

Minutes

Audit & Control Committee

April 22, 2021, 8:35 a.m., Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Nazzaro, Odell, Gould, Niebel

Member Absent: Harmon

Others: Tampio, Ames, Chagnon, Bentley, Dennison, Walsh, Aldrich, Abdella, Carrow, Wendel, Guttman, Meleen, Almeter, Crow, Barmore

Chairman Nazzaro called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

Approval of Minutes (3/18/21)

MOVED by Legislator Niebel, SECONDED by Legislator Odell.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

Chairman Nazzaro: O.K., do we have any messages that need to be read or anything Olivia or Kathy?

Clerk Tampio: I have not received any communications for the privilege of the floor.

Chairman Nazzaro: I will note that the one resolution Authorize Use of Lake Erie Management Commission Capital Project H.8020.37011 Funds to Co-Fund Barcelona Harbor Dredging has been pulled. Is that correct?

Clerk Tampio: That is correct.

Legislator Odell: That is correct and we pulled that from Planning & Economic Development last night as well Chuck. They are just not ready for it. It will be reintroduced when the time is right.

Chairman Nazzaro: So we'll see that at a later date, I'm assuming.

Legislator Odell: Correct.

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2021 Budget Appropriations to Accommodate New Customer Billing Software for Chautauqua County Sewer Districts

Mr. Walsh: This amendment is to amend the budget for appropriations to accommodate new customer billing software for Chautauqua County sewer districts. This is a purchase of a billing software program that we're implementing for all sewer districts. The PPD, North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District, and the South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer District. So moving forward, this is just a program that will take us into the 21st century with multiple additions that we can utilize such as on-line billing and possibly telephone billing. So this is pretty much the purchase and just a flat fee and maintenance of the program.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Tom. I know, Kathleen, in Public Facilities, I did ask a few questions about the funding for this and Kathleen, if you just want to explain regarding the contingency fund.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, Chairman Nazzaro had asked some questions about why we're decreasing appropriations in ESS.9089, undistributed benefits. It is a rather unusual title. That is a title for that particular classification. Within that classification there is an account that is called a contingency account. The South & Center Sewer District has had this contingency account for a number of years. Their budget is \$214,500 and so it is in their budget and it is there for use such as this unforeseen expenditures and sometime used for unforeseen maintenance expenses sometimes. So they are moving some of the money from that contingency account into the administrative contractual account to purchase the software.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Kathleen. The only reason I brought that up was because of the account doesn't really fit what it really is, so it's undistributed benefits and as Kathleen explained, it's like a contingency fund.

Mrs. Dennison: Mr. Chairman, if I could just add another note. The reason it's called undistributed benefits is that, the other accounts in that classification are payroll and employee benefit contingencies so I think probably it started as a contingency fund for personal services or undistributed benefits hence the title. But, that classification now includes, as I said, it includes a contractual account that is just contingency account for non-personal services related items. I just want to make one other comment. The system will also be used by the Industrial Sewer District, that's correct, right Tom?

Mr. Walsh: That is correct.

Mrs. Dennison: You don't see any change in the budget for the Industrial Sewer District, the EW fund because the amount of money is very small for that district and they already have sufficient budget in their contractual classification. They only have, really, one contractual classification so they don't need to move it from, let's say, sewer treatment or sanitary into administration. I just wanted to make it clear that the (*inaudible*) will also be used by the Industrial Sewer District.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Legislator Gould: I have one general question. How many contractual funds like this are there in the County?

Mrs. Dennison: You mean how many of the contingency funds?

Legislator Gould: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: There are only two. There is the one in South & Center Sewer Districts and then we did in the 2021 budget include a contingency amount but those are the only two accounts of this type.

Legislator Gould: That's good to know, thank you.

Chairman Nazzaro: Good question Jay, thank you. Anything else from the committee? All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Acceptance of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act 2021 (CRRSA) Grant to Defray Operating Costs for Chautauqua County Dunkirk Airport

Mr. Bentley: Good morning Mr. Chairman and yes, I think Ron and I went for the longest title of resolutions for this month. I'll take my plaque later. Yes, this is to accept approval for the \$13,000 offered to the Dunkirk Airport and like you said, there is a similar one for Jamestown which will be next. I had some good discussion in Public Facilities about the use of this. This is for impacts due to the coronavirus. The FAA besides the DOT allows this grant to be used for operating expenses. It's pretty broad so we're going to treat this like we did the last one. We're not going to be increasing the revenues as it's meant to offset some of those impacts but we're also not increasing expenses yet because we don't know what the final impact is. If something happens towards the end of the year where we might need this money because of additional expenses, we may apply, do a resolution to account for some of this. But at this time, it is not necessary because we don't have a specific need identified. The other thing about this is, it's not like the other grant assurances that we get for capital projects. It does come with its requirement that it be used for coronavirus impact but again, it could be used for operating expenses at the airport, to make sure the airport continues to operate. The FAA needs this back with the resolution by April 30th. I had received a written response from the FAA, because originally they wanted it back by the 23rd, earlier than the Legislature meeting so we've got a concurrence so everything showed up in line to get this money. Any questions?

Chairman Nazzaro: Ron, anything you want to add? I think Brad covered it but you are always welcomed to add anything.

Mr. Almeter: No, I have nothing to add unless you have any questions.

Legislator Odell: I will just add in there for the 4th WHEREAS, the Airport Commission did review and is recommending that the County accept this grant for the purpose of offsetting these, actually broad operating expenses. So we have concurrence.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you. I believe Ron, you sent out an email after the Public Facilities Committee explaining the grant as well.

Mr. Almeter: Yes. There was a question that arose in Public Facilities about the breath and scope of what the funds could be used for and I sent out the FAA's written interpretation of the statute and it is very broad. It can be used for virtually any normal operating expense at the airport.

Chairman Nazzaro: Again, we do not have to recognize the revenue at this time. So, any questions or comments from the committee?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Acceptance of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act 2021 (CRRSA) Grant to Defray Operating Costs for Chautauqua County Jamestown Airport

Chairman Nazzaro: Same language, different airport, same amount.

Mr. Bentley: I'll say ditto, Jamestown.

Chairman Nazzaro: Brad, that's the shortest thing I've ever heard you say. Any questions or comments on this?

Legislator Odell: I'll just add one more thing. Maybe Ron you could help me elaborate on this. One, thank you both, Brad and Ron for asking the questions to get the need to accept and the resolution deferred. That way it kept us moving on another special meeting in April, thank you for that. Two; what we'll notice is that the numbers are the same, \$13,000 for each. Typically Jamestown's much higher. Ron, I know that you know the answer but if you could elaborate to everyone why they are the same.

Mr. Almeter: The appropriation was divvied up by the FAA according to – they were given broad discretion as to appropriate the funds according to need. The airports with commercial airline service got the vast majority of the funds. In case of Buffalo, several million dollars, Rochester, Syracuse, and so forth. Jamestown was formally a commercial line airport, as you all know, but, since we've lost the commercial carrier, we've now been reclassified as a regional general aviation airport, (*inaudible*) Part 139 certification. What that means is, we don't get the big piece of the pie that the airports with commercial airlines get. That's the bad news. The good news is, along with this piece of legislation the FAA is picking up 100% of the local share of the 2021 airport improvement program capital projects. So, that has a big consequence for Jamestown in particular this year because we have this \$5 million dollar runway project that is funded under the AIP program so we'll be getting 100% (*inaudible*) on that which will save us

about a quarter of a million dollars in local share. It pays to be an airport commercial airline service but we're fortunate this year with the Relief Act that we're getting 100% coverage on the capital projects.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Ron. So both airports now, the Jamestown and Dunkirk airport, both have the same classification? Is that correct or not true?

Mr. Almeter: Yes and no. Both are considered public regional general aviation airports. However, Jamestown still has the Part 139 certification which allows us to operate charter aircraft and gives us the capability to resume commercial flights if we get a carrier. It's not the case in Dunkirk obviously. We don't have a passenger terminal and so forth over there (*inaudible*) capability. So they are similar in how they are treated from a funding standpoint but they are still different in how they are treated from a regulatory compliance standpoint.

Chairman Nazzaro: So at some point in the future if we were fortunate to start having a commercial carrier come back in, we don't have to reapply for different designation? We already have that, is that correct?

Mr. Almeter: Yes. So long as the commercial carrier is less than a 10 passenger cabin or aircraft. If we want to bring in an air carrier that fly's a 30 passenger cabin or a 50 passenger cabin, then we will have to upgrade from our Part 139 type 4 classification to a Part 139 type one or type two classification. Probably doesn't have a lot of cost implications for us but we would have to – if we were flying a larger cabin, we run an air carrier that flew bigger airplanes, we would have to step up our firefighting capability a little bit.

Chairman Nazzaro: Last thing and this is probably more Public Facilities, sorry, but its interesting topic. So if you had a charter coming in that had a capacity of 30 passengers that is allowed to come in here?

Mr. Almeter: Yes it is, under Part 139, Group 4, Category 4, our current status. Charters are treated a little bit different than a commercial carrier, public carrier.

Legislator Odell: Only because they are not scheduled Mr. Chairman. That's the big distinction. Just for laymen's terms, but also, as Ron eluded yea, basically we're poised and ready to go. I didn't want to belabor that on this resolution but at least make it known why the dollars are the same and how we're classified today (*inaudible*). Years ago that was one of the first things we did was right size our Part 139 designation. We were Part 1. I mean, that's like LaGuardia basically. We knew we weren't going to be that so basically scaled it down to be manageable for our intent and purposes and save a little bit of money on (*inaudible*) and a handful of other items.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you for the additional information. That is informative. Any other questions or comments from the committee?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Cleanup and Sale of Tax Foreclosure Property

Ms. Crow: Let me chime in right now. Kim was on but I don't see her right now.

Clerk Tampio: She's on.

Legislator Niebel: While they're checking, I can jump in a little bit.

Chairman Nazzaro: I think Kim is ready to go here.

Ms. Crow: She's coming in now.

Chairman Nazzaro: We'll give Kim a chance here Terry.

Ms. Meleen: This resolution has to do with a parcel that was (*inaudible*) in the June auction of 2018. It originally sold for \$14,500. They found out that there were environmental issues on the property. Those issues have been resolved but the buyer now wants to purchase it for \$2,700 or \$2,750, I'm not sure. I recommend getting that parcel back on the tax roll and accepting the offer. I know that Steve has some other information like legal aspects of what happened with it if he wants to chime in and help me.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you. Steve, do you want to add to it?

Mr. Abdella: What was contemplated when we worked with DEC on it was having a complete cleanup of the tanks and the contaminated soil on the property and that project did go forward. Unfortunately what happened was, when that work was done, the DEC faced two obstruction. One was the roadway, a street nearby and secondly, there was an underground natural gas line that was an obstruction as far as removing all the contaminated soils. So, at the end of the day, they were not able to remove all the contaminated soil. I mean the DEC is not going to seek any further action against the property at this time but what they indicated in the report, in the letter was, that any future owner of the site, if they engaged in any excavation or soil work in the vicinity of the contaminated area, they would have to test that soil and if it showed any characteristics of petroleum contamination, they would have to take additional steps to remediate. So, what changed in the deal so to speak was we were hoping that we would be able to sell the property as a clean property, absolutely clear of any further environmental responsibility but instead, we're having to sell the property subject to these DEC conditions and continuing environmental responsibilities. So, what we've negotiated with the buyer is this revised price that takes into account that they are not getting a clean property and instead will continue to have some environmental responsibility. As Kim said, we would recommend moving forward with the sale to remove the County from responsibility and also get the property on the tax rolls.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Steve. Legislator Niebel, did you want to add anything?

Legislator Niebel: At this time, a question for Steve. So we sold the property and after we sold it the environmental concerns arose?

Mr. Abdella: That's my recollection, yes. It was not known at the time of the auction or to bidders at the auction or if it was known, it was again, it was portrayed that they would be receiving a clean slate bill of health after the clean-up occurred. But as I described, that was not able to be done.

Legislator Niebel: As far as information, the full market value of this property is \$157,000. The back taxes owed are \$27,000 but look, as far as the environmental concern, I understand that and I agree. Any future sale of this property could be hindered by the (*inaudible*) requirement put on it by the DEC. I guess my question would be, when this property is sold, I mean, if you go to the GIS, they do have a picture of the property. It's just across from the Fireside Manor, in the picture it clearly shows a canopy, it shows the gas pumps, why wouldn't somebody – I guess it's not a big jump to think that there might be underground tanks on this property and if so, should the County warn that there could be environmental concern or if not the County, the auctioneer?

Mr. Abdella: Yeah, and I'm sorry Terry. We don't have Jim Caflisch available who would have more direct knowledge of this.

Legislator Niebel: Yeah, and I realize Kim can't answer this.

Mr. Abdella: As I read the resolution, I think this was pulled from the auction and then there was a negotiated sale of the property. I'm checking the 2019 resolution where it was understood that DEC was going to go in and do a clean-up. I think all the parties knew the status and the \$14,500 was the best offer that we got at that point and time.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., but this is a revised offer for \$2,750.

Mr. Abdella: Yes because the clean-up was not successful.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., Chuck, I don't have a problem with this. I wouldn't buy property that has a potential liability as far as DEC. I'm o.k. with this.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Terry. Any other questions or comments?

