

Minutes
Budget Hearing
Human Services Committee
Audit & Control Committee
Monday, October 5, 2020
Legislative Chambers and Virtual via Zoom
Gerace Office Building

Members Present: H.S. Pavlock, Rankin, Whitford, Whitney via zoom (Absent: Lawton,)
A.C. Nazzaro, Gould, Harmon, Niebel, Odell

Others: Tampio, Ames, Dennison, Hansen, Schuyler, Lis, D. Anderson, L. Luka-Conley,
Chagnon(zoom), Boria, Agett, M. Spanos, Melquist, Carlson, Brinkman, Swanson

Chairman Pavlock: I want to thank everyone for being here today in starting the process of our budget review. Will work down our agenda today. Does anyone have any questions as we go along, just speak up and get your question in. I look forward to this process. Kathleen, do you have an overview for us this morning?

Mrs. Dennison: I do Chairman Pavlock. Good morning and welcome everyone. As I will say to the Audit & Control Committee, they will probably get tired of hearing my overview because they are going to hear it several times but for the benefit of everyone, I hope that you got my email from about 10 days ago where I did send out most of the overview notes in advance so that gave you an orientation to the budget binder and the materials that we provided as well as provided some highlights of the budget.

So just to add a couple of items to that overview, Janelle did pass out this morning the FTE analysis. That document shows the changes in wages and fringe due to positions added or deleted. That's kind of the center portion of the document. So those are what we are calling the changes that are due to volume or, as I said, changes in numbers of positions. Then there is also a block that shows the changes in wage and fringe due to rate changes or changes in the contract. That was kind of important this year because we, in the 2021 budget, we have all of the contracts settled for all collective bargaining units. So there was quite a dramatic increase in base pay rates because in the 2020 budget, we did not have the settled contract, at least for 6300 and so there were no increases included for that bargaining unit. So the 2021 budget does quite a bit of catch-up so we wanted to show what was the effect of those changes in the base rate and then there is also some comments on that sheet about particular departments that may have added or changed positions, some of which were funded by outside sources. That is an additional document that was not included in the original budget book or in any of the materials that I sent out.

The other thing I just wanted to comment on is, I think you'll hear from a lot of departments, especially when it comes to wages, that the increases are contractual changes and the benefits too, that there are changes that are largely out of the control of the departments. There is a lot of truth in that. As I said, the base wages are determined by the contract settlements and the benefits are determined by rates that are not within in the control of departments and the health insurance elections obviously are not, of individual positions are not within the control of the department. But they obviously do have control over how many positions they have. So just

kind of a footnote that that is how the department heads can exercise control over their wages and benefits. You'll also see in the computer categories, those numbers are generated by the I.T. Department and provided to the department heads. So the department heads in general use those figures but again, they do have control over them, they don't have to take the suggestions of the I.T. Department. Those suggestions are based on a number of positions that they department has and also just a regular schedule of replacement of a computer equipment. But they are still at the department heads discretion should they choose to adjust them.

I guess the last thing I just wanted to add as an overview, we are, as usual, suggesting that the department heads work from the budget summaries that they provided and that are in the tentative budget book. The summaries show the department budgets at the classification level and so again, our recommendation is, to start with that summary and walk us through that. There are comments on there for any significant variances and then if there are particular questions that people have about individual accounts, of course, that account detail is provided for you behind the department summaries. So that is all I have for you Chairman Pavlock.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you very much. We'll move right into the Health & Human Services section and we welcome you two this morning. I can't see on the screen, is it just Val with you or who else is with you.

Health & Human Services

Mrs. Schuyler: Val is on the phone, Diane Anderson is the Director of Certification, she's over Temporary Assistance programs in the back and this is Leanna Luka-Conely, she's Deputy Commissioner for Adult, Children Family Services and I'm Christine Schuyler for those who don't know me.

Val could not be with us in person today so she's is joining us via phone and you are going to be hearing her voice a lot from the speakers because obviously she's our financial guru when it comes to our budget. We don't typically spend a lot of time on the front page because we get right into the detail. I don't know if anyone has any questions on that very giant summary or we should just dive into the backup pages if that is alright with you.

Chairman Pavlock: That would be fine.

Mrs. Schuyler: The next page I believe everyone has, is the FTE page. You can see we have decreased our FTE's by a total of 17.88 over the 2020 adopted budget. Looking at specific areas, you see that nursing is down. We had some Health Aid positions that went unfilled, also part of where we took – we left a lot of positions vacant in our Social Services Admin, that's our giant Social Services FTE slot. We really tried to look at increasing efficiencies and as people have retired or moved on, did we really have to refill that position or could we do things differently. As we all know and I think we'll say many times that we are in unrepresented times right now and our world certainly has been turned upside down in the Health and Human Services setting. So we have made the best decisions that we could make going forward and that we have really made cuts every place we thought we could especially when it comes to attrition, not layoffs but really looking at those who are retiring and moving on. So, any questions on the FTE's?

Chairman Pavlock: Less employees in the nurses in the Jail, is that due to population or just - what is the difference there? What is the need for a decrease there?

Mrs. Schuyler: We really were never able to recruit and hire so we've had a couple of nursing vacancies in the Jail that have just been vacant. We weren't able to recruit. We've still been able to use some of our CASA nurses and we do have a part-time staff that helps to fill in the holes. So far, it's been working the best as we can but it's a difficult place to recruit for.

Legislator Rankin: I'm concerned for you Christine with any reduction in that what you went through this last year, how your staff was so overworked and obviously we hope that things get better with COVID (*inaudible*) areas I'm worried about in reduction in FTE.

Mrs. Schuyler: Thanks, I appreciate that. So we'll take all 17 of them back. I think like I said on the Jail side, we had really wanted to recruit for a couple of part-time positions, we thought that would be easier but those were removed I think last year at budget time, I think the County Executive took those out, County Executive Borrello. We thought it would be easier to have part-time people willing to fill in hours, per diem basically because you know, if you have a full time job somewhere else and you just want to work per diem but we really don't have a pre diem status in County government. I'm per diem, that language comes from my hospital days, because you are able to have staff who can work whenever they can and help and fill in. That's what we really would have benefitted by, I think, not only in the Jail but also in our public health world too. We call in part-time so that really is the only flexibility that we lost in losing part-time positions, we lose flexibility of having people on the books who you can call when people are sick or on vacation or if an emergency arises. But other than that, we were able to bring on some part-time help for going through COVID now, we did hire 2 part-time nurses, RN's. Another LPN part-time and with the State's COVID money, we brought in - well, right now we're recruiting for one full time nurse. Public Health Law dictates that the nurses have to have - Public Health nurse has to have a Bachelors' degree and that's always a little challenging in our County because we don't have a Bachelors program. JCC offers an Associate's program and we did hire a full time Health Educator with our COVID-19 funding that came through.

Chairman Pavlock: Do you find that wage makes it difficult for you to locate nurses and hire?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes. We definitely have not kept up with the private sector when it comes to pay. I think in general government fringe benefits, used to be more of a hook for people but with the changes in the State retirement system that really isn't so much of a hook anymore. We did an analysis, I'm going to say maybe two years ago now, and I don't know if Kathleen was involved with it or Val remembers, for nurses, when Jessica Wisniewski was here, I asked to have a salary analysis done and we are definitely well below everyone and we require Bachelor's degree which you don't have to have in most any other setting when it comes to nursing. It is an area where I really think the salary range should be adjusted for nurses.

Legislator Whitford: That's your biggest drawback for recruiting.

Mrs. Schuyler: Oh yes.

Legislator Whitford: I have a question on – you know, certainly during this process you have to take into consideration what your anticipation is for State funding. I know in Health & Human Services that is probably the most volatile area in the County as far as receiving funds from the State because it changes from month to month. It's incredible what you have done here but, how much did that factor in to this? How do you possibly make arrangements for what you feel the funding is going to be for the year?

Mrs. Schuyler: I wish I could tell you there is this wonderful mathematical analytic ability we have to do that but when it comes to positions - oh, go ahead Val, there she is.

Legislator Whitford: I was just wondering if you are being overly optimistic or –

Ms. Lis: No, I don't believe so. We're really – several times were funding and actually the Federal side is much larger than the State. It comes through the State (*inaudible*). We have on the Health side, many grants and a lot of our grants have pretty much (*inaudible*) for the year. They don't change a lot and they cover particular items. Then we have our State Aid which is 38%(?) of our (*inaudible*) except for (*inaudible*).. They don't cover fringe benefits which (*inaudible*)... That kind of stays pretty level as well. If something is not covered by a grant it will fall on State aid. A lot of other people might find (*inaudible*), on the DSS side, there is a lot of different programs (*inaudible*) of block grants (*inaudible*) some of the others are percentage based on what kind of services we're providing but they're open ended. (*Inaudible*), the structure is really pretty (*inaudible*) and so what I generally do is I budget all of our expenditures and then work back from that and (*inaudible*) then I go and fill the revenue side. (*Inaudible*) and I can show you guys if you want to see a particular area but (*inaudible*)....

Mrs. Schuyler: I think we have been careful as far as FTE's when we have people who have been out for extended periods, let's say it's a medical leave that is approaching a year, we really have to really look to see, we've been without this person for all this time, do we really need to refill this position or can we go without. I asked all of the Directors on every vacancy to really put together what we had to have filled now which was critical to operations, what we could try and put off to the 2021 budget year and what we thought we didn't have to fill. They've been going through that exercise probably for about 6 months now since we've started with the pandemic and everything going on. Really trying to look at things. There still is that 20% threat out there from the Governor. I think that's just out there. I don't know if that will really happen or not, as far as withholding on some of our payments.

Ms. Lis: (*Inaudible*) summarize what they've actually withheld but again, that is not on the Federal side, it's only on the State side and certain programs they (*inaudible*). The biggest one that we've seen which was a couple of days ago, our Child Welfare settlements (*inaudible*) and it's not (*inaudible*)... so they are all budgeting as normal and (*inaudible*) that maybe they won't get that. (*Inaudible*) that we won't get it. I think that there will be a revolution if they did.

Chairman Pavlock: Do you feel that your adjustments on your personnel here is related to the current budget situation with the pandemic and do you feel you will be looking to put these back on in the years ahead?

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, it's been my experience in my 12 years in County government that once you give your positions up, you don't get that back, so there really isn't an assumption that they will come back. Unless something were to happen that we could really justify needing to have more staff back. If the Legislature wanted to consider anything when it came to FTE's, the only thing that I would say, especially on the Public Health side right now would be, a couple of nursing part-time FTE's that are just out there so that if we would have the ability to bring that per diem help in if we needed to be.

Legislator Nazzaro: The 10 ½ FTE decrease in 6010, I know that we have to go through the detail, where is the majority of that? That's a good size number. When I was going through the budget book, I was reading the notes and just trying to identify where the majority of that is or it's just spread throughout?

Mrs. Schuyler: Val, do you have that in front of you?

Ms. Lis: I could dig it up but (*inaudible*), I would say that probably the largest area is (*inaudible*) area that (*inaudible*)

Mrs. Luka-Conley: I hope that it's not all 10 positions but –

Ms. Lis: (*Inaudible*) all 10 positions but I think a lot of it would be more towards (*cross talk*)....

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Right. We were looking at our Adult Protection area so we've been streamlining the best way we can. I know with COVID, things have been different. I know that with schools opened up right now, things are looking a lot different for us. But we're seeing where we can streamline and be more efficient. Also preparing for Family First ahead of ourselves because that looks completely different from what we've been doing every day. The (*inaudible*) situation with Taverse, actually if we didn't have that technology during this pandemic, we would have been serious trouble. Has really helped the Case Managers being able to work out in the field and being more effective. Raise the Age is another area, which we don't know what is going to happen with that budget because it's been 100% reimbursed but we haven't seen the flow of kids into Raise the Age like we thought we would. We also took over PINS which we've streamlined with the Social Services side. Just a lot of more blending with the staff that we have to be more effective and using community resources as the main hub.

Mrs. Schuyler: The Family First Preventive Services Act is Federal legislation that is really, a complete reform of the Child Welfare System on the preventive side. Really looking to not put children into congregate care, meaning any higher level institutions, group homes, or even OCFS or (*inaudible*) facilities and utilizing Foster homes and really families more than anything. So a lot of the FTE's when we've had our community services workers, kind of like a health aide type of a position, with the new legislation out, there really isn't as much of a need for community services workers as there has been in the past. Our role is changing in what the expectations are for County Social Services and it really is case management and care coordination of a child welfare case and the prevention services that are provided must be on a

federally approved list, in a clearing house, and they are all evidence based programs. They all mainly require a clinician or a higher level that is going to be available in the home 24/7 providing services to children and families. So we really were looking at how the Child Welfare system is changing, what do those positions looking like in the future that we're going to need and we really need to make sure that we maintain our case workers. CPS is still an area that is of great concern. We have several vacancies in CPS. The pandemic has really hurt with that because there has been no civil service testing and we have no active list to even hire anybody, haven't been able to hire for CPS positions and it's a year of training before they can take an active case. We saw caseloads go down during the pandemic. Good or bad, I just think the mandated reporters weren't getting their eyes on these children that are in their homes. Now we have seen, just this last month, we are already up higher than we have been in a year and half for the month of September for (*inaudible*) reports. So it completely jumped right back up again when school reopened. I mean, I think it looks dramatic. I think some of these vacancies have been open and we just did what was asked of us, that we needed to make cuts and we needed to reduce our budget and we've done the best that we can. Unfortunately you'll see when you go through here, because of the increases with the contract and the wages, the cuts we made, didn't give us this giant savings but if we wouldn't have cut almost 18 positions, I can't imagine how high that personnel budget would be right now without (*inaudible*).

Legislator Nazzaro: Maybe this will be more for Kathleen, to Christine's point now, the 17 positions that we have here, a decrease, those were actually opened positions that currently aren't filled, that are vacant, is that correct? Most of them.

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, they have been given up.

Legislator Nazzaro: They've been given us so as we go through this budget process, these were in the 2020 adopted budget?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., so now we just are taking those positions out.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Of the 2021 tentative budget.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, so this is a variance from the number of positions in the 2020 adopted budget and Valerie can correct me if I'm wrong but based on my previous discussions with the department, none of these positions are currently occupied.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., just wanted that clarification. Thank you.

Legislator Whitford: Part of them are positions that hadn't been filled and part of them are positions you didn't refill because of attrition, right?

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Whitford: I mean, that's the balance that you had with that 17.

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: Christine, first of all I would like to complement you and your staff, I think that you guys have done an excellent job during this COVID situation but having said that, I'm still going to ask questions later on. You mentioned the Family First legislation. That comes up later in the budget, are you going to discuss that more in depth?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., because I might have a question or two on that legislation.

Chairman Pavlock: One question that kind of goes along with what Mr. Nazzaro was asking, obviously last year we adopted a budget with the personnel and therefore we had the revenue that went along with them or also we had the line item budgeted for them and we didn't pay those people so we had extra money, in a sense, for those items and we were able to help balance the budget with that, I'm assuming or are we going to have a lack of – how is that affecting the budget?

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct me if I'm wrong but our expenses are reimbursed based on actual expenses so we have to spend the money and then we put our claim in and the State reimburses us. So if we don't have those expenses, we don't get that revenue. So when we do the budget, that many less positions, Val also took out any corresponding revenue that would have come with those positions. Right Val?

(Val was not available at this moment)

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions? If not, we'll move onto the next section.

Mrs. Schuyler: I believe your next page is again, DHHS. This is our overall summary. I think it's probably worth it to go onto the specific account areas. First one I have is 6010 DSS Admin. Here is where you can see where we had a large drop in the number of FTE's but at the same time, the personnel service costs is going up year to year. I think that was explained as, per Kathleen. Do you see there is a request in there for some more Surface Pros for our Child Welfare staff? That is related to the current technology that we are using. We have Surface Pros, tablets, for all of our Child Welfare staff, well not all of them. We started and we've been ramping them up and trying to get everyone with them. Very thankful that we had that technology and utilizing the Northwood's Child Welfare software program and that was an approved capital budget that we were able to purchase the Surface Pro's in the past. We were one of the early adopter counties onto the Northwood's program but because we did have the ability for all of our workers to work remotely, I really don't know what we would have done during pandemic with Child Welfare if we wouldn't have had the technology and the capabilities that we've had. It really works well, it connects with the State system, workers are able to see histories, they can do their documentation, they can print, they can do everything that they need

with the mobile technology but we do have a need for more of the staff, some of the Community Services workers didn't get Surface Pros the first time around and it's really important when they do their supervised visitation and other things that they able to document as well. So that is in there as an equipment request and those costs came from I.T..

Going down, I think when Val looks at our revenue –

Ms. Lis: *(Inaudible)*

Mrs. Schuyler: O.k., as long as you are there. I feel like my life line is here. Val looks at our trends in determining the amount of revenue percentage that is there. Val, anything you need to speak to on that?

Ms. Lis: *(Inaudible)* really see, I got cut off, I'm not sure if we're on 6010.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, we're on 6010.

Ms. Lis: Basically I go through and look at, as I said, the block grants. Sometimes we don't know what we're going to get to far ahead but they don't fluctuate an awful lot and generally I will *(inaudible)* to what our most recent allocation has been. I look at see what has happened over the years *(inaudible)* down a little bit. And then there are other areas – a lot of that is *(inaudible)* 6010. The other areas *(inaudible)*.... they are mostly percentage based. The other *(inaudible)* which is about \$5 million dollars, that's *(inaudible)* money, those are generally going to *(inaudible)* in 6010 because when you get paid *(inaudible)* you can't say this part is for adoption subsidies, this one is for employment services or something like that. So, we can't *(inaudible)* down everything *(inaudible)*.....

Mrs. Schuyler: So result in increase in local share here, even after cutting that many FTE's is related to salaries.

Legislator Whitford: Five point five percent, right?

Chairman Pavlock: Can everyone hear Val o.k.?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yep.

Ms. Lis: *(Inaudible)* the breakdown of how the salary changes came about whether it was *(inaudible)* people or contractual, so we really can't know what that *(inaudible)*.

Mrs. Dennison: Val, I will email you a copy of that. But just to make one comment on it, there is a little bit of a, I don't want to say disconnect but there is a little bit of a difference between that report and the budget changes because in the rate and volume report for the FTE's, those numbers are based on the home department for each position. Because there is a lot of variables involved in this to get something that could be done in a timely manner. I did it based, as I said, on the home department. When it comes to especially 6010, and within Health & Human Services, there are a lot of allocations. So a person's position may be located in 6010 and it's allocated to another department or visa versa, so you won't see an automatic correspondence

in the changes in wages and benefits between the variance report and the budget. But it will give you some idea of what – it will give you an idea of the effects of the change of changes in the number of people and the rates they are paid.

Legislator Nazzaro: So Kathleen, piggybacking on that, when I looked at the supplemental sheet that you sent, or gave out, so on department 6010, you are showing added or deleted positions, if I'm reading this right, we reduced it by \$494,000 for wages and \$327 for fringes for a total reduction of \$821,000. So, at a high level, if these positions had not been deleted out of the budget, then with the local share going up for 6010 by about \$1.2 million. Is that a fair assumption?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., because I had asked Kathleen and we talked about this many times to get a handle on the variances in the budget because we had the contractual increases which there was a 2 year catch-up because when you did the 2020 budget, it didn't have the increases in there. The adopted budget, then we approved a lot of contracts so it's almost like a 2 year lag when doing 2020-2021. So to keep it simple, I said, identify what positions were actually deleted and what they meant. So, that would be – if we didn't have the reductions, it would actually be a \$1.1 million increase to local share. Is that roughly right?

Mrs. Dennison: For 6010?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, that's correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: Could I get this electronically too?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, and I will try and do that now and Val, just for your reference, for some reason I'm on my laptop but it's not allowing me to email any excel files so I'll send it to you as soon as I can.

Ms. Lis: Thanks (*inaudible*).....

Mrs. Schuyler: So in reality, the cuts that we made, were a significant savings to the County budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: Christine, you mentioned Northwood, Northwood is the company that has come up with our Traverse(?) program?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, Northwood's is a company and the software they developed is called Traverse. Kind of like the GMC –

Legislator Niebel: How much is our contract with Northwood? Do you know off hand?

Mrs. Schuyler: Val would know.

(Please note that Ms. Lis was communicating through the phone system on zoom and therefore majority of her answers were inaudible up to this point when the sound was improved.)

Ms. Lis: It's a good chunk of change and I hope I'm not lying to you when I say it could be about \$150,000 a year. It's not an inexpensive software but I believe it's head and shoulders above what the State offers on their own. There is really only two options out there that I'm aware of, to choose from. Leanna can speak about it but I believe that it's really a wonderful thing.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: It's a document management system so all of our documents go in there. When they take the Surface Pro out and about, families can sign off on it and I was just on a call on Friday with several other counties that have also invested in the Traverse system and there were a couple of counties that were on the call seeing if it was feasible for them to invest as well.

Mrs. Schuyler: With the early adopter, we got a significant – what was it, 50%, I think Val, reduction in the start-up costs.

Ms. Lis: Yes, we really did.

Mrs. Schuyler: And we do get State reimbursement on the system itself. So that contract, we do get reimbursement so it's not a –

Legislator Niebel: That was going to be the next question Christine. Fifty percent reimbursement?

Mrs. Schuyler: Sixty two is the –

Ms. Lis: It's kind of an average because costs are broken down over many programs. You've seen me say that before and then there is also the State additional Child Welfare settlement which is 62% which is for certain areas that go over our allocation. So 63 to 65% is our general number.

Legislator Niebel: The program that we actually have to use, to input our information, is the Connections program with the State?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, the State has the Connections system. That's a very antiquated DOS based program –

Legislator Niebel: They are updating it from time to time, as I understand.

Mrs. Schuyler: Well, they are trying to update. I waited for several years before moving on Northwood and it was because of the early adopter package that we were able to get. The State kept promising us that they were going to update their system and they were going to have mobile technology and that they were going to do this for us and after several years, many of us counties gave up on the State doing this. Thank heavens that we did because we've been using paper files and just for security alone, to think of what our staff have had to be working from home, working remotely, doing things that have been done, I don't know if we would have done it if everybody still had to have a filing cabinet and all of their paper documents. This really is an electronic management records system. Similar to hospitals, or our electronic medical records system. This really is an electronic management system (*cross talk*).

Legislator Niebel: Christine, understood but this is optional. This is something that we decided, Chautauqua County decided to do. It's not required by the State.

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: So I guess my question is, do you see it as any duplication of services with the State Connections program?

Mrs. Schuyler: No. Because the State Connection's program doesn't have the ability to do this.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: It's not mobile. So, like I said, the Traverse system holds our documents and they are able to take the Surface Pros and have people sign off. The Connection's system is, which they can also copy and paste certain things out of Traverse and put it in Connection's for the stuff that we need the State to have. The same thing with the uploads, I know that that is something that they just added to Connections but –

Legislator Niebel: (*Cross talk*) upload pictures and stuff now on Connection's –

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Right but what was also told to us on Friday is that they are not going to have the feasibility to hold everything in a State – I mean, it's a State system. It's not – you have to always in my – because I am from the private sector, you have to have something that compliments the State system in order to be flexible. I can tell you that if we did not have Traverse during this pandemic, we would have been in trouble, big trouble. Because we don't – I'm not going to have my Case Workers take all these files at home which we work with a very confidential area, not to mention them running all over the County to try and get a piece of paper. So, I think ourselves and many other counties have felt very comfortable moving in this direction because it has given us the flexibility to be able to do our jobs more effectively.

Legislator Niebel: You mentioned other counties. Are there a lot of other counties that have Traverse?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: Now there are.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: We were like maybe –

Legislator Niebel: The second or the third?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Well, we were the first with Traverse but with Northwood, there is different software packages. Traverse is – what do they call it – we don't own the software.

Legislator Niebel: Proprietary.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Yes so we don't have to pay for the license (*inaudible*) it's like a leasing type of situation that if something ever changes, we can just break the lease.

Ms. Lis: That is where we were the first but there were several – I believe, wasn't it also, we didn't support the operating systems that the old one was on, that's why we couldn't do it earlier as well?

Mrs. Schuyler: Before Traverse's software had to be run on the ipads and the County I.T. here, we don't support iPad technology. So we didn't have an option to even go down the Northwood's road until the Surface Pros were available.

Ms. Lis: Yea, we're not technically like the first, we're more like the first getting involved. An early adopter of the new way that they sold it and that's what gave us that nice discount in the beginning.

Legislator Niebel: I guess the last question, so with the Traverse program, can we make changes to the program? Or, for example, we have a new County Executive, I assume his letterhead is on a lot of your forms. Would we be able to make that change or did we have to contact Northwood to make that change and are we paying for those changes?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: So, that's part of our service agreement.

Legislator Niebel: It's included.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: It's included so all the forms that are in Traverse and if there are changes to those forms, they'll make the changes which is a very quick turnaround. Sometimes it's like 24 hours we get the form back. If it's a brand new form, I think it's like \$100., so all the forms that we uploaded which there is a ton of forms, even some forms that we didn't know if we were going to use, we just wanted them in there in case we had to make changes later on. So, that's part of the service agreement.

Legislator Niebel: Thank you.

Mrs. Dennison: If I could just add a comment to answer Mr. Niebel's question. The Northwood's contract, the current contract, it's a three year contract and the total amount is \$491,000 so average expenditure would be \$164,000 per year. I'm not sure whether there's variance between the years, maybe it was a little bit more in the start-up year but the total

contract is \$491,000 and as Val and Christine mentioned, and Leanna, some of that is reimbursable.

Legislator Niebel: Approximately 62%.

Mrs. Schuyler: Sixty two to 65%.

Mrs. Dennison: I would have to defer to Val on that one.

Ms. Lis: Yes, 62-65% is our general rate.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions?

Legislator Rankin: I really think that maybe the best use of technology that we can is a great idea and in hindsight looking at the difficulties that the State systems had during the pandemic, they were overwhelmed but Christine, correct me if I'm wrong, but your departments were able to keep operating due to your local technology.

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Rankin: So I commend you for moving in that direction, as you said, and getting rid of paper to me is always a great efficiency.

Legislator Odell: Just to (*inaudible*) a big fan of Surface Pros, bullet proof, work great in the field. Use them all the time with customers. The contract manages software and stuff like that. We do a lot of that in the private sector with our stuff and I totally get what you are doing. I think just from the sounds of it, it's worth every penny (*inaudible*) efficient service for the constituents out there, getting it done and keeping your people moving with doing more with less. So, I like it.

Chairman Pavlock: I think a note to make also is, this is costing us some money but also I think that it saved us some money possibly in personnel so, that kind of –

Mrs. Luka-Conley: That was the other thing moving in this direction because we hire a lot of the younger generation who love technology and aren't too crazy about paper which has really helped with retention and flexibility. So that is something that we've seen with individuals that we've hired.

Mrs. Schuyler: I think with every industry, those who are the least comfortable with technology and utilizing this mobile technology, push back the hardest and its taking longer to get them to adopt the system. As Leanna said, most of our younger workers, they just think this is great to have this and have adopted it easily and really helping others to utilize it fully.

Ms. Lis: I was just going to say that it's also helping with retention of those younger workers and those are the ones we don't want to lose because you have to invest so much time training them.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, and we had a lot of time were staff – they don't know what forms they need. You can't carry every form and every consent and everything with you in paper in your car. So now they have it at their fingertips everything they might need. They don't have to go back to the office to get additional forms and then go back to the family's home again to get signatures and get things done. They have every form that they could need right there on their machine and the ability for parents to sign consents right there on their machine.

Legislator Niebel: Just to summarize. I'm all in favor of utilizing the latest technology. My concern was whether or not there was any duplication of services between the Traverse program and Connection's and I think that question has been answered. Thank you.

Chairman Pavlock: O.k., we'll go onto the next section.

Mrs. Schuyler: Next section is Day Care, which really we call it, it's Child Care, 6055. Val, do you want to take over here. It's the Child Care block grant is the funding for this program. The expenses that are related in this program really are for those who provide child care whether they are licensed or their exempt so it could be any of our licensed child care providers who do subsidize child care including - well whether they are a facility, whether they are private individual and whether they're legally exempt provider which could be a grandparent, aunt, uncle, who's caring for children while someone is at work, receives the subsidize child care. We also have a maintenance of effort in here that every county has to put in local share funds that's included in the \$2.8 million tentative expense that you see there.

Ms. Lis: So basically our costs have been trending downward over the past few years so we continued that trend. There is some day care that is funded federally and some are funded by the State. I may mix the two up but basically the difference is people who are working and people who are not. The State covers at 75% and the Federal covers at 100%. So I basically built my revenue numbers based on the trending between those two groups which, I think we've been leaning more towards the people who are employed. We have more of those than the other, if I remember correctly. Perhaps Diane can straighten me out there.

Mrs. Schuyler: This is one of Diane's program areas so programmatically she can answer any questions you may have on the actual Child Care programs. We don't make money so that really is kind of deceiving when you look at – it's not there is anything there. It's all reimbursed with State and Federal funds.

Ms. Lis: The people who work in that area are budgeted in 6010. We have a lot of that because we allocate their time over to what they work on. We have to do time studies according to the State so it's not always exactly what the people are doing. You test them for like a week every quarter and then you allocate their pay based that way. So you can't be that scientifically, we just budget them into 6010.

Legislator Nazzaro: Again, this question is probably for Kathleen. You provided us Kathleen with a 12 month rolling expenditure versus budget. I believe that everyone got that. It was in the front part of our budget book, it was a loose leaf, so when I look at and hopefully I won't have to ask this every time but I think just to clarify again, when I look at the expenses, for

the contractual, you are projecting 2020 to be a \$2.8 million. Then when I look at the rolling average you provided, you have projective of \$2,933,000, because I know you used June through December 2019 actual and then you used January through June 2020 actual to come up with a projected so there is a slight disconnect. I think the reoccurring concern that I am going to have and a lot of us, I just want to have – and it's different than when we prepared budgets in the past, is, I'm probably going to be focusing more on, are the projections that we have in the 2021 budget realistic? Are we understating expenses or are we overstating revenue? I just want to make sure as Audit & Control and I think all my committee does, that, when we get to day 5 of these hearings and we make a recommendation to the full Legislature, are we thoroughly projecting expenditures and revenue? There is so many uncertainties because of the pandemic and there are so many uncertainties because of what State aid may or may not be. So, when I look at, we're doing a decrease in expense here, so I just want to make sure – a comment was made that our actual expenditures are down from what they have been. So what numbers should I be looking at Kathleen when I compare what we're budgeting for 2021? Should I be looking at the rolling average or should I be looking at what you have in the book?

Mrs. Dennison: Just a couple of points of clarification that hopefully will answer your question. I agree with all of your observations. In the 12 month rolling average those numbers are actual numbers. There are no projections in the 12 month rolling average report. So, the 12 month number which is in this case is \$2.9 million dollars, that is what has been currently booked in January through June of this year plus what was booked for July through December of last year. Now the projections would be the departments, obvious projection or educated guess of what is going to happen just in calendar year 2020. You can see that the 6 years in calendar year 2020, I mean, 6 months from January to June, are significantly less than the 6 months in July through December. So, I think that would suggest that we may see – we're seeing a decrease now, will that continue into 2021, that question I would have to defer to the department. Obviously they have a little more knowledge of what goes on in that particular department. But, I just want to clarify the rolling average, there are no projections involved in that report.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., then I guess my question to Val or Christine, or Leanne, do you see a heavier, and again, this is a whole different year because of the pandemic so do you see a heavier concentration of expense in the last 6 months of the year due to either timing differences or the utilization of services, or is it pretty much spread throughout, the expense? Because to Kathleen's point, the expense for January through June is significantly less than what we actually had in July through December of last year. So again, I'm not looking to add expense, I just want to make sure these numbers are – I know they can't be 100%, I've learned that over all these budgets, but I just want to, as we go through the entire budget, I'm a little concerned that some of these things, as I went through your budget especially, the expenses were down. I just want to make sure, is that related to the pandemic or is that truly the trend?

Mrs. Schuyler: I think and Diane, feel free to join our conversation here. The expenses that you see, those are the costs of those who are providing child care services. So when we have a period of time where we have a lot of people unemployed or others choosing to stay home, they are not paying – they are not utilizing child care services. So that means the expenses to us, as the government entity that pays subsidized child care, go down. We then get reimbursement based what we claim. I don't think that we have had as many children in child care during this

time. Are we going to see more in 2021? I don't know. Diane, if you have anything to add based on your discussions with the Child Care Council?

Mrs. Anderson: (*Inaudible*) COVID that probably most likely have (*inaudible*) numbers. It's hard to say but our caseload has been trending down anyways, so, -

Ms. Lis: I can tell you historically over the past few years, child care census continues to decrease. It's just the fact and I think we've also leaned more towards, like relatives caring for the kids versus centers. We don't have that many centers, that's less expensive and also, I don't believe that there was any summer camp this year. So that is going to make this year a little lower. As far as I know, they didn't even open. So, if you look at it, between my projection of this year and my budget for next year, I kept them flat. (*Inaudible*) trends (*inaudible*) down over the year.

Mrs. Schuyler: I think what Mr. Nazzaro is asking, do we feel confident that 2021 is going to continue to trend down or even to be at a level that it has been decreased because of the pandemic or are we going to be in a situation where it costs us more than that? In reality, if it does cost us more, that means we get more reimbursement. So, it should be –

Ms. Lis: Right. I don't believe that really my cut is really pandemic driven that much.

Legislator Nazzaro: Val, you just hit the nail on the head. So, saying, and again, we aren't going to be able to get the right number no matter what we do because there are so many uncertainties. I think, on any of these items, if it's not totally pandemic driven and it's based on what trends were happening prior to the pandemic, then I'm comfortable. And you are seeing less child care needs, that's great. Obviously, we're going to have risks to matter what we do because if things, hopefully they get much better next year and camps open up and things like that, that can have an impact too and depending on the schools. I mean, there are so many variables to you hit the nail on the head what you are saying Val. I appreciate that. It's not the decrease or the trend is not pandemic driven and your budget is not based on that, I'm fine.

Ms. Lis: Right. This one in particular, just in general when I did my projections I had to say, "o.k., I don't want to go too (*inaudible*) on my projections because maybe things will improve". So I kind of had to walk that thin line, saying, "alright if things kind of act fairly normal later in the year, where is my (*inaudible*)". I tried to – because I didn't want to undercut and say that we're not going to spend that money but I didn't want to overestimate either so it was a little bit of a tight rope walk.

Legislator Rankin: I know I've seen in the news a number of day care centers that weren't getting enough people, they were closing. It seems to me that the pandemic had a huge effect on that, just antidotally. So I guess my question to tag onto that, I mean, Mr. Nazzaro asked what I was going to ask about the effect from the pandemic, but happens next year, if there are more, and I'm trying to get a sense of, based on reimbursement. A lot of the expense is covered is reimbursed from the government funding. What kind of impact would that have on the budget if these places start opening up again? I'm sorry if I'm asking the same question but a different way. I want to say, what will happen to the budget then?

Ms. Lis: I don't think that any of (*inaudible*). We have to pay for spots for the kids even though they are not there.

Legislator Rankin: Like the family based businesses in the homes, a lot of them have closed. Maybe I'm wrong but I know people who have been in the business of caring for kids at home and they shut down because they didn't have enough kids.

Ms. Lis: I don't have that connection to that. That's (*inaudible*) world.

Mrs. Anderson: And they not have been subsidy children that were going there but I don't have a good sense of that at this point, how many were effected by our children.

Ms. Lis: I know that the workload hasn't really decreased as far as paying for the care. It's still very active.

Mrs. Schulyer: Right because not all child care providers receive subsidy. If you don't meet the income guideline requirements then you pay out of pocket. If I had little ones that had to go into child care, I'm not going to qualify for subsidy and I'll have to pay full price on my own. All of child care in the county is not included in this. This is just what we subsidize.

Chairman Pavlock: I have a comment and a question. The comment I suppose is to go along with conservation that we've had this morning, it is a challenge to look at the budget this year and also for the next couple of years to think of how do we calculate our trends. Was it a trend that was happening before the pandemic or is it pandemic driven, so it's a challenge we're going to face through our whole budgeting process and something that we'll all work through and it will certainly be affecting our budget next year as we may have to make more adjustments as things kind of flatten out or start to recover. One question I do have regarding this is our reimbursement. Obviously we are receiving reimbursement, is there anything that would be alarming that we wouldn't receive reimbursement or that it may be affected or the State or Federal government is going to cut that reimbursement at all or that revenue stream seems solid?

Ms. Lis: It's a block grant. We never spend it all. It rolls over from year to year and let me say that every year for the past four or five years, however long I've been doing this, child care expenditures have been slowly decreasing. This is not unheard of.

Mrs. Dennison: I would like to add one other comment to Mr. Nazzaro's question and this is a general comment about the rolling average report. Departments that are largely driven by contractual costs, which this one is, will in general have higher expenditures in July through December and lower in January through June. Because typically we do not – we book contractual expenses on a one month lag so January through June, typically only includes 5 months of activity and July through December includes 7 months of activity.

Ms. Lis: That is definitely true. Sometimes more. Some of our vendors are very slow at billing us. Not so much child care but a lot of them are very slow.

Mrs. Dennison: So this particular department if you took an average of the July through June activity, assuming that it is and I double checked it, its 7 months, and 5 month equivalent of that would be \$1,277,000, so even with that adjustment, we are seeing a little bit lower expense in the first five months of this year.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions in 6055?

Legislator Odell: Just a point of clarification. Val, thanks for confirming that this was put together based on not pandemic trends or COVID but just on normal trends that it's receiving. Regardless, if we do see an increase in expenditures, they are going to be offset by reimbursements so it's going to become a push, anyways, plus or minus a \$100,000/\$200,000.

Ms. Lis: Right. That definitely reimbursement will following any extra expenditure.

Legislator Odell: Thanks for confirming.

Chairman Pavlock: My point was, as long as the State and Federal government paid.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's Federal.

Ms. Lis: It's a little bit both but mainly Federal.

Chairman Pavlock: O.k., let's go onto 6070.

Mrs. Schulyer: The 6070, Services for Recipients, this is called. This is really contracts that we have in place with a child psychiatrist for court ordered evaluations and also for our non-Temporary Assistance Client/Residential Domestic Violence services. The jump in the 2020 amended budget really was catch-up from 2019, so that is why that was higher. We are projecting \$90,000 for 2020 and kept that flat for 2021. Costs here have gone up because in the past, State legislation required that anyone who was in need of domestic violence sheltering services also had to apply for Temporary Assistance so that would cover their stay at the domestic violence shelter. The State has changed that regulation affective last year, I think it was, where now you cannot make someone apply for Temporary Assistance if they seek help from a domestic violence shelter. That's to protect their confidentiality and also just not to force them to have to apply for public assistance when they're really in need of domestic violence services. But those costs then turned into completely local share costs. So the longer someone, a woman, man, children, stay at a domestic violence shelter, that cost is now a local share cost and that was a change in State statue. So there are some increases that you see there that are based on that.

Chairman Pavlock: Any questions for Christine? O.k., next one.

Mrs. Schuyler: Next is 6109, Family Assistance. This is Temporary Assistance for needy families, TANF, is what else we call this. Again, Val can speak more to this. It really is in line with what – the State has put out a template for Social Services districts to be able to help with their budgeting, especially given the pandemic and what we're seeing in public assistance. Val

did utilize that and it is in line with that the State put out. Val, if there is anything or Diane – the monthly reports that Diane provides really has shown that we have had a decrease in our public assistance cases during this pandemic. You know, what people had been receiving an extra \$600 a week, so (*cross talk*) for public assistance really wasn't there as it had been before. Val, you did the budget so if there is anything else you want to add as far as how you come up with your numbers.

Ms. Lis: Basically this is one of, like Chris said, I had done my projection in my budget and then later the State came out – I can't remember exactly how much they said but I remember certain things, they said like, they expected a 2% increase Statewide and I went back and checked and really what I had come up with originally was fine with what they said. On this one, I feel confident because that is what the State budget office estimated so that gave me a little backing there. There is more than one thing in here. There's (*inaudible*) aid to families as well as Foster Care, through TANF. So the blended caseload will affect our revenue and what I have been doing is, I've always been doing a trending over the past 5 to 7 years of what that revenue has been and I usually come up with (*inaudible*) with that trending of what our revenue percentage reimbursement will be and that's how I build the budget. As expenditures go down, of course reimbursement will go down as well. There is very little State aid here (*inaudible*). I know that people always look at the repay, kind of where I went on those this year was, we were doing pretty well earlier in the year so I kind of built on that for my projections but slowed it down and I kind of cut those a little into next year thinking, well, people aren't going to have the money to go after. That's the theory I put behind the departmental income that you'll see in a few different departments.

Chairman Pavlock: Any questions with Family Assistance?

Mrs. Schulyer: I do think this is an area when we talk pandemic, we don't know what is going to happen. If the economy continues as it is, if there is not additional revenue out there for people and the job market doesn't get back to where it's been, then, we could see increases in this area. But TANF is the area that is really more reimbursed by the Federal government versus the Safety Net program that we'll get to next. It's such an unknown area for us right. We just don't know what is going to happen with the economy moving forward during the pandemic.

Ms. Lis: Yes. This is one of the ones that we really can't say.

Mrs. Schulyer: And a lot of the work requirements and the other requirements of the programs, face to face interviews, and recertification, all of that has been put on hold. So people have not had to do anything. Our participation rate is down to like 3% but that is because people don't have to right now. They don't have to go do job searches, they don't have to be in compliance with any of those Federal and State requirements during the pandemic. How all of that will change as we move forward, is to be determined.

Chairman Pavlock: I don't know the population of Chautauqua County, what it's done, if it's decreasing if any of this has to do with related services. If people are moving in or out, I don't know what our population has done in general. That could be effecting things too, to a point. Are there any other questions?

Legislator Nazzaro: So as the note indicates in the book, this is a Federal reimbursed program at 79%?

Ms. Lis: Yes, approximately. It's been decreasing. A lot of these programs, the revenue percentage has been decreasing over the last few years, slowly.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess I get more concerned about those programs that are State funded more than those that are Federal funded. Not saying there couldn't be a change but knowing the condition of New York State's budget, I'm more cautious of New York reimbursement (*inaudible*) Federal so if there is an uptick, obviously the State, as you noted, reimbursement is negligible, just about all of it comes from the Federal government.

Mrs. Schuyler: In TANF, yes.

Ms. Lis: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: Unlike the next topic, Safety Net. One of my favorites.

Mrs. Schuyler: Actually we don't have Safety Net next in our books, we have Child Care which is Foster Institutional Care, 6119. This section isn't Child Care like Day Care. This is Foster Care and children that are in institutional care. This budget was based on trends. We do expect to see a decrease in children in congregate care and in higher level of care because of the Family First legislation. There are certain stipulations that have been put into effect for children to, first of all, to be even put into a congregate care setting and then for them to stay there. Val does the revenue projections. You can see there, this is really based on trends, our reimbursement rates. We do get a Foster Care block grant.

Ms. Lis: Which I've shown in A6010 as I explained before because it's just different kinds of Foster Care funding flow through different departments. The EIF or (*inaudible*). I can't tell you how much, the chunks, of Foster Care block grant we receive for either one so we put them in 6010.

Mrs. Schuyler: When we talk about really wanting to maximize the Federal revenue, 4E(?) Federal reimbursement for Foster Care placements. Part of the Family First legislation is in order to be eligible for that 4E reimbursement, now there are a lot of other stipulations going into place so that we are going to be eligible for 4E and that really has to do a lot with the preventive services and the evidence based practices available in the Federal clearing house that we have to utilize. Nothing else will be reimbursable through 4E.

Legislator Niebel: I didn't realize with the Family First program was until I did a little research on it. Apparently it encourage juvenile placement in Foster Care homes as opposed to group homes or institutional settings.

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., but, in order to get the Federal reimbursement, there has to be come preventive programs in place. I didn't print them all out or I didn't list them but does Chautauqua County have those preventive programs in place at this time, in order to allow us to get the Federal reimbursement that we're entitled to?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: If we were to use preventive services for those kids to remain in the community versus even a Foster care placement, there is an evidence based list that New York State is building on the OCFS side. So right now, there's a few because they haven't streamlined with the other evidence based list in New York State. So for example, parents as teachers, is on there.

Legislator Niebel: Drug abuse programs or whatever.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: A lot of therapies and treatment that we already have in place in Chautauqua County that are reimbursable through Medicaid, that are treatment providers have like trauma informed care. Many of those resources are available. We're working, we've been meeting like three times a week on Family First so we have a round table of voluntary agencies and community partners that will help us establish those evidence based programs. So in order to get on the list, it takes a few years because it has to go through tons of hoops in order to get on the list. For one of them, Jamestown Learning Council is a parenting program which is evidence based and it's on the list so obviously we would want to work specifically with them because it was identified.

Ms. Lis: Also Family First doesn't really start until next September, is it? We have to start sliding into it but it's not something that you can automatically start on. But if the programs aren't available yet, it's a work in progress. It's not a road block.

Mrs. Schuyler: If I can cut to the chase, probably where (*inaudible*) the conversation, we do not have staff in our department who are trained or certified or even meet the qualifications to provide the evidence based clinician driven 24/7 services that the Federal government is going to require in order to draw down 4E reimbursement. They are looking at family functional therapy. They are looking at a lot of trauma informed care. You are looking at like our mental health providers are the ones who provide those services. We have voluntary agencies such as the GA Home, or Hillside, some of the other ones are escaping me that provide those sorts of high intensity, true, what they call preventive services. That's what is going to be reimbursable. We are not going to be hiring master's level licensed clinical social workers in trying to get our own program started. Talk about duplication, that is exactly what that would be. We have providers in the community who already provide these high intensity preventive services.

Legislator Niebel: Are you going to work with these providers Christine or contract with them or whatever the case may be?

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., because I'm just looking at this and this is a \$900,000 reduction. This is a huge reduction. I was concerned that we had the – or we were able to use these preventive programs in order to get this Federal reimbursement.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: That number is based on – because you are actually flipping. So if you were to place a child in a congregate care setting, that's like \$450.00 a day versus \$31.00 a day.

Legislator Niebel: It's a tremendous cost.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: So a lot of the things, I guess, because this is a culture shift for not only us but for Probation, for Mental Health, to not just automatically go to placement. So really what we are trying to do right now is, we're putting administrative review in place which is going to be mandated by the State eventually so we're being proactive with that. The other thing is, right now, I know Mental Health, Probation, and my department are meeting as far as streamlining some of the single point of access meetings to really have a robust review of these kids and families because we cannot automatically think of placement when the child is having behavioral issues. And then we, putting in a kinship policy, a really robust kinship policy that we were given a grant to have a consultant work with us through a legal firm who has worked with other counties to help support families out there or non-relatives that know the children, to be able to provide care for them. So, it's really switching those costs to something else that is less and it's less traumatic for the child.

Legislator Niebel: So Leanne, if I'm hearing you correctly, you're meeting with Probation and Mental Health, two or three times a week, in order to make this cultural change?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Well, they just started today but they've heard about Family First ongoing but it's now getting to the point where they need to be on the same page with us because we're the ones that pick up all the costs, so it's hard to shift that culture because it's easier for them to say, we want to place a child, but we absorb the costs. I really shouldn't just say costs. I should say it's a poor outcome for the child and family, it really is, to look past the cost of it. So, these discussions are – that is where we want to build in that team because it's not just our area. It's the feeder into our area of having those robust conversations.

Legislator Niebel: So you do have a policy in place, or at least, tentatively in place to make this change.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Oh yea, it's a hefty one. I mean, we have done a lot of work over the past year of Family First. Family First is a very scary thing especially when it comes to reimbursement and it's scary because you are shifting a whole culture of thought process.

Legislator Niebel: It's a big change.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: It is.

Mrs. Schuyler: It involves Family Court and everyone in the system.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Family Court also is one of those areas where they're part of larger discussion about what this is and how we're actually creating a bench card for the judges to focus on kinship because a lot of time they are on the bench and they may go straight to how they've always ruled before. So really have a bench card to help direct that conversation.

Legislator Nazzaro: So again, the effective date of this is September of 2021?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: They are starting to roll out things in October, but it won't affect us until next year.

Mrs. Schuyler: But that's not going to be a light switch where you can take all the kids that we currently have in congregate care and open the door.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well, it's got to be a big transition.

Mrs. Schuyler: Exactly and that's what we are doing now, is that transition. Getting kids out of congregate care placement, not putting into congregate care placement who shouldn't be there but there again, the buck stops with Social Services.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: And New York State doesn't have an approved plan yet.

Legislator Nazzaro: That does not surprise me one bit.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: So we're like one of the last states to have an approved plan but we're really focusing on where you see that reduction of costs, keeping five youths out of congregate care. When we looked at the numbers and I know that Melissa McMann and myself have been going back and forth with Val, I think that is doable. If on top of that is even lessening the care days that is going to decrease costs as well.

Mrs. Schuyler: One thing we have seen during this pandemic is children who have been in congregate care placements, have stayed there. They've just gotten stuck in the system during this pandemic time which is very sad. So our care days are longer right now but that's got to change.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., so this \$889,000 savings represents keeping approximately 5 kids out of congregate care?

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Yes. It is really a big chunk of change.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions related to this category?

Legislator Whitford: The Family First and getting them out of congregate care, what kind of specialized training do we have with our staff that can work on that transition part of it because this is something new. I'm sure not all in congregate care can transition to that program. So is there some template on how you evaluate individuals and their issues and if they would really be a good candidate to move towards Family First? Do you understand what I am asking?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yea, a lot of it is children entering into the system. So it's doing the due diligence up front.

Legislator Whitford: Before they get into congregate.

Mrs. Schuyler: Before they get into placement.

Legislator Whitford: Also, they want you to focus on moving them from congregate care.

Mrs. Schuyler: And that should be an ongoing focus. Our job truly as the government entity of Social Services is to be the care managers. To be the case worker who's overseeing that case.

Legislator Whitford: That's what you have been doing all along, I understand that, but this is something new.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's new in that we have to work with our partners in the Probation world, in the treatment world, in the schools, in the day cares, everywhere to make sure the children and families are receiving the early intervention and the services as soon as possible and intensely and not letting children fall through the gaps and then say there is nothing to do with them other than remove them from the family that they are in and put them in Foster Care or put them into an institutionalized setting. So, providing more support to that family instead of removing the child from them. How can we help to support the family and keep that child in the community and in their home? A lot of the services are mental health based, they're intensive therapy based and they must be available 24/7. They call it preventive because you want to prevent those kids from being placed into Foster Care or being placed into an institutional setting. So that is where this huge culture shift is. It's been a kneejerk for many, many years in this country, in the Child Welfare system is, well, they are terrible parents, you have to get that kid out of there. Well those kids don't do better because – it's very rare that you actually have severe abuse or neglect where a child is actually going to do better and not want to have a bond with a biological parent. We do see it, we have terminations. We have kids that are adopted that do very, very well, but in general these kids are not going better and they still want to go back to their families anyway. So what supports can we give to the family to improve our entire community? It's a culture shift.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: A lot of the residential, the GA Home, of course saw the writing on the wall with Family First and are more community based in Foster Care but, New Directions and Hillside, they are enhancing their community support because they have to shift their culture. They are not going to get the kids flowing into the residential facilities anymore because of this legislation. So they are at the table, they want to be engaged, they want to do more, because their whole world is changing as well. In fact, any child that is in a residential facility placed there, they have to review every 30 days by an outside provider.

Mrs. Schuyler: That still has to be determined who's going to be that independent evaluator.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Especially here in Chautauqua, but, that will basically show or prove why that child has to remain there because we do have a lot of kids that are in residential that really shouldn't be there. They really shouldn't and once they bypass that 6 month period, they become institutionalized. They really do. It's hard to make that transition back into the community.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions on this segment? We haven't reached our break in the book yet, but we have by time so I just suggest that we take a few minute break to get up and stretch and then we'll come back and keep plugging away in the book.

(First part of Raise the Age was missed)

Mrs. Dennison: ... information and Val Lis and I have done some cursory research on this topic. Information from New York State indicates that we would lose that funding unless we are determined to be in financial distress. The determination of financial distress is based on the Office of Management and Budget from New York State and my guess is that we are not going to be determined to be in distress.

Ms. Lis: Also of course, you know they are like a year or so behind to figure out who's in distress. That's not going to be something they do automatically. They have a list. I'm hoping that this is going to be an issue Statewide that all the counties will see this and the State will recognize it. I believe NYSAC said something about this in a recent communication with the State about ideas they have to help out.

Legislator Niebel: So Kathleen, we could possibly lose \$530,000 in State aid?

Mrs. Dennison: That's correct. If we spend \$530,000, if we incur those expenses, yes, there is a possibility that we would not qualify for that reimbursement.

Legislator Niebel: That's what is budgeted here, is \$530,000?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Ms. Lis: This is where, I'm not sure because I don't understand juvenile justice and all of that, but you know *(inaudible)* said, don't send kids to OCFS custody, too expensive. I think that there may be some leeway in how these cases are adjudicated. Whether they go to Raise the Age, I don't know that. I think it's something we should look into and discuss with Probation, the courts, whoever, to make sure that if we can limit who goes into Raise the Age, because a lot of these cases don't go very far. I mean, there have been other kids but really haven't had a lot of activity so I don't know if we can shunt them in a different direction and maybe that risk will be there.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Raise the Age is very specific on how they funnel through the youth part of the court. So, there again, it's having those communications with Probation because they are kind of like the gatekeeper to those placements for Raise the Age which at this point are

100% reimbursed for Raise the Age. So the whole goal even on the Raise the Age side, is to try and keep kids out of placement.

Chairman Pavlock: Kathleen, is there any other areas that you know of that are in that particular thing, if we go over the tax cap that we may not get reimbursed?

Mrs. Dennison: This is the only one of which we are specifically aware.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions in Raise the Age?

Mrs. Schuyler: Next is 6129, State Training School. This is the cost of children who are in the State's custody in an Office of Children and Family Services facility. I don't know if this got updated Val to –

Ms. Lis: No, this is our gift. We didn't tell anyone this.

Mrs. Schuyler: This is our gift to you today. We actually, as of, I think it was Thursday afternoon or Friday, Val and I were going through the children who were in care and we actually got an updated list that some kids had gone out so we are able to – we want to decrease the tentative expense down to \$949,000. Val, you better correct me if I'm wrong on my number there.

Ms. Lis: That's the budget number, yea. And then we were also going to bring our projection down to \$906,100.

Mrs. Schuyler: A 2020 projection down to \$906,100, correct?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: Then our tentative 2021 budget to \$949,000. So that would be a \$237,000 savings in local share.

Legislator Nazzaro: Can you go – you said, \$949,000 tentative and what was the \$906,100?

Mrs. Schuyler: That is the 2020 projection.

Legislator Whitford: From one sixty nine?

Mrs. Schuyler: We just got an updated list from the State of children who actually left care.

Ms. Lis: They kind of dropped the ball there because someone left a position. We get a quarterly list and a monthly list and we hadn't seen the monthly list for quite a while and we were just like on the cusp (*inaudible*) another quarterly, so we were a little bit in the dark for a minute there.

Legislator Nazzaro: So this is based on the report you received from the State?

Mrs. Schuyler: Right because the children are in the State's custody so they're the ones that are managing the children while they are in there. Their custody in their facilities. So they don't always communication with us timely which is very sad because the kids come back to our community and it would be nice if they did a lot more transition and after care work than they do but, that's a whole other topic. Val and I talked about this at length and we feel comfortable in decreasing both that projection for 2020 and the tentative 2021 budget.

Mrs. Dennison: So again, just to confirm, you are proposing to change the classification to \$949,000 which is a reduction of \$237,250?

Mrs. Schuyler: Correct.

Ms. Lis: Exactly.

Legislator Niebel: So Kathleen, an increase of \$73,000 then for the 2021 budget?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Mrs. Schuyler: Seventy three thousand, one hundred.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, an increase of \$73,000 over the 2020 adopted budget, yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to know so that report, when was the last time you got a report Val?

Ms. Lis: There are two of them and we get them quarterly. I had one as of the end of June back in July and then we usually get a monthly one from someone else and it turns out that I thought, hey, I haven't seen one in a while so I contacted the State and they actually got back to me really quickly when I finally said what was going on. Someone had changed jobs and they let the ball drop, so they sent me the information and that's when we – we had an inkling that a kid was going to move on but when the State gives you an inkling, they don't do it right away so you have to make sure they really did. So, I asked for an update of that monthly report and the one kid did actually leave custody. These kids costs a lot of money. They cost like \$1,200 (*inaudible*) per day and we pay half of that. Of course, they are a couple of years behind on billing us. That's always – you know, we're not certain of that rate but that's what it's been.

Legislator Nazzaro: So Val, it's based on a combination of one youth leaving the program, is not in a State training facility and two; is based on adjusting retroactively what the rate, what it should be for this County?

Ms. Lis: No, I just mentioned that as an additional bit of information that they are behind on billing us so the rate I'm using may be a little bit off but it's been safe so far. I was just saying that, that's why it's a nice decrease as these kids are costing us \$600 a day.

Legislator Nazzaro: So for 2021, the budget now is based on the most recent report which represents how many kids?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: How many kids, current year, are in a State training program?

Mrs. Schuyler: Six and two have left that we didn't know of. September 29th is when we just got this updated report from the State and why we –

Legislator Nazzaro: So now it's based on – you said we have six. We had eight before?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

Ms. Lis: What we've done actually, some of those kids that are in State custody, are in voluntary agencies which throws them over to Foster Care department. We have 4 kids that are actually in OCFS buildings, I believe. Those are the ones that go here so I budgeted that all the ones that are still there now will be there through the rest of the year because these kids normally don't move. The one that left had been there for years and then I put in another kid coming in next year just in case.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., that's good because it's great news to have a reduction but then I want to make sure we weren't making that number too low for the number of children. So you added one.

Ms. Lis: I did because there still is once in a while one we'll go in and I try not to leave too many gaping holes.

Mrs. Schuyler: Four out of the six that are in OCFS custody are in OCFS facility. Two of them are in a voluntary agency facility. So Val budgeted for them staying where they are at for the rest of the year and then just in case an additional child gets added in, she added that in.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: Just to kind of put in perspective, the one that just left, left from New York City, Brooklyn. We have kids all over the place in those types of facilities.

Mrs. Schuyler: He had been there for 4 and a half years.

Ms. Lis: Pretty much as long as I have been looking at that list, he's been there.

Legislator Niebel: Just to sum up, our expenses for this sub-department has gone down \$237,250 and there is no State or Federal aid that we have to be cognizance of because there just isn't any reimbursement for this program?

Ms. Lis: We pay a net half of the bill. That is what you are seeing here. There is a State share but it doesn't come as revenue. We just pay half the bill.

Legislator Niebel: Because there is no revenue listed here.

Mrs. Schuyler: It's a State's bill because the State has these children and then they bill us for half of their costs.

Legislator Niebel: So what, is our savings then \$237,250 or half of that?

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: So it's \$237.250.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yes, those kids are expensive. That's why we need to keep them out of the system and out of facilities.

Mrs. Luka-Conley: The less kids that are in OCFS facilities, the more it will cost us if we have one go in because their rates will increase.

Mrs. Schuyler: Because there will be fewer children so the State will increase the cost and these kids do not do better for being there. They life outcome are not better.

Legislator Odell: Chuck, it's ironic we were just talking about that offline. Val we're glad that you budgeted in that extra one, a contingency because that is what we were discussing, making sure contingencies are filled and not underestimating the budget performance, so thank you.

Chairman Pavlock: It's always good to be not cutting it so close. O.k., Safety Net.

Mrs. Schuyler: 6140. This is the New York State Safety Net program. We get reimbursed 29% by the State. The budget was made by looking on track what again the New York State budget office projections. Cases are down right now. Some of that probably for 2020 is going to be a reflection of the pandemic but there again, similar to Family Assistance, Val based her budget on trends and what she's seen so far.

Ms. Lis: This is another one where the State Office of Budget came and said, this is what we're thinking is going to happen next year and they were pretty much in line with what I had so I have confidence in this, as much as I can.

Chairman Pavlock: Any questions for Safety Net? O.k., next.

Mrs. Schuyler: Is HEAP, 6141. We get allocations from the State, an administrative allocation and a programmatic allocation. We don't know what those allocations will be yet so the budget was based on revenue trends and expense trends. Some of the payrolls costs are in the larger A.6010 account. This program is really a wash.

Ms. Lis: We don't have a lot of contractual here because a lot of the invoices are actually handled by the State. We do a lot of the administration but then they pay the bill directly.

Chairman Pavlock: Just to speed things up, I think I just want you to continue reading down through the notes for each section and if someone has a question in an area, just stop her and that way we can get through this section.

Mrs. Schuyler: Good, next A.6142, Emergency Aid for Adults. We budgeted that at an even level. We receive 50% State share net of recoveries. No change year to year.

A.6100 is our Medicaid account. This is based on our weekly shares. Val does have a spreadsheet to back-up the determination of the numbers. Decrease in 2020 partly due to pandemic relief through the FMAP program. That portion of decrease is expected to end in April of 2021. If you look at the higher cost in 2019, there were 53 payments that year.

A.6101, Medical Assistance. We do have the Medicaid CFCO program which is consumer first - trying to remember what it stands for. It's a consumer directed program but it's fully funded, 100% so that is what it is.

A.7020, Youth Bureau. Another area underneath Leanna. We don't have any expected changes in Youth Bureau activity from 20' to 21' and the administrative allocation of revenues is expected to remain unchanged. It is what it is. The Youth programs, there again, 7310, we don't expect any changes in the Youth Bureau activity so we have not budgeted for anything different. The \$10,000 local share requirement is in there as it always is for the runaway, homeless, and youth programs. That brings us to the end of the Social Services component of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Chairman Pavlock: Does anyone have any questions?

Legislator Nazzaro: We appreciate the speed that we went through but on the one, I just want to go back to 6100, Medicaid. Obviously the note does explain it, the Medicaid weekly shares, so the decrease is expected to end when the State comes out with their new budget on April 1, 2021, so I just want to get a handle on the numbers. We're projecting and again, I always have to be careful of this projection, \$28 million and then the tentative budget is \$28 - is very close, it's only \$300,000 difference roughly. So, on the surface, the \$1.9, it seems like the 2021 tentative should be higher than \$28 million if they are taking away the relief. I'm sure you double checked this number because it's a big number. We're getting 52 payments, not 53 this year, it doesn't affect us until 2024 or something like that. See Kathleen, I read your spreadsheet, so, does the \$28 million seem low?

Ms. Lis: No. What this is and Kathleen I did share the spreadsheet for this with Kathleen, it came from the other fiscal administrative across the State are using it. It was built on the last time that we got our letter telling us what our weekly share would be and you put in different items from that letter. So our weekly share decrease, not all that decrease, but due to the FMAP, the pandemic help was going to decrease a little anyway, so what we're doing is, we're saying that pandemic relief will end and then we're keeping it the same afterwards.

Legislator Nazzaro: So we had 2019 actual of \$30,800,000, did that reflect 52 payments back then?

Mrs. Schuyler: Fifty three.

Legislator Nazzaro: And how much is your weekly payment?

Ms. Lis: Like \$560,000 or something.

Mrs. Dennison: Five thirty nine Val.

Mrs. Schuyler: It was like \$599.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., let's take out \$600,000, so now in 2019, you took the \$30,800,000, take out \$600,000 because there are 53 payments in there, is \$30,200,000 in 2019. So we're actually going to be \$2 million dollars below 2019?

Ms. Lis: Yes. Like I said, Kathleen's got that spreadsheet, if you want to send him a copy of that.

Mrs. Dennison: I would be happy to share it with the committee.

Legislator Nazzaro: Kathleen, you are comfortable with this?

Mrs. Dennison: I am. The information comes from Val but also from the Medicaid professionals at the State. There is a lot of variables involved but it is all documented.

Mrs. Schuyler: We were waiting a long time to find out what are Medicaid numbers were going to be back as far as April 1, 2020. It was the dice where we didn't know what to say it was going to do. This could have gone up by \$2 million dollars, it could have gone down, who knows.

Legislator Nazzaro: I remember hearing that discussion in Audit & Control but it's – I'm not complaining one bit. It just that when I see something going down by \$2 million dollars to 2019, two years ago, it just sends up a little flag just to make sure, let's double check and I'm hearing it from Val and hearing it from Kathleen, and you, that we're good. Is there any risk in 2021 that they come back and say that that number is wrong?

Ms. Lis: Well not that they say (*inaudible*) is wrong but what they are going to say – they are going to give us a new number in April, so you never know. But if you look at it in total, the weekly amount they charge fluctuates but in general from year to year there hasn't been a lot of change. It was really very definite the way we calculated this time based on the letter from the State that said, this is what your weekly share is going to be, this is the FMAP portion of it, this is the part that is for COVID relief, all those things were entered into those spreadsheet and then we just said, o.k., we're going to (*inaudible*) that pandemic relief is going away and so the weekly shares will increase after April. I can't promise you what they will be but that seemed to be the conservative, most efficient, most proper way to do it.

Legislator Nazzaro: When you calculate the FMAP percentage, does the unemployment rate come into effect when that's calculated?

Ms. Lis: I cannot tell you about that FMAP. That FMAP is calculated at the State level and then filters down. It's not done at the County level so all the numbers aren't available to me. We're at their mercy on that one.

Legislator Nazzaro: I could be wrong but I believe when they calculate the FMAP percentage, they factor in the State unemployment rate, I believe. So the risk would be, we want unemployment to improve, to go down and if unemployment goes down, I believe that FMAP percentage would change where we would owe more money. But, again, I'm going by memory here.

Ms. Lis: FMAP shows up in many different areas, not just here.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right and the County Home, when we had the County Home it was a big number in our IGT, if I remember that terminology right, the governmental transfers that affected that but we can move forward Mr. Chairman. I just saw the big difference in the number and I'm hearing confidence in that number.

Mrs. Dennison: Just to add a little bit more perspective, I mean, the weekly contribution in 2019, now of course it runs on the State year which is different than ours but in general the latter part of 19', the contribution was \$581,000 per week. Our current contribution is \$499,000 per week so there has been a decrease in that weekly contribution of \$80,000. So, if we just, kind of on a basic comparison that translates into a \$4 million dollar change. So, we're not dropping it \$4 million because of all the other factors that are involved. But I just say, I just want to offer that that there has been a sizable change in the weekly contribution.

Legislator Nazzaro: You said \$580 to \$490?

Mrs. Dennison: It's \$581 to \$499 and again, that's in the latter half of 2019 so it would be the 19'-20' State fiscal year and that's in our current contribution is \$499,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you and again, I'm not complaining, I just want to validate.

Chairman Pavlock: It's good to cover all of our basis. Any other questions before we move onto the next section?

Mrs. Schuyler: We can transition to Public Health. On our Public Health side, Bill Boria is here. He's the Director of Environmental Health Services. Was promoted to that position with the retirement of Mark Stow last month and Brea Agett is here, she is our epidemiologist if we have any programmatic questions in those areas.

We'll start with A.4010, we'll run down through these. Here you see the increases in cost of staff related to the base rate changes that Kathleen has gone over before. We have various grants that are included in our revenue is in Federal aid. Some of this is a moving target. We did get some COVID grants. One for \$181,000 and another \$15,000 added onto our Public Health Emergency Preparedness grant that is in this area. Some costs that are in this, in our Admin 4010 that aren't covered by grants are covered with 36% State aid on salaries only. No State aid on fringe benefits.

Next section A. 4010 Nursing, and that's where the majority of our nursing staff are located. Some of our nursing programs. I just our FTE sheet, there was a decrease in FTE's in this section related mainly to Health Aids that were not refilled. Also some furlough savings. Under the contractual, there is a difference there, our Family Planning expenses are trending lower. Our grant has decreased, our Family Planning activities obviously decreased but we did receive an additional one year extension of the Family Planning grant. I think that is the 5th one year extension of the five year grant program that we've been trying to transition out of. Those of you who have been around for a while, know that we've been – I firmly believe there is a natural transition of County services to a Federally qualified health center when you have one and that's what we've been working on with the Family Planning program. When they finally do come out with the next five year block grant, we will not be applying. I feel that is better placed in the community where they can actually provide the services. One thing for sure with this pandemic, it has really outlined the importance of our core public health services and if we were busy providing our – you know, we see 7,000 patients a year in our Family Planning clinics and nobody would be getting Family Planning services for the last 6 months because it's been all hands on deck doing what we're actually mandated to do in public health. So I think it's another good example of the importance of leaving the clinical service provision to the private sector and really focusing on what it is that we're really charged with doing in public health that nobody else can do. Right now you see a total decrease in our cost there.

Public Health State Aid is A4010. Pretty much budgeted that to stay on target. That is the 36%, Article 6 State aid I was talking about. We may see an increase there but we did not budget for that because it is still somewhat of an unknown. The State Health Commissioner has finally declared an imminent public health threat related to the COVID-19 pandemic. When that occurs, the Article 6 State Aid increases from 36% to 50%. But we don't have an exact timeframe that the State will allow that to go back to so we could see an increase in revenue for 2020 and then into 2021 depending on how long the state of emergency lasts.

Ms. Lis: And I don't know if I'm correct here, I don't want to throw a damper, but I think that 50% may be just on COVID related costs. But, I might be wrong.

Mrs. Schulyer: Correct.

Ms. Lis: So we have FEMA covering a bunch of that stuff, we have grants covering a bunch of that stuff. I'm not sure how much COVID activity will fall down because we go to State aid last because as you're hearing, it's not the best as far as percentage goes.

Mrs. Schuyler: A.4090 is Environmental Health. When you looked at the FTE's you saw there was some transfers of FTE's between the 4090 account and the lead testing account. So you see that reflected in the budget here as well as far as numbers. I did not chose to make any changes to the computer throughout the Health & Human Services to the computer and I.T. related budget that Jon and the I.T. Department provided. Pretty much standard here when you see the transfers which is in lead testing which is our next section, 4189. You'll see a pretty much even swap there between the costs.

Under lead testing, the head grant ended in 2019 where we used to have a significant more money. You will be seeing a resolution come forward soon to amend the 2020 budget and hence the 2021 budget for – we were awarded another new lead abatement grant which was

really phenomenal. We have one of our newer sanitarians, Anna Powell took over the lead program and did a phenomenal job writing this application in conjunction with – we're going to partner with COI, Chautauqua Opportunities on the lead abatement program.

Chairman Pavlock: You are going to partner with that, the positions that we currently have in that program or to assist that program, no need for other personnel to help manage that or facilitate that?

Mrs. Schuyler: No, I mean, the pandemic (*inaudible*) because a lot of the sanitarians have been helping with enforcement issues as well as the restaurant inspections and such. So, they've been very stretched with trying to perform their usually environmental health duties. Hopefully that with the winter coming maybe we'll see somewhat of a decrease in our rabies activity and that we usually see which has been up this year too. Even the animals are crazy I think this year. Right now we're o.k.

Chairman Pavlock: We had the luxury in committee of listening and hearing a presentation on the lead exposures and hazards in our communities and what effects it has, long-term and so it's important that we find the contaminated places and fix them before it effects – it will affect other parts of our budget with health related issues.

Mrs. Schuyler: A lot of that is getting (*inaudible*) from the landlords who own a lot of the rental properties with the high lead exposure and working with us and doing the actual abatement.

Bill, do you have anything? We do have one vacancy right now where Bill is working on to actually refill from his promotion so that will help.

Mr. Boria: I will just mention that we have started something new. Gym inspections this year. As you know, the Governor mandated all gyms be inspected within a two week period. We pretty much had to drop everything and go out and learn how to do gym inspections and then through trial and error, complete approximately 26 gym inspections. It was difficult. Along with that, we had no summer staff. Usually we have 4 summer staff that help with the seasonal inspections, campgrounds, pools, things like that, so we didn't have summer staff this year. Some of those program numbers will decrease like children's camps. A lot of those didn't open, a lot of beaches did not open, so we had to deal with that and we're dealing with more work, a lot of work, with fewer people, but the staff has done a great job. I want to hand it to them. They are at their limits at this point and we're looking to, since Mark Stow retired, I took over his position, we are looking to add one more technical person at a technician level. Any questions on any of that?

Legislator Niebel: You mean to fill your position or this is an additional position?

Mr. Boria: No, Mark retired, I took over Mark's position so this would be to do some of the things that I previously did.

Mrs. Schuyler: Yea, it's a refill.

Legislator Niebel: It's not an additional position?

Ms. Lis: No, there is no additional positions and actually in Bill's plan of whatever may happen going forward because we still – you know, now Bill's position needs to be filled, etc., we did I think at the bottom of the ladder, put in a position that is a little bit lower than the current bottom of the ladder so we expect to see a small bit of savings in our payroll there and a benefit to the work that needs to be done.

Chairman Pavlock: Its one thing you move up in a position and then you carry on your old duties also so you've created more work for yourself but thank you.

Mrs. Schuyler: I'm very thankful that he stepped up and took this on.

Chairman Pavlock: Now he's doing one and a half jobs. Any other questions?

Mrs. Schuyler: Next, 2960. This really is our Preschool Special Education program. We did see a decrease in transportation costs due to the pandemic but expenses are expected to return to pre-pandemic levels here. We also have a new contract with the transportation provider which is an increase in costs. We get 50 ½% reimbursement of the transportation tuition costs for pre-school special education plus the administrative fee of \$75 per child and we have increased revenue due to increased expenditures. But as always, this is a very expensive program and one that was also talked about again in the NYSAC document with again, the recommendation to move this program to education because education is who administers the programs, sets all the rules, and the County pays for it. We do have more kids. We have more kids in Early Intervention, we have more kids in Pre-School Special Education, and those trends are continuing to go up.

Chairman Pavlock: The State recommends the students that the County doesn't have a decision of what students are in that category, right? It's recommended from the school.

Mrs. Schuyler: Right. Next, A.4059 is Early Intervention. The increase costs, again reflected from the increase contractually. We receive 49% State aid revenue for children who are not Medicaid eligible. The children with special health care needs grant and we have a new additional grant of \$27,000 to help with this program this year. We do do some Medicaid billing for the service coordination component that our staff does. Again, more children in the program. The contractual there is the escrow amount which Kathleen is aware of, we have an escrow amount to pay for children who are not covered by insurance or Medicaid. Mandated program for children zero to three.

A.4017 is the Jail clinic. As you recall a few years ago, Human Services took over the administration of the Jail medical program. We have seen a decrease in the salary costs with losing some of the part time FTE positions that we had there. The only revenue we get really is based on the State aid, Public Health State aid we can get for anyone who's under the age of 21 receiving services in the Jail. That's all dependent on our Jail population and that has decreased. But overall, a decrease in the cost of running the Jail clinic.

1185., our Coroner program. That really has remained pretty much the same as we've have seen for the last few years. I know what caught my eye on the projection for the Coroner's salary and Val you sent that to me, but did I print it and bring it with me, why that was lower?

Ms. Lis: It's lower because there is a portion of our two doctors in there. The one who oversees all our different things and we share with the EMS and everybody else and they spent a lot of time in a lot of meetings for COVID response. So a lot of their payroll got transferred over into A.4010 to claim through there against FEMA, or no, the PHEP grant, we put that towards.

Mrs. Schuyler: So you really don't notice that increase in 4010 because it's much larger but with the Coroner's budget as small as it is, it kind of stuck out. So, I wanted to make sure we could explain that to you. We have had an increase in our overdose deaths, so that is an increase in autopsy costs as well. There will be some additional costs that we have not budgeted for and that's related to post-mortem testing. The State is now requiring that anyone who passes away who had any sort of respiratory systems or anything that could have be COVID symptoms that was not tested, must be tested post-mortem for COVID and influenza. So that means our Coroners are going to have to be trained in doing and that means like it should have been done yesterday, in doing that swabbing and we will have to contract or use our existing Public Health contract to have those tests run. So, we'll have a little more in the equipment budget, I guess is where it will be.

Legislator Rankin: Could you remind me, we talked at one point about laptops and technology assistance for the Coroner's. What did we do with that? I'm just looking at the equipment line and there is no expenses on there.

Mrs. Schuyler: We're all set. The Coroner's each have their tablets, they all have iphone's so we're set now with equipment for them.

Legislator Rankin: O.k., thank you.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions. Obviously we have a lot of information that we just plowed through. Anyone have any questions, not only with the Coroner's section but with the Health & Human Services budget in general? But specifically, I guess for the Coroner's right now since we're on that topic still. Coroners have been steady. I know that we have had some turnover in that department.

Mrs. Schuyler: I think we're doing well now. We had had two Coroners sharing a position. Dan Tyler was one and he actually chose to take the furlough for COVID and then resigned and decided he was ready to fully retire. But, fortunately the person he was sharing that with him wanted to take over the rest of his time. We're at four Coroners who have really done a fantastic job. Our medical direction is under Dr. Faulk and Dr. Walters. Brea is over the Coroner program so she's here if you have any programmatic questions. They really have done a great job. A lot of conversation with the Medical Examiner's office. Every case is run by so people aren't sent for autopsies unless it's deemed it's necessary for them to go and the overdoses are really driving a lot of what we're seeing with the need for autopsies.

Chairman Pavlock: I guess a follow-up question in regards to the Coroners. We used to send the Coroners out for a lot of calls. What would you say our average Coroner call log is now in comparison of what it was a couple of years ago when it was not run by your department?

Mrs. Agett: In 2018, we had 418 Coroner cases and we took over the program in July of 2018 and then in 2019 we had 291 total over the course of the entire year. So that 418 in 2018 versus 291 in 2019. So that number was probably higher obviously in 2017. I don't have those figures in front of me but you can see that it's trending down.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you. Any other questions?

Legislator Gould: How many autopsies have we had (*inaudible*)?

Ms. Agett: In 2018, there were 59 and in 2019 there were 90. So we expect to see about that many this year, probably a few more given the increase in drug related fatalities.

Legislator Nazzaro: Any questions from the Audit & Control committee? I know that you are going to have one budget- normally you'll be – right?

Mrs. Dennison: I was just going to ask Chairman Pavlock, yes, if you want to make a motion to amend the tentative budget for the change we discussed in the State training school. It would be to **reduce the budget for classification A.6129.4 to reduce it by \$237,250.**

Chairman Pavlock: Would someone like to entertain that motion?

Legislator Whitford. I will make that motion.

Legislator Rankin: Second.

Chairman Pavlock: All in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Pavlock: Any other discussion, comments, questions for Mrs. Schuyler while she is here? Well, thank you very much for coming and to those who have assisted you and thank all who joined us on line to give us some good information and answer questions. Thank you for your commitment and work that you and your departments have done over this time of year. Hopefully moving forward we continue to do with and things get better for us, so thank you.

Mrs. Schuyler: We're hoping so, thank you.

Chairman Pavlock: We can adjourn for lunch if there are no more comments or questions?

Legislator Niebel: Do you think (*inaudible*)...

Chairman Pavlock: I don't think that MaryAnn Spanos is here. MaryAnn is on line? We could, sure. It's hard to say, I can't see everybody on there. MaryAnn, are you there? Would you be able to present now?

Legislator Niebel: Or if not, 1:00 or just move the schedule. Whatever your preference is.

Mrs. Dennison: Chairman Pavlock, I did send a reminder notice to Greg Carlson from Veterans. We might have to communicate with him since he's in Jamestown or if he could be at the end of the schedule but he is definitely planning to be here at 2:00 at this time.

Chairman Pavlock: It's hard to adjust the schedule to much without ripple effects. We could get ahold of Director Carlson, Mrs. Brinkman, and MaryAnn is available at 1:00, so we'll do that. We can reconvene at one if that is o.k. with everybody.

Committee recessed for lunch at 11:51 a.m. and reconvened at 1:09 p.m.

Office for the Aging

Mrs. Spanos: Is Josh there in person?

Mr. Melquist. Yes, I'm here.

Mrs. Spanos: I just want to thank everybody for being here and kind of turn it over to Josh to kind of walk us through how we arrived at our budget for 2021, what factors we looked at that are affecting 2020 and then we'll just field any questions, so take it away Josh.

Mr. Melquist: Thanks for having us here obviously. It's obviously been a challenge this year to put this together but, we were fortunate, just as a kind of an overview, high level view. We were fortunate to get funding from our State Office for the Aging right in the beginning of this whole thing. That kind of supplemented all the increases that we were going to have. The way they told us to spend these funds has helped us out in the last 7 months, whatever it is. There is a caveat there that was a huge help to us. We didn't have to use the FEMA funding that did come through from the State/Federal government. We were able to just use the funding we received.

Mrs. Spanos: You are referring to the COVID funds so we were part of two stimulus packages that the Federal government passed the CARES Act and I forgot what the second one was but in both of those we received additional Federal funds via – and the State got them out to us very quickly to help people during the pandemic specifically. There was some guidance about using them for particular programs but we were actually just given maximum flexibility to use them however we saw fit in this crisis.

Mr. Melquist: So, I'm going to start off just with a quick summary of the 2020 budget, just kind of where we're at and where we foresee ourselves being by the end of the year and then we'll get into this year's. So, I use for some numbers, I'm going to give you here, I used all of

our expenses through August 31st. What that tells us is the personnel expenses and the benefits through the end of August, but the contractual really only reflects through July expenses. Just due to getting the vouchers, you know, later than that, so just as an overview. Personnel wise, we've spent about 53% of our budget as of August 31st. Contractual, it's about 49%, and benefits, right about 62%. Some notes about that, the personnel is lower mainly because of the furlough, so you guys are all aware of. We had two open positions throughout the year that we have not filled as of now still, so those were savings that were directly into our budget that lasted through the entire 9 months here. Then our biggest decrease in services was contractual and it was because of services being placed on hold. Our Adult Day Care centers, they were completely shut down. Our in-home care, we had a significant decrease just because of the pandemic and individuals going into client's homes, then home repair program was basically non-existent. That was a big chunk of the decreases that we are seeing in the contractual line item for 2020 itself. We have picked up our pace as far as spending for the year. Personnel, nothing there has changed besides the furloughs, furloughed employees coming back but service wise, we are close and in some cases, on the same pre-pandemic pace as far as spending goes which is a positive. Everything is in the budget so it's all covered by State and Federal funding but we're very close to being back up to the pre-pandemic level which is an attribution to our workers and the individuals in the community who work for these companies that have gotten all of our clients back up to speed, utilizing the services that are there for them. So for a summary of the expenses, we expect to spend less than what we budgeted in 2020. We've already reflected that with some resolutions but we expect it to be a little less still through the end of the year. As we continue to try and add people back on services and our contractors can take on the service, it will be natural increases in costs but again, it's all in the budget. All of it is covered by at least 75% State funding and in some cases, 100% State and Federal, excuse me, some cases it's 100% just depends on the situation. So even with slight increases as the year goes on, we're not going to be looking to exceed our 2020 budget. Honestly at the moment, the expectation is for us to reduce our local share still further from what we did from the original resolution in June/July, whenever that was. So that is our expectation right now as far as that goes.

Mrs. Spanos: I just want to jump in here a second so that you understand. We actually have two people retire at the end of January and then one leave us for other employment. One was our Nutrition Director and we had a Dietician who was under contract for a special grant so we hired her as our new Nutrition Coordinator and that grant actually had to pause because of the pandemic. The other two positions are Health Educator and a Nurse for our home-care program. With the pandemic coming on board, we were actually poised to rehire these positions but then the pandemic hit and health and wellness programs really kind of came to a big stop so we were able to and the State waived a lot of conditions for both health education and for our in-home care programs. So we were able to do without these positions because of the waiving of some obligations that are still enforced right now. We don't have to do in-home visits to lay eyes on the client. We're doing everything telephonically which is great, as I said, not only allowed us to do without these two positions but also has had a great effect on mileage as we don't have to travel to clients homes who can't get out. But we don't anticipate those or we can't know when those regulations are going to come back enforce and so that is kind of guiding us as we develop our 2021 budget.

Chairman Pavlock: I have a question just to follow up with some of the employees. Obviously you've made some changes in personnel, would the pandemic, is there any new things that are required because of the pandemic or any new programs that you would see moving forward? Obviously the community that you are servicing is one of the communities that's obviously effected mostly by the pandemic so anything different that you are doing moving forward that you don't know of yet?

Mrs. Spanos: Well, certainly our services are up, as Josh will tell you the exact amount that we received in the CARES Act and we have until September of 2021 to spend all those additional stimulus dollars that we received. A lot of that has gone – our Nutrition program, although congregate meals sites are closed for the most part. We do have a few restaurants that we had sites at that are continuing to do take out for seniors. But most of our congregate meal clients have transitioned over to getting a home delivered meal and there has been an increase in demand for home delivered meals during this time. We also added some new services, shopping assistance for people during the pandemic and we figured out with Social Services how to utilize people's SNAP benefits to kind of facilitate their on-line shopping during this time. But we've done that part utilizing most of our existing staff. Another program is we've been working with local farmers to do a Farm to Table program again because people are hesitant to go out and nutrition is really important to keeping them healthy and well and we wanted to support our local farmers. So, we've started a Farm to Table program. I think it just ended up a pilot where we helped seniors get vegetable boxes for about 8 weeks that we're really tailored to them. So that is some of the new services that we have been doing. Of course, as time goes on, we have been trying to provide some of our health and wellness programs via Facebook and the local access stations, and we're looking to bring on more restaurants because we don't know when our congregate meal programs will open up again and frankly, they were on the decline for the last, well, for as long as I have been there. I think this newer generation of seniors isn't as inclined to go to the senior center or a church for meal anymore. The dining program has been the one that is growing where people have a choice to go to various restaurants around the County and use tickets that they get for a donation through Office for the Aging to have a full meal at any of those restaurants. Of course, it's great, you know, public/private partnership where our dollars can support these local businesses that are struggling. So we are looking to try and expand that to give people more choices as long as this goes on. Did that answer your question?

Chairman Pavlock: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Melquist: On that same note, she just mentioned about the congregate meal program. So, I'm moving down to my revenues in 2020 budget now, and the biggest – State and Federal aid, as we spend it, we're going to get reimbursed for it. It's pretty cut and dry but our departmental income which relies on contributions from our clients, they share in some of the costs that we provide, cost-share program for a couple of our funding sources, that, we have seen a noticeable decline in revenue throughout this year. As you will see as we go through the budget summary, we budgeted about \$564,000 and at the end of July we were on pace to bring in about \$327,000. As of now, we're right at about \$300, so it looks like we're going to exceed that but how that ties in with congregate meal programs is that when those sites closed, we lost all the donations that would come in with those sites. So expenses roughly remained the same because these clients wanted home delivered meals but the donations did decrease a little bit. It's not

going to impact our bottom line until the end of the year. Luckily the increases that we did end up with were covered by those COVID funds that we mentioned a couple of times today so there is no direct correlation or direct decrease in that funding. It's just that line item is going to be decreased by the end of the year, is replaced with Federal aid is essentially what it winds up being. Just something I wanted to note. That was one impact we directly saw with those congregate meals closing. We don't know what that might – you know, as we reshuffle and expand the congregate meal program, I don't know if - we're not completely sure how that might affect the donations we get if we start doing pick up from stores and things like that. So, it certainly could affect it. It's one of those things that you are kind of blind going in and you see what happens as things change essentially.

Mrs. Spanos: So, just so people know, our State programs do require us cost share although the State has told us during this time that we can waive different parts of the program. None of these Federal funds for COVID, required any cost sharing. We do continue to send people donation letters on a quarterly basis but we're not – it's really up to them whether they donate or not. People are having a hard time with things. Another services that I failed to mention that we have been promoting during the pandemic is, you know that we have had close to 200 people on our wait list for services and believe it or not, it has not changed. It did go down somewhat, we were at one point up to 400 but it seems like more people are asking for this service during this time. For all of those people on the wait list, besides just calling them and making sure people were o.k. and have what they needed especially food and access to medicines, we have offered all those people on the wait list a personal emergency response button free of charge. We're going to continue that through the end of December utilizing these COVID funds. We just felt that that was something really tangible that we can give these people so they would have a way to call for assistance. The partner that we used to give this program is called CST Link to Life. They've just recently been bought out by Best by Health and on the other end of that line is not just somebody who can call 911 for you, but they actually have Social workers on that call line just to be there for people, to talk to them about anything they want to talk about. We tell them to press the button for anything. Certainly they will direct them to services if that's something that they need but they can also be that safe voice on the other end of the line if people are feeling lonely or unglued during this time. We've given them the local resources and our New York Connect health line so they are directing people back to good information that is local. But, I don't know how many people have taken us up on that Josh but I do want to say it's at least 40 or 50 people that have agreed to have those lines in their homes. We've told them it's free of charge until the end of December. I thought that was a good breaking point and then we can reevaluate it.

Legislator Nazzaro: Actually, as MaryAnn was speaking, I've followed the audit trail here, I was flipping pages, and my question Josh answered but I want to make sure and then I saw where the managed care income is reclassified, as you pointed out, to department income so, there is a lot of moving parts here but at the end of the day it all made sense so I'm o.k. with it.

Mr. Melquist: Yes, that was a recent change we did during the budget process.

Mrs. Spanos: I think that is in line with what the other departments are doing with income from insurance or Medicaid.

Mr. Melquist: Quite honestly, it was in a bucket but I didn't know why it was there. It was set up (*inaudible*) prior to me coming here and we just, Todd Button actually pointed out that it might need to be reclassified as some departmental income and he kind of just arrived at that and made sure it was in line with the rest of the County. That is about my 2020 budget update specifically. Does anyone have any questions about what I just went over?

As far as the 2021 budget, like MaryAnn eluded to, kind of talking about how we arrived at our numbers. As the pandemic hit in March when we started to really see a down turn as far as spending went about, we noticed the down turn in the services I mentioned earlier, Adult Day Care, in-home services, home repair, nutrition services (*inaudible*) they increased basically just based on need, covered again by our COVID funding, that was an increase but for the most part, we saw a drastic downturn as far as spending wise. In some cases we were getting vouchers that were 5/600% less than what we were used to, (*inaudible*) was very, very low as far as the services that we could provide. At that point, I kind of looked at it from a pre-pandemic and during pandemic and just deciding, not decide, but talking with department heads and MaryAnn in determining basically what we were going to spend in 2021. What made the most sense as far as where our spending went? To not cut services to our clients or anything like that. So we went at it from that way, looking at the pre-pandemic levels, current (*inaudible*), you know, during the pandemic level and just seeing what made the most sense as far as budgeting went for our contractual costs.

Mrs. Spanos: Before you get into that, I just want to give them a couple of primers. As we were going through the pandemic, it causes you to re-evaluate the services that you're providing so before I even got into the budget process, I had a talk with the County Executive about two programs in particular that I didn't feel, at this moment in time, it was to the County's advantage to continue to have them within the Office for the Aging. One is a Resident Advisory program. Until recently we had a contract with Brocton Herbert Star apartments and with the Dunkirk Housing Authority to actually have a staff person at their housing units to kind of be the liaison, making sure that people living in those buildings had everything that they needed to be connected to. Dunkirk Housing Authority over a year ago decided to hire that person internally and so we really only had the Brocton Herbert Star and looking around at the different housing units and as we have been working with them very closely through the pandemic, I really questioned why were in that space at all. It really makes more sense for us to provide training and have that connection with housing but not really have a physical presence there. So, we have decided to stop the contract with Brocton Herbert Star but we will be available to train their new person as we've done in other communities and other housing units. I think we'll build up that program of offering training and connection. Certainly, got all of the housing units on a list serve now, all their advisory's or whoever is running the particular housing unit and that was critical as we were trying to figure out who had needs during the pandemic. So, I think that is a good move and we were just in because we've probably just been in it for 30 years and that is not a good enough reason for us to have a staff person there.

The other program is the Senior Employment program. This is a training to work program that we get funds from the Department of Labor through a company called Senior Services America and when I started with Office for the Aging in 2007, we utilized Senior workers. Their on the County payroll, as you always see, this huge chunk of employee –you think they are employees but they are not but they are placed in government and not-for-profits throughout the County and they get paid by this grant through the Department of Labor 20 hours

minimum wage and it's to facilitate them gaining skills so that they can gain a job that is not subsidized. There is a four year limit to the program. When we started, we utilized them very heavily within our office and within other County departments. CARTS and I think for a time there were people in the Pistol Permit office, in HHS, County Historian, and now we have two in our office, we haven't had somebody at CARTS in probably a year. I think that may be DOH had one part time person but for three people, there is County share along with this. It is not a lot of County share but I think there are other entities in the community who can take this program over and it could work well. I informed, after I got the o.k. from the County Executive, I did tell Senior Services America that we would not renew our contract because it goes from July 1 to June 31st but that I was looking to transition this program as soon as possible. I have the one employee who is running the program is getting ready to retire and we just don't see – I think the benefit to the County to the host. It's an important program, we will do everything that we can to make sure that it finds a good home because training to work is really important and will continue to have senior workers in our office but I don't think they need to be on the County payroll. I don't think that the County needs to be the lead on this. So those are two changes. Some of that, you are going to see is still in our 2021 budget because we don't know when that will transition. They were actually going through a bidding process that just concluded and they have to go through a Federal bidding process (*inaudible*) their bid. I was notified last week and it sounds like they are going to try the transition program to a new entity before the end of the year but, we did build in for them to be in our budget until June 2021. That is just a little (*inaudible*) before we get into the nitty gritty.

Mr. Melquist: Yea, that covers basically what I was saying. That's greater detail and going to give you a lot more information. More or less what we were doing before, what we're doing during and determine what is best for our clients in the County. That's definitely kind of where we ended up with these numbers. So, I'll go right into the budget summary. The first page you see, and we're going to go into details obviously but you'll see the decreased ended up about \$43,000 on our local share from 2020 to 2021 budget and as I said, we'll get into the details, we'll address that as we go. So for the FTE's, I put a lot of information in there as far as what the changes meant but the high level, what we need to know as far as what we did for this budget, in order to keep our services the same, we removed one of our Aging Services aids which MaryAnn could elaborate on what she worked on and then two part-time Clerk II's that worked in reception for us. That was kind of the highlights that ended up being removed from our budget from last year to this year. Aging Services aid, is a position that had kind of grown into – it was helping with health insurance counseling more or less and MaryAnn correct me if I'm wrong, -

Mrs. Spanos: Let me just expand on that. One other program as we were going through this process that didn't happen before the budget but as we were starting to know that we needed to come up with more savings, we started to look where else made sense for us to reduce. Our Health Insurance Counseling program is extremely important program. It saves over \$600,000 for people in the County every year by helping evaluate their Medicare. The problem with this program is that we, first of all, receive about \$30,000 in Federal funds and we put into it a lot more than that. In recent years, we have been approached by various brokerages to – it was originally only a volunteer program. We would could only originally partner with not-for-profits who were willing to provide this Medicare counseling service for free to clients but in recent years, we've been approached by brokerages and we got the o.k. from State Office for the Aging,

not to make them certified Medicare counselors but to provide some very specific training to brokers who offer all the different major plans and the training is more of a technique on how the counsel people to select the best insurance and also how to use Medicare.gov. It was really surprising to us that brokers don't have a lot of training. They get specific training if they sign up with Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Humana, or Independent Health, whatever it is, they get training on there but they don't get training on how to look at clients holistically and help them make a decision on whether staying with traditional Medicare with a supplement is best for them or going to a Medicare Advantage plan. So we were given the o.k. and we piloted last year before the pandemic hit because we were seeing, you know, we haven't even gotten to the peak of the baby boomers generation. That won't happen until 2030 but we were seeing every year, more and more people coming to us for this service and we saw a 900 people during open enrollment the last few years which is huge, for 7 week time period that open enrollment is and it was just really hard to keep up. We were sending more people to the State and to the Medicare.gov phone line which they really didn't like because they don't get that one on one attention. We've developed other partners in Southwest Independent Living, in Findley Lake Community Connections, but really hadn't identified more partners, not-for-profit partners. As I said, the brokerage houses were hungry for training in technique and would that be o.k. to do this last year and it was very successful. So, we expanded it so that we could have this public/private partnership of brokerages and not-for-profits, and the Federal and State resources to be able to meeting the needs that were out there. We don't do any direct referrals to a for profit entity. What will happen is, everybody will request health insurance counseling through the Office for the Aging, we've made priorities (*inaudible*) people that are in our home-care program or people that we've already counselled in the past. But new people will be given like a private provider list and on that list will be these not-for-profits, the training brokerages, as long as they keep up their training. I will tell you these brokerages are paying us to train them and then they will be paying us for annual updates as well and they get paid on the back end. If they enroll people in a Medicare plan, that plan actually pays them so they don't charge the client anything. We as the Office for the Aging, even though we enroll people in plans, we are prohibited from receiving any payment by the plans. So, just feel like this is a good way to go to meet the needs. If we don't train brokers, we we're seeing a lot of people that were getting bad advice and they are coming back to us anyways to solve the problems. So, I thought this was really, if we could train people and make sure that they are giving as unbiased counseling as they can and not charging clients directly for the service, that that was the right way to go. We had one full time position dedicated to this. All the other counselors within our agency are Case Managers who do other things besides counseling so we just eliminated the one full time position and the two part time receptionist, we don't have people coming into our office right now. We're doing everything telephonically so we feel like we could do without these two part time staff. Whether that will continue or all of 2020, we really don't know but at this point and time, it makes sense. Any questions?

Legislator Gould: What is PB6772-0000? What is that?

Mr. Melquist: Kathleen, if you can answer that. I don't know what that is.

Legislator Gould: No, nobody knows, that's why I'm asking.

Mrs. Dennison: I was going to let Josh answer but I'd be happen to answer. It stands for position budgeting and as Josh started to say, it's kind of a place holder in our system and it is the position that holds expenses that are not related to an individual position. Expenses such as overtime, vacation buy back, those expenses they don't go with a particular position that has a salary or has wages so it's just our mechanism of getting those other personal services, personal service and benefit expenses into the budget. Sometimes departments will have one or two of those and then the next year they might have a different number. So that is why there is a change. They each have an FTE value of .01.

Legislator Gould: Is this an actual person or just a bookkeeping –

Mrs. Dennison: It's a bookkeeping mechanism to insert certain expenses into the budget.

Legislator Gould: Thank you.

Mr. Melquist: In order to get my accurate numbers, I had to include that. Probably not necessary, I know. Moving onto the account classification summary. I'll just kind of walk down and stop me if you have any questions but my notes hopefully answered a decent amount of them. I know it won't be everything. So to start, under the expense classification, the personal services, we saw a decrease in the 2021 budget. A few reasons for that, first I'll start off with two actual increases. The promotional step increases that we're all aware of and then the senior aid minimum wage, New York State minimum wage, increased 70 cents from \$11.80 to \$12.50. On that same Senior Aid program, that MaryAnn has already mentioned, we are in the process of transitioning that out of our department and will be picked up by a host agency in the area. But because of that, we saw a significant decrease in the spending that we have for the Senior Aid program. We are only budgeted for that program through June 30, 2021. MaryAnn mentioned that it might leave sooner. The local share impact for an entire calendar year is about \$30,000. So if this transition at the beginning of the year, then you'll see a \$15,000 savings because we're only budgeting for that half a year. We just don't know the status of that as of now. As you mentioned, we've committed to helping that transition to make sure (*inaudible*) host agency so everyone can continue on the program with no interruption but that did cause a huge decrease in our personal services. Although they all don't work in the County, they are placed in areas around the County and they go off our payroll. That is why you see that direct impact there.

Contractual costs, what I was eluding to earlier as far as looking at our services, pre-pandemic, during pandemic in determining what our costs truly needed to be, we ended up in about the same cost structure as we did in 2020. The big part of that is increase in nutritional services that are covered by the COVID-19 funding. That kind of bridges any gap or any decrease that we would have had. Another highlight I want to make is, the 2020 projected amount, you will see is about \$723,000 less than our 2020 budget there. The reason for that is that decrease in services we were talking about earlier. The Adult Day Care, the in-home care, home repair, all decreased throughout the year. Increase in nutrition didn't make up for it enough where we were going to reach the same spending level. With that said, as I mentioned earlier toward the beginning, spending has increased throughout since May/June as we sort of kind get back to a little bit of normal, so that \$3.1 million dollars will probably be a little higher. The caveat of that is, a minimum of that is going to be covered by 75% State or Federal funding and a (*inaudible*) is 100%. It's nothing outside the realm of what we budgeted for this year so it's all

covered in there. Just so you kind of have an idea of why that number seems so drastically large. Hopefully we've cut (*inaudible*) departments are far as our spending and our services to our clients. How much so, don't know exactly where that will shake out but I know we won't be exceeding that amount throughout the end of the year. Employee benefits, just a couple of notes, it's pretty self-explanatory but, there were decreases in a few types of expenses underneath that line item and then our Senior Aid program only being for a 6 month period also decreased, what we would be spending in that benefit there. They really just pay the taxes but still there is a little bit of an impact there. Any questions on the expenses?

Now onto the revenue classifications. The first one is the departmental income. These numbers will appear very funky as pointed out earlier. What happened with it is, there are a couple of things. First off, contributions and cost share have been trending down in 2020. We didn't see it prior to the pandemic but as soon as it started, we did notice that. It has a direct correlation to a decrease in services. So the congregate meal program, we've mentioned, we rely on that for a lot of our donations and then just our cost share clients, not necessarily able to pay as an invoice came due. Little things like that. (*Inaudible*) huge amount, it's definitely not a material difference but it does happen and it does effect the amount that we had received throughout probably the month period of March through July or so. When those things happen, we set up payment plans for the clients. Whatever the case might be to keep the service going so they don't have to remove those things. But that's just a little note, little caveat. As far as the departmental income, the contribution line item is part of that so the (*inaudible*) contribution that MaryAnn mentioned that we send out each quarter for our clients that contribute to our program, we have seen a decrease in that. I tried to estimate that portion of this budget a little lower for next year just in anticipation that continuing. If we surpass that, that is great, but we don't know what it's truly going to look like next year? If that congregate meal program doesn't come back, it changes the whole ballgame in that line item. Luckily we'll be able to weather the storm next year and it will be the same thing as we did this year, we'll have to re-evaluate how we move forward after that. We're fortunate to have that COVID-19 funding to help supplement any potential loss there. In the future, we'd have to be more creative of course, but luckily it's not as much of a 2021 problem. The managed care income that the councilman pointed out. We reclassified that from our New York State aid. It was just in the wrong bucket so it never looked significantly higher than it really is. It's going to have a correlating drop when you put New York State aid when you get down there. That is the only difference there.

Next couple are pretty self-explanatory too. Insurance costs, they vary from year to year. Our Meals on Wheels contractors, actually operate using County vans and they reimburse us for the insurance portion of those County vans. It's just a fluctuation of the cost. Sometimes it's up, sometimes it's lower, I just try to find somewhere in the middle to estimate what we might receive in the next year and we don't find those out until about the beginning of January of each year.

Miscellaneous, that whole line item is donations that we receive. So strictly unsolicited donations we receive from our clients or family of clients, whatever it might be. You'll notice a very high number that we received so far this year, over \$36,000. What that encompasses is a large donation from a Trust from a family or from an estate from a family to our Mac McCoy fund that is housed at the Community Foundation in Jamestown. We don't budget for those things. We budget for just true donations coming from our clients and that reflected amount of about \$3,800 is more realistic than what we expect to see from our clients. Anything else is a bonus and anything else that increase, anything from the State or a Trust, we actually expense

out of our expense accounts because it's one for one, in and out, so you see both sides of it in that realm of things.

New York State aid, I kind of mentioned earlier the Managed Care income was reclassified so you see a large increase. That is where that was housed before, the Insurance income that we received. But also, we just seen a little bit of a decrease as far as spending goes. As we gradually work up our spending, chances are we're going to spend a little more in January to March, to kind of make up for any small decrease that we have this year. It's all reimbursed at the same rate as it's always has been so the budget kind of stays the same in that sense. Local share stays the same, nothing changes there.

The Federal aid, a little more convoluted probably as far as explanation goes. There's a decrease partly because of spending but also because we did see a little bit of a decrease in funds, in general, from the Federal government that is passed through New York State. The highlights I put below were just large decreases in general. There is also increases that go along with that. We had COVID-19 funding that will be deferred to next year. We'll be able to use it next year to offset several of those decrease but it's more or less kind of showing you some of the direct decreases and the effect they had on services. So we had, our carryover line item is just the amount of funding we don't use in one fiscal year to the other and we just saw a decrease from what we had planned for that. We saw a direct decrease of little less than \$6,000 for on in-home care funding, which is one of our programs under that line item, a small decrease in our nutrition funding, and the same with our wellness funding which is the health classes, Healthy Bones, things like that to keep our clients healthy and active. The decrease that I mentioned in COVID-19, it's really not a decrease, it's just the rest of the portion is being allocated to 2021 to utilize throughout that year in our increase nutrition services for our clients. I think that summarizes it unless, MaryAnn, you want to add anything to that.

Mrs. Spanos: I think you've covered it very well. I was just looking up that big increase was from the estate of Evelyn Lippard(?). We actually got two disbursements from her. One that was over \$30,000 and one that was \$20,000 the year before. She was somebody that we had helped a long time ago who had passed away and named us along with many other organizations in her estate.

Chairman Pavlock: Overall in this budget process Chairman Chagnon had asked each committee in preparation for budget season to develop a list in committee, we did and I see a lot of those things that came into that work is present in the budget presentation as you've provided so we had some time to do some work to prepare for this budget session in what you have provided us today with some changes you've made in the department. You did manage to have some local share savings which is a good thing. Anyone have any questions?

Legislator Nazzaro: First a brief commentary. I want to thank Josh and MaryAnn for presenting today. I like how you approached the budget looking at pre COVID because when we had Social Services here, we had that same discussion. The pandemic is very hard to predict some of these programs so I do like the approach. One high level question, I think you'll find this year that our budget approach is a little bit different than in the past. It's only day one here but we're not nickel and diming these budgets, we want to make sure we're having realistic budgets. That revenue projections, at least in my opinion, are not overzealous or over calculated and that expenses are looking at the pre COVID which you have and you've identified some

programs that are not going to continue. So, one thing we're all concerned about, you get a mix of Federal and State aid, you see any risk in this budget? That's the high level question.

Mrs. Spanos: I don't and the reason is, I think both at the Federal and State level, they have identified that older adults are the most at risk and we see them doing everything they can to protect those people. There has been a real recognition for our services in how they help people to stay independently in the community, how they keep people off the Medicaid roles and right now, nobody wants to go into a nursing home but it's the most cost effective to keep them home but they need sometimes a little bit of service to help them stay there. So, I think we're seeing increased recognition for the role we play in helping people in the long term to be independent in the community.

Mr. Melquist: Two things to add to that. One being, we haven't seen a reduction in claims yet and we figure with what is going on now, we would have seen that already. We just submitted everything and we're going to get paid 100% of what we submitted. So as of now, positive and your right, it certainly is a concern and MaryAnn addressed that part. But also the Director for the Office for the Aging, as of about a month ago, Greg Olson in Albany hadn't been asked to present a reduced budget or anything like that. So obviously, you take that for what it's worth but the Governor hasn't directly had a line on Office for the Aging in the State. Of course, that can change but as MaryAnn said, just the way they've identified the need, I think they are kind of recognizing who is vulnerable essentially in that sense. Of course, there are risks. It would be wrong to say there wasn't but I think we're in a good place.

Legislator Nazzaro: Nothing overly apparent.

Mrs. Spanos: There has been a lot of talk about more (*inaudible*) in helping reduce Medicaid costs and hospitalization by partnering more. Whether that will come to fruition, right now I don't know but they are looking at it, of putting more money into the Office for the Aging to see if we can help reduce Medicaid costs.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you and a little more detailed question. I don't mean to get into the (*inaudible*), but just a question here. I couldn't help but notice, like office supplies, 4190.5.

Mrs. Spanos: I'm sure they've gone through the roof.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well, now I'm looking at it, as I speak, you are not budgeting anything in 2021?

Mr. Melquist: That's actually a line item that we get directly from I.T., so we don't add anything else to it typically so it was just a cost that wasn't needed in 2021.

Legislator Gould: I thought that you were going to get computers every year.

Mr. Melquist: We had a bunch this year and we're still ongoing in that process actually.

Legislator Gould: So none next year, according to your budget here.

Mrs. Melquist: Yes.

Mrs. Spanos: Actually, I'm glad that you brought that up Mr. Gould because we've been having discussions with I.T. Some of our staff actually use both tablets and have desktops and they have suggested to us that those who carry their tablets back and forth, they can actually use their tablet as their modem. So we were able to eliminate some desktops this year. So we had a lot more budgeted (*inaudible*) actually we ended up. We did change a lot of computers last year and this year I think because Microsoft had a huge update and our computers were not meeting the new security guidelines and Jon could probably answer more of that but they were all scheduled. But then as I said, we didn't have to go through some of them because of our tablets that we carry into clients home to do evaluations on the (*inaudible*) that we could get these State – what do you call them Josh?

Mr. Melquist: The docking stations.

Mrs. Spanos: Right, so we were able to eliminate the desktop and just have like a monitor and the tablets actually act as modem.

Legislator Gould: That's nice to hear.

Mr. Melquist: We're actually going to see savings this year from that. They are actually ongoing right now. The reason I'm getting a docking station, my desktop is going to be repurposed to somebody in our department who needed a new computer. So we're already seeing the savings because of the advance work done by I.T. and Jon's team there. Same correlation for next year.

Mrs. Spanos: One last thing, we certainly considered all of the request for reducing but our goal was to maximize the services that we provide to people to help them stay at home and in the community are needed more now than ever. So our thoughts to the budget were, what can we reduce without impacting services and that is what we came up with. Anything more, we'd probably have to start chipping away at our home delivery meal program, the biggest part of our share is with the program and I don't think that is a good idea at this time.

Legislator Niebel: As far as one line item, mileage reimbursement is up 18%. Is that because the reimbursement rate has gone up or are we traveling more?

Mr. Melquist: I took that truly at its pre-pandemic levels. The reason for that is, we have requirements from New York State Office for the Aging in-home visits. MaryAnn can expand on it if she needs to but we have requirements of having to go into our clients homes. That's been suspended throughout the pandemic. We don't know what that is going to look like in 2021. They have given no indication that the suspension is going to be extended where we don't have to go into people's homes or if it's going to revert back to what it was where we will. So I took the true pace of what we were going to spend this at our current rate, not knowing next year's rate, I kept it the same, and what we expect to spend next year. That is where we came with that

number. It could certainly decrease a ton. It's not going to go beyond that but it could decrease significantly. It's closer to what we're at this year. It just depends on what guidance we get from New York State.

Mrs. Spanos: I mean, we are dropping things on people's porches but we aren't doing the visits that we were and we have a lot more people that we have brought on program prior to 2020. We've got a huge influx of funds to help increase services to people who are on our waiting list and that brought down our waiting list from over 400 people to just about 200 people. So, that was a lot of people to bring on board. So we expect that we'll have to do a little more traveling once we resume having to do those in-home visits. One other caveat, I was just recently asked by the State because their budget process, they want to know how many people we had on our wait list so I think they are considering funding that. They certainly maintained the funding they've already given us but it sounds like they may be considering putting more money into that program.

Mr. Melquist: So yes Mr. Niebel, it's exactly what you said. This year, this is the greatest hypothetical, if the pandemic never happened, we would have probably spent a little more than what we budgeted in 2020 as far as mileage goes. That was the pace that we were on and that just reflects going back to that pace and again, if you don't end up with those requirements, then it will be lower.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions?

Legislator Gould: Same one I had last year about the vehicle fuel, gasoline. It about doubled from 18' to 19' and then this year it has dropped to \$50.00. Now it's up to, for next year, \$1,020. Who is the other I guess is the first part of the question? I hate the word other. I would rather you put anything other than other. It means nothing.

Mrs. Dennison (*inaudible*).

Mr. Melquist: So gasoline other, I think it's just the account name. I assure you I would give you more detail if I could on that part of it so the question as far as the actual vehicle itself, it's just the fuel we use when we have travel in the car for whatever the case might be and it's kind of the same idea as we did before. We don't know what it's going to look like so we wanted to have enough in there where that \$54.00 that you see in 2020, those reflect the conferences that would have taken place from March through now and we gradually picked that up and wound at a much higher amount. It's just the conferences we've been – we try and rent cars based on the guidance from the County as opposed to driving long distances and whatnot.

Legislator Gould: This is not other then, it should say us.

Mr. Melquist: It could say us, yes. I don't disagree with that. But yes, it is our department. It's truly the fuel that we expect to use when we go to conferences and other such things.

Legislator Gould: O.k., but it is a very uneven line too.

Mr. Melquist: It is, there is a lot of movement. We didn't really get a true grasp of what 2020 would have been for obvious reasons.

Legislator Niebel: Josh, you guys have a van?

Mr. Melquist: Not as a department, no. We usually borrow the one, if we can, from DPW.

Legislator Niebel: You used to have a van at one time, correct?

Mr. Melquist: Not as long as I have been here. MaryAnn, did we have a van?

Mrs. Spanos: Who said that? I didn't know we ever had a department vehicle.

Legislator Niebel: I thought you did years ago.

Mrs. Spanos: (*Inaudible*) George was still there, I would have lobbied for us to get one.

Legislator Niebel: You probably would have gotten one.

Mrs. Spanos: He kept telling me, we don't use enough mileage to have a vehicle.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions for these two today, before we move onto our next category? It seems like everybody is o.k. for now. Feel free to ask these two any questions you have through email or contact as the rest of the week plans out. But thank you for preparing this today and coming here and joining us via zoom. Thank you.

Veterans:

Chairman Pavlock: I would like to welcome you here today and thank you for coming and presenting to us today.

Mr. Carlson: Should I just jump right in or do you have any specific questions?

Chairman Pavlock: If you just want to go over your budget, any changes you are making to employees and just an overview. I see you have some notes in here and reasons for some of the changes moving forward. Some of these I remember through other discussions that we've had but just cover them and we'll see if it brings out any questions from anyone.

Mr. Carlson: O.k., so I'll start with the basics. Our costs are very fixed and very minimal and pretty much limited to the employees that we have and what it just takes to maintain the basic functions of our office. One of our positions, the PFC Dwyer(?) grant is actually funded by a grant so that is not going to be reflected here in this budget. Beyond that, we have a total of 4 employees. Myself, we have 2 full time service officers, one in Jamestown and one in Dunkirk, and then an operations assistant. There was really no room to cut any person because each person is responsible for a very viable workload that greatly offsets the cost of Medicaid and also

brings a ton of revenue from the Department of Veterans Affairs into the County. So from that perspective one of the first notes I had as it pertains to the salaries, for personal services, the increase there is just a basic reflection of just the standard, either step increments or percentage increases that they get for the union. If I'm not mistaken Kathleen, I took zero this year.

Mrs. Dennison: That is correct, yes.

Mr. Carlson: To try and help a little bit but it didn't help a whole lot but did help some. The other thing you'll see, we were planning on moving to a new office space but obviously with COVID hitting and now we've moved a lot of things to doing as much stuff remotely as we can, we're not going to be making that move so that is going to be some cost savings from what we anticipated. The increase in opt out rates is something beyond our control. That is just is what they came up with for insurance. Where we have tried to cut down in some areas like for example, supplies, during COVID we weren't seeing clients. That's not a big part of our budget but we weren't seeing clients so we kind of had a stockpile of supplies so we reduced our budget a little bit for that next year. Now that we are seeing clients, we're starting to use our supplies again but we have enough where we can spend less next year than we would this year. Same thing with mileage reimbursement, we're obviously not traveling as much as we did before because we're doing a lot more things remotely so that reflects that but then again, our entire budget is some other budgets margin of error so there is only so much that we can cut out and save. Let's see if there are any other changes other than the building rent/lease. I mean, that's it. Overall if you look at our budget from last year to this year, there is a 3% increase but those are just fixed costs that there was really no way we could cut without cutting a position. Any questions?

Legislator Nazzaro: So Greg, the move you were talking about, was that the move from West 3rd Street to Hazeltine or are you talking about a different move?

Mr. Carlson: Different thing. So, the VA Clinic is moving from West –

Legislator Nazzaro: (*cross talk*).

Mr. Carlson: Yes, their moving. We were actually looking to move with OFA to the, I can't think of the name of the building, but it's down by WCA Hospital, in that area, because we needed more space because of the waiting room, bathrooms, there was just a lot of reasons but that was all tabled once COVID hit. It just wasn't realistic move.

Legislator Nazzaro: And that's off the table now?

Mr. Carlson: For Veterans, it's off the table. OFA may be still looking at it but Veterans at this point, is not.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know that's separate but the clinic, is moving?

Mr. Carlson: The clinic is moving yes. So they, under a new contract, they are moving right next to the Social Security office near Hazeltine.

Chairman Pavlock: As far as vehicles, I see, you have a van?

Mr. Carlson: Yes, the Veterans van, it's actually operated out of CARTS and we contribute contractually towards maintenance and we also get donations as well that we help to offset the cost of the van. There is a little bit of a reduced cost. What we did was we looked at the maintenance for this year and the fact that with COVID happening, people are not traveling. We've actually had some days where the van just haven't traveled because there hadn't been anybody set to go.

Chairman Pavlock: Any questions? I appreciate you taking the no pay increase for the savings which is much appreciated. It's not budget saving overall but it's certainly speaks to your attribution from your department. So thank you.

Legislator Odell: As long as we're discussing this, this is a small overall budget that Greg does but the impact, profound impact his department has on the citizens of Chautauqua County is immeasurable, so thank you.

Mr. Carlson: Just to give an example of that, if a Veteran has a total combine disability rating of 70% or higher and they go into a skilled nursing home that is contracted to the VA, that's a VA contract in nursing home, just one person and I know of several, who are in VA contract facilities whether it be – some of them even may have moved out of County like Warren has a VA contracted facility. If you look at the cost of one person in a skilled nursing home that's \$12/13,000 a month so just one Veterans who's 70%, you do the math, that's \$130 to \$140,000 just for one. That doesn't include all the other pension with (*inaudible*) that people were able to get in assisted living who don't have to go on the Medicaid roles right away or just Veterans who get award service disability and they use that money to pay their property taxes or to make purchases at – well, not so much local restaurants and stuff during COVID but all the different ways that they use that to enrich their own lives but also helps the County. So we bring a lot of business in from the VA.

Legislator Niebel: Greg, \$1,400 for other supplies, we didn't have anything for 2019 or 2020, but our budget for 2021 is \$1,400. Page two at the top, other supplies.

Mrs. Dennison: That is computer equipment because it's equipment that costs less than \$1,000 per piece so a lot of times it's printers. So that would be equipment that the I.T. Department has scheduled to replace in Greg's department.

Legislator Niebel: We didn't have it the last two years Kathleen?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. A lot of those computers replacements are on a 3 year or more year cycle.

Mr. Carlson: Right, so certain years we're scheduled to get certain things.

Chairman Pavlock: It looks like everybody is happy with your presentation so I don't see any questions. Thanks again and if anybody has any questions that they can't think of now, Greg will be happy to answer them if you get back with him. Thank you for coming today.

Mental Hygiene

Mrs. Brinkman: Once again, I wish you a good afternoon and we'll try and be as brief as possible. I'm very proud to present our budget this afternoon. As you can see from the budget that you have in front of you, the Department of Mental Hygiene grew our revenue by 12.3% while the local share is down by 2.1%. Our budget includes an increase in staffing of 5 positions designed to meet the requirements of the certified Community Behavioral Health Center grant that we received in the spring. The budget of the LGU, 4310, is decreased by 71% and that's because we were able to allocate more of the expenses from the LGU across the additional programs that Mental Hygiene now operates. I'm proud that we were able to do our best to decrease our local share as we have done virtually every year and we take our burden to the taxpayer very seriously. I'm very pleased to say that for each of the \$19.4 million dollars that will be spent on Mental Hygiene programs to serve those fighting mental health and addiction challenges in Chautauqua County, far less than one cent of that dollar comes from the Chautauqua County taxpayers. So, I really believe that we are an incredible value that we bring to the community. Also, while it's a little bit more difficult to quantify, in addition to the fact that we provide these services at such a low cost to the taxpayers, the outcomes that we achieve through the work that we do with our clients, also are such that they reduce admissions to the ED, to inpatient units, they reduce homelessness, they reduce admissions to the jail, so there are a lot of other ways that we save the taxpayers of Chautauqua County money while we enrich the lives of those that we serve.

There is one area that I would like to call to your attention that is an area of concern in this budget. That is, account 4322. That represents funding for cost incurred. When the courts send an individual to a certified OMH licensed facility for competency restoration, the cost for this area of our budget is rising due to the fact that OMH began charging 100% of the cost for each day at the facility, rather than the previous, 50%. That was the case up until April 1st. In other words, its cost shifting, it's moving the cost from the State, at least 50% of the cost to the counties. The problem with this area of our budget, in addition to the fact that the cost per day have gone up by 50%, is the fact that we have no control over this. It is strictly up to the courts and to the defendants that come through the court and to their attorney's when they decide whether an individual needs to be evaluated for competency and once that determination is made, an order is given to our office to procure the services of licensed psychiatrist or psychologist to make that determination and when two psychologist or psychiatrist agree, if the person is deemed to be incompetent, that person is then remanded to the custody of the New York State Commissioner of Mental Health and then assigned to one of the forensic facilities around the State. Right now, the charge that we are incurring per month for every individual referred for forensic competency restoration is \$32,000. So far this year, we have been billed for \$195,000, so you can see the budget has far exceeded the \$50,000 that we have in this year's budget and we are three months before the end of the year and we also have one individual we suspect will be going because of their behavioral health concerns. This is an area that we would put before the committees as one area that might be reviewed actually for an increase to better reflect what we suspect we'll see in 2021.

Legislator Odell: Could you just repeat those numbers again? Or what you've budgeted so far.

Mrs. Brinkman: We have incurred \$195,000 of expenses to date.

Mrs. Swanson: That is above and beyond what we have budgeted for 2020.

Mrs. Brinkman: So that is an important clarification. It's above and beyond what the \$50,000 that is currently in the budget. Actually \$245,000 is what we've been – so I should have clarified that that was the overage, the \$195,000 is the overage.

Legislator Nazzaro: About \$250,000 actually, right?

Mrs. Dennison: But I think Legislator Odell, you were asking for the figure on the cost per person, per month, is that correct?

Legislator Odell: No, the bill to number.

Legislator Nazzaro: So we're \$195,000 over budget but year to date, it's about \$250,000, is that correct?

Mrs. Brinkman: Yes.

Chairman Pavlock: And what do you think the projections will be for next year?

Mrs. Brinkman: I just know it's not going to likely be \$50,000 because we know that we'll send at least one person and one person is \$32,000 a month so, I mean, this is an area when I talk to my counterparts around the State, we're all reeling from this change. I mean, it was never an easy charge to pay to begin with when it was 50% but for some counties are actually in the millions of dollars with this cost.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just following up on that, I think Dan and Mark, so we have that amount of \$250,000 plus you said earlier the reimbursement is changing?

Mrs. Brinkman: No, Chuck that is a good point. Part of that \$250,000 was charged prior to April 1st and could have been at the lower rate. Anything since April 1st has been charged at the full cost, the 100% cost.

Legislator Nazzaro: So now we're responsible for 100% of the cost?

Mrs. Brinkman: A 100% of the cost.

Legislator Nazzaro: Where prior and you can correct me Pat, I won't be offended, and prior to April 1st we were reimbursed 50% of the cost?

Mrs. Brinkman: We were charged for 50% of the cost.

Mrs. Swanson: The State picked up the rest.

Legislator Nazzaro: A couple important factors that you are pointing out here. Increase use but also 100% now goes to the County, cost. I want to get my notes right.

Chairman Pavlock: And an unknown of what it's going to actually cost you throughout the year. It sounds to me like there is guess work involved but also it is what it is. You can't really control that input.

Mrs. Brinkman: I can tell you that we're doing everything we can to minimize the number of individuals that are going. Now that the courts are coming back on line, we'll be meeting with the judges and with the attorneys to talk about other options other than sending someone for competency restoration. Is there a possibility of diverting them and doing some of that work in the community and assuming that public safety is maintained and making sure that individuals have the option of services before this is extreme option is taken? Once that 730 order, which is the order that the judge gives for a competency evaluation is done, that it moves out of the hands of the LGU.

Mrs. Swanson: There is a possibility that another \$30,000 to \$60,000 could be added on to this year because there is a gentleman that is in line to be going.

Mrs. Brinkman: At least one. There could be more but that's one that we anticipate.

Legislator Nazzaro: You said the cost is \$32,000 –

Mrs. Brinkman: A month, roughly speaking. What happens Chuck is that the New York State OMH comes up with a daily cost, just like acute care hospitals do and that's the cost that is billed back to us. We have absolutely no ability to impact that rate.

Mrs. Dennison: Just to provide a little historical perspective. Obviously the \$50,000 budget is something that might be difficult to achieve but if you look at results prior to 2019, that \$50,000 budget did prove to be reasonable. The expenses in 2018 were only \$15,000, that is one five, \$40,000 in 2017, \$29,000 in 2016. So, unfortunately it's a relatively new problem that that budget is difficult to achieve but as I said, that is one reason that we put it in at the standard level of \$50,000 instead of going in with a higher figure.

Legislator Nazzaro: But in 2019 Kathleen, there is a pick uptick and if we're under the new formula, it would be close to \$300,000.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm not sure two years is a trend -

Legislator Odell: And we had reimbursement to go with.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right.

Chairman Pavlock: Take into consideration we're trying to be accurate as we can especially in this challenging year.

Legislator Odell: We don't want any surprises, there is a different scenario for each one.

Chairman Pavlock: That's true. Now we got the bad one out of the way. Let's get to a positive one.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you for pointing that out, I think. Thank you for your honesty.

Mrs. Brinkman: Well, the other way it happens is, I'm going to have to come back and give bad news all throughout the year and I'd rather put it up there in the front and know that we've made a good decision at the beginning and if I need to come back after that, I can assure you that will have done everything that's within our control to minimize the number of people that are sent.

Did you have questions or did you want me to run through each of these?

Chairman Pavlock: If you would just give us an overview of the items that have – I see you have comments in here, maybe just hit on your comments and if anyone has questions or a question regarding one of those comments, they can stop you but if you just want to move through some of these reasons for some of the changes and positions, it gives us a nice overview.

Mrs. Brinkman: If you look at personnel services, basically we have increased, as I said, our positions by 5 and we had the 3% wage increase as well as the 50 cents per hour in 2019 and we are covering those increases by clinic, State, and Federal revenue.

In terms of, as you were talking about with Greg before, we're on a 3 year cycle for computers and we've replaced our computers so the funding that's there is basically to purchase laptops for new employees through the grant.

The change that you see under contractual is a contract that will likely be done for a Crisis Stabilization Center to enhance our crisis services throughout Chautauqua County. As many of you know, Brooks is going to lose its 939 status in April so we need to have an opportunity in the north end of the County to be able to see and triage individuals because at this point, the rate of people seeking crisis services are such that they cannot be handled at UPMC without having huge waiting times. Benefits again are reflected as a result of the new positions.

The increase in revenue is due to the CCBHC grant and the ability to bring on more staff to provide services. We also have received an integrated license that allows us to be overseen by the Department of Mental Health so it allows us to provide services at full rate rather than at a discounted rate.

The miscellaneous category that increase is due to our Healing Community Study grant. That has to do with opioid addiction and funding from our DSRIP. It basically has come to an end but that is funding that we've accumulated over time.

We had a change in our funding from OASIS. They did not renew a one-time opportunity and so you see the loss of that revenue. The increase in funding of the \$1.4 million is due to the increase in CCBHC funding, Tapestry grant which we got for \$1 million and those are kind of offset by ending of the earlier Tapestry grant.

Again, 4310, the changes that you see are mostly reflective of us being able to reallocate those costs across more programs.

Legislator Gould: What's building maintenance, 4310.4350?

Mrs. Brinkman: The building maintenance was for- it's the extra cleaning for the COVID that we need to do which we suspect will need to do for a good part of 2021 as well as cleaning for City Hall. Did you get that Kathy?

Mrs. Swanson: Well, the 4310 is the LGU at 2 Academy and the \$950 is the extra cleaning that we're budgeting for, for COVID. Is that what you are asking?

Legislator Gould: I hadn't heard cleaning ever referred to as building maintenance before.

Mrs. Swanson: The reason we put it in that category is because when I did a consolidated fiscal report that is due to OMH and OASIS every year, they consider it maintenance.

Chairman Pavlock: I appreciate your overviews here because and you just talking through because we gain knowledge as you talk and if we just ask questions, I won't necessarily hear those tidbits you are telling us that are in your explanations, so thank you for that. You can keep moving through the list if you will.

Legislator Nazzaro: Going back to DSRIP funding. I saw in your notes, you are saying the increase is Healing Communities Study grant, that has been approved by – that money will be available for 2021?

Mrs. Brinkman: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is DSRIP going away then?

Mrs. Brinkman: DSRIP is going away.

Legislator Nazzaro: And there may be, just a question for the future, not for the 2021 budget, but, is there monies that have not been spent that you may be able to get because the PPS didn't spend all the money?

Mrs. Brinkman: They put out an RFP a while back to clean up some of those funds and we were not in that mix.

Legislator Nazzaro: Oh, you were not.

Mrs. Brinkman: No.

Legislator Nazzaro: That's too bad. Thank you.

Mrs. Brinkman: O.k., let's move to 4320. In terms of 4320, again, this is where the new positions for the CCBHC reside. It's also where we have our think pads for those staff. It's where the Crisis Center is residing and that's why there is the increase in contractual. Again, benefits are increasing due to the additional staff.

Clinic revenue will go up because of those staff so I've covered the other two and the local share is down to \$448 on those programs. That's just an amazing number when you look at what it is throughout the State for other counties.

4322, we just spoke about in my overview.

Chairman Pavlock: Does anyone have specific questions in those last couple of accounts for Mrs. Brinkman?

Legislator Nazzaro: Just going back to the CCBHC grant, first of all again, congratulations on that. That was a huge success for this County. So if I remember right, the overall grant was \$4 million?

Mrs. Brinkman: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Was it \$2 million in 2020 and \$2 million in 2021 or is there an overlap in 2022?

Mrs. Swanson: It's overlapping.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., so in this budget for 2021, and again, your local share is nothing, in here basically is reflected \$2 million dollars? I mean, obviously you have the expense. I see an increase in expense by two, increase in revenue by \$2 million so just a high level question in the 2021 budget, are you roughly recognizing \$2 million in revenue for that grant?

Mrs. Swanson: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then we'll see something in 2022?

Mrs. Swanson: Correct. I believe that it will be 4 months.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions? Thank you very much for the work that you have put into your budget process. I guess I'm not thankful for the sad news you have given us about the one account but we'll push through that as we always do. Thank you for being here today and giving us the summary.

I guess that is our agenda for today unless anyone has anything else to add or have any questions.

Legislator Nazzaro: The only question I have Mr. Chairman is did you want to propose any budget amendments to be considered by the Audit & Control Committee?

Chairman Pavlock: Based on our second half of conversation here, does anyone have anything that they would like to recommend?

Mrs. Dennison: One other piece of information further on the competency hearing expenses, in July, August, and September, the actual expenses were over \$60,000 a month and that changes the picture. When the budget was developed, as I say, we were partially looking at history but also working with what had been recorded through June. What had been recorded through June was \$57,000 so this is a change that obviously was kind of brewing as the budget was being evaluated and prepared but the recent recording of actual events does cast a little bit different picture that when we consolidated the budget with the department.

Legislator Nazzaro: So you are saying now Kathleen, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but, based on this information that you have now, you are somewhat concerned that this amount of \$50,000 is too low?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, it's up to your committee.

Chairman Pavlock: The problem is, as Mrs. Brinkman has pointed out, it's an unknown number. Obviously we have a number in there and it's a bad number but what is a better number, I guess?

Legislator Rankin: Is it reasonable to consider that \$60,000 a fair number for the remaining months of the year?

Mrs. Dennison: That is a question I think that Mental Hygiene is better equipped to answer than I am just because they know what cases are currently – what individuals are currently awaiting the competency results. It's difficult to predict, it's kind of like the State Training School kids for Social Services. It's that no one can really tell who's going to be recommended for these programs.

Legislator Rankin: We don't know until we know.

Legislator Whitford: I think the question is, the amendment should reflect in the 2021 budget because 2020, we do that in our normal process but \$50,000 for 2021 obviously seem inadequate. I would suggest – our shortfall at least to this point before the end of the year is \$195,000, am I correct?

Chairman Pavlock: Yes, you are correct.

Legislator Whitford: So if nothing changes for 2021, I would imagine we would be short by more than \$195,000 if the trend continues from 2020 to 2021.

Mrs. Dennison: The shortage right now is \$145,000 because \$245,000 –

Chairman Pavlock: I thought she said the shortage was \$195,000.

Legislator Whitford: The actual was \$245,000 and budgeted was \$50,000, correct?

Mrs. Dennison: We did amend the budget in May when we did the large amendment due to COVID. We increased it \$50,000 in May, so the amended budget is \$100,000. So we are \$145,000 over the amended budget, we are \$195,000 over the adopted budget.

Chairman Pavlock: So I suppose it gets us back to the question now of what type of recommendation that this Committee should put forth for - (*cross talk*)...

Legislator Nazzaro: What you could do is, you could use a portion – you had \$237,250 budget reduction, I believe it was the State Training School and of course, right now the offset to that would be a reduction in overall appropriations so what you could do is use a portion of that to whatever that number would be to increase this allocation here.

Chairman Pavlock: I think that it is accurate that we do so but, it is important to remember that we need to keep in mind the potential loss of grant revenue, the \$500,000 for –

Mrs. Dennison: For Raise the Age.

Chairman Pavlock: Yes, so we need to keep finding money and not giving it back right away either so we can get under our tax cap so that poses an additional \$500 and some thousand that we could potentially be negatively hit with. If it's the wish to accurately portray our budget with Mental Hygiene, we've saved some money for a short period of time but I think it's necessary.

Legislator Odell: As Chuck said, a portion of that offsets savings might be appropriate but what number is that?

Chairman Pavlock: (*Inaudible*), can we have Mrs. Brinkman put some more input in or should we pick a number?

Legislator Nazzaro: You could either get more input or possibly (*inaudible*) number because Kathleen pointed out, in 2018, it was very low at \$15,000. If you double that because of the change in reimbursement would be like \$30,000. In 2019 you were looking at about \$290,000 what would have been, so, who knows. I think \$50,000 is definitely too low considering we amended the budget for 2020 to bring it up to \$100,000, so I would think anywhere between \$100/\$200,000 in total would be a more appropriate number.

Legislator Whitford: That was my idea, \$150,000 would be a conservative estimate and I would move this Committee to change that budget appropriation for that from \$50,000 to \$150,000.

Chairman Pavlock: Elisabeth, are you in agreement or –

Legislator Rankin: I am. I thinking about for the youths that get sent to the facilities and how they budget that is usually trying to take a look at trends or what is in the pipeline because it is not the same from year to year. So they try and make the best guess they can based on - excuse me, my teenager just came home, make your estimates on your best guesses. I like what Paul was saying because kind of in the middle, I'm not comfortable with \$50,000. We do need to add more knowing that if Pat gets extra cases she would bring them to committee on a case by case basis to make budget adjustments but we don't want to be doing that every time. So, I like being able to add some more and if she can say, I can't remember what she said, do they send 2 or 3 a year? What I did like hearing is that they do everything possible to keep from sending them, so it's kind of hard to predict. So, I would go with Paul's suggestion, which was actually from Chuck first, and then Paul agreed.

Legislator Niebel: I think you had a valid point. If we take too much of this \$237,000 that we just found here today, if we take too much of that, right now we're going to exceed the salary cap by, Kathleen, help me, by \$900,000?

Mrs. Dennison: The tentative budget exceeds by \$975,000.

Legislator Niebel: If we don't meet that, I mean, if we exceed the salary cap, we are in danger of losing Raise the Age money and that's \$560,000.

Chairman Pavlock: For clarification of that, are we in danger or are we losing?

Mrs. Dennison: The way the regulations are stated, if you exceed the tax cap you lose it. Unless you are declared fiscally distressed.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is that the way it was listed in the report you shared just recently – was it Kitty or you?

Mrs. Dennison: Kitty and then me. The report from NYSAC just indicates that this question is being evaluated kind of for the Statewide but I can read to you, this is from the State's website on Raise the Age. It says, in certain circumstances there may be a local share of RTA costs if a County or New York City is unable to comply with the tax cap or demonstrate fiscal hardship as required in the RTA bill. So I guess I should kind of restate my answer, it doesn't say, you will be penalized. This is a question that was posed on the website and the question is, who will pay for the additional costs incurred by the County to implement Raise the Age and the full answer is, the State financial plan assumes the State will pay 100% of incremental costs incurred by the counties to implement Raise the Age. Then it goes on to say, in certain circumstances, there may be a local share of RTA costs if a County is unable to comply with the tax cap. So it's kind of vague. Val Lis and I did raise the question with the representative from New York State and this is his response. This is from the Budget Analyst from the New York Office of Children and Family Services. He said if the County cannot meet the property tax cap, they can fill out and submit a hardship waiver to Department of Budget for consideration. If neither of those are approved, then the County will not be eligible for RTA funding.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., a hardship waiver, but what is our chances of getting that if we're actually showing a decrease in the tax rate?

Mrs. Dennison: That is a very good question and if you look at – I tried to find out how we could get a hardship waiver and what I know so far is, I looked at the fiscal stress monitoring system and it's my understanding at this point is that you have to – that's how you are declared a hardship case. The counties and municipalities that are considered to be under fiscal stress, they have a rating on the fiscal stress monitor of 60 or above. On a scale of 1 to 100, high being bad. Chautauqua County right now is at about 30/31/32, so today, would we be a hardship case? I would have to say no.

Legislator Niebel: I hardly see us being designated as a County in distress if we're actually decreasing – our tax rate is actually decreasing. I just don't see that happening.

Legislator Nazzaro: Here is my thought on this and maybe not even on this particular issue but as we go through all these budget hearings, I think we need to identify, as a Legislature, the areas of potential risk in this budget when something is presented to us by a department manager. At the end of the day when we do all the tallies which won't be until Friday, we will then, it's up to the Audit & Control Committee whether to move the adjustments to the full Legislature. Of course again, we have committee meetings next week so more information becomes available. I think we have to be reasonable. Something was presented to us. I think, my opinion at this point, we most likely are going to have to override this tax cap because of the formula. We don't have the overage to carry forward that we had last year of over \$800,000. Also the rate of inflation was only 1.5% so you use the lower of that or the 2% so now we're using the 1.5%. We don't have the carry forward so most likely, as much as I don't want to, we may have to override that cap. But that hasn't been decided yet. We're not there yet so I think the Audit & Control committee on Friday, if you don't want - that's fine but if the committee brings forward an amendment, we may or may not decide to carry that forward because we may have many amendments, we don't know that yet. To your point Terry, I think we're going to have to wait and tally all this up and have a good discussion as a Legislature, what does this mean to us as a County? At the end of the day, it is what it is,

Chairman Pavlock: Yea, I wish we know all of our tallies and potential savings that are not reflected in the tentative budget. If we know all those savings today, it would make our decision a little easier. Paul, anything you want to add?

Legislator Whitford: My thoughts might be a little different than anyone else. My suggestion to amend this budget was just that. To protect against actual shortfalls which we see that is something that is realistic but if we're going to make our amendments or work our budget around the potential loss of \$500,000 in another department, I don't think that we were doing our due diligence. I think we have an Audit & Control committee I think is second to none, I mean, they spend hours and hours especially Mr. Nazzaro on the budget prior to the County Executive's budget. So, I just think as a committee with Human Services, with all the information that we've received, we can't do anything but make that adjustment. Now, it's up to the Audit & Control committee if they are going to take out of the \$237,000 to make an adjustment to this portion of the 21' budget but I still firmly believe that we have to make an

amendment to the Mental Hygiene budget to accommodate what really is a realistic potential loss for their department. So, still stick with that.

Legislator Rankin: I agree with Paul. I'd like to be able to recommend some number like that and see how Mrs. Brinkman feels about it. If it feels good to her, what she thinks about that number, because she needs to be able to live with what we put in there but I agree, we need to increase it by something and then get her input. We're meeting with her next week, right?

Legislator Gould: Week after.

Legislator Rankin: A week after, right. You probably want that answer before then. Dan, would that be you getting in touch with Pat?

Chairman Pavlock: I can certainly reach out to her but as we just talked with her here, she made us aware and I asked her the question if she knew a better number and I didn't seem to get a direct answer. She may be able to say that yes, she probably is going to need more money in that account but it didn't reflect a specific number and I think if she knew that, she may have – she did say that there is probably going to be another person introduced into that area so I think that those expenses are going to still be present so I think an increase is valid. We obviously do have a situation where we know we'll probably go over budget if we did not increase, we would knowingly be under budgeting for that area. So I think an increase shows that we are aware and I'd be happy with an increase today to be proper.

Legislator Rankin: O.k., I would go along with that.

Chairman Pavlock: What would your suggestion be Paul? You were at \$150,000 before, is that fine?

Legislator Whitford: I'm sticking by that amount. I think it's conservative if you are talking about \$32,000 a month and potentially one or even more.

Chairman Pavlock: Do you want to form it into a motion, Paul?

Legislator Whitford: Yes, I would like to make that motion.

Legislator Rankin: Second.

Legislator Nazzaro: Can I ask for clarification? I know that I'm not voting on that but just clarification, are you adding \$150,000 or your bringing it up to \$150,000?

Legislator Whitford: I'm adding \$100,000 and bringing it up to \$150,000, which I believe is very conservative but we are addressing the issue.

Legislator Nazzaro: That's fine Paul, I just wanted to make sure.

Chairman Pavlock: So the recommendation is to make it \$150,000, not including anything, just like Paul stated, it's up to you what funds you want to use to offset that but just to move that to \$150,000. We have a first and second, all those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Mrs. Dennison: I just want to put the numbers with it so it would be to increase the appropriation for A.4322.4, increase of \$100,000.

Chairman Pavlock: Yes.

Legislator Whitford: Yes.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other areas to discuss? I hope you guys make the right decision at the end of the week with it.

Legislator Nazzaro: Appreciate you Mr. Chairman making the recommendation and then again as I said, on Friday, we tally all this up and to Paul's point, see how we're going to fund it and whether we carry those forward to the Legislature. I think you did the right thing.

Mrs. Dennison: I just wanted to add just an additional comment on Raise the Age. The report that Mr. Nazzaro is referring to is a report from NYSAC and it's entitled "Overcoming the Current State Local Budget Crisis" and there are a couple of comments in here about Raise the Age. The recommendation is first to maintain the State's commitment to fully fund incremental costs for Raise the Age but also to delink the State property tax cap and County eligibility for future reimbursements for State mandated RTA costs. So, as I say, this certainly is not law, but, there is some lobbying by NYSAC to, as it says, remove the linkage between the State tax compliance and funding for Raise the Age.

Legislator Nazzaro: What page is that on?

Mrs. Dennison: That's on page 8.

Legislator Rankin: I want to thank Chairman Pavlock for doing a good job running today's meeting.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you. I saw attendance your cat and then your teenager. So thank you for attending today. That's it for today.

Legislator Whitford: Move to adjourn.

Legislator Rankin: Second. *Unanimously Carried (3:09 p.m.)*

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