

Minutes

Public Facilities Committee

October 15, 2019, 4:00 pm

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, N.Y.

Members Present: Wilfong, Gould, Scudder, Nazzaro

Member Absent: Hemmer

Others: Tampio, Ames, Bentley, Starks, Davis, Dennison

Vice Chairman Wilfong called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (08/19/19)

MOVED by Legislator Gould , SECONDED by Legislator Scudder to approve the minutes.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time.

Proposed Resolution – Close Capital Projects and Amend 2019 Budget – Landfill

Mr. Bentley: This resolution is to close the Phase II capital project that was in 2010. That work is actually going to be completed as part of the Phase IV construction. So it's really just to move the money into (*inaudible*) work is being done. In addition to that, we're asking for another \$900,000 for the Phase IV construction so when you do the math, you can see that the increase in the appropriations accounts, \$900,000 there. This is to do a couple of things. We've asked for additional improvements in the gas collection system at the landfill. That was not part of the original engineering design so there is increased costs there but for good reason. The more gas you capture up there, the less environmental affects you have on there and the more money we could use to make power or more gas makes power, the more money you get. In addition, the landfill was based on a quantity basis so the original quantity is of moving dirt and as you imagine, digging a hole, you have estimates but, the real estimates are what you move and by (*inaudible*) and so there has been some increase quantities that were not in the original estimate of the engineers. So that has gone up a little bit and in addition to do some of the additional engineering, some of the asbestos and stuff like that, there has been an increase in the engineering time. That is built on an as needed basis. It wasn't done on a fixed price. So, that \$900,000 is to help pay for those bills overall. Again, the Phase IV project was started in 2007 or

08', so this has been a lot of cost accruing over those times. Really what we're down to now is the construction of the cell and we're hoping to wrap that up this year, weather permitting. It's going to be a tight race between the weather and getting it done but hopefully we can get everything done, test report written, DEC accepts it and we can open the cell for business.

Legislator Nazzaro: I can either ask Brad or Kathleen, why does this resolution not balance?

Mrs. Dennison: It does not balance because historically, for the enterprise funds that are essentially funding these expenditures from their own funds, there is not a – in the past we have had unbalanced resolutions when they are in an enterprise fund and using capital appropriations. Because the overall enterprise fund is essentially going to fund itself for this capital projects. It's not using capital reserve, it's not drawing from other sources. So that is one reason why it's not balanced. If we could, put in a use of EL fund balance to make it balance. Because that is what we are doing but as I say, historically that has not always been done.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you for that Kathleen because that was going to be my question. Why would we not at this time, reduce the capital fund balance?

Mrs. Dennison: We could because that's –

Legislator Nazzaro: Wouldn't they get a truer picture? I mean, I know it's an enterprise fund but wouldn't it give a truer picture of all of our fund balances if we did that? But if that's not the standard –

Mrs. Dennison: It's not the standard and the other reason we're not proposing to reflect it that was is that, with the overall expansion project, the funding sources for that are a little are still being evaluated. Whether it's going to – whether there's a bond, how much the bond is going to be, and so, the funding source for the increased \$900,000, it may be bonds, it may be EL fund balance at this time that is not completely known.

Mr. Bentley: It could be revenue.

Mrs. Dennison: It could be excess revenue, yes.

Mr. Bentley: You don't want to hamstring it.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess I don't agree with the approach not to do that but I guess I'll wait to make any amendment to discuss it in Audit & Control.

Mrs. Dennison: I agree, it could be reflected either way.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just don't think, on the financials, it makes me uneasy that we're increasing appropriations and we're not offsetting for a balance, designating it. Obviously when funding sources come in or some of these unknowns, we can always adjust it further then. I don't know what the pleasure of this committee is, but I can wait and see.

Mrs. Dennison: I have to say that I don't disagree with you.

Legislator Gould: I agree with you Chuck but I'll vote to pass it and then we can discuss it further in Audit & Control.

Legislator Nazzaro: And as one individual, I'll be interested to see what his (*cross talk*), the Chairman, Mr. Chagnon.

Mrs. Dennison: In 2018, we adjusted the appropriations budget for the expansion project because as Brad indicated, the project started in 2007 and there have been quite a few adjustments to the project and the spending plan. So there have been a lot of budget amendments to the appropriations. In looking back at the history that the budget was increased twice for the same amount of money so into 2018, we attempted to right size the budget. At that time, we made a big reduction to the appropriation, over \$16 million dollars. That resolution was also, on its face, not balanced. The other thing that is kind of unique about the capital projects is that we have to have a budget in that account to enable spending. But the way that expenditure is funded as indicated before, can be somewhat (*inaudible*).

