

Minutes

Administrative Services Committee

November 12, 2019, 5:00 pm, Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Muldowney, Starks, Proctor, Davis

Member Absent: Scudder

Others: Ames, Dennison, Caflisch, Hemmer, DeAngelo, Bentley

Vice Chairman Muldowney called the meeting to order at 5:19 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (10/15/19)

MOVED by Legislator Starks, SECONDED by Legislator Davis.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time.

Proposed Local Law Intro. 6-19 – A Local Law Continuing An Additional Mortgage Tax

Mr. Abdella: This additional mortgage has been in place since 2005. Under the State law it has to be periodically renewed and it's coming due for renewal. The only thing I'll mention that is odd about it is that you'll see that the extension goes through October 31, 2022 so it's short of 3 years. I won't even attempt to explain the quirk in State law but this is the longest we can do it for and it's not an even calendar year. It happened to fall on a calendar year the last time but this time it does not. So, it extends it for 2 years and 10 months.

Legislator Davis: So is it a typo there were it says through October 31, 2019?

Mr. Abdella: Yea, there was a revised agenda that came out that had the 2022 in there.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Any questions or discussion?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Local Law Intro. 7-19 – Amending Local Law 7-90 Providing for a Management Salary Plan for County Officers and Employees

Mr. Abdella: Jessica Wisniewski was unable to come to the meeting tonight so she asked me to sit in for this purpose. In the 2020 annual budget there was a budgeted, as I understand it, increases for up to 2% for managers. This local law would allow that budgeted increase to be made available to potentially to all of the managers. This amends the range. The phenomenon that occurs is that some managers who are at the top of their range, but for this local law amendment, would not be able to get any increase. To state for the record, I am one of those. I think there are 9 managers in that circumstance. Last year in 2019, no such local law was done so there were a number of managers who just stayed the same in 2019. So it's just something that you all need to consider as far as periodically whether to up the range so that certain managers are eligible to get some increase.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: So the senior people don't max out, basically?

Legislator Starks: That's what we're preventing, right?

Mr. Abdella: This would increase that cushion, so to speak, or amount, in the range so that those that are currently at the top of the range, would be able to get an increase, yes.

Legislator Starks: Would you know how many didn't get a raise last year because of this?

Mr. Abdella: I know that there are 9 people who this will effect this year. I'm guessing they are the same 9 people from last year but someone could have movement that brought them –

Legislator Starks: Nine to all of the managers.

Mr. Bentley: I had two on my staff and one partial. He got a partial raise but –

Legislator Starks: That's nine out of all of the managers?

Mr. Abdella: That's right.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Is this budgeted in the 2020, anticipating Audit & Control Chairman asking?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. I just want to comment that our budget module allows us to put in the 2% increase. We do put in a blanket 2% increase for all managers, that calculations doesn't go out to the local law and look at the salary caps. So the short answer to your question is yes, the budget includes a 2% increase for all managers in the relevant classes even if that increase would put them above the current legal cap for their position.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Any more discussion?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2019 Budget Appropriations – Information Technology Services

Mr. DeAngelo: Several months ago we were asked to find some potential savings in 2019 which our department was able to find quite a bit, I think around \$120-140,000 –

Mrs. Dennison: I think more than that.

Mr. DeAngelo: Was it, great. So we found a lot. We did have one oversight and that was in the Print Shop. Because we are outsourcing a lot of our printing now, we won't see those expenses but on the opposite side, we won't see that revenue either. So, we needed to make the similar adjustment to the revenue on the Print Shop budget for \$65,000. So the savings was greater than \$65,000, I can tell you that, because we are down half a staff person plus the expenses that would have been incurred by doing all that printing. So, we need to fix this so that now our revenue at the end of the year will be what we expect it to be.

The other piece is, either a typo or an oversight, it's just, again, we found some savings in personal services and we just took it out of the wrong account. So instead of 1610, which is our Office Services, we need to be taking it out of the Communications, which is 1650. Again, this is a savings that was recognized several months ago and it just came out of the wrong account so now we're just getting it on the correct line.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: The \$65,000, that's \$65,000 less on your savings but also on your expenses. Is that right?

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Or was that already accounted for?

Mr. DeAngelo: That was already accounted for, several months ago. So we said, yea, we're going to save, I think it was like –

Mrs. Dennison: For the Print Shop it's \$65,000.

Mr. DeAngelo: Is what we said several months ago that we would save. But that actually – our Print Shop is pretty flat so what we spend to create print jobs, we charge back to the departments. So we said, alright, we're not going to spend it, but we forgot to say, we're not going to make it either. So that's what the oversight was.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: What does that do?

Mr. DeAngelo: We did have .1 savings though in the Print Shop.

Mrs. Dennison: As Jon explained, his department was very forthcoming with savings, almost \$200,000 in savings. Unfortunately what we overlooked was, as Jon said, \$65,000 of those savings have a corresponding decrease in revenue. We discovered this when we were going through, for the 2020 budget, and you may recall, that we made a change in the 2020 budget to essentially eliminate the Print Shop department. So in making those changes, I realized that, in looking at budget to budget comparisons, I realized that we had a problem currently

because right now, the way we amended the budget for the Print Shop, the Print Shop is scheduled to have a profit if you will of \$65,000 which isn't going to happen. It's going to have a profit of zero. So when we did the mid-year budget change, we took all the savings from the department and then we, for lack of a better word, our plug was adjustment to the revenue budget for Social Services and Public Health. Because we expect that Social Services will not achieve its revenue budget. So, with all the other savings, we had about a \$500,000 in savings so we said, o.k., we'll reduce Social Services budget by \$500,000, round figure. So what we're saying now is, o.k., \$65,000 of those savings are not real. So we should have only reduced Social Services budget by \$435,000. That is what this resolution recognizes is that we have less in the savings that we anticipated. Now one thing we could do without giving too much information, we structured this resolution to be a useable (inaudible) so it would be kind of self-contained (*inaudible*) for Information Services. Another alternative is to say, o.k., our revenue adjustment for Social Services is too much so instead of taking it out of fund balance, and we're going to essentially increase their revenue budget. We decreased it by \$500,000, that's too much, now we're going to increase. So that's something for you to consider if you would rather do it that way, you can. Or we can leave the resolution as presented. It really has the same affect at the end of the day. Social Services revenue is going to be what it is or be what it isn't and that's going to come out of fund balance or contribute to fund balance if they exceed their budget.

Mr. DeAngelo: Is there any advantage doing it one way or the other at the end of the year when we make an end of the year adjustment? Because if I do come in better than expected, which I hope to, then at the end of the year adjustment might help us.

Mrs. Dennison: Yea, I would say in general there is probably not an advantage one way or the other because, as you said, we make these adjustments to your budget, if you come in better, that's going to attribute to the fund balance. But we thought it was worth-while bringing this to your attention now because we didn't want to just leave it for the year end balancing because it's a fairly big number in Jon's department and we thought that we should come and say, hey, we messed this up and we'd like to fix it.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: What is the committee's pleasure?

Legislator Davis: I would say that we just take it as it is.

Legislator Starks: I'm good with the way it is.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: I am too.

Legislator Starks: The intent is the same. It lands in the same place.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: We appreciate all your savings.

Mr. DeAngelo: Like I said, we'll hopefully have more at the end of the year.

Mrs. Dennison: Even taking this out of the puzzle, I would say Jon's department volunteered savings of over \$100,000.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Thank you, good job. All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Cancellation of Delinquent Tax Liens

Mr. Caflisch: First resolution we have here is a cancellation of delinquent tax liens. There is roughly \$5,800 in cancellation of taxes. This will help the city to develop two pieces of property that have been tax delinquent for a while and there was demolition work that had to be done on it too. So, it would be my recommendation that the properties be put to a better use and that we approve the cancellation of these taxes so that they can move forward with the project.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: I assume they are both side by side?

Mr. Caflisch: Yea, they are adjacent.

Legislator Davis: Is that where the fire was downtown?

Mr. Caflisch: No.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: You said there was demolition on this?

Mr. Caflisch: There is going to be demolition on it, yes.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: I was just trying to figure out where they are. As you come into Jamestown, are they on the –

Mr. Caflisch: It's going to be where the new Dollar General is going downtown.

Mr. Abdella: Next to the viaduct?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes. These are relatively small parcels.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Any questions or discussions?

Mr. Abdella: I'll just reference, I may need – I thought a different version came, the same practical effect, but, I may need to modify some of the WHEREAS clauses but I can do that at Audit & Control.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Distribution of Mortgage Taxes

Mr. Caflisch: I simply to do the calculations and prepare the resolution. I couldn't give you a lot of background or history. It does look like a substantial return for our mortgage tax.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Why is Dunkirk so much bigger than Jamestown?

Mr. Caflisch: It just depends on what the properties are valued at. (*cross talk*)... properties are mortgaged and the transaction.

Legislator Starks: The timing of –

Mr. Caflisch: Yes and people buy different properties at different times, they take out different mortgages. I've seen some of the smaller localities have \$100,000 or more in mortgage tax.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: You just – the City would be like three times the size of the other city, isn't it, basically?

Mr. Caflisch: Not three times, yea probably.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: So things are good though, it looks like.

Mr. Caflisch: There is a lot of interest too in the North County with the Athenex proposal coming forward. There has been a lot of what I call redevelopment work going on and people are interested in property up there.

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Any questions or discussion?

Unanimously Carried

Other

Vice Chairman Muldowney: Anything under "other"?

MOVED by Legislator Starks, SECONDED by Legislator Davis to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (5:37 p.m.)

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