

Minutes
Budget Hearing
Human Services Committee
Audit & Control Committee
Monday, September 30, 2019, Rm# 331 & 333
Gerace Office Building

Members Present: H.S. Rankin, Whitford, Pavlock (Absent: Wilfong, O'Connell)
A.C. Chagnon, Gould, Muldowney, Nazzaro (Absent: Niebel)

Others: Tampio, Dennison, Hansen, Schuyler, Lis, J. Anderson

Health & Human Services

Vice Chairwoman Rankin called the budget hearing to order at 9:02 a.m.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Kathleen Dennison will give us an overview before we start.

Mrs. Dennison: Good Morning and welcome to the new set up. We're using a different format this morning, a physical format so that hopefully we can hear everybody and audience members can hear too (*inaudible*) than Jenelle. Our audience of one. So I just want to start by giving a quick overview of the binder and then a few highlights of the budget. There is not any change in format this year. Your binder starts with the tentative budget book which is the opening cover back to the black hard tab and that has been posted on the internet for public view. The most important document for our purposes really is the first one under the operating budget. That is our summary that shows the tax rate, \$8.37 and also the tax levy, 63,593,160. That is the overview and following that there is the budget detail by department. This detail is only at the classification level, no line items. So mostly we include this primarily because it is what is posted for the public. Behind the black divider are the budget summaries and these are in order by organization number and you'll also find the corresponding organization or tab number on the schedule this morning. We have, for each department, we have the budget summary which will show their results for the organization, their local share, their FTE's, and then detail by each department within the organization. There is also an organization summary tab which sums all the sub-departments within each organization. We are going to recommend that the departments walk through the tentative budget summary and give us an update on each of the departments within the summary. If additional detail is needed, there is the line item detail behind the green tab in each section. You also have in the front of your binder, the rolling 12 month actual results. So those are actual results for July of 2018 through June of 2019 with comparisons to both the 2019 budget, adopted, and the proposed 2020 budget. There is also the five year projections of appropriations, revenues, and (*inaudible*). So that is what is in the book.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: The separate on that you talked about –

Mrs. Dennison: That is the 12 month rolling average and you should have financial projections as well. Any questions on the budget materials?

Ms. Hansen: If at any time someone is missing a page, please let me know and I will fix that. But to my knowledge everything should be there.

Mrs. Dennison: We used a new printing service this year and there were some things that were out of order so Janelle has checked all the binders but with a thousand pages in these binders, like you say, if you find that you are missing something, Janelle had a good point, we have extra copy so we'll get you a copy of what is missing. Moving onto the budget itself, as you are aware, there is no increase in the tax rate. The budget is not structurally balanced. We are proposing a use of general fund balance of just over a million dollars. The budget does include base pay increases for the contracts that are settled so that would be the Sheriff's union, the Lieutenants union, and the part-time Deputies union. There is also an increase built in of 2% for managers. As in the past, the departments have the option with the managerial salaries, they can adjust individual positions if they chose to but the general guideline was a 2% increase. There is no increase in base pay for the contracts that are not settled so that would be CSEA 6300 and the Correction Officers. One other thing that I just wanted to bring up and that is the health insurance. In the 19' budget, we had a very small increase in health insurance rate, just about under 2% and we also had in the 19' budget a lot of people that had changed their election to the high deductible health plan. Unfortunately we do not have those benefits in the 2020 budget. There is a 6% increase generally in the health insurance rates and if any employee change their election and then went back to the PPO plan sometime during calendar 19', they are budgeted at the plan that they are using now or were using in June. So instead of people in the 19' budget, people migrating off the PPO plan and in 20', we have quite a few people that are migrating back. It's a more expensive plan. So overall we're looking at a \$1 million dollar increase in health insurance costs. In the 19' budget, we had the benefit of an actual slight decrease in the overall health insurance costs. As I said, we're looking at a million dollars in the operating funds A, D, and DM. So that is just a little back drop for insurance in 2020.

Legislator Nazzaro: You said a 6%?

Mrs. Dennison: Six percent is the increase in the rates. As I said, the A, D, and DM funds together, the cost of insurance increased a million dollars to approximately \$16 million dollars. Going from the 18' to 19' budget, the health insurance cost for those same funds, actually decreased by \$700,000. So that has been a big challenge in this year's budget.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: That will be reflected in each department?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I noticed your increase, I was going to ask about that so that's

—
Mrs. Dennison: Yes, that is across all departments, all employees. I should add that obviously there is some employees that switched to the high deductible plan and they stayed there. With those people, a little bit of a benefit because they are not new to the high deductible plan so that their personal deductible is not fully funded if they are in the second year of the high deductible plan. Those people that have stayed with the plan are a little bit less than they were in

the prior year but actually in the 19' budget, we have not built in that cost of the deductible so it came in as an actual expense but it wasn't in the 19' budget. So again, for 2020, you have the increased rate and unfortunately people, more people migrating back to the PPO than going the other way. So those are just a few overview comments. So Vice Chairwoman Rankin, I will turn it back over to you.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: O.k., welcome all the the Human Services and we have big job all the time and a lot of work went into this. Thank you for all your time. We'll let you take the floor.

Mrs. Schuyler: Everybody knows me and with me is Val Lis and John Anderson, Deputy Commissioner of Social Services.

Mrs. Dennison: That would be tab 31.

Mrs. Schuyler: I don't know if we're in the same order as you are but usually these are the two, not do the summary, but dive into the (*inaudible*) pages because the summary is so huge.

Mrs. Dennison: I would suggest maybe that you skip over the summary, summary, because we're going to talk about it on each page but if you would make any comments that you would like on the FTE page.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: So you are in the front section? You are not on tab 31.

Mrs. Dennison: Well, tab 31 and not in the tentative budget book. Section 31 behind the black divider. But maybe Christine, make a general comment on local share change for the overall organization and then we'll move into FTE's and then go through departments.

Mrs. Schuyler: Overall, our local share increase for 2020 compared to the 2019 budget was \$613,320, a 1.3%. You may recall in previous years when we discussed, especially the opioid epidemic and what we were going to see as some of the fallout from that. We were projecting to see increases coming down the road for child welfare, returned child health programs, preschool special education, and that's pretty much where we're seeing the increases. Although the situation is very sad but in general given what we have seen with public assistance decreases and such, and our economy in general, I think that we would be in a really good place as a community for the opioid epidemic but it just didn't hit our community, it hit all communities and that's where we're really seeing the major increases, which are in those areas.

Our FTE's, we have decreased our FTE's. We did use existing FTE's, moving people around to increase a Sanitarian. You are familiar that October 1st, the action level for childhood lead poisoning has dropped from 15 micrograms to 5 micrograms. That means that we're just by the numbers of children that are tested in our County, that's over 300 more children that we're going to have to follow up care coordination plus a Sanitarian is going to have to go in and check for lead in the home and then we're going to have to go through the Board of Health abatement measures. So it's a partial funded mandate, I guess you could say. The State thought it was really great because they set aside some more money for public health State –aid but that's only 36% of

salary, only. Nothing for fringe and allowable expenses such as like the XRF gun that we get reimbursement on. So without additional staff, we're not going to be able to fulfill the mandate. We did reduce our FTE's, it looks kind of complicated on your spreadsheet there of how this worked out but we have utilized existing FTE's to the best of our ability to allow for the increase requirements that have come down from the State. The big chunk you see moving is related to Raise the Age. That's because Probation and Public Defender FTE's moved back to their own home departments who had been in here.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: So they will see in their FTE's.

Ms. Lis: Yes they will. We weren't sure how the claiming would for those groups and actually the Public Defender's FTE's are not going to be funded under the Raise the Age plan. They kept changing how it was going to work and so whether they actually do hire those people, I don't know but the ones they planned to hire, were in our budget in 2019 under the Raise the Age department but they will no longer be on our schedules.

Mrs. Schuyler: And we just learned this last week the County Attorney work will not be covered as well under Raise the Age. So any work that the County Attorney office does for Raise the Age children will not be reimbursable as a 100% as we originally thought it would be.

Ms. Lis: They are very strict on what we're considering additional work and they felt that that work was already there.

Legislator Nazzaro: So has that been built into this then?

Ms. Lis: Well, the FTE's actually never – they never filled the Public Defender spots this year. So there is no monetary issue on this year but the FTE's were there and now they are coming out.

Mrs. Dennison: You asked about 19' or 2020?

Legislator Nazzaro: Actually I'm looking at 2020 because of the change. Now it's not going to be 100% funded when this budget was prepared for 2020, that information built into the – the reimbursements.

Mrs. Dennison: We just found out about this maybe Tuesday or Wednesday, so, as Val said, the Public Defender did not put any FTE's into the 2020 budget. So for the Public Defender, there is no affect. In the 19' budget, the Public Defender put people in but they were fully funded. But there is a monetary effect for the County Attorney. That is not in the 2020 budget because we found out about it after the budget was finalized. We can probably talk about that when we review the County Attorney's budget but I do have that as a possible change that needs to be made because he had in the 2020 budget, he has 55% of an attorney that he anticipated being reimbursed by Raise the Age and we now know that that is not going to happen but the work still has to be done. So, when we get to the County Attorney's budget, I believe he will comment on it but I will preface it by saying we're going to probably have to change his tentative budget. The other department, their either didn't put it in for 2020 or Social Services

component is still fully funded. The Probation Department did appropriately budget for everything because they knew about this in time to prepare their budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: So Social Services is still fully funded?

Mrs. Dennison: Social Services and Probation is covered.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just wanted to make sure. You are funded but the County Attorney

Mrs. Dennison: The County Attorney and the Public Defender's office is not.

Mrs. Schuyler: So in total without the Raise the Age component there, we have decreased our FTE's overall.

Legislator Chagnon: I have a couple of questions. You indicated on the lead testing that there is State-aid, by 36% of salaries, but there is no increase in your aid for lead testing. There is no increase in your revenue for lead testing from the previous budget.

Ms. Lis: That is part of the regular State-aid that is not showing in the lead testing department. It's in that one department by itself.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's called Public Health State-aid.

Legislator Chagnon: Because you do have State-aid and Federal-aid for 4189 lead.

Ms. Lis: I think that is the grant. That is not the Article 6 State-aid. That is the one that we're talking about when we say 36%. The ones that you are seeing in the 4189 lead, are grants that has State and Federal portions to them.

Legislator Chagnon: The other question is, why has HEAP FTE's increased?

Mr. Anderson: Part of the reason why HEAP is increasing is because the State extended the window of applications could be processed sooner in the HEAP season and get more people enrolled.

Mrs. Schuyler: And we use seasonal mainly for HEAP so it's really not kind of a switch around of people, there is not an overall increase in the total number of people. It's just where they fall out.

Ms. Lis: Another thing with HEAP is that, it's become a little bit more of a year-round situation. There is a cooling piece to HEAP now, there is a repair part of HEAP so it doesn't really go away like it used to.

Mrs. Schuyler: There again, the big page we usually go to, right to 6010. I don't know what page that is numbered in your book but, -

Mrs. Dennison: The summary documents don't have page numbers on them. The line item detail does (*inaudible/cross talk*), get to that if anyone has specific questions.

Mrs. Schuyler: O.k., the DSS Admin, A.6010, this is where you will find the staff in the Social Services part of our department. We do budget for 100% employment.

Ms. Lis: We should have changed that comment actually because we did put in a slight adjustment to somehow pick up on our amount of turnover. There is an adjustment there for vacancy this year and that comment is actually outdated.

Mrs. Schuyler: That was at the County Executive level.

Mrs. Dennison: I apologize for not changing that comment. Christine and her staff pointed out when they presented their budget to the County Executive, as all departments, the exception was 100% employment. The County Executive wanted to put in a vacancy factor or what we call a turnover savings. So there has been an adjustment to Social Services to reduce their personal services and employee benefits to compensate for the fact that generally they have some vacancies when trying to build budget (*inaudible*).

Legislator Whitford: How are they calculated back?

Legislator Gould: I'm so glad we were talking about personal services and employee benefits. How can the personal services go down and employee benefits go up? Will somebody answer that for me?

Mrs. Dennison: I will be happy to answer. That is an effect that it is not in control of the departments, it's a Countywide effect. You are going to see this in other departments. The reason the benefits are going up is what I talked about at the beginning and that is, increase in health insurance rates, an increase in the use of the PPO plan. Also there has been a big increase in health insurance surcharge. The health insurance surcharge, a lot of that piece is the money that we pay for retiree health insurance. There has been a big increase in the last few years in retirees that are opting to get cash out instead of using insurance after they retire. That expense has been increasing, well Kitty Crow has – I'm going to say \$200,000 a year based on my memory. She is the one that prepares that budget so I just want to put a caveat on that, that I'm doing that from memory. But there definitely is a big increase in the expense for retiree insurance cash out that is built into the surcharge. That benefit also includes Worker's Compensation surcharges which are also increasing. So even if there are changes in personnel, (*inaudible*) we have a more expensive health insurance cost per employee that can outweigh the changes in the personal services.

Legislator Gould: I just seems a little excessive.

Mrs. Dennison: It does seem like a big swing in this department but this department has the most employees of any, almost any department. This one sub-department so it has a bigger hit because of that health insurance effect.

Mrs. Schuyler: We have a very high fringe rate. Not just us, County government.

Mrs. Dennison: That is all I was planning to comment on. And then, Paul, you had a question on the turnover savings, how it's calculated.

Legislator Whitford: Yes, is that based on history?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Whitford: Like five years.

