

2021 TENTATIVE BUDGET WORKSHOP  
November 16, 2020

Vice Chairman of the Board Pemrick called the meeting to order.

Roll Call was taken. PRESENT: Eric Connolly, Alan Grattidge, Philip C. Barrett, Jonathon Schopf, Richard Lucia, Preston Allen, Jean Raymond, Michael Smith, Daniel Pemrick, Kevin Tollisen, Darren O'Connor, Thomas Richardson, Benny Zlotnick, Theodore Kusnierz, Willard H. Peck, Sandra Winney, Thomas N. Wood, III, Tara Gaston, Matthew E. Veitch, - Edward D. Kinowski, John Lawler, John Lant - 22. ABSENT – Arthur M. Wright - 1.

The Clerk read the rules of the Budget Workshop.

1. The Law and Finance Committee held its Budget Hearing on November 12<sup>th</sup>. Each member of the Law and Finance Committee and the Chairman of the Board were eligible to vote on amendments, and all amendments presented today were approved with at least four affirmative votes in Committee.
2. During today's meeting, the Chair will accept amendments from the floor. All motions to change the 2021 Tentative budget, as amended by the Law and Finance Committee, either adding to or deleting from the budget, will require a majority of the weighted vote of the entire Board of Supervisors (109,804 votes). All voting will utilize the weighted system.
3. The 2021 Tentative Budget, along with all amendments approved at the Law and Finance Hearings and today's workshop will be presented at a Public Hearing on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, at 4:30 PM in the County Board rooms.

Mr. Pemrick said the Board members have the Law & Finance Amendments that were approved at their last meeting. He asked if there was a motion to accept these amendments. Mr. Connolly made a motion to approve the amendments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kinowski.

Mr. Barrett said just so we are on the same page so we know what is under consideration is it all of the suggested new positions that were created or recommended. Mr. Hellwig said yes. Mr. Pemrick said everything that is on the sheet in front of him. Mr. Barrett said as far as he was concerned Law & Finance had in front of them \$1M in new positions that were recommended to be created which he thinks is tone deaf to say the least. He said in 2020 we have had a lot of economic challenges. Now with the prospect of another economic shut down of sorts that is pending or sure to come, he thinks creating \$1M in new positions is aggressive to say the least. He said it would behoove the Board to review these positions as a Board as opposed to just the Law & Finance Committee that passed the recommendations through just the other day.

Mr. Pemrick asked for any other thoughts.

Mr. Kinowski said he believes there were a lot of other Supervisors in the room. He thinks the only one that was discussed at any length was the Public Relations doing PSA's and other work that would assist the Administrator. He remembers discussing that years ago, quite frankly 3 or 4 years ago. But at that time he was hoping for the position and settled on the contract. That company has fulfilled our requirements to date but the one that could speak best to that would be the Administrator because that contract was focal to the Administrator. He said the rest of the positions it didn't appear to be any major discussions in our open Committee meeting. The meeting was open then, we are open now he would like to hear discussions on each and every one. He said with regards to the budget and the growth of the County we are doing very well. He said in order to fill requirements we may need to fill these positions.

Ms. Gaston asked for a point of clarification. She asked if a Public Affairs position was in this amended list. Mr. Hellwig said it was not. She said she thought there was also some discussion on the DA and the on call pay being

a significant concern to a number of Supervisors who were concerned about equity across the County. She asked Mr. Barrett if he wanted to go position by position or what made sense. She said it was going to take her a minute because what was handed out at Law & Finance is different than what was handed them today. She has to do a lot of very quick math. She said some Supervisors may be in the same position and may want to ask questions. Mr. Barrett said that was part of the concern he was expressing.

Mr. Kusnierz asked Mr. Pemrick if he was understanding it correctly that these 12 positions that would add additional \$1M in payroll and benefits to the County budget would have to be funded by fund balance at this time if it were to be added in. Mr. Pemrick said that was correct. Mr. Hellwig added that there is \$146,000 in revenue against those positions. The net after subtracting that is \$989,000. Mr. Kusnierz said ok, it is close to \$1M in fund balance. He said he must say, he has to echo his colleague from Clifton Park's comments. All of us around the room here have been just recently very involved in putting our municipal budgets together. Some of us had some very challenging decisions to make and with the decrease in sales tax, the significant in the occupancy tax, now is not the time to be adding 12 positions that have to be funded by fund balance. He said he isn't saying they all shouldn't be funded and he is happy to go through each category if the rest of his colleagues are willing to do so. He thinks some of these positions can be funded but he thinks that tone deaf is accurate. To put this kind of addition and strain on the County budget is just not the right thing to do at this time.

Mr. Lawler asked if the on call pay was in or out of the Law & Finance amendments. Mr. Hellwig said it is not included. Mr. Lawler said the public relations officer is not in the amendments either, correct. Mr. Hellwig said correct that was not included.

Mr. Kinowski asked if there was still money in the budget for the contract position to supply those services. Mr. Hellwig said yes.

Mr. Lawler said, as we look at this list, the IT Department desperately needs help. They are understaffed. They are short staffed. They are called upon to do more and more every year. We live in a world that is more and more dependent on technology and the threat to the County in the event of a technological collapse both in terms of delivering services to our residents but perhaps more important the risk of ransom software/malware attacks. He said if the Board is going to walk through these one at a time he thinks the Information Technology request is very reasonable. He thinks it is urgently needed and one that the Board should get behind as it is a department that needs additional resources.

Mr. Barrett said he would agree with that wholeheartedly. He thinks we are behind as a County on IT. We have made some progress over the last several years but there is a lot of progress left to go. With regards to our meetings, they have been woefully inadequate, the technology used during the meeting to make sure residents of Saratoga County and anyone interested in listening or being a part of these meetings. It's been a real challenge for them and we need to do a much better job especially if we are going into another shut down period. We need to become much better with our ability to allow residents of Saratoga County to listen in and watch our meetings. He said they have been streaming their meetings in Clifton Park for 12 years or more. They have been on cable longer than that. He said he knows other towns do the same. Saratoga County could establish the same system if we put our minds to it. He would wholeheartedly agree with more information not only for these positions for Information Technology but also additional funds to expand our ability to be more transparent to Saratoga County residents.

Mr. Kinowski said he would make the recommendation that they go right down the pike then. Mr. Pemrick said we need specifics and not just state concerns. We are in the middle of Information Technology right now.

Ms. Gaston said to that effect is Eileen around. Mrs. Bennett said she was on the call. Ms. Gaston said great, thank you as she did see there were items on the amended budget as proposed here that were not actually positions. Software and furniture specifically. Mr. Hellwig said when the position is created; obviously, we have to provide those resources to the new employee. They don't exist so when you go through the list and you find those discrepancies that's just providing the ancillary costs that are associated with creating those positions. Ms. Gaston said that made sense but she just thought if there was an item that's on the list that hasn't been discussed she would

like to know from Eileen if it's sufficient or is there other software or furniture items that may be appropriate while we are talking about IT that may be beneficial to meeting the guidelines. Especially if they weren't originally included in the budget. Mr. Pemrick asked if that was a question for Eileen. Ms. Gaston said if Eileen feel the Administrator at least appropriately recognized those particular instances that's fine for now.

Mr. Kusnierz asked if the information that was handed out, by he thought the HR Department, had a budgetary figure of \$169,679 that's not the same number that adds up in the column for IT. He asked what the difference was. Mr. Hellwig said the difference was the furniture and the software. The items that are needed for that individual to actually work. Mr. Kusnierz said it's about an extra \$1,000. Mr. Hellwig said yes.

Mr. Pemrick said he thinks we are good with Information Technology. He said we should start at the top. Clerk of the Board or do we do these one at a time.

Mr. Barrett said he would move to approve the Information Technology request. Mr. Schopf seconded the motion. The Information Technology request was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said Clerk of the Board. Mr. Lawler said this was for the Historian. Mr. Grattidge made a motion that this request be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kinowski. The Clerk of the Board request was approved by the following vote:

AYES (113653): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423)

NOES (103906): Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), John Lant (16173)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Lawler asked if he could say what the position or positions are as we vote. Mr. Hellwig said for the Treasurer's office the position would be a reclassification of Account Clerk Typist Part time to Foreclosure Supervisor at a base salary of \$59,870. Mr. Lawler asked what the budget impact was. Mr. Hellwig said \$76,797 on the salary.

Mr. Pemrick said Treasurer. On a motion by Mr. Zlotnick, seconded by Mr. Smith.

TREASURER Position 1<sup>ST</sup> VOTE - FAILED

AYES (103877): Alan Grattidge (4133), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423),

NOES (113682): Eric Connolly (9776), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), John Lant (16173)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Lawler asked what the outcome was. The motion Failed. Mr. Zlotnick asked if we could allow Mr. Jarosh to speak now. Mr. Pemrick asked Mr. Jarosh if he would like to speak. Mr. Jarosh said one clarification he would like to make on that position was it would be taking over for other positions that already exist. Then those positions wouldn't be filled so the net budget impact would be zero. Mr. Pemrick said it was too late. Ms. Gaston said it

is not too late and we can always bring it back up. She said if there was a department head that is here who would like to speak about it, could we ask if they have any comments to make. She said that would probably be beneficial to Supervisors to be aware of how that is going to work out in their department and not just it's going to be \$77,000. Mr. Pemrick said it shouldn't be an issue.

Mr. Jarosh thanked the Board and the Chairman of the opportunity. He wanted to express why this position was requested. He said there are changes coming up in 2021 in the County Attorney's office and the representation there. There is currently a position in Steve's office that handles the title searches for the foreclosure process. That position compiles everything that is needed for the foreclosures; goes through the County Clerk's office to make sure all the interested parties are identified. Then when Steve goes to make a motion before the court, the County doesn't get sued. If a property is foreclosed on incorrectly, the County may be sued by the previous owner, and the winning bidder would each have a viable lawsuit. That position becomes a keystone position in the foreclosure process. The person who currently occupies that position, let's just say she is well eligible for retirement and quite possibly might happen. In the interest of succession planning, he has been working with Steve and Marcy on a plan for 2021 when there will be two foreclosures to do because there was no foreclosure this year. The position is a key position and if it becomes vacant, there needs to be a plan. The idea was to create a new position, which wouldn't be filled unless or until the other position was vacant. He said he has a part time account clerk position, which could be combined; the two work out to one position. That person would currently start assisting to learn the job, then if that person decides to retire as she has more than earned in her career, then his part time person would take over and become full time in the new position.

Mr. Tollisen said the position on the amendment list does not show a net zero. Mr. Jarosh said it was not net zero to add it to the budget. It is understood that when one position becomes vacant in the County Attorney's office, that position would not be refilled. The part time position, who is the lead candidate for this, in the Treasurer's Office, would become full time. Mr. Tollisen said can't the department be re-organized at no additional cost. Mrs. McNamara started to respond; but was asked to move to a microphone because she could not be heard. Ms. Gaston reminded those speaking to keep their masks on. Mrs. McNamara said a full time position was budgeted for because of the unknown if the person in the County Attorney's office will retire. This is succession planning and to have the flexibility if there is a retirement. If the part time employee in the Treasurer's office were to take the full time position, that would be the net cost depending on who will take the position. She said she knows that there is going to be a void that will need to be adjusted.

Mr. Richardson asked if we are planning in advance to make sure everything will run smooth next year. Mrs. McNamara said yes. Mr. Richardson asked how the Board would vote again on this. Mr. Dorsey said there would need to be a motion. Mr. Pemrick said if someone would like to make the motion. Mr. Grattidge said he would make a motion, on the understanding that this is going to have no budget impact, if this position is put in place as one would drop. Mr. Hellwig said the position would be funded. The position wouldn't be filled so the money would not be spent until such time that this individual whose future is uncertain at this point in terms of her tenure here, once she leaves then the salary would stop in that budget and it starts getting paid in the Treasurer's office. Mr. Grattidge said what he is asking for is the bottom line. The bottom line is there is not going to be a budget impact if this position is put in place as a placeholder. Mr. Hellwig said it would increase the tentative budget by \$76,000. The actual cost, that will offset it next year when the position is filled.

Mr. Schopf asked if the budget could be amended when the one person retires and we need to move the position up. Mr. Hellwig said the position needs to be created. If you want to wait until next year to do that, there is also a learning curve. If we have to wait a month or two months, unless they get someone with a background in this, it takes time to get a person up to speed.

Mr. Richardson said we are planning in advance. It only makes sense that we do something like this. He asked if he could put a motion on the floor that we take a new count on the position for the Treasurer. Mr. Pemrick said Mr. Grattidge has a motion. Mr. Grattidge said he would withdraw his motion and defer to Mr. Richardson's.

On a motion by Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Connolly to put the Treasurer's position back up for a vote. Mr. Lawler said it's a motion to reconsider and asked the County Attorney if that can be done. Mr. Dorsey said yes.

Mr. Tollisen said he was still unclear and is the motion about this being net zero. Or are we funding this and we aren't worrying about it. At least Supervisor Grattidge was saying as long as it's budget neutral we are fine. Is that the intent of the motion.

Mr. Jarosh said in order to create the position, you have to budget for it. We won't actually incur those dollars as an expense unless and until the position in the Attorney's office becomes vacant. At that time the expense in that position stops, even though it will be budgeted for a full year. Then the expense in the Treasurer's office would begin. The expense is being transferred from one department to the next should the event arise.

Ms. Gaston asked if it was possible to create a position and not fund it. That would allow the Board to see that it's there and then do budget amendment more quickly than creating the position. Can this be done. Mr. Hellwig said yes. Ms. Gaston asked Mr. Jarosh if it would create a position in his budget that was not funded. Mr. Jarosh said no so long as it doesn't take another month or two to fund it. This position is a specialized position in foreclosures on properties. His only concern is that when there is knowledge that this event is going to occur then he would bring forward to the County Administrator and to the Board and respectfully request the Board act expeditiously on it. Ms. Gaston asked how much time is given when an employee is leaving that type of position. (many speaking couldn't make out the answer)

Mr. Veitch asked if this would be subject to vacancy review and should we say now that it is exempt from vacancy review. Mrs. McNamara said there is always a vacancy waiver. Mr. Veitch said he would want to make sure that happens so it goes through quickly.

Mr. Connolly said let's play out the scenario and there is only a two week notice that this person is retiring, will this allow enough time for this to come back in front of the full Board to approve. Mr. Jarosh said it would depend when the notice is received. If it is received on the first day of the month then yes it could. He added it is unknown if this person has any plans on retiring. It is not up to us to ask. It is up to her to divulge that to us. He said she could retire this year. Mr. Connolly asked how that would affect his department. Mr. Jarosh said that would not be good. He would like as much notice as possible for his part timer to learn from her. Mr. Connolly said if the salary is not funded today and you don't get much notice on when this is happening how does this impact the flow of work. Mr. Jarosh said it was far from ideal; and, will make due with whatever the Board decides. He said it was part of the succession planning and apologized for the budget impact. But understand that all the dollars won't be spent until the event occurs. If the Board funds both positions for a full year there is going to be a surplus at the end of the year.

Mr. Pemrick called the vote. Ms. Gaston asked for clarification on what the motion is. Mr. Hellwig said it was to approve the position in the Treasurer's office. Ms. Gaston said with funds budgeted. Mr. Richardson said yes.

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Jarosh thanked the Board. Ms. Gaston said she didn't want anyone to apologize to the Board for asking for what they think their department needs.

Mr. Hellwig said the Real Property request is to create one Real Property Tax Service Assistant at a cost of \$67,993.

On a motion by Ms. Winney, seconded by Mr. Zlotnick the request to create on Real Property Tax Service Assistant Failed by the following vote:

AYES (82161): Alan Grattidge (4133), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287)

NOES (135398): Eric Connolly (9776), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Tara Gaston (13293), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Hellwig said there is a request under County Attorney to reclassify one Paralegal Specialist to one Contract and Grant Administrator. The cost is \$5,902 for that reclassification. Mr. Pemrick asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Allen made the motion to approve the request. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrett asked what the reason behind this move was. Mr. Dorsey said he did not request the position. It came through HR so he would have to defer to Marcy on that. Mr. Barrett said you did not request it. Mr. Dorsey said he did not. Mrs. McNamara said this position would make sure, in our comp schedule we have positions that are based solely on grant funding, and when the State decides not to give grants for a percentage of the salary, there is no checking out in regards to that. She said the Director of Finance was at the meeting as well. We feel that this position would actually re-coup the funds if/when the State doesn't fund the position; that there is some check and balance; that someone actually knows when the grants have not been received by the department head for the funding. What happens is they end up not being funded and then the County goes ahead and keeps funding. This is costing the County a significant amount of money. Mr. Barrett said we don't have those checks and balances now he takes it. Ms. McNamara said no, not that she is aware of. Mr. Hellwig said what they have come across is in certain instances where positions are funded or supported as a result of a commitment to have them covered with outside funding. There have been instances where the revenues aren't being received. That should be something and in most cases he thinks the department heads keep an eye on but this is someone that would enhance that effort to make sure that when the Board approve these positions and they are told they are going to be funded with outside revenues sources that in fact the County is getting that money. Mr. Lawler asked if this person exists now and we are going to ask them to do more. Mrs. McNamara said yes. Mr. Lawler asked if this was a unionized position. Mrs. McNamara said it is not a unionized position. Ms. Gaston asked for clarification on the question Mr. Lawler asked. The person already exists who is already doing this. Mrs. McNamara said this person is responsible for the contracts administration for the County. So she is the one that keeps track of all the contracts for the County ensuring they are all current. Additionally she would be keeping track of the grants, asking the department heads to submit a quarterly report to the Director of Finance, and to ensure that these grant monies are still being received. And if they are not the position can be adjusted for the next year's budget cycle. Mr. Lawler said he doesn't have any problem with the concept of there being some checks and balances and some coordination between grant money promised and grant money received. It would seem to him, why isn't that part of somebody's job every day. Mr. Hellwig said it is and we shouldn't have to do this. The reality is in some instances whether it's carelessness or some other reason we have come across instances where the revenue we should be receiving it either hasn't been vouchered for or there is some other barrier. This is an attempt to tighten up that process. We could certainly go back out and remind the department that this is an expectation that they stay on top of. Mr. Hellwig said he knows in this instance there was some thought given to someone who does this kind of work in the County Attorney's office, that would be capable of taking this on, and being able to be adept in some cases in staying on top of this. Ms. Gaston said asked if we have any idea how much money we've expected to receive and have not received as a result of whatever process did not quite work out. Mrs. McNamara said the State cuts back little by little so it may be 100% and then it could go to 80%. The State generally cuts back on these contracts. Ms. Gaston said to be clear she isn't asking what the State cuts back because we all know we can't predict that. She said it seemed the Administrator was indicating that the process had not been followed ideally. She asked if there was an amount that we can track down to what our staff has done or not done that has prompted this expense to be presented here. Mr. Hellwig said it's ongoing. It is not something that has been entirely ignored. He thinks the point here is there seems to be discrepancies between what the expectations are and what we are receiving. This individual would track that down and try to close that gap.

Mr. Barrett asked Mr. Dorsey is he would be losing a paralegal or how is this going to be re-structured. Mr. Dorsey said this would just be a title change right now. Her title is Legal Assistant contracts. She does many of the contracts and tracks the insurance to make sure the policies come in that are needed. She also helps in other areas as well. She helps draft court orders for the attorneys in the office. She is very active. Right now she is taking off one day a week for the FRCA time. She is working a four-day week right now. Mr. Barrett said she is working a four-day week. Mr. Dorsey said right now she is. She is fully capable of doing the work and she is very talented. He has no concerns about her doing the additional duties. She is totally capable of doing them and is very conscientious.

Mr. Pemrick asked for the vote. On a motion by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Smith the motion to reclassify one position in the County Attorney's office Failed by the following vote:

AYES (103240): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (114319): Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said Information Technology has been completed. He asked Mr. Hellwig what was next. Mr. Hellwig said under the District Attorney there is the creation of a Senior Typist, creation of a paralegal specialist and the creation of an Assistant District Attorney. The cost is \$291,323. Mr. Pemrick asked for any questions or comments.

Ms. Heggen said she was on the call if anyone had any questions. The motion was made by Mr. Veitch and was seconded by Mr. Richardson. Mr. Pemrick asked for discussion.

Mr. Barrett asked how are the changes in the court system, which are brand new over the last 24 to 48 hours how does that effect the caseload for next year as compared to 2020. Ms. Heggen said the real impact over the past year and the increase she foresees continuing to happen has come as a result of the criminal justice reform and the volume of information that her office is collecting in as well as disseminating out. She said they have gone well above the resources of the support staff and the attorneys that are in the office to keep up with things. These positions are bare minimum to at least catch up to some extent. The court systems are a challenging situation each and every day. We have two courts today alone that have closed, so the office staff needs to shift and pivot to be able to handle things in different ways. The positions requested were ones she asked for last year. She was told to wait and see what her need really was. She asked for the positions in light of the tough budgeting year that everybody has. This is the minimum that will keep her office with their heads above the water. Mr. Barrett said with that year experience what is the result. Ms. Heggen said just one case coming in is taking hours and hours more. They have to collect all the information from the police and disseminate within 20 days to 35 days. They have to disseminate the information to defense attorneys. The process for every single case is now their responsibility. Before it was less than 25% of the cases her office dealt with they were doing this. They now have to do it for 100% of the cases. Those cases include felony and misdemeanor cases; and, that is an explosion of the amount of information that is flowing back and forth. The volume of video from body cameras, cell phones and from businesses has increased and the amount of time we have to review the information before it is sent out has made it a very tight period of the 25 to 30 days. Staff is spending hours and hours reviewing the information before it is sent out.

Mr. Lawler asked what the rationale for the additional Assistant District Attorney was. Ms. Heggen said part of the challenge has been the increased load in the local justice courts. She has had several courts throughout the County who have asked to increase the number of days her office staffs court appearances for them. She said that puts her in a tough position. She staffs right now 124 court appearances a month with 21 ADA's with just about all courts asking for additional times. She said if she adds just one day for each judge that will be 41 more court appearances. She can't have that with just having one person but if she had the ability to alleviate some of the

back log and increased time factors that are happening because of all this additional information flowing, that is where she is looking to address this new Assistant District Attorney. Mr. Lawler said he wanted to make sure he heard Ms. Heggen correctly and asked how many court appearances for how many ADA's. Ms. Heggen said she has 124 court appearances a month for 21 full time ADA's and 3 part time ADA's. Mr. Lawler said if his math is correct that is 5 or 6 court appearances a month. Ms. Heggen said yes, at least for each ADA. She said she is staffing multiple appearances in County Court. That number is only factoring in one person a day appearing in County Court. Mr. Lawler thanked Ms. Heggen.

Mr. Schopf said he didn't want to catch Ms. Heggen off guard but he had just learned before he came to the meeting that the court system has suspended bench trials. He asked if that affected criminal bench trials as well as civil. Ms. Heggen said that this could cause some real backlog both at the County Court level and the local court justice level in trying to move cases forward. We will be significantly impacted because her office is not going to be able to bring to conclusion cases. The ADA position is going to be able to afford her the opportunity to have the flexibility to address the needs of the local courts as that backlog continues to grow. Mr. Schopf asked if it was the same in criminal and in civil that bench trials can be virtually. Ms. Heggen said if the defendant consents to waive a jury trial and proceed by bench trial that can be done, yes. Mr. Schopf said he didn't know if Ms. Heggen had done any yet. He said it had been his experience that there is a significant amount of preparation. He asked if that was the same for criminal. Ms. Heggen said yes, very much so. The timing and the other factors involved in virtual appearances, which her office is doing every single day in County court and Saratoga Springs City Court. These move at a slower pace than they do then if they are in person. Mr. Schopf asked Ms. Heggen if she had to make a choice between the Senior Typist and the Paralegal, which would be your top position, and why. Ms. Heggen said she would say the Senior Typist over the Paralegal because she has not had a staff increase. She has each Senior Typist aside from doing duties that are not related to attorneys are supporting five to six attorneys apiece. That is not a sustainable situation. She was asking for both positions because it would finally give her office the ability to keep functioning at a decent balance in workload. She said some agencies are talking about adding body cameras and the amount of work to view this will add a tremendous amount of work to her office. She said if she had to pick one she would pick the Senior Typist and added the Paralegal is just as critical to the functioning of the office. Mr. Schopf thanked Ms. Heggen.

On a motion by Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Veitch the motion to approve the District Attorney's positions were approved by the following vote:

AYES (149953): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423)

NOES (67606): Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), John Lant (16173)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Schopf said before the Board moves in to the discussion on the Public Defender, he would like to make a motion that the funding for the on call pay portion of the District Attorney's budget that was not recommended under the Law & Finance Amendments to the budget in the amount of \$53,600. Ms. Gaston seconded the motion.

Mr. Lawler said this may sound like an appropriate thing to do, he thinks it is an inappropriate expense especially as some of his colleagues has pointed out, the possibility of appearing tone deaf. He said the worst note we could play in the symphony today would be to pay people to be available in case they are called and then be paid once called. He thinks that standard can be applied to a great many departments and services in the County. We have Social Services people that are called out on an emergency basis. He knows there are Highway workers that are called out on an emergency basis. We don't pay our Highway crew to be on call just in case we need them, if snow comes. He's not really comfortable with this. He doesn't know what makes this an appropriate expense. He said this comes with the job. If you are an Assistant District Attorney then you understand that there may be times you may be called to respond. A schedule could be set up to show who is on call. Multiple professions manage their availability based on a simple rotating schedule. He said his own judges do this in town. For those



towns that have more than one judge, the judges work on a schedule. He said to pay people just because they may be called, then pay them if we call them, to pay them if they are never called at all this may not be the year to do this. He said he understands the inequity between the DA's office and the Public Defender's office. He doesn't think the Board should compound one bad decision with another. He thinks this would be difficult to explain to constituency why we are paying ADA's just in case we need to call them. Mr. Lawler said there are multiple services here in the County, including Highway and the Sheriff's Department, whose employees work on an on call basis. He fears we are taking a step down a very expensive road if we start paying people just because we want to have them available to answer the telephone.

Ms. Gaston asked if we currently pay our Public Defenders to be on call to respond as needed. Ms. Heggen said they are part of the counsel at first arraignment on call program that has been set up. There are three people on call on off hours, evenings and weekends. They have divided the County in to three zones so they do currently have an on call system that is funded by the State. She said she wanted to clarify that this pay would be for her ADA's to be on call and would not be getting any additional monies if they were called upon to do anything. She added if the Public Defenders are called out they are then paid by the 18B Counsel funds. There is a distinction between what she had asked for versus the current system that is set up with the Public Defender's office. She said they get paid for being on call and if they are called out, they then get additional pay. She is just asking for the on call pay. Ms. Gaston thanked Ms. Heggen for that answer. She asked the County Administrator if the budget contained the money for the Public Defenders on call, even if the money originates from the State. Mr. Hellwig said the Public Defender on call is part of the budget. Ms. Gaston said she recognizes the money does not originate from the County it is still something that is budgeted and something that is done. She said paying the attorneys to be available, to provide speedy prosecution representation as necessary is a just request from the DA office.

Mr. Lawler asked if the Public Defenders that are on call are County employees. Mr. Hellwig said there is both. Mr. Cooke said yes. There is a counsel at first arraignment panel essentially of which some are County employees and some are private attorneys that wish to be on the on call list. He said that list is developed on a monthly basis and rotates. He added it's not every employee in the Public Defender's office. It's just those that chose to be on call.

Mr. Peck said he believes the reason it did not get recommended was the belief that centralized arraignment was coming in the near future. With that being the case the on call for the Public Defenders would stop. He said if the Board wants to do this he would recommend that when the payment or reimbursement for on call staff through the Public Defender's office stops, it would also stop for the DA's office. We have outstanding people that are doing a great job and that's why they are trying to get Ms. Heggen the resources they need for the changes. He said it was reviewed by the subcommittee and it was not recommended. He does understand there is an inequity currently. The State pays the Public Defenders. He said if the Board wants to go ahead and do this they should tailor it alongside the on call pay the State pays the Public Defender's office.

Mr. Schopf said that sounds acceptable. His initiative in making the motion was to ensure the fairness in equity among the same class of employees. He thinks it is currently inequitable how it is structured. Just because one side should not be just getting paid because there are grants available when the other side performing equivalent work. He said he would view it the same if the roles were reversed.

Mr. Lawler said perhaps the way to solve the inequity problem is to stop paying the Public Defenders to be on call. He thinks that no County employee should be paid to simply be on call. He thinks the Corners are the only exception to that but they are an elected official. We have rationalized it with the pay being the State's money so no harm to the County budget. No harm to the County taxpayers. We might use the State's funding for the Public Defenders to be on call as rationale to now pay the ADAs on call that does affect taxpayers. We started this meeting today talking about how important it was to not be tone deaf. He can't think of a more tone deaf action this Board could take then to pay people simply to be on call. Even if it is a matter of equity because the State is giving the County money to pay the Public Defenders, he doesn't know why we would stop at the DA's office. He said he doesn't know why Public Works isn't in there. You could go down a list of people who could get a phone call from this government/their department head to be asked to go in to work. He asked where the line is

drawn and suggested it be that no one is paid to simply be on call. Mr. Lawler said to Mr. Schopf's point, if we don't want to have inequity then the next budget resolution should be to take it away from the Public Defender's office.

Mr. Barrett said from what Supervisor Lawler just mentioned, doing quick math, we are \$600,000 into the fund balance to create new positions. He said we have passed tone deaf.

Ms. Gaston said it would be equally problematic to 1. Remove pay that is currently expected and not expected to be changed by the department head also, even if the money was originally planned from the State this does impact Saratoga County taxpayers in whether we seek to use money that comes from the State or how we utilize it. The impact is already there for our taxpayers and she thinks they will appreciate being able to have some equity and also support our County employees. However that works. For the same class, again an attorney on call is recording different duties than a snowplow driver on call. Not saying one is better than the other but they are different classes. This speaks specifically to Supervisor Schopf's concern that individuals in the same class in cross departments get the same equity.

Mr. Lawler said he wants to make sure he understands this correctly, we are setting up equality based on who's in what class. Ms. Gaston said that is precisely not what she said. Mr. Schopf said many employees are governed by bargaining agreements that don't exist for attorneys.

On a motion by Mr. Schopf, seconded by Ms. Gaston to add Call in Pay to the District Attorney's budget Failed by the following vote:

AYES (59667): Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293)

NOES (157893): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said Public Defender is next. Mr. Hellwig said the request is to create one Assistant Public Defender with the cost to the County being zero.

Mr. Pemrick asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Kinowski made the motion. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrett asked why it was zero. Mr. Hellwig said the Board passed a resolution a couple of months ago to accept the State funding for the next budget cycle that included funding for this position.

Ms. Gaston asked if the position is mandated. Does the County have to have it and if we decline the funding can we not have it. Mr. Hellwig said he had no idea.

Mr. Cooke said as part of the \$7M grant package that the County is receiving from ILS, part of that is to reduce caseload. It is more or less a mandate that they are asking the County to add an additional position that the State will fund in an effort to reduce the number of cases per public defender. We don't have to do it but it is strongly suggested to reduce the caseload.

Mr. Grattidge asked if this position goes away if the funding goes away. Can that be added to the minutes. Mr. Hellwig said the five year plan for the State is for them to take this over entirely. For the County to be out of Indigent Legal Services. Now, who knows where we will be when that day comes but at this point we don't expect to have a Public Defender's Department within County government at the end of the cycle. Mr. Grattidge said just to be clear, this position would go away if the funding stops. Mr. Hellwig said yes, it is not coming out of the County's pocket.

On a motion by Mr. Kinowski, seconded by Mr. Richardson the request to add one Assistant Public Defender was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said the Animal Shelter is next. Mr. Hellwig said the Animal Shelter's request is for the creation of one Senior Animal Shelter Aide, one Animal Shelter Aide and one Cleaner part time. He said the Senior Animal Shelter Aide has been recommended and the Animal Shelter Aide was recommended. The Cleaner part time position has been modified and that position has been placed in the Public Works Department. The cost for the Animal Shelter for the two approved positions is \$131,881.

Mr. Pemrick asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Kinowski made a motion to approve the positions. Mr. Zlotnick seconded.

Mr. Schopf asked if the Senior Animal Shelter Aide position being created for an existing Animal Shelter Aide to go to or is this for two new bodies. Ms. Heritage said this is the creation of two new positions. Last year an evaluation was done by Cornell Team and they pointed out several gaps in structure. There are certain key roles our current Senior Shelter Aides are taking on. For the Senior Animal Shelter Aide the key role would be an animal care manager position. That would be a critical position. The Animal Shelter Aide was additional. As we have transitioned a few other shelter aides into these positions in the areas of foster, volunteer management, behavior, animal welfare, adoption and marketing, animal care management all these are critical to managing the shelter. We have moved up Shelter Aides in to the Senior Aides to handle these. Right now there are three full time Shelter Aides and three full time Senior Shelter Aides. Another Senior Shelter Aide would allow her to fulfill the animal care manager spot and also another full time shelter aid position to free up staff to handle the specialty roles which are critical to the operation of the shelter. Ms. Heritage said 40% of her staff are part time employees so a lot of those part timers have other part time jobs so may not be available to help fill the gaps. She said her staff is stretched because of multiple duties and these two positions are key. The shelter operates every day through weekends and holidays. Days can't be skipped when it comes to the care of the animals. She said she is experiencing staff shortages due to medical leaves. She said the creation of these positions would help cover the shelter not only for medical leaves but for vacations, turn overs, personal days, and sick days. These positions would help with the planning for future growth as Cornell is recommending.

Mr. Schopf asked if Ms. Heritage was anticipating an increase in services or a decrease in services next year. Ms. Heritage said it is hard to say with Covid. Operations are much different now as everyone else is too. Adoptions are by appointment. There is an increase in protocol. She said there were over 2,000 animals received at the shelter last year and to date there is over 1,700 received. The shelter continues to serve residents and provide a critical service. She doesn't know the answer. With Covid, there has been a lot of changes and the shelter has helped many families re-home their pets and keep them out of the shelter.

Mr. Schopf said he was going to put her on the wheel, budget reality. He asked if Ms. Heritage had to pick one position which would she chose. Ms. Heritage said she would pick the Senior Aide because that has been a big gap.

Ms. Gaston asked if both of the positions she was requesting are direct animal care, is that correct. Ms. Heritage said yes. The Senior Shelter Aide would have some direct animal care but they would also be ensuring the care the others are providing as well. The full time Shelter Aide would be strictly animal care.

Mr. Schopf said at this time he would move to amend the resolution on the floor to approve the creation of one Senior Animal Shelter Aide at a cost of at least \$68,570 as well as the part time Cleaner at no cost as that position is being moved under Public Works. Mr. Barrett seconded the motion. Mr. Hellwig said for clarification there is no Cleaner budgeted in the Animal Shelter. The Cleaner is in Public Works. Mr. Schopf said we are creating it under Public Works and Mr. Hellwig said yes.

Mr. Schopf said the motion would be to modify the resolution on the table to create a Senior Animal Shelter Aide and to eliminate the proposed Animal Shelter Aide position. Mr. Barrett seconded. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

On a motion by Mr. Kinowski, seconded by Mr. Zlotnick the amended motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick recognized Ms. Stanko, Real Property Tax Director. Ms. Stanko asked to address the Board. Mr. Pemrick asked what she was speaking to. Ms. Stanko said to her position that was already voted on and she apologized as she should have spoken up then. Mr. Pemrick allowed her to speak. Ms. Stanko said her department is currently down two positions. Last year her department had 10 employees. She said there was a recent retirement. When she moved up to Director that position was left vacant. The staff is now eight employees. Five of the eight eligible for retirement within 5 years. Two of those are eligible for retirement right now. She said her thoughts were to start restructuring and cross training. The two that are eligible for retirement within 2 years are the two women who calculate the tax rates, tax levies, go over town budgets, print the assessment rolls, print 100,000 tax bills so she would like to bring someone in at an entry level position and move someone up to start learning some of these tasks. She respectfully asks that the Board reconsider the position.

Mr. Pemrick asked if anyone would like to make a motion. Mr. Smith asked what the original recommendation was. Mr. Hellwig said the request was to create on Real Property Tax Service Assistant with the cost of \$67,993. Mr. Zlotnick made a motion to reconsider the Real Property amendment. Ms. Winney seconded the motion.

Mr. Grattidge asked for clarification are the two empty positions still being carried in the budget. Ms. Stanko said she believed the one Real Property Tax Map position is and her plan would be to eliminate that and move someone into that as a supportive position. The Real Property Administrative Assistant is someone who goes on the roads and reviews the auction and that person retired in the fall. We need to have someone in that position to review the auction properties. She plans to move someone within the department up to that position. The new position would be an entry-level position. She said she worked with HR last year to reclassify some of the positions, as some of the titles were very outdated. Mr. Grattidge asked about the funding. If it's not filled and not planned on being filled can it be reclassified to the entry level position so there would be no budget impact in fact there would be a surplus. Ms. Stanko replied that in the next few years that may be able to happen but the knowledge that will go out the door with the Senior Tax Map Tech has been there 31 years and when she goes there is one

person that can work in tax mapping. She really needs to keep those positions. The same goes with the side of the department that work with the tax rates and budgeting. She said it may seem like they are a little heavy now filling the department to 10 or 11 employees but in a few years we may be able to cut back to 9 or 10. When she started in 1988 the department had 18 employees. We are slim right now and technology has helped. Mr. Grattidge said he is confused as he heard there has been a position empty for over a year that hasn't been filled. Ms. Stanko said that was her position that she vacated when she moved to the Director. Someone actually moved to that position and left a Tax Map Tech open. She said her thought may be to reclassify that and give it a new title but in the meantime she needs to bring someone in to start at the ground level and move up.

Mr. Lawler said he wasn't clear and asked Ms. Stanko how many vacant and budgeted positions are there right now. Ms. Stanko said she has two vacant positions right now and they are technical and it's not easy to just pull someone in and put them in that position. Mr. Lawler said assuming the position is a necessary position eventually someone will have to take the position. He said he understands she is asking for a new position but wonders why she hasn't filled the positions she has. Ms. Stanko said one had just become vacant. She said the Tax Map Technician hasn't been filled because someone into that position before Ms. Stanko had been named Director and that person was never trained. She is currently working on training her. There are two technicians in the mapping department when we were approved for four. Mr. Lawler said it is difficult to get his arms around we need more people when there are two vacancies. The idea that someone moves up and takes another position, then their position becomes vacant. He is trying to get an understanding that there are vacancies why are we not filling them when it seems like you have a problem because they are not filled. Mr. Lawler asked how long the vacancies have existed. Ms. Stanko said one not even a month and the other a year. That one that has been vacant for a year she would like to reclassify. Mr. Lawler asked if that was part of her request. Ms. Stanko said no it was not.

On a motion by Mr. Zlotnick, seconded by Ms. Winney to reconsider the position requested by Real Property Failed by the following vote:

AYES (101579): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lant (16173)  
NOES (115980): Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Tara Gaston (13293), John Lawler (8423),  
ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said Emergency Services was next. Mr. Hellwig said there is a request to create one EMS Coordinator part time at a cost of \$34,075.

Mr. Kinowski made a motion to approve this request. Mr. Allen seconded the vote.

Mr. Lawler asked for the rationale for this request. Mr. Pemrick asked Mr. Zeilman if he would like to provide that. Mr. Zeilman said Mr. McEvoy has been in that position for 20 plus years now in a volunteer capacity. The County has grown over the last few years and we have seen a greater need to rely on Mr. McEvoy. The need grew in February and March when he joined the team almost full time in combatting the spread of Covid-19. He has been an integral part in making sure our emergency services community is ready to respond to Covid-19. Prior to this issue he has been very active in the biological emergency response team which is the first team set up in the State of New York. Moving forward he sees Mr. McEvoy's need in the office is to not only help mitigate against any other communicable issue that might present, but also he has been instrumental in setting up the distribution program with Public Health. The distribution of a vaccine, he sees, may be coming in a couple months. Mr. Lawler said Mr. McEvoy does a fantastic job and the County is well served by his volunteer efforts thus far. He agreed with Mr. Zeilman that this has become a position that cannot reasonably be expected to have someone do on a volunteer basis. It is just too important.

On a motion by Mr. Kinowski, seconded by Mr. Allen the request to create one EMS Coordinator part time was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Ms. Gaston said she has no problem with this position and asked if Mr. McEvoy had been volunteering his time. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Zeilman said Mr. McEvoy has been working under the offices of the Covid-19 Disaster declaration so up to this point through Federal reimbursement. She asked if the position that was just approved would not be eligible for that funding. Mr. Zeilman said this position would be available for a 50/50 grant reimbursement. His office has been very successful in securing grants and could see other grant funding being steered to offset this position but other positions as well. Ms. Gaston wanted to clarify that we weren't relying this much on Mr. McEvoy and he not be compensated for that.

Mr. Pemrick said Public Health is next. Mr. Hellwig said the request is to create two LPN's at a base cost of \$43,745. Both positions will be grant funded for two years. Mr. Kinowski made the motion to create these. Ms. Gaston seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrett asked where the grant would be coming from. Mr. Hellwig said he didn't know. Mr. Barrett asked if it was Federal. Mr. Hellwig asked if Ms. Medick was on the line. Mr. Cooke said she had a medical issue she needed to tend to. Mr. Schopf asked if we were created two positions in perpetuity or are we just creating the two position for the term of the grant. Mr. Hellwig answered perpetuity unless the Board decides the positions go away when the funding goes away.

Ms. Gaston asked if the \$1,500 that was shown is in support of the two positions. Mr. Hellwig said yes.

On a motion by Mr. Kinowski, seconded by Ms. Gaston the request to create two LPN positions under Public Health was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said Public Works was next. Mr. Hellwig said under Public Works there is a request to create 2 Cleaner positions one of which was moved from the Animal Shelter request and will be assigned to the Shelter on a part time basis. One Laborer position and one PC Software Database position will be abolished.

Mr. Pemrick asked for a motion to move this request. Mr. Kinowski made the motion. Mr. Zlotnick seconded.

Mr. Kinowski asked for clarification on the request. He wasn't understanding the abolishing ones. Mr. Hellwig said there is a Labor position and a PC Software Database position in Fund D that will be abolished. Public Works have positions in Fund 1 and in the Highway Fund so the cleaners will be a general fund expense and the abolishment of the other positions will come out of the D Fund. The General Fund cost will be \$131,278 however the abolishment of the two positions in the Highway Fund will result in just under \$100,000 in savings which reduces the transfer from the General Fund by that amount. The net is about \$32,000 with those changes.

Mr. Barrett said there is was position under the Animal Shelter that was part time. Now there is a position here that says 2 full time. Mr. Hellwig said the one assigned to the Animal Shelter will be part time. Mr. Barrett said ok.

On a motion by Mr. Kinowski, seconded by Mr. Zlotnick the request for the Public Works Department was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick said the Highway Fund is next. Mr. Hellwig said the next two items are a function through Public Works approval. We are reducing due to the elimination of those positions, the Laborer as well as the Software Database Technician. There's the \$99,000.

Mr. Grattidge made a motion for approval. Mr. Kinowski seconded. The Highway Fund changes were approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick asked for additional requests from the Board members.

Mr. Grattidge said it had come to his attention that in this budget there are 158 non-union employees that currently did not get budgeted for a 2% COLA. In the past, this group has followed along receiving the same increments that our CSEA union workers would be getting. In the abundance of caution the Administrator did not include these. As we have talked about equity today and keeping our workforce strong and retaining the workforce we have he moved that these 158 employees receive the similar COLA that every other of our bargaining units are receiving this year. All three of the County's other unions are getting a 2% COLA and the cost impact would be \$264,000. It would be similar to Resolution 280 that we passed in 2019 for this group. Again he puts this on the table to take this out of Fund Balance. The reason the County has Fund Balance is to use it at times we need it and he believes this would be an appropriate use to keep our workforce running strong and be equitable with the other labor units. Mr. Tollisen seconded the motion.

On a motion by Mr. Grattidge, seconded by Mr. Tollisen a 2% COLA was approved for these 158 employees by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick asked if there were any additional requests. Mr. Smith said he was approached by the Saratoga County Fair through the Agricultural Society. The Agricultural Society has recently torn down the grandstand building due to the age, deterioration which made it unsuitable to utilize any more. The Fair has come up with a budget to replace the grandstand facility and he would like to ask to add to the 2021 budget a matching grant in the amount of \$250,000 to assist the Fair in replacing the grandstand. He said he had conversations over the last few days with Assemblywoman Walsh and Congresswoman Stefanik who have agreed to try to solicit some funding on their levels. He said it is a worthwhile cause as the grandstand was over 100 years old. The Fair is a staple in our community from an agriculture standpoint and from a family friendly atmosphere. The grandstand hosts all the big events at the Fair and hopes he has his colleagues support.

Mr. Pemrick asked for a second. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrett asked if there was a plan or anything that the Board could see, anything they put together. Mr. Smith said they have some raw sketches with enough information that they have gone out and got proposals to develop a budget. These sketches will replace the bleachers, which anyone who has been to the Fair can attest to the accessibility of the old bleachers. The new plan would be fully ADA compliant, allow access for wheelchairs, and handicap accessibility. Mr. Smith added there is not a final set of blue prints or plans. He said there are sketches enough to come up with a budget. Mr. Barrett asked if it was something the Fair could produce and bring to the Public Hearing and present. Mr. Smith said he could ask. Mr. Barrett said he would feel more comfortable if there was a plan he could look at. The Fair has been an important part of our County for many, many years. He wants to make sure they have what they need to be a viable part of the County.

Mr. Lawler asked Mr. Smith if the total budget was \$1.3M. Mr. Smith said yes. Mr. Lawler said that the Fair has asked for \$250,000 from the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Smith said they are going out and soliciting private contributions throughout the community for this and that was why he felt a matching contribution from the County would be appropriate. That way they have skin in the game and they aren't just getting \$250,000 from the Board. Mr. Lawler asked if it would be reasonable to say that the Board's \$250,000 is contingent on them raising the difference. Mr. Smith said yes. Mr. Lawler said if the County is the final \$250,000 to make the grandstand area safe; that's his primary concern. Mr. Smith said there is no grandstand area any more. Mr. Lawler said he meant construct a new grandstand that would be safe. Mr. Smith said yes. Mr. Lawler said if the County's \$250,000 was the last piece of the puzzle that sounded like a very reasonable request.

Mr. Pemrick said December 2<sup>nd</sup> is the date for the public hearing and asked Mr. Smith if renderings would be available. Mr. Smith said he would have to ask. He knows they have sketches but they are not full renderings by any means. Mr. Pemrick asked if this should be tabled. Mr. Dorsey said there is a motion and a second so it needs to be tabled, voted on or withdrawn. Mr. Barrett said the public hearing is still part of the budget process and it wouldn't hurt to hear what they have to say before moving forward. Mr. Kinowski said then maybe it should be tabled until the public hearing. Mr. Barrett said it is obviously a worthwhile move but thinks it would be good to hear from them. Mr. Pemrick reminded the Board that there won't be any motions at the public hearing. This would then wait until the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting if we wanted to do anything.

Mr. Richardson said based on the fact this will be a match he doesn't see why it couldn't be voted on now. He is assuming the plans will have to be put together to even get the match from the County and he thinks as they start to reach out to other organizations they will start to get money as well as in kind services. He wouldn't mind voting now as it is a match and not upfront money. Mr. Pemrick asked Mr. Barrett if he was ok with that. Mr. Barrett said we are on the front end of the fundraising, right. Mr. Smith said yes. Mr. Lawler said maybe there could be a compromise, take a vote on approving the funding, contingent upon being the final \$250,000 needed and the submission on the plans to support a \$1.3M expense. If those conditions aren't met then there is no funding. He said this funding should be conditional on the County's funding be the last piece of the puzzle and contingent on submission on engineered stamped plans.

Mr. Richardson said he agrees with Mr. Lawler wholeheartedly but he thinks the important part is when other organizations and other companies see there is a commitment from the County, it will give the people from the



Fair leverage to reach out to other people. He agrees with Mr. Lawler that it should be the last piece and show the County supports this.

Ms. Gaston said she recognizes the importance of the Fair to the County and its history she is looking at a piece of paper that is asking for us to submit \$250,000 for a grandstand that will seat 1,500 people. She said she doesn't think the Board should be considering this request at this point. We are in the middle of a global health crisis. We are cutting positions our departments have requested. In the course of the past year we have refused outside agencies funding that are working directly with our public with regards to health and services, she personally as much as she respects and enjoy it, at this time she cannot support promising or allocating \$250,000 for a grandstand which is not necessary to hold the Fair. It is nice and beneficial but given the conversations we have had previously in this room today, it is difficult to understand why the Board would pass this at this time. Mr. Pemrick said to Ms. Gaston her comments were on the record.

Mr. Dorsey clarified what the Board would be voting on. The motion to table was removed. Mr. Lawler had made a motion to make the funding request the final piece to be received/last piece of the puzzle. Mr. Grattidge said he would second the motion that the funding would be the last money in. Ms. Gaston asked for clarification if we are voting on the amendment and not the original motion. Mr. Dorsey said correct. The amendment to the motion passed by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

On a motion by Mr. Smith seconded by Mr. Richardson the funding request for the Fair was approved by the following vote:

AYES (190973): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (26586): Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293)

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Ms. Gaston said at the Law and Finance Committee Director McNamara regarding the Public Affairs position, she needed more information on this position, she sees the usefulness of a public relations officials and she thought there would be discussion on where it would exist. She doesn't know how this occurs or what classification, and we would need the Director's assistance, but she would support/move a position under the Board of Supervisors for the purpose of providing public information, press releases available to each member of the Board and improve our accountability and transparency to the public. She said her preference would be to do this instead of having an outside firm so that it is here in the County and better able to respond, as we need to. Ms. Gaston asked Ms. McNamara if she had any information that would be beneficial to her motion. Ms. McNamara said there was a question on what other County had this position. She said Warren County had just created a Director of Public Affairs at \$65,000 and the City of Buffalo created one at \$110,000. She said the qualifications differ from what she submitted. Ms. Gaston asked what Warren County's description was for their position. Ms. McNamara said the position would be responsible for planning, coordinating and deploying public information. She added to educate and gain support of public regarding objectives of the Board of Supervisors and County government. Ms. Gaston asked if that position reported to the Board. Ms. McNamara said the position was directed by the County Administrator. Ms. Gaston said she would move the creation of a position of Public Information Officer. Mr. Pemrick asked for a second. With there being no second to the motion the discussion ended.

Mr. Pemrick asked for any other requests.

Mr. Kusnierz said he would like to request the Board consider if we have learned anything over the past year is to get more transparent in what the Board does, and get information out to the public as quick as possible. One of the ways we can do that is to make our County government more accessible to the public. We are doing that in our towns now through Zoom meetings and some of our towns are doing live broadcast of their meetings and he thinks the times have come at the county level that we position the Board of Supervisors so that what we do here is out in the public domain immediately. To do that that is going to require significant IT upgrades. It is not provided for appropriately in the budget that is before the Board. He had the pleasure of having a nice conversation with our IT Director Eileen and she had some ideas. In a nutshell, and he knows Supervisor Veitch has additional information, essentially, we should be looking at funding those upgrades here at the County. He said he thought the upgrades would come in around \$350,000 or somewhere in that range depending on what the Board does. The other thing we need to be cognizant of is that it is only a matter of time before all governments are going to be mandated by the State to live stream their operations. He thinks this is something the Board needs to take a serious look at. He said he would like to defer to his colleague in Saratoga Springs who has drilled down on that matter and will present some additional information.

Mr. Veitch thanked Mr. Kusnierz. Just as a background in the beginning of the year, this year, the idea came about of improving the AV in the Board Rooms along with some additions to the Boardrooms and the Committee Rooms, if they will ever be used again. At that time, there was a discussion about the projectors. They would be expensive to repair and are not functioning that well. There are speakers in the back of the Boardrooms that don't work, monitors needed in the Committee rooms for presentations, and figuring out what some of the boards are and what they do. The IT Department was asked to go out to see what it would cost to revamp the IT for the area of the County. There was a bid that came back at a cost of around \$250,000 to do all of it. It did include a lot of technological upgrades to get us back to today. The technology in the Board Rooms dates back to the 2000's. The other suggestion was to include public access to Wi-Fi in other areas of the County. He think the only one the County has is in the Board Rooms. Mr. Veitch made a motion to put \$350,000 in the budget for next year for IT upgrades. Mr. Kusnierz seconded the motion.

Ms. Gaston said while again she would like a person doing public relations she thinks this is a necessary step to move the County forward. Our staff has worked very hard to make sure the public has access to the things that they needed. There are Supervisors who can't attend in person for various reasons. It does not make any sense for a County as well appointed as we are, cannot be accessible to the public as we need to be and she thinks it is imperative that we support our IT Department, the rest of our County staff and the Board's priority and functions in this way.

Mr. Lawler said there was a bid process. Mr. Veitch said the bid was submitted to one of our preferred vendors who came back. Mr. Veitch said it was not a formal process and was just a quote. Mr. Lawler said it would be part of this motion that we go through the formal bid process and follow the normal purchasing rules. Mr. Veitch said yes. Mr. Lawler said we could argue about the money or some of the items but we can agree that we are woefully behind the curves in the technology here. He said he agrees with Supervisor Veitch in that our constituents and residents will have much greater expectations in us than what we are able to do right now.

Mr. Kinowski said he wants to make sure the Board sets the right amount. Is this a not to exceed amount. Is there a better concept. Mr. Veitch said he would be happy with a not to exceed amount. Mr. Lawler said the County should bring a consultant in. Mr. Veitch said sure. (Many supervisors speaking at once.)

Mr. Kusnierz said in his conversations with Eileen she did recommend bringing in a consultant to present to the Board what the best plan of attack to make the upgrades would be. He said that would be part of that expense.

On a motion by Mr. Veitch, seconded by Mr. Kusnierz the \$350,000 for IT upgrades was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel

Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick asked for any additional requests. Mr. Veitch said he had another request. He said this is from the Trails Committee. One thing Mr. Veitch did this summer as he had plenty of time to go out and hike the trails, was to visit every County trail, various forestland, the Zim Smith Trail and the County Park in the Town of Day. He said we haven't had the ability to maintain them to the level they were at when we first opened them. He found trail maps that were either missing, damaged or dated, garbage overflowing, trails overgrown, and this is no reflection on the Planning Department. They do everything they can do to keep these things up. They just don't have the resources to keep up on these. At the Trails Committee meetings there has been discussion on updating the Departmental Supplies Line in the budget from \$2,000 to \$15,000 to give the Planning Department some funds to spruce up the trails. Mr. Veitch made the motion to place \$15,000 in the Departmental Supplies Line. Ms. Gaston seconded the motion.

Mr. Richardson said Mr. Veitch put together a document that shows a lot of the things on the trails that need to be worked on and he did a great job on that. He thinks it is a reasonable amount of money for the Planning Department to keep up on things. Mr. Veitch said he would share the document with the Board.

Mr. Pemrick asked if the trails are County trails or town trails inside the County. Mr. Veitch said they are County owned parcels on County forestland trails that belong to the County. Mr. Pemrick asked if the towns provide any support for this. Mr. Veitch said no it was all County. He said there is one trail in the Town of Wilton that the Wilton Wildlife Preserve are the stewards of it.

Ms. Gaston said she supports this and has seen the work that Supervisor Veitch has done. She said the trails should look nice but some of this is a public safety risk. The public is using the trail system more during the pandemic and she wants to make sure that all residents and visitors are safe and have appropriate maps and signage and fences. She thinks this is the bare minimum that can be done to make sure everyone is safe.

On a motion by Mr. Veitch, seconded by Ms. Gaston for \$15,000 in the Departmental Supplies Line in the Planning Department budget was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Tollisen said he had a couple of questions he thought Mr. Hellwig could answer. He asked if the \$150,000 Economic Development that we did this year in the budget as well. Mr. Hellwig said it was. Mr. Tollisen asked if Mr. Hellwig could email him where that was because he could not find it. He asked if the Landfill Profit Sharing monies were included in the budget for 2021. Mr. Hellwig said yes.

Mr. Zlotnick said we sat down here at 3:00 p.m. and decided to go through these items line by line. We approved everything but Real Property. Then we approved \$250,000 for the grandstand, \$350,000 for IT upgrade and then another \$260,000 for everyone non-union. Page four of our document says our second largest source of revenue comes from Property Tax collection. We have heard our department head say she is running at 80% capacity and that's the only item that we decided to cut from this \$1M worth of additions. He said this is incredibly short

sighted and he knows he is new at this but would like to take a third bite at the apple. He made a motion that we spend that motion. Mr. Richardson seconded that motion.

Ms. Gaston asked if there would be discussion. Mr. Pemrick said we've done this twice. Ms. Gaston said she wanted to be on the record to be clear that that was not the only item that was removed from this amendment. Mr. Zlotnick said that is correct. We also took \$5,902 out of the County Attorney's budget. Ms. Gaston said the Animal Shelter was also changed. She said there were several things. She said she does not object to Supervisor Zlotnick bringing it up again she is just saying for the clarity for the public and those in attendance that is not the only amendment or adjustment that was made.

Mr. Lawler said could we just walk through them. He said start at the first item and say if it was approved. Mr. Kusnierz asked if the actual dollar amount could also be stated with this review. Mr. Pemrick asked if we really needed to go there. There is a motion on the floor. He would just assume have a roll call vote and would like to be done with this.

Mr. Tollisen said he voted against that resolution. He said part of his confusion with this is there is two positions open that have not been filled. He is not trying to cause strife here. With two open positions, that are not filled, how do we know that we need that additional position. He said he would be supportive of it if it comes up next year. He said we need to fill the two positions first is the way he interprets it.

Ms. Stanko said one position has only been vacant since October 30<sup>th</sup>. The other position has been vacant a year. That position is a technical position and one that she cannot just fill. There are many skills needed for that position. The last time the test was posted for this position there were two people who took the test, both current employees of that department, and only one passed. She does want to classify the fourth Tax Map Technician position into a Tax Research Technician she has not been able to do that yet. She has been extremely busy her first year in the Director position. The position of Real Property Administrative Assistant she will be promoting from within. She would like to bring in an entry level person. She does not plan on filling one of the positions once she has people in.

Mr. Richardson said you have two open positions. Are those positions currently in the budget or are they not. Mr. Hellwig said they are in the budget but we have switched over the position control this year. He said if they are vacant they are not funded and asked if that was correct. Mr. Cooke said it would depend on how long the position was vacant. The position that was just vacated would be funded but the position that was vacant for a year would not be funded. Ms. Stanko invited the Board members to go down to her department to see what they do. Finance Director O'Connor said two Tax Map Technicians are funded and one Senior Technician is funded. Ms. Stanko said one is not even funded. Mr. Lawler asked for clarification on the positions and if they are funded. Mr. Cooke said there is one position of tax map technician that is not funded. He said with position budgeting this year if a position was vacant for a period of time it was not funded. It doesn't mean it can't be funded. Mr. Lawler said the Board wants Ms. Stanko to have what she needs to run her department. The way he looks at this is how many people do they have, how many vacancies and it is confusing to him. There has been a vacancy for over a year and have had a person take a civil service test and pass but the position is still vacant. If there is a position that has been vacant for this long, in a business world that position is questioned whether it is needed or not. He said if she wanted to take that money and use it for other things, that's great, we see that from department heads all the time with positions. What we are lacking here is enough detail with the numbers to truly understand the impact. Mr. Lawler said tell us what you want to change, or what you want to abolish and let us know what the net impact on the budget is. Mrs. McNamara said what Ms. Stanko needs is to create one Real Property Tax Assistant which totals in this year budget with fringe \$67,993. She has a vacant position that she never filled that was her old position that she is having a hard time finding a qualified candidate for but is still needed. The other vacancy just happened three or four weeks ago.

Mr. Tollisen asked if he was hearing that this position that the Director held previously is not even funded in the 2021 budget. Ms. Stanko said her old position is funded but there is one position that is not funded. Mr. Tollisen said is there anything that Ms. Stanko is requesting except this new request. Director O'Connor said there are 3

positions, 2 are funded and 1 is not funded. Ms. Stanko said technically the new position could replace the tax map technician position for less money. If she needs a new tax mapper in a couple years, she could come back.

Ms. Gaston asked about the funding. Ms. Stanko said two are funded and one is not. Ms. Stanko said it is an entry-level position.

Mr. Grattidge said just for clarification, during initial review of the positions by the committee was it at all presented that we had this open spot and that we are changing it to a lower spot. It would have been easier for the Board. He said what we are doing is taking a position that last year was x number of dollars and we are actually filling it now for less money than we had, correct. Ms. McNamara said no we are actually creating a new position and we are not reclassifying. Mr. Grattidge said we are eliminating one position. Ms. McNamara said the one position that was Anna's old title, she still feels like she is going to fill at some point. Mr. Grattidge said there was a mapper that got dropped out of the budget because it wasn't filled and that wasn't her position. So technically from last year's budget to this year's budget it would be a sideways move, in fact a reduced move because it would be less money than the mapper was paid. Ms. McNamara said correct. (Many people are speaking at once) Ms. Gaston said abolishing one position is not the answer. She asked Ms. Stanko that she needed this new position. She said yes she would expect to have the other position filled.

Mr. Richardson said we obviously have a department in distress that needs help. Mr. Zlotnick made the motion and he seconded and he would like to call for the vote.

On a motion by Mr. Zlotnick, seconded by Mr. Richardson the creation of the position in Real Property was approved by the following vote:

AYES (138068): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)  
NOES (79491): Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Darren O'Connor (14765), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Tara Gaston (13293)  
ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. Pemrick asked for additional requests. Mr. Barrett said a couple years ago there was an issue with the recycling dollars for municipalities with recycling centers. He asked if that was in the budget this year and asked what section it was in. Mr. Hellwig said it is in the budget. Mr. Cooke said it was in the Highway fund.

Mr. Barrett said he is pleased about the increase to the IT abilities. As he mentioned at the beginning of the meeting transparency with Saratoga County residents. The one other area of the budget that he asked about the other day and will ask briefly again is the bed tax projection. He asked where that number was for next year. Mr. Hellwig said the number is \$900,000. Mr. Barrett said it appears for 2020 bed tax is going to be down 67% that's the estimate from the Treasurer. What was it before Covid \$1.1M. Mr. Hellwig said the budget was \$1.1M. Mr. Barrett said that was pre-Covid. He said a 67% drop is a significant amount of money. We heard from the Chamber at the Economic Development meeting this month that first quarter will be very difficult with the loss of conventions, weddings and going into the winter which is always the worst quarter of the year anyway. He said the 2021 projection is rather rosy to say the least. Based on everything we have heard he doesn't know how we would think we would receive \$900,000 or anywhere near that. He asked Mr. Hellwig if he was sticking to that projection. Mr. Hellwig said he put the tentative budget together and this Board makes the final decision. If there is a feeling that it is rosy or that number should be changed, that's up to this Board to decide. Mr. Barrett said he thinks there should be a realistic number and a transparent process. If the Board decides to spend \$900,000 in the budget which would be all of his estimate, he thinks there needs to be a realistic bed tax estimate. Then be honest everything over that amount is Fund Balance. It's not going to be bed tax, it will be fund balance if indeed we do indeed decide to spend over a certain amount.

Mr. Barrett said there is a line that says unallocated. He asked if that was supposed to be allocated for something. He said usually unallocated means it's up for grabs. Mr. Cooke said the unallocated is where the \$150,000 was

placed last year that the Board approved as part of the municipal grants for Economic Development. He said that was maintained. Mr. Barrett said that line item should say those funds are allocated as part of the budget process for a specific use which would be the municipal grant program.

Mr. Grattidge said the program was set up to be handled by Economic Development. Last year they rolled out the grant program for municipalities to take advantage of. That is the way that \$150,000 was set up. Mr. Barrett said correct but in the budget it says unallocated. Mr. Hellwig said we can put any title on it. The reality is, it came up last minute. It was put in an existing account and was an oversight for not renaming the account to one that is descriptive of what the money is used for. Mr. Barrett said if it is scheduled to be allocated for a purpose there is no sense in having it unallocated. If it is not allocated for a specific purpose then it should come out. We are already spending money for tourism well above what we can hope to receive next year. He said those are his concerns. He thinks there should be a more realistic bed tax and those funds unallocated should be allocated or take it out of the budget.

Mr. Peck said everyone needs to keep in mind we are in dire straits with the pandemic. But there are vaccines that are scheduled to roll out. He thinks people will be coming out of the pandemic period ready to spend. He said budgeting \$200,000 less than last year will be ok and can be evaluated throughout the year. The general population will be eager to get out and do things he predicts Saratoga County will be a destination.

Mr. Kusnierz asked for clarification when it comes to Economic Development funding. As he reads through SEDC allocation there is \$150,000. He looks at the Partnership the budget officer has \$450,000 in there. But has him perplexed the \$375,000 for actual amount. Is that the actual amount the County has provided the Partnership. Mr. Hellwig said they have been paid for three quarters, \$125,000 a quarter. Mr. Kusnierz said the Board when the budget was approved last year we kept the budget at half the bed tax which is statutorily provided for. He asked how we got above that. Mr. Hellwig said the contract authorized by the Board is for half a million-advanced payments. If there are discrepancies during the course of the year, it will be reconciled the following year. Mr. Kusnierz said that is very interesting language and he actually had a copy of the contract. What this Board approved and the contract to include was half the bed tax. Plain and simple. He said in the past the contract was a page and a quarter that was executed with the Partnership. The contract that was executed for 2020 was at least 4 pages with scheduled payments, advancements if you will. Four quarterly payments each of \$125,000 which exceeds what Board provided for authority for funding. He asked how that happened. Mr. Hellwig said the contract authorized advance funding. It is not known during the course of a year where we are going to wind up until the year is over with. Mr. Kusnierz said so unlike previous years we advance quarterly payments but the reconciliation will take place per the contract in March, is that accurate. Mr. Hellwig said sometimes after the end of the year. Mr. Kusnierz said the language that is stated in that contract says that amount of money refunded will be the amount unused portion. So it is a back door way to give more than this Board approved. Mr. Hellwig said he doesn't see it that way. Mr. Kusnierz said they are getting more than half the bed tax. A half million dollars, he thinks the Treasurer is sitting here. We have heard that the projected bed tax for 2020 is going to be down about 67% and by his calculations that is about \$300,000 and the County provided \$500,000. He said someone exceeded their authority, he believes. He wants to know how we got to something that was legislatively approved by this body to being more than what we approved. He doesn't understand this. Mr. Hellwig said he doesn't know what else to say. The contract authorized the payments. The payments were made in accordance with the contract. Mr. Kusnierz said he understands the payments were made in accordance with the contract. The contract doesn't mirror what the Board approved.

Mr. Barrett asked if this was reconciled next year. Mr. Hellwig said at the end of the year, we have never had to do that in the past. Mr. Barrett said sure because the bed tax has been steady. Ms. Gaston asked if there have been any discussion on reconciling out given the difference in bed tax and what has been provided to them. Mr. Hellwig said reconciliation is when the year is closed out. Ms. Gaston asked if there have been discussions. Mr. Hellwig said not that he has been involved in. Mr. Kusnierz said there won't be any need for reconciliation because the language in the contract is extremely clear and it is for those unexpended revenues. He said he assures the Board the Partnership is spending every dollar.

Mr. Lawler said since the creation of the Partnership, the cash advances made are and then the true up is made at the end of the year. There is no way to know what the bed tax will total before the year is over. We have a very unusual year here due to the circumstances. He said what he believes the Administrator did was to follow past practice, to advance funds of \$125,000 quarterly, no money has been advanced this quarter as Supervisor Kusnierz has stated it does not appear the sales tax is going to be sufficient to cover the allocations already made. He thinks the Administrator acted responsibly in stopping payments as soon as it became apparent that the bed tax collections would be insufficient. Historically it has been the practice to do the true up at the end of the year. Mr. Lawler asked Mr. Jarosh when that payment would be known. Mr. Jarosh said 24 days after the end of the quarter. Mr. Lawler said towards the end of January. That's when we will know. Mr. Kusnierz said for the record he did not say sales tax would be down he said occupancy tax would be down. Mr. Lawler said he stood corrected. Mr. Kusnierz said the contract in place in 2019 when Mr. Tollisen was Chairman made no reference to a true up. Only the one this year makes reference to that. If the occupancy tax is collected and reconciled quarterly, why wouldn't we provide payments that are real time to the organization versus guaranteed a whole year's worth of funding and then true up. Why would we do that. Mr. Lawler said the short answer is that the first quarter you don't get the bed tax occupancy numbers until April which would mean you would be asking the Partnership to run their business for three months with no funding. That would effectively put the Partnership out of business. Which he guesses would not be a bad thing for some of the members in this room. But that is the rationale if you are going to have viable organization you have to provide funding for it. The basis was quarterly disbursements of \$125,000 quarterly with a true up at the end of the year. It has become apparent that there will be a short fall and repeated that the County Administrator acted responsibly when he stopped the payments.

Mr. O'Connor asked Mr. Hellwig if he didn't make a payment that was called for in the contract. Mr. Hellwig said there has not be a fourth quarter payment. Mr. O'Connor said his question is did the contract require that fourth quarter payment. Mr. Hellwig said he couldn't say what the language in the contract was, he would have to look at it. Mr. O'Connor said his is not sure that the date has passed yet and that Mr. Hellwig has withheld a payment. Mr. Kusnierz said the last payment was due October 15<sup>th</sup> and at the last Partnership board meeting he had asked if the Board had received it. The Executive Director of the Partnership said they had received the payment. He's not sure where the disconnect is or if there is a misunderstanding somewhere. The County Administrator is saying that the Board withheld the last quarterly payment. Mr. Hellwig said correct. Mr. Kusnierz said the Partnership doesn't know that. They believe that payment they received October 15<sup>th</sup> he thinks they believe that is their final payment meaning fourth payment for the year. Under the current circumstances he thinks they are watching their money very carefully and he doesn't think they would make that mistake. He will clarify that with the Board.

Mr. Jarosh said he doesn't have a horse in this race but wanted to clarify that the disbursement schedule. The disbursement they receive in January is actually last year's fourth quarter payment. So yes, the October payment was their fourth payment they received in this calendar year, but the fourth quarter payment wouldn't be received until the following January. He thinks Spencer is accurate.

Mr. Kusnierz said as a follow up what would be the total amount of money the Partnership has received in 2020. Mr. O'Connor said from what he understands that Drew just said, there has been no withholding of required payments. We made one payment in January 2020 for 2019 and made 3 payments for 2020 and the fourth payment will be in January. Mr. Jarosh said correct but the fourth quarter of 2020 will be a negative payment because of the true up. (Mr. Jarosh was not at the microphone and his voice is muffled.) Mr. Kusnierz said if we take into consideration the 2019 final payment received in 2020, what is the total amount that has been sent to the Partnership for this year. Mr. Jarosh said \$375,000. Mr. Kusnierz asked if it was true that they would not receive the final payment for 2020 if the bed tax does not exceed \$375,000 for this calendar year. Mr. Hellwig said yes.

Ms. Gaston said to be clear, no one has discussed this with the Partnership. Mr. Kinowski said he has called the Partnership and asked for information concerning this evening and the budget. What may or may not be brought up and the \$375,000 and Shelby is fully aware of that. He would assume that the Supervisors that are on that Board and are here in the room want the Partnership to succeed. They are doing a good job. Discussing the what ifs, he suggested speaking with the Board of the Partnership. Ms. Gaston wants to know if this has been made clear to them regarding the payments. Her concern is we are estimating \$900,000 for bed tax and are estimating

their budget to be \$450,000 she thinks this organization is being set up to fail if we are putting these numbers in the budget. She doesn't think that is reasonable. Perhaps there need to be adjustments in the budget figures. This does not make any sense that we are not taking in to account the economic reality we are sitting in. Mr. Kinowski it is everyone's best estimate. He said it is difficult to run an organization based on estimate. He would assume the Supervisors who are Board members of the Partnership would come to this Board and tell us they need more cement added to the budget. Ms. Gaston said when budgeting there are many things to take into consideration. She doesn't think this budget does. Mr. Lawler said we have had some remarkable news regarding vaccines. It will be in the hands of the public by the end of the year. He thinks it is reasonable to believe that 2021 won't be the economic nightmare that 2020 has been. A majority of the weighted vote of this Board last year stripped away all the funding of the Partnership, except what was statutorily allowed which is the bed tax. The Board knowingly did that. The Partnership is 100% dependent on the bed tax. We are in this situation because this Board stripped the Partnership of any other funding from the County other than what was allowed by law. He thinks if people are generally concerned, then we should consider funding the Partnership outside of the bed tax. We could make it contingent on the bed tax. If the bed tax does well then the Partnership wouldn't get the money. He thinks that is a reasonable compromise. Let's not make these mistakes again and fund in a reasonable way. If they say they need \$450,000, then let's put that in the budget and commit to it either through bed tax or through County funding. Ms. Gaston asked if the Partnership's budget of \$450,000 developed independently or was it developed based on the bed tax projections in this budget. (Many Supervisors were speaking at once.) Mr. O'Connor said the Board of the Partnership approved the budget. Mr. Pemrick asked Mr. Lawler if he wanted to move his idea. Mr. Lawler said sure, he would make a motion for that, but while we are on the topic of contracts and concerns about meeting contract requirements. Mr. Lawler said that he has the SEDC contract from last year and has some questions about that. Ms. Gaston questioned if there was a motion or not. Mr. Lawler said no. He has two questions for the Administrator. We have \$150,000 budgeted for SEDC next year, no one has voiced concerns about that, and asked if we have a contract for 2020. Mr. Hellwig said that we don't have a renewal. Mr. Lawler suggested that any funding for SEDC would be contingent upon an executed contract. His second question was regarding section 3.3 of the SEDC contract which states "SEDC will provide a written report to the County Administrator for all monies expended within 15 days after the close of each quarter. The documentation available for review at all times will be invoices and payments receipts in accordance with the marketing services performed" Mr. Lawler asked if we have received these reports on a quarterly basis and been able to see the invoices and receipts that the contract requires. Mr. Hellwig said no. Mr. Lawler said that therefore SEDC has not met a fairly critical item in the contract that we currently have. Mr. Hellwig said correct. Ms. Gaston confirmed that they have then missed 3 due dates this year and asked if it has been reported to the Board that they missed any of them. Ms. Gaston agreed that it's problematic not meeting the guidelines of their contract, but also would not otherwise know that they are in violation of their contract. Mr. Tollisen questioned if we look at the contract to ensure they are following the rules prior to making payment. Mr. Tollisen said it does not make any sense to him, no payment should be made on anything unless they are following what they are supposed to. Mr. Tollisen said that this is messy and there is no reason for it. He does not understand why this is not being checked. Mr. Lawler suggested that before we consider additional dollars for SEDC, we should have two things, 1. a contract, and 2. make sure that all of the reports that had been required have in fact been delivered. Whether they are late or not, at a minimum. Mr. Lawler said that once we receive the reports, that should go a long way to helping us decide what our next steps are, along with some other information such as financial statements, independent auditors report. Mr. Tollisen asked if we have asked for the reports. Mr. Lawler said he is asking for it by bringing it up today. Mr. Barrett said that financial documentation would be given if the relationship was renewed and a new contract created. Ms. Gaston asked if anyone has, before today's meeting, asked about any of the reports that were due but not provided. Mr. Hellwig said no. Mr. Kusnierz said that the Partnership has a meeting scheduled for next Monday, and questioned if the last payment to SSCP will be withheld. Mr. Hellwig said yes. Mr. O'Connor said that his understanding of the Partnership Board is that they are getting that \$125,000. Mr. Hellwig said that a legal opinion is needed on that. There is a Resolution that states 1/2 the occupancy tax and there is a contract that authorizes something other than that. Mr. Hellwig said that his instructions up to this point were that the Resolution essentially trumps the contract. If there is a different opinion on that, then we can take a different approach. Mr. Kusnierz asked if anyone had reached out to the Partnership to advise them that they will not be receiving the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter payment. Mr. Kinowski said that he would be happy to contact Ms. Schneider, but he would hope that one of the members from the Board would reach out to them and advise them of the conundrum, and then seek a resolve through this board.



Mr. Barrett said that going back, if this is the level of funding that would be included in the budget, that a large majority of the money allocated for various economic development purposes, will be from fund balance. He does not believe there is any doubt about that. Mr. Barrett said that he hopes we get back to normal levels next year, but there just seems to be no way that will occur. Mr. Barrett said that he would further like to make a motion that \$100,000 of the \$150,000 that is unallocated be reallocated towards the grandstand. Mr. Barrett said that it is unallocated and there is no official purpose for it. Mr. Schopf seconded the motion. Mr. Zlotnick said that he believes a much better use of that \$150,000 would be to split ½ to the grandstand and set aside the other ½ for the Prosperity Partnership. Mr. Zlotnick said that they have helped tons of small businesses in this county with PPE, promotions, and the economic programs they have started. Mr. Lawler said that as he understood the \$150,000 that was in a line item named unallocated, is actually money that was allocated last year for the individual Town economic development grants. That \$150,000 is the \$7,100 for which every Supervisor has submitted applications for projects to be approved. Mr. Lawler confirmed with Mr. Hellwig that the budget line is just not named. Mr. Hellwig said correct. Mr. Pemrick said that the \$150,000 was extremely valuable, and that although it is unallocated, it was directly set aside for the Economic Development Committee to dispense to the Towns. Mr. Pemrick said that the Town of Greenfield project will be in the Saratoga Today newspaper coming out this weekend. It was very valuable to the Town of Greenfield in terms of developing our own economies in the Town and promoting the Town. Mr. Pemrick said that he would advocate for leaving that \$150,000 in that unallocated fund, or if it's really important, rename the account. Mr. Barrett said we should allocated it then, if we know what it's for, why is it unallocated. Mr. Hellwig said that the account was not set up last year when the budget was changed late in the year. It can be fixed and renamed. Mr. Jarosh said that creating a line item for the budget is complicated, there are comptroller guidelines that need to be followed. Mr. Jarosh said that last year the item was created late during the budget workshop and a last minute spot was needed without creating a new line item and going through the guidelines. Mr. Jarosh suggested that Mr. Brian O'Connor have the opportunity to review the comptroller guidelines before we decide that line it will go under. Mr. Schopf asked if this creates any financial liabilities for a comptrollers audit having an unallocated line. Mr. Jarosh said that it's immaterial. Mr. Barrett said that he believes at the time that was created he was Economic Development Chair, and believes the name they had discussed was the Saratoga County Municipal Planning Fund, under the guise of promotion and tourism. Mr. Lawler asked Mr. Barrett if he was withdrawing his motion to reallocate the \$150,000. Mr. Barrett said yes, and made a motion to move the funds from unallocated to a local municipal planning fund. (Many Supervisors were speaking at once.) Mr. Pemrick asked if there was a second, Ms. Gaston said that Supervisor Schopf already seconded. Ms. Gaston clarified the account number being referenced is division 000, division 114 under Economic Development, unallocated item 9000 for \$150,000. Mr. Peck said that earlier during the discussion he had noted this as Municipal Grant Program. Mr. Pemrick asked for a roll call. Mr. Hellwig clarified if this vote was to rename an account. (Many Supervisors were speaking at once.) Mr. Hellwig said that a resolution is not needed to change the account name. Mr. Barrett requested a vote be taken.

On a motion made by Mr. Barrett, seconded by Mr. Schopf, for renaming the unallocated account line was approved by the following vote:

AYES (217559): Eric Connolly (9776), Alan Grattidge (4133), Philip C. Barrett (18352.5), Jonathon Schopf (18352.5), Richard Lucia (6531), Preston Allen (856), Jean Raymond (1214), Michael Smith (3545), Daniel Pemrick (7775), Kevin Tollisen (21535), Darren O'Connor (14765), Thomas Richardson (5196), Benny Zlotnick (18575), Theodore Kusnierz (14728), Willard H. Peck (5087), Sandra Winney (1995), Thomas N. Wood, III (5674), Tara Gaston (13293), Matthew E. Veitch (13293), Edward D. Kinowski (8287), John Lawler (8423), John Lant (16173)

NOES (0):

ABSENT (2048): Arthur M. Wright (2048)

Mr. O'Connor said that it is his understanding there is a legal question of whether the resolution or the contract controls the payment to the Partnership. Mr. O'Connor said that a great deal of money depends on the resolution of this legal problem. As he understands it, if the resolution controls, then not only will the Partnership get zero dollars for their fourth payment, they will have to pay back the County a certain amount of money. If the contract controls, then the Partnership will get the \$125,000. Mr. O'Connor asked if he was correct on that. Mr. Hellwig said yes. Mr. O'Connor said that he believes the Partnership is assuming it will get the \$125,000. Mr. O'Connor

asked when that legal question may be answered. Mr. Dorsey said that the resolution controls. To the extent there would be shortfall, Mr. Dorsey said that Ms. Schneider really needs to address the Economic Development Committee next month to request additional funding to get to the end of the year, and up to the amount they thought they were going to get based on the projections that were available at the beginning of the year when the contract was entered into. Mr. Dorsey said that a number had to go into the contract, no one knew what that occupancy tax was going to be, yet on January 15<sup>th</sup> they needed a check in order to meet payroll. We had to come up with numbers based on current projections of what the occupancy tax was going to be. In working with Justin Miller they put in the payment schedule language. No one knew Covid was going to happen and that the bottom was going to fall out. Mr. O'Connor said that he would convey that information to Ms. Schneider and Ms. Hill.

Ms. Gaston said that in the County Administrators budget in 2020, division 991, division 999 Contingency, item 9000, there was an unallocated amount of approximately \$400,000 and it looks like none was spent. For 2021 the request was for \$500,000 and under budget officer is says \$591,000. Ms. Gaston asked if it's correct that none was spent, and what the change was between departmental request and budget officer. Mr. Hellwig said that this is the contingency line and this is what is used for things that come up where no money is budgeted for. Shortfalls, special projects, etc. Most of the funds are used at the end of the year when we find areas where there are deficiencies. The money is moved to help cover shortfalls. Mr. Lawler clarified that this number is not specific to the County Administrators office, it's basically a catch all for any department that exceeds its budget for any reason that is unforeseen at the time the budget is created, that's why it's called a contingency line item. Mr. Lawler said that you really can't know how much of the funds will be used until the end of the year. Usually it's a very fractional percentage of the overall budget, and on a \$300,000,000 budget with a \$500,000 contingency is well below 1%. Mr. Hellwig said that you will not see an expense under the contingency account line, the funds are not spent, they are transferred into another departments for them to cover the expense. Ms. Gaston asked why the change from \$500,000 to \$591,000. Mr. Hellwig said that the budget process begins in July and he would need to go back and review his notes. Ms. Gaston said that it may be helpful if the Supervisors were involved in the budget earlier in the process. Ms. Gaston said that a number of questions have been asked here at the Board and the response has been from various departments and individuals, it was an oversight. Ms. Gaston understands that the County runs very lean and she is very happy with the general financial status, but we are in a situation where these sorts of oversights should not occur.

On a motion made by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Smith the meeting was adjourned unanimously.