

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: BUDGET - PUBLIC WORKS

DATE: AUGUST 26, 2009

---

---

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS GERAGHTY  
BELDEN  
CHAMPAGNE  
KENNY  
SHEEHAN  
MERLINO  
TAYLOR  
STEC

OTHERS PRESENT:

HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
JOANN MCKINSTRY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
SUPERVISORS BENTLEY  
PITKIN  
STRAINER  
THOMAS  
VANNESS

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR O'CONNOR

REPRESENTING THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS:

WILLIAM LAMY, SUPERINTENDENT  
JEFFREY TENNYSON, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF ENGINEERING  
PAUL BUTLER, DIRECTOR OF PARKS, RECREATION & RAILROAD  
DON DEGRAW, AIRPORT MANAGER  
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS  
SANDY CLOSS, FISCAL MANAGER  
AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

---

Mr. Geraghty called the meeting of the Budget Committee to order at 9:30 a.m.

The Committee commenced with a review of the 2010 Public Works Budget Request, a copy of which is on file with the minutes.

William Lamy, Superintendent of Public Works, began by introducing Sandy Closs, the newly appointed Fiscal Manager for the Public Works division, who had previously served as the Fiscal Manager for the Tri-County Nursing Home for the past 27 years. He then read the memo prefacing the 2010 Budget Request which stated that he and his staff had made every effort to develop a budget which would maintain the current duties performed by the Public Works Division without incurring an increased financial impact to the County. Additionally, the memo noted that in 1995 the Public Works Division had been comprised of 169 staff members which had been reduced over the years and could be potentially reduced further to 114 employees, if the seven vacant positions within the Division remained unfilled. The memo went on to state that the funding allocated to the annual paving program was not adequate to meet the needs of the deteriorating County infrastructure and suggested that the money currently allocated for the 2005 storm damage be returned to the paving program at the completion of the bond payments. Subsequent to reading the memo, Mr. Lamy advised that in developing the 2010 Budget Request he had reduced expenditures as much as possible in order to avoid any layoffs of active employees. He noted that if the decision was made to abolish the seven vacant positions, the budget would be reduced further.

Mr. Belden thanked Mr. Lamy and his staff for their exemplary efforts in developing the 2010 Budget Request. He then stated that although Public Works was one of the largest County divisions, they had significantly reduced staff over the years while continuing to maintain the level of service provided and he felt that other Departments could do the same. Mr. Belden concluded that the expenses included in the 2010 Request reflected a decrease from the 2009 Appropriations and he hoped that the Committee would vote to approve it.

**Summary of Budget Request - Section A, General Fund:**

Resuming the review of the 2010 Budget Request Mr. Lamy pointed out an increase of \$24,563 in Code A.1490, DPW Administration, over the 2009 Appropriation. He explained that the increase was due to a change in budgeting the salary for a Confidential Assistant position that had previously been included under Code D.5010, Highway Administration, which consequently reflected a decrease for 2010. Mr. Lamy noted that the figures included under Codes A.1623, Old Westmount Building #10 (*the current Social Services Building*), and A.1624, Health & Human Services Building, were unpredictable and would depend upon whether the Social Services Building was retained or demolished. He added that the figure listed under Code A.1624 included estimated utility costs and janitorial services for the Human Services Building. Mr. Lamy noted that all of the requests included the 3.5% salary increases for Union employees.

Mr. Lamy apprised that there was a vacancy in the Buildings & Grounds Division which might need to be filled in order to accommodate the cleaning needs in the new Human Services Building. He explained that although there were currently two staff members cleaning the Social Services Building, additional cleaning staff would be necessary upon moving as the Human Services Building was much larger. In addition, Mr. Lamy stated that there were vacant maintenance positions at the Airport and Warrensburg DPW Shop which had led to the need to use Buildings & Grounds staff to provide janitorial services at both locations. He said that he would recommend filling one of the vacant positions, or at least retaining the funding for one of the positions within the 2010 Budget in order to allow for it to be filled at a later date. Mr. Lamy stated that there were positions in other areas of the Public Works Division that could be abolished in order to offset the costs of the custodial position.

