

Minutes

Audit & Control Committee

October 18, 2018, 8:35 a.m., Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

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

Others: Tampio, Ames, Caflisch, Abdella, Bentley, Dennison, Swanson, Brinkman, Cresanti, Geise, Crow, Hayes, Almeter, Zahn, McCord, Schuyler, Lis, Borrello

Chairman Chagnon called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

Approval of Minutes (9/20/18)

MOVED by Legislator Gould, SECONDED by Legislator Nazzaro

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time

Proposed Resolution- Acceptance of Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Grant

Ms. Brinkman: I am very pleased to start your meeting off with the announcement that we received \$200,000 from HRSA to do a comprehensive strategic plan for the opioid epidemic that we're facing. The monies will be used for staff, data analysis and education for the public. We will be using the County Executive's alliance for enforcement and rehabilitation- the group that he has already assembled to be the vehicle and then we will be adding some partners to that. There is absolutely no local share to this grant.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions?

Legislator Nazzaro: Can't argue with that one.

Chairman Chagnon: Pat, you have some of this in the 2019 budget, or is the budget yet to be reflecting of this grant?

Ms. Brinkman: I believe when we came to present our budget, the adjustment was recommended and I believe that Human Services recommended that the adjustment be made.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. I just wanted to get that on the record. OK, any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Acceptance of Funds from NYSDOT for the Hangar J Door Replacement Design and Construction Project at the Chautauqua County/ Jamestown Airport

Mr. Abdella: Mr. Chairman, it would probably be best if we had an executive session regarding this item briefly. The question would be, would you want to do that now or push this resolution until later in the meeting and then hold an Executive Session to discuss aspects of it before you decide what to do with it.

Chairman Chagnon: With a long agenda and several discussion items, later in the meeting is probably going to be a couple hours from now. I hate to keep everyone tied up until then.

Legislator Niebel: How long is this going to take, the Executive Session, five or ten minutes?

Mr. Abdella: It might be fifteen minutes. You know how these things go. It would be for the purpose of discussing a lease amendment where publicity could substantially affect the value there of.

Chairman Chagnon: OK.

MOVED by Legislator Gould, SECONDED by Legislator Nazzaro to enter Executive Session to discuss threatened litigation.

Unanimously Carried (8:40 a.m.)

MOVED by Legislator Muldowney, SECONDED by Legislator Nazzaro to close Executive Session.

Unanimously Carried (8:52 a.m.)

MOVED by Legislator Nazzaro, SECONDED by Legislator Gould to Table.

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Acceptance of Funds from NYSDOT for the Replacement of Existing Bulk Hangar No. 3 and Construct Public Safety Hangar Project at the Chautauqua County/ Dunkirk Airport

Mr. Bentley: So this is a project to demo an existing hangar that is in full need of being demolished and replace it with a new hangar through the grant. Our local share is 21%, of which, we're planning on doing a self-performance of the demo, which is why you have the accounts for those line items for our personnel to do the work. There will still be a local share- I don't have a copy of the amended one yet-

Legislator Nazzaro: We went over this quite detailed in public facilities.

Mr. Bentley: So, \$63,580 is proposed to be part of the self-performance. The \$57,800 would be the local share.

Chairman Chagnon: Is everyone straight on that? Discussion on the proposed resolution?

Legislator Nazzaro: I did have questions, but they were answered by our Finance Director in Public Facilities regarding the accounting of it.

Chairman Chagnon: Good job, Kathleen.

Mrs. Dennison: It wasn't me, I was absent on Monday.

Chairman Chagnon: I take that back Kathleen. Good job Kitty. Any other discussion on the proposed resolution? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget for Public Facilities Airports Division

Mr. Bentley: This is a resolution to account for our projections for our revenue and expenses at the Dunkirk Airport. We are running a little bit over on expenses due to some maintenance items. This is our best guess at the revenue from CREDC. Going forward, these are still estimates, but we feel that these are the best numbers that we have at this point.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Adjust DPF Large Equipment Capital Account

Mr. Bentley: This is a resolution to account for surplus machinery that we sold, which included a pickup truck and other miscellaneous equipment. Those funds are being used to pay for a sander for our snowplow and removal activities that will be forthcoming as we see the weather is turning.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget for Environment, Public Facilities Road, and Public Facilities Road Machinery Divisions

Mr. Bentley: I'm going to try to talk about this at the high level. There is a lot of details that are contained within the accounts. This is to account for the need to buy salt for the winter as we change from the (*inaudible*) model to the expense model. So, there is \$500,000 in that. This is also to account for the roads that were rebuilt due to the windmills up in Arkwright. This is just to get the dollars into right accounts so that we can pay the bills that we used to fix those roads. In addition, this is also to account for the fuel cost increase that we noted at the DPF committee. The price went from what we had estimated last July at \$1.62 a gallon to what it is today, which is about \$2.60. It changes every day, but this is to account for those expected increases in the fuel costs for this year so we have enough to buy until the end of the year. Along with that, we do sell some of our fuel to outside entities, so we increased the revenue accounts to account for those additional sales. There is another \$100,000 for vehicle maintenance which is our anticipated year-end maintenance spend. We have seen costs increase and I know that was some of the- that helps lead to some of the decisions that were made in the 2019 budget to help fund our capital improvements to buy additional vehicles. The older the vehicle gets, the more we have to maintain them and the more it is going to cost. Along with that, there is \$50,000 for environment and recycling. This is due to the City of Jamestown sending their recycling up to the Landfill and on the revenue side there is a \$50,000 increase in our revenue. As part of our review, we looked at some of the appropriations accounts. We tried to search for where we had money left over so we could help pay for some of these increases I just mentioned. With Kathleen and Kitty we came up with- the first two are due to me not having an Administrative Assistant. I have a bell. The maintenance of roads was just based on trends. That trend may differ so we will just have to continue to watch that account and if there are any additional adjustments we may need to come back. On the revenue side there is various things that are due to timing and cash flows of when we received some of the funds- the Marchiselli Funds and the Federal Aid- so, these are the expected in-flows on the revenue side.

