

Minutes

Public Facilities Committee

Monday, February 13, 2017, 4:00 pm

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, N.Y.

Members Present: Hemmer, Wilfong, Nazzaro, Scudder

Member Absent: Gould

Others: Himelein, Tampio, Carlson, Dennison, Crow, Horrigan, Abdella, Porpiglia, S. Cummings

Chairman Hemmer called the meeting to order @ 4:00 pm.

**Approval of Minutes (1/17/17)**

MOVED by Legislator Scudder, SECONDED by Legislator Wilfong.

*Unanimously Carried*

**Privilege of the Floor**

No one chose to speak at this time.

Renew & Amend Res. 111-16 – Authorize Director of Finance to Increase Appropriations for the South Main Street Bridge, PIN 5761.00 County Bridge 1085 Rehabilitation

Ms. Crow: This is an amendment to renew and amend so this will be withdrawing the previous resolution and replacing it with this technically because the budget was adjusted for the project. So rather than just amending the budget again, Steve thought that it would be o.k. for us to do the renew and amend process. Just replaces the whole resolution.

Chairman Hemmer: I noticed that it went up over a million dollars.

Ms. Crow: Yes. I think that is based on the bids that came in so then they revised the total budget and everything that follows is when we have to amend the budget as well.

Mrs. Dennison: Director Spanos said that yes, the bids did come in over budget but he was planning to go ahead with the bid that matches the resolution that is proposed.

Legislator Wilfong: This is for 100% replacement of the bridge, not a rebuilt, this is a brand new structure.

County Executive Horrigan: No.

Legislator Wilfong: We're still repairing.

Ms. Crow: Well, the capital improvement - that I can't answer for certain but I would imagine just because it's -

County Executive Horrigan: No, this is the South Main Street bridge. They are not ripping that out and putting a new one in but there is a major rehab that has gone on in the arches and all of that. But, it is not a rip out and replace.

Legislator Wilfong: A lot of people have asked me that.

County Executive Horrigan: Very expensive because of the old nature of the bridge and that is the nature of it but New York State really does most of the work on this stuff. George Spanos is involved and our team is involved but, New York State with the bridges, something this big, they are very much involved in negotiations. Obviously that bridge is critical to Jamestown and traffic going through there. It's served it well and has been on limited service for quite a while.

Legislator Nazzaro: Just on the increase in use of fund balance, the \$237,000 is struck out and replaced with \$185,250. Could you explain that please? The project is going up.

Ms. Crow: There was a disproportionate share of how the funding was broken out in the previous resolution which is one of the reasons we are doing this. The distribution of the State and the local funds was not distributed properly before. Sometimes the State said that they would only fund - typically they will fund 75% of the non-Federal funds because it ends up being 80% Federal, 15% State and 5% local so the prior resolution had it almost 50/50, State and local but their revised estimate shows the -

Legislator Nazzaro: So at the end of the day even though you put it in simple terms, even though the price of the project went up significantly because of the formulas and all of that, our local share is going to be less than what we anticipated? Is that a fair statement or is that not?

Ms. Crow: Yes in the context of the former resolution which was breaking down the State and the local share to be almost 50/50 and it really should be 75/25.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right so actually we're going to be taking less out of reserve. Even though the project went up because of everything you just said, the amount that we are taking out of the reserve, our capital reserve is going to be less than the original resolution was indicating.

Ms. Crow: Correct.

Legislator Nazzaro: And when is this project set to - I mean, it's been a couple of years now.

County Executive Horrigan: I don't have the exact start date. ASAP.

Legislator Nazzaro: This year?

County Executive Horrigan: Oh yes, it should be this year.

Ms. Crow: It was just the design phase that we have already been in and this is the construction and inspection stage phase.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know without George being here I know the concern was about the truck traffic coming into the local industries. Has that been addressed as part of this Mr. Horrigan?

County Executive Horrigan: I'm sure it has. I don't have any details on that but that was part of the reason I think we ground the street down remember, for a long time in there to make sure we could do that. That way, they will come in that way instead of the other way. I'll reconfirm with George.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'm sure it's done because we talked about that.

County Executive Horrigan: That has been a big player in this whole thing to make sure we keep business cooking.

Chairman Hemmer: Any further questions?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution - Confirm Appointment - Chautauqua County Airport Commission

Chairman Hemmer: I'll be taking Dave's place because Dave is busy these days. That is the reason I'm being appointed unless someone else wants it. Any discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliation – Department of Public Facilities – CARTS

Mrs. Dennison: CARTS experienced higher than expected personal services costs partially because of increase in the contracts for Unit 6300. Also, Michelle Westphal, the Project Coordinator, indicated that they have a new provider who schedules their Medicaid drop offs and pickups and she said that that scheduling doesn't mesh exactly with the CARTS schedule so sometimes they have to add runs to pick up these people rather than having this service schedule them on scheduled CARTS runs. So there is also an increase in personnel costs to service those pickups and drop offs and their contractual costs were below expectation because they had a budget for two contracts that did not start in 2016. A contract with Teen Services and contract for

the Workforce Investment Board. Those two contracts were in the budget for 16', but as I said, they did not really come in since 16', so there are no expenditures associated with those contracts.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions?

Ms. Crow: The thing that I will add because you'll probably see other resolutions adjusting their personnel costs that as a reminder going back to when we adopted the CSEA contract in last 2015, the 2016 budget was already adopted and so we knew that the wage increases for CSEA weren't included in the budget but we did project out other offsets that would offset that wage increase. One mainly being the health insurance for 2016 came in at lower rates than what was budgeted so for the most part that savings in the health insurance we knew would offset the wages and/or create an overall surplus. Aside from this committee, when you get to the full Legislature, you will see other resolutions that have some of those kinds of adjustments.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you for that explanation. All in favor?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliation – Public Facilities Transportation Division

Mrs. Dennison: The main driver here is, you see the contractual costs for the transportation for the County road sub-department is over budget. Was over budget by \$715,0000. That is primarily due to increased use of salt, especially in December where the expenditures were unusually high. So, there is an overage in that category. That is offset by a savings in other contractors for the department. Different department within the "D" fund so there is a savings among other contractors for the maintenance of roads department and then there is also for the maintenance of roads, a savings in health insurance related to what Kitty mentioned earlier.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions on this resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliation – Public Facilities Road Machinery

Mrs. Dennison: As you can see the adjustments in this department are relatively minor. We have a small increase in personnel costs due to the new contract for CSEA 6300 and with all of their additional expenses are offset by savings in the contractual category.

Chairman Hemmer: Any discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Determining that it is in the Public Interest to Modify the Map and Plan for the Increase & Improvement of Facilities for Phosphorus Removal and Other Upgrades to the Treatment Plant of the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District

Mr. Abdella: I will lead off here. We did discuss these projects last month but I'll certainly give you another recap. Last month, if you recall, the Legislature did set the public hearing for the revised project for the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District and as we discussed at that time a couple of different things happened in the time period since your initial approval of the project for the \$2.8 million. One was that the district did get an indication from the Environmental Facilities Corporation that they would be eligible for no interest financing for the project which is a very significant development. Also, in the course of a new engineering for the project as they proceeded into the design phase with the new engineering firm, it was determined that they could better address the phosphorus issue with a different type of technology, an ultra violet treatment technology.

Mr. Carlson: DEC did a switch. They are now getting into de-chlorination. They want you to add chlorine to disinfect but now they want you to take it out. That was not a factor three years ago but now we have since learned that our new project will require that. So, we can either add chemicals and add equipment to do that or we can go with UV which is a very clean sort of application, low power cost in the Village of Mayville. It seemed like a good fit for this project. Little more money upfront but our engineer did an analysis of a 20 year time and figured we would come out ahead after 20 years. It's a long payback period but none the less.

Mr. Abdella: Presumably that eliminates the risks associated with handling chlorine gas. There was also a few other modifications to the project. That is the primary one.

Mr. Carlson: There was a piece of equipment estimated cost of \$150,000. That was original to the plant in 1978. That piece, bar screen, it's a screening devise, we'd like to replace that under this zero percent loan. Another one was paving after the project is done. We've kind of held off on paving and repairing the blacktop, anticipating these projects and we didn't want to invest in paving and then have it tore up during the projects so we kind of waited and we'd like to do that afterwards. If I could at this time, introduce Scott Cummings. I'm retiring March 22<sup>nd</sup> and Scott has been appointed by the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District Board of Directors to take over.

Chairman Hemmer: Well, thank you and happy retirement.

Mr. Abdella: To sum up from the financial aspects of it, you have two resolutions actually before you. One is the resolution which you determine that it is in the public interest to move forward with the modified project. Because of the no interest financing the projected impact on the typical users within the district actually goes down even though from what was projected two years ago, from \$472 to \$466, is the expected charge and that's allowed the district with the no interest financing to create a much better project with more being accomplished ultimately for a lower cost. So they really wanted to take advantage of that no interest financing for that purpose.

Legislator Nazzaro: Why in the resolution before we had in there the amounts of what the change – is it in there? I don't see any. I know that we talked indepth about that.

Mr. Abdella: That's in the public hearing resolution. It's not in the public interest one.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is there a reason for that?

Mr. Abdella: We could add it in. It's just a certain framework for what has to appear in each one under the statue but we could add that information to the second resolution. It was in the resolution last month.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because this is what has to be passed to move the project forward.

Mr. Abdella: That's right.

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't know what the pleasure of this Committee is, I just wondered why it was in one and not the other.

Mr. Abdella: I would be happy to add a reference back to the public hearing resolution and put that either in a WHEREAS clause or somewhere in this resolution if you would like.

Chairman Hemmer: Maybe that would be the thing to do.

Legislator Nazzaro: Would that be an amendment then?

Chairman Hemmer: To add a WHEREAS clause.

Legislator Nazzaro: That would be an amendment?

Mr. Abdella: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: Then I would make a motion to amend so there is no question to clarify what the user fee change is or the sewer district.

Legislator Scudder: We're going to amend it to what they were paying.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's going to show what they were paying and what they will be paying now.

Legislator Scudder: It's a projection and then the decrease?

Legislator Nazzaro: Yes, similar to what the language was before.

Legislator Scudder: I will second that.

Mr. Abdella: I can do that and just pulling it from the report that was sent to you, so the current existing charges for the typical user, per unit, is \$378 per year. It had been projected to go from \$378 to \$472 per year instead it's going to go from \$378 to \$466 per year. So that is going up by \$88 instead of \$94.00.

Mr. Carlson: The project cost will go up \$1.1 million.

Legislator Scudder: I have a question just about that filtering and I had it but now I'm – so if it's obvious forgive me but I'm going to ask it anyway. So does the lighting get rid of the chlorine or does the lighting do away with needing the chlorine?

Mr. Cummings: That's it. We're going to eliminate using chlorine gas.

Mr. Carlson: We don't have to store it, we don't (*inaudible*) to store it and the hazards of it, we don't have to deal with.

Legislator Nazzaro: And if you didn't do that then you would have to dechlorinate it.

Mr. Carlson: Use another chemical to take the chlorine out.

Legislator Scudder: Take it out that is what was thinking the lighting was doing.

Legislator Wilfong: I heard you say something Tom about the additional asphalt after the project is done. Is the additional charge for the asphalt in this?

Mr. Carlson: It was in this for \$40,000 to mill out and to replace existing asphalt.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other discussion on the amendment to the resolution?

*Unanimously Carried (amendment)*

Chairman Hemmer: Any further discussion on the resolution as amended?

*Unanimously Carried as amended.*

Proposed Resolution – A Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of \$3,972,700 Bonds of the County of Chautauqua, New York, to Pay the Cost of the Design and Construction of Improvements to the Treatment Plant of the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District in and for Said County

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions or discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Reallocating Salary Grade for Transfer Station Supervisor

Mr. Porpiglia: We're asking for your consideration to reallocate the salary for the transfer stations supervisor from a Grade 12 to a Grade 14. What the current practice here is, there is a Grade 12 salary plus a premium which is a \$1.25 on that salary. This has been created because of previous contracts that compress salaries with our MEO's. Our Motor Equipment Operators are a Grade 10. The Grade 10 Motor Equipment Operators were essentially making more money than our supervisors at the transfer stations. So we did patch work and put the premium on it several years ago with the language in the collective bargaining agreement that said, "until such time a permanent resolve can take place", and that is what we're asking you to do today. To make it a Grade 14 so we do not have this patchwork situations. It conforms with the rest of our supervisors, our entry level supervisors throughout the Department of Public Facilities. The natural ascension to a supervisor to a Grade 14 is from the Grade 10 MEO. So our road construction supervisors are all at that Grade 14. We see the equivalent supervisory role of the transfer stations supervisors at the Grade 14. We think that it is appropriately allocated there and we're asking for your support to make this permanent change to streamline not only the payroll process but the understanding of the status of that supervisor role.

Legislator Scudder: Current Grade 12, it says, \$17.50 to \$22.36 plus a \$1.25 premium rate per hour. So that \$1.25 is added on per hour?

Mr. Porpiglia: All hours.

Legislator Scudder: Already happening?

Mr. Porpiglia: Yes.

Legislator Scudder: So really that takes that from \$18.75 to \$23.61 because we're adding that \$1.25 in.

Mr. Porpiglia: Correct.

Legislator Scudder: So we're actually going down at the starting pay and up 37 cents at the top.

Mr. Porpiglia: Yes and for the current encumbrance, if I may. There are two and a half FTE's here. There is two full time supervisors and there is a half fill in FTE. For the current staffing because of the steps that they are at, this will have about a thousand dollar budgetary impact for 2017 because some people are below and some are above so it will have about a \$1,000 impact.

Legislator Scudder: For a year?

Mr. Porpiglia: Correct. Total, everybody, 2 ½ FTE's, the rest of the year. If you approve this, the premium goes away.

Chairman Hemmer: That will change the 2017 budget?

Mr. Porpiglia: That dollar amount is accounted for. They won't have to do any transfers or anything. It's built in because of changes.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other questions?

*Unanimously Carried*

Other

Proposed Resolution – Confirm Appointment – Portland-Pomfret-Dunkirk Sewer Districts Board of Directors

Chairman Hemmer: Any discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – NCLSD

Mr. Carlson: Can't believe we went over budget.

Chairman Hemmer: But you were able to find a patch for it.

Mr. Carlson: Yes, we found enough in the budget to cover our costs. A lot of this stuff, maybe the budget was too tight, didn't leave us any wiggle room and the biggest thing was contractual sanitary sewers. Last year we replaced a couple large control panels. They were a capital expense and budgeted. They are about \$9,000 apiece. But, with replacing a lot of other ancillary equipment and materials that went in to doing that which I think kind of threw us over.

Chairman Hemmer: Hard to imagine everything. The money that replaces this came through depreciable equipment?

Mr. Carlson: Yes, what we didn't spend on pumps. We normally do budget for that.

Legislator Nazzaro: Did it have any affect then like this year? You didn't do the pumps. I'm assuming that you have to replace the pumps.

Mr. Carlson: Not so much and we will and I believe that we have some in this year's budget for that too. There is a lot of bits and pieces to sewer districts.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other questions on this resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – S&CCLSD

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution is a similar situation to the other ones that we presented that there is an overage in personnel services related to contractual issue but the South & Center Sewer District was able to cover that with a savings in its contractual costs.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions on this resolution?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – PPDS

Mr. Carlson: Again, we have for the last four or five years been doing some pump station rehabilitation. That district was formed in 1984. We were able to do three stations already and working on a fourth more in-house rather than trying to go outside with engineering and contractors. With that, we ended up expending a little bit more than what we wanted to but none the less we were able to find it within our budget to cover that. That would have been under contractual 8120.8124. Under contractual sewage treatment, that district pays the Village of Fredonia to treat the wastewater that is generated within that district. That is based on a percentage of what it would cost. As our flow increases or our percentage increases towards theirs, we pay a higher costs. And with ConAgra going out, their percentage of flow went down which means our cost went up. And they really hit that hard. I'm surprised it's only \$7,500 over. So we made some big budget changes this year and hopefully we'll be able to cover that. But it added about 50% or \$50,000 to the cost of treatment to that district. They are looking at rate increases probably. Hopefully will have something in place by the end of the year, end of summer so that Board will address that issue.

Legislator Nazzaro: Other depreciable items again, pumps?

Mr. Carlson: Yes. Well, actually – we tried to do this in-house rather than trying to get engineering but we do have money that we have budgeted for this year to finish that project that we didn't finish last year. Sometimes things just don't seem to happen as quickly as we would like them to.

Chairman Hemmer: And you've got more in the 2017 budget to cover the increase that you anticipate in the –

Mr. Carlson: Yes and the Board, they will have to do something about the rates. We had a meeting Tuesday of last week and we told them.

Chairman Hemmer: You're really not putting out anymore, it's just the ratio.

Mr. Carlson: Right, exactly.

Mr. Cummings: The cost to Fredonia has gone up.

Mr. Carlson: It will also pay part of their capital costs so they put in a new centrifuge which basically thickens sludge and that was what, a million dollars?

Mr. Cummings: A lot of money.

Mr. Carlson: So we have to pay part of the capital costs.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other questions?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – Parks & Forestry

Mrs. Dennison: It's a similar situation to what you have been hearing this afternoon but there is an increase in the personnel services cost due to contractual changes but there is an offsetting savings in the employee benefits in the health savings categories. There is a couple of other minor changes that we could have done by Executive transfer because they are less than \$4,000 but we elected to include them in the Public Facilities Parks group, elected to include them here just because they were doing a resolution anyway.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – Blds. & Grds.

Mrs. Dennison: Buildings and Grounds experienced an over budget situation for the Hall Clothier Building and for the Jail. The Hall Clothier overage is due to additional water and sewer costs as well as other contractor costs and the Jail overage is due to the cost of other contractors. I spoke with Drew Rodgers in Buildings and Grounds and he said that there was a leak in the cooling system that affected Hall Clothier, the Court House, GOB, and the Jail. He said also a booster pump failure in the Hall Clothier so those were repaired which caused the other contractor costs. He said as far as the water and sewage expenditures, there was a leak in the cooking towers and he worked with the Village of Mayville on water and sewer rates for the cooling tower operation. They have also worked with another (*inaudible*) to reduce the water usage needed for the cooling tower and he said that their work with the Village has helped so he doesn't anticipate that that will continue in 2017. He feels that Buildings and Grounds has fixed the problems with the cooking systems and they won't be repeated in 2017. Those overages they were able to cover with an under budget situation for their employee benefits in the health insurance and retirement categories.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – Landfill Enviro.

Mrs. Dennison: In the landfill environment agency, when the 2016 budget was prepared there were individuals that were budgeted in the landfill and they actually were working in the

recycling function. So, there were a lot of payroll expenses that were allocated from the landfill into recycling and the budgets were not moved in 2016. So we had people working in recycling that did not have a corresponding budget.

Ms. Crow: They were budgeted for its just where they were at. In 2016 the landfill wanted to begin to allocate people in the area where they are actually doing work. Previously they kind of consolidated most employee wages into one account and now they have distributed to the area where they are actually performing work. I believe that that is reflected in the 2017 budget. They have allocated them out to the GL account where they are going to be doing the work. So, they are trying to more accurately show the real cost of each area of their budget.

Chairman Hemmer: I'm really happy that employee benefits made up the difference there.

Legislator Nazzaro: All in all when we're all said and done, do you know, because we keep decreasing employee benefits, mostly due to the health insurance and pension?

Ms. Crow: Not so much the retirement, mostly the health insurance.

Legislator Nazzaro: So at the end of the day, Countywide, what is that number that we're actually decreasing benefits by?

Ms. Crow: We're only decreasing where we needed to use it. We're not decreasing it by the whole amount. That will be the net adjustment with everything else that goes to fund balance at the end of the year.

Legislator Nazzaro: Right, I was just wondering –

Ms. Crow: I will be able to give that to you once we're –

Legislator Nazzaro: I know I'm premature. It's got to be a big number.

Ms. Crow: Oh yes. We anticipated that it would be.

Legislator Nazzaro: And that was because of the contractual increases over –

Ms. Crow: Well, two things. One is the settled contract included an increase in the percentage of the employee share but additionally and probably more significant than that was the actual rates of health insurance budgeted, it seems like so long ago but, roughly I think it was, we budgeted for maybe 5% and it was almost zero percent increase or it was like a 2% increase so we had a couple of percentage points where we had budgeted for health insurance rates to increase. Because at the time that we do the budget we don't have the final health insurance rates. We usually have a pretty close estimate but it was much better than what we had estimated the actual rate.

Legislator Scudder: What I find interesting and this isn't a criticism, just an observation and I should be quiet but sometimes we make our decisions and we move forward thinking about savings and realizing what you are projecting in all of that. So, it's interesting that we, how we use the word absorb the savings up into these amended budget numbers.

Ms. Crow: We could do little changes here and there and not use the point eight expenses. When we're doing all of these adjustments, we're going to find the account that has the biggest pot of money that is going to offset all five up here. Not do a little bit from here, a little bit from here, and a little bit from here.

Legislator Scudder: Oh no, I 'm just thinking out loud and like I said, I shouldn't.

Ms. Crow: I will be able to give you a final savings of health insurance across the budget when we're closer to finalizing the numbers.

Legislator Scudder: Without these numbers, it will be a net less these numbers.

Legislator Nazzaro: No, the grand total (*cross talk*). They are using what they need to make this balance and following the guidelines – we're doing these as we –

Legislator Scudder: I'm not being critical.

Legislator Nazzaro: No, but I guess the comment and I'm not – we have several increases in many areas. We're fortunate, I guess, that the health insurance costs, the increase came in significantly less. We thought that we might have 5% and we came in almost zero or 2% and then we had some increases in employee contributions but, I guess the point and this may be discussed in Audit & Control, you are not going to hit every one of these right on the dime but also if we didn't have this then where would we be finding the difference. It would either be fund balance or some other account but also this gets into categorizing when you talk to Audit & Control about when one area is under budget, one expense is significantly under it doesn't justify increasing another area category. You are looking at account classifications?

Ms. Crow: Well, let's just say the health insurance came in exactly at budget. The other increases that we saw, wages you can't include in this category because we knew that we were adopting a contract and that there were going to be wage increases so anything else, yes, if the budget was that tight taking wages and benefits out of it, for everything else if something the cooling towers leaking and we have to do a repair, we might have had to make up that difference out of fund balance. But, we've had a surplus elsewhere in the budget so we're using that to offset it in these budget adjustments. We still have to pay for the repair of the cooling tower. So, the most efficient way is to take care where we see the big balance so that we can minimize the number of adjustments on the resolution.

Legislator Scudder: I get that. Like I said, I probably should have not said –

Ms. Crow: I don't want you to come away thinking that we can't validate that we saved money or show that what we projected out were the offsets when we ratified the contract didn't come to fruition. I think that is what you are getting at.

Legislator Scudder: Yes, good answer.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other discussion?

Ms. Crow: I will just say one other thing. I mean, these are the only accounts that needed adjustments for those purposes. All the other accounts that we don't need to adjust for wages that went over were able to manage within their existing budget and then some of the smaller departments sometimes don't have – they are small departments so they're budget for their wages is a little bit more tight because they don't have the turnover, it's what it is so if there is an increase in a wage rate, it's going to be more evident.

Legislator Nazzaro: I am sure we're going to have a discussion in Audit & Control because we have a whole lot coming through there. This is just a tip of the iceberg.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2016 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – Water Fund(EW)

Ms. Crow: This is the water – actually there is a sewer component too in the industrial park in the north County and they have some minor adjustments that were offset by savings in the debt service line. The debt service payments are actually paid against the liability on the balance sheet so we had no expense in there. I'm just thinking you might think how would we come in under budget in debt service but that is why. We had an expense that should not have been budgeted for in the water fund but we did take that out in the 2017 budget so the debt service is not re-budgeted. But, they just had some additional contractual costs.

Chairman Hemmer: Any discussion?

*Unanimously Carried*

Chairman Hemmer: Is there anything else to come before the Committee? Seeing no one, entertain a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Nazzaro: I'll move to adjourn.

Legislator Wilfong: Second. *Unanimously Carried (4:55 p.m.)*

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