

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: BUDGET

DATE: OCTOBER 24, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS GERAGHTY  
TAYLOR  
CHAMPAGNE  
BENTLEY  
KENNY  
MERLINO  
GIRARD  
CONOVER  
BELDEN

OTHERS PRESENT:

DANIEL G. STEC, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD  
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
JOANN MCKINSTRY, ASSISTANT TO THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
ROB LYNCH, FISCAL ASSISTANT TO THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
SUPERVISORS LOEB  
MCDEVITT  
MONROE  
STRAINER  
THOMAS  
VANNES  
WOOD  
PAT AUER, DIRECTOR OF HEALTH SERVICES  
TODD LUNT, DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
JULIE PACYNA, PURCHASING AGENT  
JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
BUD YORK, WARREN COUNTY SHERIFF  
DR. JAMES SEELEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CORNELL COOPERATIVE EXT.  
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*  
THOM RANDALL, *ADIRONDACK JOURNAL*  
AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST  
*Please see sign in sheet for additional meeting attendees.*

Mr. Geraghty called the meeting of the Budget Committee to order at 9:36 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the prior meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the Budget Officer's 2012 Budget proposal were distributed to the Committee members; a copy is also on file with the minutes.

Mr. Geraghty began by reading aloud from a document outlining the highlights of the budget proposal which included notations on uncontrollable increases in health insurance premiums, workers' compensation and retirement costs, as well as those associated with the Hudson River/Black River Regulating District. He advised that in order to achieve a manageable budget increase of 1.9%, a planned consolidation of the meal sites supported by the Office for the Aging, reductions in the Planning & Community Development Department, elimination of the Print Shop and Human Resources Department in favor of a Generalist position, as well as other workforce reductions, were suggested; *a copy of the Highlights document is on file with the minutes.* He concluded his review by thanking the Department Heads for their continued cooperation throughout the process of developing the budget proposal and noting the Budget Team's concerns with the future economy of Warren County, as well as anticipated costs associated with the Westmount Health Facility in 2013. Mr. Geraghty advised the process to make these determinations had not been easy, nor enjoyable, and tough decisions had been necessary to reach a proposal figure beneath the specified tax cap.

Mr. Belden noted the budget proposal included a reduction of two vacant positions from the Department of Public Works (DPW) and he questioned whether this was appropriate. Jeffery Tennyson, DPW Superintendent, advised he was comfortable with the position eliminations because an agreement had been reached to place some of the funding from the position reductions in a budget code that would allow him to hire temporary help when needed.

Mr. Taylor questioned the amount allowed for the Contingency Fund for 2012 and Paul Dusek, County Administrator, advised \$250,000 had been included, as well as an additional \$129,000 for non-union position wage adjustments. Mr. Taylor commented that he liked the bottom line figures included in the budget proposal and said he understood that a number of difficult decisions had been made to reach this figure. He added that most of the Committee members were seeing the recommendations for the first time and although many could make arguments against the reductions unfavorable to them, they would never be able to maintain the bottom line figure provided if they proceeded in this manner. Therefore, Mr. Taylor stated, he reluctantly agreed with the budget proposal as presented.

Mr. Champagne said the budgetary situation could be affected by union negotiations and he suggested that an executive session be held to discuss the matter and gain a better sense of their status. Mr. Geraghty responded that he did not feel such discussion was appropriate for the Budget Committee and Mr. Champagne countered that it would be very difficult for him to make a decision on the budget without some indication as to how labor costs associated with union negotiations might affect the 2012 Budget. Mr. Geraghty advised the 2012 Budget proposal had been crafted in the same manner as in prior years and did not include any unknown labor costs, such as those that would be incurred through a renewed union contract; he added that these issues would be addressed at a future date when the exact costs were known. Mr. Dusek apprised that an executive session could certainly be called to discuss the collective bargaining negotiations and the strategies planned if the Committee believed it would be helpful in increasing their comfort level with the budget proposal. Mr. Champagne confirmed that he would like an executive session to discuss the previously mentioned matters and Mr. Geraghty requested that it be postponed until the end of the meeting.

Mr. Girard thanked Mr. Geraghty and the Budget Team for the work they had done in developing the 2012 Budget proposal. He then asked Mr. Geraghty to elaborate on the proposed elimination of the Human Resources Department in favor of a Generalist position, noting that during his tenure the Board of Supervisors had determined the Department was necessary and had canvassed the area to find a great candidate. He added that any time an employee problem arose, the Human Resources Director had been called upon to provide a history of the situation and direction as to how best to proceed. Mr. Girard said he felt the Human Resources Director presented a tremendous value to Warren County due to the number of staff employed and since he had not heard any complaints as to the job performance of this person, he was unclear as to why the Department had been targeted for elimination. He concluded that he had a very difficult time accepting this elimination when a funding increase of \$150,000 to the EDC (Economic Development Corporation) was being proposed. As a compromise, Mr. Girard suggested the bottom line figure be maintained by retaining the Human Services Department and reducing the amount of funding to the EDC. Mr. Geraghty advised that the Human Resources Department was not being eliminated, but rather the staffing changed to remove the Director position in favor of a Generalist position which had a lower classification that would add more value to the County.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Kenny, Mr. Geraghty advised \$250,000 had been contributed to the EDC for 2011 and the 2012 Budget proposal sought to increase that amount to \$400,000. Mr. Kenny said that the increase seemed to represent a considerable leap of faith for a corporation with an unproven Director.

Mr. Monroe questioned the decreases to the Planning & Community Development Department which seemed to

be almost identical in value to the increase in the EDC funding. He said that many of the towns located in the northern parts of Warren County used the Planning Department to assist with grant opportunities and he expressed his concern that the EDC would not provide the same valuable services, which might result in less grant funding. Mr. Monroe added the fact that they were going to have community driven economic development plans which would create grant opportunities and he did not understand the reasoning for increasing the EDC funding by removing it from the Planning Department. Mr. Geraghty advised the EDC felt they could provide more benefits by introducing jobs to the County if they had the additional funding; he added that the Planning Department would retain a minimal staff to provide assistance to work with anyone needing help with grants. Mr. Geraghty further advised that due to Governor Cuomo's newly instituted Economic Councils, all grant applications had to be forwarded to them, so partnering with the EDC was a better option. He said there had been some discussion with the EDC relative to their assuming some of the work currently done by the Planning Department, as well. However, Mr. Geraghty noted, not all of the functions would be assumed and that was why one Planning and one GIS (Geographic Information System) position would be retained.

Mr. Dusek confirmed that Mr. Monroe's observation was accurate, in that the funding being removed from the Planning Department would be transferred to the EDC. Additionally, he advised that in his discussions with the EDC relative to whether they might assume some of the duties held by the Planning Department, the EDC had presented some interesting thoughts as to how both the EDC and the LDC (Local Development Corporation) could be used and structured somewhat differently to address them. Mr. Dusek said that the conversations had not gone to great lengths as they had needed to determine whether the Committee was in favor of moving in this conceptual direction and implementing a merger of this nature. In order to provide the services the EDC could not offer, Mr. Dusek said the Budget Team had envisioned retaining one Planner position and one GIS position. He pointed out that through the increased contribution, the County would actually receive twice the benefits for their money in that the EDC needed additional funding to aggressively pursue the types of programs they sought to engage in for job creation, which was a benefit to Warren County, and would also be providing for the services transferred from the Planning Department. Mr. Dusek stated that initially, the EDC had contacted the County seeking additional funding and the Budget Team had determined there was not sufficient funding available to simply concede to the request and had instead developed the aforementioned plan to provide the funding while gaining services from the EDC. He added that while there seemed to be a willingness for the EDC to provide services as requested, there were details to be worked out, and if the Committee was in favor of the proposed structure, they would have to move forward with aggressive negotiations to secure agreements as quickly as possible.

Mr. Bentley apprised the Town of Horicon had received assistance from a volunteer grant writer who was also working with the EDC on some grant opportunities. He added that he believed the EDC's participation was already improving as he had not had any involvement with the prior EDC Director and the new Director had already visited the Town of Horicon twice in her short tenure.

Chairman Stec said that he appreciated the efforts of the Budget Officer and the Budget Team and agreed with Mr. Taylor's prior statement that although each of the Committee members might object to one facet of the budget proposal, if they started to make changes they might never reach the same minimal increase figure. Referring to the Contingency Fund contribution of \$250,000 eluded to earlier in the meeting, Chairman Stec questioned whether this figure was comparable to contributions made in prior years and Mr. Dusek responded it was the same amount. Chairman Stec then noted the County's prior history with collective bargaining negotiations and questioned whether the Budget Team was comfortable in assuming they would be able to cover the implications of the renewed union contract in the proposed 2012 Budget, to which Mr. Dusek responded that this question was not appropriate for public discussion and should be addressed during executive session. Continuing, Chairman Stec pointed out the sizeable appropriations from the County Road fund balance (\$750,000) and the Road Machinery fund balance

(\$550,000) and questioned whether they were one-time reductions. Mr. Geraghty advised that some of the reductions were attributed to closing Capital Projects and would serve as one-time budget reductions. Mr. Dusek added there were a number of one-time reductions included in the 2012 Budget proposal, including appropriation of the Waste Management fund surplus, the closure of Capital Projects, as Mr. Geraghty mentioned, and a reduction of the Road Machinery fund balance, which he noted, would reduce the fund total to approximately \$300,000; therefore, he added, they could not count on using the Road Machinery fund as a source for Budget reductions in 2013. Having said that, Mr. Dusek noted the 2012 Budget proposal had been crafted in a manner to account for the one-time reduction items and to look ahead to the 2013 Budget as they were very concerned about perceived deficits that could potentially be incurred in connection with the Westmount Health Facility and the Hudson River/Black River Regulating District in 2013. To offset these issues, he advised the Budget Team had made the difficult decision to take drastic measures and ensure recurring savings to the County through Departmental and workforce reductions. Mr. Dusek pointed out that although recent reports had indicated favorable sales tax increases, they had maintained a conservative approach and refrained from including prospective increases in the 2012 Budget proposal in order to assist with the 2013 Budget, as well as to build the fund balance.

Mr. Champagne questioned the amount projected for the fund balance in 2012 and Mr. Dusek responded they were targeting a \$7-\$8 million balance. He added that this amount would alleviate any need to borrow funds in January or February. Chairman Stec asked for a rough total of the one-time reductions included in the 2012 Budget proposal and Rob Lynch, Fiscal Assistant to the County Administrator, advised the total was roughly \$2.2 million; Chairman Stec then noted that they would need to keep this figure in mind when working on the 2013 Budget proposal next year. Mr. Dusek pointed out that part of the difficulty in establishing the 2012 Budget had been in dealing with the one-time budget reductions received in 2011, such as the \$838,000 in Social Services FMAP (Federal Medical Assistance Percent) monies received which would not be repeated for 2012. He said they were able to overcome this issue with the 2012 Budget proposal and had also configured the proposal in a manner to assist with the 2013 Budget.

Mr. Belden noted the Budget proposal did not include any reductions for the Sheriff's Office, which represented one of the largest, and most expensive, County Departments. He said that while he felt the Sheriff's Office did a great job for Warren County, reductions in their operating budget should have been made, as well. Mr. Belden stated that overtime was up in that Department and requests to fill positions had been approved without question; he added that the staffing could likely be reduced by two or three positions without affecting the services provided. Mr. Dusek confirmed that no reductions to the Sheriff's staffing had been made, in part because the staffing of the Correctional Facility was mandated and because they had assumed from prior comments that the Board was happy with the patrol levels maintained by the Sheriff's Office. However, he noted, the Sheriff had made certain concessions to reduce operational costs to the County, one being a reduction in the amount of cars to be purchased through the County Budget from five to three, as Sheriff York had agreed to attempt to purchase two using asset seizure monies; additionally, Mr. Dusek advised that at their request, the Sheriff had agreed to take in Federal prisoners, a measure he had been reluctant to employ in the past, and projected an additional \$225,000 in revenues for these services. He said that the Sheriff had been asked to perform the same tasks as all of the other Department Heads in finding ways to reduce their operating budgets and raise revenues wherever possible, but noted that the Committee had the option of reducing positions if they so desired. Mr. Kenny stated that while he felt the Budget Officer and the Budget Team had done a great job in developing the 2012 Budget proposal, he agreed the Sheriff's Office should suffer the same reductions as other Departments and suggested the elimination of two patrol officers from each shift for a total of four positions and a budget savings of approximately \$200,000.