Legislator Odell: I'm just looking this one up too Terry. I just realized it's the old Van Buren Mini Mart/Post Office out there on Rt. 5. I have no problem with the sale as long as it's kind of as is at that price.

Mr. Abdella: I'm sorry, I stand corrected. I did just pull the 2019 resolution. It is explicitly stating that the County discovered after the auction that there were underground petroleum storage tanks. So that was when the person who was the high bidder at the auction agreed that they would continue to go forward with the purchase if the clean-up occurred. So that was what was pursued in 2019 but then as described, the clean-up was only partially done hence now revised negotiated price.

Legislator Niebel: That's fine and this is no reflection on Kim but, really, I'm not sure why the Tax Department in 2019 wouldn't have known that there could be storage tanks there because it was a gas station. But, whatever.

Mrs. Dennison: I have a question for Kim. When this property, assuming it's sold for the \$2,750, and it goes back on the tax rolls, at what value does it go back on the tax rolls?

Ms. Meleen: Currently what it is assessed at. They would have to go to their local assessor if they wanted their assessment changed. So whatever it's currently assessed at is what it would be capped at as of this time.

Mrs. Dennison: Do you know how much that is?

Legislator Niebel: It's \$26,780. But that's in Pomfret and they have an equalization rate of 17%. So the full market value would be \$157,529.

Mrs. Dennison: Thank you Terry.

Chairman Nazzaro: As always, we rely on Terry when we come to these issues. Thank you Terry. I think the point you are making here too and obviously Mr. Caflisch isn't here anymore but going forward when we see something like this we should proceed with caution and do our due diligence on property like this.

Legislator Niebel: I think so because I got this information just by going to the GIS and clearly there is a picture. You can see the gas pumps, you can see the canopy, and I guess my concern would be and Steve can address it, any potential liability if we don't at least put some sort of warning or say there could be a possibility of environmental concerns.

Chairman Nazzaro: Kim, you are taking notes, right?

Ms. Meleen: Yes.

Chairman Nazzaro: Steve, anything you wanted to add? You're good.

Mr. Abdella: I'm good.

Legislator Odell: Just add one more point and you basically to you guys, I can see where you are going with this. I think if we can scrub the list prior to auction time, we should be able to boot out, if we have 400 properties that are destined for the auction, maybe 350 are R1's, residential is o.k., we know those are going to be fine and we see on the list is commercial, we just put a microscope on them. I realize Real Property is in a little bit of a state of transition and flux during this last period but just something again to put in your notebook. *(Inaudible)* properties a little bit and just see what our potential or head off any potential liabilities going forward.

Legislator Niebel: It's an awful lot of work to get ready for the auction so sometimes these things can be missed but to the extent that we can check them out perhaps a little bit better, I think would be a good thing for the County.

Chairman Nazzaro: O.k., anything else on this topic? All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Quit Claim Deeds

Ms. Meleen: This one is a vacant parcel. It was originally foreclosed upon with the house parcel that's in front of it. The owner reacquired the house but decided to let the landlocked vacant lot go to auction. It went to auction and there was no bid. The owner now is selling the house property. Attorney Shane Uber called and asked if we would be interested in selling the landlocked parcel to this new potential buyer of the house. The individual is going to pay all the back taxes, (*inaudible*) fees which is at \$361.89. We'd like to sell this property to them so that way it will also be on the tax roll and they are going to have it in their deed that that parcel is merged into the house parcel so something like that doesn't happen again.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Kim. Seems pretty straight forward. Any comments or questions from the committee?

Legislator Niebel: Kim, this is Terry, just a quick question. Yeah, this is .2 tenths of an acre, it is landlocked, now as far as the back taxes, when I looked it up yesterday, it looked like the full liability with charges was \$390.29, the school levy tax was \$1,344. It's a little bit higher than what we have here, the \$361.

Ms. Meleen: The amount that I (*inaudible*) March amount when this started to go through so that's where if it was accepted they will have to pay through that and not the other stuff. Interested had been loaded and everything.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., thank you. Take this one and run.

Chairman Nazzaro: Any other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Fiscal Year 2020 Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant Program

Mr. Guttman: This is a grant from the Federal issued down to the State used primarily for HazMat training and planning exercise. It's a grant that we've had for several years. I'm obviously getting up to speed but it's mostly on administrative for training and planning of haz mat materials and activities.

Chairman Nazzaro: That grant will be expended in 2021 and that's why we're making this at this time because it was not – Kathleen, I'm assuming this is not in the 2021 budget?

Mrs. Dennison: That's correct, it is not. As I mentioned at the Public Safety meeting, Emergency Services department has a plan or customary practice of amending their budget with their grants when they know when they are going to spend the money. A lot of these grants, they have a performance period of several years and so when the grant is accepted we don't always know exactly when we are going to spend the money. So that's why it was not originally included in the 2021 budget. Plans are now that it will be spent within the 2021 calendar year.

Chairman Nazzaro: Seems pretty straight forward but you never know until I open it up to questions. Any questions or comments from the committee? All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Nazzaro: As I said at the beginning of the meeting, this has been pulled to gather more information.

~~Proposed Resolution – Authorize Use of Lake Erie Management Commission Capital
Project H.8020.37011 Funds to Co-Fund Barcelona Harbor Dredging~~

Proposed Resolution – Authorizing the Submittal of a New York State Community
Development Block Grant Application for Microenterprise Assistance

Mr. Aldrich: This is a grant application we plan on submitting next month, there will be a public hearing at next week's Legislature meeting as required by the Office of Community Renewal. We've applied for a \$200,000 grant in partnership with Chautauqua Opportunities for development. The County is the required entity that needs to apply because we serve as the pass through. There is no County local matching share however, again, the partnership between CREDC, CODI, and the Small Business Development Center. Again, we're always looking to expand their (*inaudible*) for small business. This would (*inaudible*) grants in the form of forgivable loans (*inaudible*) in the amount of between \$5,000 and \$35,000. It's tied to job creation and investments, targets throughout the County with the exception of not allowed for the two cities because they are entitlement communities. That's it in a nutshell and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Nazzaro: O.k., so it is for a smaller grants, like you said, between \$5,000 and \$35,000, you said.

Mr. Aldrich: Correct.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Nate. Would anybody like to add to it or any questions? All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Accept Grant Funds from the Community Foundation for Greater Buffalo to Purchase Mobile Trail Counters

Mr. Aldrich: I believe it was last December when the department applied (*inaudible*) grants of \$7,000 through the Community Foundation for Greater Buffalo which is part of the Ralph C. Wilson legacy fund (*inaudible*) design and access. We were awarded a \$7,000 grant a few weeks back. This is to accept that grant. We would purchase two trail counters that could be used on County trails or Rails to Trails, (*inaudible*) trails, etc., as a means to quantify their usage and use that information to prioritize the resources (*inaudible*) and also to seek future funding in the form of (*inaudible*)...

Chairman Nazzaro: The only question that I had which is just more of curiosity, I saw it was coming from the Community Foundation of Greater Buffalo. Do we normally receive grants from them?

Mr. Aldrich: The Community Foundation of Greater Buffalo is the recipient of a very large grant from the Ralph C. Wilson Jr. Foundation to establish a regional pot of money for the five counties of western New York (*inaudible*)..... We have seen a few awardees in Chautauqua County in the last few years. The County (*inaudible*) small grants and I'm sure there is probably a few others. So it's a funding source that we can take a look at.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you.

Mr. Bentley: I would like to support Nate in his efforts and just to kind of expand on your question there. The County's Park system is just one small part of the whole County trail systems. There is snowmobile trails, there is equestrian trails and the Planning Department has had a long history of being involved in the trails systems, outdoor activities, I know they did kayak launches, last year the year before, so this is all align and certainly we all work together and Nate and I have had some conversations about how to use these trail cameras and really get the counts on how much usage goes into them. We have attendance sheets that are posted at trail heads with pencils but a lot of people just bypass them. These trail counters are really very helpful in getting a greater understanding of how many people truly use our trail systems. I know that some of the Parks Commission members are using that data to go after additional grants for trail improvement on State lands, the east and west overland trails so we're actually putting that data to good use. The more counters we have, the better. So I fully support getting these.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Brad. You make a good point that the information that we receive from these counters can be very helpful and beneficial for other purposes. Any questions or comments from the Committee?

Legislator Odell: Just an additional point Mr. Chairman. Yeah, this was brought up last night at more length than I expected at Planning & Economic Development and all good questions just like the one you posed and yes, it titles Greater Buffalo and part of the mission statement as Nate said is outreach to the surrounding communities and counties. The five counties around the metro Buffalo area. But, one of the surprising facts with these hanging

counters is that the technology is so finite that it can distinguish a human from a bear. We'll see how these actually works, but we'll see.

Chairman Nazzaro: Any other questions or comments? All in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Nazzaro: I believe we received a late resolution. I only have one before me.

Proposed Resolution - Amend Budget for County Clerk to Accommodate Digitizing of Microfilm

Clerk Tampio: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Barmore is here to address that resolution.

Chairman Nazzaro: Yes, I saw him hovering behind you.

Mr. Barmore: I can't get the computer I'm supposed use to work so here I am. Pretty much go back many years ago when microfilm was the latest technology and this office had all these civil court records put on the microfilm. Ever since then, we've used antiquated microfilm readers to look at them as well as the title searchers. Anybody that's ever used microfilm you know how difficult it is to use it. You know what's on the roll but there is 5,000 images and you have to scroll through it until you find the one you want. So, anyways, we have a 40 year old microfilm reader, I've been here 7 plus years and this is the fourth time that it's broken down. The guy charges \$350 to come from Erie just to look at it and they haven't made part for it in five years or more. I looked into buying a new microfilm reader and that's going to cost about \$8,000 and then we have to hook it up to a computer and a printer which is an additional expense. I got to thinking, why don't we look at digitizing all of these microfilms and getting them on our regular system with everything else that we use instead of just kicking the can down the road and getting a new microfilm reader. So we checked into that and we have approximately 60,000 images on the remaining 24 microfilms that we haven't digitized yet and our software provide, IQS said that the cost of getting them onto the system, categorized so that they can just be accessed at the touch of the finger will be about \$12,000. So, I called Kathleen Dennison and asked if we saved any money because we had an employee off the whole first part of the year and then we replaced this employee with a single insurance when the one that was here had a family 3 and Kathleen said that we had and are going to save conservatively \$19,000 because of this. Also I have another employee that has been here 30 years and she's leaving next Thursday so it's going to take a while to replace her as well. So, anticipate additional savings there. What I am asking for now is to transfer this \$12,000, this savings out of payroll and benefits into an account that we can use to get this microfilm digitized.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you Larry. So going forward now, this will finish digitizing what we currently have, the remaining rolls of microfilms so what about the future, the future records?

Mr. Barmore: They are already digitized the day we get them.

Chairman Nazzaro: So this is just a one-time cost to catch us up?

Mr. Barmore: Well, for the Civil Court records. We have other records that are still on microfilm but they don't need to be used often and most of them are restricted from public view but by law, we have to have these records that are on the 24 rolls of microfilm available for public view if they are asking. Plus, they are mostly lis-pendins(?), mortgage foreclosures, and things like that from the 70's and 80's. So when the title searchers are doing a search for someone when they are purchasing a home or property, often times these are records that they have to look in order to get their searches done. So without them being readily available, it's a hardship on them which ultimately results in a higher cost to the person buying the real estate.

Chairman Nazzaro: So these are all things of public record?

Mr. Barmore: Yes.

Chairman Nazzaro: Any questions or comments from the committee or Kathleen anything you want to add from a budgetary standpoint?

Mrs. Dennison: I just want to clarify that the estimated savings of \$19,000 that Mr. Barmore mentioned, that is an estimated savings from both of the personnel situations or changes that he described. The one Clerk or Operations Assistant not returning to work and being replaced with a single instead of a family plan person and the anticipated replacement of the upcoming retiree. So it's a combination of both of them.

Mr. Barmore: My mistake, we still have enough money I guess.

Mrs. Dennison: Yea, I just wanted to make it clear that it's not \$19,000 plus some more, its \$19,000 for all of the changes that you have identified.

Chairman Nazzaro: One good thing with zoom is I watch people's expressions, I can always tell when Kathleen or Kitty wants to add something. Larry, you said this was 24 rolls?

Mr. Barmore: Yes, we have 24 rolls. We got a grant probably 10 or 15 years ago to digitize the images on all of these Civil Court records way before I was here. They spent all the money that they got in the grant and these 24 rolls were left over. They didn't have enough money at the time to do them. Cost 20 cents an image to get the image off the microfilm, digitized, and put on to our system so that anybody that sits at a computer that has IQS on it, access them as easily as any other records that we have there.

Chairman Nazzaro: Thank you. Any other questions or comments from the committee?

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Nazzaro: Any other resolutions to come before the committee? Now, I'll open up for "other".

Other

Discussion – Clarifying Contingency Accounts – Kathleen Dennison
Complementing County Attorney Abdella – Legislator Niebel

MOVED by Legislator Gould, SECONDED by Legislator Niebel to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (9:27 a.m.)

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