Legislator Nazzaro: Let me just ask one other question and then we can move on. Is this the only enterprise fund that we do that with? Have we done it in the sewer districts, have we done it with any other enterprise funds or is the landfill treated differently than the other enterprise funds?

Mrs. Dennison: That's a good question. We have made adjustments to -

Legislator Nazzaro: Where they were unbalanced like this.

Mrs. Dennison: I think the answer is yes, we have done it in other enterprise funds. I know that we did do a couple of years ago, looked at a lot of different capital projects (*inaudible*) enterprise funds and made some adjustment to those especially in the South & Center sewer district that had some projects that were deemed – whether or not they are capital or the amount was changing. I believe that those were unbalanced but I would be happy to look back and see.

Legislator Nazzaro: Maybe for Audit & Control if you could just give us a little history besides this fund.

Mrs. Dennison: Right, like I said, I know the main one for the expansion was unbalanced but I'll check on this further.

Legislator Scudder: So that \$900,000, how are going to – are you just going to list all the possible places that that money is going to come from? Do you know what I'm saying?

Mrs. Dennison: If we were to balance it, at this point, I would think we would say it's coming from the EL fund.

Legislator Nazzaro: How much is in there?

Legislator Gould: Which is how much?

Mrs. Dennison: The EL fund balance, the liquid fund balance actually presents as a negative.

Mr. Bentley: Tell them the reason why.

(Cross talk)

Mr. Bentley: Because you are taking into account that if the landfill closes today, the commitment to close it. So in reality, there is a lot of cash in out there because it's not an actual item that has occurred. So by accounting standards, it's negative, but by cash, it's positive.

Legislator Gould: Well, that's good.

Mr. Bentley: And it's cash positive by a lot. Like double digit millions, you think?

Mrs. Dennison: But we've also got the bond anticipation note so –

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes, that would have to be paid off.

Mr. Bentley: So there is all these moving parts in here and that's why I think there is some benefit to doing it unbalanced and not –

Mrs. Dennison: Doing it unbalanced, you said.

Mr. Bentley: Doing it unbalanced because now you have the flexibility on whatever conditions come at you, where you want to pull that money from.

Legislator Gould: Now we're finding out why it's unbalanced. We don't have enough money to draw it from there.

Mr. Bentley: No, you could draw it from there.

Mrs. Dennison: We could draw from there.

Mr. Bentley: You just have less reserves in the event of forced event. There is no set dollar amount that you have to have in there. There is no requirement. So, you can draw what you need because you can do it. We don't need the money right away and that's the other part of this. This is in anticipation of it might be at the end of this year, it might be even next year. When you need that \$900,000. So you might, as we go along when we actually need to move that money, have the need for that cash, it could come from a couple of different sources. It's not something that I need today. As a matter of fact, I'm moving over \$1.3 million now.

Legislator Nazzaro: Actually the other way to do this would be –

Mrs. Dennison: Just to move the \$1.3.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just move the \$1.3 would make more sense to me.

Mrs. Dennison: We did discuss that.

Legislator Nazzaro: Since there is no urgent need, it would make more sense to move \$1.3 and (*cross talk*)...

Mr. Bentley: Alright, let me rephrase. Will need the \$900,000. It's just a matter of time. I'd rather do this once.

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't want to belabor this.

Legislator Gould: No, we'll have a long discussion on it in Audit & Control.

Legislator Nazzaro: So I think, you'll be there Jay, so, you'll back me up and say we did not amend this but we're somewhat uncomfortable with it.

Legislator Gould: I can hardly stand it to see what the Chairman has to say.

Mr. Bentley: We'll see what consistency pattern there is out there. For someone trying to be consistent in the past, if we passed things that haven't been balanced before –

Mrs. Dennison: I know, he's done it before.

Legislator Nazzaro: Sometimes being consistent is not the right way. You can be consistently right or consistently wrong.

Legislator Gould: That wasn't a million dollars either. That bothers us some.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Are we ready? All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Adjust DPF Building and Grounds Accounts

Mr. Bentley: I've talked about this a couple of times. We're no longer able to use brine. Everybody is worried about hazardous chemicals that are coming up from the ground water. We used to use brine out here so we're going to all rock salt so that means we have to have a sander on the back of the pickup truck. We have some money in personal services that we're going to move to the equipment side to pay for the sander. So this is all self-contained with in Buildings & Grounds to effectuate the purchase of that sander.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just a brief comment. I know we've done these types of resolutions before but always makes me uneasy when they are not the same account classification. You

know, when we're decreasing personnel services to get a new piece of equipment. They're two different account classifications and I think as we move forward, the challenges that we have in the 2020 budget, being able to keep a watchful eye on it. It's not supporting \$4,200, it's just that it's two different account classifications.

Mr. Bentley: I asked her if I could do it and she said yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't know how you feel about that Kathleen.

Mrs. Dennison: I believe you are pointing to an issue that it may be better to just to save the money and not buy the (*inaudible*) equipment in this year.

Mr. Bentley: How do I sand the south parking lot? I think that's a safety/liability issue if we don't get this done.

Legislator Scudder: Do you buy the brine? How do you get that?

Mr. Bentley: Well, in the old days, we would get it for free but now it has to be tested. Even if it's tested it's still (*inaudible*), it does make sense.

Legislator Scudder: Have we budgeted to buy the brine – the brine wasn't even in the picture?

Mr. Bentley: We barely made (*inaudible*) last year, meaning the first part of 2019. Alright, let's go through the budget process. So the 2019 budget is set when? Mid 2018. That was before all this DEC stuff blew up so I had no chance to budget a sander in 2019. We were able to get someone to test their brine so we could get by winter 2018/2019. I'm not in the 2019/2020 budget. I cannot use brine. So I have a choice. Leave the parking lots with nothing on them, untreated, which would be a liability issue for the County or try and buy a sander with this money.

Legislator Gould: You said the key words. Sander.

Mr. Bentley: I would like to see how you're going to walk in on the sand.

Legislator Gould: I will get in and I limp.

Legislator Scudder: There is no brine savings that could be had? You know what I mean?

Mr. Bentley: No, you don't save.

Legislator Scudder: If we saved \$4,200 by not buying brine –

Mr. Bentley: We don't buy brine.

Legislator Scudder: O.k., got it. You answered me completely, thank you.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is there any excess in the equipment account to buy this spreader or has he fully used up all of this equipment budget? I'm asking Kathleen.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, and then some. There is a small amount of money available in the equipment account. I believe the cost of a piece of equipment is – well, it's in excess of \$5,000.

Mr. Bentley: Yes, this is what I need using up the rest of these monies.

Mrs. Dennison: So there is some budget left in the equipment account. The proposal is to use that plus this.

Legislator Nazzaro: It does not say that.

Mrs. Dennison: No, it does not say that.

Legislator Nazzaro: Oh, because I was thinking that was the total cost.

Mrs. Dennison: No.

Legislator Gould: The truck is \$10,000.

Mr. Bentley: No, I'm not buying the truck, I'm just buying the sander/spreader.

Legislator Scudder: He said sander, he means spreader.

Mr. Bentley: It's the same term.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to make sure, this goes back to the account classifications. (*Cross talk*).. left in the equipment account, I would prefer to use that but what you are telling me is, this \$5,000 is left –

Mr. Bentley: Five thousand left in equipment, no. You didn't hear that right. We had a little bit left, the spreader costs \$5,000. We probably had about \$800 left in the equipment budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: Oh, o.k.

Mr. Bentley: And we need \$3,200 more to pay for the whole thing.

Legislator Nazzaro: Oh, o.k., so the total cost is \$5,000.

Mr. Bentley: Approximately, yes. I'm using everything I have and this is what I got left. So, you can –

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to make sure because of the account classification. I'm ready to vote.

Mrs. Dennison: There is a small typo under, Increase Appropriations Account where it says, the dot should be in front of the 2, not after the 2 so it should read, A.1620.----.2

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any other discussion?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Adjust D.5112 Capital Improvement Account – Funded Roads

Mr. Bentley: This is Cassadaga Wind. They applied for a permit to use our roads to construct the wind farm. (*Inaudible*) we did an analysis on what roads they were going to destroy and the approximate cost to repair/replace, the roads that they are going to be on. It was a little over the \$2.4 million dollars because they had to put a deposit down which we've already received. I think that was like \$30,000. This is remainder of what they owe us, \$2.4 million dollars. They have paid it, we have issued the permit and I need to reserve this money into an account where it does not get lost in somebody else's fund. So this will put this into the revenue account for the licenses and permits so that when I have to go fix these roads, the money is there.

Legislator Nazzaro: That's a lot of damages to those roads.

Legislator Scudder: Is a repaired road as good as the road before they destroyed it and needed to repair?

Mr. Bentley: In general, no. The roads that they are on are rural roads right now and they are generally in all poor to good condition, I'll say at this point. We're going to repair them so they are basically new.

Mrs. Dennison: So I think the answer was yes.

Legislator Scudder: O.k., so we have this road in 2015 that isn't ruined yet. Then we have a road in 2020 that has been repaired. Which is the better road? The initial non-destroyed road or the repaired road? Now, I know the repaired road is better after it's destroyed but, would we be better off if those trucks had never ruined those roads?

Legislator Gould: No because we would be paying the \$2 million dollars ourselves to fix that road someday.

Mr. Bentley: To answer your question a different way. The County is not putting any additional funds to fix the roads. We're charging them the full load to get back because we wouldn't have touched those roads in the first place.

Legislator Scudder: I've seen some of those roads and they have really taken a beating.

Mr. Bentley: Before or after?

Legislator Scudder: After.

Mr. Bentley: After we've fixed them?

Legislator Scudder: I guess I can't ask the question -

Mr. Bentley: We only fix the roads after they are done with construction.

Legislator Scudder: O.k., you have this road before the windmills and it's going to be 10 years before we have to fix that road. Now they come in and do these windmills and they have destroyed that road. Now we fix it.

Mr. Bentley: We're going to fix it better than what it was.

Legislator Scudder: So it's going to be better than it was before -

Mr. Bentley: As or better than.

Legislator Scudder: So it's going to last longer then.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Scudder: Make sense, the question?

Mr. Bentley: Yeah, makes sense the answer too.

Legislator Scudder: Well, I don't know about that.

Mr. Bentley: The windmills are required to fix anything they damage.

Mrs. Dennison: The roads are going to be better than if nothing ever happens.

Legislator Scudder: I get a concern about - I mean, the base, everything is going to be better.

Mr. Bentley: Yes, we're going to make the roads a whole lot better. (*Inaudible*) all the roads we fix are in much better shape (*cross talk*)

Legislator Scudder: Sometimes you have an occurrence where the old is better left un -

Mr. Bentley: The roads they are proposing to use are rural roads with a lot of issues.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any other questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2019 Budget for Road Salt

Mr. Bentley: Alright, I'm going to give you some facts and figures to write down. Our capacity, in our salt barns are about 17,000 tons. We need approximately 11,600 tons to fill the barns which is what we do every year and have done every year since we've been plowing roads. We have enough money in our existing budget to buy approximately 7,200 tons of that 11,600. So I need approximately \$500,000 to buy approximately 4,300 tons or whatever the math is there. Our costs for salt is going up from \$68.00 to \$76.00, which we talked about during the budget meetings.

Legislator Nazzaro: Sixteen percent roughly.

Mr. Bentley: Twelve or 14%, whatever the math is.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Wait a minute, you said \$68.00 to what?

Mr. Bentley: To \$76.00, an \$8.00 increase, per ton.

Mrs. Dennison: Twelve percent.

Mr. Bentley: So, I'm going to go over some other numbers.

Mrs. Dennison: The increase takes place now or January 1st?

Mr. Bentley: Now. So generally you buy salt through the winter season so the contract expired July so any new salt purchases are – now, we actually have to commit to an amount to buy for the whole year. We have been, on average, as we have talked about in the budget meetings, been averaging between 30 to 35,000 tons a year, over the last five years. Obviously, everything is weather dependent so things can change. So I'm going to go over what was budgeted. As we all may remember or we may not, this used to be an expense item.

Legislator Nazzaro: It used to be an inventory.

Mr. Bentley: It used to be an asset and inventory so this was never an issue in the budget. It has not become an expense item. There has been some, lack of a better word, miscalculation about how much to budget in the budget. I will say that \$1.6 million dollars in the 2019 budget just was not enough.

Mrs. Dennison: One point five.

