

## WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

**COMMITTEE:** BUDGET- *Public Safety*

**DATE:** August 24, 2009

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

SUPERVISORS GERAGHTY  
BELDEN  
O'CONNOR  
CHAMPAGNE  
KENNY  
SHEEHAN  
MERLINO  
TAYLOR

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

FREDERICK H. MONROE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD  
HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
JOANN MCKINSTRY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
REPRESENTING FIRE PREVENTION & BUILDING CODE ENFORCEMENT:  
KAREN PUTNEY, ADMINISTRATOR  
REPRESENTING SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT:  
BUD YORK, SHERIFF  
SHANE ROSS, CHIEF DEPUTY  
MICHAEL GATES, CAPTAIN, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
REPRESENTING OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES:  
BRIAN LAFLURE, DIRECTOR/FIRE COORDINATOR  
AMY MANNEY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR  
SUPERVISORS BENTLEY  
THOMAS  
STRAINER  
VANNESS  
RICHARD MURPHY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FISCAL SERVICES  
SARAH MCLENITHAN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:**

SUPERVISOR STEC

---

In the absence of Committee Chairman Geraghty, Supervisor Belden, as Vice-Chair, called the meeting of the Budget Committee to order at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Belden informed the Committee that the meeting would commence with a review of the 2010 Fire Prevention and Building Code Enforcement Budget.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Karen Putney, Administrator, Fire Prevention and Building Code Enforcement, to present the Building & Fire Code 2010 Budget Request, (Code A.3620), a copy of which is on file with the minutes.

Ms. Putney advised that thus far there had been a 22% decrease in revenues in comparison with what had been budgeted in the prior year; therefore, she said, there was a \$500 increase in her budget. She explained that she had doubled the amount of revenue received by June 30, 2009 to calculate the estimated revenue received in 2010. She apprised that she could increase the amount of estimated revenues from \$100,100 to \$106,000 to reflect a decrease in the 2010 Budget from the prior year.

Ms. Putney apprised that she had increased the amount budgeted for Supplies, Code. A.3620 410, from \$1,800 to \$3,800, due to the State no longer providing the Code books at no cost to the County. She stated that she had removed funding for the Uniforms and Clothing, Code A.3620 453, for the 2010 Budget as well as decreased the budgeted amount for Automotive-Gas & Oil, Code A.3620 442, due to the reduction in employees and vehicles in the Department.

Mr. Champagne suggested increasing the estimated revenue from \$100,100 to \$106,000 to reflect a decrease in the Budget from the prior year. Mr. VanNess recommended increasing the estimated revenues to \$104,000, as he felt it would be more reflective of what the actual revenues received would be in 2010 and Mr. Kenny concurred.

Motion was made by Mr. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to increase the 2010

---

Building and Fire Code estimated revenues from \$100,100 to \$104,000.

Mr. Bentley asked if the revenue received after July 31, 2009 had increased in comparison to the first half of the year and Ms. Putney replied affirmatively. She stated she was unsure of whether the increase would continue through the remainder of the year.

Mr. Champagne questioned what the reduction in revenue was in July of 2009 in comparison to July of 2008 and Ms. Putney replied she was unsure. She explained that revenues at the end of June had decreased 15% from the prior year and there was a 17% reduction at the end of August. Mr. Champagne queried whether the fees could be increased and Ms. Putney responded that they had been increased in November of 2008. Mr. Kenny asked how the fees were in comparison to other municipalities and Ms. Putney replied that they were similar to the fees charged by the Towns of Queensbury and South Glens Falls.

Motion was made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. O'Connor and carried unanimously to forward the amended 2010 Building & Fire Code Budget to the Budget Officer for further review.

Mr. Belden commended Ms. Putney for decreasing her expenses and noted that the 2010 Building and Fire Code Budget had decreased 3% from the prior year.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Brian LaFlure, Director of the Office of Emergency Services (OES)/Fire Coordinator, who distributed copies of the 2010 OES Budget request, a copy of which is on file with the minutes.

Mr. LaFlure apprised that the 2010 Fire Prevention and Control Budget (Code A.3410) appropriations request was \$133,896, as compared to the 2009 appropriation of \$75,480, an increase of \$58,416. Mr. LaFlure suggested the increase in the .2's and .4's included the purchase of a new fleet vehicle which could be used by his Department in responding to emergency situations, as well as for any necessary Departmental travel, rather than using his personal vehicle and seeking mileage reimbursement. He mentioned that the EMS training aids were necessary to continue the training for EMS responders.

Mr. Taylor asked why there was a substantial reduction in revenue and Mr. LaFlure replied that it was difficult to estimate revenues because the Department was primarily supported by grant funding which fluctuated based on the amount awarded, as well as when the funding was received which was sometimes unpredictable. Amy Manney, Deputy Director of the OES, pointed out that she had not included a dollar amount for the Homeland Security, (Code A.3645 3306) and Homeland Security-Homeland Security Grants, (Code A.3645 3380) as she was unsure what dollar amount would be awarded; however, she said, she would amend the 2010 County budget when the funds were awarded.

Mr. Champagne queried whether the total taxpayer contribution for the operation of the OES was available and Mr. LaFlure replied in the negative. Mr. Champagne apprised that it was necessary to know whether the OES budget request had increased, decreased or remained the same as the prior year. Mr. LaFlure reiterated that it would be difficult to provide the correct amount of taxpayer contribution, as he was unsure of how much grant funding would be awarded in 2010. Mr. Belden suggested reviewing each portion of the entire OES Budget separately and the Committee concurred.

Commencing with the Traffic Safety Board, (Code A.3311) portion of the Budget, Mr. Belden apprised that the 2010 Budget request was \$2,000, as compared to the 2009 appropriation of \$1,700, an increase of \$300. Mrs. Manney explained that the increase was in Advertising Fees, (Code A.3311 436), for a billboard that encouraged safe driving and to not drink and drive.

Mr. Kenny commented that he did not think \$300 was a sufficient amount of money to lease a billboard. Mrs. Manney advised that a portion of the funds for the billboard would come from the Traffic Safety Budget and the remainder would be disbursed from the Stop DWI Program Budget. Mr. Kenny queried what the cost of the billboard was and Mrs. Manney replied that it was \$800 for a three month lease.

Mr. Kenny questioned why Supplies, (Code A.3311 410) had increased \$200 from the prior year and Mrs. Manney responded that funds had been transferred from Membership & Dues, (Code A.3311 427) to Supplies, (Code A.3311 410) to accurately outline how the funds were used. Mr. LaFlure apprised that it had been necessary to make changes to the way the Budget was prepared in prior years to present an accurate scenario of how funds were utilized.

Mr. Champagne advised that he would be inclined to vote in opposition unless the Traffic Safety Board Budget remained the same as the prior year. Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative and Fiscal Services, apprised that it was necessary to compare the 2010 budget requests to the adopted 2009 Budget, not the 2009 amended Budget which reflected an increase in Supplies, (Code A.3311 410) of \$950.

Mr. Bentley stated that he did not think that \$500 was a sufficient amount for supplies, and he noted that the actual amount expended in 2008 for supplies was \$1,629.81. Mr. Kenny asked what types of supplies were purchased and Mrs. Manney replied that office supplies were purchased, as well as supplies for the new driver bag. Mrs. Manney explained that there was an existing agreement between the District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff's Department, the County Clerk's Office and the OES that each Department would purchase a certain amount of supplies for the new driver bags.

Mr. Champagne reiterated that it was necessary to know whether the OES budget request had increased, decreased or remained the same as the prior year in order to make a determination as to whether to approve the OES Budget. Mr. Belden interjected that it was necessary to review each portion of the OES Budget separately. Mr. VanNess suggested eliminating the \$300 request for Advertising Fees so the Traffic Safety Board portion of the Budget would remain the same as the prior year.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously to eliminate the \$300 request for Advertising Fees, (Code A.3311 436) from the 2010 Traffic Safety Board Budget request and forward the amended Budget on to the Budget officer for further review.

With regards to the Stop DWI Program, (Code A.3315) portion of the Budget, Mrs. Manney explained that although the revenue may exceed expenditures it was necessary to budget the same amount for them. Mr. Champagne stated that he felt the OES Budget was difficult to follow. Mr. VanNess advised that because the primary source of funding for the OES was grants, it was difficult to calculate the taxpayers contribution, as the amounts awarded fluctuated.

Mr. Geraghty entered the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Payne referred the Committee to page 22 of 22 of the Budget Worksheet Report which displayed a \$58,602.31 increase for the OES Department from the prior year. Mr. VanNess queried whether the \$180,070 in estimated revenue was an accurate amount or if more grant funding was anticipated and Mr. LaFlure replied that he did anticipate additional grants being awarded; however, he stated, he could not include it in the Budget until the funds were awarded.

Mr. LaFlure reiterated that the \$58,602.31 increase was due to the purchase of a new fleet vehicle for the Department and EMS training supplies. Mr. Champagne apprised that although he understood the need for a new fleet vehicle, he would be inclined to vote in opposition of the OES Budget due to the substantial increase from the prior year.

Mr. Belden questioned if there was an area in the OES Budget where Mr. LaFlure could eliminate the \$58,602.31 and Mr. LaFlure replied affirmatively. Mr. Kenny interjected that he felt that it was necessary each portion of the OES Budget be reviewed separately to avoid confusion.

Returning to the Stop DWI Program, (Code A. 3315) portion of the Budget, Mr. Kenny questioned why there was

a substantial difference in 2008 actual expenditures and revenues and Mrs. Manney replied that when revenue was received through OES but disbursed to different Departments, such as the Youth Bureau or the Probation Department, it was not displayed as revenue for the OES Department.

With regards to the Stop DWI Program, Mr. Belden advised that he was concerned that if the amount of estimated revenue for 2010 was not received, items funded through the program would be underfunded or not be funded at all. Mr. Kenny suggested decreasing the 2010 estimated revenue to the amount budgeted for in the prior year to prevent a shortfall since it was anticipated that revenues for the program would decrease in the coming year.

Mr. LaFlure pointed out that if the Stop DWI Budget was reduced then the funding that other Departments received from the program would have to be reduced. Mr. Bentley apprised that the total amount of revenue could not be calculated until the end of the year as it was received periodically throughout the year. Mr. O'Connor advised that he did not feel revenues would decrease; therefore, he said, he felt the budgeted amount was sufficient.

Chairman Monroe suggested the contracts with the Stop DWI Program could be for a percentage of the amount of revenue received rather than a fixed dollar amount. Mr. O'Connor asserted that it was necessary for the contractors to be aware of the amount of funding they would receive so they could develop their own budgets for the year.

Mr. Taylor suggested removing the \$500 request for Advertising Fees, (Code A.3315 436) from the Budget, as it had been agreed upon the billboard would not be purchased; therefore, he stated, the \$500 was no longer necessary.

Motion was made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. O'Connor and carried unanimously to eliminate the \$500 requested for Advertising Fees and forward the amended Stop DWI Program Budget on to the Budget Officer for further review.

Moving along to the Fire Prevention & Control, (Code A.3410) portion of the Budget, Mr. Kenny questioned the need for a new vehicle when the fleet vehicle previously being leased for the use of the OES Department had been relinquished at his request. Mr. LaFlure apprised that it would be more cost efficient for the County to purchase a fleet vehicle for the OES Department which could be used when responding to emergency situations, as well as for any necessary Departmental travel rather than having the employees use their own personal vehicle and seek mileage reimbursement.

Mr. LaFlure reminded the Committee that the OES Department had been promised an older Sheriff's Patrol car, which to date had not been received. Mr. VanNess interjected that he would request that the Sheriff locate an older Patrol vehicle for the OES Department. Bud York, Sheriff, entered the meeting and advised that he would locate a vehicle for the OES Department.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried unanimously to remove the \$38,500 requested for Highway & Street Equipment, (Code A.3410 240) from the Fire Prevention & Control Budget.

Mr. Belden questioned why there was a request for Rent-Building/Property, (Code A.3410 411) in the amount of \$9,600 and Mr. LaFlure responded that this amount was for the lease of indoor storage space for the hazardous materials (HAZMAT) vehicle and trailer. Mr. VanNess apprised that it was necessary to find an indoor storage space for the HAZMAT vehicle and trailer, as the Glens Falls Fire Department had notified the County they could no longer provide the necessary storage space.

Mr. Champagne asked if any of the purchases could be delayed to prevent an increase in the Budget from the prior year and Mr. LaFlure responded affirmatively. Mr. LaFlure reminded the Committee that over the past two years the OES Department has delayed making any new equipment purchases to decrease the Budget; however, he noted, in the future it would be imperative that new equipment was purchased.

Mr. Belden questioned why there was a \$6,000 request for Medical Fees, (Code A.3410 435) and Mr. LaFlure replied that it was for the HAZMAT Team physicals which were required on an annual basis. Mr. Belden questioned if the City of Glens Falls could pay for all or a portion of the physicals since the HAZMAT Team consisted of the City of Glens Falls firefighters and Mrs. Manney responded in the negative. She pointed out that although the HAZMAT Team consisted of firefighters from the City of Glens Falls, they responded to incidents throughout Warren County.

Mr. Belden queried why the Contract, (Code A.3410 470) had increased and Mr. LaFlure responded that the figure varied, as it pertained to the number of incidents the Fire Investigation Team, which was contracted through the City of Glens Falls, responded to throughout the year.

Mr. Kenny questioned why the Travel/Education/Conference, (Code A.3410 444) was \$4,000 and Mrs. Manney explained that due to the lack of a fleet vehicle the mileage reimbursement for the Department was substantial.

Mr. Payne asked Mrs. Manney if she had received price quotes for the laptop and Mrs. Manney replied affirmatively. Mr. LaFlure apprised that the laptop would be purchased through the Information Technology (IT) Department.

It was the recommendation of Chairman Monroe that the OES resubmit their 2010 Budget request with a zero percent increase as opposed to forwarding the Budget on to the Budget Officer to make the necessary cuts. Mr. Belden questioned whether Mr. LaFlure felt he could amend the 2010 Budget request to achieve a zero percent increase from the 2009 appropriations and Mr. LaFlure replied affirmatively.

Mr. O'Connor queried whether the owner of the prospective indoor storage space for the HAZMAT vehicle and trailer had submitted a quote for the rent and Mr. LaFlure responded affirmatively. Mr. LaFlure apprised they had submitted a counter offer to the individual, as they felt the rental price quote they had received was too high and they were awaiting a reply.

Mr. Belden interjected that it was necessary to address the salary increase within the Civil Defense, (Code A.3640) portion of the Budget, as he did not think with the current budget crisis a salary increase could be approved. Mr. LaFlure interjected that it was not a salary increase; it would merely be allocated from a different budget code.

Mr. Belden pointed out that if the increase was no longer being allocated through the Stop DWI Program portion of the Budget, the expenditure would fall on the taxpayer. Mr. LaFlure countered that because the position received 50% grant funding only half of the burden would fall on the taxpayer.

Mr. Belden questioned why they should continue to pay Mrs. Manney when she was no longer performing Stop DWI tasks. Mr. LaFlure stated that the Traffic Safety Board had approved the hiring of a part-time employee to perform the Stop DWI tasks in order to allow Mrs. Manney the ability to focus on her other tasks. Mr. LaFlure noted that given the fact that Mrs. Manney was the Deputy Director of the OES he did not feel it was fair for her to take a \$5,000 reduction in salary which would cause the salary to be the equivalent of a Senior Account Clerk position.

Mr. Kenny noted that the minutes from the Traffic Safety Board had stated that once the part-time Stop DWI Coordinator was hired, Mrs. Manney would no longer receive the additional \$4,800 which was included in her salary as compensation for performing the Stop DWI duties. Mr. VanNess expressed his concern that as the Chairman of the Public Safety Committee, he had not been informed of the decision that was made during the Traffic Safety Board meeting. He added that he was sure the Public Safety Committee would be opposed to a reduction in salary for Mrs. Manney. Mr. Kenny reiterated that Mrs. Manney would no longer be performing the Stop DWI duties. He added that Mrs. Manney had informed the Traffic Safety Board that she could no longer handle the workload of both positions and she requested the hiring of a part-time Stop DWI Coordinator to take over those duties.

Discussion ensued.

Mrs. Manney clarified that upon the inception of the OES in 2007, in lieu of a raise they had given her the designation of Stop DWI Coordinator which was accompanied by a \$4,000 stipend. She noted that although she was entitled to the OES Deputy Director salary, it was not commensurate with the position, as her base salary was that of a Senior Account Clerk. She added that she was responsible for more work than other Deputy Directors because the Department had a part-time Director.

Mr. Taylor suggested that Mr. LaFlure should revise his 2010 Budget request to reduce it further and reach a zero percent increase and return to the Committee for approval.

Mr. Belden suggested removing the salary increase from the OES 2010 Budget and further reductions to decrease the total Budget to a zero percent increase over the 2009 appropriations.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously to return the OES 2010 Budget request to the Department for further reductions to reach a zero percent increase and resubmit it to the Committee for approval.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Bud York, Sheriff, who distributed copies of the 2010 Sheriff's Budget request, a copy of which is on file with the minutes.

Beginning with the Sheriff's 911 Center, (Code A. 3020) portion of the Budget, Sheriff York advised that the 2010 Budget reflected a request of \$1,304,105, as compared to the 2009 appropriation of \$1,223,219, an increase of \$80,886. He noted that the increase was due to salary increases and the required update to the 911 Communications Center equipment, which he noted he had no control of.

Sheriff York reminded the Committee that the previous administration had signed a five year lease with Verizon in 2004 for all of the components and software, as well as servicing the equipment in the 911 Communications Center, which had been paid with Capital Project funds. He stated that Verizon had informed him that unless the equipment was updated prior to the lease expiration in September of 2009, they would no longer provide support for the equipment. He added that the update would cost over \$300,000 or a contract could be signed to lease the equipment for a cost of \$4,900 a month.

Sheriff York said that he had researched whether another company could provide the necessary support for the equipment at a lesser cost and he had determined that they all required updates to the equipment after five years. He apprised that the updates were necessary to keep the 911 Communications Center running efficiently.

Mr. Belden advised Sheriff York that it was necessary for all budgets presented to reflect a zero percent increase from the 2009 appropriations. Sheriff York suggested reviewing the Sheriff's Law Enforcement, Code A.3110 and the Sheriff's Correction Division, Code A.3150 portions of the Budget prior to making any cuts, as there were decreases in those divisions from the 2009 appropriations.

Sheriff York explained that he did not make changes to the total estimated revenue for the Sheriff's 911 Center, as over the prior three years the amount had remained constant at \$320,000. Mr. Geraghty queried whether Sheriff York had included the new cell phone surcharge which would remain within the County and Sheriff York replied in the negative. He explained that he had not included the figure, as he was unsure of the amount of revenue that would be received from the surcharge.

Mr. Taylor asked why nothing had been budgeted in Forf. Crime Proc. Restricted, (Code A.3110 2626) when in the prior year \$50,000 had been budgeted and Sheriff York responded that he had been informed by the County Treasurer's Office that he was not allowed to include the revenue received in the Budget, as the money could only be used for narcotic enforcement purposes. Mr. Kenny stated that the drug asset forfeiture money should be

accounted for in the 2010 Budget; otherwise they would be funding drug enforcement costs from the General Fund Balance.

Sheriff York agreed that it would be preferable to include these funds in the Budget; however, he said, as per the advisement of the Treasurer's Office there were Federal guidelines associated with the funds which had to be followed that did not allow them to be included in the Budget. The Committee requested that Richard Murphy, Deputy Commissioner of Fiscal Services, be asked to come in to answer questions regarding asset forfeitures.

While waiting for Mr. Murphy to arrive Mr. Payne suggested decreasing the Telephone, (Code A. 3020 423) to a figure more reflective of what would be expended for the year, which was \$75,000. Mr. VanNess asked if the Hyper Reach had been paid for and Shane Ross, Chief Deputy, replied affirmatively.

Motion was made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to decrease estimated appropriations in the 2010 Budget Request for Telephone, (Code A.3020 423) to \$80,000.

Mr. Taylor queried what the Jail Services, (Code A.3150 2264) was and Sheriff York responded that it was revenue received for boarding inmates. Mr. Taylor asked if Sheriff York felt that the \$50,000 increase from the prior year was accurate and Sheriff York replied affirmatively.

Mr. Kenny queried why revenues had decreased substantially and Sheriff York replied that it was partly due to not being authorized to include the asset forfeiture money as a revenue, as well as a reduction in funds received from the State.

Mr. Belden questioned why there was an increase in salaries when there had been a reduction in the number of employees and Sheriff York replied that the increase was due to salary increases. Sheriff York pointed out that the positions that were eliminated had not been deleted from the Budget; therefore, he said, there would be an additional estimated savings of \$200,000.

Mr. Murphy entered the meeting at 11:33 a.m.

Mr. Belden asked Mr. Murphy if the asset forfeiture funds could be included in the Budget and Mr. Murphy replied affirmatively. Mr. Murphy explained that although there was not a guarantee that any funds would be received, an estimated figure could be included in the Budget. Sheriff York asked if the Federal guidelines allowed for the funds to be included and Mr. Murphy replied affirmatively.

Sheriff York suggested budgeting \$50,000 for Forf. Crime Proc Restricted, (Code A. 3110 2626). Mr. VanNess apprised that he felt that \$75,000 was more reflective of the amount of revenue that would be received.

Motion was made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to increase estimated revenues in the 2010 Budget Request for Forf. Crime Proc Restricted, (Code A. 3110 2626) to \$75,000.

Mr. Payne advised that he felt that the 2010 appropriations request for Workmen's Compensation was too high, as the cost for all three divisions within the Sheriff's Department was \$34,100 respectively and the Committee concurred.

Motion was made by Mr. O'Connor, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried unanimously to decrease the request for Workmen's Compensation to \$34,100.

Mr. Belden asked why there was such a substantial decrease in Other Sheriff's State Aid, (Code A.3110 3384) and Sheriff York apprised that he had estimated conservatively due to the reduction in funding from New York State and the uncertainty of when awarded funds would be received.

Mr. Merlino questioned whether the \$211,029 of estimated revenues, (Code A.3110 3384) in the 2009 amended County Budget had been received and Chief Deputy Ross responded that of the \$211,029 budgeted only \$73,000 had been received to date. Chief Deputy Ross explained that when a grant was awarded an amendment to the County Budget was necessary even though the funds had not been received. Mr. Belden queried whether the grant funds had to be expended on specific items and Chief Deputy Ross replied affirmatively.

Mr. Belden asked Mrs. McKinstry how much more of a decrease in the Sheriff's Department Budget was required to achieve the goal of a zero percent increase from the 2009 appropriations and Mrs. McKinstry replied that an additional \$640,000 was necessary to cut from the Budget. Mr. Bentley queried whether the positions eliminated from the Sheriff's Department were removed from the Budget and Sheriff York responded in the negative.

With regards to the County Jail, Sheriff York apprised that Captain Michael Gates was in attendance to explain how the number of inmates to staff ratio in the Warren County Jail compared to surrounding Counties. Captain Gates explained that the three different types of supervision that facilities could use were linear style, remote pod, or a direct supervision in a unit. He stated that the formula used to calculate the facility performance was by dividing the facility personnel budget by the total number of inmate days which was the maximum population multiplied by 365 days.

He apprised that the Inmate cost per day for Warren County was \$60.68, the Washington County cost was \$62.53, the Saratoga County was \$72.11 and the Essex County was \$56.53; however, he noted, there were different types of housing units in each jail. Sheriff York interjected that the New York State Corrections Division performs staffing analyses at each facility to determine the mandated number of Correction Officers for each facility.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Belden asked if the Sheriff included the Marine Patrol Unit in his 2010 Budget request and he replied affirmatively. On an inquiry made by Mr. Belden, Sheriff York apprised that he was unsure of whether Washington and Essex Counties would be providing funds for the Boat Patrol Unit on Lake George. Mr. Kenny stated that although the Marine Patrol Unit had a minimal effect on the Sheriff's Budget, he felt the County should not be fiscally responsible for the patrol of Lake George as it was a State waterway.

Mr. Belden advised that there was a 5.3% increase from the 2010 Sheriff's Budget request compared to the 2009 appropriations. Sheriff York pointed out that he had decreased expenses; however, he said, due to revenues decreasing and increasing salaries he was unable to present a Budget request with a zero percent increase.

Mr. Kenny apprised that although he was sympathetic to the difficulties the Sheriff faced in reducing his Budget, a zero percent Budget increase would be required as it had been of all other Departments. Mr. Geraghty stated that Sheriff York needed to find a way to reduce the Budget which might include employee layoffs if no other means could be found.

Mr. Belden asked how many personnel were employed by the Sheriff's Department and Mr. Payne replied that in 2009 there were 190 employees, which was an increase of 74 employees from 1999. Mr. VanNess asked when the new County Jail was built and Mr. Payne replied that it was built in 2004, which accounted for the substantial increase in personnel.

Chairman Monroe interjected that he felt a Special Board meeting was necessary to discuss the options available to cover the anticipated \$3 million shortfall which included either a tax increase or additional employee layoffs.

Mr. Kenny advised that although he would rather reduce the Sheriff's Budget through decreasing expenses such as uniforms or gasoline, he felt that the only way to reduce the Budget to a zero percent increase would be to reduce the number of Sheriff's Road Patrol. Sheriff York advised that he did not agree with the decision to layoff active employees but would proceed in the direction given by the Committee.

Mr. Champagne suggested delaying a decision on the Sheriff's Budget until the completion of the Budget Committee meetings, as there may be some other Department Budgets that could be decreased enough to compensate for the Sheriff's Budget increase.

Discussion ensued.

Pursuant to the discussion it was determined that the Budget request should be resubmitted to the Public Safety Committee for further reduction.

As there was no further business to come before the Budget Committee, on motion made by Mr. Kenny and seconded by Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Belden adjourned the meeting at 12:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah McLenithan, Legislative Office Specialist