

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: BUDGET

DATE: OCTOBER 7, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS GERAGHTY  
O'CONNOR  
CHAMPAGNE  
KENNY  
SHEEHAN  
MERLINO  
TAYLOR  
STEC

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR BELDEN

OTHERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK MONROE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD  
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY  
HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
JOANN MCKINSTRY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE &  
FISCAL SERVICES  
RICK MURPHY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FISCAL SERVICES  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
SUPERVISORS GOODSPEED  
PITKIN  
SIMMES  
SOKOL  
STRAINER  
THOMAS  
VANNESS  
PAT AUER, DIRECTOR, PUBLIC HEALTH  
ROBERT IUSI, DIRECTOR, PROBATION  
CANDY KELLY, DIRECTOR, OFFICE FOR THE AGING  
CHRISTIE SABO, OFFICE FOR THE AGING  
RICHARD KELLY, PERSONNEL OFFICER  
TODD LUNT, DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES  
ROB METTHE, DIRECTOR, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
CHRIS LAFOUNTAIN, SENIOR PROGRAMMER, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
WILLIAM MONTFORT, COMMISSIONER, BOARD OF ELECTIONS  
FRANK O'KEEFE, TREASURER  
ROB LYNCH, DEPUTY TREASURER  
SHANE ROSS, CHIEF DEPUTY  
MIKE SWAN, DIRECTOR, REAL PROPERTY TAX SERVICES  
BARBARA TAGGART, ADMINISTRATOR, WESTMOUNT HEALTH FACILITY  
PATRICIA TATICH, DIRECTOR, PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
JEFFREY TENNYSON, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF ENGINEERING  
SHEILA WEAVER, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
BILL BROWN, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY RESIDENT  
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*  
THOM RANDALL, *THE ADIRONDACK JOURNAL*  
AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Geraghty called the meeting of the Budget Committee to order at 9:00 a.m.

Copies of the meeting agenda were distributed to the Committee members, a copy of which is also on file with the minutes.

Paul Dusek, County Attorney, announced that an executive session was necessary to discuss a claim filed against the County, as well as for attorney/client privilege to provide information relative to the claim filed.

---

Motion was made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to enter into executive session to discuss pending litigation pursuant to Section 105(d) and attorney/client privilege pursuant to Section 108(3) of the Public Officers Law.

Executive session was held from 9:01 a.m. to 9:46 a.m.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Geraghty announced that no Committee action was necessary pursuant to the executive session.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the September 16, 2009 Budget Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Commencing with the agenda review, Mr. Geraghty announced that Item 1 consisted of a request to amend Resolution No. 30 of 2008, Adopting the Personnel Policies and Rules for Non-Bargaining Employees in the Sheriff's Office and Updating the Agreement. He explained that the amendment was necessary to reflect the 2010 Budget Guidelines which stated that no raise would be given for non-bargaining unit employees for the 2010 budget year and that any salary increased for 2011 would be determined in 2010. Mr. Geraghty further noted that this action would include a change in the Undersheriff wages as adopted by Resolution No. 498 of 2008.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend Resolution No. 30 of 2008 as outlined above and the necessary resolution was authorized for the October 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Geraghty stated that Agenda Item 2 referred to the listing of funding provided to outside agencies for non-mandated programs, a copy of which was included in the agenda. He advised that this information was being provided at the request of some of the Committee members who wanted to review the contributions to determine if further reductions could be made.

Mr. Taylor stated that he was one of the Committee members that had requested further review of the listing of non-essential programs and he felt that each of the items should be reviewed individually to determine if additional reductions could be made to the list. Mr. Kenny questioned whether any of the contribution totals had been altered since they were last reviewed by the Budget Committee and Mr. Geraghty replied in the negative.

Mr. Stec began the review of proposed funding by suggesting that all funding to Extension Services be eliminated from the 2010 Budget. Mr. Taylor stated that he too had an issue with the funding for Extension Services as the County continued to reduce services and lay-off their own employees but maintained a considerable amount of funding for an outside organization that employed six people. Mr. Sheehan said that he was opposed to the reduction in funding and noted that the Extension Services contract had previously been cut by \$25,000 and he said that he was happy with the level of funding listed. Mr. Champagne agreed with Mr. Sheehan's statements and added that a number of County residents were assisted by the Extension Services program and although he was not opposed to further minimal reductions in the program, he did not feel that all of the funding should be eliminated. Mr. Kenny stated that he felt it would be redundant to discuss the merits of each of the programs receiving funding as all of them were valuable in some matter; however, he said, he associated the Extension Services with the 4-H and agricultural programs offered, which were minimal in Warren County. That being said, he announced that he would not be opposed to an additional \$100,000 reduction in the amount contributed to the Extension Services program.

Mr. Pitkin interjected his feeling that it would be very short-sighted of the Committee to eliminate the Extension

---

Services program funding as they might require use of the program again in the future and would have to re-build the it from scratch. He said that he agreed with a reduction in funding but was opposed to complete elimination of funding as a number of residents in the northern portion of the County relied on the programs offered. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Pitkin's statement and advised that the program was one of the few that attempted to reduce dependence on public assistance programs by offering parenting, financial and nutritional programs.

Mr. Taylor stated that due to the current financial crisis the majority of businesses, municipalities and other governmental entities were reducing staffing and programs in an effort to sustain operations during difficult times; however, he said, the Extension Services program had yet to decrease either programming or staffing, which he felt was inappropriate. Mr. Geraghty replied that this information was incorrect as the Extension Services staffing had been reduced by two positions. Mrs. Simmes announced that she felt it would be appalling to eliminate funding to the Extension Services program as it assisted a number of County residents.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried by majority vote to reduce the amount of funding provided to the Extension Services program by \$100,000, leading to a total contribution of \$246,875 for 2010, with Messrs. Merlino and Sheehan voting in opposition.

Mr. Stec pointed out that the County intended to contribute \$50,000 to the Southern Adirondack Library System (SALS) for 2010 and he proposed that figure be reduced by 50%. Mrs. Simmes and Mr. Thomas both stated their opposition to this reduction as the funding was distributed to free libraries throughout the County, including those in the Towns of Bolton and Stony Creek. Mr. Stec stated that the Town of Queensbury and the City of Glens Falls provided a considerable amount of funding to Crandall Library, located in the Town of Queensbury, and he did not feel the amount being funded to SALS by the County was appropriate. Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, stated that the entire \$50,000 was not contributed solely to Crandall Library and although the SALS funding was initially forwarded to Crandall Library, it was subsequently distributed to the free libraries located in towns throughout the County. Mr. Stec questioned whether the expense was funded with taxpayer dollars and Mrs. Sady replied affirmatively.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried by majority vote to reduce SALS funding by 50%, leading to a total contribution of \$25,000 for 2010, with Messrs. Kenny, Merlino and O'Connor voting in opposition.

Mr. Champagne questioned how the funds attributed to the Warren County SPCA (Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) was spent and Mrs. Sady replied that an accounting of expenditures was received from the SPCA each year which outlined how the funds contributed by the County were used. She added that typical expenses included services provided on behalf of the various towns of Warren County. Subsequent to Mr. Champagne's suggestion that the funding attributed to the SPCA be reduced, Chairman Monroe cautioned that he believed the SPCA was the only organization that provided services to the northern portion of Warren County and he did not know where they would seek replacement services if the SPCA no longer offered assistance.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried by majority vote to reduce the funding to the Warren County SPCA by 50%, leading to a total contribution of \$8,000 for 2010, with Messrs. Merlino and O'Connor voting in opposition.

Referring to the \$6,500 appropriation to the Adirondack Park Local Government Review Board (APLGRB) for operational costs, Mr. Stec suggested that the amount be reduced to \$3,500. Mr. Thomas stated that he was opposed to the reduction in funding as the APLGRB represented the residents residing in the Adirondacks who were

being mistreated by the State of New York; he added that a reduction in funding was an affront to those residents. Mr. Geraghty said that he served as an alternate member of the APLGRB which was a very small group that addressed the State and the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) regarding issues faced by the residents of the Adirondack Park region. He noted that although the State contributed a small amount of funding to the APLGRB, the monies provided by the Counties was crucial to the functionality of the organization in taking on the APA which was a much larger and better funded organization. Mr. Pitkin said that he too was opposed to a reduction in funding to the APLGRB as he felt it was very short-sighted to cut funding to advocacy groups that assisted in dealing with larger entities at the State level. He further noted that the \$6,500 contributed to the APLGRB seemed like a small amount to pay to retain rights within the Adirondack Park region and it seemed ludicrous to reduce the funding as the \$3,5000 savings that would be attained would hardly affect the \$7 million budget deficit.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Kenny to reduce funding to the APLGRB by \$3,000, leading to a total contribution of \$3,500 for 2010, and the motion failed with Messrs. Champagne, Merlino O'Connor, Sheehan and Taylor voting in opposition; Mr. Geraghty abstained from the vote due to his affiliation with the APLGRB.

Moving on, Mr. Stec made a motion to reduce funding to the Lake Champlain-Lake George Regional Planning Board (LCLGRP) by 50%, leading to a total contribution of \$3,500 for 2010, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Kenny.

In response to Mr. Kenny's inquiry as to the function of the LCLGRP, Patricia Tatich, Director of Planning & Community Development, advised that the organization provided services related to funding received under the Federal Economic Development program and reviewed economic development funding applications submitted by small businesses which were not handled by the Planning & Community Development Department. In addition, she said, the LCLGRP provided planning services on a regional level and did work relative to the census programs, as well as serving as a repository for census materials for the region. Mr. Champagne said it was his understanding that the LCLGRP employed a revolving account allowing them to loan money to small businesses in the area and Ms. Tatich replied that this was correct; she added that they also provided for some larger programs and businesses with funding contributed by the Department of Commerce. Mr. Champagne then stated that this might be another case where a reduction in funding to the organization was not the right decision as the LCLGRP provided a considerable amount of services to the area and were struggling with the amount of funding currently received; he added that he would vote against any motion to reduce funding for this group.

Mr. Taylor said the LCLGRP served as a backup to the Warren County Planning Board and he recalled that at one time they had considered utilizing the services of the LCLGRP in lieu of maintaining a Planning Board at the County level. Mr. Dusek agreed with Mr. Taylor's statement and confirmed that if the Warren County Planning Board did not remain in force, any cases to be reviewed would be referred to the LCLGRP.

Mr. Geraghty called the question and the motion to reduce the funding to the LCLGRP by 50% was carried by majority vote with Messrs. Champagne, Merlino and O'Connor voting in opposition.

Mr. Stec questioned the function of the Youth Program 4-H Camp and Mr. Geraghty apprised that the funds contributed helped to fund a camping program for underprivileged children in Warren County who would otherwise not be able to enjoy such activities. Mr. Kenny asked what facility the camping program was held at and Mr. Geraghty replied that it was held at the Skye Farm Camp in the Town of Warrensburg. Mr. Thomas interjected that approximately 100 underprivileged children attended Skye Farm Camp annually through the 4-H camping program.

Mr. Taylor asked why the program was not included under the Extension Service program and Mr. Geraghty replied that these had always been presented as separate programs, but he did not know why.

Mr. O'Connor apprised that he was a member of the Knights of Columbus, who also provided funding to the Youth Program 4-H Camp. He stated that he felt there were a number of organizations that donated to the program and they were not totally dependent upon the County's contribution.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Taylor to reduce funding for Youth Program 4-H Camp to \$16,000 and the motion failed with Messrs. Geraghty, Kenny, Merlino and Sheehan voting in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried by majority vote to reduce funding to the 4-H Camp to \$20,000 with Messrs. Kenny and Merlino voting in opposition.

Moving on to the Local Development Corporation (LDC), Mr. Stec stated that as Chairman of the LDC Board, he felt the organization could reasonably sustain operations with reduced funding and he suggested that the contribution be lowered from \$21,000 to \$15,000 for 2010.

In response to Mr. Taylor's request that she comment on LDC operations, Ms. Tatich apprised that the Planning & Community Development Department and the County Attorney's Office provided assistance to the LDC for the operation of their activities, as well as the LDC's small business loan program. She noted that a proposal relating to the LDC for alternatives to position reductions within the Planning Department would be presented later in the meeting which might affect decisions made to LDC funding. Ms. Tatich stated that there were certainly opportunities to reduce LDC funding due to the administrative funds available within the organization; however, she said, the Committee should be aware that there was some legal work pending that had contributed unforeseen expenses that would have to be covered. She said that she was not opposed to the reduction proposed by Mr. Stec and felt that it could even be reduced further if need be.

Chairman Monroe stated that the Committee should be wary of reducing the LDC budget too far as there were some necessary expenditures that needed to be covered, such as those attributed to the audit. Mr. Stec replied that all of the money in the LDC budget was used to cover audit and accounting costs and he felt that although the funding would be very tight, they could sustain with a \$10,000 County contribution.

Mr. Champagne said that he felt the operations of the LDC could be covered under the umbrella of the Economic Development Corporation and he suggested that they review the legal implications as to whether this change could be made.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried by majority vote to reduce funding to the LDC by \$11,000, leading to a total of \$10,000 in funding for 2010, with Mr. Champagne voting in opposition.

Mr. Stec stated that although the Soil & Water Conservation District provided a number of benefits to the County, he felt that the funding contributed to them could be reduced from \$215,000 to \$200,000 for 2010.

Speaking as Chairman of the Soil & Water Conservation District, Mr. Thomas stated that he was opposed to any reduction in funding as the Soil & Water Conservation District provided services to the County for half the price they would get them elsewhere, and in some cases for less than half the cost. He added that the total budget for the Soil & Water Conservation District was close to \$400,000, most of which was funded by grant funding pursued by

the Soil & Water Conservation District themselves. Mrs. Simmes said that she agreed the Soil & Water funding should not be reduced as the majority of the services provided were in an effort to protect Lake George which was one of the largest assets to the County. Mr. Geraghty stated that it was very rare that an organization was willing to assist with the County's needs as the Soil & Water Conservation District did and they had helped every community within the County. Mr. Stec stated that he was not detracting from the efforts of the organization or the assistance they had provided in the past, but was simply stating his opinion that the Soil & Water Conservation District could sustain operations with reduced funding. Mr. Pitkin interjected that this was another instance where he felt the County would be harming itself by cutting funding as in the long run it would end up costing the County more to seek the services currently offered by Soil & Water from other sources. He added that he felt small cuts were reasonable, a \$17,000 reduction had already been made, which he felt was sufficient and any further reductions should be very small.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Champagne to reduce funding to the Soil & Water Conservation District by \$15,000, leading to a total of \$200,000 in funding for 2010 and the motion failed with Messrs. Geraghty, Merlino, Taylor and O'Connor voting in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Kenny to reduce funding to the Soil & Water Conservation District by \$10,000, leading to a total of \$205,000 in funding for 2010 and the motion failed with Messrs. Geraghty, Merlino, Taylor and O'Connor voting in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried by majority vote to reduce funding to the Soil & Water Conservation District by \$5,000, leading to a total of \$210,000 in funding for 2010 with Messrs. Geraghty, Merlino and Taylor voting in opposition.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that the EDC contribution had yet to be reviewed. Mr. Kenny stated that as the economy continued to decline it seemed that the need for the EDC increased commensurately; however, he said, the amount contributed to the organization could be reduced.

Mr. Kenny made a motion to reduce the EDC contribution by \$25,000 but there was no second. He proceeded to make a motion to reduce the contribution by \$15,000 and the motion was seconded by Mr. O'Connor.

Chairman Monroe said he recalled that in a prior Committee meeting EDC representatives had requested that both EDC and Empire Zone funding be combined into one contract, which had been approved by the Committee and Mrs. Sady advised that the funding for both programs was included in the \$315,000 contribution listed for the EDC. Chairman Monroe noted that the State was currently revising the Empire Zone Program and he questioned whether the County was still required to contribute to it and Mrs. Sady replied in the negative, noting that as per Len Fosbrook, President of the EDC, the County was no longer required to contribute funding to the EDC.

Mr. Geraghty called the question and the motion to reduce funding to the EDC by \$15,000, leading to a total contribution of \$300,000 for 2010, was carried by majority vote with Mr. Taylor voting in opposed.

Mr. Stec proposed that funding to the Warren County Conservation Council (WCCC) be reduced by 50%, from \$1,000 to \$500, for 2010. Mr. Kenny questioned the purpose of the funding and Mr. Thomas replied that it was likely the contribution to the Resource Conservation and Development Council. Mr. Stec replied that because a use for the monies could not be confirmed, he would suggest that the funding be eliminated.

---

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously to eliminate all funding to the WCCC, leading to a \$0 contribution for 2010.

Referring to the \$100,000 listed as the contribution to the City of Glens Falls for recreation facilities and the Glens Falls Civic Center, Mr. Stec suggested that the amount be reduced to \$50,000.

Mr. Taylor stated that he strongly objected to the reduction in funds proposed by Mr. Stec as the City of Glens Falls sustained its own Police and Fire Departments, and housed the only hospital in the area, as well. He added that he felt it would be very short-sighted for the County to reduce this contribution. Mr. Kenny agreed and said that the funding should remain at the figure listed in light of the fact that the City paid taxes to the County but did not receive services from the Sheriff's Department or the County DPW Department as the City maintained its own Police and DPW Departments. Mr. Goodspeed said that he had no wish to affect services provided by the Glens Falls Hospital; however, he noted that the spreadsheet outlined the funds as being used for recreational services, including East Field and the Glens Falls Civic Center, which could reasonably be reduced. Contrary to Mr. Kenny's statements, Mr. VanNess apprised that there were instances in which the City of Glens Falls was assisted by the Sheriff's Office when the need arose.

Discussion ensued.

Motions were made by Mr. Stec to reduce the contribution to City of Glens Falls to \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 and \$80,000; however, there were no seconds to any of the motions made. A subsequent motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Geraghty to reduce the funding to the City of Glens Falls by 10% to \$90,000 for 2010 and the motion failed with Messrs. Champagne, Kenny, Merlino, O'Connor, Sheehan and Taylor voting in opposition. Mr. Stec made a final motion to reduce funding to the City of Glens Falls by \$1,000, leading to a total contribution of \$99,000 to the City of Glens Falls for 2010, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connor and carried by majority vote with Messrs. Kenny and Taylor voting in opposition.

Mr. Champagne noted that the spreadsheet reflected a \$4,500 appropriation to the Sister Cities programs and he questioned whether this was accurate as he recalled that the funding had been previously eliminated. JoAnn McKinstry, Deputy Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, advised that the funding had not been removed as the resolution eliminating funding had been tabled at a previous Board meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried unanimously to remove all funding from the Sister Cities program, lowering the amount to \$0.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to reduce funding to the Warren County Historical Association by 50%, from \$2,500 to \$1,250 for 2010.

Mr. Stec noted that a \$4,000 contribution was listed for the Community Action Agency and he suggested that the amount be reduced by \$1,000.

Mr. Pitkin pointed out that the funding to the Community Action Agency was for delivery of foods to emergency food relief organizations and he did not feel that the funding should be cut, to which Mr. Stec responded that Warren County was not the only entity that supplied funding for this program. Mr. Thomas stated that in light of the amount of money the Federal Government supplied to the program, he felt that the entire County contribution should be eliminated. Mr. Champagne agreed with Mr. Thomas, noting that the program was having a hard time

---

spending all of the funds received and the elimination of funding from Warren County would not hamper the program. Mr. O'Connor apprised that the Federal funding provided to the program had nothing to do with delivery of foods and could only be spent in manners approved by the Government. He added that he agreed with Mr. Pitkin's assessment that the funding should not be reduced and would vote against any such motion.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Champagne to remove all funding listed for the Community Action Agency for 2010 and the motion failed with Messrs. Geraghty, Kenny, Merlino, O'Connor, Sheehan and Taylor voting in opposition.

Mr. Stec stated that he failed to comprehend why the Committee would be in favor of retaining funding for the Community Action Agency in light of Mr. Thomas' statement that the organization received an overwhelming amount of funding from the Federal Government. Mr. Champagne added that it was his understanding that the Community Action Agency held a sizable general fund within the organization and he questioned why these funds could not be used to subsidize food delivery costs, rather than continuing to accept donations from municipalities, such as Warren County, for the same purpose. Mr. O'Connor responded that the fund had been established and was replenished with the funds received from municipalities, such as Warren County, to cover the costs of food deliveries; he added that these small donations were used to feed people all across the Country.

Discussion ensued.

Chairman Monroe stated that all of the organizations whose funding had been reduced should be notified by the County, regardless of the fact that they would likely read about the reductions in the local newspapers before notices could be provided by the County. Mr. Kenny suggested that in addition to written notifications, email messages be forwarded in an attempt to notify the recipients before the information was printed in the newspaper.

Resuming the agenda review, Mr. Geraghty announced that Item 3 pertained to position reductions. He reminded the Committee members that during their prior meeting they had identified 20 positions to be eliminated and the Committee had requested further information pertaining to the net savings to the County for each and this information was listed in the spreadsheet included in the agenda. Subsequent to the meeting Mr. Geraghty said that he was approached by several of the affected Department Heads who sought the opportunity to present alternate methods to save money within their Departmental budgets and avoid position eliminations and the alternatives provided were also included in the agenda packet. He noted that the initial proposal to eliminate 20 positions would have saved the County a total of \$700,827, while the alternatives provided would realize a savings of approximately \$140,000 more.

Mr. Taylor questioned whether a motion could be made to accept the alternatives collectively and Mr. Kenny stated that he felt each alternative should be reviewed individually to determine their merit. Mr. Goodspeed asked if it was possible to accept the alternatives proposed and then proceed to seek additional budget reductions and Mr. Geraghty advised although the Committee could certainly decide to seek further budget reductions prior to this session, he would prefer that each of the positions be discussed individually and motions to accept or reject the alternative proposals would be necessary for each.

Mr. Geraghty announced that the first position for discussion was that of a Legislative Office Specialist to be abolished from the Clerk of the Legislative Board and he noted that the proposal for position elimination had been accepted by the Department Head.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to abolish the position of Legislative Office Specialist from the Clerk of the Legislative Board and refer same to the Personnel Committee.

The next positions to be discussed were the Case Manager and full-time Activities Director positions within the Countryside Adult Home, Mr. Geraghty said. He noted that the Department Head had already agreed to the position eliminations and they had been previously abolished by Resolution No. 621 of 2009.

Mr. Geraghty stated that the next positions listed for elimination were those of the Typist and Investigator positions within the District Attorney's Office, and he noted that, once again, the Department Head had agreed to the position eliminations.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously to abolish the Typist and Investigator positions within the District Attorney's Office and refer same to the Personnel Committee.

The Parks, Recreation & Railroad Director position within the Public Works Division was the next to be addressed, Mr. Geraghty announced. Mr. Stec stated that the alternative proposal was not appropriate; therefore, he said, he felt they should abolish the Director position and accept the alternative proposal as well, which included reduction in budget codes within the Public Works Division. Mr. Kenny pointed out that the alternative plan included a \$30,000 reduction in the gas & oil budget and he questioned whether this was wise due to the volatile nature of the fuel market. Additionally he noted that although the savings indicated in the alternate plan for the Parks, Recreation & Railroad Director position were equal to the position's salary, they were one-time savings and did not save the County annually as a reduction in positions would.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried by majority vote to abolish the position of Parks, Recreation & Railroad Director, with Messrs. Geraghty and Merlino voting in opposition, and refer same to the Personnel Committee.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Kenny to accept the alternate plan proposed by the Public Works Division in addition to the position elimination.

Jeffrey Tennyson, Deputy Superintendent of Engineering, advised that William Lamy, Superintendent of Public Works, was on vacation and he was present in his place. He said that he thought Mr. Lamy had presented this alternative with the prior guidance that if he could provide savings equal to the total salary for the Parks, Recreation & Railroad Director position, the position abolishment could be avoided. Mr. Tennyson added that if it was the Committee's goal to determine an equivalent savings amount by abolishing positions, he felt that Mr. Lamy would like to have some say in which ones were identified for elimination and he asked if the matter could be delayed until Mr. Lamy could address the matter personally. Mr. Geraghty stated that when the option of providing an alternative savings plan was addressed, he had been very clear in cautioning each Department Head that the Committee might decide to adopt both the initial plan for position elimination and the alternative proposal provided. He said that it would be up to the Committee whether they wanted to delay the process to allow Mr. Lamy time to speak on the matter.

As there was no indication that the Committee wished to further delay the issue, Mr. Geraghty called the question and the motion to accept the alternative proposal presented by the Public Works Division, in addition to the position elimination, was carried by majority vote, with Messrs. Geraghty, Merlino and Taylor voting in opposition.

Mr. Pitkin cautioned the Committee that he felt they might be entering dangerous ground if the continued to

abolish positions and accept the alternative plans presented as well. He noted that if these practices continued, he felt the Department Heads would no longer trust the Board of Supervisors in the budget reduction process and would be uncooperative or present inflated budget figures in the future to prevent something like this from happening again. Mr. Taylor agreed, adding that it was very important to remember that most of the Department Heads had presented alternatives based on the thought that one of the options would be selected by the Committee and not both.

Continuing to the two positions listed under the Health Services Department, Mr. Geraghty noted that the Office Specialist position had previously been abolished by Resolution No. 621 of 2009 and an alternative plan had been presented for implementation in lieu of eliminating the Fiscal Manager position.

When asked to speak on the matter, Pat Auer, Director of Public Health, stated that she felt the Board of Supervisors had made a big mistake in abolishing the Office Specialist Position. She advised that the alternative proposal presented would basically eliminate a Supervising Nurse position and put that person back in the field to serve the community. Ms. Auer added that the change would lead to the addition of another revenue generating position. In addition, she advised that there would be a retirement in her Department occurring on January 1, 2010 and they would not seek to backfill that position. Ms. Auer said with the Point of Care they were not able to redistribute some of the duties that had previously been handled by the Supervising Nurse position to another Clerical position.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously to accept the alternative plan provided by the Health Services Department in lieu of abolishing the Fiscal Manager position.

Mr. Geraghty said that the next position listed was that of the Information Technology Director for which an alternative savings proposal was included in the agenda.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to accept the alternative plan provided in lieu of abolishing the Information Technology Director position.

Continuing, Mr. Geraghty presented the alternate proposal provided to avoid the elimination of the part-time Food Service Helper working within the Office for the Aging.

Motion was made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried unanimously to accept the alternate proposal provided in lieu of abolishing the part-time Food Service Helper position.

Subsequent to the Committee's brief independent review of the proposal provided for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Deputy EMS (Emergency Medical Services) Coordinator position within the Office of Emergency Services, motion was made by Mr. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to accept the alternate proposal in lieu of position abolishment.

Referring to the elimination of the Personnel Technician and Administrative Assistant positions within the Personnel/Human Resources Divisions, Mr. Kenny requested clarification on the alternative proposal provided. Mr. Geraghty noted that the information included in the agenda packet regarding the alternative proposed consisted of a copy of an email forwarded by Rich Kelly, Personnel Officer, which had included a power-point presentation outlining the evolution of the Department as justification for the number of staff members in place, but did not offer any type of alternative proposal.

Mr. Kenny questioned when Civil Service exams were given and Mr. Kelly advised that they were limited to the State mandated schedule which required exams to be given on Saturdays September through June, and were rarely scheduled in July or August. He noted that on the average, two exams per month were given. Mr. Kenny suggested that they consider making one of the positions that administered Civil Service exams a Tuesday through Saturday position during the weeks that the Saturday exams were given in order to eliminate any overtime incurred when giving examinations. Mr. Kelly replied that this option had been explored in the past and it had been determined that when the positions were filled, it was with the understanding that the work week would be Monday through Friday with mandatory overtime required on the Saturdays that the exams were given; therefore, he said, negotiations with the Union would have to be held before any changes to the workweek could be made.

Mr. Strainer questioned the current status of the Department as opposed to what it would be subsequent to the position reductions and Mr. Geraghty advised that there were currently two separate Departments, those being Civil Service, which consisted of Mr. Kelly and two office staff, and Todd Lunt, Human Resources Director, and one office staff. He further noted that the two Departments would be combined when they moved to the Human Services Building and would consist of Mr. Kelly, Mr. Lunt and one office staff person. Mr. Strainer then questioned the sensibility of having a Department which consisted of two managers and one office staff member; he also asked what the duties of the two positions proposed for elimination were.

Mr. Kelly apprised that a considerable portion of the Human Resources Administrative Assistant position duties would be somewhat in question until a decision was made as to whether or not a new time keeping system would be implemented. He advised that the Civil Service Department had previously been responsible for entering leave time into the time-keeping system; however, he said, those duties had been transferred to the Human Resources Department. Mr. Kelly said that it had initially appeared that these duties would be alleviated when the new Kronos Time-Keeping System was introduced on a County-wide basis, but it now seemed that the system would only be implemented at the new Human Services Building while the rest of the County buildings would continue to use the current system which required manual entry of all employee leave time.

By means of comparison, Mr. Kelly advised that Civil Service (*previously the Personnel Department*) had consisted of four support staff, which had been reduced to three in 1990 with the understanding that each of the remaining staff would assume more responsibilities within the office. He added that there were no secretaries working within the Civil Service Department and that there were professional Personnel Technicians, as well as himself, the Personnel Officer. Mr. Kelly said that in 2009 the Civil Service Department was saddled with the additional responsibilities of administration for the City of Glens Falls' Civil Service responsibilities, increasing the classified service numbers by an additional 500 employees. To put this in perspective, he advised that Hamilton County, which served 502 classified employees, had a Civil Service staff of two and under the current proposal, Warren County, which served 2,670 classified employees, would have the same number of staff, which was inconsistent with the needs of the Department. Mr. Kelly stated that the existing Civil Service staff each had more than 20 years of service with the County and were able to address the many complex questions and situations that arose due to their valuable expertise in the Civil Service field. He said that if one of these staff members were eliminated, their expertise and experience would be lost also.

Mr. Pitkin said that an RFP (Request for Proposal) had been authorized to seek out a time-keeping system and while Kronos might not be the system chosen, another comparable system would eventually be implemented for the benefit of the County which would lead to less staff involvement as far as data entry concerns. Mr. Kelly countered that leave time would still have to be entered manually until such time that the new system was introduced and he further noted that although a new system was slated for the Human Services Building, a decision had yet to be made as to if or when the system would be standardized amongst all County buildings.

---

Chairman Monroe questioned if any reimbursement was received from the City of Glens Falls for the additional workload assumed in addressing their civil service needs and Mr. Dusek replied that according to the Civil Service Law, it appeared that if the work was not done at the City level, the work had to be done by the next higher level, which was the County, and no reimbursement could be sought.

Speaking on behalf of the staff member slated for abolishment in the Human Resources Department, Mr. Lunt stated that his Administrative Assistant was a professional employee who dealt with employees on a daily basis and was a vital part of the Human Resources Department. He said that the Administrative Assistant answered all questions regarding leave time, benefit or pay related questions and he felt this situation should continue when the Human Resources Department was co-officed with the Civil Service Department. Mr. Lunt stated that he did not feel that the reduction in staff was appropriate to the operations of either Departments.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the operation of the entire County centered around its employees and if the appropriate staff was not available to address County employee questions and concerns, larger issues might arise. He said that he felt this was another instance where they were attempting to reduce staff in the wrong area and he would likely vote against Committee action to that effect.

Subsequent to further discussion on the matter, motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried unanimously to table the issue pending further presentation by the Department Heads as to how many staff members were necessary to appropriately operate both Departments.

Moving on to the Assistant Director position indicated for abolishment in the Planning & Community Development Department, Mr. Geraghty asked Ms. Tatich to speak on the alternative proposal presented in place of position elimination.

Ms. Tatich apprised that the Planning & Community Development Committee had reviewed the three alternative proposal presented to avoid the elimination of the Deputy Director position and had approved Alternative B, a copy of which is included in the agenda. She noted that Alternative B included methods for generating additional revenues to offset the costs of the Deputy Director's salary, which she estimated to be \$81,236 including fringe benefits. Ms. Tatich stated that part of the plan included a fee for service scenario associated with the LDC as the County had been graciously providing funding for the services of the Small Business Specialist provided to the LDC and the loan re-payments being received through the Small Business Program indicated that the County should seek funding for that position. She noted that the Planning Department managed approximately \$2 million in funding which was distributed to various parties and all of the staff members had different responsibilities within the Department and there was very limited redundancy in duties; therefore, she said, all of the staff members were necessary to the Department. Ms. Tatich pointed out that the same level of revenues would be received for 2010 and 2011, making this a two-year savings plan.

Chairman Monroe noted that a significant amount of the additional revenues indicated in Alternative B would be received from the LDC Small Business Loan Program and he asked if the reduction in funding to the LDC would have any effect on the anticipated revenue figure, to which Ms. Tatich replied in the negative.

Mr. Kenny said that he felt that all of the items included in Alternative B could be done in addition to the position layoff and he questioned why the increased revenues indicated in the proposal were not being sought already. He added that he was opposed to the \$8,000 revenues attached to the Tourism Study which would be funded by the Tourism Department. Mr. Kenny stated that it was not appropriate to continue to seek funding from the Occupancy Tax Fund because they would eventually be at the level of promotion in force before the Fund was

---

introduced, which was unfair to the entities that were required to pay into the Occupancy Tax Fund.

Ms. Tatich noted that the \$8000 in revenues from the Tourism Department had been included in Alternative B when it was indicated that the Tourism Study, which had been performed by the Planning Department at no charge for the past ten years, would be contracted to an outside source at a cost of approximately \$8,000 if the Deputy Director position was abolished. Mr. Kenny stated that the EDC had offered to perform a complete white-paper Tourism Study at no cost to the County and Ms. Tatich countered that the study provided by the Planning Department was much more extensive than the white-paper study that would be provided by the EDC.

Mr. Pitkin stated that he was concerned that it appeared Planning Department revenues were being increased by transferring expenses to other Departments and entities and that no actual budget cuts were being made. He noted that this was not fair to the other Departments who were being forced to cut budgets and reduce positions in order to meet the expectations of the Budget Committee.

Chairman Monroe commented that the Deputy Director position had been extremely valuable to a number of the Towns and entities in Warren County and they needed to make sure that the functions of the position were continued regardless of whether or not the Committee desired to abolish the position and Mrs. Simmes agreed with this statement.

Subsequent to further discussion, motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to table the issue of abolishing the Deputy Director of the Planning & Community Development Department for further discussion at the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Geraghty announced that the next item for discussion was the abolishment of the Major position and creation of a Lieutenant position within the Sheriff's Office for a total savings of \$7,628. He noted that this proposal had been accepted by Bud York, Sheriff.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether it was sensible to abolish and create positions and suggested that they simply abolish the Major position instead.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Kenny to abolish the Major position within the Sheriff's Office and refrain from creating the Lieutenant position.

Shane Ross, Chief Deputy, cautioned the Committee that as per Civil Service Law, this action would cause a number of demotions within the Department, as the person currently filling the Major position would be demoted to the next lowest position and this chain would continue by seniority down to the person filling the lowest level Patrol Officer position who would be the person subject to lay-off.

Mr. VanNess stated that this would lead to only a savings of \$30,000 as the Patrol Officer would actually be the person laid off and Mr. Stec countered that this was incorrect because the position abolished would actually be the Major position, which included the highest salary.

Mr. Geraghty called the question and the motion to abolish the Major position and refrain from creating the Lieutenant position was carried by majority vote with Mr. Geraghty voting in opposition.

The next section of the spreadsheet referred to a number of positions within the Social Services Department, Mr. Geraghty advised. He noted that all of the position changes were either part of the re-organization plan presented

by the Sheila Weaver, Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, or proposals that had been accepted by Ms. Weaver.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to approve all of the position changes listed.

Mr. Geraghty announced that the final position to be discussed was that of the Senior Typist within Veterans' Services which had been proposed for abolishment by the Budget Committee and the Department Head had agreed to the proposal.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to abolish the Senior Typist position within Veterans' Services.

Mr. Geraghty asked the Committee what direction they wanted to take in order to impose further budget reductions. Mr. Stec suggested that the first step the Committee should take was to determine a specific percentage for further budget reductions and that all of the Department Heads should be directed to make additional cuts to this extent. Mr. Stec added that he felt the Committee should also consider a third round of position eliminations and that information regarding the potential savings that could be attained by altering the heating and cooling temperatures maintained within County Buildings be provided. Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, noted that information regarding temperature changes in the County buildings should be easy to attain as this information was tracked by Siemens Building Technologies, the installers of the co-generation systems that heated and cooled the buildings located at both the Municipal Center Campus and the Annex Buildings.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that a meeting of the Budget Committee and all Department Heads be scheduled so that the Committee could express their specific expectations for further budget reductions to County staff directly. As the Committee was in agreement, it was determined that a meeting of the Budget Committee and all Department Heads would be scheduled for Wednesday, October 14<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Monroe suggested that the listing of non-mandated programs offered by the County should be reviewed to determine if further reductions could be made. He noted that he hoped to schedule a meeting with Senator Betty Little to discuss reductions in funding from the State, as well as the lack of timeliness in re-payment of funds from the State, and the subsequent effects on Warren County in order for Senator Little to address the issues at the State level.

Mr. Stec agreed that a further review of non-mandated programs should be made and he noted that they should also look more closely at the Countryside Adult Home to determine if services at the facility should be reduced or continued. He added that in reviewing positions for reduction, they should look to eliminate part-time and unfilled seasonal positions to possibly reduce in these areas, rather than laying off all full-time positions. Mr. Stec stated that he also felt they needed to be sure that they had exhausted all avenues respective to discussions with the Unions regarding salary increases for bargaining unit employees. He said that he congratulated Mr. Strainer for taking a public stand on this issue.

Mr. Strainer commented that he felt the budget reduction process was moving in the wrong direction, as it was not fair to balance the budget solely based on position eliminations as the County employees were not the ones who had caused the deficit. He stated that the Solid Waste Facility, decreases in sales tax and increases in uncontrollable expenses such as retirement and health insurance costs, had caused the deficit and he felt they needed to seek out ways in which revenues could be increased to offset the budget deficit. Mr. Strainer reiterated that it was

inappropriate to continue attempting to balance the budget on the backs of the employees.

Chairman Monroe interjected that the voluntary furlough program was one alternative available for employees to assist their fellow employees and avoid position reductions by taking unpaid days off. He said that this was one means to effectively reduce the salaries paid to employees without violating Union negotiations. Chairman Monroe pointed out that the Voluntary Furlough Program was set to expire in November and he felt that date should be extended.

Mr. Kenny said that although he was aware that the Budget Officer was permitted to reinstate or remove funding for various items at his discretion, he felt it would be helpful if a listing of budget changes made outside of Committee were provided for review.

As there was no further business to come before the Budget Committee, on motion made by Mr. Kenny and seconded by Mr. Taylor, Mr. Geraghty adjourned the meeting at 11:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist