

Minutes

Audit & Control Committee

November 15, 2018, 8:35 a.m., Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

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

Others: Ames, Dennison, Abdella, Crow, Cresanti, Gerace, Caflisch, Bentley, Barone, Walsh, Lis, Schuyler, Walsh, Narraway

*Chairman Chagnon called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.*

Approval of Minutes (10/05/18 & 10/18/18)

MOVED by Legislator Niebel, SECONDED by Legislator Gould

*Unanimously Carried*

---

Privilege of the Floor

*No one chose to speak at this time*

---

Tabled Resolution 229-18 – Acceptance of Funds from NYSDOT for the Hangar J Door Replacement Design and Construction Project at the Chautauqua County/Jamestown Airport

Legislator Gould: I will make a motion to bring this off the table.

Legislator Niebel: Second.

Chairman Chagnon: Discussion on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried to bring off the table*

Mr. Abdella: I'll just mention that procedurally this did go to the full Legislature and was tabled at the full Legislature, so technically this resolution is in the hands of the full Legislature at this point. It had been tabled in Committee, so I think it's worthwhile to have a discussion. I don't

know that you really need to take a vote because it is in the hands of the full Legislature at this point. It will be on the agenda for the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. I appreciate you bringing it to us again because this is the committee that tabled it.

Mr. Abdella: Yes. So, just to- I'll go ahead and speak to a few points. This was discussed in Public Facilities. With regard to the hangar door grant, we did approach the FBO operator and ask for a contribution relating to the local share. The current lease provides- we may have discussed this some last month that the operator would be responsible for the replacement and repair and maintenance of the door. It's not an obligation to replace when we decide we'd like to replace it, it would be an obligation to replace it if it can no longer be maintained.

This grant has come along and I think to clarify some of the discussion from couple days ago, this is not an FAA grant. In fact, FAA grants would not be available for this type of hangar door replacement. This is a State DOT grant which was related to me by Mr. Almeter yesterday. So, this grant and a similar grant for hangar improvements at the Dunkirk Airport have come down from the State and are frankly unusual and not really precedented as far as being a State only grant to assist in these facilities. I don't believe it's the case that if we pass on this grant that it's something that can simply be restarted in a year or two. I think we should view this as an opportunity that if we don't take it now it probably won't be there in the future. However, what was negotiated at this point with the FBO- as an alternative to them continuing to maintain the door, they're willing to contribute the local share but they would request that it be amortized over the remaining period of the lease which is eleven years. So, that is what was discussed and agreed to at this point as far as the negotiations go.

At Public Facilities a few days ago there was discussion about seeking a shorter amortization than the eleven years, but that's the background I will state at this point. I think from speaking to the County Executive, there's definitely a concern about not taking advantage of this grant for the long term. The County's the owner of this building and this is an opportunity to do a significant improvement to that building at relatively low cost. We really don't want to lose that opportunity to get the \$270,000 state share that would pay for a brand new door.

This is a hangar that would be intended to house planes from Boutique Air if that application for a restart of commercial airline service were to be successful. This hangar will be important for that. Brad, is there anything else you want to state at this point?

Mr. Bentley: Great explanation. I'll just add a couple things. In talking with Ron, like you said the New York State DOT has granted these kinds of unusual grants. We do have a couple more in the hopper, so if we- we've gained a lot of momentum and a lot of credibility with these grants and being able to perform the work. We have a couple more that we're applying for and I want to make sure that we don't stop our momentum either. I think it's important not to just look at the hangar door in the small bubble that it is, but to look at the broader picture of getting more money and more grants from New York State. I believe I heard Ron- we talked to the FBO about shortening the lease and I think they thought about it and I don't think they were willing to shorten that time frame. It wasn't within their business to be able to get that to work.

Mr. Abdella: It certainly is an option if it was desired to have a discussion about negotiation strategy as far as lease amendment that would be a subject that could be discussed in Executive Session.

Legislator Nazzaro: I won't get as excited in this meeting as I did in Public Facilities. There are two sides to this discussion. I agree it would be wise to replace the hangar door for future

marketing and to sustain the airport. You clarified- and as it puts in the resolution, it's New York State, it's not FAA. One concern I had, were we at risk because the FBO agreement- I just want to clarify. Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. The maintenance of the doors is the responsibility of the FBO, right?

Mr. Abdella: And it will continue to be.

Legislator Nazzaro: If it ever became determined that the door was just non-functional or just totally unsafe and could not be repaired anymore, under the current agreement, who's responsible for replacing the door?

Mr. Abdella: That would be the FBO.

Legislator Nazzaro: OK. So, that was my issue- was that we went around and around. Is it a repair or a replacement? It's a fine line.

Mr. Abdella: Right.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess to sum it up, I've thought about this and I'll support getting the door. I still feel the FBO has a responsibility under the agreement we have. The history here has not always been good. I would prefer that the repayment for the County share would be for a shorter period, such as three, maybe five years. As long as we have an agreement that he will pay for it over the remainder- at that point, if for some reason we don't get paid, that's another issue and we'd have a discussion then. I'll support getting the door.

Legislator Niebel: Just for clarification- the FBO is not willing to contribute anything toward the door?

Mr. Abdella: They would contribute the full local share but it would be spread out on a monthly basis over the remaining eleven years of the lease, not with any interest. So, it's the \$30,200- would be \$228 per month over the eleven years.

Legislator Niebel: How many years?

Mr. Abdella: Eleven years.

Legislator Gould: Instead of fixing it he's putting the fix money into the new door- basically is what he's doing instead of spending \$2,000-\$3,000 every year to fix it. He's putting it into a new door.

Legislator Niebel: The only other question- if we don't take- I understand that if we don't take the grant that it might not be available in the future, but could we take it and use it for anything else at the Jamestown Airport or the Dunkirk Airport if we don't use it for the hangar door?

Mr. Bentley: I believe at this point since we've applied to do a specific project and it's actually spelled out that it would be-

Legislator Niebel: Understood.

Legislator Muldowney: Any idea the life of the door? Is it a thirty year door?

