

# BOARD MEETING BUDGET ADOPTION

## Transcript 12/8/2021

### **SPEAKERS**

Mo Wright, Mike Smith, Bill Peck, Dan Pemrick, Matt Veitch, Therese Connolly, Bridget Rider, Jean Raymond, Tara Gaston, Steve Bulger, Darren O'Connor, Phil Barrett, Jonathan Schopf, Benny Zlotnick, Jack Lawler, Ridge Harris, Dick Lucia, Eric Connolly, Theodore Kusnierz, Matt Rose, John Lant, Sandra Winney, Michael Hartnett, Joe Grasso, Several Supervisors, Tom Wood, Kevin Tollisen

### **Theodore Kusnierz**

Okay, we're gonna get started like to welcome everyone to a special Board of Supervisors meeting for the purpose of adopting the 2022 budget and ask the Clerk to please call the roll.

### **Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Allen is excused. Supervisor Barrett.

### **Phil Barrett**

Here.

### **Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

### **Eric Connolly**

Here.

### **Bridget Rider**

Gaston.

### **Tara Gaston**

Here.

### **Bridget Rider**

Grasso.

### **Joe Grasso**

Here.

### **Bridget Rider**

Kinowski is excused. Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Lant.

**John Lant**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Peck.

**Bill Peck**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Richardson. Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Smith.

**Mike Smith**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Winney.

**Sandra Winney**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Wood.

**Tom Wood**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**  
Wright.

**Mo Wright**  
Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

Here.

**Bridget Rider**

Quorum is present.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you. And if everyone would please rise for attention to the flag.

**Several Supervisors**

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you very much. At this time, I'd entertain a motion to ratify this special meeting.

**Kevin Tollisen**

So moved.

**Phil Barrett**

Second.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Tollisen and seconded by Supervisor Barrett. Roll Call.

**Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lant.

**John Lant**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Peck.

**Bill Peck**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Smith.

**Mike Smith**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Tom Wood**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion passes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you. And this time, I'd ask the Clerk to please begin reading of the Resolutions 313 through 319.

**Therese Connolly**

Resolution 313. Introduced by Law & Finance. Amending the Tentative 2022 budget.

Resolution 314. Introduced by Law & Finance. Adopting 2022 Saratoga county capital plan.

Resolution 315. Introduced by Law & Finance. Authorizing 2022 agreements with various agencies.

Resolution 316. Introduced by Law & Finance. Adopting the 2022 Saratoga county compensation schedule.

Resolution 317. Introduced by Law & Finance. Setting 2022 salaries for certain temporary and part time employees to include a 2% cost-of-living increase.

Resolution 318. Introduced by Law & Finance. Setting 2022 salaries for certain county employees to include a 2% cost-of-living increase.

Resolution 319. Introduced by Law & Finance. Introducing a proposed local law identified as Introductory no. 7 print no. 1 of 2021, relative to Amending the 2022 compensation schedule for certain County officials and setting a date for a public hearing thereon.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you and at this time I'll entertain a motion to remove Resolutions 310 and 311 from the table.

**Kevin Tollisen**

So moved.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

A motion by Supervisor Tollisen.

**Jonathan Schopf**

Second.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Second by Supervisor Schopf. And at this time I'll entertain a request. Oh, I'm sorry. Roll Call vote.

**Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lant.

**John Lant**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lawler.



**Jack Lawler**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Peck.

**Bill Peck**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Smith.

**Mike Smith**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Tom Wood**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion passes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you. And are there any requests for separate votes on the resolutions? Supervisor Peck?

**Bill Peck**

Yeah, I'd like to request a separate vote on 313 and then 310, please.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Request for separate votes on Resolutions 313 and 310. Any other requests for separate votes? All right, at this time. Would someone like to move Resolution 313 for discussion?

**Phil Barrett**

So moved.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Moved by Supervisor Barrett. Is there a second?

**Jonathan Schopf**

Second.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Seconded by Supervisor Schopf under discussion? Supervisor Peck?

**Bill Peck**

Yeah, I'll just touch on quickly. And then I'll have further discussion on the full budget. But the amendment here to the budget two things I got serious concerns about are the bonding of the \$11.5 million in the various items that would normally be part of the regular budget. And I think when you'll hear me during our next resolution dealing with the budget, when you have so many cash, one-time cash infusions into the budget to balance it, pay raises for the Board of Supervisors, I am not in support of. So I would make an amend, I would move to amend and remove the 13,127 increase, which was a pay increase for the Chair, the Vice Chair and the entire Board. You have a better understanding of my reasoning or if you want to know but in general, when we got one shot fusions into the budget to balance I think that's not good optics.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Is there a second on the motion to amend?

**Benny Zlotnick**

I'll second that.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Second by Supervisor Zlotnick? Roll call vote on.

**Jack Lawler**

Is there discussion on the amendment? I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Oh, I'm sorry go ahead.

**Jack Lawler**

Are you willing to entertain discussion?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes.

**Jack Lawler**

I just I confess a little bit of ignorance I guess. I'm not, can you, can somebody just very lightly touch on the Supervisor Peck mentioned bonding for what should be recurring, which we should be operating expenses. So just could someone please refresh my memory on what the bond proceeds are going to be used for?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

County Administrator Steve Bulger to answer that.

**Jack Lawler**

Thank you.

**Steve Bulger**

Sure this was approved by the Long Range Capital Committee. And it's about 11.4 million. It's a variety of projects, both facilities, upgrades, and equipment. All of the bonded components will have to be approved by our bond counsel to make sure they meet all the requirements for that, we're working closely with the Treasurer's office. So these items we identified as having at least a five year or longer life. So that's why they were included in the Long Range Capital Plan.

**Jack Lawler**

Okay, so the PPU for the useful life to match the bond schedule those two things tie out and the Treasurer has, has looked at that. I don't know if Drew is here, but I assume he's looked at that. And, and blessed it, as it were.

**Steve Bulger**

Yes, he's reviewed it. We've also reviewed it with an initial review with the bond counsel as well.

**Jack Lawler**

And Mr. Chairman with your indulgence, could I ask Supervisor Peck a question?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes.