Mrs. Dennison: We actually just looked at, in 2018, what percentage of the budget departments used and their actual results. So some of the larger departments, they didn't use their entire budget and so we used that utilization percentage to figure out o.k., they are using say, 95% of their budget, so we have a 5% turnover savings. So that is the methodology we used to calculate how much of a savings we might realize in 2020.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Is that common practice in other places you've (*inaudible*)...

Mrs. Dennison: I don't know enough to comment how common it is but it's definitely not unusual. It's always been kind of a point of discussion for the County. We kind of realized that we had built in, as you say, a little bit a cushion by assuming 100% employment because generally that is not what actually happens.

Legislator Nazzaro: Did you do that in other departments too?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. It did not affect all the departments but in Social Services was definitely the biggest adjustment, probably had the largest adjustment.

Legislator Whitford: Probably has the largest turnover.

Mrs. Dennison: I will highlight other departments that had that affect (*inaudible*)...

Legislator Nazzaro: To your point, it is not necessarily common and to Kathleen's point, it does remove some cushion so it makes the budget tighter to live within because before if you did not have a vacancy credit, then you had some wiggle room. So it does make it a tighter situation.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Trying to get a more accurate picture.

Mrs. Dennison: The further that point Chuck, the other thing to remind you again that the budget, 2020, does not include any base pay increase for the CSEA 6300 contract.

Legislator Whitford: When do those expire?

Mrs. Dennison: They are out of contract now.

Legislator Whitford: Presently in –

Mrs. Dennison: In negotiations. The negotiations are, from what I'm told, are pretty far along. I would say that we're expecting a proposal by the end of this calendar year but we don't have it now. So, we were not able to include it in the budget. That is also consistent with past practice that the contract isn't settled, we're assuming status quo, no increase in base pay. Of course, there are of course, all the increments and step increases included but no change in base pay.

Legislator Whitford: That is the largest collective bargaining agreement in the County.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. That is a big threat. Especially with already taking these turnover savings – (*cross talk*)...

Mrs. Schuyler: There is no cushion in that to account for raises if they go retroactive.

Legislator Chagnon: The overtime pay is already, this year, exceeded \$80,000 and you're budgeting \$25,000 for next year. That \$81,000 is against the budget this year of \$25,000.

Ms. Lis: We have a lot of people working overtime right now to fill those positions that are not filled. We've actually been told, let them work overtime because the refill process is so slow. We're hoping that this won't be the case going forward.

Legislator Chagnon: Do you have any reason to believe that it's going to be different next year than it was this year? And in 2018, it was \$100,000 and in 2017, it was \$176,000.

Mrs. Schuyler: A lot of the overtime stems for child welfare. That is where we've had a tremendous amount of turnover in CPS. It continues and we're not alone in that. Every county and city across the State is in a child welfare crisis, particularly with CPS. Next week there is a convening of the State Civil Service officials and State OCFS officials and they have taken comments from local Social Services districts and there will be State education representatives there as well, trying to figure out if there is something that can be done with civil service to increase recruitment for, especially two positions, which are the two that all counties are having trouble with and that is CPS case workers and what we call Social Welfare Examiners. They are the main workers in Temporary Assistance and Medicaid who do eligibility and under care for those programs. So the proponents are, how do we - is there a way that we can have more frequent civil service exams, is there a way that we can get the results back for civil service exams quicker and can we get list established and get this hiring process faster than it has been. OCFS has also changed where case workers now have to travel to Albany for all of their training. They used to be able to do it in Buffalo, the regional office, and only have to go to Albany for two weeks out of the year. Now, all retraining is at the State's new center they built in Rensselaer, so that has increased especially those of us counties that are furthest away from Albany, are seeing the most increase in cost for workers to be trained. A CPS caseworker cannot take a caseload until they complete one year of training with OCFS. That is something else that I wish the State would change. To me, I use the example of, in my comments that I've sent onto the State, if I was still running a hospital and you hire staff, I can't imagine hiring a nurse and that nurse not being able to independently take a caseload or take care of patients by his or her self for a year until they've gone to Albany for a year worth of training. I said, it would

absolutely cripple the health care industry. Right now, these things are crippling the child welfare industry.

Ms. Lis: We had a large class, so to speak, of, we hired a lot of people late last year, early this year, and so we're hoping to get over that hump. They will have had their year of training. It's an ongoing problem. They leave. You just don't know but it's supposed to be – we expect with that large group that came in, that they will be able to take cases and the other people who have been covering, won't have to do that.

Legislator Chagnon: Is it possible for us to get a report of where the overtime has been spent this year?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Chagnon: We would appreciate that. Thank you.

Ms. Lis: Also with that cushion of unfilled positions, we (*inaudible*), since we haven't, if there was a position that was open, other people were covering and spending overtime and we felt that we were o.k. with that during that time period that the position was open. Now we have taken that and decreased for expected turnover.

Mrs. Dennison: You are experiencing a decrease in the base pay but an increase in overtime for the vacancies.

Ms. Lis: Right.

Mrs. Schuyler: And that budgeting at a 100% of employment helped cover when the vacancies happened and others are working overtime to make up for it.

Ms. Lis: Because the work was still happening.

Legislator Chagnon: That's why until it came to light, I was o.k. with that but now, I've got issue with it.

Mrs. Dennison: If I could just interject, I have the numbers in front of me now, the turnover savings in A.6010, the reduction of base pay is \$249,000, the reduction in benefits is \$144,000.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: O.k., anything else? O.k., we can keep going.

Mrs. Schuyler: In total, there is a \$265,000 decrease in local share on the expense side. You'll see we've kind also have a drop in revenue but all of our positions and all of our contracts, everything, does get reimbursement at some level. So when we decrease expenses, we also decrease revenue.

Ms. Lis: Also, we know that we did over budget certain items in 2018 and 19', when we had that down turn because of – you know, we've talked about this before, so our 2019 budget was a little high in some of the revenues as well, that is why there is such a decrease in the revenues this time.

Legislator Chagnon: Why are repays trending upwards?

Ms. Lis: I couldn't say why. I can look at why. I mean, they come from many different areas. Mostly it's going to be coming from child support. So if we're having, for example, all the costs are going up, we have some more complicated cases, so the repays on those may be going up. I don't think that there is anything in particular happening there. It's just that, I don't think that we have gone out and found – there has been no change in our processes there that we're bringing in more. I think there is just a bigger population.

Legislator Chagnon: You note on your fund transfers, it says FCEBG revenue. What is FCEBG?

Ms. Lis: Foster Care Block Grant. Is that in interfund transfers?

Ms. Lis: Oh no, that's just an additional note at the bottom that wasn't meant for that line. It was just because in the past it used to be broken down into different accounts but I just want you to know that that is block grant that doesn't – no matter what our costs are, that's what we are going to get. I just wanted that number to be known.

Mrs. Schuyler: Every county has an allocation from the State for Foster Care with the Foster Care Block Grant. It's based on claims. It doesn't fluctuate a lot but you can see that it has. It increased slightly from the State fiscal year 17'-18' to 18'-19' but now our 19'-20' allocation is a secret again. It stay within a set range but it does change somewhat.

Mrs. Schuyler: The State sets that and it does not come close to covering Foster Care costs.

Ms. Lis: And most of the time we don't even know what it is until part way through the year.

Legislator Chagnon: So your New York State aid, your projecting this year to be at \$6.5 million dollars and you are projecting next year to increase to \$7.3 million dollars.

Ms. Lis: We do have an additional grant in there, (*inaudible*) funding of \$70,000 that is in there. I do have something broken down here but I don't have them next to each other but I have broken down where I got that State aid number. We do pull down detention money from our – we get a detention allocation and if you don't spend it all, I can use it for your STSJP program which I'm not sure what that stands for. But that is for juveniles and there has probably been an increase in that. I can go look and see exactly what area that came from but, when expenses increase, that is going to increase as well.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess to Pierre's point, if I may. When I look at the (*inaudible*) projected, I'm more interested in that. So that would be a \$780,000 change, which makes it more of a concern.

Ms. Lis: O.k., I will look more into it.

Legislator Nazzaro: Even if you took away the \$70,000, you are still talking \$700,000 increase in State aid which is like 10%.

Mrs. Dennison: Val, isn't there a shift going between Federal and State aid with the block grant? So it's causing the State aid to be higher and the Federal to be lower? So the block grant is three quarters New York State aid? No?

Ms. Lis: No. I don't have anything in front of me that says, here is where the different numbers compare with the different pieces within it. I just have my breakdown right now, of the budgeted number, where it comes from. Because there are several components. There's the budgeted expenses and our basic percentage that we generally get for those. There is the MA (*inaudible*) demo, there's the Code Blue money, there's the CAPTA/CARA grant, the Foster Care block grant, RSTIA(?) money, and Child Welfare and (*inaudible*) settlement, there are several pieces in there. So I'll make something that shows what all of those are for those three time periods.

Legislator Nazzaro: One quick follow-up on that. I know that you are going to get us information but, aren't expenses going down though? I mean, if the reimbursements are tied to expenses and expenses are going down, I would expect reimbursements to go down, unless there is a new program or the percentages are completely –

Ms. Lis: The percentages aren't changing that much but one thing that you will not see here is we don't get charged for occupancy any longer. I'm not sure what the differences between what I had in there, the two years, those don't show in our expenses but we do get to claim against those. So that has an effect as well.

Legislator Nazzaro: I think that that detail is important. Thank you. Very complicated, I know. We have been down this path many times.

Ms. Lis: It's hard for me to answer questions on the fly because everything is related so that is why I say that I'll come back to you.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Any other questions on this?

Mrs. Schuyler: A.6055, Day Care or we call it Child Care. The staff that works this program are in the A.6010. What we have here are the contractual line mainly with Chautauqua Opportunities as well as the individual child care providers. Then we do get a block grant from the State. We have fewer cases and we also have a carryover from the Child Care block grant and that 100% Federal funded. So we have a maintenance of effort that's reflected there as well. We're fortunate, actually in our County, that we – most counties go over in this. They don't have

enough money allocated for child care. We've had enough to keep the program running and actually that's why we have a carryover. I don't know how many more years the State is going to allow us to have a carryover when other counties don't have enough money and we're allowed to carry ours over that we don't spend.

Ms. Lis: It's over a million dollars and it continues to increase over the past few years because we just don't have that much (*inaudible*).

Mrs. Schuyler: This is the subsidized child care.

Legislator Chagnon: It says that the State aid is 75% and Federal 100%. So how can the aid decrease more than the expenses?

Ms. Lis: Good question. I do have something and I'll find out what I did there but it is based on the expenses. It may be that – I mean, I'm coming into understanding this better. The Child Care block grant is kind of two prong. There are people who are paid for by the State and then paid for by the Federal government. I'm going to get this wrong probably but I believe that the Federal government is paying for – let me think, they are paying for the people who are on Temporary Assistance, TANF. So they pay 100% of their day care. The people who are - some are working, but they meet the limitations that they don't make too much money that we can give them a subsidy for their child care, are only paid 75% by the State. So what I'm thinking is, we keep moving more toward those people who are working. So we're getting less money in net, for our population that we're taking care of. Also what we have to do is, there is the maintenance of effort as Christine mentioned, is we do have to pay in at least, it's around a half a million dollars, that we have to spend on that State side. So as the people qualify for the State side have been dropping, we have to pay in more. So it's kind of a – I'll have to make you something. It's not as straight forward as you think. There are two different populations within that group.

Legislator Chagnon: Two different rates.

Ms. Lis: The mix is changing.

Legislator Whitford: Just so I understand it, more of the population is moving toward the 75% than the 100% Federal.

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Whitford: So that would account for a higher decrease in the (*inaudible*) you are talking about.

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: A.6070, Services for Recipients. That really is the – we contract with actually a child psychologist for court ordered evaluations. We just put that number based on our recent years usage of the psychologist to have that there.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: That is a big change.

Ms. Lis: We basically have budgeted it at \$50,000, I think for a few years and we never used the \$50,000. So we thought that we would bring it down a little closer to what we're actually seeing even though it is fully funded. We don't want to have to come back if we do have a bunch of people all of a sudden go here but we thought we kind of (*inaudible*)...

Mrs. Schuyler: Next, we have 6109, Family Assistance. That's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. That is the Federal program. We all get 60 months in our lifetime to be on Federally funded temporary assistance. So that is where this falls in. We have been seeing a decrease in cases and I think that is reflective of the economy. People are working. So we have seen a decrease trend in cases in both our Family Assistance and Safety Net that we'll talk about next. For the Human Services committee, you get a great deal of detail at your monthly meetings with the monthly report. If any members of the Audit & Control Committee are interested in that monthly report, this is the most recent that we talked about at committee this month. So there has been a 36% decrease in total Temporary Assistance caseloads since back in 2012. As well as Safety Net we'll talk about next. So that's why we budgeted to decrease it. Didn't want to go crazy with the decrease because it's hard to really say where this economy will go. For instance, in January of 2016, there was 1,088 TANF cases, 2017; there was 951, January of 18'; 930 and in January of 2019, 824. So, that's why we felt comfortable in decreasing that amount there.

Legislator Chagnon: Under Federal aid your note indicates that you have a blended reimbursement rate of 79% of expenses. With your \$900,000 decrease in expenses, 79% of that is \$711,000 and yet you have decreased your Federal aid by \$515,000.

Ms. Lis: I will have to take a look at that. But it's not – I'll have to look at that. I don't want to tell you something incorrect at this point.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess that's especially true but is there any occupancy tax related to that here too?

Ms. Lis: That's all going to show in the A.6010 mainly. A lot of our stuff shows in A.6010. We don't have a lot of choices how we book things. It's kind of crazy. The State actually dictates even our chart of accounts. So where things land is up to them and so the people working on this routed 6010, and the occupancy costs and all those sorts of things, but when it comes down to actual payments made for these clients, those are here in this department.

Mrs. Schuyler: I guess to put it in perspective, if you think January of 2019 there was only 824 cases jus throughout the County, it's a huge price tag. Really not a lot of cases.

Next tab, we have 6119, also called Child Care. Foster and institutional care. This is where you see all of our costs for Foster Care. That includes are family boarding homes, therapeutic Foster Care and higher level of care which are voluntary agencies or facilities. There are kids that are, some are in our custody, they are in Foster Care and they could be in State custody which that is our OCFS facility, are separate, but if a child is in the custody of the State, and put into a voluntary agency instead of a OCFS facility, they would also fall into this category.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Are they the ones who would go through Family Court and be assigned or is that a different group?

Mrs. Schuyler: This is Family Court. So we know that within our expenses, about \$2 million dollars a year goes out in adoption subsidies. Then we have significant costs related to higher level of care is what we call that and that is the kids that are in voluntary agencies such as GA Home. In 2019, year to date, we're about \$900,000 for kids that are in higher level of care facilities such as Hillside, Gateway Longview, the GA Homes, (*inaudible*) Hope, Conners, Glove House, William George, whatever voluntary agency can meet the child care needs the best.

Ms. Lis: It's probably through July or August maybe. (*cross talk*)...

Mrs. Schuyler: So right now, number wise, I just looked at as of August 8th, we had 35 children in the higher level of care. Three of those children are Raise the Age kids, so they should be reimbursed at 100% when in some day, that all magically happens from the State. They are expensive. They are about \$250,000 for half a year for the Raise the Age kids.

Mrs. Dennison: But those costs foreseen they would not be in this department.

Ms. Lis: No, they are going to be in the other.

Mrs. Schuyler: They will end up coming over but in general, when we look at our kids that we have, we have 35 of them from our County that are in some sort of a what we call voluntary agency or facility. The facilities have different rates so it all depends on what level of care the child needs, determines what the rate is for them, then how long they stay in that facility. We get charged per day, per child. It is very, very expensive proposition.

Ms. Lis: While you see an increase here, part of this increase is because we're hoping to get some of the juveniles out of OCFS facilities. It costs so much and then next step down is to here. It's probably about half as much a day but several of them have been moving. So that would cause us to increase a bit.

Legislator Muldowney: How young can they be?

Mrs. Schuyler: How young? Very young. We have a one year old, we have a – this also includes therapeutic Foster homes and we have two, two year olds, two four year olds, six year old, thirteen year old. This doesn't have any names on it but it tells you the cost per facility.

Ms. Lis: I think that is the room and board. There is also tuition on top of that.

Mrs. Schuyler: That's the room and board, right.

Ms. Lis: So I think that's probably about half of it. Right now we're averaging 110 children in Foster Care. That is just in my care custody. When I first took over, Social Services

in 2011, I think, we were averaging about 100 kids in Foster Care. That seemed kind of like the State's average.

Legislator Gould: I can't hear you.

Mrs. Schuyler: A 100 kids we had averaged in care when I took over Social Services and now we're averaging a 110 kids in care. It's an average because kids come and go constantly, sadly.

Legislator Whitford: The main reason why they enter into this system is (*cross talk*).

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, it all starts with CPS. We get a report from the State of suspected child abuse or neglect and if the children are in eminent danger, then they are immediately removed from the home and either put into what we call safety plan, which is a relative or someone who checks out o.k., that is able to temporarily care for the child while the investigation ensues or they are put into a Foster home. Then the Family Court process folds out so it really comes down to the safety of the children.

Mr. Anderson: They can also move within the higher levels of care based on what is going on with them while they are in their placement so they could go up or down into a lower restrictive or more supportive environment based on what is going on.

Mrs. Schuyler: John is exactly right and what we're seeing is kids with more complex needs. We've had a lot of positive tox babies, a lot of (*inaudible*) syndrome, a lot of parents who are struggling with substance abuse and that's a long road. So, kids could be in Foster care for a lot longer period of time while we have to do diligent efforts with the parents to try and reunite the families because that really is our first charge. To reunite families. It's not to remove, it's to reunite. But that can take a long time. The Family First Preventive Services Act, is going into effect in some states sooner than others. New York State got a waiver, or got an extension, so, by September 2021, we have to be in full compliance with the Federal Act. It is a total culture shift of the Child Welfare system in New York. New York ranks, I think it's 46th in the nation for our permanency rates and our ability to keep kids in Foster homes versus in these voluntary agencies. New York has pretty much been, put the kid someplace and they are too hard to handle so they have to go into a facility. We're being charged in the future with keeping kids in the community. So we're going to need more Foster homes. We're going to need a lot more community support that we currently don't have and then Federal government has started to put together a clearing house. We must use only evidence based or promising practices for preventive services. So that means like, right now, we could have community services workers that do some parenting but it's not evidence based. They are really looking at you utilizing clinicians, so you have to have licensed master's level social workers and 24/7 availability and we internally, don't have that nor should we have that nor will we have that. But we have to make sure that our community partners have those right programs. Right now internally the only program we have that so far is on the BEDS(?) list, we only have 12 programs so far on this list, is Nurse Family Partnership. We are the only ones in the County who do have the Nurse Family Partnership and it's one of the evidence based programs that were there. So when we get down to the health side, that will be a funding source in the future for Nurse Family Partnership which is good.

Legislator Whitford: Right now you have very few there that are evidence based (*inaudible*)...

Mrs. Schuyler: The 12 that are there, there is Nurse Family Partnership that we have and Parents as Teachers, which is an excellent Community Based program run by Jamestown Community Learning Council. So that is already on there. So that is a good thing for them too. It's sustainability for their programs moving forward. But that is a huge culture shift for our staff. It's going to be a huge shift for the courts, for everyone to keep these kids in the community so we have to have the right services that we can wrap around these children and families to keep them in the community and we need more Foster homes. So we're already starting to work on those initiatives but you can see how much it costs to have these kids in these facilities and they are not having good outcomes. Even in State facilities. They usually come out worse than they went in. So what we can do to keep them in the community will be much better off to do so.

Mr. Anderson: And also an emphasis on more utilization of family members for family certified Foster Care which they will also need additional support of the community like Christine is talking about in order to support that child with them.

Mrs. Schuyler: Sort of the main reason we took over PINS diversion. Persons In Need of Supervision because of January 1, 2020, any child that is placed into voluntary agency or into detention, there will be no reimbursement for.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Wait, say that again.

Mrs. Schuyler: There will be no reimbursement for any county or any Social Services district for a child who is placed on a PINS petition. So a school or a family petitions a child as a PINS, then it goes to court and if that child is placed, there will be no reimbursement. Now the Judge still has the ability to place a child.

Mr. Anderson: But it won't be reimbursed.

Mrs. Schuyler: But our main job really has got to be keeping these kids out of court. I don't want a kid going into the Family Court system. I don't want them to go before the Judge to even have a chance to be sent away. That's really why we are assuming PINS diversion from Probation. We did that without adding any extra staff. We have moved some caseworkers around, we have utilized our own FTE's, so we didn't increase to take this over. We swapped out what we could to get the caseworkers that we'll need to do currently, we're working on it now, the PINS diversion. I believe that Probation is continuing to utilize their staff for Raise the Age children as well as the (*inaudible*) that is coming in January 1st. But, that is where we are at with the higher level of care. Through July, we were like \$1.4 million dollars. We have to get these kids out of these facilities and back home. We have kids that have been in – the one kid, 899 days. Put that into years. Two sixty five, 269, 271, 423, 640, 762 days.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Same place the whole time?

Mrs. Schuyler: No. When they change around, some of them have been in the same place. One thing about budget, I know each one of these children personally by the time I've looked at all of their things but, like this is a child and this is their length of stay and how many days they were in which facility and how much the rate is per each day. (*Inaudible*).. identify information off of there for you. The bottom line is, we need to get kids out of these facilities and keep them with family or in a Foster home situation and we're not going to have an option because we're not going to be, not just reimbursed for PINS but when Family First Preventive Services initially hits us, the reimbursement is very, very limited. If you would like to see the ADM, I didn't bring it with me but it's our administrative directive that we get from the State. There is a – you have to be back in court, I think it's every two weeks, is all you are allowed to have a kid in a higher level of care. There has to be assessments done, you have to prove that that child really needs to be in that congregate care setting. So it would be very difficult to get any reimbursement for any child. So if the child really needs to be in congregate care, then they need to be there but you really have to prove that that is the best setting for the child. It should really help to decrease our costs moving forward if we can get the things in place, meaning the community. That you'll end up seeing on the contractual line but that's already where you see the costs because we have to contract with all of these facilities in order to place children there.

Ms. Lis: But we probably won't see it until 2021. We might start working toward it but we really can't say.

Mrs. Schuyler: This is a tough one for my staff in Child Welfare. They are not used to this. Sadly, they feel these kids are at a lot of risks so we don't – it's a risky piece out there to keep them with families and try to get community support in for them. We're having a struggle internally with staff on this one.

Ms. Lis: It's a different kind (*inaudible*) as well because one thing that they have started to do is they want us to do more of the kinship. So if someone could take in a child but they need to make a bathroom handicap accessible, we're allowed to help them do that now. So there is different kinds of costs in order to put those children into the family care versus keeping them – it's very hard to quantify right now.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Alright, anything else on that one?

Legislator Chagnon: I understand this is a very complicated situation but looking back at last year, last year we knew that the 2017 actual cost was \$4.8 million and we knew the 2018 was running ahead of budget and ended up at \$5.3 million and our budget last year was \$4 million dollars. So clearly and I recall some of the conversation, you had intentions of actions to be taken to reduce the cost. Now that we're taking the budget back up to \$5.9 million dollars, apparently some of what you had hoped to accomplish in 2019 was not successful. Could you just give us an overview of that?

Ms. Lis: I don't know that it was an accomplish item, I think it was more that we had seen a decrease because some children had left care so we were building on that, hoping that was a trend and it wasn't. We had information on that with Kathleen but we had talked about this one. I don't have it with me right now but, -

Mrs. Schuyler: Honestly, I think that we under budgeted.

Ms. Lis: We did. It was wishful thinking probably because we did see that we had the number of kids coming in, in the first part of the year, was slower than normal. We had a couple more kids leave but then it caught up with us and it turned out to be pretty much a normal year. We're always trying to base this on what we're seeing. We don't want to come here over budget so based on what we've seen, we had hoped that that was the case but it wasn't.

Legislator Chagnon: So what I hear you saying is that this was more just the 2019 budget was wishful thinking based on trends through the first half of 2018, not that you had intended to make progress that those intentions didn't come to fruition.

Ms. Lis: Right. I don't think that there were any changes in initiative or anything like that.

Mr. Anderson: I don't recall that there were.

Legislator Chagnon: O.k., you have that puzzled look on your face.

Mr. Anderson: I was just wondering if you were thinking of anything specific that we might of talked about last year that you would like to ask about.

Legislator Chagnon: Well, its specific, Christine made comments today about we need to get these kids out of these facilities. Get them into the community and that sparked some of the conversation from last year.

Ms. Lis: And now we really do have to because the Federal government will not fund us anymore if we don't. So now the whole State is in this same situation. Everyone is going to have to do it.

Mrs. Schuyler: And sadly, with just Leanna (*inaudible*) who is Deputy Commissioner of Family and Children Services and myself saying, we have to keep these kids in the community, quite placing them, isn't really working. We have to get our caseworkers on board. We have to get Family Court on board. Things need to change or it's going to cost us an absolutely fortune, more so than it already does.

Legislator Chagnon: Your last note, which doesn't necessarily relate to this account, but it says, the Federal Community Block grant –

Mrs. Schuyler: Foster Care.

Legislator Chagnon: Foster Care, is decreasing?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Chagnon: Why is it decreasing?

Ms. Lis: It's what we've been allocated.

Mrs. Schuyler: The State sends out your allocation.

Mr. Anderson: It's a percentage of each county is allocated based on utilization and maybe the total block prepared grant dollars available to the State were reduced.

Ms. Lis: We can get you a copy of the (*cross talk*).. of how they do it but it's what we are given.

Legislator Chagnon: You have no idea why they are decreasing it then, it's just what they do?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: This isn't tied to anything down State or anything like that.

Ms. Lis: No there is nothing big going on and this is the same thing that we talked about in A.6010 because that is where that revenue is kept. It went up a little, went down a little and it stays within the same general area. We can find you that. There is an explanation in there that particularly makes sense to us.

Mrs. Schuyler: I even asked the State for more clarification and they pointed me back to the (*cross talk*)...

Ms. Lis: It's based on historical expenditures but I think it's based on several years ago.

Mrs. Schuyler: I think it was 2014 expenditures.

Ms. Lis: But I can get you something about how that is done.

Mrs. Schuyler: And then some of what we run into actually with all of our 6010 costs too is those random moment studies that we talk about when you talk about how much reimbursement we get at the State level. Remember, random moment studies are how the State calculates how much time your staff spends working on what program areas. That determines what percentage of reimbursement we get on them. Well, on the public health side of the world, our staff keep track of their time all day, every day. They know which program they work in, so it's charged accordingly to which grant or which program for State aid. The Social Services world, the State has what they call random moment surveys with the five big counties. So, there is no rural county that's in it. It's just the five big ones and State budget staff calls staff working in those counties and say hey, what are you working on right now? And they tell them if they are in Temporary Assistance or they are in Medicaid or whether it's Safety Net or whether it's Family Assistance. If it's Child Welfare or Foster Care or which area they are in and then whatever the results are from those five big cities, that percentage is extrapolated across the entire State. It makes absolutely no sense but that is the way that the State does it. One thing that we have learned this year, was, for some reason, the random moment studies negatively

impacted some of our counties more so than others. Cortland was one of them, we were one of them and it came down to staff in the big counties staying they were working on actually non-reimbursable areas. It was called Title 20 of other. So, I've gone to the Commissioners and I said, what does the State ask for your staff when they call? They didn't know. So then, how do you train your staff to answer the surveys. They have no answers to any of this. I said, I don't understand because what your staff is doing and what you are telling them to do, is actually impacting every single county in the State. So we're taking it to OCFS and to the New York Public Welfare Association with the request that please find out what is on the survey. What are they asking and then we need, as the New York Public Welfare Association, my suggestion was that we put together some sort of a training for staff because it is important how you answer. We ran into this in Environmental Health. They use the electronic help information system that the State has for specifically Environmental Health and staff found it just easy to throw something under admin. If you are a Sanitarian, you put admin? We're not going to get as much reimbursement as if you put in for your actual time being public water or public sewage or whatever the thing is. So we really looked into that and trained them that, that is the last category that you use.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's really unfortunate, quick commentary, they are basing this on the five largest. As you are talking about this, I think about how, in my former life in health care, how the allocations and you said admin, when you get reimbursed, if you stuck too much into admin, it reduced what you are getting reimbursed in your Medicaid rates. So to me, they really should have it upstate - they shouldn't just base it on a downstate because it's a five downstate -

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, it's Erie, Onondaga, Nassau, Suffolk, it's not New York City.

Ms. Lis: New York City has its own rules most of the time.

Mrs. Schuyler: But it is Nassau and Suffolk.

Ms. Lis: Westchester.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: They are highly populated.

Mrs. Schuyler: Erie and I think Onondaga.

Ms. Lis: Though we all face the same issues, we are different sometimes. This all flows back to why our revenue numbers were not right for last year and this year. What happens is, a lot of money gets funneled into that Title 20 all other and when it goes into claim, they actually pay us for it but then they go wait a minute, this was your limit, you've gone over your limit, and the limit is very small, and they take it back. But they don't take it back for 9 months, a year, and even though it shows up on report (*inaudible*) take it back, I can't rely on the reports because they actually take it back for several months after that. So, it's kind of been a learning curve, I have to admit but we've been peeling back this onion for a while and trying to get some help on it.

Legislator Nazzaro: And there is no local filings or no filings that you do with the State where you can – you say this Title 20 which is all other, which is what, admin, you said? It's like miscellaneous almost. There is no reporting that you do to the State where you can challenge that?

Ms. Lis: No, it automatically goes there. The biggest problem with that Title 20 other, is, you are falling into the Child Welfare zone and that grouping, you get your Federal money and then there is the State funding of 62% which is open ended. So if you go over on those things, you still get State funding on that overage. Title 20 all other, you do not and so if something goes in there, we're just going to get the little tiny bit of State funding they allow us and no State funding and that's -

Legislator Nazzaro: Is this for Federal, this –

Ms. Lis: Title 20 is Federal government and so that is what is happening. It's taken all those costs and just not allowing us any State reimbursement on them. That is really what it's doing.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Any other questions on this? We are scheduled to take a break now. We'll take 10 minutes. You all good with that? (10:18 a.m.)

(Committee reconvened at 10:30 a.m.)

Mrs. Schuyler: I neglected to tell you- you might notice this candy bar sitting here, but one of our CPS senior caseworkers when I was down there with staff last week and I gave them a little budget prep of what was coming- she went into our office and she brought back a million dollars. So, if you want a million dollars more, you each can have a 100 grand. She gave me ten 100 grand bars and I thought that was really funny.

(Cross-laughter)

Legislator Rankin: Thank you.

Mrs. Schuyler: I told her I would do it, so there you go.

Legislator Nazzaro: Everyone knows this, but as you're looking at the summary sheet where the local share went up \$613,000 and I know things went down and other things went slightly up, but foster care/ child care is three quarters of a million. So, if you didn't have that there are other things that are going down, obviously. It's just having a huge impact on the local share. I know you all observed that, but it's a big number.

Ms. Lis: It is a big number.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: A6123- Juvenile Delinquent Care- that's detention. That really is for- we use East Fairy (?) in Buffalo as the short term secure detention center. Based on what we've been seeing with kids and also knowing that with raise the age- 17 year olds going into effect tomorrow, if we need short term detention where 17 year olds are going to go. That is why we kept it as what we are projecting-

Legislator Rankin: That's the same one we've been using, right?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yeah, in Erie County.

Legislator Muldowney: Is this all court ordered, or is this-

Mrs. Schuyler: When kid's go- yeah, they have to be placed in there.

Ms. Lis: That's where they go temporarily in the very beginning.

Mrs. Schuyler: They are picked up and taken to detention- literally secure detention.

Legislator Muldowney: O.K.

Mrs. Schuyler: Again, if a child is placed into this detention on PINS after the first of the year, we won't get any reimbursement at all for any of these kids, which we pay 51%, so we get 49% reimbursement on it, but that won't happen if they're on PINS.

Ms. Lis: This will also bring up a problem that we have, in case you don't remember, they haven't billed us in three years. We know how many kids have been in there because we have reports, but they haven't billed it in three years. So, lots of time the information that we have is the- you have to kind of wrestle it out of their hands to do anything with it.

Mrs. Schuyler: 6123 got RTA- the juvenile delinquent (*inaudible*) for raise the age. We did just have a resolution go through where we did increase what would have been in the 2019 budget for this because we are seeing kids that are in those higher level of care placements and the voluntary agencies that are falling (*inaudible*) raise the age kids. So, that kind of is what it is. It's another crazy state area that- I wouldn't bet one of these candy bars on that 100% reimbursement since it seems to keep getting cut- what they're actually going to cover under that.

Ms. Lis: And you see going way up, what I did is I budgeted based on our raise the age plan we put in with the state last year. Last year was even newer, so we really didn't put so much in there other than the people knowing that it was 100% funded, so if we needed to adjust it wouldn't be such a terrible thing. We didn't get any bills- we didn't really know how many kids were going to come through. In August, I think, we got our first bills from the children's home in Wyoming is where they all are right now. I can't remember how much it is, but it's going to be a good million dollars, I think. I can't remember. I just did the resolution. It's going to be an awful lot of money through the year. It's the one that just went through at this last meeting. We just

don't really know, but if we do the amount of that money will be 100% funded. We're not worried about that. We made our best estimate.

Mrs. Schuyler: Another fun topic- A6129- state training school, which really means OCFS facilities. So, these are children that are in the care and custody of the state and they are in a state owned and run facility. We are getting better data from the state on who is where.

Ms. Lis: Yeah, for maybe a year now. Before that, they weren't even telling us what was going on with the kids.

Mrs. Schuyler: We do have better data on that.

Legislator Nazzaro: Again, you're budgeting less?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: You feel good about that?

Ms. Lis: They've been moving out of here. Of course some of them (*inaudible*) was called the foster care accounts- the childcare- they've been shifting down and then they take a step before they leave and can go into electronic monitoring and daycare, which we found out because really there was so little communication- we don't have to pay for. It's included in the rate we've been paying all along. So, all the times they're in there shifting out is free. So, there's been more of them shifting out. We did actually get a couple more in there than we hoped to get. That's why our projects a little higher.

Mrs. Schuyler: I really looked at each one of these children and from the time that we prepared the 2019 budget, we have had four children re-enter an OCFS facility. So, they were stepped down to after-care. One was stepped down in June of 2018 and returned in November. Another was stepped down August of 2018 and returned in December. Another was stepped down in November and returned in March of 2019 and then another one was stepped down in July of 2018 and returned in September. Then we had three new children placed in OCFS custody and facilities after we prepared the 2019 budget- two in December and one in February of 2019 and only one child was released from OCFS custody and that was in February 2019. So, there was a lot of movement. Four kids are a lot that we thought were stepped down and going to stay out that went back in and then three new ones went in. So, when we- as of July 1st, the information we had when we prepared the budget, there were 12 children in OCFS custody. Four on after care or monitoring, five in an OCFS facility and three of them in the voluntary agencies, which falls under the foster care line item. Now, even just since we've prepared the budget information as of September 18th, we have two children were released from OCFS custody, two children have returned to an OCFS facility. One was released in August, who came back at the end of August. One was stepped down in April and went back. So, right now we have ten kids in OCFS custody. Five of them are in an OCFS facility, one of them was just stepped up to a secure facility, three children in a voluntary agency and two children are now in after care placement. So, just one kid makes a huge swing.

With the Raise the Age legislation there is a limit on how long a kid can be in a congregate care setting, but OCFS has not done that for their kids that they currently have. We've got kids that have been in OCFS custody for literally years. 1,321 days- that was at the end of June, one child had been there that long. Another one- 949 days, 613 days, 670 days, 908, 1,433, 1,057, 1,059, 894 days. These kids are not coming out any better after being in an institution for that long and every single one of them when they were released on after care; they went back in because the state does not do any work with transitioning a child. We didn't even know the kids were released and sent back to the same exact community, same exact situation they were in. So, you go from a really structured setting where you're getting a lot of support and a lot of instruction and a lot of help back to the City of Jamestown and life as it was before you went in there two years ago and no wonder they go right back in.

Ms. Lis: The conversation is there. At least they're talking to us now, we know where the kids are, we know what's going on and on some of them we can work with them and try to move them along.

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Gould: You said 3 kids were in voluntary-

Mrs. Schuyler: Voluntary Agency is the facilities that we talked about under foster care like New Directions, or Gateway Long View, or William George Connors. Those are all facilities that are owned and operated by not for profit agencies and the state refers to them as a voluntary agency.

Legislator Gould: Wouldn't it be best to have them all in voluntary?

Ms. Lis: Compared to this-

Mrs. Schuyler: Once the kid gets to court and the judge places the kid in OCFS custody, we lose all say. We have absolutely no say in anything that happens with that child until they're released back out. So, it's up to the state as to where they're going to put the kid.

Legislator Gould: But they can go to court (*inaudible*) that way and they would be a lot better off, the county would be a lot better off-

Mrs. Schuyler: It would be, but that's not-

Legislator Gould: Everyone would be better off.

Mrs. Schuyler: It would be. Unfortunately all of this cost hits our budget, but we have no say in it because probation takes the kid for a JD- juvenile delinquent charge, our county attorney's office is who is the attorney and then it's a family court judge. So, mainly whatever probation and our county attorney recommend usually the judge does. So, if they're saying send the kid to OCFS then the kid goes to OCFS. That's the stuff that we really need to get a better handle on and Jon had a great question. We were looking at all these kids and what was going on

and what were there charges. If there's not a really serious offense or somebody is violent, they should not be off to OCFS.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, an offense with a weapon, a sexual offense, a violent sexual offense, attempted robbery- those are the only children that really should be in a facility like this and that's the way it had always been for many, many years here in Chautauqua County. I was with the department back then when we had very low numbers. As Christine said, at this point it's a different scenario with the way that probation is operating and the way that kids are run through the course. So, we don't know an awful lot once a child hits the court with what the decision is going to be or where that child is going to land. It's really out of our hands at that point.

Mrs. Schuyler: Another reason why we're taking over the PINS diversion because most of these kids start out on PINS. So, if you can do a good job, really do diligent effort and diverting them you keep them out of the court system, which then keeps them out of OCFS.

Mr. Anderson: And only take the right cases to court- the ones that need to be there because there's a violent situation.

Mrs. Schuyler: We updated these graphs, actually for last year, and when you look at these you can see the number of care days that a kid was in an OCFS facility and the dollars that go with it. It's interesting to see the length of stay too in the last couple of years. So, kids are staying there longer. There might be fewer kids, but they're staying there longer.

Ms. Lis: There's a core group that are kind of staying because we have gotten more involved and said what the heck is going on and we can't do anything, but we did complain a little and I think they've moved some of the kids down to voluntary agencies, but there's a nugget that is staying and the other kids are staying, so you have these kids that just stay all year. So, the length of stay just naturally-

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Gould: I wouldn't complain a little, I'd complain a lot.

Ms. Lis: Leanne gets very involved-

Mrs. Schuyler: Oh, she does.

Ms. Lis: The kids that went in- we couldn't believe more kids went in because we've been telling everyone not to send more kids there and she tried, and tried.

Mrs. Schuyler: A lot of times it's on truancy or something. It's not a violent offense. It's because they don't go to school and the parents can't control them and they're out on the streets doing bad things.

Ms. Lis: Because they're bored, like kids get.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just for clarification, your comment there- and I know we don't get reimburse- you said we pay net 50% after state shares, so really the total overall cost of this is twice that-

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: And then the way they bill you they already deduct their share, so there's no revenue- it's not like you're billed and the revenue comes, so really the cost to the New York State taxpayer is twice that amount.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, I don't know what it is per day at this point, but-

Legislator Nazzaro: That's where I was going-

Ms. Lis: We don't actually know. They haven't billed us since 2016.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because that's the whole issue. They upped the rate that last time and we got-

Ms. Lis: And they might do it again, we don't know.

Mrs. Schuyler: The rate doubled from \$429 to \$998.

Mr. Anderson: Ten years ago it was around \$500-\$600 a day and now-

Ms. Lis: We haven't been billed since 2016, so they may do it again. They've got these facilities; they've got a cap that they can charge us statewide-

Mrs. Schuyler: \$55 million statewide.

Ms. Lis: So, that's the cap of what they can charge everybody, but then they're going to go what kids are in there, what's our daily rate going to be, so the counties that have the most kids in there are going to shoulder that burden.

Mr. Anderson: Right.

Ms. Lis: That's another reason we've been working towards not having kids in there.

Mrs. Schuyler: When you look at the graphs you can see how when we're doing a really good job with diversion, the number of kids was down to I think two that were in facilities. Since then it's just skyrocketed.

Mr. Anderson: There were a lot of initiatives that various departments used to run that were specific to these kids that aren't as (*inaudible*) as they used to be or maybe not even in place. So, a lot has changed with the way that we try to divert kids from this level of care in particular. So, there's been a lot of change and a lot of shift over the years-

Mrs. Schuyler: We've just got to keep them out of court.

Mr. Anderson: I can tell you that because I was here previously.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, financial questions- the rate- the last adjustment that we got that was from 2015 and the rate was \$900 and some dollars a day? In this budget are you using that amount?

Ms. Lis: I've been budgeting at \$1,200 a day for the last few years because I just don't know.

Legislator Nazzaro: OK, so you're budgeting \$1,200 so when they come in eventually and reconcile and go back to 2016-2020- if the rate is \$1,200 or below-

Ms. Lis: We're good.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, if all of a sudden it went above that we would owe something?

Ms. Lis: I'm kind of torn. I don't know if I should be upping that rate, but I've just kept it at \$1,200 because I just have no idea.

Legislator: That's good to know because that was a huge-

Mrs. Schuyler: It is. When they rolled out the \$55 million cap statewide, which is really good because of the way that this system works, I believe at that time there were only statewide 32 kids in OCFS facilities statewide. We had 15 of them. So, that shows you we have a serious issue with not keeping kids in our community and sending them to OCFS.

Mr. Anderson: It's particular to our community and a few others.

Mrs. Schuyler: Nobody has anywhere near the kids that we do.

Mr. Anderson: Much larger counties don't. Larger counties and similar counties don't have these numbers.

Ms. Lis: The issue is that the \$55 million cap is re-negotiated every year at budget time. It's not the- you don't know if you're going to get it. It's an annual re-up of that \$55 million and so far, they have done that. You know, the state's not-now they have the raise the age kids, so hopefully they've rearranged their facilities, but they weren't going to close their facilities just because there's fewer kids in them because they do, as a whole, have fewer kids, but they weren't doing anything about it. The facilities were just running at full steam and they were still charging us.

Legislator Nazzaro: What is the actual rate right now? A day?

Ms. Lis: I don't remember- think it's-

Mrs. Schuyler: I think it's on that sheet. The sheet I just sent around.

Mr. Anderson: The other sign of that, after they've taken \$900 plus a day, when they discharge the child unless it's to a facility like Christine talked about there is very little support that is provided by the state because they have custody of the child after the child is discharged. That's why you see a huge number of these kids going right back into the facility. They're already complicated situations and then they release them with after care, which is out of the Buffalo office. There might be one or two staff that handle the eight region counties, so they're not well versed in what's available in Chautauqua County, they certainly don't know the families, they haven't spent a lot of time with the families. Once the state takes custody- once the court places the child in state custody, we lose most of our contact with that case.

Mrs. Schuyler: Until they show back up again.

Mr. Anderson: So, again, it goes back to making sure we're diverting the right children from court.

Mrs. Schuyler: For instance, once teenage girl that was OCFS custody and they released her on monitoring got pregnant while she was out and then went back in. So, now we have a mothering teenager.

Mr. Anderson: It's not a lot of kids as you know its ten kids or whatever the number is. It could be a lot less.

Mrs. Schuyler: I called the facility-

Mr. Anderson: If we were doing things differently and right for the family- you can imagine what you could do with \$900 a day.

Mrs. Schuyler: I was so mad they weren't getting reproductive care. I mean, why are you not getting reproductive healthcare within an OCFS facility.

Mr. Anderson: There is nothing else more expensive than-

Legislator Rankin: They can't hook them up with the county's services here?

Mrs. Schuyler: They could.

Mr. Anderson: They could do a lot more.

Mrs. Schuyler: They should, but that's all on the state.

Ms. Lis: So, in 2014 the rate was \$429 and 2015 it went up to \$998 and then in 2016 it went down to \$984.

Mr. Anderson: So, that had to do with the way that they're distributing the cost and-

Ms. Lis: Yeah because there were so fewer kids in there.

Mr. Anderson: They were shifting the cost back for lower of care- or lower level of children in care means less money coming in. They had (*cross-talk*) facilities at a certain level, and it still cost that amount of money (*cross-talk*) they had to raise the rates.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well that's why, to be honest with you, when that came out we met with George and somebody from the state comptrollers. We wanted to challenge- I think they're just finding a way to shift costs and say OK we've got to balance our budgets and we're going to stick it over here and pass it on to the counties.

Mr. Anderson: Well they've got to figure out something to do with the employees that –

Ms. Lis: I think they were just keeping those-

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, the cost allocations, which are so critical.

Ms. Lis: So, I don't know what they've done now with raise the age- if they've taken some of those places and made them for that, so they're not wasting all that steam on this and raising the cost per day for this particular kind of thing, but I was at a seminar one time and I believe the woman I was talking to was actually from the office of budget or the governor's office or something because I was saying what the heck is going on with these rates and I was being my vocal self and complaining and she said that they were looking into it. So, I think that the whole OCFS- what they've done the rest of the state knows about it- the state government and is looking into it. What they'll do and how long it will take, no one knows.

Mrs. Schuyler: A lot of counties didn't notice it as badly though. We just had so many kids in there that it was awful.

Legislator Whitford: I would think you would notice it if you (*inaudible.*) Let's be realistic, if you're paying attention to what's going on and you're talking an increase within three or four years that more than doubles, someone's got to look at it. I don't understand why any of these systems aren't driven by some type of results. I can understand the ones that don't go from OCFS into a voluntary thing because it's pretty obvious that if they're severe you can't, but you're in the business of diversion, right? You want to-

Mr. Anderson: Keep kids in the community with their families.

Legislator Whitford: Absolutely. So, do they track the results on each child and why they're in there and how they got out? For that amount of money they should at least keep a record of that.

Mr. Anderson: One of the things with the family first initiative that is going to affect us with the children that are in Christine's custody, that initiative by design is designed to basically support kids at a lower cost, community based level. I can't remember if the state children are part of the family first initiative, but the answer to your question with the state is no there aren't incentives at the state level that I know of to keep these children out.

Legislator Whitford: Nothing is outcome driven.

Mr. Anderson: No, it is not. That's why the only thing that really impacts or should impact-

Legislator Whitford: (*Inaudible*) spend that kind of money and then not have a better outcome.

Mr. Anderson: It comes down to the decisions that are made here at the point at which there's a decision to move that case to court-

Mrs. Schuyler: These are our kids and we want to keep them here-

Mr. Anderson: That's really your focal decision point because once they're in court you don't know if the child is going to go here to this level of care or will the judge say no they are going to be diverted back to us or keep them in Christine's custody and continue to try diversion.

Mrs. Schuyler: There's a new study that just came out looking for the pipeline to prison and I can't remember what the percentage is – the risk- any kid that's sent to detention or to these facilities for any length of time the odds are that they're going to end up in prison. Once you're a juvenile delinquent, once you get into one of these facilities you're pretty much almost guaranteed to end up in jail.

Mr. Anderson: The same is true for just on the very, very front end of all this- earlier you asked how do these kids come in. They come in on an SCR report to child protective services. As soon as that kind of thing happens it increases the likelihood that- we don't want people coming into contact with us at all because once they do it increases the likelihood that there's going to be more of that contact all the way up to this at \$990 dollars a day or whatever that rate is. So, we want to divert early and keep kids as much as we can out of our eyesight and also up the chain.

Mrs. Schuyler: That also means that we'll need less staff, we'll need less everything if we could just turn some of this around.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Anything else on that? We could probably talk all day on just that.

Legislator Chagnon: Madame Chairman, I apologize, but can I go back to raise the age?

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Which number was that?

Legislator Chagnon: That was the previous department. I overlooked the fact that I have a detailed question. My detailed question is that you'll notice that the contractual expense in the 2020 budget is \$693,000. It's listed in the detail as postage.

Ms. Lis: Oh, is it?

Legislator Chagnon: Yes.

Ms. Lis: That's weird. Well, it's not.

Legislator Chagnon: I didn't think that was postage.

(Cross-talk)

Ms. Lis: I have no idea. We'll find out and we'll fix that, but it's basically going to be the facilities where the kids are.

Legislator Chagnon: That's what I thought.

Ms. Lis: Yeah.

(Cross-talk)

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: We are on safety net now?

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, cases are trending down and they have been. I can't predict how much lower they will go. Here again, on the monthly report that goes out to Human Services Committee they were briefed on where we're at with cases. *(Inaudible)* safety net cases are here somewhere- 888 we had in May in 2019. On our big spreadsheet if you're interested in these statistics, these are going back to 2016 every month. The blue charts are family assistance that's TANF, that's the federally funded. Those are individual and cases. The orange color over here is safety net and these are individuals and cases. So, you can clearly see there's been a decline on both. That goes back to my comment that if it wasn't for this stupid drug epidemic I really think we'd be in a good place in our community.

Ms. Lis: Someday it's going to plateau. We don't know for sure, so we're budgeting a decline.

Mr. Anderson: It's economy dependent. If you look at trends *(inaudible)* before 2008 when the stock market went down we were in a similar position because you had a higher rate of employment across the board nationally. After 2008 for a few years the caseloads went up and now they're on this downward trend because the economy's in a better position and fewer people are qualifying for assistance. That doesn't mean we've had fewer applications. There are still plenty of people that apply on a regular basis and that number has continued to go up the last several years. A lot of people applying and reapplying-

Mrs. Schuyler: I was in the South County Office Building last Thursday morning. The line was out the door for central intake in Jamestown. Out the door.

Mr. Anderson: We get about 38,000 through the door on an annual basis in Jamestown - 38,000 visits.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is there a limit on the amount of time they can-

Mrs. Schuyler: That's just Jamestown.

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Nazzaro: So, they can get beyond this-

Ms. Lis: It's the five years in the TANF and then they go to safety net. Also, a lot of our homeless people end up in the safety net as well.

Mrs. Schuyler: Because they're single-

Legislator Nazzaro: So there is a shift from TANF to safety net?

Ms. Lis: If you're in there for five years you'll shift over.

Legislator Nazzaro: You can be on safety net-

Mr. Anderson: Indefinitely.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just wanted to make sure that people weren't rolling off, which they're not.

Ms. Lis: Nope.

Mr. Anderson: What happens with this population that's left is they're- the vast majority are people who have multiple complexities that make it difficult for it to move off safety net or to be fully employed. When you have a larger caseload you can kind of help people along to other work related activities to get them off. Again, we're in a situation where the people who should be working and can be working are working and they're off the system.

Mrs. Schuyler: If you look at the monthly report when it shows our participation rate-how many are exempt from work activities and non-exempt. Right now we have a large portion of people that are exempt from work activities. That means they have medical or mental health or substance abuse issues that are preventing them from working. Right now we've got substantially more exempt than we do non-exempt and that negatively impacts our participation rate.

Mr. Anderson: This also follows that economic trend line from 2016. This is the eight Western New York counties. It shows how at this point the participation rate is lower amongst all counties because of the mix of cases that you have and it's affecting our participation rate and it is everyone else's as well.

Mrs. Schuyler: So, as you know of our yearly discussion of safety net it's a gamble depending on what we think next year is going to bring as far as economy and people working-

Ms. Lis: Like I said, sometimes we just feel like we may hit a plateau at some point just because these are the people that just- there's no way for us to get them out of there when we hit that bedrock.

Legislator Muldowney: Are those the people that are in the hotels that we talked about?

Ms. Lis: Yeah, some of them.

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, some of them.

Mr. Anderson: It's not a huge number. The overall number is anywhere from 20-30 at any given time that are in emergency shelter. So, that could be hotel or it could be actual shelter.

Ms. Lis: Some of our regular people on regular assistance- there's not enough money there. We're having a hard time finding landlords.

Mr. Anderson: So, what happens is the budget for emergency assistance when someone comes in in a housing emergency is much higher, so you can afford to put somebody up in a hotel or other emergency shelter, but when it comes to getting out of that shelter and having a TANF benefit the amount of money that the family or individual receives is not enough to cover the rent for many places. So you have people that are continuously – not continuously, but end up in emergency shelter looking for something they can afford and it's difficult for them to get out of emergency shelter, so it costs us more money and they're there longer than we'd like sometimes. That's what it boils down to.

Legislator Chagnon: Since we're talking economics-

Mr. Anderson: Yeah.

Legislator Chagnon: You indicated that the trends are dependent upon the national economy and the unemployment rate and things like that. So, how much of a lag is there? The reason I'm asking the question is let's say hypothetically we had another 2008 crisis in December of this year. Would we see immediate turnaround, or is there a lag of a year or more?

Mr. Anderson: I looked at data that originally came from Christine. She brought it back over the summer months from the commissioners meeting and it went back to a little bit before 2008 and then after 2008 and it looked to me like there was maybe a year-ish lag between when

those numbers start to creep up again of people applying for assistance and they're application and whether they get it is completely dependent on income.

Mrs. Schuyler: I think some of it would have to do with unemployment benefits or when that runs out-

Ms. Lis: How long it takes for the stock market crisis to actually effect companies and they lay people off. There's that type of-

Mr. Anderson: Or when they stop hiring.

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Chagnon: So, thank you for that, but my question really was how much risk do we have in 2020 if the economy suddenly turns bad. Really, there's probably not much risk in 2020 at this point. It would probably be the year after 2020 where we would see-

Mrs. Schuyler: I think so.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, your \$500,000 decrease in projected- I always look at the projected more than what we budgeted- that's based on trends? You're just saying it's a nice – I don't mean to phrase it that way, but it's a nice number that you're basing on trends?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess the reason I bring that up is because all of us have to be really careful because we're building a lot of- there's a lot of things that could flip here.

Mrs. Schuyler: There always is.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm one of them that said lets reduce safety net and you're not going to hear me say that this year, obviously. We're getting there and eventually it's going to plateau off. Everything goes in cycles and it's usually an eight year cycle for things with the economy. I think to Pierre's point our economy- I think we're plateauing.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yeah, there's some signs there.

Ms. Lis: You can see our- we had some nice steady decreases, but down toward the end here they're starting *(inaudible)* a little bit.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Anything else on this? Our next two fit into the conversation about emergency aid.

Mrs. Schuyler: This is the HEAP program, part of the Temporary Assistance Program. Some of our payroll and administrative costs are rolled into the 6010 account. We don't know what our allocation is yes. We haven't received it, which is typical. We never do. So, we're

budgeting what that's going to be based on trends and then we'll have to do a resolution to fix it when we get the allocation.

Ms. Lis: I would say the majority of the expenditures under HEAP are paid by the state. Everything's fed through the state system and they actually issue (*inaudible*) to the heating companies or whoever it may be. So, that's why you don't see a large contractual. We're basically administering the program.

Mrs. Schuyler: We have to administer the program; that's a mandate. When we used to be able to work with our partners like COI and Office for the Aging they could take applications and do some of the administrative processing. That changed a couple of years ago when the state said that it has to be two social services workers. It has to be a worker and a social services supervisor to sign off on every HEAP application. So, they don't give us very much for administration costs, so at that point it made no sense for anybody but our own staff to be doing this because it still would have to come back to our own staff. It was just an extra step and money that we didn't have.

Ms. Lis: It seems to be being a lot more work every year. For a popular program, it has been-

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, as the summers get warmer the cooling component has grown because you can buy fans, air conditioners, and all of that for the summer months too.

Mr. Anderson: There's a lot of phone calls. Many people who receive HEAP are elderly. They have a lot of questions and a lot of support is needed in processing that application. So, HEAP is a very, very busy time for the staff that do this. Many staff are moved off other duties to kind of pick up the slack for the small number of people we have assigned to this program overall.

Ms. Lis: Right. We have increased who's assigned to it specifically, but still we call in other people to help for the short term just because of the huge paperwork.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's all hands on deck. Next is A6142 – Emergency Aid for Adults. This really is for clients in the adult protective services program and they have emergency needs and its 50% (*inaudible*.) Next we have 6100- Medicaid. This is for the county's share of the cost of Medicaid services for the residents of our county who utilize Medicaid for their health insurance. We have not received our updated weekly share amount for 2019 yet, so it was due April 1st and we still have not received it. We have been yelling-

Ms. Lis: We have been told it probably won't come until the end of the year and we don't know why, but that's what they're doing.

Mrs. Schuyler: We have asked the- the County Executive has also taken this to NYSAC. We've taken it to the state, to DOH because this is a huge number for every county. We budgeted for our current weekly share amount, which is just shy of \$600,000 a week. It's that

\$581,357. The difference- why you're seeing a decrease in 2020 is because there are 52 weeks in 2020 and there had been 53 weeks in 2019, which is always very confusing.

Ms. Lis: They do it on a Tuesday or a Wednesday, so it just depends on how many of those you have in the year.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, that's a one week payment?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

Ms. Lis: Our projection is based on that, so we've got all of 2019 going at that rate and we've got all of 2020 going at that rate. We don't know what it's going to be. It has been going down slightly over the past few years. We're hoping so because that gives us some room, but we just have no idea. We can't make a guess at it because it's a very complicated statewide calculation, which we don't have the information we would need to try to guess how it's going to turn out.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is this uncommon? In the past have you had the rates by now?

Ms. Lis: Oh yes. In April

Legislator Nazzaro: So, this makes me very suspicious of what they're doing.

Ms. Lis: Me too. Also, I think that they don't trust the feds because their year ends in September, so they're giving themselves a cushion to take care of whatever the feds do at the end of their year.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Nobody trusts anybody.

Ms. Lis: So, I think they're watching that and I'm hoping we have it by the end of the year so we know how we stand for this year.

Legislator Nazzaro: But is it their protection that-

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Nazzaro: So, if it did go up there is a-

Mrs. Schuyler: There is a limit.

Legislator Nazzaro: Have we calculated what that would be for us?

Ms. Lis: No, it's not really-

Mrs. Schuyler: I thought it was about \$32 million.

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: And we were at like \$30 million. So, there's a chance it could. We could still go up and depending- our county residents per year is more like \$250-\$275 million a year.

Ms. Lis: Something huge.

Mrs. Schuyler: I mean we have the most- basically the most expanded Medicaid program in the nation. So, it's very expensive.

Ms. Lis: When you asked about that limit, what I was thinking about is there's an (*inaudible*) percentage that they can- which has been going up by like 5% a year. Now it's up to the top. It's not changing. So, we don't know what that means.

Legislator Nazzaro: As we go through these budget meetings, it's just (*inaudible*) like what is our exposure in 2020 that we don't know.

Mrs. Schuyler: Perhaps the Legislature could issue a formal letter to the governor's office or to someone to say hey, this is a huge part of our county budget and we need to know the weekly share amounts.

Ms. Lis: We really don't know where we stand. They're totally crippling us as far as budgeting.

Mrs. Schuyler: They're not telling us, but maybe-

Legislator Nazzaro: You said the County Executive has done that?

Mrs. Schuyler: NYSAC has taken it, but no answer.

Legislator Chagnon: To put it in perspective, in 2017 the local share was \$30.1 million. In 2018 it was \$30.3 million and now we're budgeting \$30.2 million. So, I think that the range of risk here is relatively small.

Legislator Nazzaro: Unless they do something- when the state delays- and I know because they have to wait for the federal side, but I think it's all posturing where the state and federal budgets are and the need and there's all the political effect of it. That map does- it could be a \$2 million-

Ms. Lis: Yes, there's \$2 million risk in here, but we don't really think so, but that is our-

Legislator Nazzaro: That's the worst case scenario.

Legislator Chagnon: You think that there's risk but there's no opportunity? You don't think it would ever go the other way?

Ms. Lis: But I don't think we'd ever go to the \$32 million either. I can't say what they're going to do.

Legislator Chagnon: I had to ask.

Mrs. Schuyler: Usually we're sitting here saying that we know what it is going to be- what it's been since April 1st and what it will be through the end of-

Ms. Lis: Next March.

Mrs. Schuyler: And then we say that we don't know what it's going to do come April 1st for the rest of the year. We don't even know now what it's going to do retroactive to this last April 1st.

Ms. Lis: Honestly it's not a big amount of money, but it's a nice place where if it does go down and we have other items that change a little bit this is what we usually use when we rearrange our budget just because of different people showing up at our door. We can't even do that now. We don't know what our availability is. We would usually know that by now.

Mrs. Schuyler: There's no cushion in this budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: That's obvious by looking at the trending-

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Schuyler: Next is medical assistance- 6101. The only- what you see in there is the Medicaid CFCO program. That's a new community first choice option. It's a new state DOH program. It's 100% reimbursed through our Medicaid administrative monies. That takes effect January 1st, so it was delayed. The programs been delayed to start until this January 1st. That means that we've had to switch some FTE's around because we needed an extra *(inaudible)* nurse to do the program because it is a mandate. That position is 100% reimbursed and was a switch around for someone else-

Ms. Lis: We have no idea if this budget is sufficient, but again, it's 100% funded because the CFCO program is- the state is like a work in progress. Every time we- they've been having webinars every other week for the longest time. Even things like meals on wheels is going to run through there now. So, we just don't know what we're going to see here.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's all part of the Medicaid redesign.

Ms. Lis: Yeah, so we've kind of kept it the same as- well, as what we've budgeted before. Our experience hasn't been very high because really what use to be in here was more of the stay at home program where it was to fix people's houses up so they could stay at home. Now it's going to encompass a whole bunch of other stuff. A lot of different things are going to come from here.

Mr. Anderson: Environmental modifications to the home, vehicle modifications- there's five or six-

Recorder Malfunction

(Committee took a lunch break at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 1:43 p.m.)

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I would you like you to come sit with us please.

Mrs. Dennison: We are on tab 33.

Mental Hygiene

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Go ahead whenever you're ready.

Ms. Brinkman: Thank you for allowing us to come and talk about the work that mental hygiene is doing in the community as reflected in the 2020 budget. As an overview of the budget- the budget is divided into three main categories. The first is 4310. 4310 deals with the local governmental unit expenses. The local governmental unit is a mandate; it's required by statute that every county have a local governmental unit. We call it the LGU. That responsibility of the LCU is to fund, oversee, and plan for all mental health, addiction, and developmental disability services within the community. Consequently, the expenses for staff that do those functions are contained within 4310. 4320 houses all of the programmatic functions of the county's department of mental hygiene. Within 4320 we have two breakouts. The first is the breakout that refers back to the requirement under 4310, which is to fund behavioral health services within the community. So, therein lays our contracts with our community agencies who help us to fulfill our mission of planning for funding and they provide the oversight. So, for example mental health association, family services of the Chautauqua region, UPMC Chautauqua, Chautauqua Opportunities Prevention works and a few other agencies as well. The other component of that has to do with the county operated services. The county operated services- in terms of the state of New York; Chautauqua County is not alone in providing services in the community. About 45% of the other counties do so as well. Within the county operated services are included the mandated services of our single point of access for children and families. Beyond that Chautauqua offers a wide array of services. As you probably know, we provide the jail services. Within the jail services offered we have addiction services, we have a mental health therapist, and we have a care manager. All of those are provided at no local cost within this budget. We are very proud of the fact that since we undertook the responsibility for jail services on the behavioral health side we have increased the safety of the inmates and provided a genuine service to the community at a very attractive cost. We have not – knock on wood- been very fortunate that we have not had any inmate suicides in contrast to the situation that had transpired prior to our taking on this responsibility. We operate two mental health clinics and two addiction clinics and in addition to that they have satellites in the school districts including Brocton, Jamestown, Fredonia, Silver Creek, Dunkirk and Chautauqua Lake. We operate the mobile transition team which is a critical service for people that are coming out of

our inpatient units, out of jail, out of residential facilities- it's an opportunity for those individuals to be hooked up with this team to have a more intensive service 24/7 so that they are hooked up with a provider before mobile transition pulls out and this linkage is really important to continuity of care and many times will prevent the recidivism that we see of people going back to inpatient or back into the jail. We are the only county in New York State that is a lead health home. We service 2,400 individuals across three counties- Chautauqua, Alleghany, and Cattaraugus and through that service we link people with and coordinate peoples care not only for behavioral health services, but for physical health care as well. Within Chautauqua County we have care management that is offered by our own staff and they do that for both children and adolescents and our adults and we offer sex offender services. We started developing a sex offender sex victim service program a few years ago because those communities based agencies who had been doing it had pulled back. So, in essence, Chautauqua County department of Mental Hygiene is a safety net for the community. We could really be sitting in front of the safety committee as well because we serve the highest risk, highest need consumers in our programs. We are the first to respond when there's a- the first to be called and the first to respond when there's a tragedy in our community, whether it's a suicide in a school program or an accident in a manufacturers plant. If there is any need for additional resources Chautauqua County Department of Mental Hygiene gets that call and we go out. We also then partner with many of the other providers but we tend to be the one that gets called for all of those events. In terms of people served over the last year we served approximately 9,400 people, which represents outside of our health home, which represents about 7% of our population and we provided 66,729 units of service to folks.

The last part of – the last function of our department is 4322. That is basically the New York State mandate that we pay for competency restoration for individuals who have been judged by the court to be incompetent because of their psychiatric issues, so we are required to pay half of the daily cost for having those individuals at a state psychiatric facility until they are determined to be competent. That's really the part of our budget that we have the least control over because we don't control who goes or how long they stay. In summary, I think you can see that our local share is even lower this year than last year. We are at incredible value for the people of Chautauqua County. We can now say that we now provide all of those services that I talked about for less than one cent for every dollar that's spend on behavioral health services coming from the local share. So, we do our best to be as self-sufficient as possible and I think that we do a very good with that.

I'm very proud to talk with you about some recent developments that are not reflected in the budget, and for which I'd like your permission to add. We were just awarded, from SAMHSA(?), a \$1 million grant per year for four years for a total of \$4 million to continue the work that we've been doing transforming our child serving system. They have now committed over \$17 million over the last three grants, so it is a major investment. When Rachel and I wrote this grant we were not sure how it would fair given that this would be the third investment in a community of our size. I think that the fact that most of what we have done here has been sustainable we have an excellent reputation at the national level. We have been asked more than I can even identify to serve on panels, to speak at conferences, to do conference call with other sites around the country, so we are held up as the model of doing the work the way that they would like to see it done. I think we were rewarded with our third rounds of funding.

