

Minutes

Public Facilities Committee

April 15, 2019, 4:00 pm

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, N.Y.

Members Present: Wilfong, Gould, Scudder, Nazzaro

Members Absent: Hemmer

Others: Tampio, Ames, Dennison, Bentley

Vice Chairman Wilfong called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (03/18/19)

MOVED by Legislator Gould, SECONDED by Legislator Scudder to approve the minutes.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time.

Proposed Resolution – Confirm Re-Appointment – Portland-Pomfret-Dunkirk Sewer District Board

Vice Chairman Wilfong: I know both of these individuals, they are great people. Any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Supplemental Agreement No. 3 with NYSDOT for PIN 5758.45

Mr. Bentley: This is for our Prendergast bridge. This is the one that we just recently got our Bridge New York, a \$1.5 million funding on. We had it designed back in 2007 and because we submitted this under the Bridge New York, it took a couple more years so we have some escalation costs and the design and also as you wait, you get more environmental requirements and filings and paper work and stuff. So, this is to actually get grant funding from New York. New York wants a resolution to get the reimbursement so this increase is also 80/20. Eighty percent Federal, 20% local by which, as long as there is Marchiselli, we also get 15% from New

York State, 5% of that is ours. If going through would be 5% of this but since we don't apply for that until afterwards, we show the 20% on there. You can see the \$15,000, that's our 20% of the incremental \$75,000 of the cost of the bridge. Due to the Bridge New York, kind of putting in that program and the delay resulting from that.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Did we decide where this bridge was at?

Mr. Bentley: It's at Prendergast bridge. Between Sherman and Stedman.

Legislator Gould: When was the last time that was done? How long ago?

Mr. Bentley: I went down and looked at it and it's in pretty bad shape. I wouldn't be leaning on the railing if I was anybody.

Legislator Gould: I never take that road.

Mr. Bentley: We have it actually posted in the winter for weight limits right now. It is in desperate need. Our plan is to get this thing moving next year.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any other questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Agreement with NYSDOT For Performance of Federal-Aid Project PIN 5762.26, Dale Drive Shoulder Expansion

Mr. Bentley: This one is in Cassadaga, so this is actually the start of the construction. We finished the design so we're looking at \$735,000 for the construction/construction inspection. So this would be the result of increases and decreases in the appropriation accounts. No real issues here. We're just moving this project along. Good project. It's going to improve the walkability and the ride ability for those fortune tellers in Lily Dale.

Legislator Scudder: I did talk to Brad about this before but there was concern about the infrastructure in that, underneath the road and the responsibility of it. Do we just move ahead and go over old and existing infrastructure and whose responsibility is that infrastructure and have they been notified of their infrastructure underneath this new construction?

Mr. Bentley: So we can get it on the record, yes, we've notified the Village of Cassadaga. We've reached out to them multiple times. There was a concern by a former Village Board member that there was aging water line infrastructure that needed to be replaced on Dale Drive. We've reached out to them on multiple occasions and in writing. Got written responses back from the Village saying, there is no plans to do anything with the infrastructure, and there is no concerns other than they just have a infrastructure that is but, so it fails, it fails but, there is no current plans actually. Once we lay it down, tear it up. We continue to reach out to them. We've done it, I would say, at least three or four times now because the question keeps resurfacing from that Board member.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know that we approved this project previously, we had talked about this at length but, I just want to understand. Did we plan on the increase in the use of fund balance by \$121,000?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: You would have been disappointed if I hadn't asked, right?

Mrs. Dennison: I was waiting back there.

Legislator Nazzaro: I just want to make sure this was the amount that we had planned on?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, it is the amount that was planned. Because when the original project was proposed, it was proposed as a \$735,000 project with a local share of \$147,000. The only thing that was put into the budget so far was the design phase. So this is the whole project. But the other thing that is going on here is originally this project was part of the H fund, the capital fund, and we're moving it into a newly created department in the D fund because it is a funded road. So we're taking all of the budgets out of the H fund and proposing to move them all into the D fund. One thing that I should have commented on when I saw the order of the resolution is that, this resolution is actually dependent on the next resolution, number four, because this resolution uses a new department that it was proposing to establish in resolution number four. So I should have suggested that we do them in reverse order. The short answer to your question is yes, \$147,000 was the originally expected local share, 20% of the entire project. As I say, there are a lot of ins and outs here but most of it is because of taking everything out of the H fund and dumping it over into the D fund and increasing the budget to accommodate all phases of the project. Not just the design.

Legislator Nazzaro: So the \$26,000, is that for the design phase?

Mrs. Dennison: The \$26,000 was the local share of the design phase.