Referring to Parks & Recreation, Code A. 7110, Mr. Lamy advised that the 2010 Request represented a \$51,532 decrease from the 2009 Appropriation. He noted that he had received, and supported, an employee request to participate in the Early Retirement Incentive program that would further reduce the budget if approved. Mr. Champagne questioned whether the position would need to be filled if vacated and Mr. Lamy replied that the position could be abolished; however, he said, there would come a time when services were not being provided as timely as they had in the past, due to a lack of staffing. Mr. Lamy added that none of the services provided by the Public Works Division were life threatening, other than maintaining the highway infrastructure, and he said that many of the duties performed by his staff could be delayed and performed when they were able as staffing was reduced. He stated that there were a number of projects that had been taken on by his staff which were nice but were not necessary to the function of the County and those would be delayed in order to perform necessary jobs; Mr. Lamy added that he had approached the budget process with the theory that his Department needed to do the work required of them with less staffing and funding.

Mr. Lamy apprised that the Up Yonda, Code A.7111, 2010 Request reflected a \$71,828 decrease from the 2009 Appropriation and this was due to the County's decision not to fund any Up Yonda operations. He stated that the \$146,363 expenditure listed in the 2010 Request would be fully funded by the Up Yonda Trust, leaving no expense to the County. Mr. Geraghty questioned whether the expense needed to be included in the budget and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively, explaining that it was necessary to reflect the expenditure as offsetting revenues would be included as they were received from the Up Yonda Trust. Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, added that because the Up Yonda budget had to be presented to and reviewed by the Up Yonda Trust, a figure had to be included for expenditures at the facility.

Moving on to Code A.7112, Snowmobile Grant, Mr. Lamy apprised that a figure had not been included in the 2010 Request and this was because the amount would not be reflected until the total snowmobile grant funding amount was known. He explained that the expenditure would match the amount of funding granted, leaving no expense

to the County.

Mr. Lamy pointed out that an increase of \$93,000 was indicated for Code A.9950, Transfers - Capital Projects, and this was because there were three major projects going to construction in 2010. He said that he felt the total expenditure for 2010 might not be as high as the \$913,000 figure included in the Request, based on the last Master Agreement received from NYSDOT (New York State Department of Transportation) for the Corinth Road Project. Mr. Lamy explained that the County had been using Local dollars to cover some of the State's share of Project costs and because the Master Agreement had increased the State Share, it would lessen the amount the County was responsible for, which would in turn lower the amount expended under Code A.9950. He concluded that they would revisit this figure to reduce it appropriately.

In response to Mr. Geraghty's inquiry regarding the decrease in total revenues for the General Fund section, Mr. Lamy apprised that revenues charged to the other Departments intended to occupy the new Human Services Building needed to be reconciled for accuracy and to better understand why those figures had decreased. Mr. Belden noted that the revenues were also down as the Snowmobile Grant revenues were included in the 2009 Appropriation figures, but not in the 2010 Request. Mr. Lamy replied that this was correct but noted that the addition of the Snowmobile Grant funds would also cause expenditures to rise, offsetting the revenues reported.

Mr. Kenny questioned whether a price per square foot for rental charges in the new Human Services Building had been established and Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, replied in the negative. Mr. Belden stated that it would be impossible to finalize any of the Departmental budgets involved with the Human Services Building until a firm figure representing maintenance in lieu of rent costs were known. Mr. Lamy agreed and advised that he intended to spend more time on this issue to develop the necessary figure.

Discussion ensued.

#### **Summary of Budget Request - Section B, Solid Waste Management:**

Mr. Lamy announced that a \$201,807 increase for Code CL8160, Solid Waste Management, was included in the 2010 Request based upon financial information received from Steve Lynch, Solid Waste Coordinator. He explained that the 2009 Appropriation figure of \$4,039,872 included what was budgeted, as well as what was identified to complete the County's commitment for 2009. Mr. Lamy apprised that as per Mr. Lynch, a more detailed accounting of 2010 expenditures would be presented in late September.

#### **Summary of Budget Request - Section C, County Road Funds:**

Beginning with Code D.3310, Traffic, Mr. Lamy apprised that there was no new staffing in this division and that the \$3,575 increase was attributed to the 3.5% salary increases for Union employees. He said that expenditures under Code D.5020, Engineering, had increased because a staff member had been added and because of the transfer of the Deputy Superintendent of Highways title from Code A.1490, DPW Administration, to the Engineering division. In reference to Code D.5148, Services to Other Governments, Mr. Lamy apprised that although they had included \$80,000 in the 2010 Request, he did not feel that this amount would be charged or received for paving work provided on behalf of the Towns and he suggested that this figure be lowered to \$60,000, which was more realistic. Mr. Lamy cited that many portions of the budget had decreased or remained the same and he proceeded to outline the listing of expenditures included in the 2010 Request.

Mr. Pitkin pointed out that a \$16,710 decrease was reflected under Code D.9010, Retirement, and he questioned

whether this was correct as he had been advised that there would be an increase in retirement costs on the Town level. Mr. Lamy replied that this number had been included upon the advisement of the Treasurer's Office and he had no control over this figure.

**Summary of Budget Request - Section D, Machinery Fund:**

Mr. Lamy stated that Code DM1910, Liability Insurance, included a 2010 Request of \$76,650 which was reflective of the number received from the Treasurer's Office. He advised of a slight increase in Code DM5130, Machinery Fund, and he noted that there were some potential savings that could decrease this number, such as the possible retirement of an employee with a base salary of \$34,000, plus fringe benefits. Mr. Lamy stated that there was an increase for Code DM9901, Transfer - Debt Service, which was attributed to the fact that they were now paying principal and interest on the bonding for the \$2.5 million of DPW equipment purchased. He pointed out that the total revenues listed for 2009 consisted of \$2,053,755 as compared to the 2010 anticipated figure of \$1,644,500, which appeared to be a significant decrease. Mr. Lamy stated that this was not the case as the 2009 figure included a tax levy of \$363,000 that was not included in the 2010 figure; he added that if the tax levy amount was subtracted from the 2009 figure, the 2009 and 2010 revenue figures were fairly consistent.

Referring to the grand totals listed for all Public Works Divisions, Mr. Lamy announced that the 2010 Request totaled \$20,421,395 as compared to the 2009 Appropriation of \$20,544,321, a decrease of \$122,926. He reminded the Committee that these figures did not include potential personnel savings or additional revenues that could be found through further budget review.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Lamy stated that he wished to provide more information on the Transfers to Capital Projects figures and he directed the Committee members to page 56 of the budget proposal which included a listing of all active capital projects intended for 2010, a number of which reflected \$0 County Share. Mr. Lamy pointed out that the Corinth Road Project reflected a \$292,000 County Share which would be supplemented by leftover funds in other capital projects. He said that a conservative approach had been taken in estimating this figure in order to avoid the possibility of incurring a shortfall in the Local Share as the project proceeded. Mr. Lamy advised that State Marchiselli Funds, which typically covered 15% of the Local Share, could potentially be granted in connection with the Corinth Road Project and they had taken an aggressive approach in seeking this funding. He explained that the State had indicated they would not provide Marchiselli funding for the engineering or right-of-way acquisition portions of the Corinth Road Project and would instead fund 15% of the Local Share for construction costs. Mr. Lamy said that in light of this information, he would have to revisit the \$292,000 figure representing the Local Share of the Corinth Road Project to determine its accuracy.

Moving on to the Harrington Road Bridge over Mill Creek Project which included a Local Share of \$241,000, Mr. Lamy advised that a conservative approach had also been taken in establishing this figure in order to avoid a shortfall. He noted that the figure represented the total 20% Local Share that would be spent if no Marchiselli funding was received in connection with the Project; however, he added, they had been advised by the State that it would be reasonable to expect to receive some Marchiselli funding and although the total to be received was still unknown, a figure would be related before construction began. Mr. Lamy advised that the safe approach would be to retain the \$241,000 Local Share in the 2010 Budget but if the Committee desired to take the risk, the figure could be reduced in anticipation of the Marchiselli funding that might be received. He stated that if the additional State funding was not received, the Harrington Road Bridge Project could be delayed until 2011, although he cautioned the Committee that the majority of the funding for the Project was currently in place and delaying the Project might

lead to that funding being used in other areas.

Mr. Belden questioned whether the State had committed to providing Marchiselli funding for either the Corinth Road or Harrington Road Bridge Projects and Mr. Lamy replied in the negative, noting that only confirmation of 80% Federal funding for both Projects had been received so far. He explained that the Local Share indicated for both Projects included the total 20% Local Share that the County would pay if no Marchiselli funding was received; however, he said, there was a reasonable expectation that 5% Marchiselli funding would be received in the first year for these Projects. Mr. Lamy reiterated that in preparing the 2010 Budget Request they had decided to adopt the less risky approach of including the entire Local Share, rather than reducing the amount in anticipation of State Marchiselli funding which was not guaranteed. He added that the Committee could reduce the amount included for the Local Share if they were willing to take the risk and he suggested that no more than 5% be removed from each, which would lead to a total reduction of approximately \$130,000.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Taylor, Mr. Lamy apprised that a signed document guaranteeing State Marchiselli funding would not be received until the construction bids and inspection figures were determined and a Master Agreement was developed, at which point the State would review the Master Agreement to assess how much Marchiselli funding would be granted. Mr. Geraghty questioned whether the Marchiselli funds were included in the revenue portion of the 2010 Budget Request and Mr. Lamy replied in the negative, noting that they would not be added to the budget until the written guarantees of funding were received in the form of an amendment to the Master Agreement. Therefore, Mr. Lamy advised, reducing the two Projects by 5% each would reduce expenses by \$130,000 but would have no affect on the revenue side of the 2010 Request.

Discussion ensued.

Moving on, Mr. Lamy directed the Committee members to page 55 of the budget proposal which included information on the Airport Capital Improvement Program that was to be subsidized by FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) grant funding, and he asked Don DeGraw, Airport Manager, to outline the document for the Committee's benefit. Mr. DeGraw advised that the document on page 55 reflected two charts, the first of which consisted of equipment and initiatives to be funded by FAA grants including snow removal equipment; an ARFF (Airport Rescue Fire Fighting) fire truck; PAPI (Precision Approach Path Indicators) installation on Runway 12-30; design, mitigation and permitting for the Runway 1/19 extension and the purchase of land easement from Forest Enterprises. He said that the cost for these items totaled \$2.2 million, 95% of which would be covered by FAA grant funding and 2.5% by the State, leaving a 2.5% Local Share to the County which totaled \$55,000.

Mr. DeGraw explained that the second chart reflected two projects for which he intended to apply for State funding, those being the design and construction of a ramp to allow for additional aircraft parking at the Airport and a ramp bridge to cross an existing drainage ditch, allowing for additional t-hangars to be constructed on property which was currently inaccessible. He said that the State grant funding required a 10% Local Share, leading to a total cost to the County of \$140,000 for both projects.

Mr. Kenny questioned whether the ramp for additional aircraft parking was actually necessary and Mr. DeGraw replied affirmatively. He added that at some point in the future FAA grant funding would be available for the project; however, he noted, the project would be very low on the FAA priority list as it was not a safety related project and he was not sure that it would ever be granted. Mr. Kenny then asked how the ARFF fire truck differed from the one currently in use at the Airport and Mr. DeGraw replied that the ARFF fire truck allowed one person to operate all functions of the truck from the inside and also employed two different types of fire fighting agents, a foam/water agent and a dry chemical agent.

When asked what purpose the old fire truck would serve if a new one was purchased, Mr. DeGraw replied that although it would be nice to have a second fire fighting vehicle on hand in the event that the newer unit might malfunction, the older fire truck could be sold. Mr. DeGraw noted that the \$850,000 figure representing the ARFF fire truck might be a little high as Albany Airport had recently purchased a similar fire truck for \$400,000.

Mr. Belden questioned whether the grant funding indicated had been guaranteed and Mr. DeGraw replied in the negative, noting that these were grants that they intended to apply for and if the grant funding was not approved, the Local Share indicated would not be expended. Mr. VanNess asked if in-kind services could be used to cover the Local Share of the grant funding and Mr. DeGraw replied that he did not believe this was a method the FAA employed but said that he could contact them to determine if this was a viable option.

Mr. Pitkin stated that due to the difficult budget year, he did not feel that it was appropriate to consider expending \$140,000 to support the construction of ramps and bridges at the Airport and Mr. Champagne agreed. Mr. Lamy responded that this expenditure had not been included in the 2010 Request and had been presented only to outline the options available for the Committee's consideration.

Mr. Belden noted that there were currently five vacant positions which could be eliminated to reduce the total budget and Mr. Lamy advised that before the positions were eliminated, they should discuss further how many maintenance positions would be necessary for the new Human Services Building. Mr. Lamy apprised that he and Mr. Morehouse had discussed whether daytime Buildings & Grounds staff could be diverted to clean the Human Services Building and had determined that the staff were currently being overextended in their efforts to cover the duties of the vacant positions and would not be able to provide necessary services at the Human Services Building. Mr. Morehouse stated that he felt three maintenance staff would be sufficient to clean the Human Services Building, provided that a system was implemented allowing for all trash to be emptied and bathrooms to be cleaned on a daily basis with the vacuuming and cleaning services to be performed in sections of the building on a rotating schedule. He said that he would ask for support from all of the Supervisors as he was sure there were going to be employee complaints regarding the fact that not all portions of the building would be vacuumed on a daily basis. Mr. Belden reminded the Committee members that there were already two cleaning staff dedicated to the current Social Services Building that would move to the Human Services Building and he suggested that another maintenance person be hired to allow three cleaners for the new building. Mr. Morehouse interjected that while he agreed with the addition of a maintenance person, he preferred that the position not be dedicated solely to the Human Services Building, but rather be allowed the flexibility to use that person wherever necessary. He added that the number of staff necessary to clean the new building was dependent upon the purchase of a new floor cleaning machine which they were trying to purchase through the bond for the Human Services Building.

Mr. Payne questioned whether a member of the maintenance staff could be assigned to the Human Services Building during regular business hours in light of the amount of visitor traffic and debris that would be tracked into the building, especially during winter months. Mr. Morehouse replied that he did feel that a maintenance person could be working in the Human Services Building during the day and he said he hoped that the new floor machine would assist in keeping the floors clean of debris such as salt and sand tracked in during the winter months.

Referring to the remaining vacant positions, Mr. Lamy stated that they would soon implement one-person plowing and had operated for the entire summer season without filling the vacant Highway Construction Supervisor position which would have been filled if the decision had been made to switch to shift work. He said that although he was opposed to abolishing positions, he was willing to leave the vacant Highway Construction Supervisor position unfunded in the 2010 Budget as the highway crews had been reduced and the position was not necessary at this time; however, he added, he would recommend that the Committee consider leaving certain positions within the

budget unfunded so that they could be filled at a later date if the decision was made to increase staffing to prior levels. Mr. Lamy stated that there was a vacant Laborer position which he agreed to leave unfunded in the 2010 budget but requested that the position be retained within the Table of Organization to be filled in the future if necessary. He advised that approximately \$77,000 plus fringe benefits would be saved by leaving the Highway Construction Supervisor and Laborer positions unfunded within the 2010 Budget. In addition, Mr. Lamy advised that an employee working at the DPW Shop and another working within Parks, Recreation & Railroad had applied for the early retirement incentive and he had endorsed their requests which, if approved, would lead to additional salary and benefit savings for the County.

Mr. Lamy apprised that another vacant position was that of the Information Systems Manager. He explained that they had combined some of the duties of the General Foreman and Information Systems Manager positions while trying to cross train one person to move into a vacancy which would occur in the next year when himself and Brian Humphrey, Deputy Superintendent of Highways, retired. Mr. Lamy said although this was a solution, it was not as efficient as operating with an in-house IT (information technology) staff as there were a number of issues that had to be responded to immediately and IT assistance was not always immediately available as the IT staff was located off-site on the Municipal Center Campus. He added that they had received acceptable service from the IT staff; however, he said, there were some issues that needed to be addressed which were not a priority to the IT staff on a County-wide basis, as they would be if the DPW had their own IT staff in-house. Mr. Lamy stated that if he could be assured that these issues would be addressed in a timely manner he would be willing to relinquish the Information Systems Manager position, which would incur additional savings in the 2010 Request.

Mr. Belden stated that the IT staff had grown significantly since the Department was introduced and he felt that one of the IT staff members could easily be moved to the DPW office to address their technology concerns, rather than hiring a new staff member. Mr. Lamy reminded the Committee that there had not been a refusal to review DPW technology issues, it just seemed that these issues were not a priority compared to issues occurring in other Departments.

Mr. Geraghty questioned whether the purchase of new programs had increased efficiency within the DPW and Mr. Lamy replied affirmatively, noting that there were some issues with these programs that required IT review and correction.

Mr. Kenny said he firmly believed that all IT personnel should be housed together within the IT Department, including the IT staff working within the Sheriff's Office, and he suggested that Rob Metthe, IT Director, be instructed to schedule one of his staff members to work at the DPW Office as needed to address these technology issues.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Geraghty stated that although he was sympathetic to Mr. Lamy's requests to retain certain unfunded positions within the Department's Table of Organization, the decision had already been made to delete any unfunded positions from the 2010 Budget.

Returning to the review of the 2010 Budget Request, Mr. Lamy directed the Committee members to page 79, which reflected the "Tentative Paving and Construction Schedule 2010". He advised that the listing totaled \$2,384,575 and represented the paving needs of the County; however, he said, it had been previously determined that only CHIPS (Consolidated Highway Improvement Program) funding would be used to support the 2010 paving projects, with no County contribution. Mr. Lamy said that because the CHIPS funding anticipated totaled only \$1,383,962,

the Tentative Paving and Construction Schedule for 2010 would have to be significantly reduced. He advised that a meeting had been held between himself, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Tennyson and Kevin Hajos, Senior Civil Engineer, to discuss how the paving schedule and associated costs could be reduced and he asked Mr. Tennyson to speak on the matter.

Mr. Tennyson stated that the listing of paving and construction projects included in the budget represented the work that would be done if \$2.4 million in funding was available. Since this was not the case, he said that they were reviewing the projects to convert them into shorter distance reconstructions, as well as to determine where patches and crack sealing could be done in preparation for future pavement overlay work. Mr. Tennyson apprised that for the 2010 and 2011 budget years they would be implementing temporary repairs necessary to preserve roads until more significant work could be done in the future as the County could not currently afford to perform the overlay and reconstruction work done in the past. He advised that the State was also using this approach due to their similar budget issues. Mr. Tennyson said that a more detailed listing of the work to be performed in 2010 would be presented later in the budget process, along with further information on the array of treatment options available for preservation of County roads. He advised that they were currently reviewing the cost implications of using an oil and stone penetration method for road treatment which would provide a usable road for immediate use and a sturdy structure to build on in the future. Mr. Tennyson noted that the County had utilized the oil and stone penetration method in the past, but had converted to more aesthetic paving methods when increased funding had been available. He concluded that additional information respective to the options available and their associated costs would be provided later in the year.

Mr. Pitkin questioned whether each of the road projects listed would receive some sort of treatment in 2010 and Mr. Tennyson replied in the negative, noting that decisions would have to be made regarding which projects would be eliminated from the list depending upon which projects could be delayed. Mr. Pitkin then asked if the roads in the worst shape would be treated first and Mr. Tennyson replied that although it would be easy to adopt a "worst first" mentality to address the roads, it was actually better to provide temporary fixes for the roads that could be saved first. He added that roads that already required full reconstruction would receive the least attention, if any, and they needed to determine how those roads could be addressed in other years.

Discussion ensued with respect to the Tentative Paving and Construction Schedule for 2010.

Mr. Payne asked if funding for bridge projects had been included in the 2010 Request and Mr. Lamy replied in the negative. Mr. Lamy said that when they had started the Bridge Maintenance Crew, they had requested \$750,000 to be expended over a three-year term. He noted that it was obvious that the County bridges required funding to perform maintenance and repair work; however, he said, due to the budget situation he had not requested funding for 2010. Mr. Lamy reminded the Committee that in 2009 they had bonded \$500,000 to cover bridge maintenance costs in 2009 and 2010 and he anticipated that \$300,000 of that total would be expended in 2009. He added that there would be approximately \$200,000 in funding remaining in the bond that could be used for bridge maintenance in 2010. Mr. Lamy stated that it seemed the more work the Bridge Maintenance Crew performed, the more problems they found with County bridges. He said that this work was something that the County had to sustain and he was sure that in the future increased funding would be required to do so as the County's bridges had been neglected for a long time. Mr. Lamy apprised that there were 57 County bridges to be maintained and although they would not see any savings now, they would realize them in the future by extending the useful life of the bridges and avoiding full reconstruction.

Mr. Kenny said that he felt the DPW staff had employed unparalleled logic and ingenuity in providing services to the County while reducing costs, for which he applauded them. He stated that he would not vote in favor of

approving the budget, but only because of the funding attributed to the railroad, which he did not agree with. Mr. Merlino agreed with Mr. Kenny's statements and thanked Mr. Lamy and his staff for their efforts in developing the budget. He added that he wished all of the other Department Heads would follow the same format in presenting their budget requests as the DPW request was clearly marked and easy to follow.

Motion was made by Mr. Merlino, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried by majority vote, with Mr. Kenny voting in opposition, to approve the Public Works 2010 Budget Request, contingent upon the removal of all unfunded positions and review of revenues to confirm accuracy prior to September 4<sup>th</sup>, and forward same on to the Budget Officer for further review.

As there was no further business to come before the Budget Committee, on motion made by Mr. Kenny and seconded by Mr. Belden, Mr. Geraghty adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist