

Minutes

Human Services Committee

**December 9, 2020, 5:00 pm**

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

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

Others: Tampio, Ames, Dennison, Abdella, Chagnon, G. Taylor, Spanos

Chairman Pavlock called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (11/10/20)

MOVED by Legislator Whitford, SECONDED by Legislator Rankin

*Unanimously Carried*

Privilege of the Floor

Chairman Pavlock: Is there anyone here to speak to the privilege of the floor?

Clerk Tampio: I don't believe there is anyone here and there were no emailed comments sent in either.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Chairman Pavlock: I question for Steve. Does it matter what order we took these, number one and number four? Should we look at four first?

Mr. Abdella: Yes, that makes sense to do those together and do four first. Or do two and three first, whatever your pleasure.

Chairman Pavlock: I can do two and three first. Christine had sent me an email a little bit ago and said she wasn't able to attend but she had given me a little response that I can read once we get to those resolutions. So we can cover number two first.

Proposed Resolution – Re-Appointments – Chautauqua Opportunities Board of Directors

Chairman Pavlock: The people that are being reappointed are Rebecca Brumagin, Marie Carrubba, and George Borrello. Any comments from any of the members of the committee?

Legislator Rankin: I think we're lucky to have this group of people who are willing to do this important work.

Chairman Pavlock: I agree. I'm just getting over to Christine's email and I will read that based on what she had said about the people and reappointments. She said, and I don't have to read the whole email. I'll get to the point where it's pertinent. This pertains to both, the people are extremely valuable to the board in to protecting the health of the County residents and visitors. I'm hoping this email through the representation from her, she said Dr. Lillian Ney has been retired Internal Medicine physician and hospital Chief of Staff who has tremendous clinical and community experience. She's very respected in the community and brings a great deal of insight and expertise to the board. I believe that's for our next resolution but I just wanted to read it while I had that open. But she was thankful that everyone wanted to re-up and take on the responsibilities for those that are new. Any questions or comments? All those in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Confirm Re-Appointments – Chautauqua County Health Board

Chairman Pavlock: There's Andrew O'Brien and Dr. Lillian Ney, the lady I just spoke about from the email from Christine. Any questions or comments?

Legislator Rankin: As a member of the Board of Health by appointment, I think these two people, Mr. O'Brien and Dr. Ney bring an amazing amount of expertise and insight experience that really contributes to the Board to the quality of the decisions that are made through the Board of Health. I'm happy to support them both.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you Elisabeth. Anyone else?

Mr. Abdella: Dan, it looks like Lillian Ney's expiration date should also be 12/31/26. Mine is showing 2020.

Chairman Pavlock: Yes, you are correct there.

Clerk Tampio: Dan, we have already corrected that typo since it was prefiled so on the original resolution right now, it does say 12/31/2026.

Chairman Pavlock: O.k, otherwise she wouldn't be in there very long. All those in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Renew & Amend Res. No. 218-20 – Authorize Lease Agreement for the Office for Aging Services at The Chautauqua Center in Jamestown, New York

Chairman Pavlock: I see that MaryAnn is with us this evening and can you tell us a little bit about this resolution and why we want to renew and amend.

Mrs. Spanos: What came to light after I brought this to you at last month, let me just give you a little background. We had been pursuing moving to the Chautauqua Center with the Veterans since 2018 and how we left things in February of 2020, I was following up with the foundations and the Chautauqua Center about funding the build out. Greg was also looking at other Veterans sources that might fund our build out. I found out late in September that the Foundations, due to the COVID crisis were not amendable to supporting the build out and was kind of told last minute that I should approach the Legislature about that as it wasn't a significant cost. So we had been talking about 2,500 square feet for the two of us to move over there. As far as I knew, both of us were moving. It wasn't until it passed the Legislature that Greg had told me that he changed his mind and there is an opportunity for him to move in with the Veteran's Clinic which has recently moved to a new location. As far as I knew, there was no opportunity there but apparently something has developed and he feels that that is a better fit. So, I've talked to the County Executive. I think the bulk of our population is in Jamestown and we should have more of a presence there and so we've talked about moving some staff out of HRC so that we can have a bigger presence in Jamestown. He thought that was a good idea. My Advisory Board also felt like that was a good idea. There is about a similar space that Veterans would occupy in HRC, about 600 square feet is what we would give up in HRC and co-locate some of DHHS staff. I don't know if they've notified so I don't want to say what part but it would be a good fit with us and better collaboration to have some of their staff downstairs. I'm sure they have more of a need for space with what's going on, the things that they are under taking at this time. They will move into about 600 square feet and I will move a little more staff to Jamestown. The problem with that is, in HRC, we are no longer paying occupancy in our budget. It's all in the DPF budget so if DHHS occupies any space in HRC, it won't be seen as a direct benefit to OFA. It will actually look like OFA is increasing their costs for occupancy, well, for rent with no offset. So I've brought that issue to the County Executive for consideration because the staff that will be occupying the space in HRC, does get reimbursement for rent from the State. So, there will be an offset from the County but at this point, it looks like our budget will go up in 2022.

Chairman Pavlock: MaryAnn, do you have those specifics regarding how it affects your budget? Obviously with the old resolution, we knew the differences for your department. Veterans Services share of that was \$3,600 –

Mrs. Spanos: I think that was the increase. I'll let Kathleen, she has all the rent numbers in front of her.

Mrs. Dennison: Right now, the current rent for OFA is approximately \$15,000 and \$8,000 for Veterans. So a total of \$23,000 is the annual rent for the current space. The new space and this would be the first year, in 2021, the new space including the build out would be \$36,375 and that's with the proposed changes and that rent would be just for OFA. So OFA would go from paying \$15,000 to paying \$36,000 so it's a \$21,000 increase annually. Veterans, they currently pay \$8,400, Director Carlson's intention is, he thinks the new space that he will occupy will be the same amount of money. So there will be no change for Veterans. There would be, as I said, about a \$21,000 increase for OFA, that includes the new space, it includes the build out costs as well. As Director Spanos indicated, if she moves some of her people to Jamestown, there would be some additional space in the HRC building that Social Services could take over. There would not be, as she also indicated, not be a direct expense to Health & Human Services, there

wouldn't be any direct to OFA because we don't charge departments for occupancy in County owned buildings. Assuming that Health & Human Services occupies 600 more square feet of space, they do get reimbursement for their occupancy costs so we calculate every year how much it costs the County to house people in our buildings. They submit that to the State and Federal sources and get reimbursement. It runs about \$15.00 a square foot, is our cost and so the 600 square feet would be a cost of \$9,000. Roughly two thirds of that is probably reimbursable. So there may be a benefit to the County of about \$6,000 but that benefit, we would not get any of that increase reimbursement until at least 2022. There is a lag time between when people move and when we can factor that into the cost that are claimable. So the short story is, it's a \$21,000 increase in rent expense for OFA in 2021. In 2021, they have defrayed a part of that by the reduction in the Senior Aide program and I understand today, I've learned from the Fiscal Supervisor of OFA, they have a position that they are planning to not, that they've had in the past, that they are not going to have in the (*inaudible*).. So there is a continual savings from not replacing that position. So there is a \$21,000 increase offset by some staff savings and then in 2022, potential increase reimbursement for Social Services of about \$6,000.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you Kathleen.

Legislator Rankin: MaryAnn, with not filling that position, how is that going to affect your services?

Mrs. Spanos: I think she talking about the Aging Services Specialist position. I think that's a position that is going away also because of the Senior Aide program. We factored that in. Up until 3 years ago, occupancy was charged to all the departments so I've raised this issue with the County Executive to see that there is certain savings that could be had. I find it strange that if they can charge Medicaid or under Title 20 which is 65% reimbursement, Medicaid would be 100%, why it takes almost 2 years to realize that benefit to the County. So this was changed a few years ago for a certain reason and I said now it's a disincentive to be moving out of the building but, I just wanted to also check with Kathleen, you came up with \$6,000 in savings but it really depends on whether it's Medicaid funded or another funding source that's reimbursable. So it could be a total of \$9,000.

Mrs. Dennison: It could be but it could also be zero.

Mrs. Spanos: Right but I don't remember what our increase was without the Veterans'. We had already factored that in.

Mrs. Dennison: Originally (*cross talk*) resolution, we were looking at the increasing cost would be about \$12,000. That's the increase if Veterans' had come with you. The new space costs \$13,000 more per year. The reason now the increase is \$21,000 is that, the space costs \$13,000 more and it was supposed to house Veterans'. Veterans' still has to be housed someplace so we've got the increase in the overall rent at Chautauqua Center versus where you are now but then Veterans' is going to be someplace else for another \$8,000.

Mrs. Spanos: Right. I'm just saying, the \$12,000 we had counted on, or the – so the \$9,000 that was their former share is really what DHHS would potentially be paying.

Mrs. Dennison: Potentially, yes.

Mr. Abdella: Just a question. On the financial information, I see those line items which I think simplistically the \$3,639 increase for OFA and then the corresponding decrease of that same amount of Veterans' accounts for the shifting in space in OFA ending up taking the entire space at the Chautauqua Center. But the rest of this financial information regarding personal services, employee benefits and then the decrease in revenue for Federal aid OFA, I just want clarification on what that is because that would seem to pertain to the rent issue per say.

Mrs. Spanos: I will let Kathleen explain but we had said we were changing – that it wouldn't affect our local share because the older worker program was going away and that's (*inaudible*) the wages and fringes and revenue associated with the senior employment program.

Mr. Abdella: So that was just not something that as covered in the 2021 budget?

Mrs. Dennison: That's correct because this change came to the budget hearings very late and when Office for Aging Services presented it they said there will be a local share savings of \$3,913 which is true but as I say, given the lateness of the adjustments, we put in the changes to the rents and took out essentially the net cost of the Senior Aide program. But when the program is actually removed from 2021 operations, we're removing a whole bunch of salaries and benefits and removing the revenue that would come with them. In the original budget, as I said, we just took out the net effect so it was an incomplete adjustment essentially. So those additional lines reflect what will actually happen in personal services and benefits and in revenue. That there would be reductions, additional reductions in personal services and employee benefits and a reduction in revenue. If we didn't do this, OFA would have essentially a \$100,000 in additional appropriations and obviously they weren't going to spend the money but we don't want it to be there so we're taking that out and taking the revenue that goes with it.

Mr. Abdella: Got it, thank you.

Mrs. Spanos: Yes, and Steve just for your information, why this was so late, when we developed the budget we gave them the option – we signed a new contract with Senior Services America which is kind of a funky year. It goes from July 1 to June 30 so we told them that we would sign one more time and our expectation was that the program would run through June 30, 2021. They are going through a Federal bidding process and once that was complete, they said, oh, we can actually – it would make more sense to transition on January 1<sup>st</sup>. We thought that was great if they could transition it sooner. We didn't want to leave the program in a lurch so they told us right before the meeting in September, a week before as we were working this resolution that they would also transitioning as of January 1<sup>st</sup> instead of June. So as Kathleen said, we talked about the savings and we didn't talk about the whole program really needing to be removed from the budget. Does that make sense?

Legislator Lawton: Could you help me with, I'm just trying to line up the pros and cons of what we're talking about doing. It was a little easier to get them to square up when we had the Veterans' going as well and now it feels like we're – I understand there might be some opportunities for reimbursement but it's feeling a little bit like we're doubling the rent. It's not

quite double but it's a pretty good jump so on the benefit side, can you help me justify, it's a little hard to support without having more justification for the benefit. It sounded like we needed a presence in Jamestown but what are the benefits that we can use to justify this increase in rent?

Chairman Pavlock: Before you start MaryAnn I just want to say, I share the same concern Ken does and I appreciate that question so you'll be answering both of our questions.

Mrs. Spanos: So the bulk of our people are in Mayville. That's where the biggest presence is but the bulk of the people that we serve is actually in Jamestown. So our County wide operations, we have close to 20 people who sit in the HRC building and travel all over the County to meet with groups and organizations and clients and that doesn't seem to make sense when the bulk of the people that we serve are 20 miles away. So having 2,500 square feet in Jamestown and moving more staff where the bulk of the population is, does make a lot of sense to me. There is a lot of opportunities in that building as we've discussed before to convene senior groups, to have programs and services right on sight, and we have a growing senior population. I suppose that we could discuss with Chautauqua Center about occupying a reduced space but if we need 2,500 square feet and we're vacating space in Mayville, a similar space size that the Veterans' would have occupied. I don't know how that doesn't equate. I know that it looks like there is this huge increase but some of that increase we had already discussed and we're o.k. with that because of the increased ability to serve people. I won't know if there's mileage savings because we're closer to all the people that we are going to be serving. Some of the people that we're going to move down there on nutrition services which deals mostly with Meals on Wheels and the kitchen is in Jamestown. We certainly are developing more clients because the senior population is exploding, so, it's really what your pleasure is but I think that 2,500 square feet is not a huge space. It's just that we are not charging OFA for HRC. So, you are not seeing any shift in cost. If we were being charged, \$15.00 a square foot for the space we're occupying in HRC that would be \$9,000 that would be – of the \$21,000 which if you subtract that, the \$12,000 difference is what we were going to jointly pay in increase.

Legislator Lawton: In the original plan with the Veterans', how much of that, was it 2,500 square feet that you were going to have in the new space and how much of that were the Veterans' going to occupy?

Mrs. Spanos: Approximately 600 square feet they were going to occupy.

Legislator Lawton: Are you still - you can't change the build out to do a smaller space?

Mrs. Spanos: I didn't know until you guys knew that Veterans' wasn't coming with us. So after two years of negotiation and I didn't think that it was fair to Chautauqua Center to change. I can certainly ask. The problem is, we will not get those build out credits if we don't sign a contract with them by the end of the year. Because this has gone on for two years and they have to firm up who's in that space. But if we had both gone, we would have - the increase to the both of us, jointly, would have been \$12,000. Then the Veterans' alone, was the \$9,000 that was left. So, we are giving up the similar space in Mayville to take over a bigger space in Jamestown to better serve the bulk of the population who resides there. There is also, as I said, many opportunities, there are a lot of senior groups that are folding because they have no support

and so we could provide more – you know there are a lot of community spaces in that building, more support for whatever they want to do but also to provide our programs and services right in that building.

Chairman Pavlock: I have a couple of questions MaryAnn in regards to this. Obviously we just have a little reservation of such a large increase for the move. I think we're in favor of a move and none of us really I don't think, care about obviously, if you need 2,500 square feet or you can fill that, that's great. It's just that there is a pretty significant increase in the rent for your department. The two questions is guess is, was there any other location that was fitting that was more affordable, if that was ever sought out and also –

Mrs. Spanos: We've been doing it for two years, yes.

Chairman Pavlock: My other question was, obviously we are justifying the extra cost this year with the deletion of a couple of programs, do you ever anticipate reinstating those programs?

Mrs. Spanos: No. Your Senior Employment program, no. I feel that any of the increases we can cover, I think that there should be some benefit directly to OFA. The appearance of that increase doesn't take into account that another County department is going to be getting reimbursed for space. I don't know why that was changed three years ago because we all used to get charged appropriately for the space we occupied in HRC but I think they wanted to – I don't know. Kathleen, you can explain that part of it.

Mrs. Dennison: The reason we changed the accounting for occupancy charges, there are several but the main reason was to put the responsibility for those costs with the people that really manage them and that's the Buildings & Grounds department. Most departments did not like being charged for occupancy because they got this big charge in their budget and they said, I have no control over this and they were right. The only control they had, I mean, they could expand or contract their space. But in general, we have one – the County offices that we own, is one amount of space, it's managed by Buildings & Grounds and the cost for that space, doesn't change based on who's occupying it. So that is the main reason we consolidated it is that, it's a fixed cost so let's put it in one place. MaryAnn is correct that if Health & Human Services expands, there is a potential for increased reimbursement but you cannot ignore the fact that this lease agreement expands our footprint in non-County owned spaces and so we're adding expense for more space. I think the question has to be raised of, do we have to do that?

Legislator Lawton: Could you help me (*cross talk*) Kathleen, that being a fixed cost, it isn't like the County is eliminating the current cost of that space that is being allocated to OFA?

Mrs. Dennison: Right, that cost isn't going away.

Legislator Lawton: We're actually keeping the existing rent. Am I right when I think that whatever our existing rent is in the existing location, the County is still covering that. This is actually more of an increase of the full amount. It's a much bigger increase in terms of the

impact to the taxpayer. We're still going to pay the existing rent, I can't remember what that number was. Was it \$13,000?

Mrs. Spanos: How does this differ from Mental Hygiene –

Legislator Lawton: (*Cross talk*) last statement clarified, sorry.

Mrs. Spanos: Oh, I'm sorry.

Legislator Lawton: I just want to make sure I understand that point. The fixed cost still remains?

Mrs. Dennison: The fixed cost, you mean for the space that OFA currently occupies in the County owned buildings?

Legislator Lawton: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: That fixed cost will remain, yes.

Legislator Lawton: Nobody is moving into that space?

Mrs. Spanos: Yes they are.

Legislator Lawton: O.k., somebody will move into that and we'll reallocate that cost to a new group?

Mrs. Spanos: DHHS has confirmed with me that they want to move staff into the space that I'm vacating. They have more need for space in HRC and so they are going to be moving people into that space mid-January.

Chairman Pavlock: I think the one point that Kathleen wanted to make which I agree with is, so yes, that space will then be rented again from someone else but the rate difference, your department will be spending more in rent because it will cost more to rent space at the Chautauqua Center than it does our own County building. That's where Kathleen's point was is, the rent expense will increase for your overall department because it's costing more to rent at the Chautauqua Center and not a Chautauqua County owned building if I'm followed that correctly.

Mrs. Spanos: I don't know how they come up with that if what she puts to the State is \$15.00 a square foot and without the build out, what we're paying was \$13.40.

Mrs. Dennison: And I'm saying (*inaudible*) and MaryAnn is correct, the cost per square foot is about the same as with the County owned space and the new space. But my point is that, this lease adds more space. It adds more space to the County operations. It adds more space, it adds more expense. There may be some additional reimbursements to defray part of it but to me, that's the question. Should the County be expanding its footprint in non-County owned spaces.



Legislator Whitford: If you will Mr. Chairman, I'm on the Advisory Board for the Office for the Aging, I understand the dollars and cents and the budgeting but, let's not forget that we're serving an expanding population that is in need. You can't deny that that service will be tremendously advanced through this move, through this space, through the services we'll be able to offer these individuals who otherwise will not have that service provided to them. I think we kind of miss some of that compassion in what we do for the residents especially the elderly. I can speak for the elderly, they are my friends, my colleagues, but we really need to not forget what our job is in County government and that's to service the people who elected us and the people who wanted us to make Chautauqua County a better place to live in. Certainly the senior population which is a very high percentage in Chautauqua County, we can't forget that we need to expand so that we can service them properly. In a location that is more suited to that general population that we do serve. So, just on that point, I understand the budgeting part of it and it's a difficult pill to swallow. It seemed to be fine when the Veterans were moving and they're my colleagues also, I'm a Veteran but still, we have to remember what our mission is as representatives of the general population in Chautauqua County and we really need to access the cost versus the compassion and the quality of service that we provide to our residents, especially the elderly. Just on that note, I'm supporting this and I really am sensitive, Ken, you brought up tremendous questions as far as the budget part of it and it is a big jump. It's a tremendous jump if you are looking at the rental budget as it was and what it's going to be and your footprint outside of Chautauqua County owned properties. But, I would like you to keep in mind what our mission is here for the Office for the Aging and for the aging and we need to concentrate on that too and I'm sensitive to that.

Legislator Rankin: Paul, I really appreciate your comments. If we think back to when we first started talking about this during the budget process, we talked about how the current space in Jamestown for example, was so small that you could hear what was happening in the next cubicle. There was no place for privacy, for storage or being able to take care of those needs. I think back to that when we were talking about that we were all on board and understanding. I especially appreciate that having been in that office and maybe not everybody has. I think that's where we started, to your point Paul.

Legislator Whitford: Right and it was really very, very inadequate. It wasn't friendly for the employees as well as the clients that we serve. It was a catastrophe. If you had ever visited it, you would see that. You had to go outside to change your mind is what I said because it was really cramped and they let a lot of the services in that building go as far as eating and (*inaudible*). So it was very inadequate.