Mr. Bentley: Just to lob onto what Kathleen is saying, what we are trying to do currently with these new funds is actually have more transparency about a project so I can go in and say, how much have we spent on this project? We can tell what the costs are and where the funding is coming from. So, it's not just in a ball of wax and trying to peel it out piece by piece. By creating these new accounts, we'll be able to more closely track this.

Mrs. Dennison: Right and as Brad said, the main motivation is so that the funded projects and the local share projects are not comingled so that we cannot overspend if you will, on one or the other because they will be in separate departments, separate budgets, so that is the other motivation for the changes.

Mr. Bentley: Trying to track this stuff a little bit better.

Legislator Nazzaro: More accountability.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: That's a good thing.

Mr. Bentley: It sounds like we're doing a lot of stuff but it's actually for real good reasons. We got into a lot of discussions, as you can tell.

Mrs. Dennison: I just did a little cheat sheet for myself taking this resolution and the prior resolution to a 3.17. When you add them both together, the end result is that the use of the capital reserve is \$147,000, the appropriation budget for the project in its entirety is \$735,000 and the Federal funding is \$588,000.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any more questions?

Mr. Bentley: Do you want to go to number four first before you approve this one?

Mrs. Dennison: Strictly speaking, we should do four first.

Legislator Nazzaro: It's establishing accounts.

Mr. Bentley: We really can't approve this since you haven't established the –

Mrs. Dennison: This department D512.393, has not been established and this resolution does not establish it but the next one does.

Legislator Nazzaro: An auditor could come back and say, you did not (*cross talk*)

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any more questions? We are talking about proposed resolution number four.

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2019 Budget Appropriations and Revenues – Capital Improvements, Funded Bridges & Road (D Fund)

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any questions?

Legislator Gould: Do we need a motion to take number four out of order?

Clerk Tampio: The Chairman can decide and if it's o.k. with the committee.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: I'm good, we can go out of order. I'm good with that. All in favor of proposed resolution number four.

Mrs. Dennison: There are a lot of things going on with resolution number four that we haven't talked about so I think that we need to discuss it before you vote.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Perfect.

Legislator Gould: I thought I heard this a month ago.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, we did the same thing a month ago yes. They were out of order last month too when we were - last month we did bridges, now we're doing roads.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: O.k., who's here to speak to that?

Mrs. Dennison: Brad already gave the introduction to this one that last month, as Mr. Gould pointed out, we proposed to you to reorder, if you will, the budget for funded bridges and establish a new department for funded bridges so we can more closely track the different funding sources and not comingle funded in local share bridges. So this resolution essentially does the same thing for roads. What I did last month is walk through the WHEREAS clauses and then kind of tell you on the bottom side where the accounting changes match up with that. So the first two WHEREAS clauses are just what we described is that we have a new sub department for funded bridges and so we're proposing to create a similar sub department for capital improvements to roads that are funded. At least in part by specific awards. So, the first two WHEREAS clauses are enacted in the first RESOLVED clause which establishes new revenue accounts and a new appropriation/classification for funded roads. And that new department number, sub department actually is D5112.393. Those are all brand new items. Then if we go back to the third WHEREAS clause, that refers to the CHIPS funding. That CHIPS funding in the past has been budgeted as a lump sum and we are proposing that it be split into funding for roads and bridges because we know that some of the funding is used on roads and some of the funding is used on bridges. So that is the second thing that we're trying to accomplish. The third thing is that, we have a lot of projects that are in process at the end of 2018 that have revenue and appropriation budgets for them and they are not complete so we want to roll those remaining budgets forward into 2019. When we move through the second and third RESOLVED clauses with all those changes, those changes are to, first, roll forward the remaining budgets. That is the second and third RESOLVED clauses, do that and then the third RESOLVED clause also does the roll forward, also splits the CHIPS funding into roads and bridges. So it takes it out of the generic category and puts it into specific road and bridge sub departments.

Legislator Nazzaro: So maybe you said it and I was trying to listen very carefully, I understand why we're doing this and it's a good thing to do but why are we increasing the use of fund balance?

Mrs. Dennison: I should have addressed it already but that is a key question. The reason we're proposing an increase use of fund balance is that, these road projects that are - I want to make sure I say this correctly. The rolling forward of these projects, when the projects were originally established, or when the funding was awarded, there is a local share component for those projects. The expectation is that the local share that was in the budget previously would be used for these projects. We have the Federal or may be State funding but we still have the local share component. If those projects had been completed, we would have tapped into fund balance to complete them. So, in order to complete them in 19', we still need to tap into that fund balance to complete them.

Mr. Bentley: Can I add to that?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Mr. Bentley: So basically project X had a local share and it would have used fund balance. We didn't get it done in the timeframe that - when we closed the books. So we have to roll it forward. In doing so, we didn't roll forward that fund balance use. So this is documenting that. It has to come from there because I don't have anywhere else to bring it from.

Legislator Nazzaro: Wouldn't there be an offset somewhere else though? I mean, what you are saying is because of the project wasn't completed, you are creating this new D fund. So wouldn't it be a decrease to the use of fund balance somewhere or am I not following quite perfectly?

Mrs. Dennison: When the project was not completed, we would not have used the fund balance so the money at the end of the year would have gone into fund balance and now we're taking it out.

Legislator Nazzaro: Is that a 2018 legislation then?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Mr. Bentley: It's much like a journal entry if you will.

Legislator Nazzaro: It sounds like a timing issue. I just want to understand so because you are moving this and the project wasn't completed, you have to - I understand why you are increasing the use, so I just want to understand the D, why we don't have an account or decrease in fund balance and you are saying because it would have been accounted for in the 2018 overall reconciliation?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. For what was actually spent in 18' and say the project is funded, it's awarded in 2018, and we're planning to spend \$20,000 of local share money on that project. We didn't finish it in 18' so we didn't spend \$20,000. That \$20,000 essentially, it's allocated in the budget for that, it goes back into fund balance because it wasn't used.

Legislator Nazzaro: So it really was never taken out of fund balance.

Legislator Scudder: We're taking out what we didn't use.

Mrs. Dennison: We are taking out what we didn't use in the past yes, but we earmarked -

Legislator Scudder: *(Cross talk)*

Mrs. Dennison: We're taking out now what we didn't take out -

Mr. Bentley: If I didn't have a year-end close, it wouldn't be a big deal.

Legislator Scudder: Right, if you could just have let it roll, we wouldn't be talking about it.

Mr. Bentley: Yes and that is what we're trying to do going forward is, roll things forward so that we don't have this issue again. But we discovered this issue, we've taken steps to make sure we don't have to do these kinds of things again because her and I have gone through too many phone calls. But the essential answer is, the money was supposed to be taken out of fund balance because of the year-end close it never happened, so this is proposing to take it out of where it should have been taken out of.

Legislator Nazzaro: So, really never then did, the adjustment never really happened in 2018 to what you just said, however, it was actually never used.

Mr. Bentley: Right.

Legislator Nazzaro: So at the end of the day, it's a timing issue?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any more questions on resolution number four?

Unanimously Carried

Vice Chairman Wilfong: O.k., now back to resolution number 3 (*Authorize Agreement with NYSDOT For Performance of Federal- Aid Project PIN 5762.26, Dale Drive Shoulder Expansion*), any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Abolish Petty Cash Funds That are No Longer Needed

Mr. Bentley: We have credit cards now. Nobody needs petty cash.

Legislator Nazzaro: And this is interesting to the point because you know we've hired Freed Maxick to do some internal audits and we're looking at petty cash funds across the entire County and replacing them with debit/credit cards. There is much better control, less cash that you have to monitor better as everything is done through debit and credit.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Great idea.

Mr. Bentley: Actually, I asked when was the last time that we used petty cash up at the airports and parks and it's been years. It doesn't get used so there is no point in having it around.

Mrs. Dennison: We wish this list was longer.

Legislator Gould: There is some that should be on there that aren't on there. I will say it for you.

Mrs. Dennison: I was just going to say, I'm not sure if this is the proper venue to say this but we approached some other departments to abolish their petty cash accounts and –

Legislator Gould: They wouldn't do it.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Legislator Scudder: And whom might - never mind.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: I think it's a fair question, who was it?

Mrs. Dennison: The ones that decline to abolish are not on here.

Legislator Nazzaro: When you say decline to abolish are you referring under Public Facilities or –

Mrs. Dennison: No, I don't think there are any in your department.

Legislator Nazzaro: So many now for Audit & Control, you can provide us with that.

Mrs. Dennison: I can definitely have a list for Audit & Control.

Legislator Nazzaro: Because this is part of our (*cross talk*) process as we're looking at potential risks. Even though the dollar amounts may not be huge, there is a risk.

Legislator Scudder: I can't wait to read those minutes.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any other questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2019 Budget Appropriations – Vehicle Purchase Allocations

Mrs. Dennison: This resolution includes changes that were proposed by 1st Deputy Director of Finance, Todd Button. He's the one that manages all of the capital assets and in doing some reconciliations at the end of 2018, he found that some of the vehicle purchase allocations that we will be charging in 2019, needed some adjustments. Some of the vehicles purchased were less than expected so the allocation going forward will be less. There was at least one vehicle that was purchased that was more than expected so the allocation is higher and then in the Sheriff's organization, there were just some figures that were used to calculate the allocation and to be honest, they just weren't correct. So Todd adjusted all of those to accurately reflect which vehicles have been purchased over a time period that will affect 2019 allocation.

Legislator Nazzaro: I guess the reason I was looking the way I was is, these are balancing out exactly so my question is, you said that some departments the vehicles, according to the resolution, some were more or less than anticipated of the vehicle allocation price so, shouldn't there be an adjustment in here somehow? I mean, how does this balance out exactly?

Mrs. Dennison: It actually was out of balance by about, I think, \$203, so instead of making an adjustment to fund balance we stuck it into the Sheriff's category. So you are right, it should balance exactly or should not balance exactly and it didn't but it was very close.

Legislator Nazzaro: We'll consider the \$203 immaterial.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any more questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2019 Budget Appropriations – Depreciation Expenses for Enterprise Funds

Mrs. Dennison: This is similar to the previous resolution. Comes out of work that we did to reconcile 2018, the results. The 2019 budget for depreciation is based on assets that are in service at the end of 2017. So obviously that is a long time ago. So Todd, when he was analyzing and calculating the value of assets that are now in service at the end of 2018, it affects depreciation that we're going to charge in 2019. So we're proposing to increase the depreciation charges for a various enterprise funds. For example, some of the things that have changed, one of the largest item is in the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District. Their phosphorus capital project was completed at the end of 2018. There was a resolution last month to adjust their 2018 depreciation charges but that is a pretty big project that the asset was not in service at the end of 17' and now in service, so there will be a full year depreciation in 2019. So, this will, as I said, increase depreciation charges based on assets that are – an update list of assets in service and it will be funded by the enterprises, by the fund balances of each of the individual enterprises funds.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Any more questions?

Unanimously Carried

Other

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Anything under other?

Mr. Bentley: I just thought I would bring you some information since you are Public Facilities. This is our road project schedule for this year. Green is surface treating which means Band-Aid's galore. Not what I would like to do but it's because I don't have enough money to fix them all. The non-green ones is what I can work on doing paving, mill, and overlay, nova-

chip. Just as far as mileage, I have 550 miles of County roads. The non-green colors represent 15.52 miles of work. The green is about 80 miles of surface treating. Service treating could just mean, doing a strip and taking out the crack and trying to reseal it. It could be some crack seal but (*inaudible*) only a Band-Aid on a nice big wound. It may last a year until you plow over it next year. That is how much work gets done this year. I'll say that we added some roads down in Celoron recently because if you go by the streets that go into the Harbor Hotel, they have really blown out recently. I took a drive down there and almost lost a tire going in it. There is some really bad stretches. Sinclairville, as you are getting off 60 and going into Sinclairville, that road has taken a toll and also from the Post Office heading north, that's blown out pretty bad. Cliffstar Drive in Fredonia, we're going to do that church section where the trucks have really beaten that up. We have a homeowner that is complained significantly about the quality of the road there so we're going to take care of that.

Legislator Scudder: What did you say, 550 miles?

Mr. Bentley: Yes, 550 miles of County roads, approximately. It's a little bit more but we try and stretch our dollars as far as we can get them but we only have so much.

Legislator Nazzaro: So it's the total cost of all of this? Local share.

Mr. Bentley: Between the CHIPS and – Kathleen, do you know how much I have for my roads?

Legislator Nazzaro: Because we gave you more, did we not?

Mr. Bentley: Not for roads.

Legislator Nazzaro: I know for equipment.

Mr. Bentley: For equipment, not for roads.

Mrs. Dennison: The local share for roads and bridges combined is \$1.6 million. That's including the CHIPS revenue and then the local share component. So \$1.6 between the two and I think the roads was about \$4.5 million and the bridges was about \$1.5.

Legislator Scudder: Total meaning –

Mrs. Dennison: Total appropriations and then there was CHIPS revenue to offset those. But yeah, the net local share for roads and bridges, \$1.6 million. Last year, for 2018 budget, the local share for roads and bridges was \$800,000.

Legislator Nazzaro: So we did give you more. I was just saying, I know that it's never enough, I understand that.

Mr. Bentley: It gives me 15 miles of doing the right thing. To give you a preview of the capital vehicles. I think I'm around \$4 million we need next year. So that two and a half million

dollars was a nice start. We're just behind. We've been sitting at \$600-\$800,000 a year for prior years and that just exacerbating the problem. Now all we're doing is, we're just staying on a schedule that were currently on, on the vehicle replacements, what's needed. We're not trying to do anything more than just go to what we've said how we're going to replace vehicles in order to minimize maintenance costs and the like. That's a preview of life at the DPF.

Vice Chairman Wilfong: Anything else?

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

Unanimously Carried (4:37 p.m.)

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