

Minutes  
Audit & Control Committee  
Thursday, April 19, 2018, 8:35 a.m., Room 331  
Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Chagnon, Nazzaro, Niebel, Muldowney, Gould

Others: Tampio, Ames, Dennison, Sanderson, Caflisch, Spanos, Melquist, Lis, Cummings,  
Crow, Schuyler, Boria, Sheriff Gerace, Borrello, Griffith, Volpe, Cavallaro

Chairman Chagnon called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

MOVED by Legislator Nazzaro, SECONDED by Legislator Niebel and duly carried the minutes were approved. (3/22/18)

*Unanimously Carried*

---

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time

---

Chairman Chagnon: At the request of County Sheriff who has a required commitment elsewhere and his resolutions that he is involved with are at the end of our agenda, he's asked if we would move proposed resolutions number 14, 15, 16, and 17 forward.

Sheriff Gerace: And 18.

Chairman Chagnon: Eighteen also. So, with the permission of the committee, we will move those resolutions forward. Hearing no objections to that, we'll start with proposed resolution #14.

Proposed Resolution- Authorizing Agreements with New York State Office of Parks,  
Recreation And Historic Preservation for use of State Owned  
Motorized Boats

Sheriff Gerace: We have three watercrafts that the State Department of Parks and Recreation provides to us and we only have a contract for one of them. They are asking for a contract, there is no cost to us, for all of them so this resolution will authorize us to have an agreement with them for the other two and any future boats that they might give us that we can enter into an agreement to accept them.

Chairman Chagnon: So these are not additional boats at this point?

Sheriff Gerace: Correct, they are boats that are already in our possession and we're using.

Chairman Chagnon: By approving of this proposed resolution we would give blanket authority to accept any additional boats in the future?

Sheriff Gerace: We would have to have a contract. A memorandum of agreement with the State. I do believe the language –

Legislator Nazzaro: I just have a question on the maintenance of the boats Sheriff.

Sheriff Gerace: Yeah, we maintain the boats.

Legislator Nazzaro: We're maintaining them now?

Sheriff Gerace: Correct. So we're responsible for the maintenance. We get the boats given to us.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess the bottom line question is, are we going to incur any additional expense by adopting this resolution to the County?

Sheriff Gerace: No, we would be purchasing the boats otherwise and maintaining them.

Legislator Niebel: Chuck, in paragraph three, that WHEREAS, the County shall be responsible for all maintenance of this equipment, but that basically our cost Joe?

Sheriff Gerace: Correct, the maintenance and the fuel.

Legislator Gould: Where are these boats located?

Sheriff Gerace: We keep these at Long Point. When they are on the water they are at Long Point otherwise we put them in storage in the wintertime. Usually at our range.

Chairman Chagnon: Following up on the previous questions, my concern is that obviously you have funds in your budget to maintain the boats that you currently use.

Sheriff Gerace: These are those boats.

Chairman Chagnon: Right, but this gives authorization to accept any future, any additional. For the use of any and all State motorized vehicles.

Sheriff Gerace: You can say just the boats that we have currently. We can come back. It is not a problem. If we get a boat in the future from them, I have no issue at all with coming back for authorization to accept it. If you want to change that.

Chairman Chagnon: Perhaps, if we could change the words, any and all to currently. Currently utilized.

Sheriff Gerace: That is not a problem.

Chairman Chagnon: What do you think?

Legislator Niebel: That is fine.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm just trying to understand Sheriff, why this is coming? What is changing that we have to do this? Because you've had the boats, we're using them.

Sheriff Gerace: Correct. What happened was, my understanding with the first boat that was granted to us, we at that point and time some years ago did a resolution for a memorandum of understanding with the State. Somehow they said, wait, we've given you two boats since and there is no MOU or agreement so in order for us to have authorization to enter into an agreement we have to have a resolution.

Legislator Nazzaro: So this will make it official?

Sheriff Gerace: Right.

Legislator Nazzaro: Now that we're going to count for all three boats.

Sheriff Gerace: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: Previously one boat had only –

Sheriff Gerace: An agreement.

Chairman Chagnon: You are o.k. with that?

Legislator Niebel: Yeah.

Legislator Nazzaro: So do we want to change it?

Chairman Chagnon: So are we o.k. with changing the wording in the RESOLVED clause from any and all to currently utilized?

Legislator Gould: Do you want to treat that as a typo Mr. Chairman or do you want to an amendment?

Chairman Chagnon: I really think that is an amendment.

Legislator Gould: I will make that amendment then.

Chairman Chagnon: So, we have a motion to amend the resolution as indicated, do we have a second?

Legislator Nazzaro: I will make a second.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? O.k., then on the motion to amend, all those in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Chairman Chagnon: Now onto the proposed resolution as amended. Any further discussion?

*Unanimously Carried (as amended)*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution of New York State Office of Homeland Security  
Funding Grant—Operation Stone Garden FY17

Sheriff Gerace: This is a grant that we received and have received for several years. There is no local share. We use this for enforcement. Some of which we use to put hours on a Lake Erie patrol but others it's an enforcement effort and it's money from the Department of Homeland Security.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution of New York State Office of Homeland Security  
Grant for Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) FY17

Sheriff Gerace: This is a formula grant that the State provides to public safety answering point or 9-1-1 centers across the State. It's a \$10 million dollar total funding stream for the entire State of New York. Our share is based on the available funding and a formula for our calls for service, 9-1-1 calls received. This is actually 17' grant funding that is now available to us for 18' but they utilized 15' and 16' data. Our data was slightly lower in 16', so they have adjusted our grant lower than we had anticipated it would be. So, the 18' funding went down approximately \$13,690 from what we anticipated it would be. So this is why this is coming before you to make an adjustment as early as we can in the budget year.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? Sheriff, I note that the shortfall is proposed to come out of fund balance. What strikes me is that the budget for this function is just a little under \$2.3 million dollars. Couldn't you find that \$13,000 somewhere else in that budget so we didn't have to go to fund balance?

Sheriff Gerace: That's possible but again, this early in the year, I can't say for sure, so that is why I am bringing it here now.

Chairman Chagnon: And we appreciate you bringing it to our attention as soon as it became known. On the same vein as you just responded, it's awful difficult for us to be appropriating fund balance this early in the year as well.

Sheriff Gerace: I understand that.

Chairman Chagnon: Do you understand my concern?