**Jack Lawler**

Thank you, Bill. What are the, what projects are you referring to is inappropriate for a bond.

**Bill Peck**

They can be bond, we haven't bonded these types of things in the past, usually during the capital budget. So in fact, in the capital plan in our budget, it's equipment for like DPW. Somebody tell me three, four million, two and a half, what's the number? Now that's the normal course of business. This is \$11.4 million, we could run down through a whole list of equipment that's listed it was handed at some point last couple months. But whether it be bucket trucks, it's a, you know somethings in buildings, when you do in large construction, you want to bond those things out. In Saratoga County, when we've had the fortitude to purchase dump trucks, these multiple small trucks on here. There's pay loaders. Those are things that we've done normally in the county budget, under our normal DPW spending. When we put an infusion of this many items in one year, this is a 12 million 11.4 million cash infusion, we're gonna get all these items, we're gonna see years down the road, what I'm really concerned about this whole budget thing will work for 2022. What I'm worried about 2023, some of these expenditures will be delayed care, and we'll be able to get to 2023, I'm really worried when I look at this budget, years 3 through 10, what Saratoga County's gonna have to respond to. So when we start looking at wearing out of equipment, that's in a normal, normal year, we would spend 3-4 million in our budget. Now we're going to spend the normal 3 or 4 and we're going to add, I'd have to add those DPW. And I'm not here to critique the DPW. But I think it was, was in good spirit that Supervisor Schopf had asked departments at the beginning of year to say, what's your wish list? But then to actually take the wish list and just try to fund it all I don't think is good governing.

**Jack Lawler**

So Just one quick question for either the Chairman or the County Administrator. So we're basically buying some equipment. That's a lot of it is for equipment.

**Bill Peck**

Well, there's other, there's other things.

**Jack Lawler**

But is it? So is it safe to assume that the equipment needs of the DPW? I know, we can't look up, you know, completely, accurately the future. But is it safe to say that we wouldn't see this type of thing reoccurring, where we were bonding, work equipment next year, in the year after? I think, I think if we need the equipment, and this makes sense to get, I don't have a real problem with it. And I don't even have a real problem bonding, as long as that's tied out to the PPU. The useful life and the bond maturity schedule matches the life of the equipment. But I think to Bill's point, it's not something that should be, you know, seen every year, what we're buying that kind of, spending that kind of money on equipment and taking out new bonds, just is it reasonable to assume that that's not going to happen?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Moving forward?

**Jack Lawler**

I know you can't look with absolute accuracy, Mr. Chairman, I know that, but basically, have we caught up? It sounds like there's a lot of, we needed a lot of stuff, we decided to go get it. And, and that we're caught up now. And that this is something that we should look at this kind of bonding and for

equipment? To the best of your knowledge, obviously, knowing that you can, you don't have a crystal ball with you.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes. So, Supervisor, as you know, as CEO of your Town and our other colleagues here, you have to balance the needs of the residents of the county in this particular case, or your Township and if you look at the adopted budget expenses, moving forward, look historically going back, say to 2018, if you take out the one shots on this budget, adopted budget increase is actually less than it has been since 2018. And we believe at this time it is the appropriate thing to do to meet the needs not only of the department but residents of the county.

**Jack Lawler**

So I'm going to assume that our DPW department he did a lot of equipment, maybe it had not gotten some funding that it needed in the past. We're doing this in a way to bring the DPW into a situation equipment wise where they can meet the needs of the residents of the county. I'm just hopeful that we're there out. And we're not going to be going back to this well to buy more equipment. While the long range capital, by definition means we should have a long range his view of it. So we should have some idea, looking out over the next one to five years saying, Okay, we're replacing this equipment today. I think we're going to need to replace this equipment next year, and so on and so on. I'm assuming that I know that plan exists. So I'm just assuming that that plan reflects a declining need of additional equipment based on the amount of stuff we're getting this year. That makes sense?

**Bill Peck**

Can I just touch on a couple things he said?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Well I think you're looking for a response Supervisor?

**Jack Lawler**

And then I'm done.

**Bill Peck**

I have the response for you as well.

**Jack Lawler**

Did you want to give me a response Steve?

**Steve Bulger**

Yeah, I would say, yes. When we sat down with Chad and DPW, we asked them to prioritize what are some of the equipment that you are going to need, that you not necessarily would get in any one year, but that's going to have a longer life, like some of the bucket trucks, things like that, that will really be a benefit that you can start using now and extend over the life of that piece of equipment, that's part of it. Another important component of what's getting bonded is there's \$1.5 million for the Zim Smith Trail, that is seed money, that will be used by the Planning Department for design purposes, that they expect

will be able to generate a significant multiple of that in additional grant funding to complete the next phase of the Zim Smith Trail. So that's one example of something else that's in here, and it's a significant expense. But because that's a long term, really a long term benefit to the county that's spread out. There's some of the airport construction items are also included in that 11.4. There's a \$2.4 million renovation of the County Clerk's Office and the vault, which is way overdue. And we anticipate that there could be, to your point about the future, we'll see what the Board wants to do. But we have to start doing in my opinion, and I think a number of the Board's opinion, more investment in our facilities, that we have to just make them more effective and appropriate for serving our constituents. So a lot of this is going towards that as well.

**Jack Lawler**

Thanks. That answers my question.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you. Supervisor Barrett, followed by Supervisor Schopf, and then Supervisor Peck. I still you have Supervisor.

**Phil Barrett**

Well, there's no doubt that we need to expend money to invest in our facilities, there's certainly some very glaring needs in that regard. And I know, Supervisor Veitch is very much on top of that issue as well. But as far as the DPW expenses, this wasn't a situation where there was bonding done to replace what the normal funding of equipment and needs of the department would be this year, it's basically moving up purchases that are identified needs of the department. Basically, we're still spending it within the budget, a large amount of money for the needs of the department and then speeding up some needs that may not have occurred and until maybe year 3, 4, 5 of a five year plan or maybe even further down the road, move those expenditures up, get the equipment now. So yes, I think to answer your question, or one of your concerns, is once you buy this equipment, you won't need to buy it next year, in a lot of cases. So that I think just wanted to make that distinction as far as the funding is concerned.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**

I think Steve Bulger explained it very well. But I would say to Bill's point, about the wish list, I think there was a much longer list of equipment that came out of DPW. And from a lot of the departments was evaluated, really we took those larger items with longer term use life and put them into the bonding plan. You know, some of those other items, you know, were deferred, they may be considered in other budgets. We did what we could do the best we could do with what we had to get those equipment into place.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Peck.

**Bill Peck**

So Supervisor Lawler just getting back through. This was, came out of their long range capital plan. So they have the long range capital plan, I think was 14 million maybe an additional 12 to be bonded for 26 million total is that accurate? So this is all tied to the long range capital plan. I just, I think that we've been in a position in the past, when you buy the equipment tomorrow, now his equipment might be a year out. That's why I say some of these items are backed up. We want to buy a truck in our town, we're a year out. So some of these expenditures won't be until next year. But I want to be clear with Jack, that it's not just DPW added new equipment there. There's other things, there's building renovations, there's airport hangars. So there's a variety of things. And I'm just not comfortable in todays, where we're at this juncture in the pandemic, yes, we're coming out, yes, we're doing a lot better. Well, we are now yeah, that to then do. And all of a sudden borrowing this money, because what's gonna happen with that truck we buy next year is that means it's one year sooner down the road, that that's worn out. At the end of the shelf life of 5, 7, 8 years but that's my point on that.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor.

**Phil Barrett**

Well, every piece of equipment or vehicle has a shelf life. So yeah, if the earlier you buy it, you can safely assume the sooner it's going to go to the wayside. But if you need it, and you're using it, it's an important part of your daily activities to get the job done to serve the residents. I don't see any problem with that whatsoever. Again, these were identifiable identified needs that are being financed in this fashion. So to label it a one shot or, or anything that I don't see it. You know, if you have needs, you have various options and how they can be financed and purchased. You know, the economy starting to slow we're going into a in 2022, a period of higher interest rates, that'll probably extended to 2023. So if there is a time to bond items, it would be sooner than later, in my estimation, but to say that we shouldn't buy something now, because it's a wait three years to buy something as opposed to buying it now. Because that way we'll have it three years later, or three years longer. That doesn't make any sense.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Peck.

**Bill Peck**

That only depends on the urgency. Any urgency, if the need is there today, if the urgency of the need is so great. I'm not sure I've been explained that all this urgency was there?

**Phil Barrett**

Well, I think the fact that these identified needs are being moved up displays an urgency because it is a little out of the ordinary compared to what we've done in the past. But again, we still have a significant amount of money in the budget. It's not being replaced by bonding. So it's on top of what we're already spending. But if you get behind over the years, you got to catch up at some point. I think that's what we're doing here in a sound way. The finances of the County are very good. Chairman Kusnierz and Administrative Bulger have spoken about that length at other meetings. Like I said, interest rates are



going to be rising over the next year or two. Now would be the time to move up some of those identified needs.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Any other discussions on the amendment. Supervisor Peck, would you please state the amendment to Resolution 313?

**Bill Peck**

So the amendment I have is to remove under the Board of Supervisors the change in 13,127 that was put in under the general amendment. I'm leaving the bonding aside. I'm not gonna I just want to mention that. The amendment was to remove the 13,127 which was which was pay increases for the Board, Chair and the Vice Chair, which I just don't think appropriate at this time.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Call the roll?

**Jack Lawler**

Mr. Chairman.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

Just a point of information, not debate or comment, but as I'm looking at three 313. If you look at unclassified revenue, it says from \$12,290,530 to \$23,000,885.88. Then it says change is \$120,000.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes, Deputy Administrator, Ridge can answer for that for you.

**Ridge Harris**

Thanks, Supervisor. So if you look at the two unclassified revenue lines on the resolution, if you total the 11,400,000 with the 120,000. That's the total difference between the two items. We split them up so you can see that one's for the Fire Training Center water line and the second one is the bond proceeds.

**Jack Lawler**

That make sense. Thanks. I thought there was a typo there with the math. That's all. Thank you.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Any other discussion on the amendment? Hearing none, please call the roll.

**Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

This is a vote on the amendment right.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

This is on the amendment to.

**Phil Barrett**

Yea, no.

**Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Lant.

**John Lant**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**  
No.

**Bridget Rider**  
Peck.

**Bill Peck**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**  
No.

**Bridget Rider**  
Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**  
No.

**Bridget Rider**  
Smith.

**Mike Smith**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Matt Rose**

Supervisor Wood you're showing that you are muted right now. Could you hit star six so we can hear you?

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion fails.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

And would someone like to move Resolution 310 for discussion? I'm sorry 313. So I'm looking for a motion to move Resolution 310 for discussion.

**Jonathan Schopf**

So moved.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Schopf is there a second.

**Kevin Tollisen**

Second.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Second by Supervisor Tollisen. Discussion on Resolution 310. Supervisor Peck.

**Bill Peck**

So, I know Administrator Bulger, I appreciate just handed something out that with his comparisons of year to year, just before the meeting, I appreciate that I'll review it after. But I look back at 2020. The actual budgeted or actual spent amount was 318 million. That's COVID year, the Department's all did a super job. So we were going into COVID it hit, Everybody pulled back and did what they needed to do. And they did an outstanding job. They held back. 2021 we budgeted 340 million. I know in your documents you'd mentioned earlier, and we talked about it during the workshop, are you using an amended budget of 371 or 2 million. Those were a lot of expenditures which I would like at the end of the year would be to have increase personnel additional during throughout the year project costs that we did on top of the budget that were outside. So those were amendments that we did at board meetings to add. We went from 340 to an active budget of 371. 2022 we're at 381 million. My real issues with it is I think it's balanced with infusions of cash, 9 million out of fund balance. 12 million of the cash infusion for the bond where it's 11.4. You've got 5 million in ARPA funding that I think is designated for lost revenue in 2022. So those are one shot revenue sources going. Now we talked about the machinery may not be, have to go in every year but we usually keep up with you needed machinery every year. Now, there's 141 we budget 128 for sales tax revenue last year. It was conservative, but it was a huge point of contention during the budget workshop if you look back to last year. We came in 145 so 17 million over. We were fortunate as a county. But part of that is, and I think my comments were at the Board meeting at the workshop last year, we had vaccines coming, people were tired of being cooped up, they'd be looking to get out and spend. And I think we saw some of that. But what I couldn't expect, what I didn't know was going to happen was the federal government was going to start printing money and handing out money. Or boosting up unemployment benefits and extending it. So there was a lot of cash that came into people's hands to help to drive up sales tax revenue. So I'm just giving a warning out there that we need to be very careful. We need to be very careful, because unless I think that Supervisor Barrett said, I think we're coming into a slowdown period again. So we need to watch it and we don't have those cash infusions. That means less money for people to spend. The other place we get a lot of sales tax money, which is a detriment to our residents is gas tax. So guess if gasoline prices are high, we get a lot of money in our coffers. Me personally, I don't like high gas prices. So hopefully that'll come down. Often I look at historical comments, or individuals that they make the view how their, what their future actions might be. Sometimes like today I see a complete 180. And I become baffled. Anybody wants a piece of entertainment, it should go back to 2020 Tentative budget workshop on November 16th. The discussion that day revolved around 12 positions and about a million dollars in fund balance. What we have for one of these later items, that's part of this budget, is I think from the budget message is 45 part time or full time employees to be

added. In there in the 8 pages of changes, there's 55, now you can catch me if I'm off by one or something, but I counted 55 salary increases. Now within the last five years, it might be three, four years ago, we did a re-matrix of the grades and steps. And that's sort of what people gives the county continuity. So we know what people have, where they're going, what the costs are. We got 55 salary increases. I'm not saying we don't have people that aren't worth it. We have tremendous people that work here. But it seems like this was an interesting time to all of a sudden put 55 salary increases in that doesn't count to 23 Board members. It was also the folks for driving transport and veterans' drivers, small increases they needed. New positions we are amending and retitling or reclassifying they usually come with increases. So when I looked at that at a time that we're in still an uncertainty. I'd say we can get through it. We can get through in 2022. In 2023 some of these things will carried but I'm worried about years three through 10. Can I have a couple more minutes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

I'll give you another minute. But there's other members of the Board I'm sure that would like to speak.

**Bill Peck**

So just the word 223 per 1,000. I think that's what we were at last year. I think the budget message we're down slightly might be 100%. I got property in three Towns. Moreau, Northumberland, Town of Saratoga. What's gonna happen, everybody has a house that sold in their town, they know prices were up. So one of two things goes down. Either your assessment goes up in your Town. Or if you don't reassess your equalization rate goes down. When we equalize back to 100%. If I'm at the same rate I was a year ago, I was at 91% in Northumberland, I'm going to be 83%. So that's going to in every household that that happens, there's gonna be an increase in taxes. I just think we squandered a year when we could make sure we had money in people's pockets, because we're spending it here. So that's on assessment. I think there's a lot of good things in the budget. I just think that there's too much of everything. And there's an old adage that pigs get fat, but hogs get slaughtered. And I think this budget worked a little bit like hogs up at the government trough. That's my guess. I think these things I just think we tried to do too much, and all of it and one year in we're still in uncertain times.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

Yes. Well, you move up purchasing needs that are identified in the capital plan. It's not, doesn't sound like there's much in the way of argument as far as what was identified in the capital plan. If you move up those purchases, you do need a revenue source to cover those purchases. So yeah, so there is a revenue source or revenue line that would be applied to those purchases, one time purchases. And every vehicle or piece of equipment has a shelf life. Um, the ARPA expenses, which I think, again, very good investments that, in and of itself is a one-time spending. That's what ARPA funding is. I don't believe we're going to get ARPA funding again next year. Well, we will get it next year. But after we get our second half next year, I don't expect there to be an ARPA program, past 2022. Maybe you know differently. So if you're allocating ARPA funding toward a purchase, that in and of itself, you could call a one time, one time spending one-time expense. So the fact that that's in the budget is not something that's going to be reoccurring, or a long term trend. It's a one-time allocation of funding from ARPA

funding, which is a two year program, and you have up to four years to spend the money. Facility upgrades? Well, I don't hear anybody saying any of these facility upgrades are a bad idea. Again, that in and of itself is one time spending, we're not going to renovate the Clerk's area or any of these other investments every year. It's do it, it's a one-time project, probably have to do it again, or should do it again, another 30 40 years or something, who knows, but it's a one-time expense. So and again, you need a revenue line or revenue source to cover that expense in the budget. So yes, it is a one-time expense. And of course, any organization, private or public must adjust their spending, their budget, their priorities and outlooks based on the current conditions. Right now the conditions are conducive for the county to make up for shortages in needs of equipment, and vehicles. To invest in facilities, investments that should have been done long ago. Now is the time to do it. So it's a perfect time. You're saying we're taking money out of people's pockets. We're utilizing funding that the county has and can acquire very easily to cover these very important expenses that are one time. I mean, you're talking about worried about, you know, years down the road, where is the reoccurring operational expenses that are being created here, needing a whole bunch of new positions? As you talked about last year? You talked about how if you want some entertainment, go back and look at it. You want to talk about creating reoccurring expenses exponentially over the course of 5, 10, 15, 20 years because the safest job in any government budget is a government job. Or I should say the safest thing to be is in a government job. Once a government job is created it very, very rarely goes away. So you want to talk about creating reoccurring expenses, that that are exponential and multiply on themselves over 5, 10, 20, 50 years? Create a bunch of new positions. So but I don't see where the reoccurring expense, budget expenses that we should be concerned about, that are being created through this budget. We've been talking about capital purchases and investment in facilities. I think some of that will save a lot of money as opposed to costing more money operationally. So I think I think what you should do is tell us the exact things, items, vehicles, equipment, upgrades that we shouldn't do. Let's go through the list.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Peck.

**Bill Peck**

I'll just make two points. You made my point for me. I appreciate that. You want, the reoccurring expenses for the 45 full and part time some of them we need. Public Health, Environmental Services, you got to fill that up. You added 45 positions. So that's the point I'm making. You did 55 salary increases, those are recurring costs that each year exponentially go up. I don't mean fringe benefits, retirement. So that's really the recurring. I didn't want to. Now if you go through line by line item. I would have loved to, I asked for that information from every department request that they want to put in, I asked for in early August. I asked again, early September, because I wanted to see what the department's wanted. I've been doing this a long time, I wanted to see where we were at, I wanted to see what the department requests were, I was denied. I was denied. The Administrator told me wasn't authorized by Chairman Kusnierz, or Chair of Law and Finance Schopf, and I got the budget, in a final version the same time the press did. So I couldn't evaluate what the real needs were.

**Phil Barrett**

Oh, the department heads wouldn't talk to you?

**Bill Peck**

No, I didn't go to each Department head. Each department submits.

**Phil Barrett**

Oh, I would have asked the department head.

**Bill Peck**

Each submits a request to the Administrator, he had probably a whole file that could have been digitally sent to me or I could have picked up. That's all I was seeking. Then I could analyze department by department.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

If I may, since I was characterized in this conversation, this budget process was the most transparent, most involved by our county employees. Department heads had a seat at the table, unheard of, unheard of. And to your comment that documents weren't available to you. All documents were available October 15, by the County Administrator to the Board of Supervisors. So to say you didn't have or indicate or intimate enough time to review it a lot of time has transpired since October 15. And I would like the County Administrator to respond to that characterization.

**Steve Bulger**

Well, the process was set up by the Board of Supervisors. A new process this year that the board unanimously approved for the budget process involving Supervisors in our budget meetings with the individual department heads in August and early September. We also invited members of the Law and Finance committee and standing committee department heads were involved in that. The reason Supervisor you did not get that information is you were not in that policy, the way it was set up. All of the information was released on October 15, including the Department budget request that was published you know, on the web for the first time. Normally what I've been told in the past that was not put out publicly, it was not sent out to the Supervisors as well. Also, the entire personnel requests were included from the beginning in the budget process. Again, that's a change from what I was told, because it used to be a small three person subcommittee of the HR committee would be making all those decisions, and then report it to HR and then Law and Finance. Under the Board's new policy, they wanted that information out front a lot quicker. So since October 15 it's all been out there. So I think you know, this is a credit to the Board for the policy changes that you have implemented to make this a more transparent process and give the Supervisors the time to go through the budget and analyze in an appropriate manner.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

If I may follow up on previous comments by Supervisor Peck and the number of employees that have been added for the proposed 2022 budget. Saratoga County is one of the most efficiently run counties of counties in New York State of similar size to ours. As a matter of fact, the number of residents served per employee is 192. If you look at other counties similar size to ours next closest County, Dutchess County serves 159, Albany County 139, Oneida County 104, Broome County 110, Schenectady County 102, Rensselaer County 101. Our employees, I have said this over and over since I took over as



Chairman are the greatest asset that we have here in Saratoga County, number one. Number two, adding employees, you fail to point out that we have mandates. Sheriff's Department has mandates. The District attorney's office has mandates we are required to expand our number of employees in those departments by state law. And we're doing that, we're not going to break the law. And so that's a mischaracterization to make it sound like we're out here writing blank checks, just to give everybody a job. That's not the case.

**Phil Barrett**

So I might, Mr. Chairman, you know, just looking at some of these expenses, you know,

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor you have 30 seconds left for debate on this resolution.

**Phil Barrett**

Two and a half for the vault rehab 92,000 for IT. Two and a half million for the body cams, Sheriff radios, and I know there's positions involved with that with two departments. We also had the expansion of the Department of Health, we've got 3 million for the for Public Health alone. So 120,000 for water line for the fire training facility. So we've got up a number of these expenses, that all relate to very important initiatives that we need to do.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Thank you. Um, with regards to the positions, it would be helpful after I ask my next question, to note, which are the positions are being added as a result of mandates, and which are not. That might be helpful just for clarification. Because I assume it's not all of them. I have no problem with the number of positions that are being added. I don't, frankly, see how many personnel we have per resident as a sign of how well we're doing as a county, I think the actual service that we perform is a better indicator, so I'm totally fine with that number going down some. However, to that end, the purpose of the County, purpose of government, in my opinion, is to help ensure the health and safety of their community. We have been doing well financially, we are spending a lot of money, vast majority of which I have no issue within this budget. But I am going to move to amend again to increase the amount for nonprofits from 2 million to 5 million. I don't know where it will go. But I know that there are a lot of nonprofits that may not make it through 2022 that are providing services. They're working with our Public Health department to get out vaccines. They're working with our Social Services department to make sure that people have food. They are making sure that individuals have mental health care, especially as we deal with an increased opioid crisis. They are providing support and working with the county employees that we do have. And some of them as a result of COVID may not exist at the end of 2022 for any additional outlay of funds. I'm not suggesting that it go to any particular one. I believe the idea of a more competitive process, or a merit based process is perfectly fine with me. But I would move to increase that amount from 2 million to 5 million in 2022. Thank you.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Is there a second on the amendment?

**Jack Lawler**

Chairman, I'll second the amendment.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Second by Supervisor Lawler. We're on discussion now. Supervisor Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

I'm sorry for discussion purposes. One of the things that became clear to me, and I got involved in it when we first started shutting down because of COVID and the not for profits were scrambling for things like facemasks and thermometers. And I got involved in that, trying to help some of the nonprofits and this Board at that time. I know Carl Zeilman did a great job of including those organizations in the distribution of personal protection equipment, and they are suffering. But I don't know that just lopping \$3 million is necessarily the most efficient way to do this. Perhaps we could agree to revisit the issue of nonprofits to have a more thorough process here of who needs money and why and then do that separately outside of this budget process. I think they are deserving I think we have to be open to their request. I learned so much that the nonprofits they work so well. In fact, there's a weekly, well it gets monthly now, call among not for profits and our Social Services, our Veterans, all the people who help support the not for profits in their mission. And I think we would be worthy of, they think they're worthy, they are worthy of our giving them an opportunity to make their case. But I don't know that you're solving, and I know you mean, you don't I say threatening not exactly what I mean, adding \$3 million to the budget, I don't have a sense of what they need. I don't have a sense of who needs it. So it would be difficult Supervisor Gaston to support your amendment. Because there's so many unknowns. And so I just that's my concern with it.

**Tara Gaston**

I understand in response, I would just say we do have a nonprofit process, where nonprofits can apply for funding. And

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor, if I may, I just want to remind the body that any amendments to the budget are required by law to be budget neutral at this time. So as part of your Resolution, where are you suggesting the money come from?

**Tara Gaston**

From the ARPA funding that's currently being used to fill a hole that doesn't? That don't understand how it exists.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Which line item in the budget?

**Tara Gaston**

What line item is the 2 million for the nonprofits coming from as it is?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

We can get that for you.

**Bill Peck**

Can I just give some insight?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor, your time I believe?

**Bill Peck**

Sorry, I really

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Okay, this is on the amendment. You do have time. So just for order, we have Supervisor Veitch and Schopf that had their lights on prior to you.

**Tara Gaston**

Okay, so

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Gaston. You had a question on the?

**Ridge Harris**

It's on the unclassified revenue amount line. I'm just getting that for you out of the A fund. I'll have that for you in just a second.

**Tara Gaston**

And is that where the remainder of the ARPA funds are coming from?

**Ridge Harris**

It is.

**Tara Gaston**

Okay. So my request would be from that, although I would also note that historically, a Supervisor has been able to request a change in funding and never had to provide the line item number. But okay. So my request would be that it come from the same place as the 2 million that's currently there. For the nonprofit. Again, this is not saying what nonprofits get it, it's not saying how much would go to each nonprofit. But there are a number in our communities, in all of our communities, Saratoga Springs, and throughout the county, that have done a yeoman's work over the course of this pandemic, and in providing resources to our community as well as we are in fact taking up the slack where the county does not. And I would like that to be set aside because we do have a nonprofit process that for the past several years, at least to my knowledge, money has not been awarded. And so that's why I am requesting this set aside. Deputy Administrator do you have the?

**Ridge Harris**

I do the line number for unclassified revenues is A 90-2770.

**Tara Gaston**

Thank you.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Gaston, you just referenced that a Supervisor has not had to, in the past, say what the money is coming from. And I'd like counsel to speak to that.

**Michael Hartnett**

Just as a point of order. This is a motion to amend the tentative which would be under Resolution 313. I'd wanted to clarify your motion to amend. We're currently discussing the adoption resolution, as opposed to the amending of the tentative. It's a slightly technical difference, but I inferred your amendment to be amending Resolution 313. I just wanted to clarify that for purposes of the record.

**Tara Gaston**

Are we not on 310?

**Michael Hartnett**

You're on the discussion of 310 which was the adoption, the motion adopting the budget. Not amending the tentative. They are two separate resolutions.

**Tara Gaston**

Okay.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

Mr. Chair, I guess I'd say just a couple of things here. First, I just wanted to in reference to the motion to amend. I agree with Supervisor Lawler on this. I think that, you know, we should probably see where this kind of plays out next year. And you know, we can always make an amendment to the budget throughout the year to fill the gap. And we've done that in a lot of different places here at the county. One thing I can think of is the Trails Grant program. Every year we budget a certain amount we get the request come in. It's more than what we budgeted. We wind up doing an amendment during the year. So you know, from my perspective, I know that we're doing this not for profit grant program next year. I am still taking, when people come to me and ask if they want you know what we're doing, I encourage them to apply for the grant program, send them in. So even though they're, I think we said they were due on October 1, I'm still having them come in now. Because I know next year, there's going to be a discussion and this program is going to go forward. So, but like Supervisor Lawler said, it's hard to tell exactly what our amount's going to be. So I won't support the amendment for the 3 million, but I think during next year, we need to look at it because this is going to come through. As far as the budget

amendments overall. In the past, we never really tried to as Chair of Government Review, we never really try to follow the process. We've always just kind of done it in our meeting, and then afterwards, the Administration took care of what we voted on. So I appreciate the fact that we're trying to do this per the book, here today. So thank you.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just like to add in my two cents on this. I don't disagree with anything that Supervisor Gaston is saying, I think there are a lot of nonprofits that are hurting. I don't disagree, in theory with allocating more funds to it. But I also agree with Jack and Matt. When we did our IDA grant program for small businesses during COVID, in Clifton Park, and also in the County, we allocated certain amounts of our fund balance boards that. I thought would be flooded with applications, I didn't think we'd have enough money we'd run out. So we budgeted a substantial but a reasonable amount towards that program. I was honestly kind of surprised as we move through the year how few applications we got in relation to the funds that we had reserved for it. We ended up then in the middle of the year doing a redo of that releasing more funds making it available. And we came out at the end of the year about neutral in our budget in terms of grants awarded versus funds we had made available. But we did it in a two-step process. And I think that was really good because it allowed us to keep our fund balance neutral. It allowed us to accrue revenue through the year, look at where we were, reanalyze and then allocate more funds if it was needed. So I think 2 million is a nice seed amount. I'm not opposed to having a discussion later in the year about allocating more funding to that. The county certainly has the resources available. But I think let's see where it goes. You know, maybe, you know, even hopefully a lot of nonprofits won't need to apply for those grants funds. You know, if their finances are doing well, at that point in the year. So I would say we hold the course now and move forward. In addition, I'd also just like to jump in, I didn't say much in the last go around, but in the past, here at the county in terms of the budget and when the numbers are available. I never saw any numbers. I never saw any numbers until I was here to vote on it. That's the way it's always been. This year, we engaged everyone in this process, Department heads, Administration, I thought it was a wonderful process, we did a great job. I don't want to talk about the past, I want to move the county forward. I think this is what this budget does, we're doing huge things that have not been done in decades in the state. We're running, turning into a full service Health Department. It's a massive commitment of time, manpower, and most importantly, money. A lot of those positions have been allocated towards that department. We've got body camera mandates, we've got Public Safety mandates to deal with, IT our infrastructure, our equipment here is seriously seriously lagging. It's terrible in some respects. A lot of these things just have to get fixed. They have to get fixed now for both our employees and the community. And that's what this budget does. And I'm sorry, I don't have my numbers with me. But Administrator or Ridge. Could one of you just address the impact on the average property tax bill that we're gonna see coming out of this budget? Do we have that an average per 100,000 of assessed value or the average \$250,000 assessed home? Anybody have that available?

**Ridge Harris**

Yeah, Supervisor you asked for the rate? That's 2.

**Jonathan Schopf**

What would that translate into a tax increase or decrease on the average assessed value of average residential home in Saratoga County? Say a quarter million dollar assessment. Did you have that calculation in front of you because I think it's going down?

**Steve Bulger**

Supervisor that would be a slight decrease. I don't have that number 250. But it is a slight decrease. And we believe that we will remain with that decrease with the lowest property tax rate in the State.

**Jonathan Schopf**

I think we're achieving a lot under this budget. As it is, we're assisting nonprofits, we're doing all the things I mentioned everything in the budget for all our departments. All departments who requested something, got something that they desperately wanted, and I think it's a great thing. That's all I have to say about it, and I fully support it.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

Just real quick, I would encourage my colleagues to maybe look at creating a program for nonprofits in their own Town using the ARPA money. This is a one time or if we add to it, a two time, but basically a one-time opportunity to use federal funds to support our nonprofits. I began a program for the nonprofit's back in July. Starting to put that together in Clifton Park. So I think you're right Supervisor Gaston you know, we know our communities and the needs. So I think if every community also had their own program, it would make all of our money that's being allocated through the ARPA program. Go that much further.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Um, well, on that note, hearing so much support for continuing and perhaps expanding the funding, I'm happy to withdraw my motion for an amendment. However, in all of the previous meetings, it had been determined that the \$2 million was, or had been stated that the \$2 million was a one time and that was it. So if there are Supervisors who are interested, in potentially adding to that later, I'm happy to withdraw it, as long as that's the intention in support of that. I just think that there should be more than that added to it that there's definitely those needs out there. So I'm happy to withdraw that then. I'm getting terrified looks from the Director of Finance and Deputy Administrator. I don't know if that's for me, or just in general, okay. Like, I hope I didn't mess up the post it note. But I'm happy to withdraw based on that. But my idea is that I think that there needs to be more than \$2 million support. And if what I'm hearing here in this room, is that that potential is there, because I know the need is there. I have no problem with that. Although Supervisor Schopf did bring up, he said that body cameras were

mandated. I'm not aware of that. I'm not sure if that's just a term of art there but if I can get that information, and then also about the personnel. Thank you.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

The motion is withdrawn on request of Supervisor Gaston. Supervisor Peck on Resolution 310.

**Bill Peck**

Can I just for my own knowledge, no point here. But to her point, the ARPA funding, there's 5 million in unexpended revenue to fill 2022. That left you with 17 million. When I looked at the budget, it looks like that 17 million is budgeted for certain eligible projects, ARPA projects. So I just want to clarify, and she's asking to move some of that money over. Need to take it away from somewhere if you did that. Am I wrong Ridge, isn't that 17 million attributed to the unallocated amount, attributed certain eligible projects, whether it be the water line for the sewer, I think, or something else. They're all it's all mapped out. Just want to make sure I'm not reading the right thing.

**Ridge Harris**

Yeah, so all of the ARPA eligible expenses in the budget are offset by associated ARPA revenue that's filed under unclassified revenue line.

**Jack Lawler**

Mr. Chairman?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

Thank you. I just have quick questions here. First, to follow up. So all of the ARPA money that's recorded as revenue addition for the 2022 budget has been allocated for expenses in the 2022 budget. Is that, is that correct? I'm not much, I thought. Can you add some context to that, please?

**Steve Bulger**

Yeah, we right now. So we received 22 million this year, we expect to receive another 22 million next year, working with our accountants, they identified, and we had this verified that \$27 million of the ARPA money can be classified under the lost revenue category, which gives us a lot more freedom on how to use that 27 million versus the current restrictions of the ARPA. So right now in the budget itself, for the 22 million we have received this year. I think it's 12.2 million is of ARPA funds, a combination of the lost revenue funds and direct ARPA patients that qualify under the ARPA, current ARPA rules, which we think are going to change by the way. 12.2 of that 22 should be, is in the budget this year. The remainder will drop down to fund balance at the end of the year unless the Board decides to, you know, reallocate it. So for the 2022 budget, we're really, we haven't really even looked at next year's \$22 million. So that will be another source of funds that we will have to deal with in the 2023 budget.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor, could you put your mic on thank you?

**Jack Lawler**

We haven't accrued for the 2023 ARPA money. There's no accrual for that. Is there?

**Steve Bulger**

No, I don't believe so.

**Jack Lawler**

Because that would be a huge difference. If you accrued it would all fall to fund balance now or be spent somewhere in this budget. So I'm assuming that 2023 ARPA money is.

**Steve Bulger**

2022.

**Jack Lawler**

It should be the 2022 ARPA money is we haven't, It's not in here.

**Steve Bulger**

Correct.

**Jack Lawler**

Right. Okay. I want to make that clear. And then a couple of other quick questions. Is it when I'm trying to do the line, the math line by line just a general question, is it reasonable to for me to assume that the new positions that are offered? Right, I think it's kind of like the same situation as the equipment at the DPW? I mean, we, you know, we're not known for going on wild crazy hiring sprees in Saratoga County. You know, I've got a lot of competence in the department heads. I mean, we say, you know, every time that we have an opportunity, we praise our department heads for their ability and their service. But I just want to know is any of the one shot money being used offset hiring this year?

**Steve Bulger**

No.

**Jack Lawler**

Okay, that's a that's a big part of..

**Steve Bulger**

It is, and I'm glad you brought it up Supervisor. So we, through the budget process through our budget liaison team, working with the departments, we ended up cutting \$8 million, out of the department head requests that they submitted, a lot of those were positions. They asked for, reasonably because there's a lot of work to do, we're the fastest growing county in the State, there's a lot of services we have to deliver. So we had to make the determinations to recommend to Law and Finance and the Board, you know, which positions really were justified and needed that we could afford this year. So there was a lot of positions we turned down.



**Jack Lawler**

That answers my questions. Thank you both.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Any Supervisors on the line wish to comment on Resolution 310?

**Tara Gaston**

Chairman.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Am I getting an answer regarding the positions?

**Steve Bulger**

What's that?

**Tara Gaston**

The changes made that some of the positions that are being added some of the 45 are mandated. Which ones?

**Steve Bulger**

I think it's approximately 10 of the positions at the Sheriff's jail and District Attorney are in response to the Executive 203 Order and also another mandate. I'm not sure exactly what it is regarding the jails, where we have to start providing additional services for inmates. And in addition, the discovery laws that were recently implemented, the District Attorney needs more staff to help with the discovery laws, especially with all of the body camera footage that is going to have to be reviewed now as that program is implemented. So those are really the ones that were mandated, so to speak, that we fill in order to achieve the Board's implementation of the 203 plan.

**Tara Gaston**

Okay, so none of the positions and the body camera program themselves have not been mandated. We are choosing to add personnel in order to meet requirements in various areas. But there aren't any positions that were mandated. I'm not trying, I just want to know what we're actually being forced to do as a County. And is it a programmatic thing or is it a personnel thing?

**Steve Bulger**

Well, in order to comply with mandates, and the Board voted to implement the body cameras, and also some of them are mandates, with the jail and the District Attorney, they have to comply with those mandates. In order to effectively implement those mandates and the body camera program, we have to make these hires. So I guess it's a matter of semantics, whether it's actually mandated by the State. But it's certainly mandated by this Board's actions, that if we are going to effectively accomplish what it is the Board has voted on, we have to hire these people.

**Tara Gaston**

Again, I have no problem with the hiring of the personnel or the problems. But there is a distinction to me, between New York State requiring us to maintain or create certain positions, and what we choose to do to meet their programmatic mandates. I don't have a problem with it either way. That was my question. Because there's an unfunded mandate issue here anyhow. But that is distinct to me and is a separate argument larger than this Board, if they are also requiring certain personnel positions. That's all I was asking, is which, because when that language was used, that's how I understood it to be. You've answered the question. The fact like, again, we need to meet the mandates, that's totally fine. I have no problem with it. That was just where my question is.

**Phil Barrett**

Isn't that? I think it's a little bit of semantics, because the 203 Committee that was the leading recommendation, correct?

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes.

**Steve Bulger**

Yeah.

**Phil Barrett**

And if we accept those recommendations, forward, there's certain positions that had to be created to make it happen. I mean you couldn't add the body cameras and not add the positions, it just, it would be impossible to do. And I think that's where maybe the getting lost in the translation here a little bit.

**Jonathan Schopf**

I would say the question of the positions are collateral consequences of the mandates, especially in regard to the discovery reform, that was a key one there.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

I would just add that rarely does Albany mandate a specific position. But it's very common to have them mandate a process, and if you look at, for instance, transitioning to a full service Public Health Department, it doesn't mandate that we hire a single person, but we have to perform the service, and you can't do it if the people aren't there. So maybe it is semantics, but you know, we have obligations that we have to meet as a County. Any other comments on Resolution 310? If not, at this time I'd entertain a motion to adopt Resolutions 310 311 313 through 319. Would someone like to move that.

**Joe Grasso**

So moved.

**Kevin Tollisen**

Second.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Grasso seconded by Supervisor Tollisen.

**Mo Wright**

I thought there was a request for a separate vote on resolution 310.

**Bill Peck**

Point of order.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Someone like to move so withdraw the motion to... Supervisor Grasso. Are you willing to withdraw your motion?

**Joe Grasso**

Sure thing.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Alright. So at this time, we'll take, I'll look for resolution to move. Okay, so at this time, I'll take up a motion to move Resolution 313.

**Jonathan Schopf**

So moved.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Made by Supervisor Schopf, is there a second?

**Eric Connolly**

Second

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Second by Supervisor Connolly? Roll Call.

**Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lant.

**John Lant**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Peck.

**Bill Peck**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Smith.

**Mike Smith**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Tom Wood**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion passes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

And that this time I'll entertain a motion to move Resolution 310.

**Kevin Tollisen**

So moved.

**Phil Barrett**

Second.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Moved by Supervisor Tollisen and seconded by Supervisor Barrett. Roll Call.

**Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Barrett

**Phil Barrett**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lant.

**John Lant**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Peck.

**Bill Peck**  
No.

**Bridget Rider**  
Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Smith.

**Mike Smith**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**



Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Tom Wood**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

No.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion passes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

And at this time I'd entertain a motion to move Resolutions 311 312 313 314 I'm sorry, strike 313. 314 315 316 317 318 and 319. Striking 312. Someone like to move that?

**Kevin Tollisen**

So moved.

**Dick Lucia**

So moved.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Moved by Supervisor Tollisen and I believe Supervisor Lucia seconded the motion. Roll Call.

**Bridget Rider**

Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lant.

**John Lant**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Peck.

**Bill Peck**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Smith.

**Mike Smith**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Tom Wood**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion passes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Thank you and would someone like to make a motion to adjourn.

**Jonathan Schopf**

So moved.

**Mo Wright**

So moved.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

Supervisor Schopf and Supervisor Wright. Roll Call.

**Bridget Rider**  
Supervisor Barrett.

**Phil Barrett**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Connolly.

**Eric Connolly**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Gaston.

**Tara Gaston**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Grasso.

**Joe Grasso**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Kusnierz.

**Theodore Kusnierz**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lant.

**John Lant**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lawler.

**Jack Lawler**  
Yes.

**Bridget Rider**  
Lucia.

**Dick Lucia**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

O'Connor.

**Darren O'Connor**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Peck.

**Bill Peck**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Pemrick.

**Dan Pemrick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Raymond.

**Jean Raymond**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Schopf.

**Jonathan Schopf**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Smith.

**Mike Smith**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Tollisen.

**Kevin Tollisen**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Veitch.

**Matt Veitch**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Winney.

**Sandra Winney**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wood.

**Tom Wood**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Wright.

**Mo Wright**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Zlotnick.

**Benny Zlotnick**

Yes.

**Bridget Rider**

Motion passes.

**Theodore Kusnierz**

And we are adjourned. Thank you very much, everyone.

**Jean Raymond**

Thank you. Good night.