Ms. Dennison: I think you hit all the high points. The last one would be that the balancing agent and the- because it is- the ins and outs are a little bit out of balance in the D and the DM funds, so we are proposing to balance the changes with a surplus in sales tax revenue. The only other item that Brad did not specifically bring to your attention- the FEMA Aid. There was aid for flood relief from 2015. It's budgeted in 2018, but it was received in 2017. We are proposing to reduce that line because those funds have already been received.

Legislator Nazzaro: We went over this in detail in Public Facilities and did you mention, Brad that in 2017, if my notes are correct, that we received \$913,000 from the permits for the windmills and that covers- it's a timing issue- we are incurring the repairs in 2018, but the revenue was recognized from those permits in 2017. The permits were- I think the total repair was about \$800,000, so that covered that.

Mr. Bentley: Yeah, I-

Legislator Nazzaro: I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. Bentley: Yeah we received about \$913,000 in permit fees from the windmills to cover the expected road damage. To date, the roads- our cost so far has been \$825,000. I think that should be number, but we have to let some of the accounts settle out. So, these numbers are in anticipation- working with Kathleen- make sure that the dollars got moved to the right places.

Mrs. Dennison: You are correct, Mr. Nazzaro. The revenue was received and recorded in 2017. At that time, we did not make a budget amendment to increase the capital roads account because that is where the expenses are incurred and they are incurred in this year.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, the other discussion point we had- we did approve this in Public Facilities, however I said that I would bring this discussion to this committee. I realize the minutes aren't out yet because it was quite lengthy. I and a couple other members on the committee were uncomfortable at this time using sales tax to cover the shortfall. We are showing there a \$723,700 use of sales tax because our sales tax is running significantly higher than we had budgeted. I realize and we all realize- at the end of the year we do the whole reconciliation, but at this time because we still have two and half months left- its like- I think it's cleaner in my opinion to use the D and DM fund balances proportionally because there is enough in there to offset the- the reason we are under- the reason we do have a shortfall is related to those two funds. I just would like to open that up to discussion- amending this instead of using the sales tax to use some D and DM funds.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you for that. I'll start. I fully support your initiative. Other comments?

Legislator Gould: I fully support not using the sales tax too. I have a couple reasons for that. One of them is we don't want to get our new Highway Superintendent in the habit of dipping into the sales tax fund. Let him dip into his own money first.

Ms. Crow: For full disclosure, it was not Brad's recommendation. It was my recommendation because generally we look to other surpluses within the budget before going to fund balance.

(Cross-talk)

Mr. Bentley: Obviously my job here, Mr. Gould, and you know this but just for everyone in the room so they don't take it the wrong way- my job here is to come to you guys with the need and the justification for what I need and to explain the costs that are associated with that. I leave it up to you guys and I work with the finance department and the folks here to- how best to get those funds moved to those needs. If you tell me that it needs to be done a different way that is fine. What I heard today and what I heard from the DPF is not that I came to you with a bad need, it's just where do the funds originate from. At the end of the year and for next year, we have proposals to use the D and DM funds next year for additional needs. If those need to be- whatever appropriate levels need to be in those funds, we will make sure that we come to you and we will reach the same agreement. If that requires the use of the sales tax money next year, I may ask to dip into it because I have a need. I'm going to bring to you the needs with the justifications.

Legislator Gould: Oh, we are not questioning that you need money-

Legislator Nazzaro: And just to-

Legislator Gould: We are just questioning what pot it comes out of.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right. This committee- you have a need and these things have been expended, we have a shortfall in this committee- our job is to be fiscal watch dogs to make sure-

There is nothing wrong with the way this is written. I want to make that clear. I think because of the timing of it with the budget and also the size of it, again, it is just cleaner to use the D and DM funds.

Legislator Niebel: So we aren't going to take it out of sales tax, we are going to take it out of his-

Chairman Chagnon: D and DM fund balances.

Legislator Niebel: OK, different accounts?

Legislator Gould: Right.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. The amount that would be- all of the changes here, what is needed from the D fund is \$461,700 and from the DM fund, \$262,000. Those two items total the \$723,700 that is currently proposed to come from an increase in sales tax.

Legislator Niebel: Do you have enough in those funds?

Mrs. Dennison: We do. If we- looking at the D fund, we are currently projecting before this amendment to have approximately \$1.3 million in the D fund. If we make this adjustment that would bring the projected D fund balance to \$888,000 with round numbers. What we just want to caution you about is that the 2019 tentative budget proposes to use another \$500,000 of D fund balance. So, we are a little concerned that if we make this adjustment and then based on the 2019 budget, that would bring the projected D fund balance at the end of 2019 to \$388,000, which is on the low side.

Legislator Niebel: That's in the D fund?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, the D fund.

Legislator Niebel: So, if you take \$261,000 out of the DM fund you would have approximately-

Mrs. Dennison: The DM fund- our current projection at year end is \$1.6 million. If we use the \$262,000, that would bring the fund balance to \$1.4 million. Again in 2019, the tentative budget is to use \$744,000 of DM fund balance-

Legislator Niebel: So, you would have about \$650,000?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Chairman Chagnon: I would point out that in the projections that the Finance Director did for going forward- that the projections for the DM fund balance at the end of 2019 are still nearly 25% of appropriations. So, DM fund balance- in my view is not as much of a concern as the D fund balance. The D fund balance is something we are going to have to keep an eye on as we move into 2019.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess that is all the more reason to do it this way because it is keeping things in the right bucket.

Chairman Chagnon: For now. OK. Questions or comments?

Legislator Nazzaro: I will make a motion to remove for the increase in revenue accounts- not to use the \$723,700 out of the sales tax, but to replace that with- they can provide the account numbers. Take \$461,700 out of the D fund balance and \$262,000 out of the DM fund balance. Again, they can assign the account numbers.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. There will be some substantial wording changes. So, if it is agreeable to the committee, I will make those and send them to Ms. Ames with the substance that Mr. Nazzaro identified.

Legislator Niebel: I'll second that.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. We have a motion and a second to amend the proposed resolution. Discussion on the motion to amend? All those in favor please say aye.

Unanimously Carried to Amend

Chairman Chagnon: So, back to the proposed resolution as amended. Any further discussion on the proposed resolution as amended? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried as Amended

Proposed Resolution- Quit Claim Deeds

Mr. Caflisch: We have three properties here that we had on our unsold property list for offers and these are the three offers that came in on those particular properties. So, I'm asking for your approval.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions? Comments?

Legislator Niebel: Unsold? They did go through the auction process?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: Are any of these three people that we are selling the property back to, where they the previous owners?

Mr. Caflisch: No. If they were the previous owner they would have had to offer the full amount of taxes owing.

Chairman Chagnon: Jim, I have a question on the second parcel. Why weren't any taxes paid on that parcel since 2004?

Mr. Caflisch: That was bankruptcy and then it just turned into a long foreclosure. That's what happens when they linger out there.

Chairman Chagnon: Fourteen years?

Mr. Caflisch: Sometimes there is just no interest in anybody acquiring the property.

Chairman Chagnon: That is staggering to me.

Mr. Caflisch: I understand, but that is what happens in some of these cases.

Chairman Chagnon: And there is nothing we can do proactively or differently to prevent things like this from dragging this long?

Mr. Caflisch: Well, we try to do everything we can to get it into a new owners hands but if nothing happens, nothing happens.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Acceptance of Forfeiture Funds held by the District Attorney

Mr. Swanson: This is pretty simple request. I'm asking you to accept money from my Forfeiture Account. We are hopeful to purchase some 360 degree cameras for our crime scene units. We have grant money that will pay for 75% of it, but there is a 25% match. I am bridging that gap with crime forfeiture funds- it's one of the permissible uses of that fund. Rather than ask the County to provide the \$4,267, we will do that. There is no local match.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions? Comments? You have the right words. All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution for New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee Grant for the Highway Safety Program FY19

Ms. Cresanti: This is a PILOT program through the Governors traffic safety committee. This is our first year receiving it, so it is new money. It will require no local match and this is for the salary and benefits of the deputy that will be fulfilling this role. It has been added to the 2019 budget, so no budget amendment is necessary.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions or comments on the proposed resolution? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution for New York State Office of Homeland Security Grant for Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) FY18

Ms. Cresanti: This is an annual grant that we receive. This is to offset the personnel and fringe costs of our dispatchers. This is just another year of funding, it is very typical and it's also included in the 2018 budget.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- State Homeland Security Program for Fiscal Year 2018

Ms. Hayes: These are routine. These are three grants that we receive yearly. The first one is the SHSP. This is to accept and it will be appropriated at a later date.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Fiscal Year 2018 Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant Program

Chairman Chagnon: This resolution was amended in Public Safety and you have an amended copy on your table.

Ms. Hayes: This is another grant. This is acceptance only. It will be appropriated later and we do receive this grant every year.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Emergency Management Performance Grant for Fiscal Year 2018

Ms. Hayes. This EMPG grant does have a 50% match. It's for salary and fringe, so the match is already in the 2019 budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Lease Agreement for Department of Planning and Development at Welch Foods Building in Westfield, New York

County Executive George Borrello: I think we have talked a little bit in the past about realigning our resources and really trying to get a broader scope for our economic development strategy. We have changed a lot of things. We're undergoing this economic development alliance and economic development strategy journey right now. It's starting with the use of our consultant, but also along the way we have been trying to do more to bring the County's economic development resources more directly to more communities. In a combination with the planning and economic development resources that we have and the IDA, we are trying to get out there more. We are doing more community engagement, which Don has been leading up. Part of that is how do we really kind of put ourselves in a better position and what we are looking to do now is to move the planning department- Planning and Community Development Department to office space in Westfield. This

essentially will be budget neutral. It's going- Don did a very good job of negotiating. We are subleasing from Welch at their space at the Welch building in Westfield. Don was able to negotiate so we are paying the same amount of money to Welch that we were paying to the IDA. The idea will be to have resources in Jamestown at the BWB building, Westfield at the Welch building and then we have the IDA and the Land bank office in the incubator in Dunkirk. I think this is a way to move things around strategically and again, this is part of the plan to redefining and realigning our resources for economic development.

Mr. McCord: I will correct one thing. As much as I did negotiate what I believe to be a fair lease in our market, it works out to \$7.63 a square foot. That includes snow clearing, heat and electric. I don't think we can do much better considering the building that we sit in today has a much higher square footage cost than that. However, there is a small increase in the overall cost above what we pay the IDA today. It's approximately \$1,121- the increase.

County Executive Borrello: For the year.

Mr. McCord: For the year. And that-

County Executive Borrello: I stand corrected.

Mr. McCord: Sorry. He was pretty close. We have been paying that rent and the same balance since 2004, so we have paid that sum for the last fifteen years. I guess if you look at it that way, the \$1,000 is really a very minor escalator in our overall cost.

Legislator Nazzaro: Do you have to do any lease improvements or- do you have to do any type of renovations to get it ready to occupy.

Mr. McCord: No, that is included in the lease cost. The one thing we will have to do is put in IT infrastructure so that we can be part of the County's network system. We have worked with IT and we have managed to keep the cost fairly reasonable. We are using a used switch and we do have to purchase a network router and the cost is \$600.00.

Mr. Geise: I also want to mention that there is going to be an IDA economic development office there. We will be rotating our IDA staff through that office as well. So, we will have a clear presence there as well. We will have scheduled office hours for community meetings or community outreach. It would probably be like Kristine Morabito, Linda Burns, myself, Rich- we will also have a presence there.

Legislator Muldowney: Will there be any secretarial in between any of those offices?

Mr. McCord: There is. In the realignment of the staffing for 2019, in between the economic development division and the planning division, we can't do it without any. We have narrowed it down to where we have a half time account clerk because we manage 93 contracts.

Legislator Muldowney: I think it is very important-

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Gould: Is this going to hurt the IDA in Jamestown? Losing the rent?

Mr. Geise: Well, we'll make it work. Obviously it is a \$10,000 hit to the IDA, but we will sublease that space and we'll make it work.

Legislator Gould: You could get another renter in there?

Mr. Geise: We are hoping, yes. I don't have anything lined up right now, but we will make it work. That's a good question.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman, I drive by the Welch building all the time. Are there other companies or firms that lease space in the building now?

Mr. McCord: Currently, Plantrol is renting space on the second floor and half of the first floor is occupied by National Grid.

Legislator Niebel: Oh, OK.

Mr. Geise: Let me also point out- this is really important. Back when- early this year we have meetings with a developer out in Buffalo that is very interested in buying and rehabbing that. As you may have noticed recently, one of the four priority projects in Chautauqua County for the CFA's is the Welch building and we really are confident that- now that that's one of the four priority projects in the County and one of sixteen through Western New York, that the money will come through the CFA which will likely- we have had ongoing meetings with this developer which will likely move this forward with them purchasing the building with the image of having this converted into rental units- you know, market rate apartments on the second and third floor and retail and commercial space on first floor. So, Westfield is a community that is on the move- I mean, you're seeing restaurants, businesses- they have a lot of activity there. What they are lacking is maintenance free residential living and that would be a key component to the further growth and the critical mass that the Village of Westfield is now approaching. So, this also plays into- one of the things when we met with this particular developer that they asked was for some assistance getting- leasing space on that first floor to help make the budget work. By us going in there and first of all being a tenant, that is going to help and I'm hoping that we can encourage other folks that do business with the County and other municipalities- engineering firms, consultants to also locate offices in that building. It's part of a long term strategy to get that building rehabbed and back on the tax rolls.

Legislator Niebel: The more space rented there, the more saleable it might be in the future. I'm in favor of this.

Mr. Geise: Also let me note, I don't- the Town is not paying taxes on that property, is it? Is there a PILOT of any kind?

Mr. McCord: I think there is some kind of arrangement, but I'm really not certain. The Town of Westfield owns the building-

Legislator Niebel: They own the building?

Mr. McCord: Yes, they own the building and they're the ones that have been pushing forward to try to market it.

County Executive Borrello: We are on a path here to get this back into private hands.

Legislator Niebel: And they have kind of an active-

Mr. McCord: They have an LDC.

Legislator Niebel: OK. And they do quite a bit from what I read in the paper.

Chairman Chagnon: Thanks to Olivia for reminding me that this resolution was amended last evening at the Planning and Economic Development Committee meeting, which I was at. The Resolved clause states that the County Executive is hereby authorized and empowered to negotiate and enter a lease- and at that point we did insert the words "With the Town of Westfield," to clarify that although we've negotiated with Welches who has a lease with the Town of Westfield, our lease and our payments will be being made to the Town of Westfield. That just clarified that our lease would be with the Town of Westfield, not with Welches. That was amended in Committee last night, so just for your information we are discussing this resolution as amended. Any other questions or comments on the resolution?

Legislator Muldowney: I think it's a great building and I think it's the route that you head to Chautauqua Lake and anything that we can do to encourage that to go into private hands- I think it's a great idea.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Application for Grant Funding from the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets to Update the Chautauqua County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan

Mr. McCord: Well, I'll make this easy on Audit and Control. After last night, Chairman Chagnon reminded me there is no local share, so we'll just start there. The resolution is to allow us to submit an application in New York State Ag and Markets for a farmland protection plan. We constructed and did a farmland protection plan in 2001. The Planning Department- we have found a \$30,000 local match through the Community Foundation in Jamestown. That takes anything except for some staff time out of this and we would be asking for \$50,000 from the State to undertake this plan.

Legislator Gould: Are we going to get it done? Every time I ask about this, I hear we don't have man power enough to get it done. We can't- we've tried to hire people, we can't get anybody hired-

(Cross-talk)

Mr. McCord: I'm still in that hole, but actually, that is another thing that I did not bring up under the Welch move. It is easier for us to recruit people when we are on the I-90 corridor because UB is the closest planning school to us. We have had at least one candidate that indicated that they wouldn't consider us if they had to drive to Jamestown. In regards to the other part Jay, the reason

that the cash match was so important from the Community Foundation was because if I could generate enough cash flow for this, then we can hire an outside consultant to get this thing done. We just needed to know that we had enough cash on the table for that.

Legislator Gould: I hope so. The farmers have waited a long time for this- many moons.

Mr. McCord: Yes, understood. We are excited about it- being able to do it.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions or comments? All in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution- Close Capital Projects

Chairman Chagnon: Kathleen told us last night that it's almost complete. We are current.

Mrs. Dennison: I think we are. When I worked on this resolution I kind of looked around to see if there were any other stragglers out there and I didn't find any.

Chairman Chagnon: This one has been straggling. I'm happy to see this one completed.

Mrs. Dennison: As we discussed last night, this is a house keeping resolution. This particular capital project, Chadwick Bay Industrial Park- as you can see, it was initiated in 1994. So, it has been straggling for quite some time. The last entry- the last expense was recorded in February of 2016. This project was the subject of some discussion- whether or not the funds were still available to be used. That's why we started looking into it and found- I could not find any record that it was closed by resolution. As I mentioned, it has not been active for over a couple of years. At the end of 2017 Deputy Director Button closed and capitalized the project from an accounting standpoint, so this would just close it by resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Consider 2019 Tentative Budget, with the Changes Listed Below, and Present Same to the County Executive for His Consideration and Action

Chairman Chagnon: With the permission of the Committee there are two items that I would like to address before we consider the proposed resolution as presented. The first item is that when we were discussing the budget at our last committee meeting for the budget, there was a question about the financial investment advisor that we have agreed to engage with to do a review of the County's investments and at that time when we were meeting, the RFP was still out so we didn't know what the cost would be in 2018 and what costs we could anticipate for 2019 if we needed to amend the budget. So, Kitty is now here to update us on the results of the RFP.

Ms. Crow: The results of the RFP is that we had no responses as of the day before the expiration of the last day to submit. Tracy did reissue to extend it until the 23rd. There were 50 people it went to through Bid-Net- about a dozen actually downloaded it, but nobody submitted a proposal. I

don't know what the next step will be if at the extension we still don't get any, we will have to talk about how we would like to precede next.