Mr. Monroe said discussion on the one-time budget reductions brought up an important point about multi-year

budgeting as the process would determine a clear picture of the budget status for future years based on current estimates. He apprised the issue had been discussed at a recent NYSAC (New York State Association of Counties) meeting where Ontario County had been used as a prime example of successful multi-year budgeting, highlighting their ability to weather the recent tough economic times better than any other county in the State. Mr. Geraghty advised that JoAnn McKinstry, Assistant to the County Administrator, continued to work on this initiative as time permitted. Mr. Dusek added they were working towards a multi-year budgeting process and had begun, in small steps, by considering financial conditions and expenditures for 2013 while developing the 2012 Budget. One other thing coming in the future would be the development of a plan for the State Comptroller's Office in terms of use for the fund balance, he noted.

Mr. Champagne pointed out an almost \$235,000 reduction in the Public Health Department and he questioned whether this was from non-mandated programs. Mr. Dusek advised this total had been reached by making reductions in a number of areas subsequent to several meetings with Pat Auer, Director of Health Services. Mrs. Auer added they had been very cautious when making reductions to mandated services, using a five-year trend for prior years to ensure that none of the programs were reduced too far; she concluded they were reasonably comfortable with the reductions made. Mr. Champagne questioned whether there would be any layoffs in the Health Services Department and Mr. Dusek advised two positions would be lost, one of which was a vacant Nursing position and the other was a Word Processor position whose duties she felt could be absorbed elsewhere in the Department.

In response to Mr. Champagne's inquiry as to reductions in the Office for the Aging, Mr. Dusek replied the most significant reduction in this regard was the elimination of the meal sites which had allowed them to save over \$100,000 in the 2012 Budget proposal. Mr. Dusek explained this initiative would include continued preparation of meals at The Cedars site and introduce a new preparation location at the Countryside Adult Home with delivery to satellite pickup locations in the various towns; however, the communal eating sites would no longer be sustained, thereby eliminating the need for rental agreements and their associated costs. He noted there was a significant amount of money expended by the Office for the Aging for programs that are not mandated and this was one of the options determined to obtain savings through meetings with Christie Sabo, Director for the Office for the Aging. Mr. Champagne asked if the meal sites had been notified of this intent and Mr. Dusek replied in the negative, advising that they were not at liberty to make any notifications until the idea was approved by the Committee and the Board of Supervisors; he added that all of the meal sites would be targeted for elimination as of January 1<sup>st</sup>, aside from the Cedars site where they were obligated to provide meal site services by contract. Mr. Dusek concluded that it was possible for not-for-profit agencies, or the individual towns, to set up their own communal dining facilities where the prepared meals could be delivered. Mr. Bentley questioned what the savings to the County was projected to be for the meal site eliminations and also what amount of Federal reimbursement funding would be lost, to which Mr. Lynch replied there would be a net savings of \$126,000 to the County. Mr. Kenny asked if the capabilities were available to prepare all of the meals at the Countryside and Westmount Facilities and Mr. Dusek replied he was unsure; he added that he could request that Ms. Sabo join the meeting if the Committee wished her to speak on the matter. As the Committee was in agreement, Ms. Sabo was summoned.

With reference to the Sheriff's budget, Mr. VanNess noted a revenue plan for the Correctional Facility had been established for 2011 that had been considerably under budget due to the fact that revenues anticipated from Dutchess and Rennselaer Counties had not been realized as both had found less expensive sites to house their inmates. Additionally, he noted, 2012 would be the first year in the past three that the Sheriff had requested funding for vehicles as an existing Capital Project had been used to make these purchases, as well as the use of asset seizure monies. Mr. VanNess stated that while the figures looked very high on paper, the Board of Supervisors was

partly to blame by asking for higher than realistic revenues for inmate boarding services not realized in 2011. He concluded that he would never vote for a budget that included a reduction in Patrol Officers, especially considering the current economic situation. Mr. VanNess apprised that he lived in a neighborhood where his children and grandchildren could safely walk down the street and he wanted to keep it that way.

Mr. Monroe noted that Pat Tatich, Director of Planning & Community Development, was in attendance and he asked her to speak on the impact the proposed reductions would pose to her Department. Ms. Tatich advised she had only learned that morning of the reductions proposed and did not feel that she was in the best position to speak on the matter. Mr. Monroe pointed out that the Planning Department had assisted in gaining millions of dollars in grant opportunities on behalf of the towns and County and he questioned how this assistance would be provided in the future if the Department was reduced. Ms. Tatich apprised she had met with Messrs. Geraghty and Dusek to discuss the status of her Department and the fact that, due to the current state of the economy, grant opportunities had dwindled and the administrative dollars associated with them had shrunk. She said the question at hand was whether or not the Committee supported the idea of the Planning & Community Development Department, and she proceeded to outline the services provided by herself and her staff which included seeking out and gaining grant funds, providing planning assistance to communities, maintaining the small business loan and GIS programs and providing for housing rehabilitation services, along with part-time building inspections in conjunction with the Fire Prevention & Building Code Enforcement Department. Ms. Tatich advised that while everyone was searching for ways to operate their Departments more effectively, she said she had been very surprised to hear the discussion about the EDC and their ability to manage the Planning Department's functions. She said she was aware that the current EDC Director had previously managed small business loan programs, but she had no indications as to the extent of the EDC's grant or proposal writing capabilities, nor their community engagement efforts. Therefore, Ms. Tatich stated, the issue seemed to be where the comfort level of the Board fell and where they would prefer to spend budgetary funds. She noted the Planning Department would not be able to provide the same levels of assistance with the reduced staff; however, she said she was extremely pleased the budget proposal had included the retention of the GIS position. Ms. Tatich advised her Department had been very heavily oriented towards community development programs and she was unsure the EDC would provide the same measures and the same level of hands-on activity that was currently provided.

Mr. Monroe noted the efforts of the Planning Department had not been restricted solely to the grant application process and had included a lot of administrative work for communities unable to provide it for themselves. Ms. Tatich agreed with this statement and advised her Department ranked among the top four within the State and were given a considerable amount of leeway in the application process because they were a trusted and proven entity that could be depended upon to follow all of the necessary procedural steps. She said she was unsure what this credibility factor was worth, but noted it might be sensible to consider this point before making a final decision.

Mr. Girard stated that he did have an issue with providing additional funding to an unproven entity that had received reduced County funding in prior years, especially in light of the fact that the money was being removed from a County Department that had proven its worth. Mr. Dusek said the Planning Department had done an exemplary job and had presented a value to Warren County, much to Ms. Tatich's credit; however, he added, as the Budget Team reviewed the issue, they had determined many of the functions previously performed by the Planning Department were no longer necessary due to changes made by Governor Cuomo at the State level dictating grant approval procedures, as well as the current state of the economy and the decreasing amount of grant funding available. He concluded that the Departmental reductions had not been suggested based on performance, but rather in relation to the future needs of the County and the ability of the EDC to provide services to both small and large businesses in place of the Planning Department at a lesser cost. Mr. Dusek advised that although the

outcomes were unknown and they were taking a chance in making the proposed change, this was like any new venture and they would not know what benefits could be reaped until they attempted it. He concluded that while it was possible the initiative could fail, the question was really whether they should try to move ahead in a new, positive direction, or remain with past practices that were likely to show declined Planning Department activity. Mr. Geraghty agreed that this initiative was somewhat of a gamble but noted that the EDC would have one year to perform and present a benefit to the County or the arrangement would not be continued.

Mr. Merlino said he agreed with the philosophy behind this decision, but wondered whether it was wise to make such an extreme change in the first year and suggested they might consider implementing half of the reductions and funding proposed in 2012, with the remainder to be done in 2013. He expressed his concern that although the new EDC Director seemed to be very enthusiastic about her position and willing to aggressively pursue the opportunities available, she might abandon the Directorship in the future if offered a better position. Mr. Geraghty responded that the Committee was able to make whatever changes they felt appropriate to the budget proposal, keeping in mind they would have to accept the consequences for them.

Mrs. Wood stated that although she understood tough decisions had to be made in order to reach an acceptable budget, and speaking as Chairwoman of the Planning & Community Development Committee, she said she had some concerns about the reductions proposed, such as whether the EDC would be able to assist communities located within the Adirondack Park. She added she was sure the EDC would be able to provide promotional assistance for businesses within the Queensbury area, which would have some limited effect on the smaller towns in the northern parts of Warren County, but was very concerned with how the First Wilderness Heritage Corridor programs would be continued and completed. Ms. Wood concluded that she was also very concerned with the manner in which the Departmental reductions had been addressed and felt they definitely could have been handled better.

Discussion ensued.

Chairman Stec questioned the hypothetical net change to the Budget for closure of Countryside Adult Home and Mr. Dusek replied that it would depend upon how quickly the facility could be closed. He advised that as per prior consultant reports, it would take approximately four to six months to close the facility and projections had shown that even if this could have been done before the end of the year, the same costs would be incurred for 2012 and a 50% reduction for 2013, with costs continuing to decline over the following years due to residual costs such as health insurance for retirees. Chairman Stec clarified he was not suggesting closure of Countryside, but noted it was a measure that could be considered to offset the one shot reductions that would not be available for future budgets.

As Ms. Sabo was now present, Mr. Champagne requested further information as to the meal site reduction plans. Ms. Sabo began by stating she was very concerned with Chairman Stec's prior statements regarding Countryside Adult Home as a lot of the plan was predicated on using that facility for meal preparations. She noted that during the budget negotiation process she had been asked to reduce her Departmental expenses by \$250,000 and meal site reduction was the only way in which she could do this. Ms. Sabo apprised the proposed plan would close the eight congregate meal sites currently supported, alleviating rent costs, and eliminating five positions and their associated wages; she added they would begin preparing the meals at The Cedars site, for delivery to Lake Luzerne, and at Countryside for delivery to Chestertown, Johnsburg and Warrensburg. Food costs would not be reduced, Ms. Sabo pointed out, because they would be preparing the same amount of meals for delivery to a designated pick-up site in each town. She cautioned she was unsure whether the State would be agreeable to the loss of the congregate sites as they presented a social benefit for the 36,000 to 40,000 people who attended them. Ms. Sabo noted designated pick-up sites would need to be established and advised that individuals not approved for meal delivery would have

to pick up their meals independently.

Mr. Kenny questioned the wiseness of embarking on a plan to prepare meals at Countryside since there was ongoing discussion regarding its closure and questioned whether it would be possible to prepare meals at Westmount, instead. Ms. Sabo replied that preparing meals at Westmount would require them to purchase additional materials to ensure the meals were kept at a certain temperature in order to meet New York State Department of Health regulations. Mr. Dusek noted that even if the Countryside facility was closed, they could retain use of the kitchen facilities for meal preparation.

Returning to the Planning issue, Mr. Monroe questioned who would provide grant submission and administration services if the funds were transferred to the EDC. Mr. Dusek advised the EDC and LDC would work on business related/job development type grants, but would not provide for affordable housing grants as they were not within their bailiwick. He said the decision to make a change of this nature was based on indications that the previous types of grant opportunities for affordable housing funding would no longer be available, meaning that the Planning staff was superfluous. Mr. Monroe responded that he had attended a meeting of the Capital Regional Economic Development Council where it had been noted community development funding would continue to be available. Mr. Geraghty reminded the Committee that a minimal Planning staff would be retained to address these types of funding opportunities, as well as to maintain the First Wilderness Heritage Corridor Project and relationships with the New York State Department of State. He added that many of the towns had started working with consultants to provide grant application and administration work independently and no longer required Planning assistance. Mr. Champagne stated there was less grant funding available now than in prior years and those funds were likely to become increasingly scarce in the years to come. He suggested that if a problem with lack of staffing was identified, they could always hire additional staffing as needed in the future.

Following further discussion, motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously to enter into an executive session to discuss collective bargaining negotiations, as well as matters leading to the appointment or removal of particular individuals and corporations, pursuant to Sections 105(e) and (f) of the Public Officers Law.

Executive session was held from 10:54 a.m. to 12:24 p.m.

Upon reconvening, motion was made by Mr. Girard and seconded by Mr. Conover to increase the funding to the Planning Department sufficiently to include the salary costs of two Planners and one GIS person and to reduce funding to the EDC commensurately.

In response to Chairman Stec's inquiry as to whether the motion would include salaries for the Planning Director and Assistant Director, it was noted they would seek to retain two base level Planner positions. Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the Budget proposal already retained one Planner and the GIS Associate, they would simply be increasing the Planning Budget to include the salary of one additional Planner and decreasing the EDC funding by the same amount.

Mr. Geraghty called the question and the motion failed with Messrs. Geraghty, Taylor, Champagne, Bentley and Belden voting in opposition.

Following a brief discussion on the meal site closure issue, motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to accept the Budget Officer's 2012 Budget proposal, contingent upon review and

approval of a written plan for meal distributions, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the November 9<sup>th</sup> Special Board meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion made by Mr. Champagne and seconded by Mr. Merlino, Mr. Geraghty adjourned the meeting at 12:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist