

Minutes

Audit & Control Committee

September 19, 2019, 8:35 a.m., Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Chagnon, Muldowney, Niebel, Gould

Member Absent: Nazzaro

Others: Tampio, Ames, Griffith, McCoy, Halbohm, Taylor, Gregory, Dennison, Quattrone, Borrello, Abdella, Crow, Zahn, Schuyler, Hemmer

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

Approval of Minutes (08/22/19)

MOVED by Legislator Niebel, SECONDED by Legislator Gould

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time

Proposed Resolution - Continuation of Interim Funding for North Chautauqua County Water District

Clerk Tampio: The sheet that I just gave you is a summary and will go over the points and where we are at this point in the capital project for the North Chautauqua County Water District. As you know, by previous resolutions, the Legislature has authorized interim funding for the project of up to \$3 million to expire at the end of this year. We are in the process now of obligating or have obligated all funds up to that \$3 million at this point. We are now requesting an extension of up to \$4 million till the end of next year. So, this was predicated by a meeting that we had with Kitty Crow and Kathleen, Todd Button, Steve Abdella and several of our Board members for the District Board and we discussed going forward how we're going to accomplish our funding for the project because as you know, all the grants that we have for the project are reimbursement grants at the completion of the projects. So we have to pay for the project upfront and then receive the grant funds to reimburse our costs and the County's costs. So they agreed that it's possible at this point to increase it by \$1 million to the end of next year and we are getting ready to go out for bid for the final project, on the eastside of the City of Dunkirk. That is

a Sheridan project, with transmission mains, pump station upgrades, and a new water tank in Sheridan. That will take place this winter so we don't anticipate construction won't begin until early Spring. At that time, we are going to meet again with all of our finance people and Mr. Abdella, to decide whether the County has sufficient funds, feels comfortable with providing the funds to finish the project prior to receiving grants or if we have to go and get some short term funding through a BAN for the project. So, as you see, I have listed the grants that we've received. The first ESD grant, disbursement agreement is being signed today and will be sent in and then disbursement requests will go out soon and we will - \$1 million dollars will come back into that capital project. The second million won't be until the eastside project is completed. Likewise, we have a \$100,000 SAM grant from New York State Dormitory Authority and then we were also awarded the \$3 million EFC WIIA grant. Also to be received at the end of the project, however, I did speak to someone in the meantime and we are exploring the opportunity whether we can get a partial grant funding of that \$3 million before the project is totally completed. So we don't know that yet. Then there is a potential to receive additional grant funding from the Department of Corrections which is a grant that would go to the Village of Brocton and then the Village of Brocton would pass it onto the District as part of the capital project. The next to the last bullet lists all the expenses that we have at this point that obligates up to the \$3 million. We have a contract that should be starting soon, the meter vaults, the balance of contract 8, which is the first water main in Sheridan and then construction administration costs and then the engineering design and bid cost for the work that is going to be done in 2020. So, as I mentioned before, we will meet again with Finance and decide how to move forward in early Spring.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments on the proposed resolution? Kathy, I looked back at the history of this and this funding stream actually goes back to a resolution in late 2016 where the County agreed to extend \$1 million dollars to be repaid to the County on or before the end of 2017. And then in 2018, we extended a million dollars to be repaid by the end of 2018 and then later in 2018, we agreed to extend \$3 million to be repaid on or before the end of 2019 and now we're looking to extend \$4 million dollars to be repaid on or before the end of next year. So, have any of these funds been repaid to the County?

Clerk Tampio: No.

Chairman Chagnon: It gives one the appearance that we don't quite really know what we're doing with this project. That we passed three resolutions saying that the funds are going to be repaid and they haven't been and now we're extending it again.

Clerk Tampio: There is a little bit of background with that. As you know the map and plan has been amended twice so additional work has been added to the capital project and that is primarily based on the availability of this grant funding. So yes, from 2016, 17', 18', things have changed each step of the way so there is additional projects.

Mr. Abdella: What it comes down to at each juncture is whether we want to have the District go out and do a bond anticipation note and incur that costs or can the County through its own cash flow reserves, in essence, front it albeit with the District paying an interest rate. I think

at the end of the day it's really about does the County want, in essence, assist the District and not force it to incur the time and expense of doing a bond anticipation note process.

Chairman Chagnon: Steve, I understand and support the intent, my concern is, we passed a resolution saying it's going to be repaid by the end of the year. The next year we didn't say why it wasn't repaid, we just said, we're going to extend it again to be repaid by the end of the year. Next year, we didn't say why that didn't happen, we just going to extend it again. If you would give the uninformed observer pause to say, do they really know what they are doing?

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman, as Kathy eluded to, I think there has been some changes to the plan. Also Kathy, the project is under motion now, the District is billing some of the users now but, we're a little bit behind, aren't we, as far as the billing? So, we have revenues coming in, we have grants that are out there, this is just a temporary, I hate to use the term bridge loan, but, this is just to raise the amount from \$3 million to \$4 million. It is going to be paid back Mr. Chairman and as Steve eluded to, with interest. It's a new project, it's a great project, it's going to help the north County, it's just that there has been some changes to it and some delays, I think.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., then let me ask the question this way Terry. Are we absolutely sure this will be repaid by the end of next year? And if we're not, then we shouldn't say that.

Mr. Abdella: I think that date is in essence forcing the question of it continuously coming back to you to decide, do we tell the District sorry, we don't want to extend you credit anymore, do you BAN, or, we'll continue on for a little bit longer. Now you could go ahead and put in December 2021, or 2022, or whatever if you could say for certain but I think that some of that money is going to come back – I mean, you mentioned that million dollars, rather soon, although we hate to say that with State bureaucracy but that's in line to chip away at that four and have it become three again. But so it all depends on how often do you want to – of course, you could at any time, but, reconsider whether to continue that extension of credit or not.

Ms. Crow: If you wanted to reword it maybe to align it rather than with a specific date to say, it will be repaid when construction is completed and the bonds are issued, the County will be repaid once the bonds are issued.

Chairman Chagnon: And then it could be revisited at the end of next year.

Ms. Crow: Or construction is expected to be completed by the end of 2020 at which time the County, the District would be issuing the bonds and that repayment is expected or projected to be around – that way, it's more clearly shows it's aligned when construction would be completed and the actual bond issues. Because typically we wouldn't want to issue the bonds until we know the exact costs so that we don't borrow for more or less than the District actually needs.

Mr. Abdella: The final costs.

Ms. Crow: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: So the authorization is \$11.75 million dollars. So you anticipate that we would be extending up to \$11.75 million dollars?

Ms. Crow: No, I'm saying that you would still say the \$4 million dollars that this is –

Chairman Chagnon: But if the bonding isn't to occur until all the construction is complete, the authorized bonding limit is \$11.75 million dollars, so we would be extending funds up to that amount?

Ms. Crow: No, I'm just saying that the repayment would occur when the – the repayment of the \$4 million dollars is what would be repaid at the time the bonds are issued.

Chairman Chagnon: So what is the maximum amount that you would see that \$4 million dollars growing to?

Ms. Crow: I don't see it growing beyond the \$4 million right now based on our last meeting that we had with the District to review the –

Chairman Chagnon: The authorized bonding limit is \$11.75 million.

Ms. Crow: I know. I'm just saying, rather than say the \$4 million would be repaid by the end of 2020, rather than saying end of 2020, say, when the bonds issued, not saying –

Chairman Chagnon: I'm good with that. But I'm just wondering if next year that \$4 million is going to be come five and then the next year is going to become seven.

Legislator Niebel: And then eleven point five.

Ms. Crow: Well, certainly we wouldn't – the County wouldn't be in a position to extend that level of credit.

Chairman Chagnon: I agree.

Ms. Crow: So \$4 million, that's why we said in the spring, when we have a couple of the details are better ironed out, we may be issuing a BAN then because beyond \$4 million dollars we can't sustain that.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., good.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman, I think at this point it's a simpler easier process to have the County extend the credit from three to four million rather than issue a BAN at this time, correct, more or less?

Mr. Abdella: Yes.

Clerk Tampio: To your point of bonding, we're authorized up to \$11.75 million but that is not what the final bonding amount is. Our projection is it will probably be around \$2 million. Just because when that bonding limit was established, it was on the total cost of the initial project but didn't include all these grant funds.

Chairman Chagnon: If you would consider an amendment to make Pierre feel better, saying that the \$4 million dollars to the District is intended to be repaid to the County on or before. I would offer that as an amendment.

Legislator Niebel: I'm fine with that. I will make the amendment if Steve and Kathy are o.k. with that. So insert the word, "to be intended to be repaid to the County on or before December 31, 2020". I will make that in the form of a motion.

Legislator Muldowney: Second.

Chairman Chagnon: All those in favor of the proposed amendment?

Unanimously Carried

Mr. Abdella: Just to clarify for the record. The County Legislature, you are in complete control of this District in all of its finances essentially. So, you can change your mind at any time. I mean, you want to give the District a chance to do what it needs to do put a BAN into place but, no matter what the resolution says, you can change your mind at any time.

Legislator Gould: Or its losses. You didn't say the whole sentence. That we're in charge of all the finances or its losses.

Mr. Abdella: This is a division of County government but yes, the ultimate grantor is the County government.

Legislator Gould: Thank you.

Clerk Tampio: You'll have a chance to examine that during the budget review.

Legislator Gould: If you are not making enough money to pay interest on \$11 million yet, are you?

Clerk Tampio: We are collecting funds through the communities, repaying us for water that we're billed from the City of Dunkirk. That rate has an additional cost on top of that, that goes to the communities. A dollar for debt service and then 10 cents for administration so, we are

—

Legislator Gould: We're changing a little.

Clerk Tampio: We are starting to accumulate – yes, money for a debt service and we are actually paying some debt service at this point for the Brocton project according to our agreement.

Chairman Chagnon: So the amendment has passed. Now any further discussion on the proposed resolution as amended?

Unanimously Carried as amended

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Acceptance of Aid to Prosecution Funds 2019-2020

Mr. Gregory: I'm Derrick Gregory and I'm appearing on behalf of Patrick Swanson of the District Attorney's office. We're requesting approval of a resolution to accept the Aid to Prosecution grant. We've received this grant for over 20 years. It's the same amount as last year. It's already included in our budget for 2020. It's a formula grant which pays for the partial salary and benefits for an Assistant District Attorney. The purpose of the grant is to bolster our ability to prosecute serious felonies and there is no matching funds.

Chairman Chagnon: You have all the right words in there. Any questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

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

Chairman Chagnon: I understand from Olivia that this resolution was previously amended.

Sheriff Quattrone: There was an amendment made to this yesterday in Public Safety. In the third WHEREAS, to state the proposed 2020 budget versus the 2020 budget. I was trying to get it done taking care of it for us. But this is a proposal for Pine Valley School for an SRO, school resource officer, which is fully reimbursed by the school district so no local costs. So the appropriate amendment for the 2019 budget from September 1st to December 31st.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments on the proposed resolution as amended?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Acceptance of New York State Reimbursement for the Raise the Age Initiative

Chairman Chagnon: I understand that this was also amended.

Mr. Taylor: I'm Gilbert Taylor. I'm the Deputy Director for Probation and I want to apologize for Director Narraway not being here this morning. He had a prior engagement. As

this is my first time doing one of these, I'm just going to read what I am instructed as the best (*inaudible*). We're requesting approval from the County Executive to accept the Raise the Age funding with revenues and expenses covered under the Raise the Age funding.

Chairman Chagnon: And the amendment to the proposed resolution was to also indicate that it is in the third WHEREAS, as the "proposed 2020 budget".

Legislator Niebel: There is also a change in the Increase Revenue Account. At the bottom we have \$122,463, that has been changed to \$112,463 to reflect the same amount in the appropriation account.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., any questions or comments on the proposed resolution as amended?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – State Homeland Security Program for Fiscal Year 2019

Mr. Griffith: This is a Federal grant that is administered through the State. The grant requires no local share from Chautauqua County. These monies are to go to offset salaries and programs in the Office of Emergency Services.

Chairman Chagnon: You have the right words too. It's a good morning. Any questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend Chautauqua County Department of Health & Human Services 2019 Budget for Increased Raise the Age Voluntary Agency Costs

Mrs. Schuyler: The resolution before you is asking you to increase the appropriation account by \$1.5 million dollars for Raise the Age. This is related to children who have been placed in voluntary agencies who are under the Raise the Age legislation. Right now we currently have three children who are in volunteer agencies. We've estimated the cost of those children through the rest of the year as over \$800,000. Considering what the State has given us as projected numbers, we're estimating one more 16 year old to be placed for the rest of this year which would be another \$144,000, approximate. And then, come October 1st, 17 year olds will now be considered juveniles under the Raise the Age law. So they could also fall into this voluntary agency situation. So we have estimated for five 17 year olds to potentially be in Raise the Age facilities before the end of the year for another \$540,000 so we rounded that to \$1.5 million dollars. Hopefully we won't have that many kids going in but that would save us from coming back here and asking for another resolution if we do. This is 100% State reimbursed so hopefully that is what we will have.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Legislator Niebel: What does it cost, approximately, for one 17 year old to be in this program? About \$100,000?

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, it depends on the child. It depends on the needs of the child and which facility they go into. Rates are different everywhere and the services within each of those facilities is different.

Legislator Niebel: I just want a ballpark figure? You mentioned \$500,000.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yea, about \$100,000 each then. That's Val's math. I can tell you, for instance, we've got –

Legislator Niebel: It doesn't have to be exact. I was just looking for a ballpark figure.

Mrs. Schuyler: One child, my numbers that I had done for just the month of June, one child was \$118,00 through June. Another one was \$62,000 through June. This is Raise the Age. The other one was \$73,000 through June. So they are expensive. That is why we need to do all that we can do to keep children in our community and try to provide the best services here we can so that they are not in volunteer agencies or OCFS facilities.

Legislator Niebel: There is a range as far as the cost based on the –

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, there are rates per day. I have all that information for various, I can't share that one because it has kids names on it but, the rates can vary anywhere from \$70.00 a day all the way up to \$900.00 a day. Some are a \$1,000 or \$1,300 a day, depending on what the needs of the child are and how many services they are receiving while they are in the facility. How much security is required within the facility for certain children.

Legislator Muldowney: With Raise the Age, where would they be if that didn't go into - would they still be at those facilities?

Mrs. Schuyler: It depends on the charges that they are under. They are juvenile delinquents so before the age of criminal accountability was raised, at that age they would have still been considered adults. So they could have ended up in a prison for a while.

Legislator Muldowney: So are those like sentenced or they are waiting – the three that you talked about.

Mrs. Schuyler: These kids have been adjudicated. So they are not sentenced per say anymore because now they are looked upon as adolescent offenders so they're being treated as children in facilities to care of their mental health, substance abuse, trauma, any other needs that they have which, what we're finding and Gib is here from Probation, he can vouch for it, that these kids have a lot of really severe problems. We have to get them younger and wrap a whole lot more services around them sooner.

Chairman Chagnon: To prevent them from getting there.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, and then preventing them from getting into the prison system when they do become adults.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions or comments on the proposed resolution? Christine, you have used the term voluntary agency. Could you help us understand what that means?

Mrs. Schuyler: I don't know if I know the exact definition. Voluntary agencies are, like the GA Home. That's an agency that runs residential treatment facility, a residential treatment center. That's the term that the State Office of Children and Family Services uses for those types of agencies.

Chairman Chagnon: It's voluntary?

Mrs. Schuyler: I guess you could say it's voluntary because it's not jail. I mean, they are children so someone has to agree to them being put there whether it's a parent, whether it's guardian, whether it's the courts. Once they turn 18, they don't have to stay there. They can leave or they can – if the child is in Foster Care, they have a choice to remain in Foster Care until the age of 21 or at 18, they could say, nope, I'm done.

Chairman Chagnon: So voluntary refers to the child or their parents then? Their rights.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes. Parent, guardian, or the courts, kids that are in our custody. We have that say on until they are 18.

Legislator Niebel: The GA Home is actually referred to as the children's home.

Legislator Muldowney: Does the local school district that the kids are in, do they have any monetary responsibility at all?

Mrs. Schuyler: No.

Legislator Muldowney: If a local school district sends a child to a GA Home, then they are responsible for it, the payment on that?

Mrs. Schuyler: The local school district, to my knowledge, cannot send a child there. Gib, do you know anything different than that?

Mr. Taylor: The local school district can in fact put a kid into one of those programs and they would assume the costs because they are not court order and they're not – it's more of a voluntary program through the school system.

Mrs. Schuyler: So the parent would have to approve.

Mr. Taylor: The parent would have to approve. Usually it's though something called IEP or some program to get them there.

Mrs. Schuyler: Under the special education track.

Legislator Niebel: But the school district would pay for it.

Mr. Taylor: If they placed them specifically there, it becomes part of the school system responsibility.

Legislator Muldowney: Which is very costly. But if it's court ordered then they are relieved of that, is what you are saying?

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's very costly to someone all the time. Whether it's in our school taxes or whether it's in our County taxes, or wherever –

Chairman Chagnon: State taxes.

Mrs. Schuyler: State taxes, I mean, it's still a high cost to us no matter what.

Legislator Muldowney: I was just hoping that they had a share of it but it sounds like it's all our share.

Mrs. Schuyler: For these kids. There is probably a whole another list of children that are there from schools being placed and from all over the State. It's not just our County kids that go to the GA Home. Just like we have a lot of kids in other agencies across the State or in other states too for that matter.

Mr. Taylor: And on the question of voluntary, you have to look at it as it's not secured. Basically the voluntary agencies are a non-secured facility whereas the other ones are secured.

Chairman Chagnon: Another good point.

Mrs. Schuyler: Like an OCFS facility would be secured.

Mr. Taylor: That is the main difference between the two.

Legislator Muldowney: Is Randolph similar to a GA Home?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes. They are run by New Directions.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend Chautauqua County Department of Health & Human Services
2019 Budget for County Coroners’ Autopsy Costs

Chairman Chagnon: I understand this has a typo.

Mrs. Schuyler: The typo was down in the Decrease Revenue Account’s line. I know it was just four dashes that were missing. Hopefully that’s been corrected on it. Kathleen will tell you because I will fully say I am not the expert on the dashes and dots.

Chairman Chagnon: We’re having trouble catching that last evening in Human Services.

Mrs. Dennison: O.k., the four dashes indicate the absence of a sub-department but are, strictly speaking, required because that field is required. So the Decrease Revenue Accounts, should read; A.6140.----.R364.0000 and similarly in the Federal-aid line, we need to insert four dashes and a dot after A.6140.

Legislator Niebel: This is just a typo.

Chairman Chagnon: The important thing is that Olivia gets it. O.k., thank you. Now you can explain the proposed resolution.

Mrs. Schuyler: O.k., on the resolution, the expenditures for autopsies are higher than what we had budgeted for 2019. So far Safety Net costs are lower than what we budgeted for 2019 so we feel comfortable in taking some money out of the Safety Net account and putting it into the Coroner’s account to make up that difference. If you want details, Safety Net through September of 2018 was about at \$4.8 million with a budget of \$7.6 – sorry, I think (*inaudible*) September 18th of 2019. So we were 61% of budget where we figured we should be about 79% by now. So we’ve got some room there. Along with the Coroner’s, we have had 196 cases through August and out of those 196 cases, 61 have gone for autopsies which also means 61 transports to the Erie County Medical Examiner’s office. I think that what’s important to know is that every autopsy that is done is being done in conjunction with the advice of our Coroner’s physicians and the Erie County Medical Examiner and we are following Public Health law for what cases need to go for autopsy. In looking at the past, for instance, and I can go back as far as 2010, but in 2016, only 3% of cases, 29 out of 866 went for autopsy. In 2017, 5% which is 41 out of 867 cases, 2018, we were up to 14% which is 59 out of 418 cases. So year to date, we’ve had a 196 cases through August. So even if we have another 100 cases projected, to say, around 300 cases per year, our autopsy rate right now is running at 31%. I know that that sounds high based on tradition of where we have been but in reality, that’s where it should be when you’re looking at true deaths that need to be investigated as far as whether it’s accidents, overdoses, homicides, anything suspicious such as that. Those are the cases that we’re really working and they are the ones that the Medical Examiner feels they need to go for autopsy. And every drug overdose now does go for their death investigation at the Medical Examiner’s office.

Legislator Gould: Are most of them drug overdoses?

Mrs. Schuyler: They haven't pulled out for me the cause of death for 2019 but in 2018, we have those numbers and that was 24 out of 59 were drug related in 2018.

Legislator Gould: Almost half.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, and I'm not sure for 2019 as far as the rates but we'll get those as soon as, the State is usually lagging behind on that and we go by our own death certificate data but it's not official data until we get it from the State. But we can give you preliminary data that we keep track of at the end of the year.