Mr. Bentley: Good question. We have- if you think about the airport that's up there now and all the hangar doors, there's- I'm sure the published life would probably be in that timeframe of 20-30 years, but we know that things can be repaired if they're maintained property to go 40-50 years.

Legislator Muldowney: I guess why I'm asking is at the end of the lease in eleven years, we'll still have a relatively new door.

Mr. Bentley: If it lasts only eleven years I'll be shocked. I would expect it to last a lot longer if we do the proper maintenance and upkeep on it, which is what we would expect to happen.

Chairman Chagnon: I just have one question. I guess this is for you, Steve. I believe that the FBO lease arrangement at the Jamestown Airport is cancelable. What would the provisions of this agreement be if the lease is cancelled?

Mr. Abdella: If it was cancelled then that obligation would go away. It's not been negotiated that if he cancels early that he would have to pay for the entire remainder of the local share.

Mr. Bentley: But the expectation is if that FBO withdraws from the airport, we would obviously be looking to get another FBO and I would think those costs would be passed on to the new operator. That's a lot of if's.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. If I were king for a day I would wish that we had another arrangement, but we may be too late for that.

Legislator Nazzaro: I agree with you. This is a tough one. I think we are all thinking the same thing here.

Mr. Abdella: I think as far as the economics of the airport, which have been discussed, the more that- and this is really the County Executive's feelings- the more improvements we can make and take advantage of these grants it can put us in a better position to hopefully obtain more favorable terms down the road and interest in the airport on a number of levels. As far as FBO operations, the possibility at some point of having the FBO operations at both airports be able to be marketed as a single package.

Chairman Chagnon: Steve, I'll just clarify my earlier comment. I recognize the benefits in proceeding in the way that you're suggesting. My concerns are about some potential theoretical risks to the arrangement that you described. I'm not going to let that stand in the way of pursuing the benefits that could come to the county (*inaudible.*)

Legislator Nazzaro: One other follow up question- do we have strong enough language in the current agreement? Since you're doing an amendment to include this- if that door gets damaged, things happen- the FBO is responsible for repairing that door? Currently the FBO is responsible for it- I just want to make sure that we're protected since we're making a commitment to getting a new hangar door that the FBO is responsible for the proper maintenance of that door and in the case it gets damaged. I realize we own the hangar, but if I understand the agreement correctly he's responsible for the maintenance of the current door and I want to make sure he's responsible for the maintenance of the new door.

Mr. Abdella: He will be.

Legislator Nazzaro: OK.

Chairman Chagnon: Is there any other discussion? As the County Attorney indicated, there is no action required by this committee at this point because this will be going to the full Legislature for discussion. If there is no further discussion we will move on.

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget Appropriations–South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District (S&CCLSD)

Mr. Walsh: Good morning. I'm Tom Walsh, the Director of the South and Center Sewer District. I'm here to discuss appropriations increase in our point one- point eight and a decrease in point fours. At the public facilities meeting prior to this we had some discussion and we'll have some further description as to why we did this. I will give you all a little overview. In our 2018 budget prior to the year in 2017, we put the budget together. In 2018 we had a hire that was not appropriated in our budget and we also had some other movement within our employees. We hired another that was planned but the grades and insurance were not completely appropriated for. So, in further description from our public facilities meeting-

Legislator Nazzaro: We had a good meeting.

Mr. Walsh: It was a great meeting.

*(Cross-talk)*

Mr. Walsh: Kathleen has some descriptions as to where the benefits and the personal services come from- those calculations.

Mrs. Dennison: Well, as Tom indicated, we did review and approve a new hire earlier in the year for an operator. There have been some other changes that occurred during the year. So, just to provide some additional detail- the additional operator, his salary expenses for the year are approximately \$28,000. As you can see, we are proposing to increase appropriations \$45,000. The other changes that have happened is that there- as you know, there was 2% increase in the CSEA contract that was not budgeted. This particular department only has budgeted six people and those positions- six operators, not including the technicians. So, the operators- the positions have been filled for the whole year, so the 2% wage increase shows up. Other departments it doesn't show up as much because there may be vacancies. So, we have an additional operator for \$30,000, we have a 2% wage increase which is approximately \$6,000 of the change, one of the lab technicians was hired at a higher grade than expected. We were expecting to hire from outside the county and the person filling that position was a county employee and they were at a high step and that contributed to \$6,000 in additional wages. There were other changes in wellness benefits; on call pay- all of those changes we're estimating will require a \$45,000 increase in personal services.

Legislator Nazzaro: And just to piggy back on what Kathleen is saying, the word that kind of struck us in Public Facilities was new hire. So, we had a discussion and Steve was there. Thank you for breaking that out. We asked her to break out what was related to the new hire and I just made the comment that we would appreciate when there's an additional new expense like that that was not in the 2018 budget, that it would have come to our attention earlier because the new hire took place in March- just so- that's what we're trying to do. The other thing we talked about- the Legislature does not approve the FTE count. Steve pointed out we approve the budget- the dollar allocations to the point ones and the different categories. So, we just had that general discussion. So, we got the breakout so we know what that was. We just thought it would be a good practice that when there's a new position that we are made aware of sooner rather than later.

Legislator Niebel: So, the new hire is not to replace somebody? This is in addition to the existing-

Mr. Walsh: That is correct (*inaudible.*) There was a position on the roster that was not filled because it's a waste water operator. The gentleman actually worked for us for five years. We paid for his training, sent him to school and for family reasons he stepped away. Operators are very difficult to find these days. We have to invest in our own operators. It's a very difficult position to fill and when he was made available, we went through-

Legislator Niebel: OK, Tom. So, the addition of this new hire brings you up to six operators from the five that you had before?

Mr. Walsh: They're not all operators per say in 8130; they're just employees in that department.

Legislator Niebel: OK, but this is an additional employee and not a replacement?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. We discussed in Public Facilities when these requests come through they are evaluated by Human Resources, by me, and also the County Executive. I and the County Executive both approved the new hire- largely- we did approve the addition of the position because it's a hard to fill position and also because it's funded by user fees. Our estimation in March was that there would be- well, it's an enterprise fund so it doesn't contribute to local share, but it would be supported by user fees and that's why it was approved. Actually, the situation is maybe a little bit better than we thought in March because the resolution- we're not proposing to cover the additional cost by user fees, but from savings in contractual categories.

Legislator Niebel: If it's been approved by you Kathleen, I'm not even going to question it.

(*Cross-laughter*)

Chairman Niebel: And this was approved by the Sewer District board of directors?

Mr. Walsh: Correct.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. Just to give you a little more information on the benefits side- Legislator Nazzaro raised a good question about why are the benefits going up even more than the salary. Again, part of that is due to the additional position- approximately \$21,000, but a big hit to the budget is in a different position- the laboratory technician, the position that I mentioned was hired at a higher grade. That person also has the (*inaudible*) plan, the Family 3 health insurance, which is the most expensive health insurances that we offer. Since it was budgeted as a new position, those are typically not budgeted at Family 3. We take the midpoint and budget them at a two person policy. So, that position, the health insurance is more than \$10,000 in addition to budget. Again, since it's a small department any changes like that show up. The benefits break down into a portion for the new hire, a portion for different health insurance than expected, and when we have higher wages of course we have higher benefit expenses for payroll taxes and retirement. So, it's a combination of those three factors.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Other discussion? I would note for the record that we've just spent the last half hour clarifying discussion from the Public Facilities Committee meeting.

(*Cross-laughter*)

Chairman Chagnon: All those in favor of the proposed resolution please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget--North Chautauqua Water District

Mrs. Dennison: I see Clerk Tampio is not here, but that's OK-

Chairman Chagnon: She's celebrating the \$3 million grant that the County was awarded yesterday for North County Water District.

(*Cross-talk*)

Mrs. Dennison: Mrs. Tampio is much more familiar than I am with the actual operations and progress of the water district. We are proposing an amendment because the water district is functioning as of October 1<sup>st</sup> and when the 2018 budget was adopted and created, we did not include any operating revenues or expenses for the North County Water District. So, we are pleased that it is operating and that we have- or expect to have revenue and expenses in this year. So, we are establishing an appropriations account which the district will use to pay the City of Dunkirk for the water it receives from the City and a revenue account because the district is receiving revenue from different municipalities that are utilizing the water.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Discussion? Questions?

Mrs. Dennison: I would like to add one comment which we've talked about in Public Facilities just so it's on the record. There will be some debt service expense in 2018. At this point, we are not including an appropriation of the debt service category because we just don't have a good enough idea of how the whole financing of debt service will play out. So, we expect

that there will be a small amount of expense in that category or classification by the end of the year. The idea is that we will do a budget amendment at year end when we know what those expenses are. We are confident that the district in setting its rates it has included an allowance for purchase of water, but also operating and maintenance expenses and debt service. It's probable that some of this \$214,000 will be reallocated to debt service at the end of the year.

Legislator Nazzaro: Originally, just for clarification, it was created originally as a capital project. Then we did resolution 107-18 and said no, it should be operating. Now, what we're saying is no, it should really-

Mrs. Dennison: No, you're skipping ahead. You're one resolution ahead.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Nazzaro: OK, sorry. Please continue.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? All those in favor of the proposed resolution please say aye? Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget for Landfill Gas Well Maintenance

Mrs. Dennison: Legislator Nazzaro set the stage for this one-

*(Cross-laughter)*

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution to modify accounts for the Landfill gas well maintenance is in general a reversal of resolution 107-18. In April we were under the opinion that we needed to pay for gas well maintenance out of operating funds, so we took money out of the reserve for gas well maintenance and created an operating account for these expenditures. Upon further review, it is the opinion of Todd Button that this should be capital expenditures and that is in general how they've been treated in the past. We are essentially reversing resolution 107-18, taking money out of the operating accounts, returning it to the reserve for gas well maintenance and augmenting the capital project for phase four construction. There is an item- an alternative is I think what it's called- in the bid for the phase four construction there is the bid for the construction itself, there is an add on for gas well maintenance and that add on amount from the contractor is \$380,893. So, the proposal is to augment that capital project and expend the funds from the capital project instead of the operating budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: And there is \$975,000 in reserve?

Mrs. Dennison: That is correct. There was a question raised by Mr. Gould- what do we spend the money on?

Legislator Gould: From the fund balance- for the methane fund balance.

Mrs. Dennison: Well the fund balance from the reserve for the gas well maintenance is \$975,000-

Legislator Gould: Right.

Mrs. Dennison: There is also question about what do we spend the money on. I did get a response from Director Panteli and he said that- he explained that the gas well collection system has to be extended whenever we have new sells. So, we're making a new sell for more garbage and we have to extend the gas collection system. He also explained that the system needs to be extended whether you're using the gas for power generation, which we have been attempting to do, or whether we're using it for a renewable gas program. So, more garbage, more infrastructure for gas collection. That is my interpretation-

Legislator Gould: That's a lot of gas lines for \$975,000.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. It has been the practice of the County to set aside funds for expansion of the gas lines as we expand-

Legislator Gould: I knew that, I just wondered if there was anything else. Did he say anything else?

Mrs. Dennison: He did not.

Legislator Gould: I'll ask him when I see him.

Mrs. Dennison: His email says that it's an integral expense of landfill operations whether you collect gas for power generation or renewable gas.

Legislator Gould: Fairly cheap gas lines though. They're not very deep.

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

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Quit Claim Deeds

Mrs. Dennison: Director Caflich could not be here today, so he asked me to speak on his behalf. As you can see, we have one parcel and the offer amount is more than the taxes owed.

Chairman Chagnon: I regret that Mr. Caflich isn't here this morning because it strikes me that perhaps we have the offer amount and the taxes owing reversed. In looking at the Chautauqua County Real Property Tax Services website, it indicates the delinquent taxes on this parcel are \$3,542.91.

Mrs. Dennison: Well, he-

Ms. Crow: I'm texting him right now. He said if he was needed he could come up.

Chairman Chagnon: The assessed value of the property is \$34,000. It strikes me that those two numbers may have been reversed on this proposed resolution.

Mrs. Dennison: Would you like to skip over these two resolutions if he is able to come-

Chairman Chagnon: We will leave that one aside for the moment since he is coming. We will also skip the resolution regarding the distribution of mortgage tax since we may want to discuss that with him as well. We will go on to the next resolution.

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget for SNAP High Performance Bonus Award Allocation

Ms. Lis: We have received a new grant from the State to be used for equipment and personal services under SNAP. We've been trying for some other grants over the last couple of years which we didn't get for self-service kiosks and some appointment reminder software. Those are the items we're going to purchase under this grant and then we will also apply some personal services and fringes toward it. The way this grant works is SNAP is reimbursed at 50% in the first place, so this will reimburse the other 50%. So, we needed to add the appropriation for the equipment because we hadn't budgeted for that until we knew about this grant. We don't need to add additional expenditures for payroll because that's already there. So, it decreased the use of fund balance by nearly \$52,000.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Val, I noticed that in the first WHEREAS clause it indicates that the award allocation is \$72,042, yet we're increasing revenue by \$92,088?

Ms. Lis: Because we are going to get that 50% from the federal government on the equipment and that's not part of this grant. That's a new expenditure. So, we bring in the expenditure, half of that will be paid for by the federal government and half will be paid for by this grant.

Chairman Chagnon: Got it. That makes sense. My second question was this is a grant award for the period of April 1, 2018- September 30, 2019? We're going to include the entire amount of the grant award in the 2018 budget?

Ms. Lis: I do know that we are about to order the equipment, so the equipment will be in the 2018 budget. Some of the payroll may be. We are still trying to figure out how we will allocate that. If it carries over into 2019 it will be a positive towards 2019. Once again, that payroll is already budgeted and we will just bring more revenue in. There may be a carry over and there may be a resolution to do so next year.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. You would bring that as an amendment to the 2019 budget?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Other questions?

Mrs. Schuyler: Realizing that it's now November and the State likes to put this back to April 1.

Chairman Chagnon: Sure. Any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget Appropriations and Revenues Associated  
With Juvenile Services Team (JST)

Mrs. Schuyler: We had applied to the State for a memorandum of understanding between Health and Human Services as a local social services district and the Department of Probation for our Juvenile Services Team, PINS Diversion and preventative work. The MOU was not approved by the State, so the reimbursement that we had put into the 2018 budget will not be realized.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. My question is why wasn't it approved by the State?

Mrs. Schuyler: The State had sent it back with some issues that they had cited on there. Some of the fiscal questions they had, Val was able to answer. Then there were other issues with who was the lead agency on PINS Diversion. There are certain requirements that have to be met in order for the State to fund Probation doing what is really considered diversion work.

Ms. Lis: We would have had to change the lead agency for that.

Chairman Chagnon: Why didn't we do that? Did I ask a bad question?

Mr. Narraway: My understanding is that whatever the State agency is- their regulations and that is established in the State plan which is put together yearly. I believe we attempted to try to switch it and we're not allowed to do it that quickly.

Mrs. Schuyler: They would have worked with us to change the lead, but we also have to meet all the requirements including opening cases, documentation and other requirements that put added burden onto the probation officers in order to fulfill the requirements that the State came back on us with for the MOU.

Ms. Lis: There also was a time limitation to get all that done. We're never going to actually be able to start doing the work and generate the revenue by the time we get that all put through the State.

Chairman Chagnon: For 2018?

Mrs. Schuyler: For 2018.

Chairman Chagnon: So, we're going to pursue this further for 2019?

Mrs. Schuyler: We've been meaning to discuss our plan moving forward for PINS Diversion and what both myself and Tom and his staff have discussed and talked about are some other options. One of them is changing the lead to Social Services and our staff taking over actually doing to the PINS Diversion work and preventative services work instead of the probation officers. They will then be working on the Raise the Age fun stuff that's come down from the State since October 1. Go ahead and elaborate because I don't want to talk for your staff.

Chairman Chagnon: My understanding is that other counties in the State have implemented such an arrangement. Is that an accurate perception?

Mrs. Schuyler: It varies across the State on how PINS Diversion is handled. Some counties the lead agency is Social Services and some it's Probation. It varies county to county, however each county decides to do this.

Chairman Chagnon: What strikes me is that we- in 2018, missed out on over \$200,000 of revenue. Val, I appreciate you bringing it to us at this point because it's not going to happen in 2018. We need a budget amendment, but it concerns me that we're just going to- the perception was when I first read this that we're just going to turn our backs on that revenue. So, I'm hopeful that we will continue to pursue an opportunity to get State assistance for this to get that revenue-

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, underneath Health and Human Services for child welfare, we do get that revenue. We get about 65% reimbursement for our preventative work for child welfare-

Ms. Lis: We'll be doing it ourselves and-

Mrs. Schuyler: We naturally get that as part of our budget where probation doesn't get that as part of their budget without this sort of an MOU, but they will be receiving the 100% reimbursement of Raise the Age costs, hopefully.

Chairman Chagnon: Then I'm confused. Why are we increasing the use of fund balance if we normally get the money anyway?

Mrs. Schuyler: We would get the money for child welfare staff, not for probation staff. The way the budget was changed- go ahead, Kathleen-

Ms. Lis: The work has to move and that will take some time, so that won't happen until next year.

Mrs. Dennison: The 2018 budget included a new revenue stream for the Probation Department. The revenue stream was based on the assumption that this MOU and this new program was doable. So, that money was put into the 2018 budget and it was kind of parked, if you will, in probation because at the time this idea was proposed we didn't know all the implementation mechanisms. We understand- the assumption was that OK, we should be able to generate this amount of money from two programs. We added the money to the Probation

Department. In April, when we had a little better understanding of how the program would be implemented that's when we moved the personnel into Social Services, moved the revenue into Social Services. In finding that the MOU was not approved- essentially it's moving the people back to probation and taking out that revenue that was added.

Chairman Chagnon: Kathleen, you used the words that I would have used in describing this as additional revenue that we included in the 2018 budget. Now I'm hearing that it's not an opportunity for 2019? For that additional revenue?

Ms. Lis: The work is going to move from Probation to DHHS. So, those people will be our people doing that work and we will get that money from them. We're hoping to do that with our current staff so we're not adding people. So, we are giving those probation people back to probation to do other work, which will probably be Raise the Age and taking the work on ourselves. There will be no need for an agreement, but the point was to bring in revenue for the County as a whole by using probation officers and- they were already doing the work, but bringing the work under us so we could claim it and get revenue on it and that wasn't going to work that way so we are going it ourselves.

