

Minutes

Audit & Control Committee

Thursday, January 18, 2018, 8:35 a.m., Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Chagnon, Nazzaro, Niebel

Member Absent: Gould, Muldowney,

Others: Tampio, Dennison, Abdella, McCord, Lis, Wisniewski, Crow, DeAngelo, Cummings, PPD Board Members, Larish, M. Webster, P. Coats, Brumagin

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

Approval of Minutes

MOVED by Legislator Nazzaro, SECONDED by Legislator Niebel and duly carried the minutes were approved. (12/14/17)

Unanimously Carried

1st Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time

Proposed Resolution – Amend Personal Services & Employee Benefit Appropriations Accounts – Environmental – Landfill

Mrs. Dennison: I would be happy to speak to this resolution. This resolution we propose to move personal service and employee benefit funds into the closed landfill department and those are coming from the landfill department. The reason for this is that Keith Stock, he is their water specialist, we want to charge 10% of his compensation to the closed landfill department and he was budgeted 100% in the regular landfill.

Legislator Nazzaro: Mr. Chairman, I just want you to note that there is a typo on this. Replace the A's, with EL.

Mrs. Dennison: I also want to add that in 2018, it has been budgeted for Mr. Stock, 10% of his compensation to close landfill and 90% in the regular landfill. So the resolution would just implement that strategy in the 17's budget.

Chairman Chagnon: Just an oversight in the 17' budget and budget neutral.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes and I believe that the landfill decided after the 17' budget was created that it was more appropriate to split him compensation between the two departments. Yes, definitely budget neutral.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Close Capital Projects

Mrs. Dennison: As you recall we went through a process last year starting in May of meeting with all the department heads to talk about the status of their projects. A number of them were flagged for completion by December 31st and so this is the list of projects that have been completed so we would like to close those projects and then any budget balance of the projects would be returned to the reserve for capital.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., good job. Any questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Confirming User Charges: Portland-Pomfret-Dunkirk Sewer District

My name is Scott Cummings and on the end is Dan Larish, who is our Vice-Chairman of our PPD Sewer Board. Marty Webster is a Board member and Paula Coats is also a Board member.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you for coming.

Mr. Cummings: The Board, over the last several months has been going over the financial status of the district and with Kathleen's help going over our finances, things have not been good. We need to unfortunately do a rate increase so the board has proposed an increase at this time. We went through a public hearing and made the motion to move it through to the County Legislature so that is kind of where we are at at this point. One of the tough things for the board to deal with lately has been the increase cost of sewage treatment to the Village of Fredonia's wastewater plant. That cost has gone up astronomically over the last couple of years. The district went from paying \$80-to \$90,000 a year to Fredonia to \$188,000 this past year so it's gone up tremendously. We have an agreement with the Village of Fredonia for them to process the sewage and they are following the agreement but it was written back in the 80's and it made sense then but it really doesn't make sense now. Fredonia lost a lot of revenue in flow to their plant when the Carriage House went out so our flows are calculated according to their flows so their flows are down which shows our flows higher which is why we're paying more. But that is the biggest reason for the increase at this point and also to help offset some of the operation maintenance cost throughout the aging district, trying to keep ahead of that.

Chairman Chagnon: A question from what you just said. Do you have an understanding of what the other user rates have done since yours have gone up so much?

Mr. Cummings: As far as the other districts in the County?

Chairman Chagnon: No, the other users of the Fredonia system?

Mr. Cummings: I don't have a lot of information on the Fredonia system to be honest with you. Dan has looked into it a little bit.

Mr. Larish: In the last two years their rates have gone up \$1.15 per thousand, wastewater last year and the year before that I think it was a \$1.00 per thousand for their own residents. Their rate for residences is \$6.17 per thousand and we're being charged almost \$12.00 per thousand and we're not the only one. They process some stuff in Pomfret, outlining streets that touch Fredonia, their system, and they're being charged almost \$12.00 per thousand too. The only difference that we haven't figured out is, do they provide the base to them.

Mr. Cummings: Maintenance/operations.

Mr. Larish: We pay for that. I haven't figured it out yet. It's a tough one to figure out, if they paid for that or not in that \$12.00 or do they – I don't think they charged them base. Fredonia's base is \$20.00 and ours is, for example, \$79.00 current, \$112.00 and \$80.75 depending on which area you are in. Using Fredonia's example, their residents pay \$20.00 for their base.

Chairman Chagnon: The reason I asked the question is that the increase that you have experienced in your understanding is perhaps inequitable to the other users of the system. If everyone's rate had gone up, that would have been unfortunate but everyone would have been treated (*inaudible*).

Mr. Larish: Their rates have gone up and not like we had to raise our rates, not even close. We are exploring through the County Attorney and our avenues with Fredonia to hopefully negotiate a new contract.

Chairman Chagnon: That was my next question.

Mr. Cummings: We tried that several months ago, I made contact with the Village of Fredonia, seeing if we could start looking at process looking at that agreement, they didn't want to do anything at that point because they didn't have an attorney. Their attorney just left so they really didn't want to do anything. At the same time, they don't want to lose that revenue so it's going to be very difficult but the way the agreement reads is, again, it's a percentage of flow so we have a flow meter that goes into their plant that measures every bit of the water we send them. But on their side, they are using just their water meter readings added up so that's their flows and ours are total flows. It's not really apples to apples. It's not really fair so my hope is that we can renegotiate that contract and make that a little fairer so we're measuring the same

amount for each side. In other words, they don't include their infiltration where we do. So that is the problem with that contract right now.

Chairman Chagnon: Steve, since this is a County sewer district, you are representing the interest of the sewer district. Do you have anything to add to this discussion?

Mr. Abdella: Not really. We will seek to see if we could get a new agreement formula in place. It is rather difficult given that it's really a sole source situation.

Mr. Cummings: We really can't go anywhere else.

Mr. Abdella: There is no practical alternative at this point but we'll work on it and let you know.

Mr. Cummings: Kristen from his office has been working with us very, very well and helping out. She's ready to start as soon as we can get some information together and work with her to start looking at a new agreement so she's ready to go. We're at that point now. We have to start gathering the information together so we can go at this. We wish that we had someplace else to go. The City of Dunkirk's plant or something like that but the cost of the infrastructure to do that would be - for 500 users in this district to pay that cost on top of what they are paying now, I just don't know if that would be feasible. Whether Dunkirk even accept us and what that rate would be, we wouldn't know that.

Legislator Nazzaro: We talked about this quite in length in Public Facilities and you asked the spot on question about the agreement and just for the minutes, the Committee recognizes a considerable increase. It's like 40%.

Mr. Cummings: We looked at that and it's about a 48% increase when you do the base charge and the water use charge. So it's a large increase but looking at the finances, we have to do that to keep the district solvent and not come back to you folks next year and ask for another increase. We need to do something to build that fund balance and move that past.

Legislator Nazzaro: And there are two parts to that. The annual rate which is billed quarterly and then the usage rate which is going from \$5.50 per thousand gallons to \$12.00. If there is any positive here, hopefully that would encourage conservation because that's a sizeable increase. We had a pretty good discussion on this and as was said, there really isn't much alternative here.

Mr. Cummings: There isn't and that's where the users can kind of save themselves some money by conserving water. Low flush toilets, appliances that have low water usage, that kind of thing to help them out, not watering their lawns, washing their cars, which all goes through the water meter and then that all gets calculated into sewer use. So, it's up to them to help do some of their own conserving water.

Legislator Niebel: The public hearing was held back in December.

Mr. Cummings: December 12th.

Legislator Niebel: Heavily attended, lightly attended?

Mr. Cummings: We had 8 to 10 folks there. A few left that were not happy or satisfied and a few I think understood what we were trying to do and why we had to do it.

Legislator Niebel: Most of the people were opposed?

Mr. Cummings: Pretty much everybody that was there. Which makes sense. I think the Board did the right thing when we put a letter together with legal help and let all the residents know what was going to happen, what the rate would be that was needed, why it was needed and we laid everything out in a nice letter to them before the public hearing. So everybody was well informed as best we could.

Legislator Niebel: Scott, I'm new to the committee and I have some questions. As far as under Section 5, the charge rate of A1, A2, and B. They pertain to the different areas on the district?

Mr. Cummings: Correct.

Legislator Niebel: And as far as the rates and stuff, these are increases, how are have these rates changed? Could you perhaps explain that?

Mr. Cummings: Sure. On Section 5 where it says charges A1, that is the Van Buren Point area, it's on older district that maybe was built back in the 30's. That was started as an old clay tile pipes, old system. That's in Van Buren Point itself. Then A2 is Shore Acres, another older section. There is about 26 houses in that area, another old, old, part of the district. The reason those areas pay a little bit more is because we must do a lot more maintenance in those areas. We have to do root control, a lot of flushing. We have a lot of infiltration in those areas. There is more work that we physically have to do in those areas. Then B is the part of the district that was built back in the mid 80's when the districts were all formed, when most districts were being built back then.

Legislator Niebel: What does that consist of?

Mr. Cummings: That consist mainly around the lakeshore, Rt. 5 and the lakeshore itself. All the way from Fredonia wastewater plant all the way going west to Woodcrest Avenue (*inaudible*) their entire district. That is a newer section of the district built in the early 80's.

Legislator Niebel: And how would these rates, right now we have \$440.00 for A1, \$440.00 for A2 and \$400.00 for B.

Mr. Cummings: What they are paying as of today is A1 is paying about \$450.00 per annual base charge.

Legislator Niebel: So they will go down.

Mr. Cummings: They will go down slightly because they have been paying a lot more than the other districts right along so we're just trying to equalize that a little bit, make it a little easier. A 2 is going to go from \$355.00 annually to \$440.00 and B is going to from \$316.00 annually to \$400.00.

Chairman Chagnon: But the real increase is in the water usage charge.

Mr. Cummings: Correct. And that again needed to be corrected to just pay Fredonia. That is half of the districts project.

Chairman Chagnon: That's the charge that goes to the Fredonia treatment process.

Mr. Cummings: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: And there is only like 500.

Mr. Cummings: Five hundred and two users I think in the whole district. Not enough for the district, when it was formed, to build its own treatment plant so they really had no choice but to make an agreement with Fredonia.

Mr. Larish: So part of our goal, this coming year, is to try and get a new contract with Fredonia, the Village, and as we know just in past experiences, it's been difficult. But, during that process we may be calling on the Legislators personally, to put weight behind it if it gets difficult because they are the only game in town and there may have to be some –

Chairman Chagnon: Discussions.

Mr. Larish: Right to make it more fair because I think what Scott pointed out is, when you talk about, when we measure all by water flow, that's the brown water and the surface water, infiltration and they don't do that. They just take their meter readings and that would be the fairest to take our water readings because we have – we have identified some issues that we had to work on down the road but we had a 10 million gallon infiltration in all of our system but most of it is the older part that we have to work on to make things work in the future.

Mr. Cummings: When the district back in the 80's accepted the Van Buren Point area and Shoreacre area, they weren't made to improve the lines in that area so they are still paying for that today unfortunately. That decision back then we're still suffering (*inaudible*).

Chairman Chagnon: So are there any discussion yet about an inflow, infiltration study?

Mr. Cummings: We're hoping to get that if we can build up some fund balance where we can pay for a study.

Mr. Larish: Well, the discussion will be - I can represent this. The discussion on that will be moving forward at the 31st of this month at our regular meeting and it's on the agenda.

Chairman Chagnon: Scott is well aware from his involvement with the Town of Chautauqua that there are State grants that would pay for that study.

Mr. Cummings: Yeah, we need to get moving forward.

Chairman Chagnon: The Town of Chautauqua just got one. Any other questions or comments? At this point, I don't think that we have any other recourse but to vote on the resolution. All in favor?

Unanimously Carried

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

Mr. Abdella: The County Legislature had previously authorized, you might call bridge funding for this district to do its preliminary design and initial construction work pending then finalization of permanent bonding that has also been previously approved by the Legislature. We had just received a request to further extend that temporary financing. It's no increase in the cap on the amount to be financed and no change in the calculation of the interest that would be paid but additional time was needed prior to the permanent financing being finalized.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions? The County's Director of Finance is comfortable with this continuation for another year? It meets our interesting earning expectations?

Legislator Nazzaro: Let the record show that she nodded.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments?

Legislator Niebel: The County water district, I'm all in favor of it.

Chairman Chagnon: It's a very small lift for the County to support it this way. It's an excellent project.

Legislator Niebel: It's going to help a lot of people.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., all those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Setting Salary for Network Infrastructure Supervisor

Ms. Wisniewski: Jon brought to our attention several months ago that he wanted to look at a current employee who is a Systems Analyst Network and he is a Grade 21 and he felt that he

wanted HR to look at the position. To look at his responsibility, are they meeting that title anymore or is there another title or is the pay appropriate. The first thing that we looked at was the pay of that position and we felt like per the job spec of what the responsibilities are of that position, that the salary should not be changed. So we went back and we asked several different questions throughout a few month as to what is it that this employee is doing that maybe is out of job spec. We did get down to the fact of, there is not a title for what he is currently now doing with (*inaudible*) employee. Jon does have a Senior Systems Analyst. This current position is Grade 21, the Senior System is Grade 26 and there is nothing really in between that he currently has. We felt that it fell in between a Grade 23 and not the 26 so we created the title of Network Infrastructure Supervisor because this individual is going to be supervising other employees now with these projects that he is working on that he wasn't previously working on so now we're here to set that salary of a Grade 23 that HR feels that that is appropriate for him to do.

Mr. DeAngelo: Just to give you a little more background. Brian Beadle, who is in this position, has been in that position for 9 years, System Analyst. Through that time, technology has changed, our responsibilities, his responsibilities have changed. So now he's really our lead on cyber security which nine years ago it wasn't as big of a deal as it is now so he has certifications in cyber security. He also leads our telecommunications. We are upgrading our system so that all of our phones run over our network and so he'll be in charge of that. This will also mean that we'll be able to support that phone system in-house more than we do now. Right now we have a contract with an outside company that we spend about \$6,000 a month on. So this will allow us to drastically reduce or eliminate that contract completely. So a small (*inaudible*) for him. There are other people that now kind of report to him in this model where he's working on our infrastructure. So more responsibility. I think he's worked for it, he's doing new work now that he wasn't doing over the past nine years so I think it's time to create this. I will say two things budget wise. I don't plan on backfilling the Systems Analyst Networks position and also I did budget for this so it is in the 2018 budget. With the reduction in the contract which I just started doing with the legal team, should almost be a wash, budget wise. Reduction in communications costs but increase in the point ones and point eights.

Legislator Niebel: This will probably come out of – I know you guys have a number of different accounts so this will probably come out of A.1680.1?

Mr. DeAngelo: It will be split between 1680 and 1650. 1650 is our communications account so a portion of his salary, I think like 10% or something like that, comes out of the communications account because he is taking on this. Most of it is out of the 1680.

Legislator Niebel: And you have \$750,000 in there?

Mr. DeAngelo: That sounds about right.

Legislator Niebel: So with not having to use the outside consultant for \$6,000, basically a wash and you say that you will not or you don't anticipate coming back to the committee asking for an increase in the A1680.1 account?

Mr. DeAngelo: Not at all.

Chairman Chagnon: Even though Terry claims to be new to this committee, he's obviously quoting very directly from the budget, your specific account number.

Legislator Niebel: I did a little reading.

Chairman Chagnon: We appreciate that.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm impressed.

Chairman Chagnon: Chuck, did you have the discussion at Administrative Services about this?

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't know, I'm not on Administrative Services, I'm on Public Facilities.

Chairman Chagnon: I'm sorry. This was discussed at Administrative Services?

Mr. DeAngelo: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: We have the benefit of reviewing the minutes of that committee and so that answered the questions that I had. Your presentation makes a lot of sense. Jon, I appreciate your sensitivity to the concerns of this committee which you nailed right on down the line.

Legislator Niebel: And I think if this person is going to be concentrating on cyber security, it's a big thing. I know in my office yesterday, I got a call from somebody claiming to be from Google and it wasn't Bill Gates, if it was, it was with an accent. So I think that is important part of this responsibility for this person.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2017 Budget for Juvenile Detention and OCFS Custody

Ms. Lis: This is simply a transfer of budget from one department to another to follow where the invoices are going to be charged when we pay them or accrue them at this point. We have several juveniles in State custody who have moved down from a State owned facility into a County level facility. So, when we pay those bills, we have different departments to where those are recorded, so we are just moving the budget to match with.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is there a difference in the rates per day?

Ms. Lis: It's not a lot different. I was surprised when I looked at it closely. It's a little less but not a lot less when you do the 50% reduction because when they are State custody, it's a 49/51.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because again, the State runs close to a \$1,000 a day, does it not?

Ms. Lis: (*Cross talk*) we have. Right, so (*inaudible*) \$500 and I looked at some of these were like in the \$400's so they are not a lot less just a little bit less.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because I guess my question and you answered it was by going to a different level, it's really, from a budgetary standpoint, not a significant cost savings.

Chairman Chagnon: Not a significant cost savings to the County but a significant cost savings to the State.

Ms. Lis: Exactly because they would have been paying their \$500 or so is gone.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., thank you for clarifying so on the juvenile delinquent care, if we're not getting -

Ms. Lis: On those we claim those and those will come back through the program. I mean, it's State detention is right off the top. They issue the bill and we pay half. With these, we will claim it through the State funding and I'm not exactly sure what the rate is on it because it will depend on where - I need to look at that.

Legislator Nazzaro: So we're still spending about \$500 a day?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Our County share?

Ms. Lis: Yeah, I believe so. I'm sorry, you stumped me and I shouldn't be stumped but my mind is not on that right now. I will take a look at that and see how those flow. I can't remember at the moment if these are again where we get a flat rate and that is all there is to it or these are the ones that we get to claim through. Because these children aren't in our custody, it's not like - we also have other children in the same facility who are in our custody who are Foster kids or whatever they may be and so their coming through on the same invoices but they're different children.

Chairman Chagnon: Excellent questions. I would appreciate if you could follow through on that. What's before us today just deals with the expense side of that. The revenue side of it is certainly of great interest to us as the impact on the County of this move. That leads me to my question on this, who precipitated this change? What caused this change for these -

Ms. Lis: Where they are located?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Ms. Lis: Like I said, they are not in our custody so it's up to the State.

Chairman Chagnon: So this is directed by the State?

Ms. Lis: Yes.

Legislator Niebel: I'm unclear, so OCFS, we get 50% State aid for the kids?

Ms. Lis: OCFS is the State so what happens is –

Legislator Niebel: I understand and it costs about \$1,000 a day with OCFS but the State does pay 50%?

Ms. Lis: Right. They bill us.

Legislator Niebel: O.k., so Val, when they step down to the voluntary agency facilities, we don't get any State aid for that?