In addition to that, I think part of this- at least 2020 portion is included in this budget, but I want to make mention of our (*inaudible*) grant we received \$1 million over three years to

continue our opioid work. We had gotten the \$200,000 planning grant and based on that had submitted when the implementation grant came available and we are one of three sites within New York State to be funded.

Last but not least, we've received an additional \$400,000 from Oasis and we will need to add that to this budget as well. Any questions?

Legislator Chagnon: So, Pat the additional funding that you just mentioned that's not included in this budget- you just found out about that after the tentative budget was prepared? So, will there be any local share associated with either of those?

Ms. Brinkman: No.

Legislator Chagnon: 100% funded by grant funding.

Ms. Brinkman. 100%.

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Chagnon: \$1 million and then \$400,000 are two separate grants, right?

Ms. Brinkman: We have \$1 million from SAMHSA (?) and we had \$1 million from HRSAI think we have flexibility in how we spend that, but I believe when we went to the county executive the portion for the \$258,000 was put in at the County Executive level for the Hersa (?) share for 2020. So, that's in the budget, but we do have the other \$400,000 that we received from Oasis. So, it's \$1.4 million that would need to be added to this budget.

Legislator Gould: You said that you service Cattaraugus and Alleghany counties- they have no mental health departments?

Ms. Brinkman: That is just- they have a department just like-

(Cross-talk)

Ms. Brinkman: No, this is a specific function Mr. Gould that we were designated by the state to serve those three counties. There's not a health home in every county. For the rural areas they designated one for a certain geographic region and were designated to serve those counties as well. We have providers in those counties that are providing the services.

Legislator Gould: Plus their own?

Ms. Brinkman: Plus they have their own regular clinics and other services that they operate.

Legislator Chagnon: Pat, I'm assuming that you'll be able to give Kathleen the detail of how that \$1.4 million would be appropriated?

Ms. Brinkman: Yes. The dollars that we received-

Legislator Whitford: Some of them are designated?

Ms. Brinkman: Yeah.

Legislator Whitford: And some of them are unrestricted?

Ms. Brinkman: The SAMHSA grant- when you apply for a grant through SAMHSA you identify the target populations that you survey. Our grant is serving zero to eight and college age students because those are the two populations that we see as the greatest need. Within those populations there are specific programs that you agreed to fund. So, we have already identified in our budget how those dollars will be spent.

Legislator Whitford: I'm kind of curious. When you say you're on boards and you're invited to conferences to speak- as a governmental agency are you restricted to marketing any of your best practices?

Ms. Brinkman: No, I think that the beauty of the system of care environment is that people share practices openly and willingly and we don't charge for that. When we were coming up- when we had our first grant those first six years- that's what struck us was that technical assistance is there for you to help build those practices in your own community. We were put in touch with people all around the country that were doing incredibly wonderful things like we wanted to do. So rather than have to reinvent the wheel, they shared it with us and we do the same thing when we have the opportunity to do that for others.

Legislator Whitford: I was just curious because I know some non-profits do market- I was just curious because (*inaudible*) restricted in marketing.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I'd like to go back to the grants for a minute. This morning Chris Schuyler was talking about the (*inaudible*) grant and then she said that you received it and she was thinking she was getting some of that money. Am I saying this right? Does that ring any bells with you? I can tell by the look on your face-

Ms. Brinkman: Certainly we're funding various partners out in the community and at this moment there's not – most of this money is not coming to CCDMH, it's actually going out to partner organizations to do the work that they do best, but as far as I know- Kathy and I both did the budget there is no allocation to social services in the tapestry grant.

Mrs. Dennison: So all of the services- the revenue you get for the grants- you have the services and contractors in place in your budget and then those expenses are already spoken for, if you will-

Ms. Brinkman: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: The contractors are already assigned-

(Cross-talk)

Legislator Nazzaro: We need clarification.

Ms. Brinkman: Yeah.

(Cross-talk)

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Is that one of the programs you think some of the money is going to?

Ms. Brinkman: No, as far as I know- the last I heard the nurse family partnership was funded in another way in Chautauqua County and one of the requirements under SAMHSA is you're not allowed to *(inaudible)* programs that exist with funding. So, even if we wanted to that would not be something we could do because you can't take funded programs and take grant funding and-

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: That's specified for something else- I get that.

Mrs. Dennison: I obviously have a list of topics to follow up with social services, so on that list is clarification on this particular grant and what function social services believes is a part of this tapestry grant because when I talked with Director Brinkman before the meeting it was quite clear from their perspective that they have the programs already identified.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: And now I can't remember what it was that Christine mentioned and how will that end up affecting her budget?

Mrs. Dennison: Well she was saying that she has expenses already built into her budget for the nurse family partnership but she was under the impression that some of those expenses were reimbursed-

Legislator Nazzaro: We'll have to follow up.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Yeah.

Mrs. Dennison: The expenses are in their budget and they were anticipating that this would be a revenue source to them that is not included in their budget.

Ms. Brinkman: Kathleen's conversation with me is the first that- there's been no discussion around this. So, I feel kind of blindsided.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I know, I'm sorry. She just mentioned it, so we thought we ought to ask you.

Ms. Brinkman. It's not that we wouldn't want to be collaborative, but we're collaborating with all these other agencies and when we wrote the grant we actually went out to the community and found out what the needs were and then wrote the grant to meet the needs for those two general populations and that particular service did not come up on the horizon- it was an existing service.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: O.K.

Ms. Brinkman: We just thought- if you look in your folder this nice tree- if you're ever asked it has a nice identification of all of the programs that Chautauqua County operates and it's a handy reference. The explanations are behind them.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: My other question was about the opioid services. You've got some money to continue with that and could you describe what you're doing and where are they? I know you said you're doing the other two counties too, but how are you involved in opioid services?

Ms. Brinkman: As a community we have come together and have been- the County Executive has had a task force where there's been treatment and then there's been the care part of it for the law enforcement and so forth to look at the opioid problem to make sure that we're coordinating. When we applied for the first HRSA grant, the planning grant, treatment became the governing body and we have Tom Tarpley (?) who is the facilitator on the care initiative for Mr. Borrello, so he also sits on the governing body so we have that combination of both groups so that the groups are working together. That group then did a comprehensive needs assessment of what existed and what still needs to be done and from that we have developed a strategic plan that was reviewed with the group. I think that we are very far along in terms of many other counties in terms of what we have. We have outpatient, we have inpatient, we have peer services, we have residential that's opening today at UPMC Chautauqua, so that is something that we've worked on and I commend the staff at UPMC for the work they've done on this and it's an exciting day in our community. The only thing that we don't have is an opioid treatment program which allows us to provide methadone and we were ready to go with methadone in the north county- UPMC Chautauqua had stepped up and was ready to do that and then we ran into a problem with the mayor insisting that it be another provider, which is not a local provider and that provider was licensed at the same time UPMC was licensed and it made no sense given the small number of people that elect methadone as their treatment. So we decided- WCA decided to move their license to Jamestown and we had a (*inaudible*) that is still looking for a place to set up in the north county, so if and when they get that done we will have methadone. We would have methadone up and going and that's the frustration from my office and I'm sure from UPMC Chautauqua that now in Jamestown for them to implement that license because of the DEA requirements and oasis requirements it's going to be a substantial capital investment so now we're looking for how to fund that or whether we can get a waiver to make it happen more quickly in Jamestown but that was monkey wrench that got thrown in at the last minute and it's unfortunate because like I said, that was the real missing piece. Our HRSA grant will be doing things like helping us to implement the jail (*inaudible*) over a period of time but we're kind of holding off on that just a bit to see what the bail reform legislation does and whether we'll have enough people to really make that worthwhile or maybe there's a different way to do that. We

are expanding the peer services that the (*inaudible*) here in Jamestown more to the north. I'm trying to think what else is in- there are a number of things. We are doing a great deal in that arena. We're always looking- prevention works is doing a lot from the prevention view point, which we think is important because if we want to stem the tide of our young people getting far down the road where they need outpatient or inpatient or any of the higher end services we have to do prevention and get into the schools with it.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I know one of the things we heard early on was complaints about not having enough beds. It sounds like you're making progress and moving in that direction especially with WCA opening so people have options where they can go.

Ms. Brinkman: From an inpatient standpoint we have sufficient beds, we have- WCA runs rather high on their census. We have beds that are available at TLC Brooks at the north end of the county, so we work- I know that Trish works very closely from UPMC with Wendy and the folks up in Irving to make sure that our folks can get admitted if there isn't a bed at WCA.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Is that the one in- is the one at UPMC the one that used to be at Jones Hill- the new one and then it moved over there?

Ms. Brinkman: And then the residential program is at Jones Hill.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Oh, that's still there?

Legislator Nazzaro: No, that's separate. That's a long term-

Ms. Brinkman: That's the new one. That opens today, so that will help people that need extended options for recovery to stay up to a year I believe it is.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Wow.

Legislator Nazzaro: Stabilization rehab-

Ms. Brinkman: We do have a strong continuum.

Legislator Whitford: Will the County be utilizing (*inaudible*)?

Legislator Nazzaro: I think he's talking about the Chautauqua Center?

Ms. Brinkman: That's a separate not for profit in the community and they provide- they also provide behavioral health services in terms of mental health and addiction services.

Legislator Whitford: I just wondered if there was any collaborative-

Ms. Brinkman: There's lots of collaboration- FQHC is one of the organizations that sits on the governing body for the HRSA grant and that serving is the- that body is serving as the guiding force for addiction services within our county, so there's a lot of collaboration between

and among providers as well as with the LGU and CCDMH. I think that's one of the things that makes us as successful as we are. I think if you go out and you talk to any of the agencies out there we talk regularly, we plan together, if there's a problem we deal with it upfront. We have very good working relationships across the board.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Sounds like it. Well this tree design is very helpful and it's a great example of all the good work that you do and it's nice to see.

Legislator Gould: I see in your budget you've got parking reimbursements going up by a couple thousand. Is that because you have more employees or the parking rates went up?

Ms. Swanson: We budgeted for more employees in the Jamestown- where we need it.

Legislator Gould: I also saw in your budget- medical equipment-

(Cross-talk)

Ms. Brinkman: Under the *(inaudible)* funding that came this way agencies were encouraged- we were selected as a demonstration site to integrate primary care into behavioral health, so we have- that medical equipment was to provide the tables and the various and assorted items that our doctors would need to do the primary care with our clients. So we've gotten it all take care of hopefully don't have to make a major investment in 2020.

Legislator Gould: I was just curious.

Ms. Brinkman: Good question.

Mrs. Dennison: I just wanted to ask the committees- we had the other departments walk through their departmental summaries by department. Obviously Director Brinkman has given us an overview. Do you want to go through any more details?

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Does anyone want any more detail discussion?

Mrs. Dennison: I have a question- maybe a question for both of you and Clerk Tampio. Do we need to pass a resolution to make the changes to bring in those new grants?

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Yes, do we want to do it now or?

Mrs. Dennison: Typically the home committee would make a recommendation to do that.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: O.K. and you'd like it now?

Chairman Chagnon: Do it now, so we don't forget it.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: How do we do that? Just make a motion?

Clerk Tampio: Make a motion and make a recommendation to the Audit & Control-

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: To accept the grants?

Legislator Nazzaro: Grants and the offsetting-

Mrs. Dennison: Modify the tentative budget to include the grants and the offsetting associated expenses.

MOVED by Legislator Whitford, SECOND by Legislator Pavlock to amend.

Unanimously Carried

Ms. Swanson: Can I ask a question? Will that be for 2019 and 2020?

Mrs. Dennison: Just for 2020.

Ms. Swanson: So, we'll have to do a resolution. Thank you.

Mrs. Dennison: But the resolution that was just proposed- we don't need to do anything more for 2020.

(Cross-talk)

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Anything else for them? Thank you very much.

Legislator Chagnon: Congratulations on the grants.

Ms. Brinkman: Thank you.

Veterans

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I would like to welcome Greg Carlson from Veteran Services to join us and I'll give him the floor.

Mr. Carlson: O.K.

Mrs. Dennison: This will be tab 42.

Mr. Carlson: I think I have the smallest budget in the county. As you can see- page one there's roughly a 5.5% increase to the local share and I think the reason for that- the biggest reason for that is we budgeted for 150% normal of our facilities budget because the facility that we're in right now is just not meeting our requirements as far as the Veterans Service Agency and Office for the Aging in Jamestown, so we're looking for alternate locations but at this point we haven't committed to anything yet, so more than likely it's not going to effect the 2020 budget. When we were doing the budget we put it in there just in case we were to move. As far

as personnel there are no personnel changes, just everybody's step or incremental increases. There's a slight change in health insurance elections and rates. We had planned for an offset to the veterans van because theoretically the VA will pay a veteran who is 30% disabled or more or someone who transports the veteran mileage to the Buffalo VA, but upon further research and digging into the code of federal regulations they will not pay a government agency for providing that service, so it has to go the individual veteran or a caretaker who is taking them of their own free will and accord. That was something that we had planned to get about \$5,000 back in mileage for the veterans van and it just never came to fruition. We had a slight increase- so every year we've gotten about \$8,500 from New York State for the veterans service agencies and there was an increase of \$10,000, so that created a little extra revenue. Beyond that there are no significant changes.