Mr. Lawton: Thanks for that Paul and Elisabeth. I don't have a good sense of the operation so that's helpful to explain the other side of it. I'm curious about two things. You had mentioned, I think, utilities and I'm wondering if utilities are included in that rent or is that an additional cost as well? The other question I had was, the number of seniors that visit in person versus call or email? Is there a lot of visits daily? I don't have a sense of what's occurring there.

Mrs. Spanos: I don't know which one of us you want to go first but right now, most of our services are remote. But when, I can't give you a specific number of how many people come in but we talked about 6 and 7,000 seniors every year. Some of them are people that come into

the office, some are people that come to our programs so we have in person programs. A lot of that is stopped because of COVID. We very much expect it to resume. There are a lot of seniors that are cut off right now because they don't have computer access. So, we see people only as absolutely necessary right now to keep them safe from COVID. We are dropping things on their porch rather than having them pick them up and conducting as much business as possible telephonically.

Legislator Lawton: Could you just give me a feel like even if it was a rough guess, sorry to be particular but, in order to support it –

Mrs. Spanos: I think there are a couple of hundred people a month that come into the Jamestown office and I would say about half that many in Dunkirk and a little less than half in Mayville.

Legislator Lawton: Thanks for that and what about the utilities, is that an added cost to it.

Mrs. Spanos: That was included, I believe.

Mr. Abdella: Per the resolution, it does that state and this was the original resolution that the space is individually metered and the County shall pay for water, electrical, and gas services.

Legislator Lawton: Thanks.

Mrs. Spanos: One question I have that might bring more clarity to the Legislators is that, I know recently Mental Hygiene within the last couple of years, moved up to the old school and the Public Defender took over more space. Is there something in that to tell us how that was handled because obviously if they weren't paying in HRC and then moved to the old school where they are paying, how that was handled?

Mrs. Dennison: Both of those moves were and are completely grant funded. The Public Defender has a five year, \$15 million dollar grant which requires he adds a lot of people so his expansion is funded by the Hurrell grant from New York State and Mental Hygiene had its own funding sources for the building out and continues to have funding for its increased rental expense.

Mrs. Spanos: So we could also pay for this through our grant but I would request that if the County got reimbursement from another source, that that could be utilized, it could offset some of that.

Mrs. Dennison: Well it will if – as we said, if Health & Human Services expands its presence, takes over space that is currently occupied by OFA, gets reimbursement, obviously that's the benefit to the County. It is not going to be a direct revenue credit to OFA.

Mrs. Spanos: That is where the problem lies. I can put this onto my grants.

Mrs. Dennison: That's an option. The answer to the question is, Mental Hygiene and Public Defenders stipulated that very clearly. There was a lot of discussion about should, especially Mental Hygiene be expanding our presence in non-County owned space but it was all completely funded. No effect on local share at least for five year from the time that they started with that lease. The PD's office, that grant goes now, I think, till the end of 2023. At the end of that grant, I don't know what is going to happen but that is the current situation.

Chairman Pavlock: Any other questions or comments from the Committee for MaryAnn, Kathleen, or Steve? I will kind of conclude before we vote. I am o.k. with the move. I think that it is going to be beneficial for the Office for the Aging for utilization of your space. People can have the space they need, the privacy they need and the presence where you will be located. It will be better for the people who come in to utilize all your services. So there is a great value there. My only reservation was that it comes with a pretty significant cost. So, I just want to make sure that we did our due diligence and asked some of the questions we did this evening and get some of those answers just so that it would help us make a well informed decision. Thank you for all your answers and conversation we've had. All those in favor of the resolution as amended?

*Carried with Legislator Lawton voting "no".*

Local Law Intro. 4-20 – Authorizing Lease of Real Property for an Extended Term for Office for Aging Services

Mr. Abdella: This is a housekeeping matter that is associated with 218-20, the resolution you just discussed. When we exceed 10 years in our leases we need to do an accompanying local law. I think what I am going to be suggesting to the Legislature as far as the agenda next week will be that this local law come after 218-20 because it's really not needed until 218-20 is adopted. They go hand in hand so that's why the need.

Chairman Pavlock: Thank you. Does anyone have any questions regarding this local law?

*Unanimously Carried*

Other

Chairman Pavlock: I have nothing under "other". Anyone else have anything for the good order of the organization?

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

*Unanimously Carried (5:54 p.m.)*

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