Chairman Chagnon: Sure, but relative to the proposal regarding the 2019 budget, we don't know enough to make a further amendment to the proposed changes to the budget. So, we will have to deal with it when we learn more or we chose our course of action. Ok.

The second item was that the Committee, in reviewing and discussing the budget, had some questions about the Coroners compensation as proposed and we had requested that the Human Services Committee give us some advice as to their view of it since it appeared that they had mixed opinions when they reviewed the proposal in their budget hearing. So, in discussions with the Human Services Committee, they have asked us to consider their recommendation that the proposal currently contains a provision for what was characterized as- a word I'm not particularly fond of, but as a stipend for the Coroners of \$45,000 per year, which would give funding for supervision and oversight and on call and things like that. After lengthy discussion with the Human Services Committee, they are uncomfortable with taking that big of a step all at once. They are in favor of the concept, they are in support of the concept, but they asked that we consider reducing the \$45,000 per year to \$20,000 per year. After a lot of discussion, they didn't feel that they had enough knowledge or experience with this to direct how those funds should be distributed, so their preference was to leave it up to Health and Human Services to decide how to utilize those funds at \$20,000 that they are recommending. So, that's for the discussion and the recommendation from Human Services.

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Chairman, then I'm assuming the \$150 per case will remain the same?

Chairman Chagnon: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then as we discussed during the Audit & Control Budget Meetings, the number of cases has gone down significantly from projected over 900 to 350. I know when we talked about it in Audit and Control, we were looking for that recommendation, which now we have one- we are not the policy setters here. Our job is to take a recommendation and decide if it is financially plausible and how we are going to fund it. So, they are proposing this \$20,000 stipend proposal in addition to the \$150 that we currently have per case?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: Mr. Chairman, did you say \$45,000 stipend?

Legislator Nazzaro: I thought the original was \$50,000-

Mrs. Dennison: What is included right now in the budget numbers would be \$50,000-

Chairman Chagnon: I'm telling you what I heard from Human Services.

Legislator Niebel: I think it was 20, 10, 10, 5 and 5, right?

Mrs. Dennison: When we revised the budget, we changed it to 20, 10, 10 and 10 because we have-

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Dennison: Yeah, in consultation with Health and Human Services. Yeah-

Legislator Niebel: We have the one-fifth Coroner-

Ms. Lis: That we weren't going to fill.

Chairman Chagnon: That explains it because the discussion- they kept talking about 20,10, 10 and 5. They were struggling to understand why there was a 5 as opposed to another 10.

Ms. Lis: They didn't discuss this with us.

Mrs. Schuyler: No one called me so, no; they really didn't ask the questions. The situation we have right now with our four Coroners is one of them is- has full time employment and isn't available for call as often as the other three Coroners. In the Administrative Code we are able to have up to six Coroners. Looking at the number of hours and availability to be on call is why I had originally put in there for two Coroners at the \$5,000 a piece because it- \$5,000 would be about what it would take to cover a portion- a lesser portion that what the other Coroners cover. So, if we don't have enough availability- if we need to bring another Coroner on at part time, not covering on call as much as the other Coroners- that was why we had originally asked for two of them at 5 instead of one at 10. I guess it all goes into the point eights- or point fours-

Mrs. Dennison: Well, when we consolidated from five positions to four, we did realize somewhat of a savings because there is no health insurance for the fifth person. That was a savings of about \$4,000.

Ms. Lis: Remember, the total wages only increased by \$19,000. We weren't taking a huge leap in total. We were just paying them in a different way.

Chairman Chagnon: Right, and that's what Human Services was uncomfortable with.

Ms. Lis: Well, there is a lot of time spent in training and different things and we are sending them on fewer calls and things like that. In order to get people to do that job we had to fairly compensate them and-

Mrs. Schuyler: I did actually look at how many hours somebody is on call and looking at it right now, we pay \$1 an hour for our CSEA folks who are on call and looking at how many hours that is. I did have a mathematical calculation behind the amount of money that I thought was fair. If you expect someone to be on call 24/7 and they only get paid if they get a call- that was a lot different when Coroners were going to every death in this County and it was over 900 calls a year. Then it was worth their while to do this job, even though it was not in their jurisdiction to be at those calls. Now we're saying that you're only going to have 300 or so calls a year and you don't get paid unless you have a call. That means your life's on hold because you're on call to be a Coroner 24/7 and you may not get called out because we are only going to those calls that fall within the County's jurisdiction.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman- but Christine, my question before- and maybe you weren't here, maybe Val- I asked it of the Committee. Are we having trouble getting Coroners? When we have a vacancy don't we have applications that we have to look through?

Mrs. Schuyler: We have not asked for anymore Coroners-

Legislator Niebel: No, but the last time we had a vacancy, didn't we have a number of applications for that position?

Mrs. Schuyler: We didn't have a number of them, but what we have done is actively recruit the funeral directors that have been interested thanks to Frank Migliore, who has been around the longest now with our Coroners. I meet regularly with the Coroners. We have been looking forward to next year and all the changes that we have put in place- going electronic, providing support for them, policies and procedures. My goal is to have a program that actually is a model across New York State because this program has no models anywhere. Part of this discussion with them has been my promise to them is that this is going to get better and this is why we took it over and I'm going to make it fair and we are going to do the right thing for them as a County and part of that is that salary. I can't guarantee you that these Coroners are going to this job for \$150. That's why one of the former Coroners says I'm resigning because my last check was- I got one case for \$150 and that's not worth my while to be on call.

Legislator Niebel: Christine, we are all in favor- I'm in favor of a professional Coroners Department, but you can't make promises to these people for increases in salary. I'll tell you, I do have a problem with the stipends because we are- we will be paying people for not working. OK? If we pay the head administrator \$400 a week, which it breaks down- \$20,000, \$400 a week. OK, that person may or may not have any cases at all because our case load has gone down from 900 to 350, which breaks down to about seven cases per week. OK, with our five Coroners it is very conceivable that some of our Coroners won't have any calls per week. OK? And yet we are still paying them stipends? \$400 a week or \$200 a week or whatever for not working. I have a philosophical problem with that, I do.

Mrs. Schuyler: There is a lot of other work that gets done within this program-

Legislator Niebel: I understand that.

Mrs. Schuyler: In addition to going out on an actual call.

Legislator Niebel: A lot of it-OK, there is training and other things, but when they go out on a call they are reimbursed for the \$150 per case-

Mrs. Schuyler: Per case that could take a minimum of four hours, up to twelve hours or more. Yes, for a case. Then there is a lot of filing-

Legislator Niebel: If there is an autopsy and stuff, sure.

Mrs. Schuyler: There's filing, there is a lot of other things that have to be done with the Clerk's Office and right now, that oversight hasn't happened. No one was watching that enough to see that we have-

Legislator Niebel: Understood.

Mrs. Schuyler: A huge amount of cases that have never been filed.

Ms. Lis: And there is scheduling.

Legislator Niebel: Alright.

Mrs. Schuyler: There is administrative oversight that is required. I'm not allocating any local share time for myself, for Bree Aghett, for my assistant- anything that we have added to this program. If you are not comfortable with the \$20,000 for the top one I would be willing to cut down on that one, but Frank does give a lot of his time to this program and doing education for our hospitals, our nursing homes, our healthcare providers, our funeral directors- there's a lot involved-

Legislator Niebel: Understood.

Mrs. Schuyler: They have trainings to go to. We don't have an hourly rate. How do you pay somebody to go to required trainings if they don't have some type of a base salary. There is no way to pay them for that. You want to pay them like it's a case? That to me is crazy. Come in to meet with me for an hour and you get \$150? The old days it was \$80 a day, so if you go to meeting for an hour and they get \$80? I mean, honestly, I am trying to legitimize what we are doing with this program and do it fairly.

Legislator Gould: What are the arrangements if you have to transport somebody up to autopsy up un Erie County? Mileage, who gets that? Do you have to have somebody that is going to do that? Are the Coroners going to do that?

Mrs. Schuyler: Similar as what we have done with indigent burials. We went out for an RFP and it's an all-comers, so we have offered the rate. So, anyone who's capable of transporting the decedents will be transporting them from the scene to Erie County Medical Examiner's Office for their autopsy. There will no longer be any transports such as a death in Westfield and taking someone to Westfield Hospital to have blood drawn and charging the County \$300. That's not going to happen anymore. The only transports are going to be to the Medical Examiner's Office for an autopsy. None of that other stuff is going to go on anymore. That's what's specified by contract. Anyone who is transporting decedents will know be under contract with the County.

Legislator Gould: Do you have any takers?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: OK, we did talk about this before. Val came and Bree Agett and others. I'm not against the concept. I think, in the medical field especially, you have people on call, you have doctors on call. I'm familiar with those contracts and to have them available there has to be some sort of compensation because they are committing to be available during that time. So we, the Audit and Control, were looking for a recommendation. We all know the history. We had the \$80 per day, but you could have had one case, two cases, three cases, but you were only paid the \$80. Now, I think we made a very positive move going to a- instead of per day rate, going to per case. I also like the fixed base. What we are talking about is having a compensation fixed and then variable (*inaudible.*) I wanted- I know you didn't just pull numbers- I've known you long enough to know that you don't just pull numbers, you have a basis for your calculations. I just thought it was too big of a leap. Keeping the \$150 plus the salary. So, that's why we said we wanted a recommendation. So, this committee- we have a recommendation from the Human Services Committee. I'm willing to act on that recommendation, but I'm not willing to alter it any further because we're not the policy setter

here. It could be amended either on the floor- it's not my preferred way, but we all know from past- we do have occasionally, recently not, amendments on the floor. I'm willing to entertain this amendment, but not to go additionally above it because we (*inaudible*) get a recommendation from the Human Services Committee, which is where the recommendation needs to come from. Our job is to balance the budget- to make sure it's financially sound.

Mrs. Schuyler: I believe that decreasing that to \$20,000 actually is a decrease.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is the \$50,000-

Ms. Lis: Well, we-

Mrs. Schuyler: In the past, at \$80 a day which is the only thing we have history on, four Coroners were working close to 300 days- paid for close to 300 days per year-

Legislator Niebel: We budgeted \$80,000 for the Coroners-

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: Also, included in this are the Coroners Physicians, which we didn't have before.

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: And we took \$15,000 out of the contractual budget to account for the \$15.00 we were paying for random physicians to sign death certificates.

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Niebel: Understood.

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: We gave up a position and the associated costs in the Social Services side of my world to help to strengthen the Coroner Program. So, that's some of the economies of scale that again, we have put into this.

Ms. Lis: No one discussed this change with us. I don't know what they were thinking.

Mrs. Schuyler: No, I'm actually disappointed in Human Services. They didn't meet last night and they didn't call me.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. They did not meet.

Mrs. Schuyler: They didn't meet and no one contacted me to actually get more information. I'm really disappointed in my home Committee that it happened.

Mrs. Dennison: Christine is correct. We have \$99,500 is what's currently in the budget for Coroner's Compensation. If it's reduced by \$20,000-

Ms. Lis: Part of it is those medical examiners. It's not all Coroners-

Mrs. Schuyler: It's Coroner's Physicians that are in there-

Legislator Niebel: I understand.

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: That weren't considered-

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Niebel: But also, the cases decreased from 900 to 350. OK. So, there is a substantial decrease there, but we are offsetting it by the increase in some of these other things. Look, some of it I agree with, Christine. I don't disagree with having a professional Coroners Department. We need to do that, it's just a question of cost. I totally agree with Chuck. I think that the numbers that have been tossed out here as far as the stipend- way too high. Actually, to be honest with you, I would be more comfortable- boy I hate to, don't quote me on this, I would be more comfortable raising the per case amount and doing away with the stipends all together because that way the folks that are working will get- you will be paying them for working instead of not working.

Mrs. Schuyler: But they are on call-

Ms. Lis: There is a lot of other work besides going-

Legislator Niebel: I understand. They were on call before, Christine. The ones that we had before were on call. Some of them had full time jobs, some of them were funeral directors-

Ms. Lis: But they got paid per day, so they got paid for being on call-

Mrs. Schuyler: And before we took the program over it was increased to-

Legislator Niebel: And some of them had three or four cases a day, Val.

