

Minutes

Human Services Committee

**May 20, 2020, 5:15 pm, Virtual Meeting via Zoom**

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Pavlock, Whitford, Whitney, Lawton, Rankin

Others: Tampio, Ames, Anderson, Brinkman, Abdella, Dennison, Spanos, K. Geise, Schuyler, Chagnon, Wendel, DeAngelo, Carrow

Chairman Pavlock called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (02/19/20)

MOVED by Legislator Whitney, SECONDED by Legislator Rankin

*Unanimously Carried*

Privilege of the Floor

There were no email comments at this time.

---

Proposed Resolution – Change Name of Capital Project Number H.4070.655

Mrs. Dennison: This capital project has existed for quite some time and the scope of the project has changed over time. At the end of 2019, the Health & Human Services Department started using the funds in this capital projects. The funds are now for an electronic medical record system and since that scope is materially different than TB testing, it was determined that we need to change the name of the project. The change in scope, it has received the approval of the Planning Board and also the legal department has determined that the original funding could be used for this purpose. So this resolution would just change the title to avoid confusion in the future when we're looking at expenses that are coded to this project and seeing that they are for medical record system rather than specifically for TB testing. So that is the intent of changing the name, as I said, just to make their name more closely match it be now the newly approved scope of the project.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you for the information. Any questions regarding this resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Mental Hygiene Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinic (CCBHC)

Mrs. Brinkman: I'm very excited and proud to bring this resolution for your review. We received a grant to become a certified community behavioral health center. This is a designation that recognizes the 51 year history that Chautauqua County Department of Mental Hygiene has of providing services to the community for those with serious mental illness and addiction as well. It is a designation that is only held currently by 66 centers throughout the country. With this grant 166 additional sites were funded so this places the Chautauqua County Department of Mental Hygiene programs right among the elite programs around the country. What this grant will do is to provide us technical and financial assistance that will allow us to fully integrate our programs with evidence based practices and achieve the best outcome for our clients. One of the highlights and I think it's really attractive of this designation is that there is a national movement to fund these sites with what's called a perceptive payment system. The positive piece of this is that once we would receive this designation, we could bill for our services to Medicare, Medicaid, and other payers at our cost, as opposed to an arbitrary rate set by the payer. So for example, if the State through Medicaid is paying \$120 for an assessment and that really costs \$200, that's a losing proposition and you have to make that up somewhere else so this is a movement nationally to take these elite centers and make them cost effective and to make them sustainable over the long haul. In addition to helping our neighbor, in addition to enhancing our services, it will also allow us to enrich the services of other providers in the community. We will be funding services with our designating collaborating organization which includes the Mental Health Association, the Program Evaluation Center at SUNY Fredonia, STEL, who does our ACT program and potentially others. We will also be offering training that is coming our way through this grant to the other providers within the community so that we will be enriching behavioral health services throughout our entire community. The grant is \$4 million dollars over 2 years and there is the potential for an extension of those dollars at the end of the grant. So with that, I will open that up with any questions you may have.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you Pat. I know that your office has put in a lot of work into this opportunity and we appreciate that work. I have a couple of questions. Staffing wise, obviously this program is going to need some staffing, where do we stand in that regards?

Mrs. Brinkman: What we are doing is, when we wrote the grant, we basically, every year we build in growth into program because we always seem to have more people coming requesting services than we had staff to provide. So we have 15 position in our current budget. This falls into the categories that will be needed by the CBHD and we will just be moving the positions and the revenue associated with those positions into the grant.

Chairman Pavlock: Anybody have any questions for Pat?

Legislator Lawton: I was really happy and surprised to see the number, \$4 million dollars, and wanted to get a sense of how big of an impact is that on our program? My first thought was, have we ever received this grant in the past? It sounds like no we haven't but if you could just give me a sense of how does this change our program whether it's staffing or the number of people we can serve or is this as significant as it appears?

Mrs. Brinkman: It is very significant. It is the seed money to be able to take our programs and move them to the highest level standard available throughout the country. It will allow us to measure what we're doing against other programs around the nation. So the positive that it brings will be the technical assistance around evidence based practices, the appropriate training that we couldn't afford to provide through our resources. It will allow us to do that. There is a significant evaluation component that we will be able to go in, we will have an evaluator who's purpose will be to go in and actually monitor the client outcomes so we should be able to see things like, are we having compliance across individuals who need to take certain medications for certain diagnosis. If we have clinicians for example, who are treating depression, we will be able to have some investment in technology to be able to look at our data and be able to say, o.k., we have Mary, Dave, and Joan and they are all seeing people with depression but wait a second, Mary is getting her people to the best outcome possible in three sessions yet it's taking Joan, ten. What's the difference in the approach and then how do we work with that? Maybe when we look at it, Joan is much better equipped to be able to be working with the different client population. So it allows you to maximize the resources that you have as your staff.

Legislator Rankin: I forget how long does this grant last, did you say?

Mrs. Brinkman: It's a 2 year grant, \$2 million dollar per year.

Legislator Rankin: When you go to reapply for it, does it ask for progress or evidence, I mean, you talked about evidence based as to the success of the grant, the next time you apply?

Mrs. Brinkman: Yes it does and certainly as we've had to do with our Tapestry grants, to demonstrate that we met the deliverable as the promises that we made within those grants, that's considered when you apply for the next one. So, for example, there are several CCBHD's up in Erie County in Buffalo. They met their deliverables, they applied in this round, and they were approved again. So yes, we certainly want to have that track record (*inaudible*) so that we deliver when we apply for their dollars that we use they well and wisely and then our clients benefit.

Legislator Rankin: I have no doubt that you will have all the good information when you go for a renewal as you very good at keeping track of everything. Thank you.

Legislator Lawton: I just have one more question. Sometimes when you get a grant like this, it's like, o.k., now the pressure is on. Do you have concerns or areas you need to (*inaudible*) where is your concern with now that you have this funding, how to lead affectively? Do you have any concerns?

Mrs. Brinkman: No, I think certainly having the support of our other County departments in helping us to make this happen is important, the collaboration. I think having collaboration with - building on the collaborations we have with the other agencies that are going to be a part of this, it's always a race through time to get the contracts through, making sure we can meet the timelines that we have to adhere to the grant guidelines. So all of those things are a worry but I think in general, we've had three Tapestry grants and two HERSA(?) grants and so we're getting

comfortable with being good at identifying services, bringing in revenue to support those needs and then making it happen.

Legislator Lawton: Great, thanks.

Chairman Pavlock: Pat, I have another question. As far as, obviously some increase staffing, do you have space for them or are you going to need more space to accommodate everybody? What does that look like?

Mrs. Brinkman: That's something we're evaluating. A piece of it would be at City Hall, we're looking at that and what staffing patterns are there. The crisis component will be in the north County and will be at a place to be determined. That is one of the next things we need to get on.

Chairman Pavlock: One other question to like the timeline, I suppose of events now that you are receiving the grant once it's going to be operational. I guess along those lines, the funding as you said is for two years, does that start once the program is started and say in two years, you have not used the \$2 million dollars, does the money stay in a balance for us to use beyond that point or is it, use it when you have it?

Mrs. Brinkman: SAMSA encourages you to use the money as you need. But for example, a lot of grants right now are experiencing difficulty doing the deliverables that have been promised because of COVID-19. So with the PAUSES and the inability to be out in the community doing services, they are being understanding of the fact that there may be some delays in spending that money. SAMSA does have a policy whereby if you get to the end of the fiscal year and you have dollars left over, you can ask for what they call a no cost extension and then move those dollars into the next year and when you get to the end of the second year, which is the final year of the grant, you can ask for a no cost extension to allow you to do the work that you were unable to do with the dollars that you have left. There are no guarantees but so far we've not had a no cost extension turned down.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you. Does anyone else have any questions for Pat today? Seeing none, thank you. All those in favor of this resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2020 Adopted Budget for COVID-19 Revenue from Federal Government – Office for Aging Services

Mrs. Spanos: The Office for the Aging has been identified in 2 of the Federal stimulus packages. The first one I think was called Family First (FFCRA), Family First Coronavirus Response Act, we got an allocation mainly for meals under that and then there is also another allocation under the CARES which was the third stimulus. A total of about \$53 million is coming to New York State Aging programs to just meet the needs of older adults who need to kind of shelter in place and stay at home. So, we are going to get, and I don't have the number in front of me of the amount, do you Kathleen?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, \$430,821.

Mrs. Spanos: Right, so under these two programs, we have seen an increase in home delivered meals and emergency food for people in the County, we've also put personal emergency response buttons in place for older adults, especially for those who are on our wait list to give them an extra line of support while they are sheltering at home. It's pretty flexible funding that we can use to meet the needs. I believe it goes through September of 2021. We're trying to be judicious, trying to think long term how to help people.

Legislator Pavlock: It sounds like you have a good plan for the use of the funds given the situation and the effects it has on our aging population. Thank you for the work that you and your office has done. Any questions or comments from the committee?

Legislator Rankin: I'm glad to see the money coming in for this population. It's good to know.

Mrs. Spanos: Just to let you know a few other things that we've kind of put in place as the result of this is shopping assistance for people. We're basically trying to help them shop with their own money rather than – if they need emergency food, we will drop them a food box. We try to keep people out of the Meals on Wheels system who are not frail elderly, who don't need an everyday drop of meals but people who have an emergency need for (*inaudible*) week worth of meals that we can drop off to somebody but we also found that a lot of people, it's not that they don't have resources for food, it's that they don't have the technology to shop on line. So, we quickly work out a system where we could either help people shop and recoup that from them or use their credit card or get their SNAP benefit, help them use their SNAP benefit because I don't know if you are aware, everybody who's on the Federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance program, their benefit for March, April, and May, were increased to the maximum. Some of our seniors only get \$16 a month, everybody was bumped up to \$194 for one person and I think its \$355 for a couple. So this gives them a lot of resources to be able to buy food but unfortunately none of the regulations have been relaxed about how they get that using technology. We're trying to fill that space for them.

Chairman Pavlock: Any questions for MaryAnn? Thank you for your presentation today and your hard work through this pandemic. All those in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Other

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2020 Budget Appropriations and Revenues Due to COVID-19 Pandemic and Other Year to Date Financial Impacts

Mrs. Dennison: I can share my screen if there are some members that did not get this resolution because it was sent out quite late. If that's acceptable I can do that.

Chairman Pavlock: Yes, please do so.

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution was amended in Public Facilities on Monday and then late this afternoon I discovered another amendment that was needed so it was further amended in Public Safety this afternoon. So the version that I am going to show you here is what I propose for the second amendment and that second amendment was adopted so I'll talk to you about the double amended resolution.

This resolution, I'll give an overview and then talk about each of the different section, also in summary, and then if anyone has any questions on individual items, I'll be happy to elaborate. So this resolution is the outcome of several weeks of work by department heads and by the COVID finance team. As you all were advised in a memorandum from the County Executive, departments were asked to evaluate their local share budget and see if they could cut their local share by 15 to 20%. So we've received responses from all department heads and all the responses were reviewed by the COVID finance team and this resolution is, as I said, a summary of the changes that the committee accepted. Some of the recommendations or suggestions from the department heads we did not include in this resolution because we are hoping that we don't have to go that far at this time. But we have in this resolution about a 6% reduction of local share. Obviously that's not a 15-20% range but it does represent a decrease in the general fund local share of just over \$4 million dollars. With these decreases, we are proposing to decrease the sale tax revenue by the \$4 million dollars. That is at the low end of what is expected as a shortfall in sales tax so this may not be the only time that we have to amend the budget. One step that we know we'll be taking in addition to this resolution is an amendment to the budget which reflects the voluntary furloughs. The CSEA 6300 members, as you were informed, we're offered a chance for voluntary furlough and their responses are due back to the department head today so at this time we don't know what savings will come from that. So when we do have an estimate of those savings, we will propose an additional amendment.

Having said that, just to give you the highlights, there is a small decrease in the use of the capital reserve. One of the reductions proposed by the Department of Public Facilities is to have a reduction in the Complete Streets program. It is a small number, \$21,000. That was originally funded from the reserve from capital so if we don't do that work, the money will go back to the reserve. The second section here are increases in appropriations. Some people have expressed surprising concern that we are increasing the budget when what we're trying to do is decrease local share. These changes, most of them because departments looked at the whole year and projected what they would need and then figured out what they could reduce and the reason that they are doing that is because the new contract for 6300 was not included in the current budget because it was adopted or ratified too late. That contract does include wage increases. Departments are anticipating that they will need additional monies in their wages but they, in most cases have offsetting savings in employee benefits. So there are some increases, most of these have offsetting decreases in other areas of the resolution. Is there any question so far? The next section is decrease in appropriations and this is where most of the activity is. A lot of changes. The first amendment on Monday was to change the airports, personal services. I misunderstood their reduction of overtime but I included a too large of a reduction so we corrected that. Another item of note is here in inter-fund transfers. This is a reduction in the amount of money that the general fund gives to the road and road machinery funds. We have quite a few savings in the road and road machinery areas which you can see here, over a million

dollars in savings, but in order for that savings to effect the sales tax or allow us to reduce the sales tax revenue, we have to send less money to the “D” fund. So the “D” fund is spending less money, they are getting less money from the general fund. So that’s why we have a reduction in the inter-fund transfer. There are also reductions in occupancy tax funded items. One of them is here in the watershed administration and the other one is here in 6420 tour so not only are we anticipating reduction in sales tax but also reduction in occupancy taxes. The second amendment that was accepted in Public Safety was to add a reduction in the capital vehicle classification for the Sheriff. He is planning to purchase no new vehicles in 2020. So this would reduce his appropriation for those capital vehicles. We have a couple of increases in revenue. At the airport, we are expecting an influx of money from the CARES Act for the airports and also, since we have a new fixed base operator, we are anticipating additional revenue due to those agreements. The last section is the decrease in revenue and the main items here would be the decrease in sales tax and those are amended just because of that change in the overtime at the airport. So we have, as I said, over \$4 million dollar reduction in sales tax. There is also, if you look here in 5420, tour, and 8020 watershed, over \$400,000 reduction in occupancy tax. The items that are highlighted in yellow, this is the reduction in the revenue in the Sheriff capital vehicle account. Since that’s kind of self-funded, if you will, within County funds so he doesn’t have the expenditure – he doesn’t have the revenue to offset that so again, those two items need to go together to take the capital vehicles out of his budget for 2020. So that is the rather lengthy summary of the resolution. As I said, I would be happy to answer any specific questions.

Legislator Pavlock: I would like to thank you for the explanation and the work that the department heads and committee put forth into this to help with our budget shortfalls this year. Does any committee members have any questions or comments at this time?

Legislator Whitford: What is the estimate for the shortfall for sales tax by the end of 2020, was that closer to \$8 million?

Mrs. Dennison: (*Inaudible*) we’re expecting the shortfall be between \$4 to \$8 million.

Legislator Whitford: So this will be an ongoing thing. This is just our first step in addressing that shortfall, correct?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. It is the first step. We’re in a little bit of a holding pattern now until we get more information on the sales tax to see how much further we have to go but as I said, the next step would be the voluntary furloughs. I have seen some preliminary information and the response has been quite good so far so we will be further evaluating those at the meeting on Friday and starting to quantify how much we expect to save from that. So that’s kind of our (*inaudible*) too and there were, as I said, kind of taking a pause before we see how much further we need to go and maybe we won’t need to go much further but we don’t know at this time. I should say too that, we’re not only reactionary, we do have several ideas, the committee has several other ideas in mind that we are considering on an ongoing basis because if we do need to take further steps to reduce local share.

Legislator Rankin: Are you willing to share any of those or would you prefer not to at this point?

Mrs. Dennison: I would prefer not to at this point because a lot of them are – there are some ideas we are considering but we’re really not far enough along to know if how, when, and if we would need to implement those.

Legislator Rankin: To whom did you offer the voluntary furloughs?

Mrs. Dennison: The voluntary furloughs were offered to all members of CSEA 6300 as well as management and confidential employees. It was not offered to Sheriff unions because those personnel were considered to be essential to the COVID response. So to the main union, management, and confidential employees.

Chairman Pavlock: Kathleen, could you put the normal screen back up at this time so we can see it. Anyone else have any questions? Seeing then, Kathleen, would you care to give us an opening of the amended resolution in regards to what we need to vote on.

Mrs. Dennison: I’d be happy to but Steve, do I need to because it was amended already, the second amendment.

Mr. Abdella: Those amendments would be considered before the committee now but certainly – no, sorry. It would be deemed to be in its amended form before the committee, so this committee does not need to re-amend. You can adopt it with the amendments previously made by the other two committees.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you for that explanation. Can I have a motion to adopt as amended?

Legislator Whitford: I will make a motion.

Legislator Rankin: Second.

Chairman Pavlock: All those in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Chairman Pavlock: We have one other “other” if Diane Anderson is still here.

Clerk Tampio: Mr. Chairman, if I may, just a reminder that the next Committee meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m..

Chairman Pavlock: Yes and I was going to say, normally I know that you go through your report detail by detail. It’s a little more challenging with our current situation and with our time limitation, just give us an overview and hit points that you feel would be important to discuss.

Discussion: Temporary Assistance Report - Diane Anderson, Katie Geise, and Christine Schuyler.

MOVED by Legislator Whitney, SECONDED by Legislator Whitford to adjourn.

*Unanimously Carried (6:01 p.m.)*

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