Ms. Lis: That is what I am looking into. I believe once again, because I didn't put a revenue adjustment along with this, then I believe that at this point, we get charged that rate and that is all there is. In other words, a net rate -

Legislator Niebel: No reimbursement?

Ms. Lis: Yeah. I'm going to look into that more closely because I prepared this a while ago and I've lost that connection.

Legislator Niebel: That is important.

Chairman Chagnon: Yes it is. Not for this resolution but it is important to us.

Legislator Niebel: Overall.

Ms. Lis: Right and I looked at it at the time and I just lost it and I don't want to tell you something that is not right. So I want to go back and look again.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2018 Budget for NYS Community Development Block Grant Wells and Septic Replacement Program Application Not Selected for Funding

Ms. Lis: This is revenue that is a program that we have been involved in for several years and so we expected it to come through again for 2018 but when the selection process was done, we were not selected for funding. One of the main reasons for that is, you may remember that something, I'm not sure exactly what the mechanics where to it, but something was done that

raised the levels of Lake Ontario, the shorelines, that caused a lot of damage to a lot of houses along there. So that CDBG money, a lot of that has been funneled that way to fix that. So our program was not selected this year among other items that felt were more pressing.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments?

Legislator Nazzaro: So we have a (*inaudible*) that you expected to get, on the appropriation side, the expenses, are they directly related, like, are there individuals involved in this?

Ms. Lis: We work with CHRIC for this so we end up with a contract with CHRIC to do the work. So the revenue is being taken off the budget as well as the expense. I wanted to get it out of there so that we didn't use that expense for something else because that revenue was not there.

Legislator Nazzaro: So that answered my question. The expense side where the contract (*inaudible*) with CHRIC so if we don't have that grant, we're not going to have that contract.

Ms. Lis: Exactly. We're not going to be doing that work.

Legislator Nazzaro: O.k., I just wanted to make sure we weren't still incurring costs for the County for expectation of a grant that we didn't get.

Ms. Lis: It may be back, we're not sure. We'll try again for funding in the next round.

Chairman Chagnon: Is this a funding application that the County makes or CHRIC makes?

Ms. Lis: We do. I think that there may be some involvement with the paperwork with CHRIC but not so much on some of the other like the lead work. This was probably (*inaudible*) by environmental group.

Legislator Niebel: The reason why you budgeted for it in 2018 is because you've had it for two or three years?

Ms. Lis: We've had it for several years and we had applied for it and we've always gotten it and we expected the program to continue but it will not, at least this year. We don't know what will happen going forward.

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Extension of Lease Agreement for Department of Planning & Economic Development at the BWB Center

Mr. McCord: The series of resolutions that we have on the agenda today including the one that we're about to talk about are all standard resolutions that we have to look at every year because the agreement that we have with the IDA, the IDA 's the public authority and we as another municipal entity need resolutions to enter into an agreement with them. The BWB lease, you will see that the amounts have remained the same since approximately 2004 and to lease the space, it's \$6.58 per square foot. The current rate here at the GOB is \$9.00 a square foot.

Legislator Niebel: I don't know about, what did you say, 2002?

Mr. McCord: Two thousand and four.

Legislator Niebel: I don't know about that but it was the same in 2016 and 2017. It goes back a lot further than that?

Mr. McCord: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: Terry, I'll ask you the question then, is this in conformance with the 2018 budget?

Legislator Niebel: I think you've accounted for in the 2018 budget, I think, right?

Mr. McCord: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: Oh, you have done your homework.

Legislator Niebel: Actually the \$6.58 per square foot isn't a bad rate in the City.

Mr. McCord: No, actually in the City, we are paying some rates that are higher than that including (*inaudible*).

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Agreement with County of Chautauqua Industrial Development Agency for Attraction and Development of Tourism Related Businesses

Mr. McCord: This is another agreement that we started approximately 3 years ago. The amount is \$50,000. This is for a position that works with existing and new tourism events and businesses. Largely, it's promoted the LECOM event and worked on that and getting that off the ground which is a very large event. It's also done the Gran Fondo. Currently a new golf event that we discussed last night at PED was the Porter Cup which we will be rolling that out in Lewiston today, this evening at an event so that will add another weeks' worth of events to Chautauqua County's tourism.

Legislator Niebel: Again, the same as the last few years?

Mr. McCord: Yes.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions? Last night at PED we discussed a request from the committee to Don to give the committee a report in the next couple of months about the activities and the results. So Don has graciously agreed to bring that to the PED Committee. So that relates to some degree to this proposed resolution as well.

Mr. McCord: We'll also gladly share that with you. The anticipated date is the March meeting.

Chairman Chagnon: If there is nothing else, all those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Agreement with County of Chautauqua Industrial Development Agency for Industrial Development and Promotion

Mr. McCord: This is another standard resolution with the Industrial Development Agency for site development and business attraction and promotion. The current amount that is in the resolution is \$145,000. That is the same budgeted amount that was in 2017. If you did go back to the 16' number Terry, it was \$125,000.

Chairman Chagnon: Terry, are making Chuck and I look bad down here. I'm impressed that you caught that. Other questions or comments on the proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Agreement with County of Chautauqua Industrial Development Agency for the Business Assistance Program

Mr. McCord: The Business Assistance Program is contract for \$59,155. That amount has remained consistent. That is a division in between - we spend just a little over \$22,000 of that for a program with the Small Business Development Center where they maintain a business permit center and assist business both small and industry with permitting processes across municipalities in Chautauqua County. The remainder is for the IDA which maintains a property data base for sites and locations across the County to market those.

Chairman Chagnon: Any questions or comments? Don, could you explain how the support for the Small Business Development Center and this resolution relates to the next resolution for the agreement with the Small Business Development Center?

Mr. McCord: Yes. This current resolution focuses just on the permit center. So the Small Business Development Center stays in contact with communities to be updated on whatever permitting process. So if a small business or industry needs to come through, they can assist

them with that. The following resolution that is about to come up, is also with the Small Business Development Center but it's for technical assistance with businesses, small businesses, in particular, doing one on one counseling. A good example, I believe, it might be on the front page of the Observer, there are putting on a program on small business accounting as an example. They also do social media and other things that might be something that would benefit small business owners as they grow.

Chairman Chagnon: Other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Agreement with Small Business Development Center at Jamestown Community College

Mr. McCord: I think I pretty much outlined what that is. It's a smaller amount, approximately \$34,000 investing in the Small Business Development Center.

Chairman Chagnon: Questions or comments on that proposed resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Chagnon: We now have another resolution that has been added.

Other

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Supplemental Agreement No. 2 w/ NYSDOT for PIN 5758.45

Mr. Brumagin: This resolution is to continue the agreement with New York State for reimbursement and it's the supplemental that now will include the right-of-way acquisition phase so we can move forward in the project. The initial agreement was an estimate on the right-of-way costs and it has been reduced slightly through the draft design report (*inaudible*) they could save a little money so it's just to extend the agreement to allow us to acquire the right-of-way and it's also revises some of the numbers. That's why there is a slight reduction.

Chairman Chagnon: The look of amazement that you see on my face is because you never come here asking for less money. Any questions or comments? You got that Terry, they are asking for less money.

Legislator Niebel: I heard that. That's why I am not saying anything.

Chairman Chagnon: I wanted to reinforce that. They really are asking for less money for this project. That's terrific.

Legislator Nazzaro: For now anyway.

Chairman Chagnon: O.k., any other questions or comments on this proposed resolution?
Good job.

Unanimously Carried

Discussion – Solid Waste Flow Control – County Attorney Abdella

Discussion – Health Insurance Enrollment – Finance Director Crow

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

Unanimously Carried (10:15 a.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Kathy K. Tampio, Clerk/Lori J. Foster, Deputy Clerk/Secretary to the Legislature