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: But, if you take \$80 per day that they were getting and before we took this program over it was increased to \$150 per case with the expectation on the part of the former Coroners that they were still going to be doing close to 1,000 cases a year. So, at \$150 per case-

(Cross-talk)

Chairman Chagnon: That was not their expectation.

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Niebel: We discussed with them a decrease in the case load and the things that *(inaudible)* that was discussed at the time we raised their per case amount to \$150.

Chairman Chagnon: That is correct.

Mrs. Schuyler: Which led to the resignation of one because he couldn't make any money.

Legislator Nazzaro: We had many discussions on this regarding why were our cases so high compared to other counties. Why are they going to nursing homes? Why are they going to routine Hospice? We had detailed discussions on that and then we got comparative numbers from other counties. Mostly, in other Counties I think the Coroners are elected in many of the counties. Which, I'm not going-I don't want to go that route- I want the record to- we had big discussions on that- on going to unnecessary cases.

Ms. Lis: There was work that wasn't completed. They weren't really doing all the things they needed to do.

Legislator Nazzaro: The issues I have with some of this too, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in the budget meetings that the- whatever we set- whatever is set as policy- whatever is set as salary structure is not geared to the people we currently have in there, it's geared to the program. I give you a lot of credit. You want to make this 100%, you took this over and want to make it professional. We need to improve the service and get the right people in there, but I just want to be careful that those are- and in any job, they should not be coming to us with what they want. We set the compensation and then people decide whether they want to fill that job, like any job. Whether it's the director of finance, an RN, whether it's your position- I don't want to be dictated that these salaries that these salaries are going to be like this-

Mrs. Schuyler: No one has done that.

Legislator Nazzaro: We set it and if they don't like it- I mean, this is the salary we set and what we can afford.

Mrs. Schuyler: I haven't had conversation with any of the Coroners about what a salary amount would be. This is from me.

Legislator Nazzaro: But I have received phone calls on this, so we will just leave it at that. I think we need to set it as a- what we can put in the budget and be done with it.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, so how would you like to proceed with the- and if I may continue, this relates to the second- the third and fourth line under increase appropriation accounts in the proposed resolutions. So, this relates to the personnel services and the employee benefits for the Medical Examiners and Coroners.

Mrs. Dennison: Would the contractual cost be affected at all by any changes in the compensation because we do have change- a decrease in the contractual appropriations-

Mrs. Schuyler: That's related to the Coroners Physicians and that's the addition in that base pay that was never seen in this program before under the point fours because the physicians that were signing death certificates (*inaudible*) contractual- the \$15 each, hence my phone call on a weekend a few weeks ago from a local hospital because they refused to fill out a death certificate because they never had to do that before.

Legislator Niebel: You set them straight?

Mrs. Schuyler: There is a whole lot of education that has to go along in order for that to be corrected because it's totally illegal and inappropriate for the way this program had been going on. I do firmly recall when I agreed to take on this program and we were going to do this the right way with Chairman Wendel, I said I can't guarantee you that it's going to be less expensive, but I can guarantee you that we are going to do it right. So, if you want to give up a certain amount within the point fours that have the discretion to use that and not set a certain rate for each Coroner, that is doable.

Mrs. Dennison: Well, you are saying that there is a decrease in- you're proposing a decrease in the contractual costs because the medical directors will be-

Ms. Lis: Will be signing them. I don't think we need to discuss that. I think that's fine the way that is.

Mrs. Schuyler: That's there. The costs for the Coroner Physician pay is now in the point fours. That was never seen in the point fours-

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: That's a large chunk of what you're seeing the total pay increase by is what we are now going to have to pay Coroners Physicians.

Legislator Niebel: Christine, look. I commend you and your staff for taking over this department and working with the Coroners. You've made some suggestions and recommendations to improve the program. My concern just has to do with the cost of the program. So, while I would prefer to see an increase in the per case thing and no stipends, if there is a recommendation to decrease the amount of the stipends to leave you guys some leeway as far as discretion as to how you are going to distribute the money to the Coroners; I could buy that. Look, this is- this would be just an action by the committee this year. If things don't work you can always come back next year and make another suggestion or make more proposals next year. OK?

Ms. Lis: So you're basically- what the recommendation is, is to cut the stipends in half? Is that what we are looking at?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: Well-

Ms. Lis: Do we need to go that far? That's pretty severe.

Chairman Chagnon: That's the recommendation that is in front of us-

Ms. Lis: That's taking the Coroners salaries lower than they were in the past.

Chairman Chagnon: Well- be careful, Val, because there are significantly lower cases.

Legislator Niebel: And the case is \$150. It's not \$80 per day.

Chairman Chagnon: It's not a salary.

Ms. Lis: I'm just looking budget to budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Budget to budget, yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: There are fewer cases but they are required to be on call the same amount of time and they are now required to do a lot more training and to do a lot more education. I'm requiring them to be an active member of the Forensic Investigation teams for the Sheriff and the State Police.

Chairman Chagnon: That's your discretion. We've given you that discretion. Steve, you had a comment?

Mr. Abdella: Well, just that procedurally I believe what you're debating today is how much to put in the budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Mr. Abdella: But if additional monies are going to be paid under some different formula then the amount per case- that will at least eventually need to be a separate resolution-

Mrs. Schuyler: Right.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. What we are talking about now is what to put in the budget. I appreciate that.

(Cross-talk)

Mr. Abdella: *(Inaudible)* rates that may be approved later, but they will need to be approved later before they can be implemented.

Chairman Chagnon: Right. That discussion should happen next with Human Services, probably at their November meeting once Christine and her staff has had a chance to figure out how they would deal with whatever changes are made to the budget.

Mrs. Schuyler: Thanks, Steve.

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Chairman, again, this has been a spirited conversation and we've come a long ways with the Coroners Program and we have a recommendation from the Human Services Committee and I agree that we need to take this in steps, not leaps, but I think we are making a lot of progress. So, Mr. Chairman, I am making a motion that we reduce by \$25,000 account A.1185- Personal Services – Medical Examiners and Coroners and it may also have the affect on the benefits, but I'm not sure what that is, but I'm making the motion to reduce it by \$25,000-

Legislator Niebel: The corresponding reduction on the point eight-

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: I'll second that.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, we have a motion and a second to amend the proposed resolution. Discussion on the amendment recommendation? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried to Amend

Chairman Chagnon: That now brings us to a discussion of the proposed resolution in total.

Mrs. Dennison: Mr. Chairman, would you like me to summarize these changes? I know we discussed them during the hearings-

Chairman Chagnon: The Committee might enjoy that because that took me about two hours last night to reconcile.

Mrs. Dennison: The bottom line effect is that these amendments result in a reduction in local share of \$433,945 and right now the resolution assumes that the savings would be a reduction in the tax levy.

Legislator Muldowney: Could you say that again?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. All of these changes- the net effect is a reduction in local share of \$433,945.

Chairman Chagnon: That's with the amendment?

Mrs. Dennison: That is before the amendment we just discussed. The resolution as written (*inaudible*) is the reduction of approximately \$434,000 and if that is used in its entirety to reduce the tax levy, that would reduce the tax levy as it states in the resolution to \$61,940,655. It would be a tax rate per thousand of \$8.38, which is a reduction of six cents from the current tax rate. Just to encapsulate the changes into the key areas, we discussed and the resolution proposes changes to what was previously called assigned council department and it will be renamed conflict administrator. Those changes result in a reduction in local share of \$86,846. There are several changes related the Sheriff's new grant that you heard about earlier, the grant from the traffic safety committee. It includes adding a deputy and increasing the revenue associated with that grant and that results in a reduction in local share of \$3,347. There are several changes related to the Planning and Economic Development Departments and that includes returning some revenues to the Occupancy Tax for use for programs rather than administration and removing that revenue source from the Planning and Economic Development Department. So, the net effect of those changes is an increase in local share of \$36,000. We reduced the transfer to capital by \$100,000 for the Board of Elections voting machines because it was found that those were expenses twice. So, the net effect related to the Board of Elections, including its fuel usage, is a reduction in local share of \$100,250. We reduced the safety net expenses on the advice of the Department of Health and Human Services and also reduced the corresponding revenue. The net effect of those changes is a reduction in local share of \$284,000. We removed revenue on timber sales so that there is no revenue coming from the capital project for timber sales and parks improvements. So, that's a reduction in revenue and in increase in local share of \$11,000. The final item is a combination of a lot of different personnel changes, including the

changes to the Coroners that were discussed, includes the removal of the memorandum of understanding for the Juvenile Services Team. It includes adding positions for Raise the Age and the associated revenue and it includes expansion of the Medical Director position. The net effect of all of those changes is a reduction in local share of \$6,502. As I said, those figures do not include the change we just discussed. And the only other comment that I would like to make is that we discussed briefly, as you recall during the hearings, that the savings that have been found instead of reducing the tax levy, an option is to reduce the use of the reserve because there are some rather aggressive use- not of the unassigned fund balance, but aggressive use of the D and the DM fund balances of the Capital Reserve. Also, use of the energy fund reserve and another option is to reduce the Tribal Compact revenue, which is also a little bit on the aggressive side.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you, Kathleen. Good summary. I like the way that you put things together there to show the net effect because there are lots of ins and outs.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Committee, what do you think?

Legislator Niebel: Kitty and Kathleen, with the changes that we just made, is it conceivable that the tax rate would decrease another one cent?

Mrs. Dennison: Let me make an estimate. I would estimate that the reduction-

Legislator Niebel: I'm just asking.

Mrs. Dennison: If I assume that the reduction in benefits is \$5,000, which is a little on the high side-

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Dennison: Let me put in a reduction of \$27,500. That would bring us to- it doesn't change the reduction. It was a reduction of 5.9 and now it's 6.2, so rounded it would still be a reduction of six cents.

Legislator Niebel: Understood.

Chairman Chagnon: So, we have a proposed resolution that has been amended. There's been some suggestions that we could consider some other uses of the reductions to the tentative budget, rather than *(inaudible)* a tax rate reduction. But, apparently the Committee is comfortable with where the proposed resolution stands.

Legislator Nazzaro: I do just want to make- I do agree- we have gone through a lot- I've gone through a lot of budgets, as well as the other members here. Any budget you're going to have some concerns and I think the ones you mentioned are very valid. However, I also see still the- hopefully the economy is moving still in the right direction. I think what had happened in 2018 with the sales tax and some of the other revenues; we've seen that upward trend. It's hard to predict some of these numbers, but I'm comfortable moving with the budget with- these amendments. As always, we will keep a watchful eye on anything that goes astray- you'll bring those to us and we will address those as needed during the 2019 year. I'm ready to move on this.

Chairman Chagnon: OK.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman, some of those numbers and some of those projections and especially the Tribal Contract, I agree are pretty aggressive. The projections and numbers that we have are based on the best information that the department heads and the best information that you folks in Finance have at this particular time, so I'm ready to go on those numbers for the time being and if we have to make adjustments in the near future, then we have to. I'm comfortable with what we have.

Chairman Chagnon: I would just like to make a comment on the record that first of all, I appreciate the fact that the Finance Department and in particular the Budget Director, in work with the County Executive and the Department Heads presented us with a very good tentative budget-excellent tentative budget. I'm also pleased that all those people were very helpful and cooperative with us on the Legislature looking for opportunities to improve on what was already an excellent tentative budget. So, I want to extend my personal appreciation for all the help and assistance that we were given because in my opinion, our work on this budget was easier than it has been in the past because of the help and cooperation that we were given. So, thank you. And with that, unless there are any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution as amended, all those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

Unanimously Carried as Amended

Discussion- Compliance Program Update- Debbie Zahn

Discussion – Investment Program Review – Kitty Crow

MOVED by Legislator Gould, SECONDED by Legislator Niebel to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (10:52 a.m.,)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Olivia L. Ames, Committee Secretary