Sheriff Gerace: Definitely.

Chairman Chagnon: So Kathleen, do you have a recommendation?

Mrs. Dennison: I actually recommended to the Sheriff that the resolution be worded in this way because with this particular grant, the expense associated with the grant are essentially fixed. It's for staffing for the dispatch center. So it's not like other grants where if there is less revenue, you can scale back the services that you are providing. So, it's definitely – well, there is no guarantee that the shortfall could be made up. But as you point out, there could be possibilities but in that particular department, the department has struggled to keep its overtime costs in check and so that was an issue in 17'. That certainly is an option to possibly reduce the staffing expense in the dispatch area to keep the resolution budget neutral but, I think that probably not realistic. Last year there were also some questions in the Sheriff's budget that some of the revenues were significantly below the budget and so I felt it was the right thing to do to right size the revenue budget in this case to be what we know it's going to be for this particular item.

Legislator Niebel: This came before Public Safety yesterday. I understand your concern about the fund balance but I guess our feeling was that hopefully it can be made up somewhere in the Sheriff's Department before the end of the year. Again, I understand your concern about the fund balance but we've kind of felt that it was an insignificant amount at this time.

Legislator Nazzaro: Perhaps a middle of the line approach is to take it out of the budget now to see how things transpire during the year and then later in the year, to Legislator Niebel's point and to your point Kathleen that one quarter of the year is gone but let's see how things transpire and then if there is a need, I'd rather do it then than maybe possibly do it prematurely because I think that we're sending a message to all departments that even though the amount is not huge, I don't like using fund balance for minor things like this unless there are no other options. I think the conversation is, there may be other options.

Mrs. Dennison: That's fair.

Legislator Nazzaro: Do you prefer it be amended, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Chagnon: O.k.

Legislator Nazzaro: To take it out of expense so it's budget neutral and not hitting fund balance.

Chairman Chagnon: I agree with that. Other discussion? Then Kathleen would you recommend how we would amend it to accomplish that?

Mrs. Dennison: I would suggest that we amend it to increase appropriation account A.3020.DISP.1.

Chairman Chagnon: We would decrease. We want to decrease the appropriation account?

Mrs. Dennison: I mean, yes you would.

Chairman Chagnon: A.3020 –

Mrs. Dennison: .DISP.1 and that would be personal services, hyphen, I will have to get you the exact text for the department name.

Chairman Chagnon: So you can get that to Olivia.

Mrs. Dennison: In the amount of \$13,690. So we're going to strike the second RESOLVED clause. Strike, the RESOLVED, the A Fund Balance is appropriated as follows. Strike Increase the Use of Fund Balance, the next line and also the second "be it further". Is that clear?

Chairman Chagnon: You can get that straight with Olivia later on?

Mrs. Dennison: Yeah.

Chairman Chagnon: So everyone understands the intended amendment? We'll need a motion to amend.

Legislator Nazzaro: I will make motion that we amend this resolution to strike any reference to the use of fund balance and replace under the Increase Use of Fund Balance to a decrease of an appropriate appropriations account related to personal services and our Budget Director Kathleen will provide the specifics.

Chairman Chagnon: Do I have a second?

Legislator Gould: Second.

Chairman Chagnon: Discussion on the motion to amend the resolution? Hearing none –

*Unanimously Carried*

Chairman Chagnon: Now to the proposed resolution as amended. Any further discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution of Statewide Interoperability Communications  
(SICG) Grant Award FY17

Sheriff Gerace: This is a grant from the State which has no local share which is specified for certain public safety communication equipment and we will be purchasing that equipment with this grant.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? Yesterday, Kathleen (*inaudible*) me that the reason that there is no budget amendment to this is because it's not yet decided how these funds will be spent and when they will be spent. Is that correct?

Mrs. Dennison: Yeah, we did not put a budget amendment with this resolution because the timing of the expenditures is not yet known. There is a similar grant that its place now for expenditures in 2018 and (*inaudible*) yet know whether the grant would be needed in 2018 or when if it would all be spent in 2019.

Chairman Chagnon: So before any expenditures are made from the grant, we would receive a resolution adjusting the budget?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. As I say, the resolution needs to be advanced as is now so the County Executive can sign the agreement in a timely manner.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Execution of Lease Agreement with Conterra Ultra  
Broadband, LLC for Tower Space

Chairman Chagnon: Olivia tells me there is a typo in the proposed resolution? Olivia, would you explain that to us please?

Ms. Ames: Last night in Public Safety we were told of a typo. The Village of Clymer in the resolution should be changed to the Town of Mina. That appears in the first WHEREAS clause and the first RESOLVED clause.

Chairman Chagnon: So instead of the Village of Clymer, it's the Town of Mina.

Ms. Ames: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: Sheriff, if you would take us away as after we've understood that typo.

Sheriff Gerace: Thank you. This is a request to lease space on our existing tower site and for this calendar year there would be revenue of \$1,920.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions or comments?

*Unanimously Carried*

Sheriff Gerace: Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k. back up to the normal sequence of the agenda and we will move to the first resolution.

Tabled Resolution- To Approve New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation Agreement for Septic System Replacement Program

Chairman Chagnon: Olivia points out that this was amended in the previous committee. Olivia, would you explain the amendment to this proposed resolution?

Ms. Ames: Yes Mr. Chairman. In the Human Services Committee it was amended in the second WHEREAS clause. Strike out, “to be issued to property owners for septic system projects” is striked out and instead add, “for addressing failing and short circuiting septic systems”. That’s it.

Chairman Chagnon: Olivia, thank you. Who would like to explain first the amendment?

Mrs. Schuyler: For those of you on the committee who don’t know Bill Boria, he’s our Senior Water Resource Specialist. (*Inaudible*) for our department but our County in general.

Mr. Boria: So this is an initiative by the Governor, by the Governor’s Clean Water program that was recently announced to address failing septic systems in priority water bodies. It is targeted at Findley Lake specifically. Is currently the only priority water body identified in Chautauqua County and it will allow us to provide some funding for people whose septic systems are basically failing. So that change in the second WHEREAS statement, it really better describes the problem in that we’re going to be addressing failing short circuiting septic systems.

Legislator Gould: What is a short circuiting septic system? I’m not familiar with that phrase?

Mr. Boria: It’s actually something that DEC started promoting when they did their TMDL’s. But in Findley Lake’s case, it’s where they have very poor sand and gravel, percolation rate is extremely high. Actually it’s so high that current State regulations do not allow the installation of a septic system in such conditions unless you augment the soil to slow down the percolation rate. So what is happening in Findley Lake is a good example. They have seepage pits which are basically large round cylinders, approximately 6 to 8 feet deep in the ground and that is their absorption bed for most of the homes and cottages around Findley Lake. Because the soil is so good, it just goes away quickly but it also makes it way to the lake. So it doesn’t come out on the ground surface like a failing septic system.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments from the committee?

Legislator Niebel: Bill, in our memorandum it talks about reimbursing property owners up to \$10,000 per project. Who sets that maximum? Is that set by us or is that is set by New York State?

Mr. Boria: It's set by New York State. It only applies to permanent residents, not seasonal or small businesses.

Legislator Niebel: I guess my thought here is, can we lower that maximum to say perhaps \$5,000 or whatever, reimburse people because I think our intent is to try to help replace as many insufficient septic systems as possible. If we allow the maximum of \$10,000, I guess that's only 15 septic systems that could be replaced around Findley Lake. If we lowered that to say \$5,000, we could replace theoretically 30. Do you see where I am going with this?

Mr. Boria: We've talked about that and that's a good point. That is something that we will consider.

Legislator Niebel: Can the County lower this?

Mr. Boria: Yes, but bear in mind this is only for permanent residents. Especially around Findley Lake there are a lot of seasonal residences.

Legislator Niebel: I'm aware of all of that.

Mr. Boria: In addition to replace a septic systems around Findley Lake, we're looking at-

Legislator Niebel: Engineering \$8-\$10,000.

Mr. Boria: Engineering systems, we're looking at \$20 to \$30,000. Because they would all be engineering systems, it's very small lots, very difficult conditions. They all have private wells which make it even more challenging.

Legislator Niebel: Just out of curiosity, how many permanent residents do you think we have around Findley Lake? It doesn't have to be exact, just roughly. A hundred and fifty, two hundred?

Mr. Boria: Around the entire lake there is 318 residents. That includes those in the second tiers off the lake.

Legislator Niebel: Those are permanent residents?

Mr. Boria; No, that is the total and of those about half of them, about 150 are permanent. However that is the entire lakeshore area, not just the ones on the lake. So this is targeted at those systems that are on the lake within 250 feet of the lakeshore.

Legislator Niebel: Do you have any kind of estimate as to how many septic systems you think might be failing or short circuited?

Mr. Boria: A lot. More than 50%.

Legislator Niebel: So it might behoove us to try and lower this \$10,000 maximum to get more people to replace their septic systems. It's just a thought.

Mr. Boria: Another thing that I want to point out is this is the first year of a multiyear funding project. In total there is \$75 million dollars Statewide has been allocated by the Governor for this program. This year they are allocating \$15 million of that \$75 million so if we spend that money, as soon as we spend that money, I'm told that we would be eligible for additional years funding. With the septic systems so expensive to replace around the lakeshore, I would argue that \$10,000 is appropriate. It will covering engineering costs plus a little bit more.

Legislator Niebel: They are a lot more expensive than on Rt 20 in Sheridan.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just a follow up question. How will we determine who gets the funding? Obviously there will be an application process. Is it based on those that are in critical shape, first come, how is it going to be determined if there is like 75 or more properties, I mean, you said the cost is probably close to \$30,000 per system. So first of all the homeowner is going to have the funding to cover the other portion but just briefly, how are you going to determine who gets the funding first?

Legislator Niebel: And Chuck, to follow up on that, will there be like a (*inaudible*) test for these people?

Mr. Boria: As far as income eligibility?

Legislator Niebel: Yeah.

Mr. Boria: There is no income eligibility acquired by the State. We will be partnering this program with our mandatory septic system inspection program so those homeowners who are being cooperative in that program and giving us the information we need and going through with their inspections, will be provided the opportunity first for this funding. So in essence it's almost going to be like a first come, first serve type of arrangement.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Accept Family Planning Grant Funding

Mrs. Schuyler: As you are aware, the County has been providing Federal (*inaudible*) Family Planning clinics since 1971. So the 2018 budget does include funding for Family Planning. When we did our budget, we were not sure how much the award was going to be. The

five year block grant had expired in December of 2015. We had applied for the next five year round. The Federal government decided instead of giving out five year awards they were going to issue two year extensions. We were not made aware of that until like as late as October that it was going to be a two year extension as a grant award. The reason for that, officially that we received was because of the uncertainty at the Federal level regarding Family Planning funding. So the 2018 budget does not have enough money in it to cover the grant award. Instead of \$500,00 that we put in the budget, our award was \$571,094. So we would like to increase our appropriation account to – the total grant amount for the year and our revenues as well.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? I have one question and the next to the last RESOLVED clause says that the County Executive is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with municipal entities for the provision of services.

Ms. Lis: That is the set terminology that we put in these things just in case that we were given by our legal department. I don't think that we do contract with any municipalities but we may – pop-up clinics maybe.

Mrs. Schuyler: Because the school districts are considered municipalities so we do go into Family Planning education, health education teaching, I believe that it is the statue that any government involved with other governments (*inaudible*) official approval to do so.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., thank you.

Mrs. Schuyler: The way it's been for many, many years. The language has been the same.

Chairman Chagnon: Alright if there are no other questions or comments.

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Authorize Acceptance of Funds from the Health Foundation for WCNY and P2 Collaborative of WNY for the Aging Master Program

Chairman Chagnon: Olivia, I understand there is a typo on this proposed resolution so could you explain that to us as well?

Ms. Ames: In the fourth WHEREAS clause they are changing, such, to “some” and then at the very bottom, Increase Appropriation Accounts, the total should be \$9,900 instead of the \$15,000.

Mr. Melquist: Just an overview of the program itself, in 2017, four or five counties in New York State were awarded funding for a program, Aging Master Program to promote successful aging, pretty much. Through workshops for exercise, sleep, healthy eating everything listed on here pretty much, numerous things. So we had one person in our office administer that grant. It was for \$5,100. At the time that was our anticipated amount but we figured that we could get and luckily this year they were happy with the results and they upped the amount to \$15,000 for 2018 and 2019. So that is the first change, the increase in the amount. Then also,

instead of the money coming directly from New York State, they are now having the P2 Collaborative in Buffalo, New York, administer the grant so we submit our claims to them. They go through that process and they distribute the funds to us. So that is another change that's in there and then just the account changes. So towards the bottom you'll see the decrease in New York State aid because the money is not coming from New York State anymore, so we changed it to our own account that we would receive that in. Then we increased personal services and contractual costs and benefit costs because they said that they would be able to cover those. Last year they only covered the contractual costs so they kind of changed how they funded us. That \$9,900 is a net change that we ended up getting. That pretty much sums it up.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Adjust CARTS 2018 Budget to Reflect Additional Grant Funding

Mr. Spanos: On an annual basis we see funding from the State for transportation operation and this is an adjustment to our budget since we received additional funding. We usually base our budget on the average of the last two years. We were fortunate that we got additional funding and so we would like to adjust the budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments?

Legislator Nazzaro: To note, Mr. Chairman, which I know you did, decrease of the use of fund balance. Is that correct?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes, I am impressed with the decrease in the use of fund balance. Any other questions or comments?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Close Capital Projects and Amend 2018 Budget—Landfill

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution is the outcome of quite a bit of work between the Department of Finance and the landfill. As you may recall last fall, we're in the process of reviewing all open capital projects and when we reviewed the landfill projects you had quite a few questions about some of the projects because they had been opened for a long time and there had been limited use of them. So we reviewed all of the projects and decided that some of the projects there should be a different accounting treatments for them, some of them could be closed and so that is the background for the resolution.

Now walking through some of the specifics. As you will see in the second WHEREAS clause, we have projects that have been completed and can be closed. As I said, we also have projects that have a change in the amount of budget that is necessary and then the third area of change is the change in the accounting treatments. So the first RESOLVED clause is the four capital projects that we decided that could be closed the rationale behind those, the first one, E.I.S. Master Plan, that project was primarily used to purchase land in the event that the landfill

needed to be expanded. So we decided to close that project and in the future, if the landfill needs to purchase property, a new project will be requested. I'm going to skip over the gas well recovery for a second. Repaving the parking lot, kind of the same situation as the master plan. We found that if the parking lot needed to be just maintained and patched, that would be a maintenance expense. If there is a complete new parking lot needed, it would become a new capital project requested at the time it was needed. Then the last one there, upgrade transfer stations, it was determined that those activities should be maintenance expense. Now coming back to the landfill gas recovery. We are proposing to change the accounting treatment for that. In the past, it has been a capital project. What we are proposing is that it be an operating expense but that operating expenses is funded from a reserve for gas well maintenance. We currently have funds in a liability/reserve account for gas well maintenance, so we're going to draw from that reserve and proposed to increase appropriations to pay for gas well maintenance. The amount, \$380,893, that is based on a bid that Pantellis has received for work that will be done or expected to be done in 2018. So that is the section on Increase the Use of Fund Balance and Increase the Appropriation Account. Then the last RESOLVED clause, Decrease Appropriation Accounts for two capital projects. Those are the capital projects that is Phase IV Construction and a capital project that is Phase II capping. Those two projects currently exist but we have determined that the amount of the appropriation needs to be changed. You can see in the first one it's going to be changed quite significantly. This first capital project, the Phase IV Construction it currently has a budget of over \$32 million dollars and the work that is planned to take place in 18' and 19', we have a bid for that and that amount is \$16,237,234. So that is the, I guess you would say, the current plan expense for the completion of Phase IV. So the resolution would correct the budget in that capital project to match the bid that is currently in place. That is the same scenario for the other capital project, the Phase II capping. Currently have a budget of \$1.5 million. We now have a bid of \$1,301,076 so the decrease in the appropriation would bring the budget in that capital project down to match the bid and again, that bid is for work expected to be completed by the end of 2019.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments?

Legislator Nazzaro: I just have an observation and a question. That is a huge difference from \$32 million to cut in half, to \$16. So I guess I will look to Mr. Spanos unless you have the answer –

Mrs. Dennison: Why the original budget \$32,000?

Legislator Nazzaro: Why was the budget so much and how could we be off by so much?

Mrs. Dennison: That is an excellent question and I'm hoping that George could address that.

Mr. Spanos: Mr. Chairman, the way that we do the capital request, we put the first year anywhere in the computer \$16 million or \$17 million and then the second year, because it was a multiyear project, it went again as \$16 million so it wasn't the estimate that that was \$32 million, it was computer accumulated budgetary issue. So it shows as \$32 million. But the project was estimated at about \$22 million.

Legislator Nazzaro: So it was entered twice into the system?

Mr. Spanos: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: George, how was it entered twice? Down at DPW or Finance – how was it carried over and nobody happened to catch it?

Mr. Spanos: It's because you apply for capital projects to go through the Planning Board every year.

Ms. Crow: What happens actually is that, at one point there was a misunderstanding as to whether it was an additional \$16 million dollars in there or should have been in addition to the budget or (*cross talk*), re-request. So actually it was a re-request of the funds but in one of the budget years, we entered as an addition to the project. Because some projects we do do like that. We have an initial amount and then the next year amount would be an accumulative total cost and that is how it was budgeted for but it shouldn't have been. It should have just not been budgeted the second year as an additional.

Legislator Niebel: The original sixteen nine.

Ms. Crow: Yeah.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions? I would just like to make the observation that this is a further example of the good work that the Finance Department has been doing to clean up the capital projects and the capital reserves. As you recall, our auditors a year ago or more, had an observation that our capital work in progress appeared to be inordinately high. This is an example of why their observation was correct. So, again, compliments to the Finance Department for the excellent work that they have been doing in cleaning up these capital projects, closing the ones that should be closed to more accurately reflect our true capital work in progress. Did I do o.k.?

Ms. Crow: Yes, but I appreciate the credit but I do want to clarify this one because this wouldn't be part of the construction in progress because there previously was no work up until now but it would have been part of our – yeah, like assigned fund balance for the landfill, it would have been necessary. (*Cross talk*).

Mr. Spanos: This will not affect the capital account because it's an enterprise account.

Legislator Niebel: It's more or less just a human error.

Mrs. Dennison: Like Mr. Niebel, I want to follow up on your comment and question and thank Mr. Chairman for his comments because one thing that we did do in the Finance Department, my assistant Jenelle Hansen, she went through all of the capital projects and did a complete reconciliation between a history that we keep with the project and what's in the general ledger. We have a separate history where we track each resolution, what the funding is and so

she was able to find and correct any errors between what should be in the general ledger and what was.

Legislator Niebel: I think that is a good thing Kathleen. It's a good thing that you guys did that. Thanks for finding that.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget Appropriations and Revenues – North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District, North County Industrial Water & Sewer Districts #1

Mr. Cummings: This is mainly a budgetary resolution. Of course, Kathleen has most of the information and I can fill in where I can. This is something where the North Sewer District is working with the the North County Water and Sewer Industrial District. We help them with maintenance and operation during the day. So it's a one year agreement that we have with them.

Mrs. Dennison: Just to give you the budget background on what Scott described – there is a contract between the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District and the North County Industrial Water & Sewer Districts and the water and sewer districts did not have the funds or do not have the funds in their current 2018 budget to accommodate the contract because the contract was newly agreed to after the conclusion of the budget. So, the proposal is to use fund balance from the water fund and the sewer fund essentially to fund that contract. So we're increasing the use of fund balance for the Industrial Water & Sewer Districts and then you'll see in the first increase appropriation accounts, those are adding to the contractual categories of the water and the sewer departments so that they can pay for the contract. The flip side of that is a decrease of in use of fund balance for the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District because again this contract was not included in their revenues. So, they have an increase in their revenue accounts and a corresponding decrease in the use of their fund balance. The contract will not cause any additional personnel expenses for the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions or comments?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Continuation of Interim Funding for North Chautauqua County Water District

Clerk Tampio: This resolution before you today is the third in a series of resolutions to enable the North Chautauqua County Water District to utilize County funds for interim funding of their capital project. The first resolution was adopted in 2016 which authorized the use of up to \$1 million dollars to expire at the end of 2017. The second resolution passed earlier this year was for the same amount but extended the funding period to the end of 2018. So this one has a request to raise that \$1 million dollar interim funding limit to \$3 million dollars and extend the funding to the end of 2019. The reason being, the District continues to construct the infrastructure of the project and the first part

of the project they have been working on is, actually the Village of Brocton project. We are now getting to the point where we're going to be constructing the project in the Town of Sheridan, the east side of Dunkirk to complete two water main sections and a new water storage tank. So the North Chautauqua County Water District Board appreciate the support that the Legislature has already provided to make available this interim funding which enables us to avoid cost of short term financing and potential interest costs on payments. So, with this making available up to \$3 million, will enable us to finish our infrastructure costs with this section section in Sheridan and then a project completion grants will be brought back into the equation. We'll receive those grant funds that we've applied and received and once the whole project is on line and receiving revenue, we will be able to make payments appropriately and reimburse the County with the funds that we utilized. Up to date, the District or on 4/17 the District has expended about \$556,000. A good chunk of that is the engineering cost initially for the other project on the west side of Dunkirk and so going forward, the water mains, the transmission mains, the estimated cost will be \$1 million dollars for the two sections. You will see a long connection that connects up to Silver Creek and then a small section where services have never been available near the Town of Dunkirk line. We expect to bid that this summer and construction to be completed by the end of this year. We will then follow that up with the water tank construction which is now potentially cited on the east side of Dunkirk, just north of the thruway and the estimated cost of that is \$1.6 million. So, we expect also some grants that will come back into the District funds to the point when the Department of Corrections, New York State Department of Corrections utilizes the funds they've promised for Brocton project. So we feel comfortable and the board voted on this to support it, bring it to you for approval. That \$3 million dollars would effectively finish our project, cash flow wise of course, and then we will, like I said, reimburse the County via the Finance Department.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Questions or comments?

Vice Chair Nazzaro: So the two major changes is changing the amount of the interim financing from one to three million and also changing the date from December 31<sup>st</sup> of 2018 to December 31<sup>st</sup> of 2019 so the project can be completed. Correct?

Ms. Crow: Yes, this phase.

Clerk Tampio: Attorney Abdella did mention after the other district meeting that at any time if the Legislature decides not to authorize this, the whole arrangement can be changed. If the Finance Director feels that a cash flow problem does not enable the County to do this, then we can change and we can look at short term financing.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: Does this create any cash flow issues to you?

Ms. Crow: No. It's not three million dollars all at once; it will be over a two year period. The alternative like she mentioned, would be that the district would have to do a ban for short term borrowing. While the district will be paying interest back to the County, it would probably be less than what they would have to pay if they issued a ban, but also there would be closing costs associated with it and that's probably a bigger cost savings is avoiding those closing costs.

Legislator Niebel: And the big thing that Kitty just mentioned is that it is at no cost to the County because the District will be paying interest on the money could have invested at the same rate.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye.  
Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Approval of Inter-Municipal Agreement between the North Chautauqua County Water District and the Village of Brocton

Clerk Tampio: This is an additional IMA. You may recall that we have a current IMA with the Village of Brocton. Early on in this process the Village, before the Regional Water District was adopted, had major infrastructure problems and applied for funding through EFC and did receive a \$5.75 million zero interest loan and \$2 million of grant funding. When the regional concept was adopted and Brocton decided to take their plant offline and receive water through the City of Dunkirk as the other townships do now. Our engineers spoke with EFC and we tried to change that EFC funding to the North Chautauqua County Water District Funding. EFC declined to take that but they did agree to modify the project as part of the regional water system solution. The project remained a Village of Brocton project. The first IMA set out the terms exactly- very similar to this. Once the construction is completed, and the district is online, the district will pay the debt service and operate and maintain the system. Then after the debt service was retired in thirty years it becomes an asset of the district- it's turned over to the district. Prior to this project that they are completing now, there was another project that came up as more of an emergency situation. They had to- as you will see on your map, there is a squiggly line with a tank at the end that goes from the Village of Brocton. That is their main water transmission line. It goes from the water treatment plant to the Village of Brocton system. That had to be replaced in order for the system to be maintained. That project was completed in 2016. The Regional Water District Board agreed that it is part of the regional system and the same arrangement does happen that through this additional IMA where the district will operate and maintain that line and pay the debt service and after the debt service is retired it would become an asset of the Regional Water District. It also has a little green dot and that is also a water tank that is in the process of being constructed now. That prior project completed in 2016, they also received an EFC loan for that but it was not zero interest and the Village has begun to make payments on that loan because that project is completed. That was a little over \$2 million for that project so it's similar to what we have done with the initial IMA, we are proposing this MA for the prior project with the same terms and conditions.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions?

Ms. Crow: I can just add this for your background information on how we will structure the accounting for this. We went round in a circle a few times with Todd Button, Kathleen and I. In the end, we decided that we will put it on the books as a capital lease so we will have the addition of the asset and a lease payable. As we make the payment to the Village it will reduce our lease payables. Then at such time that this whole part is put into use by the District, we will begin depreciation and that will show up as the expense in the operating budget. We don't have a firm date for when depreciation will start but once it does, that's when we will amend the budget to increase the appropriations for the depreciation expense. That's why there are no budget amendments in this resolution right now.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye.  
Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2017 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Capital Projects

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution is the outcome of work by First Deputy Director of Finance Todd Button. He has reconciled all of the transactions to capital projects in 2017. Part of that project found that some of the budgets were not in line with the actual activity in the projects. The resolution is self-balancing but we are asking for some increases in some of the appropriations, increases in some revenues and decreases in some revenues. The projects involved- under the increase in appropriation account – the first two in the buildings and grounds and the road machinery areas there is an increase in the appropriations there but those projects were not over budget. The original budget included an expense rebate so the budget was structured with the expense being a net expense and the proper accounting treatment would be to record the expense at the full amount and record the rebate as an income. We need a little higher expense account but there is a corresponding increase in the revenue streams and you will see that in the first two lines under the increased revenue accounts. The third line under increase appropriations, a project for Edgewood Warehouse, that project was slightly over budget \$1,758. There were also some additional revenue streams to counteract that increase in expenditure. So again, the increase in appropriations and also modifications in the revenue stream for that project of the Edgewood Warehouse. The other notable item under increase revenue accounts state aid for project 6420.531. There is an increase in State aid of \$400,000 that's to Chadwick Bay Industrial Park. There is a corresponding decrease too in the interfund transfer, which are funds from the capital reserve. The project got \$400,000 more from the State than originally anticipated and \$400,000 less from the capital reserve. The change in cash flow, if you will, that happened over a couple of years ago but the budget was never amended to match that change in revenue stream. Again, these changes are just to amend the budget to match the actual activity in the capital projects so that they can be closed and retired.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions?

Vice Chair Nazzaro: So the increase in revenue from the grant- Kathleen, when did that occur?

Mrs. Dennison: I'm told it was at least two years ago.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: Is that the way that you would record this, as an increase in revenue?

Mrs. Dennison: It's just the change in the- right now if you look at the budget on the actual, it looks like we are over budget in the State revenue. We have more revenue in the State budget so that one is over budget, and then the revenue from the capital reserve is under budget. It is just amending the budget to essentially match the actuals.

Ms. Crow: We are (*inaudible*) the budget to match what the actual is.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: OK, that's what I wanted to hear.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Close Capital Projects

Mrs. Dennison: The projects on this list- there are two categories of projects but all of these projects are completed and can be closed. The first two on the list pertain to the South County Office Building so they are to be closed because they are no longer needed since the property has been sold. There was no activity in those, but they are active projects so they can now be closed because they will not be needed. The other projects on the list are older projects and they have been completed for some time or they have had no activity for several years but we could not find any Legislative resolution that closed them. As I mentioned earlier, this is the result of Jenelle's work of going back in and reconciling all the active projects with the history of resolutions. It's just kind of a formality to close them so we can have documentation that they have been closed by resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions? Comments? Those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget Appropriations and Revenues Due to Changes in Occupancy and the Sale of the South County Office Building

Chairman Chagnon: Olivia tells me that this proposed resolution was amended in a previous committee. Olivia, could you please explain that amendment to us?

Ms. Ames: Yes, in Public Facilities this resolution was amended. In the section "Increase the use of Fund Balance" the total was changed from \$170,821 to \$95,821. At the very end, "Increase Revenue Accounts" there was an added account- A.1620.----.R266.0000 Sale of Property Compensa/Sale of Real Property with an amount of \$75,000 which made the new total \$514,058.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. This is a long resolution.

Mrs. Dennison: It is. The overview of this resolution is that when the 2018 budget was being prepared, the talks were in progress to sell the South County Office Building but we did not know if the building would be sold in time to include it in the 2018 budget. In the 2018 budget there was one adjustment made in the budget. We put in kind of a (*inaudible*) reduction in contractual costs at around \$35,000. That was the only amendment that was put into the- I shouldn't say that, that was the only change put into the adopted budget for the sale of South County Office Building. Now that the building has sold we have had a chance to analyze the effects of that sale and the overall outcome is that we have a need to use fund balance, \$95,821. That is the bottom-line effect of all of the changes due to the sale of the building. The reason there is a use of fund balance in 18 versus a projected savings is that it's a timing effect. For example, the sale of the building \$1.7 million in benefit to fund balance was reported in 2017. So that's a big chunk of the difference. There are other expected savings from selling the SCOB that

don't influence the A fund. Those would be savings and future capital investments. Again, that is not reflected in the operating fund. What is in the operating fund- we had to reassign the occupancy charges to all departments since we no longer own the South County Office Building. The square footage of county owned office space declined so it affects the distribution of the cost across all departments. That is the main driver in the section on increased appropriation accounts. There is also an increase in the lease expense which shows up in the contractual costs for Buildings and Grounds. The second major chunk of changes is decrease in some appropriation accounts. There was a savings in some personnel costs for buildings and grounds. We have one less maintenance person. The original projections for the South County Office Building assumed that we would be eliminating two maintenance positions. That has not been completely implemented so right now we are down one and have a savings of staff- that's the main element in the decreased appropriation costs. In the decreased appropriation costs you will also see a decrease in the CS funds for insurance administration. That is because we no longer have the property insurance on the building. We also have some increase in revenue accounts. The majority of these are in the Buildings and Grounds area because Buildings and Grounds is now charging departments more for their occupancy so it's an expense to the departments but it's revenue to Buildings and Grounds. Then the other big item in there is the facilities in the South County Office Building- in Health and Human Services, since their occupancy has gone up they can now claim that expense so they now get reimbursement from New York State and the Federal sources. There is a new revenue or an increase in their revenue from State and Federal sources. Then in the final category, "Decrease Revenue Accounts," there is a decrease in the CS fund. It's an offset to the decrease in the insurance premium since it has a lower premium it's not charging departments as much so there is a corresponding decrease in revenue for the Insurance Administration. Kitty also pointed out that the other revenue was the addition that was added in Committee that we are planning to sell the Sherman Shop in 2018. That will be a revenue of \$75,000.

Chairman Chagnon: I got all of this yesterday. Kathleen was kind enough to spend some time with me yesterday. Any questions? Kitty it looks like the Committee has your spreadsheet in front of them.

Ms. Crow: I did, just as a follow on to this- I thought you would want to see how the net effects of the changes- if anyone doesn't have a copy with them, I have a copy of what I sent out yesterday. There are a few differences, some pluses and minuses. Luckily, overall they were mostly pluses. In the first column I'm just showing what originally had for 2018. The full sale including the South County Office Building, the Ag Center and the Sherman Shop would result in a \$1.85 million in revenue. In actuality, we received the- in the next column is really kind of cumulative to 17 and 18. We have already received the \$1.7 million for the sale of the South County Building and we anticipate the additional \$75,000 this year for the closing on the sale of the Sherman Shop. The Ag Center, there are complications related to that because it is on airport property and there are FAA requirements that we need to- hoops we need to go through before that sale can close. Right now I'm showing that it wouldn't close until 2020 and that \$75,000 would be received then. The next line is also favorable. The original model assumed that the value of the building was \$1 million so the tax revenues coming back to the County for it being on the tax rolls was originally projected at \$8,500. The final assessment was about \$2.2 million so- but that was effective March 1<sup>st</sup> this year, so it won't be until the next years taxes are due,

2019 that will start. That more than doubled what we were originally projecting for additional tax revenues. The third line there is the increase in what HHS can receive in reimbursement for the increase cost for their facility usage. The rent expense is as we had originally projected- I will just note there that if you take the square feet times the rate per square feet you won't exactly get that total of that rent expense and that's just because the actual lease term is from November to October so there is going to be, every year there will be two months at the next years rate in this model but I didn't try to true up by the months because- it's always twelve months at that rate, but in each calendar year you're going to have two months at the increased rate. So the net rent expense total is calculating that. We did retain the cleaning and that- the actual cost to the cleaners is pretty close to what we had originally projected- a couple thousand dollars less. What was not contemplated originally was the ongoing share and the Building and Grounds administrative cost. So, we have added that into the model. I do anticipate over time that administrative costs should probably go down a little bit but I don't have a good- that can be up to the Buildings and Grounds Department if there is way to reduce some of the administrative costs that are allocated to the Buildings and Grounds budget overall. Since we won't finalize the sale of the Ag center until 2020 right now I'm leaving what our net cost is to maintain that in the model until 2020. That is the net local share after the revenue that we received from Cornell. The insurance costs- we had originally projected that roughly \$22,000 in insurance costs would go away but we will retain some insurance costs, approximately \$11,000 this year and then I projected an increase going forward. Our new net expense is projected out twenty years. The cost of ownership- there were no changes down below so the net savings and loss over the period of time- mainly because of the increase in revenue of the reimbursement from HHS gives us a better position over the twenty years.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. So, the effect on the net present value?

Ms. Crow: Over the first ten years- the present value is \$2.4 million or just a little under \$2 million for the twenty year period. I know that there are some questions as to- in the original projected savings, the range between the savings and the net present value in the twenty year view and I have double checked my formulas and they are all correct. I had Kathleen look at them also. Really what we believe is driving that is in the original model, which I have a copy, in the second ten year period there are greater losses that were incrementally higher each year. So that range was much different in the original model but I think that because of the changes that we made some of that was evened out more. The changes weren't as dramatic in that second half of the twenty year period. I believe that's what's impacting that.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. So for the committee then, when we made the determination based upon the model to sell the building, we were motivated by the projection indicating to the net present value savings of the transaction over ten years would be \$1.7 million and now with the new updated information it appears that it will be \$2.4 million dollars. That's a greater amount of savings in the ten year period and in the twenty year period we had been expecting a little under \$500,000 net present value savings and its now nearly \$2 million net present value savings. Updating the model to reflect or better understanding of the expenses and revenues indicates that our decision was not only sound, but this makes it even more attractive that we did do it. Again for the Committee those of you that don't have a grasp of net present value, that reflects the fact that \$1 of expense ten years in the future is not the same as \$1 today and \$1 of

revenue ten years in the future is not the same as \$1 of revenue today. It takes those future expenses and revenues and discounts them back to the present value. I think that completes the story on the proposed resolution and Kitty I really appreciate you updating the model not only because it reflected a better picture, but because it is always good to double check what our expectations were against what the reality develops to be. I appreciate your work with that.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: So part of this is a timing issue too, regarding that sale of the Ag Center.

Ms. Crow: Yeah.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: I think this goes maybe to our Chairman, are you comfortable using the use of fund balance? Because we had a previous resolution that was smaller, \$13,000, for the Sheriff- is there any alternative at this time not to increase the use of fund balance or are you comfortable using it?

Ms. Crow: I might add that I view it as we are using the revenues that we received last year, the \$1.7 million really is bringing back into this model- that's what it's really based on. The fact that we got that additional \$1.7 million that was going to be spread over the period of this.

Chairman Chagnon: So Chuck just to clarify, if the timing of the revenue had occurred the way that we anticipated it in the budget, we wouldn't have needed that- the \$1.7 million would have supplemented the fund balance.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: That's because it closed in 17?

Ms. Crow: Correct.

Chairman Chagnon: So, am I comfortable with it? The fact that we have already received the \$1.7 million and deposited that in the fund balance, yes I'm comfortable with that.

Ms. Crow: And to that point, in future budgets we would expect to- well, our cost should be less than what we would have spent, although some of that expense was capital expense.

Chairman Chagnon: That's the other point I was going to make. In future budgets we will have less capital expense which is part of the savings that is anticipated in the projection. Thank you for asking.

Ms. Crow: In the maintenance, ownership our annual operating expense is \$633,000, whereas, in our rent model- where we are renting our rent expense is \$900,000. So we would expect to be using the revenue that we generated to offset this difference as we go forward.

Legislator Niebel: Kitty, number seven, your assumptions regarding administrative costs- all the way over to the right it says for the purposes of this model 2-

Ms. Crow: Oh. It should be 2.5% sorry.

Legislator Niebel: Ok. That's what I thought.

Chairman Chagnon: Wow, eagle eyes down there.

Ms. Crow: Really, the overall personnel costs should be reduced further. The maintenance person that was anticipated- two retirements that would not be replaced. One of the two has happened and the other one is pending.

Mrs. Dennison: The model assumes- does not include (*crosstalk*) of the second person.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, any other questions or comments on the proposed resolution? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Accept New York Voting Access for Individuals with Disabilities, Polling Place Access Improvement Grant Funds to Enhance Voting Opportunities To persons with Disabilities

Mrs. Sanderson: The Board of Elections received this grant in 2008. The original balance as it shows was \$40,453. That leaves us a balance of \$10,057 that was currently in the revenues and expenditures in the 2018 budget. The Board of Elections is hoping and anticipating on using the balance of this grant in 2018 which will then reimburse the cost of training our inspectors. In 2017 the Board of Elections trained 407 election inspectors which was a total cost of \$10,200. We would almost be breaking even.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Quit Claim Deeds

Mr. Caflisch: Before you today are six properties which we have received offers for which did not sell at last year's real property tax auction. The offers came in I thought really well for these properties versus the taxes owed. It would be my recommendation to proceed with the sale of these properties. They are just vacant lots.

Chairman Chagnon: OK. Just vacant lots and its more than the taxes owed. That's a good thing. Questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution- Amend 2018 Budget to Accommodate New Position of Deputy County Executive for Economic Development

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution is the follow up to the change in the local law to create the title for Deputy County Executive for Economic Development and it amends the budget as necessary to accommodate the changes in personnel and where the personnel are budgeted at. The adopted budget included a budget for Kevin Sanvidge and he was entirely budgeted in department 6420 Promotion of Industry. With Mark Giese filling the newly created position, once the law is passed, he will be under the jurisdiction of the County Executives Department. So the resolution moves most of the budget associated with Kevin Sanvidge into department A1230 which is the County Executive. There is also a movement of funds into the Planning Department- A8020. That occurs because in part of the change, Don McCord's position has been or will be modified and his salary is increasing with his new position. So to summarize, the budget is moving originally budgeted funds for Kevin Sanvidge into the County Executives Department and into the Planning Department. The resolution is self-balancing so no change to local share associated with the movements.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions? Comments? Those of you that will read the minutes of the PED meeting last night, you might note that some of us were surprised by the increase in planning- the increase in salary for Mr. McCord. Not that we were upset by it, but we were surprised by it. What we were told was that this was all a wash and we didn't ask the question specifically if anybody's compensation was going to change. I thought a wash was a wash. There was some discussion last night about not liking to be surprised but Mr. McCord apologized to me last night. The County Executive apologized to me this morning. It was just an oversight that they didn't bring this up. Certainly Mr. McCord does a fine job for the County and I'm not offended by that, but it's just that it was a surprise.

Legislator Niebel: His salary increased by about \$3,000?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes. That's correct.

Mrs. Dennison: Well in interest of full disclosure, I should point out that is the amount that is going to the Planning Department. He is budgeted 50/50 between Planning and Promotion of Industry. Some of his increase- his overall increase is more than the \$3,000 you see here because some of his increased stays in Department 6020 so it doesn't have to move anywhere.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: So it's twice that amount? Just under \$6,000.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. These changes are predicated on the assumption that all of the staff changes will occur on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. So it reflects five months of activity. The proposed change for him- the new salary is \$89,500. I believe his current salary is around \$82,000.

Legislator Niebel: Is that a title change?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: We have learned even more this morning than we learned last night.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: So the message here is that we would like full disclosure when things like this happen. It was my understanding that he would not receive an increase in salary. In essence he is receiving a \$5,700 increase.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Other-

Proposed Resolution- Establishing Energy Benchmarking Requirements for  
Certain County Buildings

Vice Chair Nazzaro: What is the emergency nature of this?

Chairman Chagnon: This was discussed at PED last night. Mr. McCord had a Southern Tier (*inaudible*) Planning meeting to go to this morning. So the nature of this is that this is part of the County's objective of being designated as an Energy Smart Community- something along those lines. There are several criteria that you have to achieve to get that designation which then makes us available for grant funds and so forth. This is one of the ones that were selected to be achieved. This is relatively easy. It's an energy benchmarking of our building energy use. So the reason that this is coming to us as an emergency is that the criteria that needed to be achieved, we had targeted to have them done by the end of April, which we are still on schedule to. Approval of this resolution will then be the step that is needed for this segment. Then we will be able to apply for grant funds. The reason that the emergency nature is, is that we have been told that other counties have achieved their status, received their grants, and the grant funds available are rapidly diminishing. Other counties are getting close, so we don't want to pass our end of April objective because we are being told that there may only be one more county receiving those grant funds and we want to be that county. That was the emergency nature.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: Thank you. Very thorough. This is coming before Audit and Control- I can understand it coming before Planning and Economic Development- it will lead to a grant application. Is that why it is coming here?

Chairman Chagnon: Exactly.

Vice Chair Nazzaro: Right now there is no budget appropriations because this is just another step?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes. Thank you.

Legislator Niebel: Mr. Chairman, page two it looks like there may be a May 15<sup>th</sup> deadline which means the Legislature would not have a chance to act on it until after that date. So I guess that's the nature of this emergency resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: Yes. OK, any other questions or comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution-Authorize Agreement for Purchase and Removal of County Owned Timber From Property #10 on County Route 474 in Town of Clymer

Mrs. Dennison: You may recall that we recently set up a capital project in the Parks Department for parks capital improvements. That project is funded by timber sales. This resolution will amend the budget to add additional funds both to the revenue in that capital project and to the appropriation to that capital project because there was a new sale of timber. The project currently has a revenue in appropriation budget of approximately \$170,000 and this sale and budget amendment would add another \$44,880 in both capital revenue and capital appropriations with the expectation and requirement that the funds be used for the parks improvement.

Chairman Chagnon: OK, questions? Comments? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed?

*Unanimously Carried*

Discussion- Fly Car Financial Analysis discussed by John Griffith.

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

*Unanimously Carried (10:59 a.m.)*

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,  
Lori J. Foster, Deputy Clerk/Secretary to the Legislature/ Olivia L. Ames, Committee Secretary