Mr. Narraway: This is an arrangement that historically, we did up until 2014 when the State put out new rules and clarifications of the rules. At that point we stopped doing it because we didn't think we were able to comply. We attempted to find a way to apply for 2018 and they rejected it.

Chairman Chagnon: So, the opportunity was to get additional revenue if the probation staff did the work?

*(Cross-talk)*

Mr. Narraway: DHHS would have to be the lead agency for PIN's and they were not.

Chairman Chagnon: The intent was that probation staff would do the work and we would be eligible for additional revenue.

Mr. Narraway: Correct.

Chairman Chagnon: And now, the work is going to be done by DHHS staff and we will not be eligible for that additional revenue?

Legislator Niebel: But you do get state and federal reimbursement which will offset the grant?

Mrs. Schuyler: The PINS Diversion work has been done by probation. Up until 2014, Social Services was the lead agency.

Mr. Narraway: No.

Mrs. Schuyler: No?

Mr. Narraway: No, we were always the lead agency.

Mrs. Schuyler: No, on the old plans I found it was Social Services- on the old stuff I found from Linda Shields days- on some of it, anyways. There are certain things- so, juvenile probation officers have been doing this PINS Diversion work. That's part of what their charge has been. There was opportunity to gain additional reimbursement through the child welfare system if Social Services was the lead agency and if the probation staff were able to meet the other requirements that OCFS says you have to do in order to get this money. We were not able to come to an understanding and an agreement on all of that in conjunction with the State and that's why this was not approved.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman- folks, just for clarification- you're applying for this grant-

Mrs. Schuyler: It's not a grant.

Ms. Lis: It's a cooperative agreement that needed to be approved by the State.

Mrs. Schuyler: In order for child welfare reimbursement- we get as child welfare. We get about 65% reimbursement of salary and fringe for child welfare work under-

Legislator Niebel: OK. So, cooperative agreement for which there is reimbursement?

Ms. Lis: Right. So, that's how we-

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes. (*Inaudible*) allowed to have reimbursement of probation staff, similar to what we do with the Sheriff's Office for security, for fraud investigations, with the District Attorney's Office for fraud investigations, with the Veteran's Service agency- we fund half of their staff under Medicaid administrative dollars, but any agreement like that- like the new one that we're proposing with Emergency Services. Anything that we do has to have a cooperative agreement approved by the State.

Legislator Niebel: OK. Christine and Val, I guess my question to you folks- we have to have this cooperative agreement. OK. I assume we have guidelines that come down from the State that tell us how to do the cooperative agreement?

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: So, we make probation the lead agency- the cooperative agreement is not approved because we've made Probation the lead agency when it should have been Social Services? Is that the bottom line?

Mrs. Schuyler: It's part of it.

Mr. Narraway: It could be either agency. It varies depending on the county who the lead agency is on that.

Legislator Niebel: OK, but the cooperative agreement was not approved by the State because why? Because you were the lead agency?

Mr. Narraway: And they required DHHS to be the lead.

Legislator Niebel: Wouldn't that have been in the guidelines?

Ms. Lis: There are no guidelines that specific. Each program when it gets to the State, they will look for certain things.

Legislator Niebel: We're applying for a cooperative agreement and we don't know who the lead agency should be?

Mrs. Schuyler: The lead agency could be changed to conform with what the State required-

Legislator Niebel: Why couldn't we change it to Social Services and get it approved?

Mrs. Schuyler: Because there were other requirements that also have to be met.

Legislator Niebel: We didn't meet those?

Mrs. Schuyler: No, we couldn't come to an agreement on being able to meet all the other requirements that were the conditions the State sends out in order to-

Legislator Niebel: Could you just give me one or two? The requirements that we'd have to meet?

Mrs. Schuyler: Again, I don't want to speak for Tom's staff. Tom and I have met several times-

Legislator Niebel: That's OK. Just in general.

Mrs. Schuyler: Some of the requirements the State has set forth in addition to Social Services being the lead, any probation staff that are working with these kids and doing this sort of work- they have to open all of those cases in our connections, which is the child welfare documentation system and they have to do all the documentation within that system. At the same time, they still have to do their documentation in the probation system, so they are doing double documentation.

Legislator Niebel: And we couldn't meet that requirement?

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Mr. Narraway: My staff is essentially- you've heard my spiel. We've got too many cases and not enough probation officers. Adding work to their list is really unfair and unreasonable.

Legislator Niebel: Alright-

Ms. Lis: We also have to keep in mind the time situation. We didn't have time to fix it and actually start doing it. At a certain point you just could not get it going in time to realize that revenue.

Chairman Chagnon: For 2018-

Mrs. Schuyler: Once it got so late into the 2018 year-

Ms. Lis: Because it took them several months for them to come back to us with those requirements.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'll try to be brief. When did you say you were notified that this was not approved?

Ms. Lis: It was September, maybe. I'm not sure.

Legislator Nazzaro: So fairly recent?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: The timing of this- had we had this type of agreement before?

Ms. Lis: Years ago.

Legislator Nazzaro: Not recently-

Ms. Lis: We tried to revive that.

Legislator Nazzaro: For the 2019 budget, was there any revenue streams for this same cooperative agreement?

Mrs. Schuyler: We took it out.

Legislator Nazzaro: We won't be having an adjustment coming through?

Ms. Lis: Right.

Legislator Nazzaro: And then what I'm sort of hearing is that in 2019 we will be- because now this comes under DHHS- we will be reimbursement the normal 65%?

Mrs. Schuyler: 62-65%.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's not 100% loss. It's going to be a timing issue. My other question is there anything you can do operationally? So, when the next go around where we could get this money- or is this not going to be something you pursue again?

Mrs. Schuyler: The PINS program, the preventative work the juvenile probation officers have been doing in conjunction with our child welfare staff is not going to happen that way anymore. So, Social Services staff are taking over. We're going to transition taking over the PINS Diversion work which is preventative work with high risk juveniles that are at risk for placement into the child welfare juvenile justice system. Keeping kids out of those OCFS facilities that cost us so much money and keeping them out of the State system, that's PINS Diversion work.

Legislator Nazzaro: And you're going to be the lead agency now?

Mrs. Schuyler: We're going to be lead agency. We will be doing all that diversion and preventative work ourselves. Probation won't get involved unless we have to actually go to court-

file charges and then we go the JD route or adolescent offender, or whatever we are going to call these things now.

Ms. Lis: We're freeing up some of the probation officers time. They can be attending to the Raise the Age issues.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know this sounds really complicated. Part of the reason it was denied was because we had the wrong lead agency.

Mr. Narraway: I'm not sure it's wrong, it's just-

Legislator Nazzaro: According to them.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Nazzaro: By switching this over- I understand your work. I appreciate it. I'm just saying that by passing it to you to be the lead we're still not going to qualify for any money under this agreement in the future.

Ms. Lis: Because we won't need an agreement because we'll be doing the work ourselves.

Mrs. Schuyler: Probation officers will no longer being doing the PINS Diversion work.

Legislator Nazzaro: We're sort of still leaving money on the table because- in the overall budget because you're getting reimbursed not 100%. You're getting reimbursed 62-65%. I just want to make sure we're not leaving an opportunity in the future. What's happened has happened- that we're not leaving an opportunity- I can't answer that because I'm not- is there any way we can get this money in the future? I see all the head shakes-

Ms. Lis: It's the same money. It's the same money, we just won't have a cooperative agreement because we're not having probation officers, we're going to do it. It's the same money we're going for. Now-

Mrs. Schuyler: It's not a grant. It's our typical- every staff member in our department gets some sort of reimbursement. So, we're very fortunate. Child welfare is actually quite generous reimbursement. We can't claim probation staff unless they're doing the PINS Diversion and doing it the way that the State says they need to do it. Since Tom needs- was going to add staff for Raise the Age, this negates the need for that to happen. He'll now be able to use the juvenile probation officers that were doing PINS Diversion work for the Raise the Age work.

*(Cross-talk)*

Ms. Lis: That's where I was trying to head-

Mrs. Schuyler: My understanding of Tom's plan moving forward is he's not going to need to add juvenile probation officers for Raise the Age, which the State says we'll be reimbursed at 100%-

Mr. Narraway: Depending on the number of incoming –

Mrs. Schuyler: So, he's counting on the reimbursement for those juvenile probation officers who are right now doing PINS Diversion work, but will not be doing so in 2019.

Chairman Chagnon: Because this is starting to come into clarity for me- so, our intent in 2018 was to have the probation staff do some work and we would get additional \$200,000 revenue to the County for that work. Now, we're not going to do that. Now, that work is going to be done by the DHHS staff at no additional expense to the County and I'm assuming that since there's no additional expense, there's no additional revenue that would come with it.

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct, unless we need to add another staff member or something. We're trying very hard to do it through attrition and not add FTE's, just to be able to shift the way that we do things.

Chairman Chagnon: Right, which leads me to the question- understanding that the probation staff is stretched very thin already, if we were able to add staff to probation could we still get the \$200,000 revenue in 2019 and still have a financial benefit to the County?

Ms. Lis: The benefit here is that we're freeing up probation officers to do other work for which they will be reimbursed at 100% and also to do other work because they're so stretched. They won't have to hire so many people as they thought for raise the age. That's the benefit. The revenue will not exist. That revenue is only because we were finding revenue on people who did generate DHHS revenue before by bringing them in with the cooperative agreement.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, so if we were to hire additional probation staff that currently doesn't exist and doesn't generate revenue for probation, wouldn't they be eligible for this funding?

Ms. Lis: But it's only 65%, so you'd have a net expense.

Mrs. Schuyler: And they still would have to comply with all the rules and regulations that the State says has to be done in order to get-

Ms. Lis: With the duplicate documentation and all of that extra work.

Chairman Chagnon: I understand and that's why I was- my question was additional staff.

Mr. Narraway: The savings comes from if DHHS is able to do all the PINS work without adding staff, our staff that we have currently doing that work will slide into Raise the Age and their positions will be reimbursed by the State through the Raise the Age.

Chairman Chagnon: 100%

Mr. Narraway: Yes, so that's where the savings-

Chairman Chagnon: And that is reflected- that scenario is reflected in the 2019 budget?

Mr. Narraway: The positions that we anticipate needing are budgeted in 2019.

Chairman Chagnon: And the revenue- the reimbursement of 100% is reflected as well?

Mr. Narraway: Yes.

Ms. Lis: So, we're taking those gentleman- or ladies, and they're going to be reimbursement at 100% rather than this deal that we were going to have at 65%.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Jay, you have a question?

Legislator Gould: Yeah, I want to change the subject and ask about the fund balance. What's left in that?

Mrs. Dennison: I have been tracking adjustments to the fund balance. We have- right now, with the items that I've tracked right now we are in the deficit about \$1.7 million. I would add to that that I track the deficits more closely than the surpluses- meaning that we know about the bad things that happen. There are a lot of revenue sources that we cannot track as closely and some of the surplus items- I would say that we don't know them as readily. Right now, the picture is negative.

Legislator Gould: Gloomy.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, but I would say that- I'm not going to say that it's a beautiful picture, but I would say that the gloomy picture may have some items that are missing that make it look worse than it may be. You are correct that definitely there are some- there have been some negative developments.

Legislator Gould: Right. We seem to be into that pretty heavy.

Mrs. Dennison: I share your concern on that.

Legislator Niebel: We've had these cooperative agreements with the State in the past. So, we've utilized or designated social services as the lead agency in the past?

Mrs. Schuyler: It has been done in the past.

Legislator Niebel: OK.

Mrs. Schuyler: In 2014 the State came out and in writing clarified certain things that needed to be in place for child welfare dollars to be used to reimburse your Sheriff's Office, your Probation Office, District Attorney's Office, Child Advocacy teams, things that have to be in place for that to happen.

Legislator Niebel: Christine, I guess my question is if we designated social services as the lead agency for these cooperative agreements in the past, why did we designate probation this time?

Ms. Lis: It's not on the cooperative agreement; it's on the plan- the child welfare plan.

Mrs. Schuyler: Honestly, those questions need to go to Tom because Probation has been the one doing- in charge of the PINS Diversion work.

Mr. Narraway: It's my understanding, and I'll have to look as well, that we've been the lead agency for a considerable amount of time on this and DHHS has not.

Legislator Niebel: OK-

Ms. Lis: The structure was different in the past. There was an interdisciplinary team that was funded-

Mrs. Schuyler: No, the team is the same. In the past, the State didn't come out and really make probation open cases, make them document into the connections child welfare system and do all of these additional work duties in order to get the reimbursement. They clarified that and basically clamped down on all of that right around 2014 when we got that letter. Again, I don't want to speak for Tom and his staff. That's a decision that they've made on what work load they're able to handle. Opening cases in connections and having to document in connections is additional work for his staff in order to get the reimbursement.

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

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Quit Claim Deeds

Mr. Caflisch: Good morning.

Chairman Chagnon: The question that I posed, Jim, it appeared to me that the numbers were reversed?

Mr. Caflisch: That is correct. They were.

Chairman Chagnon: So, the taxes owing are \$3,513.73 and the offer amount is \$350.00?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes, it was just an error.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, we would need a motion to amend this proposed resolution.

Legislator Muldowney: I'll make that motion.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'll second.

Chairman Chagnon: Discussion on the motion to amend the proposed resolution?

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to commend you because the numbers were presented, you took the initiative to go on the website and look at this and you caught the reversal. I think that shows the amount of work and dedication you put into this. I would hope that if you hadn't done that, the correction would have been brought to us previously. Since Mr. Caflisch was not here I'm a little concerned about that, that you caught it and the office should have caught it. Were you aware of this before it was brought to your attention?

Mr. Caflisch: I really wasn't because when it's prepared I signed it through- I looked at it quick and I just missed that.

Legislator Nazzaro: Errors happen.

Mr. Caflisch: It wouldn't have affected the transaction. The record would have had the numbers reversed here, but in our office, the transaction itself would have occurred correctly. This shows that everyone can check taxes owing and it's not that hard to do.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions?

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Caflisch, this was prepared by your staff?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: But nobody checked it?

Mr. Caflisch: Well, when it comes to me- it goes from staff member right to me and when I signed it through, I didn't-

Legislator Niebel: The staff doesn't check it? Just one person prepares this?

Mr. Caflisch: Just one person prepares this.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Other questions or comments on the motion to amend? All in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried to Amend the Resolution*

Chairman Chagnon: The proposed resolution is amended. Now, discussion on the proposed resolution as amended? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried as Amended*

Proposed Resolution- Distribution of Mortgage Taxes

Mr. Caflisch: Normal distribution- I receive all the information from the County Clerk's Office and then I prepare the resolution to put the numbers in.

Chairman Chagnon: Discussion?

Legislator Gould: Up or down?

Mr. Caflisch: I don't track- Kathleen would be the one to ask. I don't track it because-

Chairman Chagnon: I can answer. Compared to last year in the same time period, it's down 9.7%.

Legislator Gould: Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: My question was- any general feeling about that? I understand that it is not necessarily something that comes to your attention.

Mr. Caflisch: No, the only thing I can relate to Real Property a little bit is I think mortgage refinancing is down just a little bit. Interest rates have jumped a little bit, so that's probably the reason. That's all I can offer at this point. There are no particular trends-

Ms. Crow: The actual revenue is down that percentage, or compared to the percentage of budget?

Chairman Chagnon: Revenues are down compared to the same time period in 2017- 9.7% down.

Mr. Caflisch: Did you look at the previous- what we did in May- the May resolution?

Chairman Chagnon: No, I did not.

Mr. Caflisch: OK. I was comparing it on a year to year basis- because the mortgage tax straddles the year from October 1<sup>st</sup> to April 30<sup>th</sup>, that's an issue and I don't know how it's accounted for.

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

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget for Office of the Sheriff

Sheriff Gerace: Good morning. Mr. Chair, this is a budget neutral modification. We've had a couple of changes that we need to adjust the budget accordingly for. One was in 911 contractual and the other was employee benefits in Pistol Permit. We're making that adjustment from our 3110.0 account.

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

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Agreement with Cattaraugus County for  
Inmate Housing

Sheriff Gerace: Mr. Chairman, we've had a long standing agreement with Cattaraugus County for them to house our inmates when necessary. This is a reciprocal agreement so we can

house theirs if necessary. It's very infrequently this happens, but we want to have the ability to do that for them.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Legislator Gould: We didn't have this in the past?

Sheriff Gerace: I don't believe we did. A lot of times, if it's a short term or short duration we would just house them without agreement because they've done the same thing. We're in a better situation right now from a population perspective and they may need to move inmates into our facility.

Chairman Chagnon: That's good news. Any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye? Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Agreement with Brocton Central School District for  
School Resource Officer

Sheriff Gerace: Mr. Chairman, as other schools have done, Brocton is interested in securing a school resource officer. We'll use the same price and formula that we have for the other schools.

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

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution of Lease Agreement with Federal Bureau of  
Investigation for Tower Space

Sheriff Gerace: Mr. Chair, this is a long standing agreement that we've had with the FBI. They're on our Ellery tower and they're looking to extend the terms of their agreement. The only difference in past agreements is we've agreed to freeze the escalator clause because we've kind of peaked out (*inaudible*) the amount being charged to the FBI.

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

*Unanimously Carried*

Chairman Chagnon: While the Sheriff is here, we've had a request to renew and amend a previous resolution- Resolution 193-18 which I believe is on your desks this morning.

Sheriff Gerace: Resolution 193-18 established the lease with Windstream. When they returned their documents to us there were a couple of changes. One was the length of time and the other was the amount, which is less. We felt it was important to have that resolution modified to reflect the change.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Maybe I'm confused but Olivia gave me a marked up version and stated that a motion was made in Public Safety to direct the Clerk of the Legislature to put this on the agenda for the full Legislature to renew and amend. The proposed amendments are shown and it's different from the handwritten numbers that you just presented. The total that you indicated is \$36,150 and the document that Olivia gave me from the Public Safety committee is \$35,500.

Legislator Nazzaro: Someone just added it wrong.

*(Cross-talk)*

Chairman Chagnon: So, what is the total over the term amount?

Ms. Cresanti: The \$36,150 is the correct amount.

Chairman Chagnon: OK-

Ms. Cresanti: It's a \$650 difference.

Chairman Chagnon: So, Public Safety didn't take any action on this except asking that this be directed to the full Legislature. We need to make sure that the correct amount goes to the Legislature for consideration, which is a total over the term of \$36,150.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's just an addition mistake. The individual numbers are correct before they are added together.

Chairman Chagnon: Yes. The correct amount is \$36,150.

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Niebel: This is coming about because of the delay in the contract from September to October?

Ms. Cresanti: Basically. This lease has been hashed out over probably the last couple of years, from what I understand. It's changed numerous times in the course of that couple of years. In all the changes that were made, the last draft contract that was provided to us by Windstream the introductory paragraph that verbalized the term did not match the graph that they provided, which we copied and used in the resolution. The graph was wrong. After discussing with Windstream, they noted that the verbally spelled out one was correct. They updated the graph and updated the contract and now we are changing the resolution to match.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this lease does include all utilities.

Ms. Cresanti: Yes, everything else remains the same.

Chairman Chagnon: So, with the minor modifications proposed to the resolution we would be asking the Legislature to renew and amend Resolution 193-18. So, my question is what action do we need to take this morning to accomplish that?

*(Cross-talk)*

Ms. Ames: Kathy suggested that you make a motion for the Clerk of the Legislature to put it on the agenda for the full Legislature and it will be renewed and amended there.

Legislator Gould: I'll make that motion.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you.

Legislator Muldowney: I'll second.

Chairman Chagnon: Discussion on the motion? All in favor please say aye? Opposed?

*Motion is Unanimously Carried*

Discussion- Occupancy Tax/Airbnb- Kitty Crow

Other- Motion to Extend Freed Maxick Agreement of Service- Re: Internal Audit

Chairman Chagnon: This motion is being requested by the Clerk of the Legislature to extend Freed Maxick Agreement of Services regarding the internal audit to 12/31/2019 because some of the services that they are providing will carry over from 2018 into 2019.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'll make that motion, Mr. Chairman. In the budget we did put in \$100,000 in the 2019 budget because this was not- at least right now, not just a one year engagement. So, the money is in the budget to extend the agreement through-

Chairman Chagnon: I would just clarify that- I believe we would encumber 2018 budget funds for this.

Mrs. Dennison: I was going to raise the question that (*inaudible*) the extension is at additional cost or is it part of the work that's already been contracted?

Ms. Crow: Well, a couple of things- we don't normally- because it's a contract, if it was a purchase order it would automatically be encumbered. A contract we would not automatically encumber. So, whatever we haven't expended against that contract, we would need to amend the budget to add that to next year's budget.

Chairman Chagnon: OK.

Ms. Crow: I don't think that we can technically- we might be able to accrue for it. If we can, we can accrue for it. That will be in this year's budget, but since the services haven't been performed yet we wouldn't necessarily accrue for something that work hasn't been done yet.

Legislator Nazzaro: But you have a contract saying –

Ms. Crow: I think we may be able to- because of that be able to accrue it. If you're going to go through the process of amending the existing agreement to extend the time period, I would recommend that you also amend the contract to also include the 2019 funding. Otherwise, you'll have to do the amendment process again sometime next year.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Our agreement in the budget discussions was that we wanted to put money in the budget for 2019 to do this again, but we weren't ready to make the decision that that was appropriate until we saw the results of the 2018 report. So, at this point my feeling is we're not ready to amend the contract for them to do additional work in 2019. What we're doing is amending the contract to say the work that we anticipated being done in 2018, is now going to carry over into 2019.

Ms. Crow: OK, that's fine.

Chairman Chagnon: And then once we've got that report for that activity, then we have to make a decision whether we want them to take on additional work that we put money in the 2019 budget for.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just for my clarification- on the agreement we currently have with Freed Maxick to provide this work, doesn't that- we have a contract to perform certain functions.

Ms. Crow: That ends at the end of this year.

Legislator Nazzaro: But does that mean the work had to be completed by the end of the year?

Ms. Crow: Yes, in order for us to pay any invoices beyond 12/31/18 we need to amend the end date of the contract.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then the motion would need to be, if I understand right, that the current agreement that we have in place needs to be extended to 12/31/19 to enable them to complete the scope that was in the original agreement.

Ms. Crow: Yeah.

Legislator Nazzaro: I will make that motion.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you for clarifying the motion.

Legislator Niebel: Second.

Ms. Crow: I'll remind Kathy that she should include that accrual when she's doing the year end process for the Legislature.

Chairman Chagnon: All those in favor of the motion please say aye? Opposed?

*Motion is Unanimously Carried*

Discussion- Assigned Council 2018 Budget- Year to Date Expenses Exceeding Budget- Indigent Legal Services- Ned Barone and Kathleen Dennison

Discussion- RFP for Investment Advisor in Conformance with Commitment to the State Comptroller- Kitty Crow

Other-

Chairman Chagnon: Is there anything else to come under other?

Mrs. Dennison: I just a little more information on mortgage taxes. I just wanted to clarify that the mortgage tax receipts, as of September, as a percentage of budget they are less than last year. That's because the budget was raised rather significantly. Dollar amounts received through September are ahead of last year. Our projection for this year is to slightly exceed the budget of \$1.35 million.

Chairman Chagnon: In total? Even though this six month period was down?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: We are on track to meet the budget?

Mrs. Dennison: We are. In 2017 the budget was \$1.1 million and this year it's \$1.35 million. In 2017, our final receipts were \$1.39 million and we were over \$1.3 million as well. So, that's why we increased the budget. I'm looking at November results. Right now we have collected 75% of the annual budget and typically the last couple of months the receipts are higher than average. We are on pace to achieve the budget for the year. I just wanted to clarify that because we talked about it in Administrative Services.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you.

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

*Unanimously Carried (11:11 a.m.)*

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