

Minutes  
Budget Hearing  
Public Facilities Committee  
Audit & Control Committee  
Friday, October 7, 2020, 9:00 a.m.  
Legislative Chambers & Virtual via Zoom  
Mayville, N.Y.

Members Present: (P.F.) Hemmer, Nazzaro, Gould, Davis (Absent: Scudder)  
(A.C.) Nazzaro, Niebel, Harmon, Odell

Others: Tampio, Ames, Dennison, DeAngelo, Bentley, Zafuto, Hansen, Rogers, Chagnon,  
Henry, Panteli, Walsh, Cummings, Westphal (LaTone, Almeter, Crow via Zoom)

Chairman Hemmer called to order the budget review hearings at 9:03 a.m. I believe we have an overview from Kathleen.

Mrs. Dennison: Most of the items that I use to include in the overview, I emailed to the Legislature about 10 days ago so I hope you all have that information. That gives you the highlights of the budget, most of the information was also presented by the County Executive in his presentation to you at the last Legislative meeting and the overview also includes an orientation to the budget book and all the materials that we provided to you. In addition to those items, I just wanted to add some additional notes. The exhibit that Janelle handed out to you this morning is an FTE variance report. This report shows the changes in the dollar changes due to changes in full time equivalent employment and we split it out between what I call rate and volume variances. So the volume variances as kind of the center column there and those quantify what the changes are in wage and fringe due to additions or deletions of positions. The second block is the variance section which quantifies the changes due to changes in base pay and other rates in the benefit section. We wanted to do this because there is a big change in rates especially for CSEA 6300 employees. Because in the 2021 budget that budget now includes the settled contract changes in 2021 and then it also has a catch-up from what raises were granted in 2020 and 2019 because the 19' and the 20' raises were not included in the 2020 budget. So again, the rate and volume variances gives us a picture of what the changes for positions changes that the department made as far as deletions or additions and then the changes that are relatively out of their control being the rate changes in the newly settled contract. So that is that additional exhibit.

That kind of leads me to my second overview item. We wanted to stress that the departments, when it come especially to employment, a lot of the changes in expenditures are out of the control of the department heads as imaged in the contractual changes. I just wanted to make note of the fact that the department head is completely in control of how many people he or she has in his organization. So that is how the department heads can implement changes to their personal services and employee benefit section. The other thing that is often stated that is out of the department heads control are computer expenses. Those items, they do get a schedule from Information Technologies with all the planned replacements of equipment and those are provided to the department heads but the department heads, it is their option to use that information, to add to it, or to subtract from it. So they have the option to say, I'm not going to do this planned

computer replacement this year. That is another item, as I say, sort of in their control and sort of not.

The last thing that I wanted to mention, mostly for Brad's information, as for the department heads, we've suggested that department heads walk through the budget summary exhibit that's in the binder behind the tentative budget section. That report is summarizing the budget at the classification level and does have comments on major variances. So that's been our general format as to walk through the summary exhibit and then if there are any questions on individual line items that information is in your book as well. We will refer to those as needed. So that is the orientation that I have for you this morning.

Chairman Hemmer: Just a quick question on the rate and volume variances, can you run through a line of it just to –

Mrs. Dennison: Sure. Towards the bottom of page 1, you'll see it says Department, second line from the bottom, is Department 2500\_1620, that is the Buildings and Grounds department. The other thing that I should point out is that the rate and volume report, this is based on each positions home department. There are a lot of allocations of individual positions and those allocations are not reflected in these numbers. So for example, if 1620 maybe isn't the best example but if there were an employee that is – there home department is Buildings and Grounds but they do half of their work at the Landfill, so, when you look at the actual budget figures, half of those expenses would be transferred to the Landfill in that example. This report, rate and volume, all of the expenses for that employee, his home department is 1620 so they are all in this line here. So if you look at these variances and then you look at the variances in personal services for 1620, in Brad's summary reports, they don't necessarily match. For the County as a whole, the variances do but as I say, there is a lot of surprising number of allocations of employees to different departments. So that is kind of just a back-drop but getting back to your question, so if we're looking at 1620, the first three columns there show wage variance, fringe, and then the total, so this says that the added or deleted positions in Buildings & Grounds, they added \$119,000 in expense. So there would be new positions in Buildings & Grounds. So that's the amount of the expenses going up which – so positive numbers are technically unfavorable, increase in expense. So in Buildings & Grounds, because of added positions that added \$151,000 to the budget. Then the second block, the existing positions, the rates, there was an increase of \$55,000 in Buildings and Grounds salaries due to changes in the base pay rates. So essentially contractual rates of pay, changes in the rates. The negative \$21,926, the cost or the rate of the fringe for the Buildings & Grounds employees actually went down. Probably because in 2020 budget, they may have had people budgeted on the old PPO insurance plan and now they are all on high deductible. So in this negative variances, would be good things and then so the total volume variances for Buildings & Grounds is \$33,000 meaning that the rate changes contributed \$33,000 to their budget, beyond their control. And then for a total change in wage and fringe of \$185,000.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you very much. That was helpful for me. Does anyone else have any questions for Kathleen at the beginning here? Seeing none, we'll move on.

**Public Facilities –**

Mr. Bentley: This is my 3<sup>rd</sup> year doing this budget and I feel I learned something each and every year so I look forward to this morning and the education that we all bring to each other. As Kathleen said, she wants me to start with the executive level budget summary and as always I do things differently so, I'm going to start with the local share summary. There is a handout that was provided on your desk because the local share summary that's in your book includes the interfund transfers and I believe that doesn't give the full picture of what you guys need to see as far as what is going on in the entire DPF budget. So, on that handout, I'm going to go at the high level and there are a lot of devils in the details and we'll have plenty of opportunities this morning to go through all those divisions and all those changes. At the highest of the levels here, my budget is increasing a million dollars on appropriations. That equates to \$600,000 increase in local share and also forecasting about a \$410,000 increase in revenues. I believe those revenues are conservative and we'll go through each one of those as what they are built upon. The first major one is the forecast from investments, that's over \$200,000 of that so over half of it is provided by the Finance Department so I believe those revenues have been reviewed and are conservative in their nature. We'll go through the other revenue side of that as well.

So, the DPF budget which includes, Engineers, Buildings & Grounds, Jamestown/Dunkirk airports, CARTS, Parks, Forestry, Admin, Maintenance of Roads, Capital improvements, snow removal, road machinery, and debt service, all those things are forecast to be \$30.9 million dollars for 2021. Again, about a \$1 million dollar increase.

So, as we go through each of the divisions today, each division has tried to meet the objectives given by the County Executive to reduce costs. There were some items that went up like the CSEA contract that was just provided to us. But we were able to find some areas where we reduced budget line items like travel, computers, training, we looked under every crevice to try and find that. We did it once during the COVID attempt to find savings. We did a good job in 2020, we continued that effort into 2021 to continue overturn the stones and find areas where it could be at. With that being said, I believe that we are at the point and probably have been at the point of critical staffing level where further reductions in staffing is going to have to be balanced with a reduction in service. I think we haven't seen the effects of these critical levels only due to the tremendous efforts of the management and the dedicated workforce that we have to overcome the hardships that has been put in place in front of them. I see time and time again, with different divisions doing things that are just unbelievable with what their provided. They take on the challenges and they address the issues and they just overcome. I will give an example of 2020. COVID has been a very difficult year for everyone and we're kind of faced with a big challenge and the County issued the voluntary furloughs and I'm going to say about ¾ of the highway staff volunteered for 2 months to be furloughed. That caused our capital improvements as well as our maintenance of roads, bridges, and infrastructure to be delayed by 2 months. When the guys got back, the management and the dedicated team, we put together a plan to take the State funding that was remaining, 80% of the CHIPS, PAVE NY, and EWR, and they hit home runs in August and September when they came back. We had some very favorable weather but I will tell you, I think you can see the pavement on the road, some very big improvements. We probably did a program that would normally take us 3 months and we did it in a month, month and a half. That's due to some really tremendous efforts and some favorable conditions but to put the plan in place, to get the contractors in place, to get all the bills, I can't believe we got

done what we got done and we're still continuing. That being said, we're still behind. We still have a lot of bridge work to do, we're still not where we need to be, there were issues filling potholes, just trying to catch-up on shoulder work and vegetation management, sign replacements, so, we have a long ways to go. But, to get where we are today, was only through the dedicated staff, the efforts that they did. I just wanted to give a big shout out to the DPF staff as a whole. Not just the highway department but the landfill, the airports, everybody went through (*inaudible*) Buildings & Grounds with the COVID cleaning and I just want to start with the recognition of 2020 efforts because I think it was a big, big win for the County to have that dedicated staff of employees that we have.

O.k., you guys can interrupt me at any time with any questions. Going to go to the FTE count. That's the next page before I get to the Executive level but budget summary. The number looks big but it's really not. The FTE count looks like it's going up 15 ½ positions but it's really due to couple of things and we'll go through them. The first one is a 3 ½ FTE count in Buildings & Grounds due to increase COVID requirements. These are funded temporary positions by reimbursements from the State. As well as the reinstatement of 2 positions that I had planned on eliminating due to last year's request by this committee. It happen to work out that that was part of the offset of the EAS positions that we added in the budget that didn't come to fruition. So, given the whole COVID thing, it was very prudent to keep the cleaners on and reestablish those for 2021 as we see those requirements continuing. We don't see COVID cleaning requirements going away any time soon. So we're reinstating those and actually taking 2 out of the airports, out of the EAS. That's a summary statement, there is devils in the details but that's the high level there.

The other big piece of this is CARTS. In 2020 we saw a definite reduction in ridership's and revenues due to COVID. Obviously, everything got shut down and businesses didn't – we didn't see the normal ridership. We were probably about 50% of our normal ridership throughout most of the spring and early summer. It's rebounded some. It's going fairly well but we were also the recipient of a \$2 million dollar CARES Act funding to help out mass transit so that is going to cover our revenue shortfalls for 2020 and 2021. But what we're also seeing is our drivers. Our drivers are mainly retired CDL drivers who – again, it goes back to applauding the efforts of our employees who are dedicated, willing to provide the service at probably some risk to themselves, but we also saw a number of drivers that they did not want to take the risk and opted out of driving. Which, in the spring and summer, kind of self-balanced. Our ridership was down, we eliminated routes that weren't seeing riders on them so it kind of balanced it out. As we try and get back to normal, we're finding we're still having a shortage of drivers and how do we know that? We had implemented Saturday service, I don't know if anyone remembers, but, we had started Saturday service before COVID and we no longer have the drivers in staff to actually restart Saturday service. We would like to, but we can't. We just physically don't have the drivers. So we try and figure out a game plan to figure out how to get drivers enticed to drive and get some more candidates in the door. What we're looking at doing is reclassifying 11 substitute drivers to partial full time and we believe that will not only – those positions so that will attract additional drivers by getting them off substitute, to get them with some benefits. So we believe that this is an attempt to get the drivers in the door so we can reestablish the service that we originally intended on providing. That being said, forecast to pay for that, any revenue shortfall is going to be covered by our \$2 million dollars of CARES Act money because we're not going to use all that in 2020 and its there's going to be – there is a lot of money for what we're providing. We can talk more about it when Michelle gets here and we go through

CARTS. So, that's really not 11 new positions, that's 11 reclassified positions but just the way the accounting works, they get put on here as new. Did I say that correctly?

Mrs. Dennison: You did and when we get to – well, actually you won't see them unless you look at the account detail but in the CARTS department, CARTS in the past has always had a large budget for substitutes and it's in a separate account from base wages. So the positions were classified as substitutes, their wages were in the substitute wage account and so really what we have done is switch those positions and the wages out of the substitute account and into base wages. We did a similar thing as this with the part time correction officers a couple of years ago. Part time CO's used to always be classified as substitutes and we realized that it doesn't really work very well from an accounting standpoint so moved the part time CO's into FTE's and that's the same situation that we're looking at with the CARTS drivers. Also, the CARTS drivers, they do get benefits now because they are classified as full time employees. They are anticipated to work 30 hours a week so they do get full benefits. Some of the drivers in the past had retirement benefits but health insurance benefits so that is an additional expense but that is covered by the grant funding.

Legislator Nazzaro: Not sure if this is the time to ask this question or we can defer it but my concern on that would be in the future years, you have the grant and now we're classifying on the substitute full time with benefits, have you thought about what this will do in future budgets once the grant funding is not available?

Mr. Bentley: Yea, obviously the answer is, it would lead to increased costs but again the critical part here is, we're not able to provide the service so we're looking at a reduced service level and we can always, if there's a – we don't know what the future holds, right? We could apply for additional grant funding to pay for some of these positions if our ridership increases. Because we're talking about 2022, right, so there is so many large unknowns going out that far. If at a later date we want to take these back to substitute positions, we can do that through attrition because obviously our drivers – there is large turnovers here. There is multiple ways to cut this back in the future if so desired. Right now, I'm most concerned about the service level we're providing in not providing the residents the ability to get to their jobs, to go get food. This is a critical service for residents of the County. To have this opportunity to pay for this and get drivers in the door to not only help with our Saturday service, but we're also talking about Medicaid rides going to the doctors' appointments, people going to work Monday through Friday, just trying to get to work that don't have access to their own private transportation. So this is a big deal. I think we're at the tip of the iceberg for Saturday service as the leading indicator of not being able to get these drivers. Not doing this is going to impact the County and we'll find steps in 2022 and beyond if the budget so calls for it but, we have an opportunity here to maintain what we should be doing and make sure the residents of the County are appropriately served through this. But we can also talk with Michelle. She'll definitely have more input on that.

Legislator Niebel: Brad, so the CARES Act covers – you have a grant for \$2 million dollars?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: I assume that it covers more than just the increase in costs for this reclassification?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: That's a lot of money, it goes for other things besides the increase in the reclassification from substitute to partial full time?

Mr. Bentley: I'll explain it at the high level here and then we can go through the details when we go through the CARTS division.

Legislator Niebel: O.k.

Mr. Bentley: The grant basically does not cover your existing local share. So if you said you were going to pay \$300,000 in local share for all of CARTS, you can't use CARES Act money to cover your projected existing local share. To the extent that your revenues were short, so let's say that we projected – the overall budget, let's say a million dollars, you predicted a \$1 million dollars of revenue. Due to COVID, you only brought in \$500,000. You can use that CARES Act funding to get your revenue back up to a million. So it covers your revenue shortfall so how you want to allocate your revenue to expenses that is not how the budget works, right. So you can say it covers something but it's really covering your revenue shortfall and so that's how you ask for reimbursement. So, the extent we're providing these services, as we go through the budget, we've projected cost and that will lead to the expected revenue shortfall. So, it's a little bit of a, we're projecting things to try and be somewhat normal so that we can ask for that reimbursement because otherwise if we reduce it, you can't ask for it because that's not your expected revenue. It's a little complicated from the CARES Act grant funding but it's different than the airports which was just, here's the money, go spend on whatever you want. This was very specific to revenue shortfalls, much like the New York subway or MTA. It goes towards their revenue shortfalls so it helps them balance their budget.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., I guess I had the impression that some of this money from the CARES Act would go to cover the increase in this reclassification.

Mr. Bentley: Because we're including into the 2021 budget, in the reclassification, now we can use it to ask for the reimbursement because we're increasing the revenues to pay for it, so on the balance sheet, right, you have an expense of the increased drivers.

Legislator Niebel: Correct.

Mr. Bentley: We're going to say well, we're going to cover it with the revenue from the CARES Act funding. So whatever ticket sales, whatever reimbursements from other funding sources, don't cover this, that decreases. Because we have a budget that expected it, we cannot use the CARES Act funding to pay for this.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., do you have an estimate or a projection as to how much of the CARES Act funding will be used to offset this?

Mr. Bentley: I believe it's a hundred and – what's the increase in revenues? I think that it might be better to go through in the details. The numbers are easier to see on the page because we actually have those in the budget.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., I guess my question is, how much of the CARES Act money is going to be used for this as opposed to other shortfalls in your budget?

Mr. Bentley: We forecast that we'll be able to fully cover the increase costs.

Legislator Niebel: With this –

Mr. Bentley: With the CARES Act funding and still have enough left over to pay for the other stuff. That is who the budget is currently set up, is that there is no additional local share, if you will. Two million dollars is a lot of money, right?

Legislator Niebel: It is.

Mr. Bentley: We are very happy with our work by the way and it's money until it runs out basically.

Legislator Niebel: And I'm sure it will be well spent.

Mr. Bentley: To provide the services for the County, absolutely. This is why I wanted to go through the FTE count. I think when you see the big number, we need to explain kind of how we got there.

The other increase was in the administration. We have some outdated antiquated computer systems that do our payroll in the DPF and it is been a challenge to keep it running. I'll equate this to the software that we use to pay out all these specifics in the CSEA 6300 contract. It's complicated and we used a program that was custom built and maintained by a 75 year old guy. We basically budget \$30,000 a year to maintain it. Every time there is a payroll change like the time off for voting, we would have to go to this guy to tell him you need to change the software program. Then it would crash and then we would disrupt payroll and then the systems that work with Mr. DeAngelo's AS400 stuff, that would crash so, we got to the point where we just couldn't maintain it anymore and we actually have to go to a manual method. So we did manual inputting and we're just finding that that's probably going to be the way we're going to have to go because we just don't have a solution that's there. I've been working with I.T. and payroll to gain more efficiencies but we're still in the manual method so it's put a strain on the administration of services personnel that I have left in our group. In order to get back to some assemblance of being able to do that in addition, I don't know, we talked about centralized purchasing but, that is no longer going forward. So some of the things I thought I was going to give to Kitty, are coming back to me and I gave up a person in that exchange. So I went down a person in trying to go to centralized purchasing and I'm not seeing the realization of that effect in efficiencies locked onto the payroll system manual efforts. So I put in the budget another payroll Account Clerk, Grade 2, low level just for data entering to help do some offloading of the administrative staff to get things done.

We talked about the FTE reductions at the airport, due to not budgeting for the EAS, so again, we can go through those details when we do the airports and we had some other allocations such as like Kathleen talked about, it's amazing how many people are allocated to different departments. I've tried to eliminate only to those that really makes sense to me. So we had some other little changes going on but, that's how you get to 15.52. O.k., so now I'll go to the Executive level summary.

As you can see personal services are the main driver of the up one million. Again, those are due to the contracts and the increases there. We've tried to minimize other increases in other areas. Principle and interest, those are due to the bonding for the heavy equipment. We are actually seeing some positive effects on our maintenance budgets for vehicles as we get newer vehicles in the shop, we're seeing less maintenance needs here. So hopefully that trend will continue.

Other line items, again, we'll go through the details but they are really small numbers in consideration of the \$30 million dollar budget. I think it's more important to go through the details than the summary as I've gone through a lot of it already. Any questions on the summary?

### **Engineering:**

If not, I think I'll step right into the first one on the list, Engineers. This is the staff of engineers that works on the roads, bridges, other things as asked, buildings, (*inaudible*), everything else under the sun that would require engineering services. Only some minor changes here. Again, personal services up due to the contract increase. We did eliminate no new computer purchases and reduced our operation supplies. So pens, pencils, and note pads, use what we have. Again, the employee benefits is due to the contract. So, any questions on the engineers?

Legislator Gould: The EX04, is a contract for computers, Kathleen?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Gould: It's strictly for computers so why is it in 21' if you are getting no computers of zero instead of \$16,000?

Mrs. Dennison: Which account are you looking at Jay?

Legislator Gould: EX04, under engineers.

Mr. Bentley: Oh, EX04, that contractual. That a compilation of a lot of things but it's operating supplies. We had some computers that needed to be replaced due to the Window's 10 upgrade. So we're not replacing any new computers in 2021 because we got some this year so we reduced the budget. We just don't forecast a line item continual computer replacement. We do it on a –

Legislator Gould: Does \$5,000, is that the cost you normally spend every year on computers or is it more than that?



Mr. Bentley: I think it varies. I think it depends on what I.T. says needs to be replaced. We've had some very old computers that they are saying you have to upgrade Window's 10 because you can't keep the old Window's system on our system. So we're hanging onto things as long as we can so it's really based on what I.T. tells us needs to be replaced. We use things until we can't so average costs –

Legislator Gould: So much of this engineering now is done on computers, that is why I question this a little bit. That maybe you should be doing computers every year with the engineers. (*Cross talk*) engineering is done on computers now.

Mr. Bentley: Just about all of it is. We have all of our CAD, auto CAD, all the drawings. I would say we're replacing computers this year and it's going to be a welcome site for that but I don't know that we need to replace them every year. I think we still can be on the cycle with I.T. I rely on the engineers to tell me what their needs are. So if they are really being hamstrung by their technology resources, we'll do that.

Legislator Gould: You can always go back to paper and pencil.

Mr. Bentley: I have some symbol rulers on my desk right now. We can always go back to some old technology at some point if we need to.

Legislator Gould: What are the other supplies in that account, Kathleen? Did you look at it?

Mrs. Dennison: You are talking about the \$1,000 in other supplies, for 1440?

Legislator Gould: Its 04, under engineers.

Mrs. Dennison: Within the 04 classification, there is a \$1,000 budget for other supplies for that department.

Legislator Gould: That's is the pencils and paper?

Mrs. Dennison: No, other supplies is equipment. Equipment items that are less than \$1,000 per piece so it can include printers, scanners.

Mr. Bentley: And we have several engineers so they have equipment that goes out in the field to measure stuff, to be able to take readings and surveys and equipment like that. There is some field equipment work as well.

Legislator Gould: Transits.

Mr. Bentley: Yep, laser levels. You need little toys that help the engineers. We bought a tool last year that really gained some big efficiencies. We used to have to send 2 engineers out to survey and we bought a tool that basically allows us to send one engineer out and he can set up

the tripod and take the readings and he can be out there by himself. So we've doubled the productivity through the purchase of one tool.

Legislator Gould: Yea, I've worked with those.

Mr. Bentley: We look for those opportunities to - that's how we get by with less. Each year we get cut a little bit more and more but we have to find these productivity efficiency gains and that was a big one. It's those types of things.

Legislator Gould: Thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: And that's all part of the contractual? Does that include all the software and stuff?

Mr. Bentley: Yes. So it's a very lean budget. Like I said, not much there but they do a good job with what they have.

Going onto Buildings & Grounds.

### **Building & Grounds – A1620**

Mr. Bentley: So, personal services are up and we talked about the position being added due to COVID, temporary cleaning that was required in 2020. We have seen the need to continue that for the buildings in here. It used to be that our cleaners worked the night shift to clean in here. We have split shifts now. We have cleaners during the day and night to do the extra cleaning in the elevators, the courthouse, there is just a lot of surfaces to have to go over on a daily basis. We've kept positions as temporary cleaning positions and we expect those to be reimbursed by FEMA. At the time the budget was put together, if that changes, then we certainly make adjustments to that as well because they are temporary. So, I think it's just a matter of what our requirements do and what the expectations of the FEMA reimbursements are. I think we're flexible but we plan to do this because I think we should plan to do this. The other two positions that we added were ones that from 2020, if you recall last year I was asked to eliminate two positions and I thought I had a plan to take care of that in the cleaning budget and 2020 rolled around and got COVID and those plans got shot. The reason I got asked that was because I wanted to add in two positions at the airport for EAS. Well, we did not get an EAS, and we did not add those two positions so, in my mind the accounting works such that I'm really not adding two positions, I just took it back the other way and said we're not adding it in the budget for 2021. So to me, it's not a net increase in my budget. It's just an accounting for which side of the ledger you want to be on for the EAS versus the cleaning. Right now I want to be on the cleaning side because that's a need and EAS is going to be what it's going to be when that gets figured out.

Legislator Niebel: That's the need right now currently but if things improve in 2021, possibly we can eliminate these 3 ½ new positions in 2022?

Mr. Bentley: Actually they are only funded part way through 2021, I believe. So right now we're only forecasting them in the first half of 2021. Again, we're expecting that to be reimbursed by FEMA.

Mrs. Dennison: But Brad, we might have to reevaluate that.

Mr. Bentley: I saw an email. I was wondering when you were going to chime in.

Mrs. Dennison: Since this is based on new information as FEMA just advised as of September 15<sup>th</sup>, cleaning or disinfecting of general work space is no longer reimbursable. So, I think we need to consider removing the positions that we added for the temporary cleaning and the associated funding because we're not going to get the funding.

Mr. Bentley: As Kathleen said, that just came out a couple of days ago so when this budget was put together -

Mrs. Dennison: Yea, when the budget was done, it was an allowable and reimbursable expense but it is not any longer.

Legislator Niebel: No problem, this is new information.

Mr. Bentley: Maybe tomorrow they come back and say, oh wait, it's still a problem, it's reimbursable.

Mrs. Dennison: Brad or maybe Drew, could you expand a little bit more on what was added that we anticipated would be FEMA funded and can we curtail those services or are they things that we're obligated to offer based on the landlords? I can't remember those details, sorry.

Mr. Bentley: I'm going to turn this over to Drew Rodgers of Buildings & Grounds.

Mr. Rodgers: Good morning. We did add, for 2020, we added some temporary cleaning positions in order to provide the split crew as Brad mentioned so that we had staff working during the day to disinfect commonly touched surfaces. They continue to go throughout lobby areas, door knobs, and bath room fixtures, anything that is seeing a lot of use. That is what we were anticipating having to continue into 2021. At least for the first half of the year was our basis of assumption going forward. In the buildings that the County leases, we did enter into agreements with the landlords for those same additional services they provide for the buildings so that we had that same service being provided throughout those buildings as well with the extra disinfecting.

Legislator Niebel: Did we have to pay extra for that?

Mr. Rodgers: Yes and that was a service that we were anticipating having the FEMA reimbursement on as well.

Chairman Hemmer: That's just added into the Building and Grounds budget under contractual?

Mr. Rodgers: Right, under those specific buildings. There is the Dunkirk DMV and the North County Office Building specifically.

Legislator Niebel: Guys, so if I have this straight, the extra FEMA funding for cleaning is just for the end of this year, not during 2021?

Mrs. Dennison: It's only through September 14<sup>th</sup>. We have asked the question just in the last week or so, there's the question of what do we want to do for the rest of this year? So we need to decide that but that's got a separate discussion. But yea, it will not be available in 2021 as of this time. But, we have also heard that these directives from FEMA, they change frequently so it's possible that it will be reinstated. I would not consider that likely but yea, the information that we have at this time is that those services are no longer reimbursable.

Legislator Nazzaro: So in the 2021 budget, you have that anticipated reimbursement through the first half of the year?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. The anticipated expense and the anticipated reimbursement.

Mr. Bentley: If you were to look on RE21, it's \$64,000. That is what we had forecasted.

Legislator Nazzaro: And that covered the expense just for 6 months or –

Mr. Bentley: The temporary cleaners, the 3 ½ positions.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then the plan was in July, they would be gone?

Mr. Bentley: Yea.

Legislator Nazzaro: The temporary cleaners?

Mr. Bentley: Yes, but we were going to react as needed. What does life look like June 30, 2021, I don't know.

Legislator Nazzaro: So the decision would be at some point -

Mrs. Dennison: But there should be, Drew and Brad, correct me if I'm wrong, but if we removed this function, there would be no local share effect because I mean, we added the positions and we added the funding to match.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: The funding totally offsets the increase in expense for the 3 ½ cleaners.

Mr. Bentley: Right, the temporary cleaners, yes.

*Unknown Speaker:* But you are not going to get the funding.

Mr. Bentley: Well, as of today's guidance. Tomorrow's guidance, it does seem to change. I think I would intend to agree once they said they are taking it away, how long is it going to be to reinstall it, but, what are the circumstances. Does COVID (*inaudible*) or does COVID get worse, what is the guidance from the CDC, what's the guidance from the State, what are the requirements they are going to put forth on us. I mean, if they continue to require us to do stuff –

Legislator Nazzaro: I mean the issue is, do we - I think we need to remove the funding because that is what we know today. Granted it can change but the most recent information we have is that the funding is not available now.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: So then the next decision is, do we keep the temporary cleaners and pay for it out of local share or do we eliminate those positions?

Mr. Bentley: There is the other downstream effect too. We eliminate the positions, you eliminate the cleaning.

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes it will or you'd have to –

Mr. Bentley: So there's - I know there is the monetary but there is also what you are doing to do for the building to keep them safe. Are we going to be o.k. with reducing the level of cleaning that we're doing today? That is a decision, I don't know that we're going to make here. But that is the effect of not budgeting for it. You're now not budgeting to do that extra cleaning and that needs to be thought through.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well, we could debate this but, I mean, at some point through our committee Mr. Chairman, we'll have to make a recommendation as far as the budget but I just want to say, if the amendment was to remove the additional cleaners as well, the directive may still be that we need to clean these buildings to be safe. You have to find a way to do it but, that's not my decision. Mine is the financial side of this.

Mr. Bentley: And it would be very difficult to do it without those cleaners. I'm not sure how you get it done. You eliminate the people doing the job, how do you do the job?

Chairman Hemmer: We'll have to take some money from somewhere else in the budget so another service would be effected. If it's a requirement that you have to continue that level of cleaning.

Legislator Nazzaro: But we don't need to debate that now.

Legislator Gould: Things could change in three or four months too.

Mr. Bentley: It might change next week.

Legislator Gould: You might not have to do it all year.

Legislator Nazzaro: Really it comes down to Mr. Chairman, a prioritization of functions. Where does this fall in our ranking of priorities? To your point, then you may have to redirect funding from another area or reduce expense in another area to cover the cleaning. Because we have to have our employees safe.

Chairman Chagnon: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for clarification. Does FEMA reimburse 100% of these expenses?

Chairman Hemmer: Yea, you have to spend the money and then ask for reimbursement.

Mrs. Dennison: Probably not. Seventy five.

Chairman Chagnon: Seventy five percent is our expectation.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: So in the budget, did we incorporate 75% reimbursement or 100% reimbursement?

Mrs. Dennison: Based on what Janelle just told me, it's 75%.

Chairman Chagnon: So if we eliminate the funding, we'd be eliminating 75% of the expense that is in the budget.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. The 100% of the expenses in there only 75% of the revenue so there is some local share expense already built into the budget, yes.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you.

Mrs. Dennison: You and Janelle are on the same wave length because she just sent me an email that said, the expense for the cleaners is more than \$64,000.

Mr. Bentley: As we know, (*inaudible*) changes weekly, daily sometimes and when you set up a budget, you think you know what the answer is and then you go, well, I'll be wrong by the time I get there. So, case in point.

The other thing on Buildings and Grounds is the Arc Flash Study. This was something that was submitted at the capital projects and was recommended that it be put into the operating side. I know that PJ had expressed during my review with him the importance and the safety aspect of this. Arc Flash is in the equipment here. Can lead to serious safety concerns and he referenced something happening at the Jamestown Schools. So, we added that cost into the contractual, I believe around \$40,000 out of the \$60,000 for that study. So, that is also part of the increase for Buildings and Grounds.

Legislator Nazzaro: Tell me again Kathleen or Brad, what is in other pay?

Mrs. Dennison: Other pay is shift differential.

Mr. Bentley: I should note that under equipment, I think we bought some new vacuum cleaners for the cleaners last year and since they last more than a year hopefully, we don't need to buy new vacuum cleaners. So we reduced our equipment budget to – again, it goes to, we're turning over every rock trying to go, what do we need, what don't we need, and let's reduce the budget where we're not forecasting to need it. Another example of a small dollar amount but again, \$7,800 is – it all adds up. Any other questions on Buildings and Grounds?

Legislator Odell: Just a quick question for Director Bentley. Brad as part of just going back a few years to and I'm glad Drew is here too, the milestone attainments for the Clean (?) (*inaudible*) Communities grants that we got from NYSERDA, one of which was, benchmarking of buildings and energy audits and between that and recent HVAC improvements and updates that we've done, are we seeing a realization in some decrease costs from that in your opinion?

Mr. Rodgers: We're seeing some. We're looking to gain more. We're hoping to do an energy based project and upgrade some lighting. But we have seen some decrease in the electric use with the fan (*inaudible*) unit replacements. It's not something that is going to be glaring, I don't think but the efficiencies are improving.

Legislator Odell: Bushel full of pennies, right? Thanks.

Mr. Bentley: I'll just add onto what you guys are talking about. We continuously look for the grant opportunities, and again, I want to thank Mr. Odell for the electric vehicles that we purchased but along with that grant funding, it's also looking at doing light replacements at the Falconer Shop, replacing all our outdoor lights with LED's so we continue to try and find these areas where it's a little here and a little there and even though we're talking about in here is replacing all the CFL's with LED lights and trying to capitalize that savings. So we have a proposal, we're making progress but with COVID things have - we haven't gotten as far as I hoped but we're going to continue to press towards those efficiencies. I know that every day we try and every day we make it a little bit further. Just keep moving forward and make sure you don't go backwards.

Legislator Odell: Duly noted and appreciate it Brad, thank you.

Mr. Bentley: Anything else for Buildings & Grounds?

### **Jamestown Airport**

Mr. Bentley: Here you see some of the changes due to some of the stuff that we have talked about, elimination of the EAS budget for personnel but we also have the offset of the contract increase. We are also increasing the admin position at the airport. As many people here have heard Mr. Almeter speak about the need for someone that can help with contract administration up at the airport to manage these FAA grants and New York State grants such that

we can get these hangars rebuilt, get the refurbishments, because these are grants that are funded in a large portion by the Federal government or the State. Some 90/95% and making use of those grants goes a long way to maintaining the viability of the airports and the equipment as well as meeting our obligations of these grant funds to maintain a public airport.

Equipment, there is a requirement for some of our parts cleaner, so there are a lot of parts and pieces at the airport so they have to buy a piece of equipment there.

Contractual, we have tried to actually reduce the operating expenses in the contractual we have in there but we do need to rent a man lift as one of the capital items did not look like it was going to be funded so in order to get to the lights in the hangars, we need to be able to rent a piece of equipment that can get up to it. So for those who have been in a hangar, it's not a 10 foot step ladder. It's a 40 foot scissor lift that they need. We're also working very hard to bring broadband to the Jamestown airport, believe it or not. There is not internet service up there that that we can consider reasonable. So we're working with DFT and I think we just got a fairly reasonable solution from DFT that we're trying to implement at a very reasonable cost. But we have found ways to with some of the additions, to overall lower the contractual. Again, the benefits go down with the elimination of the positions there. On the revenue side as we see goes up a little bit. Part of that was the CARES Act funding for 2020 but the other things for the revenue were the positive changes, we have a new FBO and they are doing an excellent job of maintaining the facilities and running the fixed based operator duties. We have new leases going through as it's been going through the legislature with (*inaudible*) and the new Chase Aviation one that is coming up. So those are forecasted in the 2021 budget. Again, small wins lead to bigger outcomes so we continue to try and make those small wins. Any questions on Jamestown?

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm just trying to understand here Brad and you may have answered it and I was paying attention, when I look at salaries now and I know I have to be careful when comparing but if I go into the detail and Kathleen, maybe this is more directed for you or Brad but the base pay for the Jamestown Airport, the adopted budget was two sixty eight, the amended budget was dropped down to one ninety seven. Am I reading that right?

Mr. Bentley: Remember, we eliminating two positions due to EAS.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right but then –

Mr. Bentley: Which is the major decrease but then you have the offset.

Legislator Nazzaro: Explain again why we're going back up to two seventy two? The overview is \$272 in the 2021 tentative budget for the Jamestown Airport is \$272,000 in salaries but we eliminated the 2 EAS positions, so why am I seeing those savings in the 2021? What am I missing?

Mrs. Dennison: You say, why you not seeing them?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes, why am I not seeing it?

*Unknown Speaker:* There was only one position eliminated (*inaudible*).....



Legislator Nazzaro: And so why are we keeping that?

Mr. Bentley: As you've heard Ron talk about the increase maintenance due to the prior FBO, operator leaving some of our stuff not in the condition we think it should be in and again, we trying to recoup some of those costs of that additional work that needs to be done, but we have requirements to maintain the buildings. So, one position down but we also increased the admin position up a little bit and then we put on top of that the CSEA contract increases. So there is a lot of things working their way up and we only took one thing down.

Chairman Hemmer: The admin position is not filled as of yet, right? The new position at the airport?

Mr. Bentley: Right. We actually have a candidate. I think there is an interview set up for next week.

Mr. Almeter: We did the interview this morning and she accepted.

Chairman Hemmer: So now the admin position is filled. Beginning in 2021 or beginning

Mr. Bentley: So in 2020, this admin position has been open and was not taken out for COVID so we've been realizing the savings over the first 9 months so we can use that savings and it still probably is going to come in under budget. This is new information for me so we're real timing it here. I assume there is a discussion that we'll have to talk to with the other person supervisor to do a turnover responsibility.

Legislator Nazzaro: Ron, is that a part time position or full time?

Mr. Almeter: It's a full time position, Grade 17.

Legislator Nazzaro: So in the 2020 budget originally we had 2 full time positions for EAS?

Mr. Almeter: We had one FTE at Grade 6.

Legislator Nazzaro: One FTE in the 2020.

Mrs. Dennison: That's the Account Clerk position Ron. I think Chuck was asking about EAS.

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes, I'm just trying to get my arms around – I understand that you are adding this other position but then we don't have EAS, I just would have expected to see the salary expense to be lower than it is.

Mr. Bentley: So last year and to deal with these high level things, we over simplify what actually happens in reality and so, the over simplification was 2 positions needed for EAS.

While it really was a combination of EAS and other needs at the airport, but you don't continuously talk about half a person. It gets lumped into a rounding factor. So unfortunately last year, it got rounded into 2 positions for EAS which was not really true. There were needs for other stuff at the airport and we made by without that other half need and Ron has been working very hard with less than optimal staffing and gets by. So, in the budget, we only eliminating one position because you can't eliminate a half of a position. We have to work with round numbers here. So, in the budget, we eliminated one position there but he still had need, so we're putting that back in so that the airport can run efficiently and the maintenance can be done on the buildings. When it comes to the contract administration, Ron needs help up there to administer these contracts so that we don't fall behind, so we don't miss opportunities to go after this money that is sitting out there just for us. Mr. Odell can certainly speak to all the opportunities that Ron puts on the table. We can do better if we have the right people in place. So this is the amount and as I talked about earlier, we've cut too far and it's affecting our ability to do a good job and we need to get these people back in the places they need to be in so that we can run the airports properly. I think the over simplification causes confusion and its unfortunate.

Mrs. Dennison: And Brad isn't it also true that maybe EAS positions in the 2021 budget, there is two positions but their each only .65, so, like Brad is saying, we're talking about 2 positions but when you look at the FTE's and the dollars, it's really 1.3 position.

Mr. Bentley: Thank you, I had forgotten about that complication as well. So, we're really not dealing with whole numbers here. It's more complicated but for purposes of discussion today, I tried to simplify it in terms that are easy to understand without going through the nuisance budget of the .6. It goes on what do we need to run the airport and what do we need to make sure we're taking advantage of all the opportunities we can to get - take advantage of stuff that's out there. I mean, these grants are 90/95% funded, a lot of them. So, we need to be able to do this and execute on them. Right now, I think we can do better.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you. One more question on the airport. In the 2020 amended budget we showed a projected departmental income of \$154,000, now in the tentative we're showing \$104,000. I don't like to look at that last column compare because that's to the adopted budget so we have amended budget so my question is, what income did we have in the 2020 amended budget that's not in the 2021 tentative budget? I just wonder how we came up with the \$154,000.

Mr. Zafuoto: It would be the CARES Act funding (*cross talk*) amended.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k.. Kathleen, was that it? I always look to you for the final – Sam, I believe everything you say –

Mr. Bentley: It took me a minute to process your question. But yes, the reduction is because we got the CARES Act funding in 2020 and not in 2021.

Legislator Odell: You'll see a similar adjustment when we get to Dunkirk too for that \$30,000, I'm sure.

Mr. Bentley: Yes, I believe that is the dollar amount.

Chairman Hemmer: So there is some CARES Act funding that is going to come in, 21'?

Mr. Bentley: No.

Legislator Nazzaro: There is funding in 2020, but not in 2021.

Mr. Bentley: Unless they pass the HERO's Act or whatever Act that makes stuff available for airlines. So if there is additional funding that comes out from Congress, we might see some but we're not budgeting that because why would you? We don't know the state of affairs that is going to happen. We try and budget conservatively on the revenue side and not be to overly optimistic on potentials.

Legislator Nazzaro: So the important thing to look at now is that, local share for the Jamestown Airport did go down by \$104,000 compared to the 2020 adopted budget.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's higher than 2019, what was actual. The local share was five twenty nine. O.k., thank you.

### **Dunkirk Airport**

Mr. Bentley: Actually very similar situation because the positions are allocated between Jamestown and Dunkirk. Some are split like Ron and Brian so a lot of the same explanations hold for Dunkirk as well as the admin position. Again, we're contractual, we're trying to (*inaudible*) operating expenses. I congratulate Ron on doing an excellent job of turning over every stone in his budget trying to find all the little wins and I think he's done a really good job. I actually told him he cut a little too far because I thought he was hamstringing his ability to actually do required work. Ron is the over achiever of the group as always. Employee benefit, again, departmental income is, as we just talked about, the CARES Act funding is part of the reduction. We did, in 2020, we're switching over from the FBO from CRIDIC to Sentric(?), so that is the forecast revenues. I think that we've done a really good job of putting this in. We're seeing actually increased traffic and increased fuel sales at Dunkirk due to their operations. It's actually on the upswing. If everybody wants to know the details, go to the next Airport Commission meeting but, we have a lot to go through today but -

Legislator Odell: Which is going on right now by the way.

Mr. Bentley: There is a lot of good stuff going on at the Dunkirk Airport and that's thanks to Ron and his team and the new FBO. I think we're making the changes that are making the difference. That are making operations more efficient. I think we're getting a reputation as a well-run airport within the commuter industry, the private plane industry. There are compliments going around, we tend to have low cost, low lease rates compared to others. It's kind of like the landfill. People will flock to those that provide a good service at a good value and that is what we

do. We provide the good value and we're seeing the returns on that and we've hired a good FBO operator that has made a world of difference. So I think that decision and that outcome really benefits us.

Legislator Nazzaro: And I just have to say real quickly, I visited both airports and when I went to Dunkirk and I had not been up there in a while, since you've been on Brad, and I was very impressed. When I saw the large private jet come in from Naples, Florida, there is more activity there than what you think. The fuel farm and all that are certainly on the uptick so Ron, I don't know if you are still there but you are doing a great job, thank you. And you too Brad.

Mr. Bentley: It goes to support the local businesses up there. I know a number of major manufacturers up there who use the Dunkirk Airport and I think it leads to keeping jobs in Chautauqua County. It's an asset that if it wasn't there, might have different outcome for some of these businesses. It's worth investing in.

Legislator Odell: Exactly the point Brad. Just expound a little bit Mr. Chairman if that's o.k. with you. As Chairman of the Airport Commission and Vice Chair Hemmer over here, I'm sure he will back me up, the airport has been a challenge over many, many years but with Ron at the helm, his biggest problem is he's been cutting budget as best as he can being tight and we were able to upgrade the admin position to something that will hopefully stick as there's been a little turnaround there, Sam over here has been in and out of that chair so much over the last few years helping with the contracts and shepherding it but having that position there will help us grow. We're just doing the basic triage. Ron would never admit it, he's a hard worker but we're just doing the bare minimum we can but, the fuel farm is online and functional and the telephone network is working now. We're seeing expedient wins there, jet traffic, plane traffic coming from all over, Jet A and (*inaudible*) that's amazing and word gets out. You have a 6,000 foot runway with not too much traffic and easy to get in and out of, we're not in a fog machine like we are in Jamestown, words spreads about that pretty well. Leases for Chase, that's a great welcome, Sentric(?) is doing great, Luscome(?) is moving, this is all good. So again, as Brad said, this is an investment. As I was looked at from that, it's payback on investment of the two airports about a million bucks. The wins are expedient for the business community especially with Cummings, Purina, Athenx too –

Mr. Bentley: Institution, it's everything. Any other questions on the airports? If not, will go onto CARTS.

### **CARTS**

Mr. Bentley: If I don't answer your questions, Terry, from what we deferred later, just bring it back to me.

Mrs. Dennison: I think we have the answer Brad.

Mr. Bentley: Good. Personal services, as we talked about moving the drivers up so you see the contract increase but along with that is the movement of the substitute partial full time. On the contractual, we did not renew the Team Services as it was a redundant service so that

saved some money. This is the first time that I get to talk about it but fuel pricing. As we figure out what to use for fuel pricing for 20/21', over the two years I've been here in trying to implement a process by which we have a standard methodology for trying to estimate what fuel prices are, as with any forecast, you are always wrong, so, I did not want to budget and so what my standard methodology was, using the last 12 running months. So, at the time it was put together that was the period ending June 30, 2020 going back from July 1, 2019, but in that second half of that period from January to June, 2020, we have COVID and we saw oil prices go negative and we saw fuel prices go to the downside that if we see that again, I'll be amazed. So I did not want to artificially include those numbers were we have a low budgeted cost incorporated in to it and then in reality when we get to 2021, with more normal pricing, everybody is going to be over budget. So, I decided to use the calendar year 2019 as the proxy. That seemed to come out in a reasonable range. So the fuel pricing that was made in 2019 for the 2020 budget, so this year's budget, was \$2.40 for diesel and \$2.10 for unleaded. When you do the calendar year 2019 going to 2021, it comes out to be \$2.25 for diesel and \$2.04 for unleaded. So it does go down but it doesn't indicate a very sharp decrease as if you would have incorporated COVID type numbers into it. I feel that was reasonable, that was the guidance I gave and still feel that is a reasonable decision at this point.

Legislator Nazzaro: So you are using the two –

Mr. Bentley: The \$2.25 and \$2.04 versus \$2.40 and \$2.10. So it does show a decrease and what holds tomorrow, who knows. I think fuel prices around here have stabilized to a point. We'll see what the next destabilization factor is, up or down. But for budget purposes, I did not want to basically put in everybody's budget a really low number and then they were going to be over budget in this item very quickly if pricing somehow went up. I think for now, we're still under that amount slightly so I think it's still a good forecast methodology. What I'm trying not to do is just (*inaudible*) I'm trying to work with a methodology and keep to it. So it's really using the rolling month average and if we have an anomaly, I think we need to address that. That was a little bit of an advance feature going into some of the other departments and divisions. CARTS uses a lot of fuel, runs around a lot. They get impacted by up and downs quite quickly so that's also part of the decrease in the contractual.

Legislator Gould: Is it all bought under the State bid and does the State bid change mid-year or does that last all year?

Mr. Bentley: We are under contract with NOCO.

Mr. Zafuto: Yes, it's through the OGS contract through NOCO and the pricing changes weekly.

Legislator Gould: Why isn't it bought under State bid?

Mr. Zafuto: It is, it's under a New York State contract.

Mr. Bentley: The OGS is the State bid.

Legislator Gould: But it changes weekly?

Mr. Zafuto: Yes, it's updated weekly.

Legislator Gould: I didn't realize that.

Mr. Zafuto: Yes, the gas and diesel are updated and propone.

Mr. Bentley: There is no one out there that want's to commit to supplying fuel a year round at a certain price. You would have a bid that would be so high, they have (*inaudible*) –

Legislator Gould: I didn't think that it could change under a State bid.

Mr. Bentley: It's just like escalation in contracts. When we go out and do paving, there is an oil escalation feature within those contracts because they will bid a project but depending on the price of oil at the time of the projects done, there is built in escalation and de-escalation. It will work in the County's favor some days and works against, but, you don't want to walk in up here and then go through the rest of the year and you could have bought – so it's not always directionally against the County. Having weekly could actually favor the County. As we saw when COVID hit, if we would have locked in at \$3.00 and now pricing is at a \$1.00 which we saw, we would have lost that if we would have been a yearly contract versus a weekly. So some ways you are going to win, some ways you are going to lose but I think overall, we wanted it to be representative of cost, we don't want to be in the speculation business. We don't want to speculate on oil and gas futures. We provide a service and we would want to provide it at that cost and be as most efficient as we can. So that's why I think weekly is more than acceptable and for that matter, I don't know that too many fuel suppliers are going to want to take the stance of being out a year with the fuel.

Chairman Hemmer: So we're adding 11 drivers but we're not really changing the contractual expense from one year to the next. So you are planning on running about the same number of miles even though you have 11 more drivers.

Mr. Bentley: So this is where it gets complicated. We didn't add new drivers, we reclassified. Substitute drivers that were already driving 30 hours for us to partial full time that they are going to continue to drive 30 hours a week. So the real increase is in the benefits because we're putting them in a benefit position.

Mrs. Dennison: Janelle and I checked the numbers for those 11 positions or 15 positions, total of 11.49 FTE's. For those 15 positions, the wages, it's almost an exact transfer from substitute to wages. The substitutes went down \$379,000, substitute wages, new wages went up \$364,000 but there is fringe costs associated with those 15 positions is \$186,000. There was some fringe associated with substitutes in general because well, they have payroll taxes and some of them have retirement. Overall those 15 positions, just doing a quick look, looks like the additional expense is \$171,000 associated with changing those positions to full time. But the other comment I would add is, a lot of that is health insurance because they get health insurance but under the Affordable Care Act, even if a person was a substitute, if that person averaged 30

hours a week of employment, they are eligible for health insurance. So that would have been something that was not budgeted but still a potential expense and Michelle correct me if I'm wrong but, they'd be eligible if they averaged 30 hours a week.

Mrs. Westphal: Correct.

Chairman Hemmer: Is that the definition of partial full time, 30 hours a week, or 31 hours a week or something like that?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: And again going back to my analogy with the part time Correction officers, the part time Correction officer, if he averages 1,560 hours in a year, in the look back period, we are obligated to provide health insurance for the entire next calendar year. I say that applies to part time positions throughout the County. If they work 1,560 hours during that look back period which happens to run from October through September, we have to provide them health insurance for the next year as long as they stay employed. It's kind of again, with the Correction officers' analogy, we looked for years at Correction officers, at a part time Correction officer, yes, he cost less per hour than a full time Correction officer but you can't find them. You cannot get the people to take the job so that's why in the Jail eventually they added, I think it was 6 full time positions because it doesn't matter if it's cheaper to get part time CO if you can't get one. So using that example, paying overtime because there weren't enough part timers and so I would say the CARTS situation is the same thing.

Ms. Crow: That would be accepting like an agreement. Whatever their proposal is, that is what (*inaudible*) County Executive as far as the agreement.

Mrs. Dennison: Was that Kitty?

(*Cross talk*)

Legislator Nazzaro: I thought she was explaining it.

Legislator Niebel: I don't think so, she wasn't trying to help you out Brad.

Mr. Bentley: I don't think so. I would like to – that's an excellent question so I just want – that's why I went through the FTE's early in the summary. I want to make sure everybody understands. We are not adding 11 or 15 positions. We are reclassifying. So it's not new, it's just a way to attract drivers because we're having a problem.

Legislator Niebel: The big change is not in salary but in fringe benefits. The substitute drivers are not entitle to fringe benefits, the, what is it, partial full time?

Mr. Bentley: Partial full time.

Legislator Niebel: Partial full time are. The difference now is about \$171,000?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. And Michelle just verified this. We still have a significant expense for substitute drivers because there are still drivers that are not in that partial full time classification. So, getting back to the initial question, o.k., so we have CARES Act to fund it in 2021, what happens in 2022? Short answer is, we don't know but I think the longer answer is, we kind of have to stay with this because otherwise we don't have any drivers.

Legislator Nazzaro: We are adding here. I'm not disagreeing with that we're doing but we have to be honest with ourselves here. We're adding reoccurring costs beginning in 2022 without funding.

Mrs. Dennison: Without guaranteed funding correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: The question I have, I've heard different numbers here, we have 15 positions that are being reclassified from substitute drivers to partial full time which equates to about 11.5 FTE's so just curious now, how many drivers do you have? Who gets to become the substitute full time or who gets to become the partial full time and who remains as a substitute driver? My only concern with this is that we're adding reoccurring expenses about \$170,000 minimum per year using our current benefit percentage.

Legislator Niebel: But he said through attrition, they could go back to substitutes.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm not convinced of that comment, that we'd go back to substitute.

Mr. Bentley: I'll just say this. As I stated when I first got up here, we have cut so much, we have not added - we're down to critical levels. We are going to have to reduce services and right now we've already reduced Saturday service and we're going back to where we were before we added it. If we continue to not find drivers, we may have to exit the business at a certain point and the County will be left with no public transportation. I think that is a disservice to the County. That incremental dollars that we are talking about, provides such a radical difference in everybody's lives and we're talking 2022. We don't know what is going to happen. The economy could rebound, we could have a lot of opportunities, we could have additional rounds of funding from grants and I'll (*inaudible*) the benefits of what Michelle and her team are doing. We've gotten not only the CARES Act funding, but we've also gotten this Modernization Grant, we got opportunities to probably pay for some of this stuff through additional grants. So, it's a little bit of a leap of faith but it's a leap of faith for the benefit of our residents, of our tourism industry. We're looking at getting trolley's for here. It's much like the airports, it's an investment but it's also a required service for doctors' appointments, for people to get to work, it's Medicaid rides, it's private pay for those that just don't have access to private transportation. We have a lot of elderly population. How do they get to the doctors' if they don't have a person to help them?

Legislator Nazzaro: And Brad, I'm not against the program at all. I'm very supportive of the program. I'm with ya on the program. I just want to understand as this is a little bit new direction we're going in, which I'm not disagreeing with. I understand the difficulty getting CARTS drivers but I just want to make sure that everyone else understood that this is going to be a reoccurring expense. Michelle, I will ask you then, what if the decision has to be made, what if



in 2022 if we don't have the funding, to me it would be very difficult to go back to have substitute drivers. I just think we have to be honest with ourselves and I'm not saying you're not, I would find it to be difficult and you have to also deal with the Affordable Care Act, the requirements there, the look back period that you have regardless of what you do.

Mrs. Westphal: Correct. It would be difficult to go back to substitute drivers. The problem is, it's a national shortage of drivers so for example, we've hired a couple of different drivers who come for training and then they just disappear. So, if we did this, we would also be saving money in training time and physicals, less physicals that we would have to pay for, less drug and alcohol tests we have to pay for so some of it is offset.

Mr. Bentley: And the training is not cheap.

Mrs. Westphal: No.

Mr. Bentley: Because you have to go through 19A certification.

Legislator Nazzaro: You have to have a CDL, right?

Mrs. Westphal: You have to have a CDL and we do that on the job training so everybody we train to get their CDL's and then they leave for a full time position because they get the benefits. So that's where this would help a great deal.

Mr. Bentley: It's about the retention of this service.

Legislator Niebel: Brad, because you will have drivers that will retire, quit, or whatever, so as those partial full time drivers either retire or quit or whatever, through attrition you will be able to go back and reclassify some of these people as substitutes. I mean, I understand where you are coming from Chuck but I guess there is a possibility that they can do that.

Mrs. Westphal: We've done that in the past. We used to have 15 partial full time positions and now we're down to 6 because we were able to fill those positions with part time drivers. Unfortunately now, we just can't.

Legislator Nazzaro: The big factor is the COVID obviously as you said because you have a lot of older drivers, retirees and I don't blame them one bit. There is a CARTS bus that goes a block up from me and they have the masks on and they are older drivers. I certainly understand that.

Mr. Bentley: We have a large turnover rate on our CARTS drivers as a normal course of business.

Mrs. Westphal: We lost several drivers because of the COVID.

Mr. Bentley: Even without COVID.

Mrs. Westphal: Without COVID, definitely. I can't tell you off the top of my head.

Mr. Bentley: Sam can probably tell you the RPC's. We average a couple every six months.

Mrs. Westphal: At least.

Mr. Bentley: There are going to be opportunities to readjust the equation.

Chairman Hemmer: How is our ridership? You said that COVID knocked it down but before COVID, was it coming up or remaining steady?

Mrs. Westphal: We were doing really well before COVID. We were up to about 200,000 rides a year and we dropped with COVID but it's slowly, gradually rising up. We're only at about 35% down now where during COVID, the main part of it we were at 60%.

Mr. Bentley: It's not where it was but again, we're not running Saturday service so that impacts our numbers. I'll get on my soapbox one more time for here, CARTS. I've taken the opportunity to ride CARTS, I've talked to our customers, I encourage as many people to go see the airport, go ride a CARTS bus. If you don't know how, we have a Mobility Manager to educate and take your own time to talk to the guy, the people that ride the bus. Find out what they do, why they are riding the bus, what their story is. I will tell you that you will find amazing stories about people that chose not to have private transportation because this service is available. I've talked to a family, husband, wife, and two young kids on a Saturday and they were taking their kids to the eye doctor because we had that. Otherwise they were going to have to walk or bum a ride from somebody. Ask someone who is going to the grocery store to Wegman's when we had the Saturday service, their alternative was a \$10.00 Uber ride. I don't know if you can get those now but think of that, that's each way and you have to wait. If you are sitting there with cold food, how do you do that? I can't imagine the life that they have to go through to do standard stuff that we take for granted. So, I encourage you. It will make a difference in your life talking to the people that ride our busses and what this service means to them. It made a difference to me. I thought I knew but I really didn't. It's truly amazing the stories that you hear from those 200,000 riders. I know that's why Michelle does it and Michelle is so powerful in the way she approaches the job, how the riders compliment – we get so many amazing compliments from the riders about our drivers, how we do it and we do it on such a limited budget and we do it with such limited things but we provide such a tremendous service to the County. Again, why is it important? For \$100,000, it's important. I'll spend that money every day to do this. I can't think of a better place to do that.

Legislator Niebel: Plus, in State and Federal aid, we receive about \$3 million dollars per year.

Mr. Bentley: Yes, and that's not including the grants that we obtain. You throw \$2 million dollars of CARES Act, you throw another \$4.5 million in the Modernization grant, it's a lot of money but it's the service, it's about the people.

Legislator Odell: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to ask that question about the Modernization Act, which is great. That was a great press release, great event you had for marketing and rebranding of it, and it helps it grow. Was any of that revenue shown in here in this budget yet or we're not at the contract state yet?

Mrs. Westphal: We don't have the contracts back yet.

Mr. Bentley: It's close though.

Mrs. Westphal: We (*inaudible*) on our end and now we're waiting for the State to send it back.

Legislator Odell: So we'll see an amendment adjustment but for the betterment. Thank you.

Mr. Bentley: Sorry for my soapbox on CARTS but I had to get on it. Anything else?

Legislator Nazzaro: I was just going to ask about the cleaning of the busses. What is that inflicted on you? I mean obviously with COVID, what are the requirements and are those costs reimbursed? You have to clean the busses after.

Mrs. Westphal: Yes. All of that right now is being reimbursed through the CARES Act. I can submit all of our expenses and get that back to the CARES Act. Right now what we are doing is a deep cleaning in the morning when they get on their busses. They clean in between passengers and then we bought electric static sprayers and they spray the busses down at night and then it sits overnight.

Mr. Bentley: We've also installed Plexiglas partition glass between the driver and passengers. They can reach around for the fare box but I think that's – again, covered by the CARES Act funding and we recently got 12 new busses. So we'll be retiring some of our older busses and we have 12 new ones that will be on the road.

Mrs. Westphal: Some of them are on the road. We have two left to get out.

Mr. Bentley: We're seeing the benefits.

Legislator Niebel: But I think the cleaning is done by the drivers, isn't it?

Mrs. Westphal: Correct.

Mr. Bentley: Yea, there's (*cross talk*) to do it because they are on the runs.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., there is basically no additional cost because the drivers are doing the cleaning.

Mr. Bentley: There is some added time at the end of the day but there is cleaning supplies.

Legislator Niebel: Understood but we're not paying extra people to do it, the drivers are taking care of this.

Mrs. Westphal: Correct.

Mr. Bentley: Thank you Michelle. SUNY, this is also associated with CARTS. They forecasted a reduction in their bus runs and it's just a pass through for us. If there are no questions on that, we'll go to Parks.

### **Parks**

Mr. Bentley: Parks is made up of Erlandson, Luensman, and the overland trails, waterway trails, reforestation properties, so there is a lot of things in Parks that we have to maintain and address. Looking at 2020, we had the Parks closed for the majority of the year due to COVID and part of that was also a cost saving measure. At Luensman and Erlandson, we have contracts with neighbors that have to open the park and so we took out but we basically didn't have the people to maintain the parks. We didn't hire any seasonal employees in the highway department or the Parks department or at the landfill so, seasonal employees were our main method of maintaining the parks in the summer. They do a lot of the mowing and regular maintenance. Other than that we have once Supervisor and half of a road maintainer in the budget. So, we run our parks on one and a half employees full time. Well, one is a full time employee, half of another and some seasonal employees. So if you don't hire seasonal employees, you have to reduce the services. We did open the parks, I think it was August 1<sup>st</sup> under a reduced – the bathrooms weren't open, so we're not doing any of the bathroom maintenance. We tried to mow where we can but it's really limited services, no large gatherings. We get regular requests for weddings and graduation parties and we've had to deny them but they are open to the public to November 1<sup>st</sup>. So if you do want to go see your park, you have a couple of weeks left to go up to it. We have managed to provide some level of service. We're continuing that going forward in the budget as if we are going back to normal for the seasonal employees and our one full time and one half time employee. Increase in personal services due to the contract, that's really what that is. Equipment, I've asked the Supervisor, who actually reports now to the District Supervisor in Falconer, to really look at the equipment that they basically need. If anybody has been on the waterway trail lately, they know there are a lot of trees in there and we need to go out and start doing that. I'm hearing a lot of complaints. But again, its manpower and resources and the only way to get out there is a boat and the boat needs a motor, motor isn't working so we need to buy a boat motor and a trailer to get the lawnmowers out to there in a safe manner. We deferred to purchase the trailer from 2020 to 2021 because we didn't really need it. We weren't doing enough maintenance so, again, just turning over the little stones and trying to defer what we can wherever we can.

Contractual, the decrease there was the -

Mr. Zafuto: It was just a cost (*inaudible*). Some of those maps that we were going to do because we do them in-house now.

Mr. Bentley: We looked at – like I said, this is all about turning over every little stones so there are a lot of little stones. (*Cross talk*), fuel savings, some map reproduction costs. Where we can save, let's do the basics.

Legislator Nazzaro: And we talked about that property tax item last year.

Mr. Bentley: That's forestry.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, I'll get to that later. I will say when I have the mike –

Mr. Bentley: We don't pay taxes on the Parks.

Legislator Nazzaro: I've been to Erlandson's several times but I have not been at Luensman's park but, my wife and I, and granddaughter went there back at the end of August and I was surprised by the amount of people there. I really was and the view is spectacular but, I admit, I had not been there. It was a beautiful day and I was very impressed by the way it was kept considering all of our past discussion on maintaining it. I was pleased.

Mr. Bentley: I will tell you the benefit of why- what improvements we've made in the structure that probably resulted in that outcome. I will say this that on our parks email, hotline, or phone line, it was a daily borage of why aren't the park's open, every day. To your point about the use. It does get used and we hear about it when it is not open. We made a change about a little over a year and a half ago or year ago due to personnel moves of their choices. Provide an opportunity to move Parks reporting responsibility under the Highway department. It used to be combined with the airport. What I was finding was that, the Highway department had the equipment, had the manpower to assist the Parks but it was always not under the same header so it was two Supervisors having to coordinate workloads and that gets difficult. Everybody has their competing (*inaudible*) when there is limited resources asking someone to do something on their schedule is always – it's going to end in conflict and things just not getting done officially. So, what we did is, we moved the Parks department, the Supervisor that worked on it, under the Highway department. I will give all the credit to the guys doing the work and specifically Mike (*inaudible*) for accepting that added responsibility with no increase of pay to him, just added responsibility, but allowed him to shuffle resources. So, on days where maybe he doesn't have everybody needed out to do something, he can send guys out to the parks. It also give him, those two employees, if he's got an emergency on the highway. So what it does is, it allows flexibility without having it be formalized. When we got back having to do maintenance and trying to catch up, it wasn't a guy and a half trying to do it because there is no way that would have happened. So the Highway subsidized the Parks maintenance and that's o.k. I leave that up to Mike to optimize his resources and do things efficiently and I think that's worked out very well. So I have to give the credit to the guys that are – I give them the structure and they make it successful. I think you saw the result of that. Otherwise you probably would have seen a lot of tall grass.

Employee benefits, again that's the contract. So few employees, little change, depending on what their elections are. The biggest thing here is, I was told that the Parks usually gets \$150,000 out of the 3% occupancy tax, I was told to expect a haircut of \$15,600 so we budgeted that in there which results in an increase in local share because that's the only other place to get

that from. Again, when you're talking about one and a half employees that probably cost you around \$100,000, \$150,000 doesn't get you very far in doing maintenance for the rest of the year. So, this is, in my opinion, cut below what it needs to but, we do what we need to do.

Legislator Gould: Communications, I question communications. I don't see any phones in the parks. There is a communication line for them.

Mr. Bentley: The Supervisor has a cell phone or am I missing the question?

Legislator Gould: For that much money?

Mr. Bentley: Which one?

Legislator Gould: A.7110.4240, that's an expensive cell phone.

Mrs. Dennison: It's \$675.00.

Mr. Bentley: It's \$25.00 a month, right?

Mr. Zafuto: No, it's more than that. I think it's \$56.00 a month.

Mr. Bentley: That's the cost that I.T. gives us for a cell phone. If you are out in the parks and you are mowing by yourself and you –

Legislator Gould: I realize they need a cell phone but I just thought it was a lot of money for -

Mr. Bentley: I don't control the cost of the contract. That's provided to us by I.T. I mean, I have control over, as we've talked about, I've control of whether someone has a cell phone or not but I don't have control over the amount they charge me. I can't go tell them to give me a cheaper price.

Legislator Gould: You can't go get a cheaper one. You have to use I.T.

Mr. Bentley: Yea, I believe I'm required to.

Legislator Nazzaro: We have a contract with Verizon, correct?

Mr. DeAngelo: That's correct. We are on the New York State contract with Verizon and AT&T. Our data plans for our iphones are about \$34/35.00 a month. So, I mean there are some small taxes on there but not anything big so that's our monthly cost on those.

Legislator Gould: Still leaves \$300 roughly.

Mr. Zafuto: Those are (*inaudible*) charged, I'd have to look.

Mr. Bentley: Is there two cell phones maybe somewhere?

Mr. Zafuto: No, it's just Art's and then –

Mr. Bentley: I may have to get back to you on that Jay. I'll find out.

Mrs. Dennison: Jon, (*cross talk*), can you comment on the differential between the monthly data charge and the total charge?

Mr. DeAngelo: For which division?

Mrs. Dennison: Parks, because we're looking at a budget of \$675 which is \$56.00 a month. So if the data is \$34/35, wondering what the other \$20.00 per month is.

Legislator Gould: Maybe there is more than one person out in the parks with a cell phone.

Mr. Bentley: If that is just the data, the regular cell phone is \$15.00 right?

Mr. DeAngelo: We do not tell departments what to budget for their cell phones. We tell them the monthly rate so could that be brought down a little bit? That would be up to DPF but I can tell you that I budget about \$40 a month per data line. There is no recurring costs for the phone itself, just the plan.

Mr. Bentley: Is there a charge for the voice? Maybe it was \$34 for the data, but, -

Mr. DeAngelo: I think you guys switched – I'm trying to remember what you did the past couple of years. You switched from just a regular flip phone over to an iphone, I think that might have been last year. So, our flip phones costs about \$15 to \$20 a month for just voice but the \$35 a month covers voice and data. I can check on line to see what you are being charged for if you give me a couple of minutes.

Mrs. Dennison: There is also a special charge in last year for \$230.00, 8811 telephone.

Mr. DeAngelo: One more quick comment on that. Like the phone cases and any chargers or anything like that would come out of that same account as well so you might see a little higher costs. I know that we've gone through quite a few phone cases with that particular line.

Mr. Bentley: I think I got it. We also get charged for the office phone for the Parks.

Legislator Gould: Office phone?

Mr. Bentley: Right because the Supervisor has a desk, phone and computer, so we get charged for the office phone that has to be allocated to the Parks. So that is also probably included in that line item.

Mr. DeAngelo: That should come out of 5910, I think, right, Kathleen? The office line? Not 4240.

Mrs. Dennison: There is no budget for 5910 for Parks.

Mr. DeAngelo: O.k. (*Cross talk*) account to see exactly what they are getting charged for.

Mr. Bentley: So I think part of it is the cell phone and the other part is the two office lines. We have a reservation phone, dedicated phone line that people call in just for the Parks just to reserve stuff.

Mr. DeAngelo: Yea, if you have a separate phone line outside of our County system which, I'm not sure, you might have that, that might come out of 4240 as well because there are a few outline locations. I think that might be one of them.

Mr. Bentley: So I don't that's just the cell phone cost.

Mr. DeAngelo: Yea, you are probably right on that.

Mr. Bentley: Do you want us to verify that with you or are you good with that explanation?

Legislator Gould: No, verify it.

Mr. Bentley: Alright, Jon.

Legislator Gould: I'll wonder the rest of my life if you don't.

Mr. DeAngelo: Will do. I don't want any undo stress.

Mr. Bentley: We'll try and get you an answer before the end of the meeting today.

Legislator Gould: If you don't know, email it to me.

Legislator Nazzaro: So Jon, so you said our average cost per cell phone per month is \$40.00?

Mr. DeAngelo: That's what I usually budget for. The Verizon New York State contract just dropped a little bit actually so officially it's \$32.00 per line.

Legislator Nazzaro: So how much, I didn't ask you when you went through your budget and I know it's allocated to each department but since we're on this topic, what is the County's expense per year for cell phones?

Mr. DeAngelo: Stand by.



Legislator Nazzaro: I know we talked yesterday and you said there was maybe around 500 cell phones? Maybe I heard that wrong.

Mr. DeAngelo: Well, that's what I said and then I went back to my desk and got some more data for the Sheriff, so, our monthly bill for Verizon is approximately between \$20-21,000 a month for all of our cell phone costs.

Legislator Davis: How many cell phones Jon are there?

Mr. DeAngelo: More than I said yesterday. Over 632 cell phones.

Legislator Nazzaro: Alright, thanks Jon. We were on that topic and - so the cost per phone now, I mean, that's a big savings. It went down from, on average -

Mr. DeAngelo: It dropped from about \$35 a month to \$32. That dropped our overall cell bill by about \$3,000 a month. So now it's around, before this, around \$23-24,000 and now we see more consistent around \$20,000 a month.

Legislator Nazzaro: But we had budgeted \$40 for each phone?

Mr. DeAngelo: That's what I do Terry. Like I said, we just tell the departments how much it costs per line and then they budget what they think is appropriate.

Mr. Bentley: (*Inaudible*) ... it's not free, you have to (*inaudible*) into your budget.

Legislator Niebel: I understand but the reduction from \$40 to \$32 is \$8 per phone time's roughly 600 phones, conceivably we could be saving \$48,000 per year just on the cell phones.

Mr. Bentley: But I think you need to factor in the purchase of the phones so its \$35 to \$32. He budgets \$40 because there is a \$5.00 a month, so I think your savings is only \$3.00 per month.

Legislator Niebel: Oh, o.k., is that it Jon?

Mr. DeAngelo: That sounds about right. He is right, the purchase of the phone can cost anywhere from zero to several hundred dollars depending on what the user wants and what the department approves and then on top of that, you have a protective cases which can cost again, anywhere between \$10 and \$40 and then additional chargers or anything like that on top of that. Those (*inaudible*) recurring costs, those are one-time costs but a recurring cost standpoint, you are talking \$32 a month.

Mr. Bentley: Alright, are we off cell phones and back to Parks? Jay, we'll get you the answer. O.k., so we talked about the reduction in occupancy tax and we do have some donations previewed to come for the October Legislature meetings. We received a request to donate \$500.00 towards capital projects. So we're going to put that in a resolution so that the money can

be reserved for capital projects and not go to operational costs. So we do get donations and hopefully we'll get more going forward as people see the need that we have.

Legislator Davis: Is there a standard fee for individuals who use the parks for weddings and things like that? Would they normally donate or is there a fee or is it free?

Mr. Bentley: Right now, it's free and then we ask for donations. I think the vast majority if not all, actually do donate.

Mr. Zafuto: Most of the weddings we get a check in the mail for \$20/25. Normally we get about \$25.00 for a wedding at the parks but that's if they (*cross talk*) ask for it. We just say, please consider making a donation for the County parks and trails.

Mr. Bentley: We could consider changing that structure but that would be something for the Parks Commission to consider and you have Mr. Hemmer here who could decide what he wants to do with that. Because that would be a change in the way we are doing things.

Chairman Hemmer: Are those donations reflected? That's the \$150 –

Mr. Bentley: That's kind of the average that we've been seeing.

Mr. Zafuto: That's for both parks. We have donation boxes at both parks and some people mail checks in now with the Falconer office.

Mr. Bentley: So we have someone wanting to donate \$500 towards capital type projects. So it wouldn't necessarily be reflected in here as it would go to prepared bridges or railings. So that money is not this part of the money. That money comes from profits made from timber harvest or oil royalties so the capital money is not this money. This is just to pay for salaries, equipment, lawn mowing, gas, just general repair stuff.

Moving onto forestry. Mr. Nazzaro I'm sure has a question or comment. I will (*inaudible*) the great job we did in forecasting our increase in tax revenue. We were off by –

Mr. Zafuto: Three hundred and forty one dollars.

Mr. Bentley: From what we, and again, it's almost impossible to figure out which way this is going to go depending on valuations and stuff, but, we are forecasting an increase of \$1,900 for 2021. In the budget we are also forecasting oil & gas royalties of \$7,000. If you remember, we came with a resolution this past year, someone wanting to restart oil & gas and obviously with COVID and negative oil pricing, he did not go out and produce very actively but I have talked to him and he's getting out there now and hopefully we'll see the fruits of that labor soon. But it was a delayed start because of a lot of circumstances. We are forecasting some revenue there. I don't think that we have any timber harvest money. Timber harvest usually you get – if you harvest a reforestation property, you're 15 to 20 years out before you can really go back and get any value.

Legislator Gould: Are we done with the timber harvest now? We were working on it a couple of years ago.

Mr. Bentley: We have one more property that's land locked and I'm trying to figure out how to get access to with the State because they are potentially doing a harvest nearby and I might be able to jump on it but yea, we have one more property that Forecon would recommend us maybe going after. They think there are some trees of value still in there. Some of the woods are not worth anything right now but there are some value out there.

Legislator Niebel: Is it in Arkwright?

Mr. Bentley: No, this one is over in Ellery, its number 11, but it's a land locked piece so we have to work with some neighbors to get to it.

I'm running behind but there is a schedule break on the agenda. I don't know what you want me to do. I can power through or we can take a break.

Chairman Hemmer: Let's do a 10 minute break.

Mr. Bentley: ....., increases are due to the contract and some adjustments from the landfill back to administration. We had an employee that was doing work for the landfill and Pantelis has hired a couple of Account Clerks to help up there so that debt service is no longer needed so we took away that allocation. That's part of the increase as well in professional services.

Contractual, to offset that Payroll Clerk, we eliminated the \$30,000 software fee from the 2020 budget because that's how much that software costs us so if you can imagine, we're going to see a savings with that recurring and that person that we are hiring, like I said, is not going to do just payroll, it's also going to be someone that can help with the duties that are going to come back to DPF due to central purchasing not being accomplished. So, there is benefits in more than just the payroll but the genesis of the position was the payroll but there are ancillary services that will be benefitted from that as well. You see the increase in employees' benefits as well there. What makes the administration look good? Is we put the interest earnings in here that are forecasted from Finance. Just to be transparent there, that's what we get from Finance that's a number that is provided to us as a revenue increase. Any questions on that?

Chairman Hemmer: Going a manual system for the payroll, is that a permanent solution to the problem or is there a new software solution that you are looking at or thinking of?

Mr. Bentley: I hate to do things manually so we are continuously looking for ways to be more efficient. I'm working with the payroll department in I.T. to enhance their data entry systems but unfortunately the contract with CSEA 6300 for the Highway and the Landfill for that matter, is so complex with shift differentials, overtime, equipment, premiums, all the different types of situations that come in that the employees earn via the contract. It really is not as simple as, I work 8 hours today. It's where do I work, did I go to a different location, you need something that keeps track of attendance bonuses, you need something that keeps track of even the time coding for COVID. It's just, actually, the contract yields it on (*inaudible*) amount of information that our current payroll system in New World just is not equipped to handle. So we're looking for some front end stuff that Sam and I are trying to optimize but in reality what

we are doing right now is manual data entry. It's really due to the fact that we have a software program that just kept crashing. I can tell you on numerous occasions we were having errors in payroll to our employees and that is unacceptable. The only way to do this was to do it manually so that we could pay our employees on time without having these errors be inflicted because the software kept crashing. I mean we basically got to a situation where it broke and we could not return from it. The upside to it was, it broke at the same time a number of our employees were furlough so we were able to figure out how to do this manually while we had reduced staff so we didn't have as much data entry but now with everybody back, it takes time and we're learning ways to do things better but it's just going to take us additional time and again, this position is not just for data entry. It's to account for other things that are coming back to me that need to be addressed. In addition, I will say this, Sam is my right-hand man in all things financial. He went down for a little while and I panicked for two weeks and payroll panicked for two weeks. Everybody else panicked for about two weeks until he got back. Part of the airport position that we talked about earlier and why that position is being upgraded is Sam needs to be (*inaudible*) condition for me, I need a back up to him. So, we're looking at these positions as a way to have back-ups in case someone goes down. Because right now, he is the only person who knows how to do certain things and that's not a good way of running a department. We need multiple people to be able to do these financial things because again, payroll, not paying people or not paying people correctly is – that gets noticed very quickly. Long answer but short answer is we're going to continue to optimize it and reduce it but it's more than just the payroll but that was the genesis of the need.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you.

Mr. Bentley: Any other questions? O.k., moving on.

### **Maintenance of Roads**

Mr. Bentley: Under personal services, again, contract increase there. Equipment, we purchased laptops for some of the trucks this year so we're not forecasting to needing new laptops for the trucks this year.

Under contractual, the big change here is my guys try to figure out how to spread the money around most efficiently and when I talked to them, I said, what is your biggest need, where are we falling short because I want to make sure our roads are safe. They go, we have always under forecasted the amount of money it costs for us to stripe the lines on the road each year by \$200,000. Not to the level of when the parks are going to be open but, I get a number of emails from constituents/residents about the white lines. When they fade each year, we have to strip all the lines on our roads each and every year. If we don't have enough money to do that, we don't have to paint the white lines but, I think there is a lot of people out there that like them. I think from a safety perspective, it's really good to have those. So that is reflective of what it currently costs and it may have been something over the years, the cost of paint increased and no one actually bumped up the budget amount and it just got consumed in some other accounts because it could. I'm doing more line item to line item, item to item accounting and so I'm trying to trim the fat where it's at but also identify where other things are (*inaudible*) subsidize without anybody knowing about it. I think this was one where it got subsidized. So I've asked for the increase in the \$200,000 here and it's for a safety issue.

Employee benefits, because this is one of my larger groups, the change in health insurance elections are more pronounced in this division. So you actually see the decrease because of the number of people going to the high deductible and it more than offsets some of the increase side of it for unemployment and other stuff.

Under the revenue. There was an accident that occurred that we got an insurance claim on for repairs. We do not budget that occurrence but that's why there is a reduction and we're finally paid for a flood that came in 2015 this year. I believe that we put that in fund balance so that money was put into fund balance to increase our fund balance but we're not projecting another flood claim from 2015. Questions on maintenance of roads?

Chairman Hemmer: The \$328,000 increase, is that all just because of the contract or are there some other money in there besides just the contract increase? Is that increase due to the increase staffing?

Mr. Bentley: There are a lot of things in there as all things DPF are. You have the contract increases, the step increases, you have the (*inaudible*) charge but also there's capital allocations in here so we assume that our highway employees work so much time on repairing bridges that we can get reimbursed for it from CHIPS and PAVE NY. Those are capital projects that would not go towards the operating expenses so we assume a certain percentage. Depending on the rates, you can assume the same percentage but as your rates go up, you'll see the allocation go up a little bit. What's the allocation on this one, 40%?

Mr. Zafuto: We have \$400,000 allocated to go to capital not counting fringe for 2021.

Mr. Bentley: I think we set a standard amount of \$400,000 for next year. So, there is reasons why this could fluctuate a little bit, depending on what projects we're anticipating as well as what reimbursements we're looking from CHIPS and PAVE NY. How much we contract out versus how much we do in-house. Because we're required to actually contract out jobs greater than –

Mr. Zafuto: It's \$500,000.

Mr. Bentley: Right, but it was \$250,000 so I would love to do all projects with in-house labor, I think it's cheaper, but, I'm required by the State to, any job that's over now, \$500,000 to contract out.

Legislator Davis: If there are monies left over in CHIPS, where does that money go? If there is leftover money, if you don't use all the money in CHIPS each year, does it carry over?

Mr. Bentley: You are leading the way to the next page but I'll answer your question.

Mrs. Dennison: Can in interject an additional answer to Chairman Hemmer's question. The short answer is that it's all contract.

Chairman Hemmer: Oh really, it's not additional employees in there?

Mrs. Dennison: No, there was no change FTE's so there is no additional employees, there is no loss of employees and it's almost all in wages.

Legislator Nazzaro: What is all in contract?

Chairman Hemmer: The \$328,410 that is what I was asking about.

Mrs. Dennison: It's a big number but percentage wise the wages, I don't want to say only, but they are going up 7% which would be reasonable from the 2020 budget.

Chairman Hemmer: Because of the adjustments, oh, alright. I get it.

Mr. Bentley: It's not just the 3%. It's the 3% and the step increase.

Mrs. Dennison: What Brad is talking about as far as what he allocates to the capital projects that amount in the .1's also did not change from 2020 budget to 2021 budget. So it's really all contractual changes in wages.

Mr. Bentley: But as a percentage of the total, as that goes up, I still have the same – it's a forecast, an estimate of what we think the allocation is going to be.

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't know if you are going to talk about more Brad, you talked about the pavement markings, the striping, and we added \$200,000, so how much was budgeted in 2020 for pavement markings?

Mr. Bentley: I believe it was \$200,000, rough number so we're doubling the budget.

Mr. Zafuto: It was \$200,000 even.

Legislator Nazzaro: So you are doubling it.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: That is the white lines on the side –

Mr. Bentley: It's the white and the yellow, cross walks.

Mr. Zafuto: And the reflective beads.

Mr. Bentley: Yea, it's paint and beads.

Legislator Nazzaro: So roughly how many more miles of roads?

Mr. Bentley: We have 550 miles of roads.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right with the extra – o.k., you are doubling the amount so how many miles of roads can you do with an extra \$200,000?

Mr. Bentley: Let me back up because obviously I didn't explain it well enough so I apologize. In the prior budget, they did not put enough money in to strip all 550 miles of roads. Half of it. What happened was, we just moved some money around and bought the extra paint from other budgets that suffered. In my attempt to line item each one, I'm looking at each and every one and how much does it truly cost and trying to get out these subsidies, (*inaudible*) subsidies that I keep finding, like, well we never increased that budget because we always took from over here. Well, I'm trimming that out and I trimmed that out last year and I come out to this saying, well, we're not going to have enough money to stripe the lines, well how much do you need? This is how much, my guys say, it costs to do this. I think it's partially a factor of, over the years you had "x" dollars allocated to it and you just never increased it and it just became part of the total mass and they just went out and did it. So it's not saying that we're going to stripe any extra miles more than we did in the past. I am just getting line for line accounting now because I'm trying to make sure that I can explain everything that's in my budget. I took it over from George and George had a way of doing it and I'm doing things a little bit differently. I need to understand things a little bit more succinctly and simply so this is the result of me being transparent and what I'm finding. If there was an offset that I could find that said where to take it out, I'm just telling you what the cost is to provide the service.

Legislator Nazzaro: I got it.

Mr. Bentley: Can I get to Mr. Harmon's question?

Legislator Gould: Sure.

Mr. Bentley: CHIPS, what happens with CHIPS if we don't spend it? In the years I've been here and Sam could probably verify the years prior to me, we have always spent it. So, we've never had that question. Other counties who don't spend, they have the option, in the past, the State's allowed it to be rolled over. This year is unique as we all know with COVID introducing new things into it. The State has notified us that 20% of our awards, CHIPS, PAVE-NY, is at risk and likely not to be there. In the 2020 budget we did not budget for extreme weather because we didn't think we were going to get it. In an unusual turn, we got it. But they were also going to reduce that by 20%. So we got an award but told us take a 20% (*inaudible*) cut. Round numbers, CHIPS, PAVE-NY, EWR, \$5.1 million dollars. Twenty percent of that, a million dollars. EWR, that was unbudgeted, increase up \$500,000. Net to the 2020 budget, about \$500,000 lower than what we originally anticipated. That being said, as we talked about before, I have been able to do a lot of the paving, but my bridge work is falling behind. I'm probably not going to be able to spend all the money that's allocated in those programs. I would look for some State guidance to probably roll that money over. There are some other options that I may have at my disposal but the simplest answer is, roll it over. The 20% that they are saying is going to be taking away, will they give that back to us? I don't know, they haven't said. I'm not planning on it, I'm not doing work that's going to require the use of that 20%. If it get it, that's great and we'll figure out what to do with it. Our roads and bridges need it so we will make use of any money that does come back to me. Right now, I would say that I'm projected to probably,

don't hold me to this one but, I would say out of that \$4.5 million dollars I'm getting for 2020, I'm probably going to be able to spend about \$4 million of it on roads and bridges this year. I might have \$5 to \$750,000 that is just going to be catchup work but there is some ways I can also deal with the reimbursements that they allow through the CHIPS reimbursement. It's complicated but the net numbers are bad and I look at it as, the work that needs to be done is budgeted and we just need to do that work next year and we'll make sure the money is there one way or the other. Does that answer your question?

Legislator Harmon: Thank you.

Legislator Gould: I wanted to talk a little bit on stripping. Has there been any discussion on narrowing the stipes and saving this \$200,000?

Mr. Bentley: I wish I had Drew here. I think there is some State regulations on the widths but I would have to confirm that with Drew. It has to be so wide. There are standards out there and I think even if you narrowed it a little bit, I don't think you're going to save half your budget.

Legislator Gould: If you narrowed it a quarter, you would save a quarter of the budget.

Mr. Bentley: I think it's a visibility thing. I think there are standards that you have to put on the roads. I will verify that.

Mr. Zafuto: You might be able to save a quarter of the supplies but you're still covering the same number of miles.

*(Cross talk)...*

Legislator Gould: We have our own painter though.

Mr. Bentley: This is just material cost, right?

Chairman Hemmer: Oh, is it, that doesn't include –

Legislator Gould: It's just material is what we're talking.

Mr. Bentley: Yea, I believe there are State standards that we have to go by and if we make it smaller, I think we put the County at a liability risk if we chose to do something that's not conforming –

Legislator Gould: Maybe they aren't wide enough.

Mr. Bentley: I believe – I've never been asked that question so it's a good question.

Legislator Gould: They were plenty wide when I was younger but now they are not wide enough some times.



Mr. Bentley: I can research that with Drew and we can get back to you with what the regulations are. I think it's in the Highway Safety Transportation book.

Legislator Gould: That would be good.

Mr. Bentley: I think there is a chapter and verse - because I can tell you, there is a regulation for where you put a curve sign on the road, what's the distance.

Legislator Gould: I know that.

Mr. Bentley: There's a regulation of shoulder depth, there is a regulation on -

Legislator Stops signs, speed limit signs.

Mr. Bentley: I would be shocked if there was not a regulation on stripping. Drew and I could probably get you the chapter and verse.

Legislator Nazzaro: Before we get off of CHIPS, I just have a question and of course, we had a lot of discussions on CHIPS throughout the year, so in the budget, I understand the Extreme Weather, we got the \$500,000 that we don't budget for, I agree with that because we don't know. So, in your 2021 tentative, that is where you have New York State aid of \$4.574,000 -

Mr. Bentley: Are you on the next page that I haven't gotten to yet?

Legislator Nazzaro: Am I too far? O.K., go ahead.

Mr. Bentley: We're still on maintenance of roads. Maybe I'll answer your question as I go through it. Maintenance of roads, any other questions?

Capital Improvements - this is the CHIPS and PAVE-NY. Our contractual, basically the small dollar change is because it's the change associated with the award given by the State. As other counties add new roads, the award is based on the number of mileage in the county. So if someone else is adding more, the total pot stays the same and they just get more money because they have more roads if we didn't add anything. So we see a small decrease each year because other people are building new roads and we're not. So, it's just a small decrease each time. DMV fees - we're still forecasting at \$750,000. As a matter of fact, I think we're going to probably come in above that this year. So we've not seen a reduction in our DMV fees. As a matter of fact, we're probably going to do a little bit better but we'll keep it the same because we want to be conservative and not go too far out. We did increase the permits. These would be the trucking permits. We are seeing a little bit more use out of the local contractors for whatever reason. So we're seeing a bump up in the permit fees. This is not including any of the wind farm permit fees that we talked about in the past. This would just be the standard gravel or asphalt or concrete trucks that roll around for everyday commercial projects and industrial projects. Any overweight or oversized vehicles. New York State aid - again, I think the right thing to do here is to forecast for CHIPS and PAVE-NY, even though those programs are at risk. I don't think budgeting for EWR is prudent. That is probably the first thing that the State will hit in total. But, I will be

transparent in saying there is no guarantees in either one of these and I think each year we've had the same issue and there could be reductions. So, how are we going to be flexible in addressing that potential zero? Number one, I think there would be a public outcry of massive proportions from every county, village, and town going this is our only money to repair the infrastructure and the outcry to the Governor would be enormous. So, do I think that they would eliminate the programs? They could if they replaced it with something else. However the dollar amount should be similar, about 20% haircut, o.k., people are not happy with that but I think they are able to live with it. We can adjust our plans of what we do in-house and contract out. We can defer some maintenance, we can defer some projects, we can do, instead of repaving, what we didn't do this year, because we reduced our budgets the 20% and also I gave back money for the COVID because we had a large number of furloughs. We did not do 80 miles of chip sealing. If you noticed, there were no oil and stone on County roads this year, zero. So, that's going to hurt down the road. It's a way to extend the life of the top pavement, it's a way to make sure that water is not going down into the base and wrecking the base of the pavement. I think there's probably going to be some long term effects of us having to do that but, we're going to live short term. Maybe next year will do more chip sealing, (*inaudible*) stone and less paving. There are ways that we can flex our program to adjust to whatever the State decides or what comes out from that. Much as the way we did it this year, we'll adjust our plans so that we're not spending money we don't have.

Legislator Nazzaro: So in the budget, again, I agree, don't budget for the Extreme Weather, so the amount that you are budgeting, that does not reflect a 20%?

Mr. Bentley: It does not.

Legislator Nazzaro: It does not and also back to Legislator Harmon's question, the unused portion that you said you normally can carry over, correct?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: How much did you say we're going to have unused, roughly? A half a million - \$500,000?

Mr. Bentley: There about, rough number. We're still doing projects and we're still getting bills in. So, I'm really eyeballing it.

Legislator Nazzaro: So Kathleen, a finance question. Is that like deferred revenue or anything or can you recognize that at all in this budget? If you have funding that you have not used but you've been granted – you get reimbursed as you use it, is that correct? You have to submit –

Mr. Bentley: You have to use the money to get reimbursed.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, so if we know – again, I'm just asking this, thinking out of the box a little bit. If you have money left over that you know you are going to use, can you add it as deferred revenue?

Mrs. Dennison: As Brad said, we don't get paid for it until we do it so it's not like some of the grants that we get paid up front and we would have deferred revenue but if we could do that, -

Mr. Bentley: I don't think that you want to do that because you don't get it until you submit it and it's approved.

Legislator Nazzaro: But all of this you have to submit.

Mr. Bentley: But if the State comes back and says, doing 30%, and you put revenue in, you might have overestimated your revenue for next year.

Mrs. Dennison: The other question that I would ask is, I mean, there is costs associated with that additional work.

Legislator Nazzaro: Everything we do, we don't get reimbursed on.

Mrs. Dennison: Right.

Legislator Nazzaro: All I'm saying is and maybe I'm not phrasing it well and I'm not trying to inflate the revenue by no means, but what I'm trying to do is make sure, o.k., we've been granted 80%, we have a funding letter that you had shared with us and we're getting 80% so in my opinion the \$500,000 or whatever is left over, Sam or whoever, Kathleen, as long as we do the projects we're going to get reimbursed at half a million and we're pretty much know that we're going to get that.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: So either we can just have that as a potential gain because I guess if you had said you budgeted 80% in here, but you're budgeting 100%.

Mrs. Dennison: One hundred percent of -

Legislator Nazzaro: Of the award. But that is deferred revenue in my opinion. If you've been granted an award and you haven't used it accounting wise, you can recognize that as deferred revenue.

Mrs. Dennison: You think even if we haven't done the work?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes, but that's just my opinion.

Mr. Bentley: Can I answer your question, if I may?

Legislator Nazzaro: I was looking at Sam.

Mr. Bentley: Notwithstanding the accounting exercise that I think we're going through, I want to put it into reality. We have "x" amount of work that needs to be done this year and just because we don't get it done because of weather and furlough and resources, even if you are moving it to next year, we still have a program of roads that we already know need to be done next year. It's not like that money can be used to offset work for next year. We have a program this year that we're just not getting done. This work, is "x", next year's work is "y", you still have to add "x" and "y". No matter how you do the accounting, you still need enough money to account for doing "x" and "y".

Legislator Nazzaro: The only comment I would have on that is, if you have, "if" you have the expense in this budget for work because you said that you have "x" and "y" certain amount of work to do, so if you had in this budget the work that you could not complete this year in the 2021 budget –

Mr. Bentley: Which is not true.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., that's true Sam?

Mr. Zafuto: He's right.

Legislator Nazzaro: Not that I doubt you but he's your finance person and like you said, you rely on him. So as long as you don't have the expense – if you had the expense in there for the additional work –

Mr. Zafuto: If we had the expense, we'll be reimbursed in (*cross talk*)

Legislator Nazzaro: If you had the expense in there, then I want the revenue in there. Do you follow what I'm saying? So what you are saying is the expense is not in there so I would not put the revenue, but if you had the expense, I would have said, let's record the unused CHIPS monies from 2020 into the 2021.

Mr. Bentley: So what we might have to do is, do an amendment for whatever gets rolled over. Let's say it's a contractor job that's over half a million dollars or whatever, we'd have to do an amendment to recognize the revenue from the rollover and the expense from the contract. You wouldn't award that contract unless you had the revenue recognition but at no point do you take the 2021 budget, it's just money that was over here. We're not forecasting any "x" to go to "y".. "Y" sits in a bubble by itself and "x" sits in a bubble by itself. So if part of the bubble of "x" goes over to the other side of the wall to 2021, "x" still aligns up. It doesn't (*inaudible*) with "y". So there is some algebra terms for you.

Legislator Niebel: Without the "x's" and "y's", so you're saying that the \$500,000 revenue this year, cannot be applied to 2021 expenses unless we defer those expenses –

Mr. Bentley: You're deflating a real term with an accounting exercise so the real thing is, if you spent "x" in 2020 and you want to get reimbursed, it's in 2020. If the State allows us to rollover any unused funds, so there is the first "if", if the State allows us to rollover which is not

a given, then if the work is done in 2021 and we asked for that reimbursement in 2021, then we will have that accounting lined up. But the work is still identified in 2020. We have work planned to spend all of the funds in 2020. It's due to time, weather, and resources that we did not get a chance to complete the projects that we would like. In addition, in 2021, we have a full list of projects already for paving, maintenance, and bridges or roads and bridges that need to be done for 2021 that are separate from 2020. But we can defer things if we don't have enough money here. I have enough for 2022, 2023, 2024, you give me enough money, I can spend it to make our roads safer.

Chairman Hemmer: Right, it's a five year plan.

Legislator Niebel: That \$500,000 has to be applied to the 2020 projects?

Mr. Bentley: It doesn't have to be but that is my plan.

Legislator Niebel: But the 2020 projects could be carried over to 2021 if possible.

Mr. Bentley: So if the State, let me go with the "if" statements. This is all conditional. If the State allows me to rollover money, I could be in a use it or lose it scenario right now. If I don't use that money and the State doesn't allow me to roll it over, it's lost and it's all because I didn't have the resources to do the work. What is going to happen is, now my bucket of "y", now that "x" has to go over –

*(cross talk)*

Mr. Bentley: The part that I'm trying to explain is, you have a set of projects that have to be done for the safety of the roads. I have more projects than I have money so I don't run out of things to do, I run out of money.

Legislator Nazzaro: And again, just to frame it up and then we'll move on Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I brought it up but I thought it was important to bring up because CHIPS is important that I just wanted to make sure there was a matching, that it looks like we may have unused funds because we didn't start road maintenance until August 1<sup>st</sup> because of the furloughs and so forth, so I just wanted to make sure there was a matching, that we weren't including expenses in the 2021 budget without the funding. I think we have a little safety net here possibly. In other words, if, and it's an "if", that the State in 2021 doesn't give you a 100% of the 2021 CHIPS money, it says we're going to go to the 80% but, another "if", you are allowed to carry over half a million, you could make it work where you could use the half a million you carried over and still do what you had in here. If you get to carry over the half a million and they gave you 100% in 2021, as long as you have the time and the crews, you could do extra work.

Mr. Bentley: I could do "x" and "y" work. I could do what I originally planned to do.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right and that equals "z".

Mrs. Dennison: Kitty sent me a message and echoed what I said earlier is that we can't record the revenue until we do the work.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well that's not really true, you can record the revenue (*cross talk*)

Mrs. Dennison: But we cannot recognize it as deferred revenue because it doesn't work that way.

Mr. Bentley: (*Cross talk*) \$500,000 is an estimate.

Legislator Nazzaro: So we may have a little safety net, maybe.

Legislator Odell: But the work is already planned.

Mr. Bentley: Well, it was planned when I began the year and I've been trying to execute it. We've only gotten to the point where we spent most of that money because of the hard efforts of the employees.

Legislator Odell: So you plan to work to work the plan under scenario "x", Terry, but, if a sinkhole erupts on Rt. 380, you have to adjust accordingly, right?

Mr. Bentley: Exactly. O.k., snow removal. High level snow removal. This is the buy the salt. We have \$2.46 million. These are the same numbers we used last year. Salt pricing in unchanged from last year. It's \$71.50 a ton. As you may recall from the winter of 2018 to the beginning of winter in 19/20', the price of salt went up \$8.00 from \$63 to \$71.50. There is no increase this year. We have a decent amount of salt in storage right now, however if you remember, maybe some don't but I gave up \$200,000 as part of COVID for salt purchase for the remainder of this year and I always put that with an asterisk, it's weather dependent. If I need salt, I'm coming back to ask for it. I might have some places where I can get that besides fund balance so if I do need it, I may go after some of the other savings that I haven't given up to date yet. But it's all weather dependent, I'm only going to ask if I need it. But rough numbers to fill the barns is about, at this price point, about a million dollars, so, this budget is meant for calendar year but if it runs over winter, it goes over two different winters, so it really depends on the weather. We have some shared services on the revenue side of this. I don't know why it's here, but it's here. Pistol range, cell tower plowing and then we also sell some of our salt to communities at cost and that revenue is in there accordingly based on historical (*inaudible*).

Legislator Davis: You mentioned that the road salt, we're getting approximately, what, \$71 a ton. Could you speak to the cost of a ton of sand if that were to be mixed in with road salt? I know that we've had these conversations before but I think in these unusual times when we're looking at budgets that need to be trimmed wherever possible, consideration needs to be given to the fact that sand is cheaper than salt. Additionally, we're not even talking about the effects to the environment, so, just if you would.

Mr. Bentley: Sure. Obviously is sand is cheaper than salt. I don't know what the actual rate is right now but it goes, as we have talked about in the past, it goes way beyond just the price of the materials. It's the changes to the trucks, it's the sanders that now have to be changed

out, it's now that you have to go out and sweep 550 miles of road to get the sand off the roads. It's the shoulders, they get built up and now retain the water.

Legislator Davis: A lot of them need built up right now.

Mr. Bentley: They do but the ones that build up are the ones you don't need. What happens is, water accumulates on the sides of the road, refreezes, becomes a safety issue in addition to it destroys the pavement because what causes a pothole? Water, it's the freeze thaw cycles. So the more standing water, the more it penetrates the depth of the pavement. I think that we've gone through this multiple times in the short time I've been here to look at the cost of sand but all the downstream effects of that, in addition, and I think is the biggest reason, the public had gotten used to the way that we remove snow and ice from our roads. This will change how that gets done.

Legislator Davis: I would beg to differ somewhat in that some of the Towns, within the County, a salt/sand mix is used. So the public is used to driving on bare roads which I know is a New York State policy on County roads, but they are also used to driving on roads that haven't been strictly treated with salt.

Mr. Bentley: I remember a conversation I had with the Town of Ellery Highway Superintendent and he told me they use all salt on the highway traveled roads and a mixture on the others. Why does he do that? It's a liability issue. He goes, I want to make sure that I don't get in trouble. The roads that get heavily used are safe to travel because he knows there is a difference between all salt mix and a partial sand and salt. There is a distinct difference in the quality of the road. You get the snow cleared off quicker, you don't have the residual sand. The same also makes it so that it's harder to stop. Have you ever tried locking brakes on a sandy road, you'll skid further, right? So, this is all about safety for me. We've accustomed the public to an all salt mix for many, many years. As a matter of fact, we did do salt and sand way back in the day John, right and we've made that switch over for a reason. It was due to the equipment, it was due to the increasing desires of the public to have roads that were clear of snow and ice as reasonable efficient as possible. People drive at higher speeds now. I don't know that everybody drives with winter tires anymore, they do all seasons. I see a lot of cars that probably shouldn't be on the road and so we're now going to make those cars in even a worse scenario and the last thing I want to do is have on my conscious is, save a dollar to lose somebody's life. We had someone die in January because the car went out of control and slid into a plow. Let me tell you, I'm sorry, but I'm just going to say, I can't honestly say go to a salt and sand mix right now because that's a change, that's a liability. I think we need to keep doing what we are doing. I don't think that you are going to save that money when you factor all the other things into it, all the maintenance, the sweeping, the shoulders and then you increase your liability potential. I just don't see it. I can't recommend it but that's just my opinion.

Legislator Gould: Sounds a lot like a young Jay Gould doesn't he? I was wondering why under D.5142.R277.0007, you have salt and sand. What is sand doing there then? Why doesn't it just say salt?

Mr. Zafuto: It's salt, it's just a new account classification.

Mr. Bentley: We purchase the salt. It's just a title.

Legislator Gould: Yea, what do we have sand there for? Scratch it off if we're not using it.

Mr. Bentley: I'm sure it's a holdover from many, many years of when we did buy sand and we do buy sand for other projects.

Legislator Gould: But it's not in that account, it's all salt.

*(cross talk)*

Mr. Bentley: I think it's an historical name convention. I mean that budget item has probably been around for how many years? Probably before you were here Jay.

*(cross talk)*

Legislator Niebel: At what time where you say you used salt brine, what's your thoughts on salt brine?

Mr. Bentley: Salt brine has basically been eliminated by the State. They have made the restrictions on the content of the salt brine. If you have one molecule of advance substance coming out of it, you can't use it and the testing requirements have become – we used to use it in the Mayville parking lot. But you can't get it because you can't pass the test. The towns are – I could probably reference the people in this parking lot, we went to all salt this year, I've never seen the parking lot in better shape. When we use salt, it used to congeal and you get ice and it was always crunchy and it was a slip and fall hazard. I've seen the parking lot in the best shape it's ever been since we made that swap over. I have to say that –

Legislator Niebel: It was a lot cheaper.

Mr. Bentley: Sure, but you can't get it now. You might get it cheaper but you can't find it.

Legislator Gould: It still goes on some town roads. I live on a dirt road and they bring it up in the summer time and put it on for dust control. They are still using it on town roads.

Mr. Bentley: I hope they have completed all their DEC requirements. Because if they get caught doing that without their certification, they are going to be in trouble. So I hope they have all their certifications done.

Legislator Davis: I appreciate your thoughts. We've had these conversations before but I would just suggest to the other Legislators that as we consider budgets moving forward and we're looking at several million dollars with of road salt, that sand it without a doubt considerably cheaper per ton. If it were mixed in, even at a percentage. Towns do it three to one, three part sand to one part salt. Some of the towns do. Maybe you could do one part sand to one part salt. You'd save a lot of money.



Mr. Bentley: Talk to the guy in Ellery. I'd give Greg Hallberg a call. He has to run different equipment for the different mixes.

Legislator Davis: Yea, I've talked to the guys in the three towns that I represent who do use a mix and it's acceptable there.

Mr. Bentley: I know but he actually does two different types. He does all salt mix and he can't take his truck (*inaudible*) ...

Legislator Davis: Right and I've seen your equipment, I appreciate the tour of the facility.

Mr. Bentley: And so if we decide to do some mixtures on some roads and some not on others because of volume, now my equipment can only be used here. So if I have a truck breakdown, now I can't send guys out, again, it gets to the liability. We are stretched so thin on just being able to plow the roads as we do now. Any kind of limitation that causes us not to be able to allocate resources around to the various – you know, if I have two truck breakdowns in Cherry Creek, I might have to take a truck from Falconer to go out there. If that is not equipped to do those roads, what do I do? And it's a cost and it's a life. I'm all for saving money and I've put together a budget that saves money, this is not the area to skim. As much as I believe in CARTS and John, in Public Facilities, what's the number one priority at Public Facilities?

Chairman Hemmer: Safety, right?

Mr. Bentley: Safety in highway, roads and bridges. This is our number one priority. If we want to cut money, cut it somewhere else. Do not cut money here. This is not the way to do it.

Legislator Gould: Are there any towns left plowing County roads?

Mr. Bentley: Yes. We have agreements. They are three year agreements, like six. City of Jamestown – but again, it's all optimization. We would rather have them not lift their plows, they are going by a County road, so it's only where those agreements make sense. Where they are going by –

Legislator Gould: How much is that?

Mr. Zafuto: It would be \$157,000 in 2021.

Mr. Bentley: But again, it's based on usage. We pay based on the number of times they have to plow. They submit their data, we reconcile that but that is written standard rates.

Mr. Zafuto: Yea, I had a 3% increase from last year.

Legislator Nazzaro: So you said the price per ton of salt was \$71.50. Just want to get into the numbers for a moment. You are budgeting \$2.3 million for road salt?

Mr. Bentley: Yea, if you subtract - we have sales so –

Mr. Zafuto: Yea, no, it's \$2.3 million for salt directly.

Legislator Nazzaro: Yea, \$2.3 million, thank you Sam. So \$2.3 million for salt which is the same amount as the adopted budget for 2020. So my question is, and I know the old way, we budget now in expense, we don't do the stockpile and all of that.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, what is our current inventory of salt, right now, compared to the same time as a year ago?

Mr. Bentley: We're not that far off actually. We're probably a little bit higher. We're probably a little bit more than, I want to say, half full and I think we were probably like 40 to 45% full last year.

Legislator Nazzaro: The reason I ask that is, the price of salt and I understand this is our number one priority –

Mr. Bentley: But I also gave up \$200,000 in the amended budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: But now I'm talking about the current budget or the one before us, the 2021, if you have – I'd be interested to see – you are saying it's pretty close. The inventory – I mean, if you had a higher inventory now then you did a year ago, then you don't need to buy as much salt this year –

Mr. Bentley: Which is why I gave up the \$200,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: Yea, but you are not giving it up in 2021.

Mr. Bentley: Well, because I don't know what the weather is going to be like.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well, none of us do. But, I don't think that we would be at risk to reduce the salt budget somewhat.

Mr. Bentley: I don't.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know that we have difference of opinion. I'm just saying, nobody knows what the weather and I can pretend to be a meteorologist, we had a very warm summer and the Great Lakes are very warm, so when the air stream comes down, boom, it's going to suck the water and drop snow. I mean, that's probably what is going to happen but I'm just saying, I'd be interested in really looking at what the inventory was and are you saying it's pretty close?

Mr. Bentley: It's pretty close and I gave up the money this year so that I'm probably going to end where I was last year. So, by giving up the \$200,000 now and you're basically cutting out \$200,000 out of what I need for next year. I need it. It's on an average year, that's what I need. That is what my guys tell me and what is the price of salt next year? It is \$71.50, is it \$80.00, is it \$60.00, I don't know.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well, there are two ways to look at this, or many ways to look at it. I'm not making a motion or anything like that but if you were to reduce the salt by a reasonable amount, obviously if we had a horrific winter and we needed more salt, we're going to have to give it to you. I mean, we're not going to not – it comes to us as an amendment, like many things. Just like this year we took away \$200,000 through the amended budget so, but all these numbers go into setting our tax levy and our tax rate. So I just want to make sure that we have too much in here. I'm not saying, too much in here because then we pass that onto the taxpayers and we have things going the other way in this budget. So, it's a thought for the committee when we get to that point.

Mr. Bentley: I'll add my two cents on this because I have to.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just added a thought. I'm not making a motion at this time.

Mr. Bentley: But, the way I liked the budget is if I'm going to change something I want to have a reason to change it so I gave up the \$200,000 because I was a little bit higher than my levels. I thought that was justified. But it's also weather dependent. Is there anything to make me change what I think my average use is in 2021? No. I don't know if the salt is going to be cheaper, I don't know what the weather is going to be like. If you are just making a change that artificial, fine. It's your prerogative.

Legislator Nazzaro: No, it's not artificial. It's based on what you have in current inventory.

Mr. Bentley: But what I'm saying is, I've already adjusted for that. You are double accounting for it.

Legislator Nazzaro: Can I see the inventory records? I would like to see what we're currently holding compared to a year ago.

Mr. Bentley: We can probably figure it out. I don't have weight scales on them obviously.

Legislator Nazzaro: That's my point. It's simple – I mean, you have a beginning inventory and an ending inventory, what you use so if our inventory is up, that's good, but I'm not trying to – I just want to be realistic that we're not over budgeting if we have a certain amount of inventory.

Mr. Bentley: So, I'm basing it on what I need on an average year and I don't consider it over budgeting because I have an increased level. I've already given that up. So, to do it again, you are making an assumption that I'm going to end next year over what I have two years ago. I don't know how you make that assumption without just making it. I don't have any evidence to make that. I've already addressed the overage by giving up the \$200,000. So, going another year out and trying to make that similar assumption, I don't think that's accurate. I don't think that's right. Especially given our number one priority. I would much rather look at other areas if you are looking to cut and do something with the tax levy. I highly recommend looking at Parks. It's our least cost thing or least prioritized, sorry. That's where we need to look. We should not be looking here to make those kind of assumptions. We should look other places, in my opinion.

Legislator Niebel: Just to following up on John's question. So those County roads that the towns are plowing, are they using just salt or a mixture of salt and sand?

Mr. Bentley: General, the cities are using all sand. It's not just adding sand to the salt, it's plowing services.

Legislator Niebel: Understood but they're also, besides plowing, they're also using salt or sand or a mixture (*cross talk*).

Mr. Bentley: I would venture to say, does Ellery on the list

Mr. Zafuto: Yes.

Mr. Bentley: So like Ellery has trucks to do all salt so we would tell them to use all salt. I would have to verify each and every one of them.

Legislator Niebel: No, I just wondered if some of the towns were using a mixture like John had suggested for the County roads that they take care of.

Mr. Bentley: I can tell you right now, I know for a fact, the City of Jamestown is 100% salt on our roads.

Legislator Niebel: And Ellery is too.

Mr. Bentley: And Ellery should be too. The biggest pay out is the City of Jamestown. We're not talking long stretches, we're talking like (*cross talk*).... We're not talking plowing the length of a County road, we're talking a very small section of it. The ones that are highly traveled, I may be wrong, but I think they are mainly all salt. If not, I probably would have heard (*inaudible*) by now (*inaudible*)... Snow removal, we're done?

Legislator Nazzaro: I still want to see the inventory.

Mr. Bentley: Mind you, we don't keep track at that accuracy level, right? You've seen the salt shed, right?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes.

Mr. Bentley: So, it's an eyeball. The accuracy of your eyeball versus mine, right. To be realistic about that. We know what we buy, we know what we put down, but there's always, as you store stuff, it rains, or something, there are things that get crushed, there is always some form of loss. As you load it into a truck, things spill over the edge sometimes from the loader. So it's not always – you can't always do the absolutes and think that's what's in there. So you go out and eyeball it. Well, how much did I have last year? If I had a picture, we have some pretty good ideas, we'll have some rough numbers but don't think this is the exact science. Anybody that thinks that is fooling themselves. We do the best job with what we can and we don't have money to go to that level of accuracy. If someone wants me to, give me the money to do it. But other than that, we do the best we can with what we have. Said expectations.

Moving on. Transfers other funds A to DM, (*inaudible*). I don't know if you guys want to go through that, I'll leave that up to you. That's a Kathleen question.

Mrs. Dennison: This is just the expenditure balance, I guess you would say, or it's the local share of the D fund and it is reimbursed from the A fund.

Chairman Hemmer: This all comes from the A fund?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. So it's a revenue here. You'll see the exact same amount as an expense in the A fund.

Mr. Bentley: Self-balancing account right? And I just get to have the pleasure of having it in my budget.

Mrs. Dennison: I would say the take away from this department is that the, such as the local share of the D fund is \$12,767,000.

Mr. Bentley: DM 5130, road machinery. This is the other section of the Highway Department. We did see an increase due to the contract. We do have some equipment that we're looking to buy to help us. BSD scanner and software which is used to evaluate error codes on trucks. So instead of putting a truck on a low boy and drive it up to Buffalo or Rochester to get a code read to know what's wrong with it, we can do it in-house and save us the money of sending it up there. So it's a little bit of a cost but it's going to save us a lot on the diagnosis of issues with the trucks. Anybody who has a car when your engine light comes on, you don't know what is wrong with it. You have to take it somewhere, right? That's the way it is with our trucks. Then there are some other stuff, (*inaudible*) machine, jack stands, minor stuff but it goes to the needs of the Highway Department. Contractual; this is where our fuel savings forecast decrease in price is. But that is partially offset by the leased vehicle costs that we've talked about numerous times and that's about \$30,000 up in this budget. I'm still waiting information from Enterprise to see whether I'm going to continue with this leasing program. We just reached out to them this week, they are saying that they are going to get me something soon. So hopefully I'll have more information on the ability of that lease program to pay off here. Benefits; unfortunately this particular part of the Highway got hit with a Worker's Compensation Insurance higher than the others. So that hit home here and that's given to us based on what happens in the department. Shared Services; since the price drop, the revenue from our fuel sales would drop. We do get some use of money, interest earnings allocated here. We had cleaned up our yard and sold a bunch of stuff, we don't have that same problem which means we don't have that same revenue. Miscellaneous; there is two parts of the fuel revenue. One that sells internally and one that sells to municipals. So the miscellaneous is to the municipals, the shared services is to the internal, like the Sheriff's Department, CARTS, the municipals like the Falconer bus system. There are a bunch of others, Town of Ellicott, they refuel so they pay us that plus a little premium to actually maintain the fuel facility there. This one, we actually charge them the cost of doing business where as with the rock salt, they help us out under shared services. It's a team effort so we don't charge them premiums for the salt shed. Sometimes we need salt and they have it and so it's one of those things where you really want to help your neighbor. Any questions? Debt service; we finally got rid of our building debt service but then bonded the \$2 million dollars for the heavy equipment last year so any time you borrow money, you have to figure out how to pay it back.

So principal and interest for those bonds are in the budget now and will be there for the next 10 years?

Mrs. Dennison: I don't know what the terms is off the top of my head, sorry.

Mr. Bentley: Whatever it is, it will be there for a while. Transfer of funds; A to DM, that's just another one of those self-balancing accounts. My voice is tired so it's probably time for the landfill if there are no other questions in general?

Legislator Gould: You used up all his time, should be send him home?

Mr. Bentley: I'll leave that up to the Chairman.

Chairman Hemmer: Pantelis do you want to stay and do your presentation? Is everyone on the Committee o.k. to stay for a few more minutes? O.k, please come up then.

### **Landfill:**

Mr. Panteli: With the landfill, all the explanations for the changes are there. Personal services are up a little bit. Some of the operation costs are down. There is a new (*inaudible*) for the new (*inaudible*). The rest are out of our control. Post-employment benefits are up and then there is a good one, the profit program, 2019, is up. Any questions on the expenses?

Chairman Hemmer: You didn't have the same problem that DPF had with the payroll? Your payroll is much simpler type of thing?

Mr. Panteli: What kind of issues?

Mr. Bentley: He did see the cost increases with the –

Chairman Hemmer: His payroll is not done manually?

Mr. Bentley: Oh, that. We actually, it is done manually.

Mr. Zafuto: They punch in and out where the highway does not. So our Clerk has to manually enter everything where the landfill does punch in and out into Kronos.

Mr. Bentley: And they don't have the shift differentials that we have between winter and summer. They don't have the equipment premiums. Everybody up at the landfill is an MEO so they, by default –

Mr. Panteli: We have some but not as much.

Mr. Bentley: There are a couple of DSA's out there but very far and few between and there the last (*inaudible*)... It's easier for them to do the accounting because they are all MEO's. Where I have road maintainers, snow road maintainers, truck drivers, RCS I, II, III, Mechanic I, II, III.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., thank you. Any questions?

Mr. Panteli: The revenue, it is more or less the same as the previous years, the prediction of revenue. We're showing a loss in the sale of equipment and that was a dozer, we had to get rid of before it was depreciated because it was costing us more money keeping it. The incomes are estimated conservatively because there is no guarantee how much C&D you are going to get or how much contaminated soil you are going to get. It all depends on the fires and accidents, clean ups.

Chairman Hemmer: Your best guess, huh?

Mr. Panteli: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to mention, did you touch on the interest income there? It was estimated by Finance and there was a change this year.

Mrs. Dennison: I'm sorry, what was the question?

Legislator Nazzaro: Not really a question just sort of making a comment. We changed how we did the calculation for the interest income?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: That was a change we talked about in our weekly meetings. We had a lot of discussion on this and Kitty, Kathleen and the rest of the team came up with a new more accurate calculation to what was going to be attributed to their - but we have to make a finance management change, do we not? Is that what we have to do in our policy?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. Kitty has drafted the change for that.

Legislator Nazzaro: So for our group here, Audit & Control, we'll be having a change in our internal Financial Management Policy reflecting the formula that comes up with the amount that is passed to an interest earnings to the landfill.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. So the landfill will retain interest earnings. The percentage of the interest earnings on its cash based on the percent of in-County waste that it processes. The percentage of out-of-County waste, that percentage of the interest revenue will be transferred to the general fund.

Legislator Nazzaro: Correct.

Mrs. Dennison: The current policy is that it's split 50/50.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, so there was a change in the policy and that will be, I hope, will be brought and like Kathleen said, Kitty is working on that.

Mrs. Dennison: It's been drafted.

Legislator Nazzaro: It has been drafted so it should be on our prefiled resolutions for October.

Mrs. Dennison: It's not a resolution because it's a change to the policy.

Ms. Crow: It does need adopted. Steve is working on finalizing the language and then we'll send it through.

Legislator Nazzaro: So we have to vote on it.

Ms. Crow: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k.

Mrs. Dennison: I'm sorry, I didn't think it was coming as a resolution. I thought it was more of a motion.

Ms. Crow: I can't remember exactly but my recollection is that it was always passed by the Legislature.

Legislator Nazzaro: I think you're correct. It does have to have a resolution. Just wanted to point that out. There was a change, for the other members here, and it will be coming to the Audit & Control but that change is reflected in the 2021 tentative budget.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other questions or comments on this? The Environment section of the Landfill.

Legislator Odell: Just an observation Mr. Chairman. Just like to thank Mr. Bentley and Pantelis for hosting us. A handful of us Legislators got the grand tour a few months back despite COVID. It was really eye opening. Got to see the new cells that is going to carry us through the next several decades under construction, the operation, got to meet Aaron Gustafson and then Kim LaTone(?). You guys are doing quite a bit with just a handful of people and that's quite amazing and thank you for that.

Mr. Panteli: The closed landfills, the expenses are the same. The contractual are up a little bit because we had a new contractor doing the environmental monitoring. The prices are up a little bit. The rest of the expenses are normal. The recycling, the 7000 account, we have some increases in the contractual. We're doing a lot more (*inaudible*) recyclables. We have a higher volume. A lot of the local people collecting that cannot process them so they bring them to us so we have to deal with them. Then on the revenue side, that's why can't get rid of them, the money, the markets are very depressed right now on the recyclables and we sometimes can't even find a market for certain things. So the revenues are low too.

Chairman Hemmer: So when we can't find a market, we just –

Mr. Panteli: We do what we can. The hazardous waste. We cancelled the events due to COVID this year so we don't have the expense but hopefully by next year, a lot of people were asking one day why and we explained. Hopefully next year we'll have the events again (*inaudible*) and take care of them. Then the last page is debt services. You know about bonds and then on the depreciation of equipment, that's the dozer that we had to sell before it was



depreciated. Actually we exchanged it with a better one. Transfer to other funds; that's a share from the landfill to the general fund and that's it.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions?

Mr. Bentley: I have a salt update to answer your question. My Supervisor was watching on Facebook so he texted me the levels he's got from 19' and 20'.

Legislator Nazzaro: We can finish up the landfill.

Mr. Panteli: Yes, let's finish the landfill.

Mr. Bentley: I thought you were done.

Mr. Panteli: Can I go?

Mr. Bentley: So, in 2019, we ended around 6,000 tons and right now we have about 8,000 tons and total storage is around 17,000. So rough numbers, it's about a 10% increase in levels.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, 6,000 tons –

Mr. Bentley: Six thousand tons in 2019 or where we ended, the winter of 2019. About 8,000 tons right now, these are round numbers, and our total capacity is about 17,000. So right now we have a little under 50% in storage. That was due to warmer weather at the end of the year. So we got really lucky because we could ended a lot worse than we did. So, if you look at that, round numbers again, if you look at percentage, it's around 10, 11, 12% so if you multiply that times our \$2.3 million dollar budget, it's about \$200/235,000 whatever you want to use, that was the \$200,000 that I gave up. It was because I was higher, that was the rough justice.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you for the numbers. What are you coming up with this 10-12%?

Mr. Bentley: I'm just going percentage of volume which will equate to price.

Legislator Nazzaro: To answer my question and appreciate getting the answer. You had 2,000 more tons –

Mr. Bentley: This year than last year which equates on storage capacity because you have to know the volume that you can store.

Legislator Nazzaro: And your capacity is 17,000.

Mr. Bentley: So if you do it based on the percentage of volume, you're around 10, 11, 12% higher than last year, multiply that times your \$2 million dollars.

Legislator Niebel: Isn't it (*cross talk*) 33% more?

Mr. Bentley: No, you do it on your total capacity so divide 8,000 by 17,000. You're assuming an 8,000 capacity. We have 17,000 capacity to fill the barns because you have to look at what it takes to fill all the salt sheds. Not just to fill part of it.

Legislator Niebel: You've lost me Brad. So you had 6,000 tons at the end of last year, right now we have 8,000?

Mr. Bentley: Let's step back. So the capacity of our salt barns are 17,000 tons. That's what it is. In order to figure out what was the percent full of the barns in 2019, you divide 6,000 by 17,000, correct? That's percentage full.

Legislator Niebel: Alright.

Mr. Bentley: So that is around 35%, rough numbers. If you were to determine how full the barns are today, you take 8,000 divide it by 17,000.

Legislator Niebel: Forty eight percent.

Mr. Bentley: So you're 10, 11, 12% higher than you were last year. Again, round numbers here.

Legislator Niebel: How many thousand tons of sand or salt do we use per year? Or how much did you budget for last year?

Mr. Bentley: An average year or a –

Legislator Niebel: Well yea, well this year as compared to last year.

Mr. Bentley: So it varies on weather but we could use, we go through at least a full barn and generally two and a half. What we're forecasting for the \$2.5 million dollars is to – that is what we use in a year. Again, what's the weather? That's dictating it but I'm only forecasting average, average.

Legislator Nazzaro: On average, how many tons of salt do you use?

Mr. Bentley: Thirty six thousand. If you guys want, I will get the facts and figures. At one point, I gave them to you last year.

Mrs. Dennison: I think that Mr. Nazzaro's point is that we have more salt now. We have 2,000 more tons of salt so that we will have to buy 2,000 less of tons of salt potentially.

Mr. Bentley: But I gave you \$200,000.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, which equates to, it's 2,000 tons, it's about \$70,000 a ton so that's \$140,000. So this year, probably come in on budget unless there is extreme weather.

Legislator Nazzaro: So in your budget, you are budgeting to purchase roughly 32,000 tons.

Mr. Bentley: Yea.

Legislator Nazzaro: So if you take \$2.3 million divided by \$71.50, that's, rounded, 32,000 tons of salt. Then the question is, what do you use, conservatively in your typical winter around here? I'm trying to pinpoint the exact level of salt and then you look at your inventory levels and you build in a buffer and then you say that is what I need to purchase.

Mr. Bentley: As you mentioned, in the (*inaudible*) days, we just bought what we needed. So this is all new to everybody being at this level of detail in trying to forecast – because we never budget this way so it was never an issue. If you ask me, I'd rather go back to that because this is, the game that we're playing, it's a game to me and I'm going to – what number do you want to use. It's kind of that. You are asking averages and averages and weather –

Legislator Nazzaro: I have to interject here Brad. It's not a game. What we're trying to do here is make sure we have the right number in here. It's not a game. We're not trying to – we all agree on the safety of residents is number one, that's our number one priority. But our job is to make sure that we're budgeting enough but also our job is to make sure we're not budgeting too much. So, you have to come up with a realistic number. That's all that I'm trying to do.

Mr. Bentley: And that's what I'm giving you.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's not a game. It's a realistic number.

Mr. Bentley: And that's what I'm giving you. I'm not saying that that's (*cross talk*), so here are the numbers. Going back to the 2017 winter, we used 35,972 tons at \$60.52 a ton for a total price of \$2.17 million. In 2016, we used 34,179 tons at a price of \$61.76 for \$2.1 million dollars. For 2015, we used 24,655 tons at \$61.76 for a total of \$1.5 million.

Legislator Nazzaro: What did you use for 2018?

Mr. Bentley: I don't have that number. If Ken is watching, he can text it to me.

Legislator Niebel: What was 2015 again?

Mr. Bentley: For 2015, we used 24,655 tons at \$61.76 for a total of \$1.5 million, in 2014 we used 33,650.

Legislator Gould: What was the last 10 year average?

Mr. Bentley: Ball parking it by eyeball, 30,000. The most recent five year is probably going to be more like 34,000. Kind of like the number I gave you before. Like I said, - I apologize Chuck if I came across the wrong way. I'm not talking about that being a game, I'm giving you a real number based on historical evidence. That is not a game to me. The game that I'm referring to is, how do we adjust it? I only want to make changes to my budget if there is a reason to change it from the real data that I have. I don't want to change it unless there is a reason to change. Right now, I don't have any data that makes me want to change from what we're budgeting. I don't feel that there is any reason here that I've been given and I want to go over to sand, there is one big thing that I forgot and Ken reminded me of this, sand actually has

been proven to be beneficial to alga blooms. So the more sand that goes in the creeks, get down to the lakes and actually increases the change of alga blooms. Those are scientific studies so –

Legislator Davis: That is fine and I'm not going to debate that. I don't know what the studies are. I know that there are studies saying that salt is harmful to the environment as well. So we could go round and round on it.

Mr. Bentley: I'm just saying that sand isn't the perfect answer.

Legislator Davis: I'm not saying it's perfect, I'm saying it less expensive.

Legislator Nazzaro: And Brad, you and I are on the same page when it comes to this because I would never or any of us in this room would never make a budget change unless it could be substantiated with facts and numbers. At least that is what I do and I know the rest of the committee here, so, I would never propose a change. So, it looks like there won't be a change based on what you're given me but until I got that information, it appeared that there could have been a change based on the extra inventory levels that you had at the end of 2020 compared to 2019. But, we can't make that decision until we get all the information so I appreciate that information.

Legislator Niebel: Brad, we're interested in the safety as well as you are but, we also have to put forth a realistic budget or tax rate for the taxpayers of the County.

Mr. Bentley: Like I said, I apologize for coming off wrong there. It was maybe a reactionary statement and I apologize. But, what I've given in the budget, as I think you guys know me now for three years, I'm transparent. I show my cards on the table, I'm going to tell you the data, I'll back it up and I think that I have provided a lot of that today and I have the 2019 numbers for you. It was 31,000 tons for 18/19' winter.

Legislator Nazzaro: For each year, what, 31,000?

Mr. Bentley: Yes, well no. Its starts November and ends in March.

Legislator Nazzaro: Oh, got it. So roughly and then we can move off of this topic, it's always been sort of a discussion point, but if I did this right, we have enough in the budget, the current price that we put in there, \$71.50 divided by 32,000 tons. So we have enough in the budget to buy 32,000, we have 8,000 tons approximately in the sheds so right now we have the ability to get about 40,000 tons of salt.

Mr. Zafuto: Without changing the budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, without changing the budget.

Mr. Bentley: Are you including the \$200,000 reduction from – because I'm buying this year's salt.

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes. It doesn't matter.

Mrs. Dennison: He's just saying from now to the end of 2021, odds are we would need 40,000 tons of salt. That is what we can buy with the budget we have.

*(Cross talk)*

Legislator Nazzaro: That's what we have available, 32,000 to purchase, 8,000 in inventory, so currently we have the ability for funding 40,000 tons of salt.

Mrs. Dennison: But we have some additional funds left over in the budget for 2021 that we haven't spent.

Legislator Nazzaro: In 2020?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: And how much is that?

Mrs. Dennison: I think it's –

Mr. Bentley: You never end the year at zero because if you do you run out. So it's always and when is the last day it's going to snow. Last day it's going to snow, you don't want to be that close to – and we didn't get any snow late in the year last year. That's great.

Legislator Nazzaro: We're good. I guess I work backwards. I say, this is what we have, and the inventory, these are our purchases, this is what we have, then, we have the numbers down and say, what do we use, is the budget reasonable, yes or no and then we move on. That's all.

Mrs. Dennison: Assuming that there aren't any invoices in October, for 2020, after reducing the budget by \$209,000 versus the amended budget, we have \$719,000 still available.

Legislator Nazzaro: You still have \$719,000 in the salt budget?

Mrs. Dennison: For 2020, yes.

Mr. Bentley: We generally by the time we go through December, we've used 17,000 tons. We have to be able to fill the barns and that money will barely get us to fill the barns. And then we need to have enough money to fill it back up again because we used 30,000 tons.

Legislator Nazzaro: So you have enough left in the 2020 budget, I'm just doing the facts, the numbers, I'm not going to get into the discussion but, right now, you have \$719,000, you have enough to buy 10,000 tons.

Mrs. Dennison: If you look back and 2019 in the last quarter of 2019, the actual expenditures were \$1 million dollars.

Legislator Nazzaro: For that period of time.

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: At a lower price too.

Mr. Bentley: No, same price, \$71.50.

Legislator Nazzaro: I thought in 2019, it was \$63.00.

Mr. Bentley: No, the salt price changes in August, not end of year.

Legislator Nazzaro: Now does that price fluctuate at all during the year?

Mr. Bentley: It's an OGS price, State contract so it stays good from, I'll say, October till the last – it goes through the winter season but it changes in August. So when I set this budget, I didn't know what the new price was but round numbers it worked out to be the same. But the money that we have left in this year's budget, is just to fill the barns this year and depending on the weather and last year we used it up. What you don't want to get yourself into is, trying to play this game close to the edge because if you get a bad winter and you don't have enough salt and everybody is reaching for the same place and there is only a limited number of trucks and everybody's clambering and we also supply to the towns and villages, we do not want to be the one that left holding the bag. So we have to be conservative in this choice. So, we will fill the barns just at the beginning of winter and as our stock goes down, we're going to replenish them. So we not only need enough money to fill the barns, we need enough money to keep ordering as replenish. I know the fiscal year matters but for us it doesn't. We go based on being able to take deliveries because it comes in at a truck load at a time. You don't magically show up with a million dollars of salt. It comes in at each truck load costs "x" dollars and it's a lot of trucks. So it's a continuous stream of in and out, in and out. We don't have the ability to manage this at that level of detail and take those chances. So, if it's an early winter and we see a lot of use and that is why I was back last year. We had some early winters here in the past couple of years. It really depleted our stock early. We got lucky at the end of the year we didn't use as much so we came out a little bit ahead, not much, 2,000 tons doesn't last you very long.

Legislator Odell: Brad, we give a significant or hold a significant and sell a significant amount of salt to the municipalities –

Mr. Bentley: A quarter of a million dollars.

Legislator Odell: Do they tend to rely on us as the backup going into the tail end of the year so they are not filling theirs?

Mr. Bentley: In some cases, we're the primary. We're not the backup. This is where they get their salt for their towns. So then if I go on the calendar year, fiscal year that we're budgeting for, I'm budgeting for at this price point, what around your numbers was what, 32,000?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes.

Mr. Bentley: At 32,000 tons, if you look at a winter and you just kind of move the dates back, if you use 32,000 tons in a year, you should budget 32,000 tons in a year. It doesn't matter whether it (*inaudible*) over a year or not, it's still, as you move along, that's what you need.

That's why these numbers are based on usage, and facts, and actuals and what fluctuates the price. An \$8.00 price increase two years ago was a killer. We're lucky that it didn't go up again this year, I guess or else we would be looking at a lot less tonnage and maybe needing that \$200,000.

Mrs. Dennison: I have two quick other wrap up questions. They won't be as long as salt, I promise but just getting back to you on questions that were raised. Brad mentioned the debt service for the DM fund for heavy equipment. He didn't know how long the bond term is. The bond term is 10 years so there will be 10 years of debt service associated with the \$2 million that was bonded for last year. Then road stripping, I sent an email to Drew Rodgers to ask about the width of the road stripes and his response is, the minimum stripe width is 4 inches and that is what gets put down. We don't go any wider unless there's a specific situation that would mandate a wider stripe.

Legislator Gould: Four to six, State law. Pantelis already showed me.

Mr. Bentley: So apparently we put down the minimum. Thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: Yes, thank you. Any other further questions? Since it's 1:08 and we're supposed to be back here at capital projects, is that you Brad?

Ms. Crow: Mr. Chairman, there is also the Energy Fund that needs to be reviewed which I can come back if you are going to break for lunch. I'm here all day.

Legislator Nazzaro: Let's have lunch, come back at one.

Mrs. Dennison: I mean there's an hour scheduled for capital projects and I would suggest that it probably won't take that long.

Chairman Hemmer: Maybe we can come back at 1:45 p.m. Alright, let's do that.

Mrs. Dennison: Because we'd have to do the Energy fund also.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., let's try and get back here at 1:45 everybody, alright?

*Meeting recessed until 1:45 p.m.*

### **Energy Fund**

Ms. Crow: The summary, you know, as you're aware there's a change in the plant operations and a new RNG plant is going to be developed there. So our model for next year looks, you know, a little bit different than our budget has been up until now for the energy plant so I'll just kind of pass on to the next page the FTE's - there was budgeted for this year a mechanic, I believe to do some work there during the year you know that's not going to continue after this year. So that's not included in next year's budget. For the most part, the budgeting is pretty simple. Going forward we will be recording depreciation on the energy plant that was originally constructed. We still have four bonds left to pay down, there'll be fully paid over the

next 10 years but we record depreciation expense in our enterprise funds, rather than the actual debt service payments. So the depreciation expenses is a straight line depreciation, so there'll be the same depreciation for the next 10 years. The principle is not recorded as an expense, but the interest is so that's kind of a difference in accounting from our general funds to our enterprise funds. We record depreciation in the enterprise funds and then interest expense, but the principle is paid down. And you'll see that on the balance sheet. So, that is the interest there. We do also have in that contractual line there are, there is a small amount of liability insurance that is charged there as well. But the main cost that makeup of that \$698,000 is the depreciation. Then down on the revenues we receive based on our agreement, we will be receiving an annual million dollar lease payment from CGE- Chautauqua Green Energy, our partner and then for the first 10 years of the agreement, there is a small revenue that we get from the gas produced that they pay a (*inaudible*) and that rate goes up in the second 10 years but for the first 10 years we get about \$5,000 we're projecting a year from that revenue it's not very much. The main revenue is the million dollar lease payment and there are interest earnings that are applied to this based on the cash balance and the energy fund, just like any of the other funds receive interest earnings. So, those expenses and revenue net out to about \$88,000 profit and what is not budgeted this year for 2021 is a transfer of profit from the energy plant to the general fund and that Will be the case for most of the next 10 years although the handout that I gave you will kind of go into that in a little bit more detail, but because the depreciation is straight lined, but the principal payment is still a cash payment that we have to make, over the next 10 years that principal payment, we still need the cash in total to make that payment and so any profit in the 10 year period needs to stay in the energy fund to be able to make the full principal payment. So that is the biggest change. I'd say as far as energy plant- you know, any proceeds going to the general fund. So if you do want to look at the handout that I provided, this is just a, like a profit and loss statement that I put together that kind of shows - first page is the first 10 years of second pages and second 10 years and then, you know, really kind of- this is just the items I just talked about that, you know, the depreciation expense, Insurance, etc and the lease payment, but the rows down in the bottom give you the picture of the - and I'm sorry that projected 2021 is a little different than what's in the budget because I must not have updated my spreadsheet to the actual budget, but regardless, down below those four rows on the bottom, show you what our cash need is to cover the principal payments. So for example in 2021 our principle is going to be \$118,000 but, You know, we have a net profit of \$90,000 so we need that to help us make that principal payments, so we are not going to transfer it to the general fund. We're going to keep it in the profit and the energy fund to help us make that payment. We are a little bit short and therefore that \$27,000 will need to come from (*Inaudible*) fund balance to make the full principal payment. And so you can see over time, you know, as the debt pays down you know by 2026 now we're starting to see that will be able to start to transfer some funds over because some of the debt will have been paid by then. There's still like two bonds left by 2026 that will be fully paid by 2029.

And then on the second page. You can see, you know, after the debt is paid. Then we'll start to see, you know, we'll have a better like actual annual revenue that we know we can count



on we're projecting out based on the gas production times the rate that we agreed to. Now, their revenue share changes in the second 10 years, so then there is potential to do to do better than this. So I think we kind of conservatively projected out the second 10 years but that kind of gives you the big picture on how the agreement was structured and how that will play out in terms of our financials.

Mr. Bentley: I guess the biggest thing we're looking for the first 10 years the certainty to pay down the debt. Then it doesn't give away everything in the back. There's some opportunity for profit based on gas pricing. So if it's there (*inaudible*)

Ms. Crow: In 2020 though, I will mention that we did budget for the million dollar transfer, which we still will make in 2020 so that that'll read on that.

Mrs. Dennison: And then Kitty, starting in 2026 there'll be an estimated surplus, which will be transferred to the general fund. Correct?

Ms. Crow: Yeah. Yeah. So, in the middle of the page here where you see the line interfund transfer - So beginning in 2026 its \$145,000 and then it grows thereafter as the remaining principal comes down and is paid off.

Legislator Odell: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a few questions for clarification, please? Thank you. Kitty, Brad – (*inaudible*) and it's been a great project going along just after taking the tour was great and enlightening and getting this going to go to the energy building we're burning methane those giant caterpillar (*inaudible*) and seeing a couple offline. Since we transferred this over to the other company. We're not responsible for the maintenance or on the turbines or any of that stuff right that's we're just going to collect our net payments, they're responsible for maintenance?

Mr. Bentley: So yeah, we are the owner of the facility. In the new agreement we are leasing it to Chautauqua Green Energy and they will be responsible as, as was the prior arrangement. (*Inaudible*) are still generating power (*inaudible*.) Those are still ongoing still working through the process and that's what the million dollar payment was for 2020.

(*Cross-talk*)

Legislator Odell: Good. Thank you for the clarification.

Chairman Hemmer: So in 2020 we're not getting a payment from the Chautauqua Green Energy?

Ms. Crow: We are.

Chairman Hemmer: Yes?

Ms. Crow: Yeah, yeah, that was part of the arrangement to get that million dollars this year. I mean, we still operate - you know, our first half of the year before the agreement went into effect and we have operated at a loss. And so we still have that loss which will kind - but we are getting the million dollar payment and we will be able to execute that transfer this year that was planned.

Chairman Hemmer: That's not going to be pro-rated or anything?

Ms. Crow: No, it was a negotiated payment to make the million dollars, you know, in this year.

Chairman Hemmer: That's good.

Legislator Nazzaro: We're still getting the payments every year. It's just we don't want to deplete it because of the points that Kitty made regarding the depreciation, so forth. We have to preserve the EE(?) fund balance?

Ms. Crow: Correct. So we budgeted the payment - the million dollars for this year and all things considered, we're able to still do that. Starting next year. We're budgeting differently. We're budgeting- you know, we know what our expenses and revenues are going to be. And that's what we're using for our budget.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other questions? It looks like a pretty good picture.

Ms. Crow: I mean - speaking to fund balance - I neglected to kind of also point out on the bottom row on the handout that I gave you shows the running fund balance. So, in those first few years we're going to have to use some fund balance to make our full principal payments and then after that we don't need to use any fund balance, we will have enough profits to cover it. At that time, we will have roughly \$950,000 undesignated fund balance and the E fund so, it could be, you know - I like to keep it there as a - if anything were to fall through with this agreement in the future we would at least have a little buffer there if something unexpected happened. But once we are comfortable that everything's all the debt is paid, you know, at that time, I think, you know, it would be reasonable to then you know transfer those funds. Once the debt is paid.

Chairman Hemmer: A little something for emergencies. Okay. Is there any other questions? Thank you very much for them presentation.

Mrs. Dennison: If you would go to the capital budget section -it is in your tentative budget book which is the second tab from the front of your binder. The first exhibit that you'll see there is exhibit C. That is a - as it says, that's the status of capital projects that have already been approved and it shows the balance of money into the capital projects. This is based on actual activity, actual expenditures through August 31st of this year. So that really is there just for point of information for you.

The next exhibit is Exhibit D, which is the same thing, but for the roads and bridges capital projects. Again shows what's been awarded what's been spent, and the balance and those projects. So really what I think we need to focus on today would be exhibit E. These are the projects that are suggested for new funding in 2021. The first page is a summary by department, not by individual project but shows you for each department starting from the left hand side. So it is the total amount that was requested for the project and then shows the, the amount that was funded for projects and those departments by the type of funding. A lot of the projects, not counting roads and bridges and enterprise funds, most of those projects we intend to fund them with earning interest on our cash balances in the general fund. And we do have an increase in interest earnings budgeted for 2021 and 2020. It's around \$900,000 and next year we are budgeting 1.3 million. So that does give us a little bit more money to work with when we're looking at projects. So that's our first funding source.

The second column- local share - that is for the vehicles and those are vehicles that are purchased, not counting heavy equipment vehicles. Those are vehicles purchased by county departments that operate in the A fund and in 2021 the only department that is planning to purchase vehicles is the sheriff. So there is a schedule of the vehicles that he will be purchasing. The \$148,000 is the purchase allocation for 2021 so he's buying vehicles in 2021 - approximately \$575,000 worth of vehicles, he will be charged in his operating budget, a quarter of that over the next four years.

When we get in the local share for roads and bridges that is the amount of money that is not funded by any other source. So it does come from local share.

You'll see under reserved for capital that we are suggesting a small use of reserved for capital \$120,817 - most of that is for light duty vehicles in in the DPF arena.

The next column bond – and we will go through (*inaudible*) show the individual projects behind this. But just to give you an over overlook, we are proposing to again bond for \$2 million worth of heavy equipment for the transportation departments.

We have parks project that is one hundred percent funded by timber sales that's \$10,000 in the next column. Then we get to state funding. So, we will have state funding for several projects, most of which are carts buses. Federal funding - there again, there is a large chunk of money for cars, buses, we also expect to get federal funding for a Brownfield Greenfield projects in planning and development.

And I should have commented under state funding that's where you're going to see under the roads and bridges section, you'll see our, our CHIPS and Pave New York awards.

Under dedicated revenue and user fees roads and bridges that will be the DMV fees and also permit fees.

At the bottom of the exhibit enterprise funds. There are not very many capital projects proposed - new capital projects proposed for funding in 2021 but the ones that are will be covered by user fees within the districts

And the last column. Other non-local funding. There are some, some of the planning and economic development, a couple of those projects are receiving funding from a source that is not mentioned in any of these other columns. So if you get to the far right column, you'll see that we are proposing to award funding and the amount of \$5 million for projects in the H Fund and the vehicles purchased by the sheriff in roads and bridges, the funding is \$6.1 million and then \$550,000 and user fees for the projects in the in the enterprise funds for a total investment of \$11.7 million. Any questions so far on the overview?

Okay. Moving into exhibit E1 that lists the projects - individual projects with the same breakdown that I just described the total amount of funding that was requested and then the funding that we're anticipating from the variety of funding sources and in general, I would say that we, I mean, we of course use the rankings that are supplied by the County Planning Board. And in general, the projects that are funded follow the recommendations of the Planning Board - just a couple of exceptions, looking at the rankings from the Planning Board their project number two- priority number two was an LED lighting project at JCC that was not recommended for funding.

Just a couple of others that were not included - Planning and Development - there was a project for site preparation and due diligence which ranked 15th from the Planning Board and was not recommended for funding at this time.

CARTS bus wash was not included with anticipation that there may be other grant funding that could cover that. So that that was bypassed. JCC distance learning was not included. And then there were a couple of projects that were not included because they were deemed to be operating expenses. One of those is the Mayville (*inaudible*) flash study which Brad mentioned his in his operating budget. The district attorney had a plan proposed project for operating for expansion of his office - redesign of his office that was also rejected because it was considered an operating expense and I do not believe it was included in the District Attorney's budget. So in general, most of the projects that were that were presented - we had a total of 54 projects that were presented to the Planning Board. And the funding takes us about through half of them, you know, there's a few exceptions, but in general, looking at the list, most items that were ranked at 27 and above were included, so I should say, you know - very close to half the projects. So that's good news that we could fund half of them but bad news that half of them we could not.

So I would suggest, I mean we can walk through the individual projects if you like, or I could just open it up to questions on specific projects.

Chairman Hemmer: How'd you guys like to do it? You want to go through -you have individual questions or-

Legislator Gould: I have a question about the Sherman shop and the Sheridan Shop. Why does one need a 30 watt generator and why does one need a 70 watt generator? Why does one need one so much larger and one is so much smaller?

Mr. Bentley: The Sheridan Shop is bigger and the equipment there- the lifts- there's extra lifts in there. It's really the size of the building and what's in there.

*(Cross-talk)*

Mr. Bentley: And someone asked me if it covered the entire building or not. And the answer is no. We are only covering the basics. And in the winter you need the heat, make sure the pipes don't freeze. We've had a significant number of outages, especially out in Sherman. The Sherman shop has been hit multiple times with lightning strikes (*inaudible.*) And as you can imagine, during a storm and an emergency is the exact time is when you need our crews out there. And so to have no - there's no backup generator at Sherman. So how can you have your crews in the dark, trying to operate by cellphone? There's no dispatch, no radios, you know, there's just nothing working so you're having a supervisor kind of running blind in the dark with the emergency go out there, it's just not a proper way to operate. The size difference is just based on the size of the shops.

Legislator Gould: Yeah. I understand why they need generators. I don't understand why one needs a bigger one than the other one. Other than the size of the shop, but that - It's supposed to be Just emergencies - possible emergencies, not the run everything.

Mr. Bentley: Well -

Legislator Gould: It looks like one wants to run everything and the other one just as an emergency.

Mr. Bentley: Now, it's actually on floor space of the equipment - I'd have to ask on the square footage of the buildings but yeah, you know you've got different equipment size to heat the buildings. You know, what it takes to heat this building is different than what it takes to heat another building. So each generator size is specific to the location. So if that was done - if they're all the same, I'd actually have the reverse question. Why are they all the same? So the fact that these are different tells me someone's looking at it is what was done is that we are only loading up the equipment that needs to run during an emergency.

Legislator Odell: Are these diesel or natural gas?

Mr. Bentley: I believe they use natural gas to cut the price.

Legislator Odell: I think you're right.

Mr. Bentley: (*Inaudible*) that's why they're so cheap. You don't have to have on site storage of backup.

Legislator Odell: Exactly.

Mrs. Dennison: One other general comment I would make about the capital project budget is that we begin the process by going through the Planning Board and having a Planning Board Review and rank the projects. But the second phase of the budgeting process is that all of the projects from the Planning Board rankings are reviewed by the capital projects review committee which meets twice in the month of August and goes through the list and recommends projects for funding and there are three items that are included in the in the budget and the County Executives budget that were not recommended for funding by the capital review committee. So I just want to point those out to for, for those of you that are part of that committee. There's a couple changes from when we met this summer. After we redid the budget for interest revenue, as I said, we do have a little bit more money to work with this year. So there were a couple of projects that the county executive added back to the budget. One, just going through on exhibit one - the first one is the bat wing mower at the at the airport in Dunkirk, that was not suggested for funding. I have to admit I was, I was a key proponent of that. I thought it's an old piece of machinery and we need it and I think we can afford it with the interest income. So that was added back to the budget.

Another change is also in the airport. The airport strategic plan that was not recommended - it was highly ranked by the Planning Board, but it was not recommended for funding by the capital projects review committee. So, we did the total cost of the project is \$125,000 where the \$75,000 local share. We did not include 100% of that local share on the budget, you'll see the local share budget is \$50,000 but the airport strategic plan was something that the county executive felt strongly that we needed to do. So that was added back and the third project that was not originally advanced for funding was for human resources, their (*inaudible*) software system. Jessica Wisniewski, the former director said, you know, we need it, but we could we could wait a year. But we did have enough funding to include that and felt that it would provide significant efficiencies in operating the human resources program as well as there's some functionality of that for exam taking so the (*inaudible*) civil service system was added to the budget. And I say the reason that was picked up is because it was, other than kind of all the JCC projects that we were deferring. It was really the next project in priority order for which there was not enough money when we did the original reviews with the committee.

Chairman Nazzaro: I guess the only one I'm disappointed in that was added back - because I obviously sit on that committee, was the airport strategic plan. You know the airports are making progress, which is good. You know, we heard it during the budget review. I'm very supportive of airports but I didn't think it's necessary to have another study - another plan. We have new FBO in there, a lot of positive things are happening. We've done plans before the time I've been up here. We've done I think at least two studies on the airport on plus we had a special ad hoc committee which I co-chaired with one of the other legislators. So I see again the project cost is 125 and we're using \$50,000 of interest earnings for that, as you pointed out, and then the state funding - there is state funding available for that - \$50,000?

Mrs. Dennison: That is based on the information that we got from Ron Almeter, yes, if there is funding available for that.

Chairman Nazzaro: Brad, I don't know if there's anything you want to add. I mean, I'm disappointed to see that back in there. And again, I'm supportive of airports, but I think we made good progress and we have so many other capital projects that did not make it into the capital budget, I just don't feel this is necessary, based on past studies that we've had because we get these studies and I think we have smart people working here in the county and I think we're making good progress and we don't need it at this time. It's just my opinion.

Mr. Bentley: I agree with you about the study at least the one - a real business study for the airport, which this is not enough money to do it that way. I think this is surface level type analysis, a true business plan for that airport would require a whole lot more money than what's proposed here. So if we could have more money to do a more enhanced study, I think I'd be in favor of it. I know my county executive was recommending this, so it's a bit awkward. But I do know that the intention of the county executive is good in what he's asking to do - I just don't know that what's being proposed and the money that's available to do it is going to get us where we need to be.

Legislator Odell: It looks like has some points to add.

Mr. Almeter: The impetus behind this capital project request was general acknowledgement that the strategic plans that are funded by the FAA for each airport and there is actually a project underway to complete a strategic plan for the Jameson airport - our strategic facility plans and they focus on a capital investment strategy for maintaining the functionality and the safety and so forth of the aviation facilities. The FAA stops well short of funding and supporting a business plan and a strategic growth plan for Municipal Airport facilities. So, we have to figure that part of the equation out with internal resources. And that was kind of the catalyst behind this. Mark Geise and the IDA were a strong proponent of this because Mark participates on the advisory committee for the FAA master plan and recognized that we're embarking on these master plan exercises or projects with FAA funding without a clear sense of what we, the community - we, the owners of the airport want to do with these airports and I think that has become abundantly clear as we do these strategic facilities plans for the airports without a good roadmap on the business case and where we want to go with the airports as a business. Whether or not it can be done with \$50,000 or \$125,000 it's all a matter of degree. It's how deep you want to dive and how far you want to look. I will (*inaudible*) based on the will of the legislature and the county leadership.

Chairman Nazzaro: So Ron, there is then state funding available to pay for \$50,000 of this? Or half? Is that what I'm looking at here?

Mr. Almeter: My apologies to Kathleen - I don't believe there is, at least not within immediate grasp. I don't know quite where that came from. There's always the opportunity or the

option to go to New York State under the New York State Capital airport capital projects plan and asked for money. But that wasn't the way this capital project was framed. I think the \$50,000 is a figure that the IDA came up with through their funding channels. It didn't come from me.

Mrs. Dennison: t's on the capital project request form under fund under financing sources. So that's the information that was used by the Planning Board and the capital review committees.

Chairman Nazzaro: I would appreciate Friday- I see the county executive is available on Friday, just to come before the audit Control Committee, just to - I know we have Mark here from the airport commission and so forth, but this was taken out by the review committee and now it's being added back in. And now I'm hearing that - I question where we're going to get the funding for this, especially when there's other capital projects that arguably could be above this. We're using our precious interest earnings to fund this - at least half of it or whatever. So maybe, maybe we need to hear from the county executive obviously he's passionate about it. I think it's a waste of money at this time.

Mr. Bentley: I'm passionate about the airports-

Chairman Nazzaro: Yeah, I'm passionate about the airports but I think this isn't a good use of money at this time.

Mrs. Dennison: And I just based on my- I mean, we'll talk to the County Executive, but based on my conversations with him, he kind of echoes the opinion of the Planning Board in that we'll do it one more time and then we're done. But obviously our decision was based on the information that we had that there was \$50,000 of funding available for this project. If that funding is not available that kind of changes the picture.

Mr. Bentley: Maybe we should talk to Mark identify (*inaudible*) at some point. That's how it got on the capital project sheet.

Legislator Odell: Mr. Chairman, I'll just add that the Lederman report, which I think everyone remembers was a funded study going back three years ago maybe sitting there collecting dust. I don't think we acted on any of it- which was out there as far as I sit on the IDA board and Airport Commission. So this is all new to me. I haven't seen any funding coming out of the IDA. Good question – let's talk to Mr. Geise.

Mr. Bentley: If no one can find the money, it may not be there.

Chairman Hemmer: So on Friday, you will have consider taking it out in the Audit & Control meeting on Friday (*inaudible*.)

Chairman Nazzaro: I'm assuming this Committee can do that but I think we need more information to be honest with you. But now that I've heard from Mr. Odell as well, I think this is sort of a surprise to several of us. So yeah, sure. The County Executive and Mark Geise, they



certainly have the right to address this and then we can decide one way or the other, if that's okay with your committee?

Chairman Hemmer: Yes, that's fine with me.

Legislator Niebel: John, should your committee take action on this?

Chairman Nazzaro: I'll make a motion to remove this from the capital budget at this time.

Legislator Gould: I'll second that.

Chairman Hemmer: Okay, all in favor of removing the airport strategic plan from the capital projects budget?

Legislator Gould: For lack of funds.

Chairman Hemmer: Opposed? So, that's four us in favor and I'm sure Mr. Scudder would follow along with us.

*(Unanimously Carried)*

Legislator Niebel: And then Audit and Control can review in on Friday.

Chairman Nazzaro: Kathleen what does that do as far as the financial side of this?

Mrs. Dennison: I would suggest that we would reduce the use of capital reserve. So, that \$50,000-

Chairman Nazzaro: *(Inaudible)* it's presented using \$50,000 in interest earnings.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. We could then use \$50,000 of interest funding towards another project and reduce the use of the capital reserve.

Chairman Nazzaro: I'm agreeable to that.

Chairman Hemmer: The total use of the capital reserves that we are planning on now is-

*(Cross-talk)*

Legislator Odell: Mr. Chairman, just one more question for Director Bentley and Ron Almeter - none of this study would have wouldn't be a cornerstone or be predicate on any other studies that would need to be done for part of maintenance for a *(inaudible)* airport, right? We don't have to have this in order to go after grant, A, B and C.

Mr. Almeter: That's correct.

Legislator Odell: Okay.

Mr. Almeter: Our capital program with the FAA is premised upon the facilities strategic plan, which, again, the FAA funds 90% of that. And that is currently work in progress. So this would have no direct bearing on the execution of our airport Capital Improvement Program as currently approved by the FFA.

Legislator Odell: And if you have a copy of it - The Lederman reports, I think it was from three years ago. It's out there. Could you just resend it all the legislators or to the chairman for distribution?

Mr. Almeter: Sure, I'll do that right now.

Legislator Odell: Super.

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Chairman, because I made the motion and Legislator Gould seconded it- I don't know what the proper procedure here is, but I agree, I would like my motion to be reducing the use of capital reserve by \$50,000. I don't know if I need to amend my motion. I just want to follow proper procedure here and I don't know what that is. I'm going to make a second motion to amend the motion that I made to add the clause that the \$50,000 savings would be used to reduce the use of capital reserve by \$50,000. Jay, would you still second that.

Legislator Gould: Of course.

Chairman Hemmer: All in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

*(Cross-talk)*

Mrs. Dennison: We did not go through each individual projects which, as I said, we can do if you'd like, or Just leave it to any other questions.

Chairman Hemmer: Just leave it to the questions. We don't have to go through them all. So then we're on to capital projects for the roads and bridges.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, just briefly, and I'll say, just one more highlight from exhibit E1 is again that heavy equipment, maintaining that at \$2 million, but it would be funded by a new bond.

Legislator Nazzaro: A 10 year bond?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Ms. Crow: *(Inaudible due to distance from microphone)*

Mr. Bentley: We're doing this because we're about \$5 million dollars in the hole on replacing equipment based on schedule life useful life. We've been behind and continues to be

behind. We had two and a half million dollars due to a capital (*inaudible*). Two years ago -two million dollars last year we have actually started to see the fruits of that investment in decreasing our maintenance costs in vehicle maintenance. Mind you, some of this heavy equipment takes 12 to 18 months to deliver. So, you know, even from the time of having that money it's taken some time to get to where we're at. And we're still behind. So another \$2 million borrowing at this interest rate. Chuck and I talked about, you know, what is an opportune time to borrow you know this seems to be a time to borrow and invest in our future. To get these returns on investment. And I just want to confirm that we are starting to see the beginnings of that return on investment. Not only in the maintenance side and like pure dollar return but in less equipment breakdowns. When we go out and pave a road or whatever we whatever action we're doing. If a piece of equipment breaks down we have guys standing outside the room. Now we have to de-mobilize some of the equipment out for repair and go back and do the job again that cost money. And that's not necessarily a documented savings that you can take off the top, but it and when you get to the bottom line. It is a saved dollar. It's an increase productivity, its safety done better. So this makes a difference and will continue to make a difference because we still have a long ways to go. And some of our equipment we have some equipment that dates back to the 1950s, still. Oh, yes. Just to give you an idea of how far that money goes a plow truck – a new plow truck costs us a little over a quarter of a million dollars - with the attachments and everything on it \$270,000. We have approximately 33 of them. So even on a 10 year replacement cycle, we'd have to basically replace a little over three trucks per year. Well that's \$750,000 plus And that doesn't include excavators loaders dozers, Paving machines chip spreaders, Bucket trucks, light duty vehicles, rollers -there's just so much, I could go on. Just to replace the basic equipment is three quarters of a million dollars on a 10 year life cycle. (*Inaudible*) dollars helps But even that is still - Probably could do more if we had it, but this is a really good start. And I appreciate the effort to legislators to listen to this, to listen to the needs. The employees welcome it when they can go out and run equipment without having to worry about breaking down or safety issues with all the equipment helps morale, so This is a needed investment and I applaud the efforts to do this under the potential bonding to do that. But I just (*inaudible*) why it's important not just do it because rates are cheap. Thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you.

Mrs. Dennison: All right, exhibit E2 is capital vehicle requests. I pretty much covered this in the introduction, the sheriff's organization is the only one that's purchasing vehicles. The Sheriff did not purchase any vehicles in 2020. So obviously I think he should be commended for that, but he is renewing his request to purchase vehicles for 2021 and it's very close to his request for 2020 that was not implemented.

Exhibit E3 is roads and bridges. This is almost identical to the 2020 request. Most years they ask is \$7 million and in most years the funding is \$6.1 million. That is again true for 2021. Funding is based on the CHIPS awards, as I said before, the DMV fees, Pave New York and

permit fees are now included in the dedicated revenue. The local share is part of the D fund budget that you already reviewed.

And then the final is exhibit as E4 is the enterprise funds, there is just two projects, one for the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District for some line repair and then the South and Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District renews its annual request for \$125,000 a year for working on collected lines and manholes and again both of those projects are expected to be funded by the district's themselves. So any other questions on capital projects?

Chairman Hemmer: Well, it looks like we're done.

Mr. Bentley: Thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: So to move on to the Water and Sewer districts

For the exciting part of the presentation.

### **South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District**

Mr. Walsh: My name is Tom Walsh and I'm the director of the South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer Districts. Okay, the South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District is an enterprise fund. We are solely funded by our user fees. For 2020 appropriations we have seen some increase in our appropriations primarily there are salary and labor due to contract raises. The cost of equipment is up from 2020 due to the purchase with four new pickup trucks. Significant increase in our health and benefits and pension costs have sharply increased and also an increase in indirect costs through IT, purchasing and legal. 2021 revenue projections are slightly down in our projections due to the closing of one of our large industries Castelli cheese, they were probably one of our top three users and they contributed significantly to our budget. Also with the COVID, about 10% of our users are industrial users and their billing is due to their consumption and when the buildings, the restaurants are closed or reduce use we see a reduction in their billing and their consumption which therefore effects the cost. We do also have an increase in earnings to offset some of these decreases from our savings of our cash fund balance and we also will be selling the pickup trucks on the Auction to offset these costs as well. And it's pretty much where we are. But overall, we are still in a good place. We are in a good budget position. We feel we can meet our budget without investing into our own cash fund balance. So that's where we are as a snapshot

Mrs. Dennison: Thank you for the overview, maybe just walk through the details of each of the individual departments and see if there are any comments?

Mr. Walsh: Sure. We do have 17 employees. We did have a part time employee that was eliminated. So we have 17 employees at the South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District. That is for not only the wastewater treatment facility, but that is also the individuals that work in a collection system and the office staff.

And all departments will be the next page. You can see the personnel services – the (*inaudible*) health insurance GASB pension expenses, unemployment is up considerably, interest earning- we will be selling our pickup trucks. We are purchasing pickup trucks and we have - we're going to keep them for two years and then put them back on the market. The market for used pickup trucks is a very healthy market. So at the cost of buying and selling to offset those costs - we do very well with that.

Chairman Hemmer: Did you have advice deciding on that?

Mr. Walsh: Yes, It's the Erie County model that actually Tracy France- we discussed that we - actually started this a couple years ago. 2021 will be really the first year that we - but Erie County, they actually started this project and we are following suit. So we're not the guinea pig. We're following. So hopefully we'll have good results.

Legislator Niebel: So, so we're up \$54,000?

Mr. Walsh: Yeah \$45,000. So that's the sale. So that would be the sale of three pickup trucks.

(*Cross-talk*)

Legislator Niebel: (*Inaudible*) increase of \$54,000? Its page 4 of 9. It's in the individual breakdown. Is that for one pickup trucks? Two pickup trucks?

Mrs. Dennison: You're looking at the \$54,000 figure, Terry? That's the change.

Legislator Niebel: Okay.

Mrs. Dennison: That's the increase. So the budget is \$171,000.

Legislator Niebel: Right, compared to \$117,000?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Chairman Nazzaro: Is that- do you net the gain against that? Is that for you Kathleen? So, the \$171,000 is the purchases minus.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. That's the purchase price and the revenue is recorded in a separate department.

Legislator Niebel: That takes into consideration the trade ins?

Mrs. Dennison: The way we account for it now is that in most cases vehicles are not traded in, they're purchased and then sold at auction.

Legislator Niebel: OK.

Mrs. Dennison: So the auction proceeds (*inaudible*) revenues and they're recorded in our in an entirely separate revenue account if someone were to purchase a vehicle and had a trade in then the net cost would be in this vehicle expense line.

Legislator Niebel: Ok.

Mr. Walsh: I guess we'll be in 8110 department. Again, GASB pension is increased, employee benefits are reflected there, contract increase steps for employee personal services also an increase. And the 8110 is what the office staff at the south and center would be considered.

The next page is the 8120. This is the collection system of the South and Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District. We are purchasing -starting to see actually a contractual electrical contractor start installing switch gears. This is our emergency equipment after 40 years we are starting to see a failure of some of this and this is just general replacement to ensure we have our electrical emergency backup. And then again, increasing post employee benefits-

Chairman Hemmer: The increased employee – you needed another employee?

Mrs. Dennison: It's just a transfer from one department to another. Yes, there was an increase in 8120 there's a decrease in 8130

Mr. Walsh: And then the 8130 department, you'll see the move of one employee. Employee benefits again reason cited- and you'll see down in department income user fee revenue down to the COVID restaurants closing. We did see a decrease in revenue due to that. And then general – the contractual, we did show (*inaudible*) we did utilize \$39,154. We are moving into hopefully the 20th century, and you're going to be able to pay via credit card. We're very excited about this kicking and screaming, but we're pushing through. We're going to do this so. And then, final sale of property- the Ford pickup trucks that will go to auction.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, you'll see you'll see on the last page is kind of a funky department- 9730 but that's where - so that's where the sale, the revenue from the sale of the trucks goes in that department in sale of property.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you very much.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you.

### **North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District**

Mr. Cummings: Good afternoon, everybody. Scott Cummings, director of the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer Districts. I've got three budgets here to go through the North Lake Sewer District budget, the Portland Pomfret Dunkirk and the Industry North county Industrial Water and Sewer budgets. These are the ones that we operate to take care of out of our office. So pretty much everything is pretty close to the same as what Tom said. As far as where things are at with even the North district, we have four full time employees and I have a part time

accounting clerk, which I'm hoping to move to full time this coming year. We've been looking for - we've held off because of budget and of course when COVID hit the spring. It was another reason to kind of hold off just trying to control our expenses for the district, but with any luck, we can get that put in place this coming year. And we have budgeted for it in the budget. Our appropriations are down a little bit, just like Tom had mentioned in our revenue for the North District - mainly looking for the possible revenue loss to the to the coven the economy right now so we're trying to be careful. And what we did. We haven't really increased a lot in our budget. We're just trying to hold the line as best we can stay within our revenue. So that's kind of where the North district is at. We operate pretty much the same as what south and Center does as far as three separate parts of our budget administration sanitary treatment, just like Tom had mentioned. As we start to go down through some of the different accounts, you know, the biggest thing of course for us was the contract increases for the employees and benefits and things are up. Things like that. The indirect cost to the districts are up some- actually quite a bit, so that was something we had to overcome.

So for the North District we're in the black this year, our revenues are a little bit over our expenses, which is what we were hoping for. And the district made a good decision A couple years ago to raise the rates, which was a tough decision, but it was the right decision And we're moving in the right direction. So, with any luck, we can keep that rate where it's at, for a while. We were able to complete our phosphorus upgrade project at our plant so our treatment plant is doing very well right now I'm mostly equipment is fairly new and replaced. So the district is going to move to try to upgrade their collection system. That's where we need to focus our efforts over the next few years. So that's what they're going to be doing. The district has done a couple of I&I studies in the collection system. So they're looking at trying to do that infrastructure repair hoping for grants from the state, but We're afraid that those may not be coming with states the budget looks at this point, but they're going to continue on and see what they can do to try and get those repairs done, we just, we just have to for the economy. We have to get that you have to get that fixed. That's where the North district is at. Questions on that one?

Chairman Hemmer: So far the increased rates are taking care of the – staying ahead of them-

Mr. Cummings: Staying ahead- if you were to look at 2018 actual and 2019 you will see that- in 2018 we were in the red and after the rate increase in 2019 we are starting to move in the right direction. And I think we're still moving that way. So I think we're doing pretty well in the north district. Like all departments, I would love to have at least one more employee, but I know the funds don't help that. So we're just got to be careful. Keep doing what we're doing.

Chairman Hemmer: Sounds good. Any questions?

Mr. Cummings: Alright. I can go over the Portland Pomfret Dunkirk budget. Again, this district - they do not have any employees they contract with the North District they pay 70% of

one man wage and benefits, 20% of mine and 20% of the account clerk. So we do what we can to help that district out and keep it going. Same thing with the increased cost for contract raises and benefits are up. Indirect costs, of course, are up from other county departments. So they've kind of had to take a take that into consideration. Our cost to the village of Fredonia for treatment for the sewage in that area is fairly high, but we were under contract with them now to try and keep that under control. Still a little high. We got another year or so on that, on that agreement. So hopefully we can renegotiate that fairly coming in a couple of years. Keep that under control. Now this district needs to purchase a new vehicle this year. They do it every- that district does it about every eight or 10 years it's been 10 years- last year was 10 years. They put that purchase off until this year and now with the budget and the way things look, they're not sure if they're going to be able to do it. They're going to hope to purchase one of those nice pickup trucks that Tom Walsh just talked about - Is the plan. So hopefully they can do that. So they budget for purchasing a used vehicle from South and Center if that's possible at a fair rate.

Chairman Hemmer: Are they going to have to go to the auction?

Mr. Cummings: Well, talking with Tom - I talked to him about it. He's got two to trade or get rid of. So he's going to put one on the auction and they're both about equal and depending on what that goes for if the district can afford to buy the other one at that price, he's willing to sell it to us if his board agrees to that. If not then they'll have to sell it on an auction. So that's the plan. But they need to do something with a vehicle for that district. They raised the rates A few years ago and it's helped. they're moving in the right direction due to the indirect costs increase and due to the needs of purchasing a vehicle They're slightly in the red with this budget, but I think if we can control our expenses as we did last year, we can we can keep within that our revenue. So that's the plan. They are going to try and do some infrastructure I&I study work also on their district to try and reduce their I&I - inflow and infiltration. That's their plan. They were rejected with the grant last year. All the grants were kind of pointed towards Chautauqua Lake, and they're on Lake Erie. So they did not receive a grant from the state. They're going to try to apply again this year and keep going. It just so happens, the North district agreed not to put in a grant for this coming year. They've already received two to kind of give PPD the chance to be in the number one chance for the County Sewer districts. That's all I have got for the PPD district, unless somebody has a question.

Legislator Odell: Scott, I have a quick question. It's not budget related because these are all tight and they're all good and things in the right direction. I'm just curious- just from conversations going back about six months on your boards- the various boards you did some right sizing this year-

Mr. Cummings: We're trying to. In talking with the law department and then the county executive has asked me to put a resolution together to talk about possibly consolidating the districts -consolidating the boards. Honestly, I think that's the right way to go. I don't know how that's going to work. But I think that has to happen. Three separate boards- three separate



districts run out of one office. Each one operates in a different way different contracts. It just gets very confusing and very tough. Kathleen and I- and Janell spent a lot of time trying to put budgets together of these three districts, especially for the industrial district coming up, that's very difficult. So that has to happen. I think that's going to be a cost savings, especially administration wise in contract wise to somehow consolidate those districts into one. I'm not sure how it happens or how it needs to be done, but it needs to be looked at.

Legislator Odell: O.K., thanks Scott.

*(Cross-talk)*

Mr. Cummings: Yeah, I've been working with Kristen Wright on it a little bit and then I've just started working on the resolution today. And then her and I can sit down next week and see how we put it together and get it presented. It needs to start somehow

Mrs. Dennison: I was going to reserve my comment on this until we talked about the industrial district, but since it came up, I will get on my soapbox and just echo what Scott said is that these three districts need to be consolidated.

Mr. Cummings: The North district, like South the Center, we have a treatment plant and PPD does not. They only have 506 customers. The Industrial District has 15 customers. I just personally really do not think you need separate boards for that. I agree with what Pierre had said. When those districts were formed and putting the infrastructure in yes you needed boards to set all that up and get it going. They've been going for thirty plus years. There's no infrastructure being installed. It's kind of sitting there. There's not a lot of growth. There's nothing against the boards, you just don't need separate boards for that size of districts. I think on the County level we're going to have to consolidate. It's going to make it a lot easier, especially budget wise. Trying to put three budgets together just doesn't make a lot of financial sense.

Mrs. Dennison: And a couple of weeks ago we had a lot of confusion with billing for the Industrial Districts and Todd Button, our 1<sup>st</sup> Deputy Director of Finance, he summed it up very nicely. He said the Industrial Districts are 10% of the customers and 90% of the work, at least from an accounting finance standpoint. As Scott said, Scott, myself, Janell, Todd, Nancy Henry, we spent way too much time working on the Industrial District and that one particularly needs to go. Needs to be consolidated.

Chairman Nazzaro: Would that need to be voted on by the users or just by the Boards?

Mr. Cummings: Well, the users are industrial users. Nobody on the Board is a user of the District. So I really don't know how that works.

Legislator Nazzaro: Probably a public hearing.

Mrs. Dennison: I have said the same thing to those Boards.

Chairman Chagnon: These are County districts that were formed by the County Legislature. The members of the Boards are appointed by the County Legislature. The County Legislature, in Pierre's opinion, can consolidate these. Now, I'm not the County Attorney. He may have a different opinion.

Mr. Cummings: It really has to happen. The amount of time spent, well, once we get into the Industrial District budget here, it's just way too much. Especially on the Budget Department and the Finance Department, spending way too much time for what they really are.

Legislator Odell: O.k., I have to ask that question now because it pertains to today's budget review but (*cross talk*).

Mr. Cummings: It all fits in Mark, it really does because this whole thing has been a long process. I (*inaudible*) spent a lot of time today just trying to do water meter readings for the Industrial District that just don't match. Where they came from, from the Brocton Mayor, who puts them together, we didn't get all the readings like we were supposed to so we're still up in the air. We can't even bill the users for their usage yet and it's been months and months waiting for revenue to come in.

Chairman Chagnon: I'll just point out for further confusion that we have a South Chautauqua Lake Sewer District and a Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District that are managed by one board.

Mr. Cummings: And I think that's how we should follow that. We should follow that same format. I think it's the best way to go.

Chairman Chagnon: That was done by Greg Yaw at the time, the attorney for the Districts and he did it with a memo that was presented to the sewer districts boards and when it was approved, it was signed by me and ever since then on my signature, we've been operating as one board, one district.

Mr. Cummings: Look how Tom presented one budget. That's what I mean and here we have three to be put together. Identical work over and over putting this together.

Mrs. Dennison: Pierre, can you do that again, now?

Mr. Cummings: So anyway, it needs to happen and eventually I hope we're going to move in that direction. It will make things a lot better administratively, maintenance wise, everything. I think it makes sense.

Legislator Nazzaro: I think at this point, I don't see any obstacles unless –

Mr. Cummings: I'm sure the board members will not like it. They will think that they are losing control, I'm sure you're going to see some of that. That's no different than if you merge schools.

Legislator Nazzaro: You're having trouble finding members too.

Mr. Cummings: And you are having trouble finding members. Good qualified members, that's what it is. The Legislature has approved board members for PPD and they never show up for the first meeting, any meeting and then we have to turn around and do it again. It's just too much. Alright, so I have the Industrial District budget to look at.

**Industrial District:**

Mr. Cummings: Unfortunately their also – that district budget this year is in the red. Their expenses are over their revenues at this point. I will make the comment that the Board was asked to adjust their rates a couple of years ago by the Budget Department, Kathleen and myself, and they did but not to what was recommended by the Budget Director so they are still struggling with their finances and funds. They raised it some but not anywhere what was recommended so they are struggling some with theirs. Again, they contract with the North District for employees and labor and administrative so that's how they do that. We provide them with what we can. Also, they are under the restrictions under the contract raises, the insurance benefit increases and the indirect costs is quite a ways up for them. So, those are some of the expenses that they have. There is not much that goes on there other than some basic pump repair, some basic maintenance work, so there is not a lot of change there in their budget. The Law Department negotiated a different contract with the Industrial District between the Industrial District and the City of Dunkirk that provides the sewer treatment. That's an ongoing contract issue they are having still having trouble with putting that together. But the Law Department has spent a lot of time with that District also.

Mrs. Dennison: That's why you'll see in the Sewer Department, 8120, there is a big increase – well, their numbers look really weird because of the contract with the City of Dunkirk. The 2020 budget assumed that the City of Dunkirk would bill the customers for sewage treatment and that we then would pass on that cost to us and then we would collect the revenue to cover it. That's why there is a big decrease in the revenues and the cost because we're not doing that contract with the City of Dunkirk. But, if you look at the bottom line, you'll see the sewer portion has a loss of \$14,000. It's almost all due to legal costs. Their indirect costs for legal services went up dramatically and this is what Scott and I have been talking about. The reason was is that it was found that they needed to have a separate accounting, separate funds for their water and their sewer and Kristen Wright had to spend a lot of time separating the funds and as Scott mentioned, trying to negotiate contracts with the City of Dunkirk, so it's a big expense. It's time, it's an indirect cost. It's time of our legal department but that's the reason for the big increase in their costs and for their loss projected, budgeted loss in 2021. In defense of the Board, they didn't know that they were going to get hit with another \$14,000 in legal fees so that's one reason they didn't raise the rates very much but they are so close to (*inaudible*) that anything is going to hurt.

Mr. Cummings: It's just not good. So that's kind of where we are at with them with the budgets.

Mrs. Dennison: It's probably more than all of you wanted to hear about the industrial districts. We've been saving that up for a while.

Mr. Cummings: It's such a little district and the amount of time spent to try and figure things out and get things done properly is very difficult because they just never operated properly for many, many years. It's hard to get them to follow the County way of doing things. It's very difficult.

Chairman Hemmer: Its sounds like a challenge. I hope that you can clear it up eventually.

Mr. Cummings: Like I say, I will be working on that resolution for the district change. I'm not sure how to format it but Kristen is going to work on it next week and you'll be seeing that coming through before too long once Steve Abdella has a chance to go through it and the County Executive. It's kind of where that is at.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., sounds good.

### **North Chautauqua County Water District**

Clerk Tampio: Number 39. This is also an enterprise account as you know and all expenses paid for by the user fees. We'll move onto the FTE account, if that's o.k. and we'll do the details. It's the same FTE count as last year and that's still the 10% time that I provide for the administrative services to the District. I think we'll go right to the 8310. The O&M for the District. Personal Services up slightly just because of the increase in salary for my 10% allocation. The contractual sees an increase based on the depreciation which was not part of the budget last year. Kathleen, did you want to comment on that?

Mrs. Dennison: We did an amendment earlier this year to the 2020 budget now that part of the capital improvements have been completed. We are starting to incur or book, I should say, depreciation expense and that accounting treatment was not anticipated in the 2020 adopted budget. So we amended the 2020 budget to add depreciation expense and it's also in the 2021 budget. There is a revenue that partially offsets expense because the, I have to check my notes on this one all the time, there is a cost of financing the construction but the value of the capital assets that were in the process of constructing the value exceeds the financing cost and so that is, according to Todd Button, that is a revenue. So, we have the depreciation expense added now that there is an asset to depreciate and some of that funky revenue to add as well. So that's in both the 2020 amended budget and the 2021 tentative budget.

Clerk Tampio: Right so that portion of the capital project is done. The \$132,000 pertains to is the West Side project that was completed under the Village of Brocton project in which the District has an agreement with them to pay their debt service for that project for the duration of

the debt service and once the debt service is paid off in 30 years, it becomes an asset of the District itself. The contractual costs also include, we also had an increase in the indirect costs just because the legal department did an analysis like they did with the previous districts with Scott Cummings with how much time they put into our District maintenance and administration. So, that had a pretty good increase of over \$1,600. It also includes, last year we made an estimate, as best we could, of the actual usage, the purchase of water from the City of Dunkirk. That was based upon the west end project plus the east end project which is the water line replacement on Rt. 5 in Sheridan. However, that project did not get completed and brought on line as purchasing water from the City until early this year. So the estimates were – it was over estimated last year. This year we tried to do a little bit better estimation based upon the quarterly bills we're receiving now and an estimation from the Athenex project of what their water consumption will be for this year. As you know, they are not fully operational, they are not producing right now, they are just finishing the construction of the building and its facility so their water consumption is much lower than they anticipate once in their full production. Also the contractual costs include not only the purchase of water from the City of Dunkirk but the O&M costs that we have provided by the entity known as CBI Waterworks which is the collection of municipalities that our water is distributed to. They also perform the meter readings, the water testing, the water utilities at the pump station, the water tank etc., and they forward the bills to the District and we reimburse them for those at cost. So then likewise the department income under the revenue of that is a little more than \$1,400,000 is calculated using the estimated consumption of water which we estimated at 300,000,000 gallons for the year and then times the rate that we charged to CBI Waterworks, our purchasers, which includes the water rate we pay to the City plus a rate for debt service and the rate for the O&M cost that we have to reimburse. Any questions on that? The last sheet is the debt service on the payments that we are currently making to EFC, correct, for the Brocton water project. If you don't have any further questions, I just want to give you a quick update on our capital project which is still in process. After somewhat of a delay from New York State because of the COVID pause and DEC's review of our design, or our Phase II project, which is the new water main that will go from the Town of Dunkirk all the way to the Town of Sheridan, the construction of a new water tank in the Town of Sheridan and the two interconnections with – actually with the Pomfret lines, east and west which is fed by the Village of Fredonia, that project should have the final approval by DEC within days, I hope, and then the project will be bid. We've worked extensively with Tracy France to get that all ready and once it's bid, we expect to award by the end of the year and probably construction, full construction, not beginning until spring. Hope to have the project completed by the end of 2021. So this Phase II project is approximately a \$6 million dollar project and it's funded through a couple of grants. A \$1 million dollar grant from ESD and a \$3 million dollar grant from EFC, the WIIA grant and then the balance to be provided by the bonding through the County.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you very much. Any questions from either committee?

Legislator Odell: Kathy, thanks for keeping this tight and this is the portion that we can control. I'm a little suspect on CBI's operations, as a customers, but, I appreciation what we control at this level, so thank you.

Clerk Tampio: Thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., we're all set. Thank you very much Kathy. That's looks like that's a wrap. Any parting comments by anybody?

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Chairman, were we going to make a motion to remove the \$64,050 in FEMA funding for the temporary cleaners that was included under Public Facilities? I'll make a motion –

Mrs. Dennison: I think I have some additional information on that which just came in. I sent an email to Drew Rodgers and he just responded. He also says, I confirm that 4 inches is the minimum line width for stripping and that is what we put down. That was his educated guess at 12:30 this afternoon so he just confirmed that was correct. But on the temporary cleaners he said, I asked him to quantify the expenses that are included and he has a total of \$85,907. Those are temporary cleaners, the Dunkirk DMV additional cleaning, and the North County Office Building additional cleaning contractual amounts. So those are the expenses that are included and then the revenue that is included is \$64,050.

Legislator Nazzaro: Thank you Kathleen so I think my motion was going to be correct and you can assign the account numbers, was to remove from the 2021 budget the \$64,050 in FEMA reimbursement and reduce expenses for the temporary cleaners by the same amount so you are still leaving in 25% of the temporary cleaners that is funded by local share. That's my motion and I don't have the account numbers but it will be budget neutral.

Mrs. Dennison: There are three different revenue accounts that have the disaster relief in them because it is split between three different sub-departments of Buildings and Grounds. I can specify those if you would like. They are department A.1620.R430.5006, department 1620.6015 or sub-departments 6050, same revenue account R430.5006 and then the last one is, A.1620.6080.R430.5006, so for a total of the \$64,050. On the expense side, I can't specify the exact account distribution because it's a combination of personnel and contractual.

Legislator Nazzaro: You don't have to do that for today.

Legislator Davis: I will second that motion.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., so Kathleen, you are going to fill in the blanks on those numbers?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Chairman Hemmer: We have a motion and a second, any discussion? Seeing none – all in favor?

***Unanimously Carried***

Legislator Niebel: We'll adjust the expenses.

Legislator Nazzaro: Yea, she'll provide all the detail on that.

Chairman Hemmer: On which accounts to remove the revenue and expenses.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct for a net local share of zero.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to emphasize Mr. Chairman that it's still very important to keep the buildings clean especially in light of the pandemic so, I'm speaking now from Public Facilities, not from Audit & Control because Audit & Control does not set policy but I'm asking our Director, Mr. Bentley, to hopefully find a way in your budget to be able to continue providing the cleaning that is necessary and keep the same standards that we are now. That's just my comment.

Mr. Bentley: We'll work with Christine Schuyler in the Health Department to find out with this new FEMA guidance if the reason for the change is due to CDC changes. If they've changed how we need to clean because they are not going to reimburse for it, then, I would say that we can make the appropriate changes to keep the public safe, to keep the employees safe, this is every changing guidance as Kathleen and I both know. Tomorrow they could say no, it is reimbursable and then we'll be back to add this back in. But we're really just trying to follow the guidance provided to us and to do the right thing for the public safety. That's really what it comes down to. We'll do what is needed to be done with consultation with those that are in the know of who best to do it. We'll find whatever way we need to do it. The more immediate concern is even for 2020 because if we're talking 2021, the guides that just came out was effective the end of September or –

Mrs. Dennison: The middle of September, the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Bentley: So, we're already in a phase where we're spending money that is non-reimbursable. Kathleen and I were talking a little bit about addressing this with the County Executive and the County Health Director on what their guidance might be for our temporary cleaners to address the situation now. I think that answer is probably just as important as the one for 2021.

Chairman Hemmer: Has FEMA although they adjusted the revenue, they didn't adjust their guidance?

Mr. Bentley: I'm not aware but again, I would have to consult with the County Health Director. I have not heard of any change guidance as of today but it could be that they are sitting out there and we just haven't asked the question yet. Again, this is relatively new so we're

having to kind of react on the spot and figure it out as we go along, as we always have. This is unprecedented type work, what is the right answer here and we want to error on the side of caution but, we want to make sure we're doing the prudent steps.

Mrs. Dennison: If I could just quickly summarize the changes that have been – the motions that have been made and adopted today for your committee. That would be a reduction in appropriations of \$50,000 in interfund transfers, that's because of the change in the capital project. That goes with the decrease in the use of the capital reserve. So there is a decrease in interfund transfers of \$50,000. There is a decrease in appropriations for main department, Building and Grounds. I will split that out between wages, benefits, and contractual costs for a total reduction of \$64,050. Then also a reduction in three revenue accounts, again in Buildings & Grounds, total reduction of \$64,050. So there is, at the end of the day, there is no change in the tax rate associated with those changes as they were either budget neutral or just reducing the use of the reserve. It does not change the tax levy so we're still at, at this point, an increase of 19 cents from the prior year tax rate. That summarizing all of the changes between the first three days of the committee meetings.

Legislator Nazzaro: Kathleen, I'll ask that you put that all in a written format for the Audit & Control committee, which I know you do anyway, for Friday.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you very much Kathleen. Anybody else have anything further for this committee?

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Bentley will be pleased that I'm not making a recommendation to reduce the salt budget, we'll leave it, my opinion, as is and we'll just keep an eye on it so I'm not making a motion. I did not know Mr. Chairman if the committee wanted at all, I mean, this budget is so challenging this year as we all know. I don't need to go over that whole presentation again but we did have at the beginning of the Public Facilities, and I understand it's all rolled into maintenance or roads, I understand that, but, I couldn't help pick up on the one comment that we doubled the amount in the budget for pavement markings. From \$200,000 to \$400,000. I understand also what Brad said like, if we needs money to do that he takes it from here, moving monies around within that department. So I didn't know if the Public Facilities committee is comfortable - I think anytime I hear doubling, we're doubling it from \$200,000 to \$400,000 that I wouldn't be opposed to reducing it by \$100,000 and giving \$100,000 more which is a 50% increase. I want to see if anyone else feels that way because at the end of the day when we present this budget, we're not coming up – it's a tight budget in every department. I value the safety of the roads and as our priority but again, the comment in the book was, we're increasing it from \$200,000 to \$400,000. That's a big increase and it's up to the committee.

Chairman Hemmer: The white lines on the edge markings, you said that in the past we have not marked them in some years and that isn't legal to leave those off?

Mr. Bentley: I'll answer it this way. I believe that we've stripped the roads, the white lines are not required, the yellow line is but we have actually, weather permitting and projects permitting, we've stripped as many as – the lines. I believe last year may have been the first year we actually repainted all of them. What happens is, when you plow them, they flake quickly so



it's just a question of whether or not someone feels safe that a line that doesn't show – you know, when you're in the fog and you can't see, is that good enough or not? So, to the effect of why did it double, it's because we caused other parts of the maintenance of roads to suffer. We took from other parts that we needed, whether it be vegetation management, whether it be shoulder work, whether it be signs, all safety functions to make sure that we had the lines painted, that we could purchase the right amount of the materials. So, it's a little bit of robbing Peter to pay Paul. What I brought you today is transparency. I'm letting you know what it costs to do the job. I can certainly take \$100,000 less but it will come at the detriment of something else.

Legislator Nazzaro: Brad, when you said that you did all of the – I thought I heard you say last year –

Mr. Bentley: Yeah, last year we stripped all the –

Legislator Nazzaro: And what was the cost of the paint? Because that's what this is – *(cross talk)*.

Legislator Gould: That's the cost of the paint.

Legislator Nazzaro: So \$400,000 to do them all.

Mr. Bentley: Yeah and that's why I provided you today was the cost to do the work.

Legislator Nazzaro: The yellow and the white.

Mr. Bentley: Even though the budget was \$200,000 last year, I took it from other areas.

Legislator Gould: I will make a motion to lower that to \$300,000. Kathleen will find the right numbers.

Chairman Hemmer: So what we're saying to Mr. Bentley is that you can still go ahead and stripe all the lines he wants but we're going to give him a \$100,000 less so he's going to have to do what he's done in the past, take it from signs, or take it from some other parts of his budget.

Mr. Bentley: I would recommend that we take the priorities of the DPF, if you are looking to cut, take it from my lowest priority area. Don't do it here. That's why we did the priorities in Public Facilities and look there, go to the Parks first, to cut that. I don't believe this is the right place.

Legislator Odell: *(cross talk)* exercise. Priorities.

Mr. Bentley: I mean, we made those priorities for a reason. I think we should stick to it.

Chairman Hemmer: Certainly safety of the traveling public has to be a high priority for us. So rather than the \$100,000 off of the road budget, take a \$100,000 out of the Parks budget.

Legislator Nazzaro: We still have a motion on the floor. It hasn't been seconded but I want to go back – I want to follow proper procedure, we still have a motion. We have to have a second to discuss.

Legislator Gould: There is no second.

Legislator Nazzaro: I will make a second so we can open it up for discussion. Which will now require a vote but, let's have a discussion. Going to Mr. Bentley's point now, the budget for Parks, the tentative budget is \$154,000. So if we were to take \$100,000 out of there, basically you are shutting down the Parks.

Mr. Bentley: Correct.

Mrs. Dennison: The other thing to keep in mind with Parks is that it does not – well, we could change the occupancy tax budget but the Parks doesn't necessarily have \$100,000 effect on local share.

Legislator Nazzaro: True.

Legislator Niebel: Just a question. So you think it's a safety issue to have the white lines on the side of the roads? Because at \$300,000 you would have more than enough to do the yellow lines but you wouldn't have enough to do the white lines, but you think it's imperative to do the white lines as well?

Mr. Bentley: Yes, it's definitely a safety issue. I've heard when we go out and – I'll give you an example, it just happened. We just repaved Lakeside Drive down in Lakewood, at Jones & Gifford. I will tell you, we just got it done and painted the yellow lines, you know what the first email I got was? When are you doing the white lines? The bikes lanes, it's all about pedestrians, this is so important and this is not the place to cut.

Legislator Gould: I think all you need is the one line down the middle and the side lines you don't need.

Legislator Niebel: He says otherwise.

Legislator Gould: In a fog, you can see that one if you stay on your side of it, you are not going to run into somebody. If you stay a foot or two or three foot from that center line, you are going to stay on the road, so I've never seen a big need for the lines on the sides of the road. Go ahead Mr. Bentley, tell me I'm wrong.

Legislator Niebel: Jay, it's not just the center line and navigating through the fog. As he mentioned, pedestrians, bicycles, all those pedestrians and bicycles keep the right of the way line.

Mr. Bentley: It's about Complete Streets, it's about –

Legislator Niebel: It's a safety issue for those people, I guess too.

Mr. Bentley: I'll agree with you that it's not required by law.

Legislator Gould: Right, there is a reason it isn't.

Mr. Bentley: However, I will tell you that the traveling public emails me and calls me about why aren't they. They are the ones that are driving it –

Legislator Gould: Tell them that Jay Gould didn't want it. I don't care.

Mrs. Dennison: Speaking of Complete Streets, can we use Complete Streets money to do white lines?

Legislator Gould: Probably.

Mr. Bentley: I believe the resolution indicated that it has to be used for complete streets.

Mrs. Dennison: My question is, what is complete – how do you define complete streets?

Mr. Bentley: Complete streets is making it walkable – example I used was just part of it happened to be in an area where that is but there are a lot of other areas where we paved where it's not complete streets but people use the roads to bicycle or to walk. I think the resolution might (*cross talk*)...

Mrs. Dennison: I agree that it might but it might not.

Mr. Bentley: I think it's probable.

Legislator Nazzaro: I agree we did the priorities but, to the point what was brought up about the Parks that is funded a lot by the 3% occupancy tax. So, you would not achieve the same amount of savings. So we have a motion on the floor, we have a second, we're discussing, in my opinion, I still think – we're doubling the amount. In the past, Brad found a way to do it. I'm not saying you've got to stripe the roads, the white lines, that is not what I do, it's not my decision. You have CHIPS funding in here, you have the carry over, I mean, I look at the whole budget so maybe the directive is, we're reducing the maintenance budget, maintenance of roads by \$100,000. I'm not telling you where to do it, -

Chairman Hemmer: Well, you are. You are telling him that you want to take \$100,000 out of his stripping budget. You are telling where you want him to do it.

Legislator Nazzaro: Well, there really is not a separate stripping –

Mrs. Dennison: Unfortunately there is.

Legislator Gould: It's for the paint.

Chairman Hemmer: (*Cross talk*)... micromanaging him now. You can just cut his budget by \$100,000 and let him do what he wants.

Legislator Niebel: But it costs him \$400,000 a year to do the stripping.

Mr. Bentley: That's a fact.

Legislator Gould: As long as he does both lines on all roads.

Chairman Hemmer: You can change your motion to just cut his budget by \$100,000?

Legislator Gould: No, you have to have numbers.

Mrs. Dennison: The pavement stripping is kind of anomaly. It has its own sub-department. So, we can either specify or you can specify to cut it out of the pavement marking sub-department or you could just do a \$100,000 cut out of general, it's D5110, the more generic road maintenance department.

Chairman Hemmer: We're kind of micromanaging (*cross talk*)...

Legislator Gould: If we say the paint, it has to stay there. You can't take it from someplace else and cut it.

Mrs. Dennison: Well, it cannot be moved unless there is a budget amendment. So for example this year, Brad's department, you moved some money out of pavement marking and into general maintenance. Or maybe it was the other way around but, probably the other way around because pavement markings is small, but yeah, pavement markings, as I said, has its own sub-department so the budget is adopted with that sub-department attached.

Legislator Nazzaro: Where is the stripping amount in here? What page?

Mrs. Dennison: It's in the "D" fund, so it's behind the "D" fund tab.

Legislator Nazzaro: The 10 page document?

Mrs. Dennison: It's on page 8 of 10, towards the bottom. So sub-department 3310 is pavement marking. So we're talking about D.5110.3310.4. Current budget is \$412,700.

Legislator Nazzaro: So the interesting thing, when we talk about this and I agree, I don't want to micromanage but in the 2020 adopted budget, we gave him \$200,000. You chose – no, in 2019 we gave you – I thought you said that we spent \$400,000 in 2019. But we only gave you \$200,000 but it shows the actual amount of \$216,000. So, if I understood you right Brad, you did all the markings, all 550 miles in 2019, which the cost of paint of \$400,000 roughly. But it's not what is reflected in the budget of actual numbers.

Mr. Bentley: Does that include any amendments?

Mrs. Dennison: Chuck is quoting actual dollars spent for 18' and 19' and in 20' we did amend the pavement marking supplies in the pavement marking contractual, we did amend it down by \$25,000. But that was because of the interruption in the furlough and a lot of the projects were changed.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, I'm just asking, how, because we only gave you \$200,000 in 2019, but I thought I heard and I just want to understand, I thought I heard you say you spent \$400,000. So I'm going to keep the motion as it is. You did it somehow and we didn't give you the money in the line item.

Mr. Bentley: I'll have to go back and check to see if there was something that got moved that didn't or shouldn't. I asked the question to my Supervisors, now much paint do you need to stripe all the lines. This is their response to that.

Legislator Nazzaro: I move to call the question Mr. Chairman.

Legislator Gould: Yeah, I'll call the question. I made the motion, I'll call the question.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., all those in favor of removing \$100,000 from the budget for road stripping, pavement markings.

Legislator Gould: No, paint. The paint for road stripping. All those in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Chairman Hemmer: Alright, that's the four of us. We're removing it.

Legislator Nazzaro: Kathleen, you may have more information for Audit & Control to my questions.

Mrs. Dennison: Yeah, and I was just going to add, well, I'll look a little bit further. I'm looking at the five year historical trend in the amended budget and the actual. We do amend the budget at the end of the year but we'd only make amendments based on the actual, actual expenditures are as we discussed. A \$188,000 in 16', \$240,000 in 17', \$179,000 in 18', \$216,000 in 19'. Those are the actual expenditures and that's just in operating supplies that count of pavement markings.

Legislator Nazzaro: We'll discuss it in Audit & Control a little bit more.

Mrs. Dennison: Since we were discussing Parks, just one other catch-up item. We did get some additional information from Jon DeAngelo about the cell phones. In general, the new plan costs \$31.00 a month. That's the line charges per phone, per month. The budget in Parks is a little bit more than that for 2021 because the anticipation is that since that person with that phone is out and about in inclement weather and interesting weather conditions, he may damage or lose the phone so there is some extra money included in there for equipment replacement.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., (*cross talk*)... Alright, is there anything more? If not, move to adjourn.

Legislator Davis: So move.

Legislator Gould: Second.

*Unanimously Carried (4:00 p.m.)*

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