Legislator Chagnon: As far as your office space is concerned, are you recommending that we take that increase out of the budget or we leave it in?

Mr. Carlson: At this point leave it in because we're- right now everything is kind of in the air. So, we were looking at moving as early as this fall potentially and nothing came together as far as a location. We have it and at this point right now we're co-located with Office for the Aging. Open enrollment is starting so trying to move now would be near impossible and we're still- we have feelers out as far as for a facility to go to- location to go to but nothing yet, so it might affect the budget for half of the year.

Legislator Chagnon: You still intend to follow through on it?

Mr. Carlson: Yes it just hasn't happened yet. We budgeted for it just in case.

Legislator Whitford: Who are you working with as far as finding a new location?

Mr. Carlson: Office for the Aging.

(Cross-talk)

Mrs. Spanos: We've been talking to George Borrello about *(inaudible.)*

Legislator Whitford: For this budget I just want to *(inaudible.)*

Mr. Carlson: Yeah, that is one thing that I think a lot of times people ask what veterans service agency actually does and how is it beneficial. I mean they see us on Veterans Day and Memorial day giving speeches but we bring a huge amount of dollars into the county through pension where we offset the cost of Medicaid exponentially *(inaudible)* healthcare also offsets the cost of Medicaid exponentially and then if you have a veteran who has a service connected disability and they get awarded monthly compensation it can be as much as \$3,000 a month for someone who is 100%. That's money that they use to shop, pay property taxes- if I were to actually put a dollar value on it I think it would be almost impossible to track how much revenue for the county in different ways is generated by the three service officers and our operations assistant who does *(inaudible)* benefits. So, between the four of us we probably do between three

and four hundred claims a year of which we win most of them. When I say win most of them it means we get something out of it, maybe we didn't get everything we ask for but we get something out of it and millions of dollars come in for our little five person agency.

Mrs. Dennison: I just want to add to something that Greg said about staffing. There are, as you can see, no change in FTE's but the personal services budget is actually going down versus last year. That's because in the 2019 budget we put in a change of rate for the service officers. Greg's been recommending that but it has not been implemented so we took out that-

Mr. Carlson: Correct.

Mrs. Dennison: We took it out of the 2020 budget.

Mr. Carlson: Yeah, we did our due diligence with it but at the end of the day when HR looked at it they were valid to say that they're where they're supposed to be and the step increases that you get account for the experience that the service officers get. So, this year we just took it out of the budget for the next year.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

Mr. Carlson: That's it? Thank you.

Office for the Aging

Mrs. Spanos: I just wanted to say that co-locating with the veterans has really helped make sure that people are not accessing our services that could be served under this federal funding stream. So, we work very closely with them to ensure that if they can get this service under the VA, they do and then we're there to help the spouses with things that aren't covered by the VA.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: I would like to welcome from Office of the Aging, Doctor Maryann Spanos and Josh Melquist. Good to see you.

Mrs. Spanos: I'll let Josh talk us through the changes that we have for this budget.

Mr. Melquist: Would you like me start with the local share summary? So, the local shares, you'll see to the right, those include a 3.5% increase as of right now. That, as we're going to go through, is going to be mainly made up of personnel increases for step increases, the benefit cost increase you guys are all aware of that are fully covered by other funding sources for us and then just basically contractual costs to maintain our current service level. So, we'll go into detail and we can break it down more.

Mrs. Spanos: I just wanted to say one thing before he goes through this. We did get that additional funding, \$487,000, to meet the unmet needs of older adults in our County. That is funding two additional case managers in full, including their benefits, but we can't use that money to offset our other case managers. It can only go for those two new people and services.

Mr. Melquist: So, then on the FTE page there is an increase of 1.94 FTE- the two case managers that Maryann just mentioned. They were both hired this year and included in next year's budget. They were amended into this year's budget as well. That was the two increases for FTE's and then we had a couple small changes. We had two clerk II positions that went from .15 to .13 and then one clerk II that went from 1 FTE to two clerks at .49 each, so that made up the 1.94 and not a full 2. Those case managers are fully funded with that new grant with benefits, personnel, everything, so that increase in FTE is fully covered.

Then, the actual budget summary. So, the personnel services- you'll see there's an increase of about \$117,000. The main reasoning for that- we did have promotional step increases that are coming this year, as everyone knows. We have a senior aid program that's federally funded and the minimum wage has been going up in New York State 70 cents a year and I think we're on third year now. Every year I've been here they've gone up, so that increases our cost there and then those two case managers that are fully funded helped increase that personnel line cost.

The contractual costs, Maryann alluded to that again, we received that additional funding from the state and that was about \$478,000 for the whole pot of money, but a good amount of that's going to services. That's kind of where those contractual cost increases are coming from. So, it's basically to provide services to eliminate our wait list. We did increase our home care rate this year. The agencies have had trouble for the last few years hiring and maintaining people to be able to provide our services and we also matched- do you want to explain what we matched?

Mrs. Spanos: Yeah, so we negotiate those rates along with the Department of Health and Human Services. For some reason the way it was implemented over the years we lagged their rates. I don't know if one year we weren't able to give an increase and they were, so we just- because we were getting this additional funding and the home care agencies were having a more difficult time with recruitment and retention of aids to serve our people we just consulted with the County Executive and we could align our current home care rate with the Department of Social Services. So, that's what we did. It was like a fifty cent increase?

Mr. Melquist: Yeah it was about fifty cents. We have two different services that we provide.

Mrs. Spanos: Personal care level one and personal care level two. Level two is somebody that helps with bathing, dressing and those kinds of things. Level one is just housekeeping, chores and that type of thing.

Mr. Melquist: Yeah, they both went up less than fifty cents. I don't have the exact numbers.

Mrs. Spanos: Normally we negotiate a rate every year in the fall, but with this new funding we decided to implement the- just aligning with Social Services now and then we'll look at it again at our usual time in December.

Mr. Melquist: And then there's some- there's a small increase in nutrition costs. Food costs did go up and we also had a new contractor in SUNY Fredonia who makes our meals in the north county and the contractor came through just a little higher than Brooks Memorial who we were contracted with before. Not a huge difference, but it was a small difference that made the increase relevant there.

Then, the benefits- you guys are aware of the surcharge increase in the health insurance retirement surcharge increase. Workers comp is the first one, but we also had health care increases for our new case managers that are incorporated here. I did notice that the amounts that recently changed with George the last- when we updated the amounts for the benefits it was \$136,000 that I had over there. I didn't update my notes to get those updated numbers, but the \$128,000 is accurate. I can update the notes if you guys needed to to find out how much our surcharges went up. It's a very small difference, but I did notice that difference today. That's the expenses. Does anyone have any questions about the expenses there?

Legislator Chagnon: Josh, I noticed that in the detail you had previously listed that all the individual contractors and now those are zeroed out in the 2020 budget and in its place you just apparently have a line item for other contractors, maintenance-

Mr. Melquist: I can explain that.

Mrs. Dennison: Josh can explain it, but I made him do it.

Mr. Melquist: That is true. So, we had those sub account numbers that identified each of our contractors, which made it easier to- basically for our allocations as far as accounts payable or claims in the future. What we've been trying to drive toward is we're not really supposed to publish names of contractors in the budget, correct? What our idea is is to eliminate those sub account numbers and then, myself, figure out a way to still be able to claim and book expenses correctly. That's what I'm working on right now. Our idea was to give that a shot in this budget with a goal of that beginning in 2020. I'm currently working on that and it's going O.K. I'll be honest; hopefully we get that (*inaudible*) in the year. What that change was is it zeroed all those sub account numbers, which is what you saw and then we put into one account which is how we'll book it in the future. That's the reason you saw that abundance of zeros.

Mrs. Spanos: The other is that, like for homecare we have six different agencies that we work with and things change. We use them on a rotating basis so when we give you what we think is what we're going to spend with Will Care as opposed to COI or another one-

Legislator Chagnon: It doesn't matter to us.

Mrs. Spanos: Right and it doesn't really tell you anything because we may have to move that around.

Legislator Chagnon: Sure.

Mrs. Spanos: Depending on who's got aids, where the clients are, you know-

Legislator Chagnon: It makes good sense.

Mr. Melquist: We're trying to get that finished.

Legislator Chagnon: O.K.

Mrs. Dennison: There is, in the accounting system, there is a report that runs by vendor ID, so having an account number tied to a specific vendor (*inaudible*) add a level of detail that we can't get elsewhere.

Mr. Melquist: Right. It's just customizing what we have done in the past to makes sure we pull that information correctly. Any other questions on the expenses?

Legislator Gould: I have a question under other (*inaudible*) - why is it going up that much? What is other?

Mr. Melquist: It's mileage reimbursement. Yeah.

Legislator Gould: See how the figures confused me?

Mr. Melquist: I see how the (*inaudible*)-

Mrs. Spanos: Is that our volunteer transportation?

Mr. Melquist: No, that's our actual mileage for the year for our employees. I guess I don't have the detail of that.

Legislator Gould: Could you get it before Friday?

Mr. Melquist: I can probably get it today just to see where we're at right now I guess and I'll see if we've increased at all and see if that should be brought down at all. That will actually relate to our local share and if it should be decreased. We do book all those expenses directly to our local program, so can I give you that answer after this? I have a list of variances here and that one's not on there of course.

Mrs. Spanos: We'll send it to Kathleen and she can send it to everybody that wants it?

Legislator Gould: Sure.

Mr. Melquist: So, for the revenue on the bottom there- let's see- the departmental income is expecting an increase. Our contribution and cost share have been trending up this year, so we're hoping to see that continue in 2020. We also will likely see extra (*inaudible*) come in because we were a quarter behind as far as sending our client contribution letters out in 2019. We were just lagging behind, so the letters themselves for the previous year went out in 2019, so basically we have an extra contribution coming in this year that we can't recognize as 2018 revenue. It's just that the letters didn't go out until 2019, so there's no way to recognize

(*inaudible*) reject it. We basically just have an extra one this year and then it will maintain- excuse me- an extra one this year that will end up going out in 2020 that we can't project the revenue for 2019. We expect that to be increased.

Mrs. Spanos: It's also going up because we have more people we're serving. As we bring people off of the waiting list, which by the way I ran it a couple days ago and it's down to 255, so it's coming down nicely.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Wow. That's exciting.

Legislator Nazzaro: What was it at?

Mrs. Spanos: At its peak it was up to 450 people.

Legislator Nazzaro: Not quite half, but-

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: That's great news.

Legislator Chagnon: Josh, your point is that the extra quarterly letter that you're putting out in 2019 will have a-

(*Cross-talk*)

Mr. Melquist: Yes. In 2020 you should see an increase with that and it should even out for the next year.

Legislator Chagnon: Right.

Mrs. Dennison: I'm sorry Josh. You'll have five quarters- you're sending the letters out this year- you'll have five quarters of revenue in 2020?

Mr. Melquist: Yes. That note could just be updated. The sale of property and compensation- that's just our insurance reimbursement that we receive from Meals on Wheels. They usually operate our vans and they pay us for the insurance. That's the amount that it was last year and it varies each year but we just stay conservative and keep it as the same amount as the previous years. We don't know until about February what the actual amount is. So, we kept it about the same.

New York State Aid- Maryann talked about this earlier, the \$478,000 for our waiting list. That's included. That's a big chunk of that \$528,000 that's increasing. We also received an increase for our New York Connects program. It wasn't requested but the state (*inaudible*) your money and someone within the state can spend it, so we were able to get some of that allocation. Other state funding sources mainly stayed the same but we also have MLTC, our managed long term care revenue, that increased slightly and that kind of makes up the rest of the difference there. So, that's been trending up for the last few years- providing more services we get more revenue basically under that managed long term care.

Mrs. Spanos: Anybody need an explanation on that? That's the contracts we have with Medicaid on behalf of our services and our sub-contractors, meals, adult daycare- that all comes through us.

Mr. Melquist: Federal aid- the last update we did- actually I was able to rerun the numbers and realized we're going to be pretty close to the same amount that we projected originally last year, so the funding for the federal programs is mostly just staying the same. Nutrition services incentive program- after running the numbers I did strike that note. That's staying about the same, so that should be a zero and there's nothing to be changed there. The decrease in senior aid funding is really more relevant to why our funding is less this year. You can see it's down \$202,000 and that's what that note is really alluding to, I guess.

Mrs. Spanos: The hard part is that (*inaudible*) our budget, so all we can do is base it on what the current year was and congress doesn't seem to like senior worker program so they keep zeroing it out and then the house puts it back in and they come come to some compromise. So, same thing, we don't know about a- all of our older American act funding, those are the ones 3B, 3E, 3C. There's been a trend that we've got a little bit more in the meal programs because that seems to be what congress is really focused on, but the other ones haven't grown significantly. Right now there's a bill but the house and the senate are very far apart on what the funding for the bill is going to be. We try to be conservative and just do it by what we've gotten in the door.

Mr. Melquist: That's all I have.

Mrs. Dennison: Just a point of clarification on the nutrition services incentive program, a decrease of \$8,000- that was in your project for 2019 right?

Mr. Melquist: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: But that (*inaudible*) probably isn't going to happen?

Mr. Melquist: Yeah. It should end up being about what it was.

Vice Chairwoman Rankin: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

MOVED by Legislator Pavlock, SECOND by Legislator Whitford to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (2:42 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed
Kathy Tampo/Clerk, Olivia Ames/ Deputy Clerk/Secretary to the Legislature, Lori J. Foster,
Committee Secretary