Mr. Bentley: Even better. We spent approximately \$2.4/\$2.5 million on salt last year. So, this extra \$500,000 is if we don't get any more snow and we fill the barns, we don't have to do anything else. We use 10,886 tons last November/December. So, remember what I told you that

we need to fill the barns, 11,600 tons and it costs a little over a million dollars, about \$1.1 million dollars. So we use in November/December last year –

Legislator Nazzaro: You said average is 30/35,000 tons?

Mr. Bentley: Yes, that's what we're seeing. So, I may be coming back again but I'm just asking for enough money to fill the barns at the start of the winter. If we have weather, I'm going to be back again before 2020 before that money kicks in to ask for more because I can't use that money and I can't wait to buy salt. Because if there is a run on salt and we can't buy salt, I do not want to be in a position where we don't have enough salt, we also sell salt to the towns, so we're not only going to put ourselves in a predicament but we're going to be other towns in a predicament because they buy from us. Not a risk I am willing to take. So I will be back to ask for more if the weather is there but I don't have a choice, I don't think, in asking for this.

Legislator Scudder: Now when you say, if the weather is there, are we talking extreme weather or just have to go out and –

Mr. Bentley: November 28th of last year, we actually put out a winter ban from driving. It's really just the amount of snow and ice events.

Legislator Scudder: Let's just say that we have a quote unquote "normal", just we had some snow no –

Mr. Bentley: Do you consider last winter, November/December normal?

Legislator Scudder: I can't remember.

Mr. Bentley: I don't know what normal is. I've lived here for a long time and I still couldn't tell you what normal is.

Legislator Scudder: O.k., so you have no understanding when I say normal, what I am talking about?

Mr. Bentley: I would say that probably 10,000 is probably not that far off from normal. If you consider November, December, one third of the months, then that's one third of the use (*inaudible*), it's probably not outside of the norm.

Legislator Scudder: O.k., thank you.

Mr. Bentley: But, I still don't know what normal is. I've lived here a long time.

Legislator Gould: I can't vote for just salt unless it's mixed in with some sand. That's my problem, if you said straight sand, I'd vote for it in my sleep but when you say straight salt and don't mix it, then I can't.

Mr. Bentley: This is my one request. I need an article in the Post Journal and the Observer informing the public how the road conditions are going to change because we're using sand. I need people to commit their names in writing saying that we're going to provide a decrease in the ability to run car at the speed limits because we're going to have hard packed snow. We're also going to have to do dust control, we're also going to have to sweep the roads, and we're also going to have silt and sand going into the ditches and drains that are going to go into the lake. That all needs to be talked about because that is an impact and that is a cost. The money that you think you are going to save in the sand, I think by the time you are done with it, you actually end up spending more because of all the labor cost to sweep, all the impacts on the roads because that sand builds up and now you have water that builds up there and you actually destroy your edges of the roads.

Legislator Gould: Fill up every year or does it take a while?

Mr. Bentley: No, every year. You have to put down a lot of sand. Thirty five thousand tons of salt plus the sand, think about what is in there. The complaints that we're going to get about the dust control. You have all that sand down there, it dries out, and it will be all over the place. Then it's on people's cars, cars are going to be dirtier, people are going to be complaining about that being on their cars. Look, I have looked at this a lot – you made a lot of comments but I'm letting you know, it's not the simple answer that you are making it out to be. There is a lot more impacts that have to be discussed that have to be informed to the public.

Legislator Gould: The public has to get used to driving on slippery roads with sand, like we used to.

Mr. Bentley: That's a liability.

Legislator Gould: I grew up driving that way.

Mr. Bentley: I'm telling you, there is a lot of drivers out there that don't.

Legislator Gould: They didn't have sand when I learned to drive.

Mr. Bentley: The kids these days don't know how to do that.

Legislator Gould: (*Cross talk*).., they had sand.

Mr. Bentley: I'm just saying that if we're going to create a gap between what service we are going to provide and what the public expects, we have to be out there and inform them of that because otherwise we're creating a liability situation for the County. They're going to say, well no one told us that we're going to have hard packed snow and maybe we're going to have to decrease speed limits 10 miles an hour. You know what it's like driving on country roads out in Panama. Try to drive it at speed. You are going to be in a ditch. You have to drive 20 to 30 miles under the speed limit.

Legislator Gould: I do anyhow.

