way to-

Legislator Niebel: So these figures are coming from you, based on discussions from our Coroners? This is what they are telling you that they need to have to stay?

Ms. Agett: That is right.

Ms. Lis: Now, I want to- right now we do have the two at \$5,000 and you're saying that we probably wouldn't fill that one?

Ms. Agett: I don't see us filling that fifth position.

Ms. Lis: So if we take that one out- one of the lowest ones, right there you have got probably about \$10,000 right there by what we estimated for the base rate plus calls. If you want to do that, I think that is something we might be able to do.

Legislator Nazzaro: The calls are going to remain the same?

Chairman Chagnon: The calls will remain the same.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Niebel: You have four coroners right now?

Ms. Agett: That's right.

Legislator Niebel: But you could have a fifth one?

Ms. Lis: We have a fifth one budgeted and a sixth one approved by the Legislature.

Legislator Niebel: But it's not budgeted?

Ms. Lis: It is not budgeted. The sixth one.

Ms. Agett: I think four is a good number because that gives us some flexibility with the on-call schedule. With the reduced number of cases, we want to make sure that the coroners have enough cases so that they are experienced and they know what they are doing on the job. If they are only doing one a month, how much experience are they getting?

Legislator Niebel: But that can vary. If you are calls go up you might want a fifth coroner, perhaps.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions? Other comments? Anything else for this department? Ladies, thank you all for coming. OK. Now, to try and summarize where we are at, Kathleen-

Legislator Niebel: What is the bottom line?

Chairman Chagnon: Well, that is what I was going to suggest.

Mrs. Dennison: I have a running total for you.

Clerk Tampio: Mr. Chairman, I have one more question for you. You know how we are doing an RFP for the firm to review the investments?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Clerk Tampio: Where is that money going to come out of for the contract?

Chairman Chagnon: I'm assuming it is going to be 2018 money.

Clerk Tampio: From the Legislature or Finance?

Chairman Chagnon: Legislature.

Clerk Tampio: OK.

Ms. Crow: That would potentially be an annual cost, right?

Clerk Tampio: Yeah. There is nothing in the budget for that. We don't know-

Chairman Chagnon: We haven't gotten any RFP responses yet?

Ms. Crow: I don't know for certain. I don't know what the time table was for that. Tracy has been out the last couple of days.

Chairman Chagnon: We can make that adjustment later on in the month at the Audit and Control regular monthly meeting. Hopefully we will have an RFP response or two by then.

Mrs. Dennison: Kathy, you are asking if it should be included in the 2019 budget?

Clerk Tampio: Yeah. I guess for this year we would have to do a budget amendment, right?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Ms. Crow: Until we know the cost- I mean, if it is going to cost \$1,500 each year maybe you have enough in your budget now for this year and add it for next year.

Chairman Chagnon: Yeah.

Clerk Tampio: It would be nice if it was that small.

Chairman Chagnon: It is not going to be huge.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's not going to be huge. It's not like the audit-

Chairman Chagnon: Don't worry Kathy.

Clerk Tampio: Alright.

Chairman Chagnon: Kathleen has been keeping a running tally and Kathleen, I'm going to ask if your running tally includes the social services contractual change and the voting machines and the additional \$200,000 from safety net?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, so what is your running total?

Mrs. Dennison: Negative \$465,248

Chairman Chagnon: \$465,238?

Mrs. Dennison: 248.

Chairman Chagnon: That is reduction in the local share from what has been approved by the other committees-

Mrs. Dennison: I'm sorry, that would be the new total including what has already been approved.

Chairman Chagnon: OK.

Legislator Nazzaro: What did you do with the voting machines?

Mrs. Dennison: The voting machines, I have that now coming out of the transferred capital appropriations. No change in any reserves, but if you take out the (*inaudible*) appropriation, it would reduce the whole share \$100,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, that \$465,000 would go up to \$565,000?

Chairman Chagnon: No, that includes the voting machine.

Legislator Nazzaro: Oh, it includes it. OK.

Chairman Chagnon: So now, just to continue to make things more confusing, I have a couple of other ones. Something that was missed at Administrative Services is that Mr. Gould felt very strongly that the Board of Elections vehicle fuel expense should be reduced by \$250 and Jay, I wasn't going to forget.

Legislator Gould: Nobody from Board of Elections said that it shouldn't be.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. They agreed. So, that- I would suggest that as another amendment to the tentative budget to reduce their expense by \$250 for vehicle fuel.

Mrs. Dennison: Mr. Chairman, I'm just trying to figure out which running total to adjust because I have about three different schedules. I have the approved and I have the tentative-

Chairman Chagnon: This is unapproved. This has yet to be approved. We are going to approve it on this committee because Administrative Services didn't touch it.

Ms. Crow: You may still have to (*cross-talk.*)

Chairman Chagnon: Yes, we do. I'm going to toss in another couple here for us to go through. I'm not done yet. So, in the review with Planning and Economic Development Committee, they were proposing to take money out of the Occupancy Tax to partially pay for their increase in expenses to both their departments. To Promotion of Industry they were proposing to take \$21,600 out of Occupancy Tax and out of Planning they were proposing to take \$14,400 out of Occupancy Tax. Our discussion at the Planning and Economic Development Committee- I took the position that I felt that it was money that we should not take from Occupancy Tax, that we should leave it for the Occupancy Tax projects which have the potential of doing lots of good for tourism and for the lakes and watersheds and also have a great potential to leverage additional grants and funds. So, what I said to the Committee was that I was proposing that we do not take that money out of Occupancy Tax but I was committed to find it somewhere else in the budget. I think with the \$465,000 reduction in the local share, I have found that \$35,000. I would make a proposal that we change the Promotion of Industry budget and the Planning budget to not take those funds from Occupancy Tax.

*(Cross-talk)*

Ms. Crow: That would be moving it from the personal services to contractual?

Chairman Chagnon: What it would be doing is it would be reducing the revenue to those two departments.

Ms. Crow: But the total revenue budgeted for Occupancy I think would be staying the same, it's just a matter of what it will be used for in the budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Right now we have an undesignated line in the Occupancy Tax budget and it would be incrementing that undesignated line.

Ms. Crow: So it would be in a sense moving from the personal services to the contractual line? The contractual line would go up because that is where the unallocated funds would normally be and the-

Chairman Chagnon: It would be coming out of revenue to the Planning and Economic Development and going to the contractual for Occupancy Tax.

Ms. Crow: I don't think there would be *(inaudible.)*

Mrs. Dennison: I think there would be.

Chairman Chagnon: I think there would be.

Mrs. Dennison: Because you want to take out the revenue that is in Planning and Economic Development and *(inaudible)* take out the revenue that is in 6420- *(cross-talk.)*

Ms. Crow: If you move the revenue to the other department you would have to increase the contractual because it- the total cost for what is being used by Occupancy Tax revenue has to match the whole-

*(Cross-talk)*

Mrs. Dennison: In *(inaudible)* and watershed we would increase the revenue and increase the contractual-

Ms. Crow: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: In the Occupancy Tax departments there would be no local share change but in Planning and Development, they would be losing revenue.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. It would then go to local share.

Mrs. Dennison: They both-

Chairman Chagnon: Trust us, we have talked about this.

Mrs. Dennison: In 6420 and 8020, they have a new revenue this year; Occupancy Tax Administration Fees. So, Pierre is proposing to take that revenue away from them.

Ms. Crow: But was that part of what we established as the total Occupancy Tax revenue? Was it a piece of that Occupancy Tax revenue for this year?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Ms. Crow: So on the schedule of items for the Occupancy tax- it's on there?

Chairman Chagnon: It is on there as an expense with an appropriation. The revenue to Occupancy Tax doesn't change but the appropriation changes.

Ms. Crow: So it is on this schedule?

Mrs. Dennison: It is on that schedule. So this will go away and it will go into here.

Ms. Crow: Yes. The total revenues will stay the same?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Ms. Crow: But you are going to take this \$21,000 and you are going to add it somewhere else, right?

Mrs. Dennison: That- the expense for that is already included in their personnel costs.

Ms. Crow: That personnel cost is going to go away, but then aren't you going to take this \$21,000 and put it down into one of these other categories? So, \$21,000 is still going to be in the budget somewhere.

Mrs. Dennison: The cost for this position-

Chairman Chagnon: Excuse me; it will not affect the local share. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. Crow: I don't think it will, but I guess maybe I would want to do-

Chairman Chagnon: Instead of giving it to Planning and Economic Development, you are using it for additional expenditures under Watershed and Tourism. So, you are getting the expense either way.

Ms. Crow: Yeah, because-

Chairman Chagnon: The revenue is unaffected.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Nazzaro: Is that your intent?

Chairman Chagnon: There is no impact on local share. That is even better than my intent.

Legislator Nazzaro: I am with you Kathleen. I'm a little bit confused.

Mrs. Dennison: I see what you are saying, but those departments have a revenue this year that they have never had before because they have a position that they have never had before. We are not taking away the position. I don't see how the-

Ms. Crow: Yes, if we are not taking the position away-

Legislator Nazzaro: The position stays, we are just not going to use Occupancy Tax to pay for it. We want to use local share.

Mrs. Dennison: I think in Tour and Watershed-

Legislator Nazzaro: It shouldn't even affect that.

Mrs. Dennison: There would be more revenue staying in those departments and there would be more contractual.

*(Cross-talk)*

Ms. Crow: Or there would be no increase in the contractual.

*(Cross-talk)*

Ms. Crow: But the total revenue is staying the same, so there has to be a total amount of expenditures that match that revenue.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Nazzaro: Was the revenue being included twice?

Mrs. Dennison: No.

Legislator Nazzaro: If you are saying it is in the Occupancy- I mean, if you are moving- regardless of- if you're moving a revenue and keeping the expense, it would have to affect the local share. Unless I am totally missing something.

Chairman Chagnon: It will affect the local share for that department.

Ms. Crow: I guess what I was assuming was that you were going to reduce the personnel costs, but if you are not going to reduce the personnel cost-

Legislator Nazzaro: No, we are not.

Ms. Crow: Then yes, it would be an increase-

Chairman Chagnon: Increase in the local share. OK, well we are back to that. It will increase the local share.

Ms. Crow: OK.

Chairman Chagnon: Sorry for the long trip around the barn. Kathleen, then I think we are- if you could summarize the actions that would be required for approval by this Committee. We are not going to vote on them right away because we are going to have some discussion, but if you could summarize the actions that are not yet approved by another Committee for this Committee.

Mrs. Dennison: The actions that have not been approved by other committees would be starting with increase in appropriations. Increase appropriations in the RTA sub department to add two caseworkers.

Chairman Chagnon: Fully funded?

Mrs. Dennison: Fully funded. So there would be an increase in appropriations and a (*inaudible*) increase in revenue. No local share. There would be an increase in appropriations to capital roads of \$223,513 with a commensurate decrease in appropriation to capital bridges. There would be an increase to 4017 jail. That is jail clinics insurance or contractual costs of \$10,292 with a commensurate decrease in the contractual costs in 3150- the jail. Again, no local share. There would be a decrease in appropriations in transfer to capital for \$100,000, which would be a decrease in local share of \$100,000.

Chairman Chagnon: That is for the voting machine?

Mrs. Dennison: That's for voting machines. There would be a decrease in contractual costs for Social Services of \$284,150 to reduce contract utilization from 100% to 90%. With it, comes a decrease in revenues associated with that, a decrease in appropriations. The local share affect would be a reduction of \$134,150. There would be an additional reduction in Safety Net expense of \$200,000 with offsetting reductions of revenue for a decrease in local share of \$142,000. There would be a decrease in appropriations of \$250 for Board of Elections fuel and then a decrease in revenue in departments A6420 and A8020.

Chairman Chagnon: That is Promotion of Industry and Planning?

Mrs. Dennison: It would be a combined reduction of revenue-

Chairman Chagnon: \$36,000.

Mrs. Dennison: \$36,000 and that would be a reduction- I'm sorry, an increase in local share of \$36,000.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. The total of those potential changes?

Mrs. Dennison: Those potential changes are- reduction in local share of \$340,400.

Legislator Niebel: And how does that affect the tax rate?

Chairman Chagnon: That is plus the previous adjustments of \$89,098?

Mrs. Dennison: That is in addition to those, yes.

Chairman Chagnon: So the total of the \$89,098 approved by other committees and the \$340,400 is a total reduction of-

Mrs. Dennison: It should be a total reduction of \$429,498.

Chairman Chagnon: And now to Terry's question.

Legislator Niebel: Tax rate.

Mrs. Dennison: It would translate into a reduction of the tax rate of 5.8 cents.

*(Cross-talk)*

County Executive Borrello: So, how much per penny-

Legislator Niebel: About 70,000. George, that is what we talked about earlier, but I can't remember where I got that but I did think after we talked about it that it was too low.

County Executive Borrello: I thought it was higher.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Niebel: I'm thinking last year, that is what we kicked around was 70,000?

*(Cross-talk)*

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Now before we get full of ourselves, if we approve everything that has just been presented to us, we are accepting the Social Services proposal on Coroners compensation the way it's established. OK? And we can have further conversation later on, but we are accepting all of the other changes that the other departments made in total. Plus, we are making these other changes that Kathleen just rattled through for us. Additional reductions to Social Services, the voting machine change, additional safety net reduction, and then the reduction and revenue to Planning and Economic Development. So, we need to take an action to accept those additional changes and then I would suggest we also take an action to propose to change the tentative budget by the total of that \$429,000 that was just outlined.

Legislator Nazzaro: Can't we do the whole-

Chairman Chagnon: I would suggest- these other changes weren't suggested before- we make that as a separate resolution and then the overall resolution be accepting what the other departments did and what we did to bring us to the total. Does that make sense?

Legislator Niebel: I think it would be clearer that way.

Chairman Chagnon: So then the first- Kathleen, did you want to jump in with something?

Mrs. Dennison: I just have another minor adjustment. It's only \$176.

Chairman Chagnon: Which direction?

Mrs. Dennison: I'm not sure yet, hold on. It's in the right direction.

Chairman Chagnon: That is even better.

Mrs. Dennison: Janelle recalculated the cost of the Sheriff's deputy that is going to be grant funded. The health insurance is going to be a little bit less expensive than the original number I had, so that is an additional deduction in local share of \$176.

Chairman Chagnon: \$176.

Mrs. Dennison: That brings us to negative \$429,674.

Legislator Nazzaro: Still 5.8 cents?

Mrs. Dennison: Let's see. Yes it is.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, so the first resolution that we would be looking for is to accept the proposed changes to the Social Services contractual, the voting machine, the non-local share effect transferring between bridges and roads, the safety net additional reduction, the raise the age two additional positions with no local share effect, the transfer of cost between jail clinic and jail with no local share effect, the reduction in board of elections fuel, and the reduction in Occupancy Tax revenue to Planning and Economic Development.

Legislator Niebel: I will make that motion and allow Finance to work out the dollar figures.

Legislator Nazzaro: I will second that. The total of those should be around \$340,000- no, \$89,000-

Chairman Chagnon: No, the total of those should be \$340,576.

Legislator Nazzaro: Alright. I'll second that.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. We have a motion by Terry and a second by my esteemed colleague. Any discussion on the motion? All those in favor please say aye.

*Unanimously Carried to Accept Changes to Reduce Budget.*

Chairman Chagnon: Then we need to have a resolution to amend the tentative budget in total, making our recommendation to the Legislature to make this total adjustment, which includes the resolution we just passed as well as the changes outlined in the handout which were done by previous Committees. That would bring the local share cost of the tentative budget down by approximately \$429,674.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'll make that motion.

Chairman Chagnon: Jay beat you to that. Jay made the motion.

Legislator Muldowney: I'll second that.

Chairman Chagnon: Mr. Muldowney seconds that. Discussion on the motion? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried to Approve all Motions by Previous Committees*

Chairman Chagnon: Good job, everyone.

County Executive Borrello: Great work. This is even better for us to bring before the full Legislature.

Legislator Nazzaro: And I would just like to say to you, since we have a reporter here, I really appreciate you bringing the budget to the Legislature (*inaudible*) had so many positive components. You took a very innovative approach- a business approach. You had so many positive things between no tax rate increase, not using the general undesignated funds, and again, I think you did great work.

County Executive Borrello: Thank you. I appreciate that very much.

Chairman Chagnon: Kathleen, before we adjourn, you had something?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Ms. Crow: It doesn't change the net number, it just adds some additional transactions to get to that same-

Chairman Chagnon: This is going to go before committees next week, anyways.

Mrs. Dennison: We are proposing to take all of these reductions in local share as a reduction (*inaudible.*) Correct?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: I just wanted to throw out that there is a rather aggressive revenue in the budget for the tribal compact. There is also an aggressive use of the Capital Reserve and the D and DM fund balance. I just wanted to suggest that those might be possible uses of the savings in local share-

Ms. Crow: I guess I would add that in consideration of the projects going into next year, currently, based on the tentative budget we are still projected around the \$500,000 shortfall. If

we have reduced revenue, that will carry forward to the next year so we are- our gap moving into next year might be a little greater than what is currently in the projections.

Chairman Chagnon: Sure.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Nazzaro: I think the Committee also shares those concerns and I think that was even brought up during some of our hearings as we are going through the Finance. As we all know, we have an Audit and Control meeting prior to the full Legislature and that is where the final recommendation will come out. I think we should have that discussion and this is what we are recommending as of today, but the final recommendation will come at the Audit and Control meeting in a couple of weeks.

Chairman Chagnon: I would just supplement that thought by saying that we've just spent all week in all the details. We still have an opportunity in committees to step back and look at it from a higher level perspective and that's when those considerations should come into play.

Legislator Nazzaro: And one of which is the Coroners. Is that correct?

Chairman Chagnon: Absolutely.

Legislator Nazzaro: They had reservations in Human Services, so I would encourage Mr. Wilfong and his Committee, if they are going to bring something forward, to bring it to Audit and Control. I don't feel that it's Audit and Controls position- in other words, if we don't get a recommendation from that Committee on the Coroners, I'm not prepared to make any changes to it unless Human Services-

Legislator Nazzaro: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Niebel: Second.

*Unanimously Carried (3:54 p.m.)*

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,

Kathy K. Tampio, Clerk/Lori J. Foster, Deputy Clerk/Secretary to the Legislature/ Olivia L. Ames, Committee Secretary