Legislator Gould: Do they get a full blown autopsy if it's expected a drug overdose or just a blood sample?

Mrs. Schuyler: That's up to the Medical Examiner. They make that determination once the body gets there.

Legislator Gould: How has that been running, do you know?

Mrs. Schuyler: A lot of times they will just do, depending on the case, if it looks like a, I guess I hate to say straight forward overdose but, they will do an external investigation of the body, make sure there is nothing there. They will do a scan and then do toxicology. The toxicology that they have the capability to run at the Medical Examiner's office is far more reaching than anything we have here. They can test for all kinds of different compounds to really see exactly what drugs they are that we are looking at in the system. We had the (*inaudible*) initiative meeting this week and I apologize, I guess I probably should have – I can share that report with you that Brea Agett, my epidemiologist, puts together that really breaks down what drugs have been seen in every one of the deaths and what is happening. Really fentanyl is a factor in everything. We're not seeing fentanyl laced into marijuana. That is the drug that will kill you. But our overdose deaths are down. That is the sign of the narcan programs that are out there that are really saving lives and some prevention efforts. I do feel that that necessarily correlates to less drug use and less demand for drugs, but I think we're doing a better job of keeping people alive.

Legislator Niebel: So the number of autopsies has increased quite a bit. Has the cost of those autopsies increased in the last year or two?

Mrs. Schuyler: Our contract with the Medical Examiner's office called for – there was a certain price for a certain number of autopsies and then when you hit that number it got higher.

Legislator Niebel: Are we higher?

Mrs. Schuyler: We renegotiated with them to increase that baseline number so we were able to cut the cost on some of them. We're now up to – it's about \$2,500 an autopsy now.

Legislator Niebel: What was it last year, off hand?

Mrs. Schuyler: I don't want to misspeak.

Legislator Niebel: That's o.k.. I'm just a little concerned Christine. This is a huge increase, \$130,000. I mean, I didn't have a chance to look at a lot of past Coroner's statistics. I did look at 2018 last night and I think that we spent \$190,000 total for autopsies – well, it was the point four so it included some travel too but this is quite an increase.

Mrs. Schuyler: It is. We definitely are doing more autopsies but I have to say, as part of my job in Administration to make sure we adhere to all the Public Health law and rules and regulations, really that is the right thing to do. We are by law required to complete death investigations.

Legislator Niebel: No, I understand. I'm just looking at 59 in 2018 and we're up to 61 already this year.

Mrs. Schuyler: Through August.

Legislator Muldowney: Are drowning's required?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes. One in 2017, three in 2018 and I don't know for 2019. Motor vehicle accidents, I mean, something you may go well geez, it looks straight forward but you don't know and we do have to run an investigation to see if something happened to cause that accident.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions or comments? Christine I understand your point that we're following the requirements of State law and regulations by doing the autopsies that are required. Is there any State funding that would help pay for these autopsies?

Mrs. Schuyler: No, there's not. There used to be. I believe it was right around 2010, we used to get Public Health State Aid which would be 36% of the cost of autopsies but the State did away with that. So now there is no reimbursement to counties at all for any death investigation work. The only thing that we were able to get covered by that, we couldn't get the Coroners' – we got 26% of the coroners and 36% of autopsies but in reality, places that have a Medical Examiners' office like Buffalo, Rochester, the big cities, New York City, took huge hits when that 36% reimbursement went away for their entire Medical Examiners offices. Tried to fight that change just like the Safety Net changes and things that the State just decides to cut to local governments, has not had success.

Chairman Chagnon: Another unfunded State mandate to put on the list for our incoming State Senator. Thank you.

Legislator Muldowney: If it's a homicide and you do the autopsy, that doesn't go anywhere towards the DA's budget at all, right? It's under your budget?

Mrs. Schuyler: The cost of the autopsy? No, that's all under the Coroner's budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorizing Additional SEQRA Review of Waterways Panel 2020
2% Occupancy Tax Recommendations

Mr. McCoy: Last month I came before you folks and we had a brief discussion on a project that had dropped out of our project list for 2020 and the possibility of doing three additional projects in its place. Typically we do an environmental review on these projects before they become incorporated into the County Executive's budget for the following year. These three projects happen to be streambank stabilization projects. Two of which are in the Chautauqua Lake Watershed and the other is in the Village of Forestville on Tupper Creek.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Legislator Niebel: So one project dropped out and we were able to fund three more because of the one project?

Mr. McCoy: That is correct.

Legislator Niebel: That one project was for around \$50,000 or whatever?

Mr. McCoy: Around \$40,000. Much bigger project but our share would have been \$40,000 which is the limit for the program.

Legislator Gould: I have a real problem locating these projects. I think maybe a map with a name, park or a (*inaudible*) or something like that would help me locate these. I'm sure the rest of the committee other than Pierre probably has no idea where they are at. I don't like voting on something that I don't know where it's at.

Mr. McCoy: I understand.

Legislator Gould: And so could we get some sort of a location map or something from now on?

Mr. McCoy: We could.

Legislator Gould: That would be nice, thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Do you want a map before next Wednesday?

Legislator Gould: That would be good.

Chairman Chagnon: For these three?

Legislator Gould: All of them. All ten.

Chairman Chagnon: All ten.

Mr. McCoy: Not a problem, we can do that for you.

Legislator Muldowney: So as a result of not doing the last project, we're getting three more projects done, correct?

Mr. McCoy: That's right.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Clerk of the Legislature to Publish Notice – Re: Public Hearing on 2020 Tentative Budget & Sewer District Assessment Rolls & Maximum Salary of Members of the Chautauqua County Legislature and its Chairman

Clerk Tampio: This is something that is required every year. The published notices of the budget hearing, your salaries, regarding the tentative budget and sewer district rolls. It's pretty self-explanatory. There has been no change in salaries for the Legislature for over 10 years, maybe 15.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2019 Budget for Operating Efficiency Study

County Executive Borrello: As you know, we've had some discussions recently about, of course, as we're looking to the 2020 tentative budget and looking at certainly some gaps as we once again have more and more unfunded mandates and our revenues are strained as well, there are opportunities for us to look more efficient way to operate County government. County government right now is essentially operating the same way it did 20, 30, or 40 years ago or more. It decentralized the County government essentially. So we spoke at our Cabinet meeting, we spoke, myself and Chuck Nazzaro, and Pierre Chagnon were all together talking about is there a way for us to look at a better more efficient way for a county government to operate. So, we reached out the Center for Governmental Research, CGR, you're all probably familiar with them and Kent Gardner came down and made a presentation to myself and the Cabinet. We started talking about how we go about this. We had this discussion with you Mr. Chairman, as you know, about conducting a survey, an assessment essentially of our services and locations. That's currently underway. I'm hoping that we'll get results here before we get into budget deliberations as part of the Legislature's review of the tentative budget and potentially have some solutions. I'm not suggesting that we're going to make any changes or major changes as part of the budget necessarily, however, it might give us a great snap shot of potential we could look at going into 2020. Some potential efficiencies that we could implement to help impact our costs.

Everything from something that is simple as, we have so many folks that are out in the community servicing clients. Do we need to have their offices as decentralized as they currently are. Technology now allows people to be able to access information and services from their phones, don't necessarily need to show up at an office. I'm not suggesting that we're closing any offices, I'm not suggesting that we're doing anything other than looking at the opportunities and if there are opportunities, to have better, more efficient and as a result, less cost of delivery of services. So that is what this is all about.

Legislator Muldowney: Does that include the Sheriff's Department?

County Executive Borrello: Yes, they are looking at all locations. The Sheriff's Department is a little bit different but all the – and again, this is being done in about a month's time so we'll call it, more of a 10,000 foot view but it will give us the opportunity to identify opportunities and then do a deeper dive if needed.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments? George, I have assumed that your tentative budget won't reflect any changes or any impact from this study.

County Executive Borrello: Correct.

Chairman Chagnon: The indication in the resolution that addressed the 2020 tentative budget would be the Legislature's deliberation of the 2020 budget, we should have the results of the study at that time.

County Executive Borrello: Correct.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Alright, any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Discussion – Ag-Related Occupancy Tax Grants – Dave McCoy & Rob Halbohm

Discussion – Compliance Update – Debbie Zahn

Discussion - Air BnB Update – Finance Director Crow & Chairman Chagnon

Other

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

Unanimously Carried (9:47 a.m.)

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