Mr. Bentley: I know but that is not the public's expectations. That matters and I think it all should matter to us. We provide a service and we need to tell people what service we're providing. So if you are going to vote no, I want – there has to be some other part to it.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Believe it or not, from my days of property maintenance and I do understand what you are saying because the sand itself gets in all the catch basins and clogs those up and any pipes that connect to the sewers, the storm sewers have got to be cleared so there is an additional impact to running sand. There is no question about that. I don't know how it plays out on dirt roads and on stuff out in the, I would say, the bush, but, in the City parking lots in the City it raises havoc in the catch basins and so on.

Legislator Nazzaro: My question is not about sand but just a quick follow up on that. Does the State of New York use pure salt?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., that's all I wanted to know.

Legislator Gould: But they have more money than we have.

Legislator Nazzaro: A couple of finance question. The price of salt per ton went up from \$68.00 to \$76.00. Now is that price fluctuate during the year or is that fixed?

Mr. Bentley: That's fixed.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is that a State price?

Mr. Bentley: OGS, yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then the second part and I believe in intermunicipal agreements and cooperation. How many towns are there in Chautauqua County?

Mr. Bentley: Twenty seven.

Legislator Nazzaro: Of the 27 towns, how many actually buy salt from us? Roughly, half, more than half?

Mr. Bentley: Half a dozen, (*cross talk*) for argument sake, six.

Legislator Nazzaro: The only reason I'm asking that is because we talk about storing. You say that we can only store 11,600 tons of salt –

Mr. Bentley: No, 17,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., so 11,600 was 7,200 so 18,800 tons is what you can store, I just was wondering, because if you get hit with a hard winter, o.k., still looking for the definition of

normal, but anyway, I just wonder if that creates an issue. I mean, I want to help the towns, I'm not saying we don't but do we – because they don't have the salt barns or they do and they just come in and –

Mr. Bentley: No, they don't. They use our salt and salt barns.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is that under the intermunicipal agreement, do they pay us exactly what we pay for the salt?

Mr. Bentley: Yes. It's under shared services.

Legislator Nazzaro: So there is no add on because we're using our storage barns and trucks.

Mr. Bentley: So here is the difference between gasoline and salt. I mentioned this at the budget meeting. Gasoline, we're the only game in town, we don't use anybody else's gasoline so they are beholding to us. For salt, some towns actually plow our roads, we have agreements with them. There is a lot more sharing that is going to go on that we help each other. No one is going to help us –

Legislator Nazzaro: That's fine.

Mr. Bentley: The (*inaudible*) thing I want to do is charge someone to incentivize them to build their own – it's the economies of scale and as a County, we should look to take advantage of those economies of scale and not have multiple salt sheds when we don't need to.

Legislator Nazzaro: So for the year 2019, you budgeted \$1.5 and you're asking for another half a million so that is \$2 million –

Mr. Bentley: And we're budgeting \$2.4 in 2020. (*cross talk*).

Legislator Scudder: Well congrats, that's going to be a normal winter next year.

Legislator Nazzaro: So \$2.32, o.k., is what we budgeted for 2020. O.k., that's it.

Mrs. Dennison: It's in the ballpark, yes.

Legislator Gould: Are any towns (*cross talk*).... salt?

Mr. Bentley: Not that I'm aware of.

Legislator Gould: Where do they get it then if they don't get it from us?

Mr. Bentley: They have their own salt sheds or they just store it outdoors. That's even worse.

Legislator Scudder: Just out on the weather?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Gould: That's terrible.

Mr. Bentley: That happens.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any more questions?

Carried w/ Legislator Gould voting "no"

Mr. Bentley: Can you submit an article to the Post Journal?

Legislator Gould: I would be glad for them to interview me on it.

Mr. Bentley: But you have to tell them the whole story.

Legislator Gould: I'm not going to spend my days watching the Post Journal. They can come and find me.

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2019 Budget for Jury Room Renovations in the Chautauqua County Courthouse and Carpet Replacement in Part 1 Hearing Rooms 103, 104, & 105 in the Mayville Municipal Building

Mr. Bentley: This is a fully reimbursable project that has been requested by the courts to replace the carpet over in the municipal building. Apparently there is some moisture/potential mold concerns and they just want to replace the carpet.

Legislator Gould: The roof leaks, huh.

Legislator Nazzaro: No local share.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any questions of this resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Other

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Anything to come under "other"? If not –

Legislator Gould: Move to adjourn.

Legislator Nazzaro: Second.

Unanimously Carried (4:44 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Olivia Ames, Deputy Clerk/Lori J. Foster, Sr. Stenographer