

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

DATE: AUGUST 27, 2007

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS STEC
BELDEN
GABRIELS
MONROE
TESSIER
CHAMPAGNE
MASON

OTHERS PRESENT:

REPRESENTING PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

PATRICIA TATICH, DIRECTOR
WAYNE LAMOTHE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
JAMIE WHITE, SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
COORDINATOR

WILLIAM THOMAS, CHAIRMAN

HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL
SERVICES

JOAN SADY, CLERK

NICHOLAS CAIMANO, BUDGET OFFICER

SUPERVISOR F. THOMAS

JOANN MCKINSTRY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF
ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES

PATRICIA NENNINGER, SECOND ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY

LEONARD FOSBROOK, PRESIDENT OF THE ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF WARREN COUNTY

AMANDA ALLEN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Stec called the meeting of the Planning & Community Development Committee to order at 11:30 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Tessier, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the July 30, 2007 Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Patricia Tatich, Director of Planning & Community Development, who distributed copies of the agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Ms. Tatich explained that the first agenda item listed pertained to pending items; however, the item would be postponed until the next Committee meeting in order to leave the appropriate amount of time for review of the 2008 Budget proposal. She then asked Wayne LaMothe, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development, to detail the two resolution requests included as the second portion of the agenda.

Mr. LaMothe apprised that the first resolution request listed was to amend Resolution No. 102 of 2007 to change the grant request amount reflected therein from \$400,000 to \$500,000 and also to authorize the purchase of a Fidelity bond, if necessary. He explained that when the resolution had initially been approved the amount of the grant request was incorrectly listed and, with respect to the Fidelity bond, Mr. LaMothe noted that grant funding was available for the bond if it was deemed necessary. He said he did not feel that the Fidelity bond would be required; however, he added, upon the suggestion of the County Attorney's Office, verbiage allowing for the purchase had been included.

Motion was made by Mr. Tessier, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend Resolution No. 103 of 2007 to change the grant request amount listed from \$400,000 to \$500,000, and to authorize the purchase of a Fidelity bond if necessary, and the resolution was authorized for the

September 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the resolution request is on file with the minutes.*

Continuing, Mr. LaMothe advised that the second item listed pertained to a request to amend the 2007 County Budget to increase estimated revenues and appropriations in the amount of \$500,000 to reflect the receipt of the HOME program grant funding, *(as authorized by the amendment to Resolution No. 103 of 2007)*, to be allocated as follows:

Appropriation Codes:	66 8668 437	Consulting	\$ 25,000
	66 8668 470	Contracts	445,000
	66 8686 410	Supplies	20,500
	66 8686 437	Consulting	9,500
Revenue Code:	66 4910	Community Development	\$500,000

Motion was made by Mr. Gabriels, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend the 2007 County Budget as outlined above and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Proceeding with the review of the 2008 Budget request, Ms. Tatich directed the Committee members to page three of the agenda which began the Budget proposal with a memorandum detailing the fact that four separate budgets were managed by the Department. The first of the four Budgets, she explained, was that of Planning (A.8020), *(also referred to as the County Planning Board)*, and she noted that the Budget reflected a 2008 request of \$4,240 in comparison to the 2007 appropriations of \$3,855, an increase of \$385. Ms. Tatich advised that of the total request, \$3,595 was intended for operational costs. She added that they had increased the amount budgeted for mileage reimbursement to Planning Board members due to inflated gas prices and that a portion of the increase was attributed to the addition of Workmen's Compensation insurance costs for the part-time employee working with the Planning Board.

Mr. LaMothe pointed out that traditionally, the Workmen's Compensation coverage costs had been paid from an 800 code rather than a 400, where they were now included, and a transfer had been done to move the necessary funds between the two codes. As another point of reference, Ms. Tatich noted that the Planning Budget would not receive any revenues and therefore none had been included in the 2008 Budget request.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to approve the Planning (A.8020) Budget, authorize the Committee Chairman to sign it and refer same to the Budget Officer.

Ms. Tatich apprised that the proposed 2008 Planning and Community Development (A.8021) Budget request was \$329,514, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$328,727, an increase of \$787. She explained that the Budget request included an overtime amount of \$1,000 to be paid to their Office Specialist for services rendered relative to the monthly County Planning Board meeting. Ms. Tatich added that this amount had not been included in the 2007 Budget because the Budget Officer had determined that the employee's workday could be started later in order to fulfill the 8-hour work day, as well as services to the Planning Board without incurring overtime; however, she said, as per the Personnel Officer this was not allowed. She said that \$800 had been budgeted for the sick leave incentive and \$3,200 had been included in the Office Equipment (A.8021 220) code for the purchase of two laptop computers, and necessary software, for use in the Department. Ms. Tatich noted that the laptop computer purchases were necessary because they had been

borrowing similar equipment from the IT (Information Technology) Department on a regular basis, which made it unavailable to other Departments.

The 400 Object Codes (Contractual) reflected the operation costs for the Planning Office, the largest of which were supplies, equipment rental and contractual travel within 75 miles of the Municipal Center, Ms. Tatich advised. She added that these funds were also intended to cover any expenses associated with the development of the Abbreviated Consolidated Plan, which would be unveiled in October of 2007.

Ms. Tatich apprised that, as authorized by the Committee and the Board of Supervisors, the Department had applied for funding in excess of \$1.2 million to assist with a variety of County and Town projects. She added that the \$500,000 awarded through the HOME Program by the New York State Housing Trust Fund Corporation, (*as acted on earlier in the meeting by the Committee*), was the first large funding award received from the agency's new administration and she said she felt that the award boded well for the relationship between the County and the agency. Ms. Tatich stated that the Department continued to use funds received from repayments made by businesses and homeowner participants managed by the LDC (Local Development Corporation).

Mr. Stec mentioned that other Departments had been experiencing delays in gaining State reimbursement for mandated programs and he asked if the Planning Department was on target for the receipt of anticipated revenues. Ms. Tatich replied that most of the State reimbursement anticipated was historically received during the last quarter of the year, therefore, those figures were not yet reflected; however, she said, there was no indication that the revenues expected would not be received. She added that the anticipated revenues listed in the 2008 Budget request had been decreased by \$10,500 based on discussions regarding LDC services and the attempt to launch their efforts. Ms. Tatich stated that some of the costs related to personnel services were not being included, other than those funded by the related grant, with the notion that this would stabilize the LDC Budget and allow their projects to begin.

Mr. Caimano pointed out that as per the report he had received from the Treasurer's Office, the Planning Department had received only 61% of revenues anticipated for 2006 and nothing for 2007, assuming that the figures reflected in the report were accurate. Mr. LaMothe apprised that they had already received salary reimbursements for the first quarter of 2007 and those figures should be reflected in the report. He added that totals had been submitted in May for the second quarter salary reimbursement and they were awaiting those funds.

Motion was made by Mr. Mason, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to approve the Planning & Community Development (A.8021) 2008 Budget request, authorize the Chairman to sign it, and refer same to the Budget Officer.

Proceeding to the Planning GIS (Geographic Information System) Program (A.8022) Budget, Ms. Tatich advised that the proposed 2008 Budget request was \$129,816, as compared to the 2007 appropriations of \$84,481, an increase of \$45,535. She explained that the majority of the increase was attributed to the costs of upgrading the aerial imagery, which had been estimated at \$50,000, and were included under Contracts (A.8022 470), as per the direction of the Committee. Ms. Tatich noted that the Budget proposal also reflected a decrease of \$6,000 for the Image Mate online map access.

Mr. Stec noted that as he understood the Budget proposal, it was being presented as if the County were

moving forward with the option of splitting the costs of the aerial imagery with the individual Towns. He apprised that the Town of Queensbury was definitely interested in obtaining the higher resolution imagery and were willing to pay their share of the increased costs.

Mr. LaMothe apprised that they had finally received paperwork from the State detailing the process for obtaining the upgraded aerial imagery and they were currently corresponding with each of the Towns to determine what the costs would be. He said that the estimated cost of \$50,000 included in the Budget proposal for the aerial imagery might decrease based on the number of Towns electing to participate, in which case the revenues would also drop. Mr. LaMothe stated that they would have to file the proper paperwork pertaining to the issue in October and the corresponding payment would be due in January of 2008.

Mr. Belden stated that it was important for the Planning & Community Development Department to contact each of the Towns to advise them of the costs of the upgraded aerial imagery if they chose to participate as each were in the process of developing their own budgets and needed this information. Mr. LaMothe replied that they were making such contact presently.

Mr. Caimano stated that he did not feel it was appropriate to approve the Budget, based on the fact that the participation and contributions of the Towns was not known, and the County should not be obligated to the total. Mr. LaMothe replied that the \$50,000 was the total cost of the aerial imagery and the Towns would be contributing half of that amount and, because the level of participation was unknown, offsetting revenues had not been included in the Budget proposal. Mr. Monroe noted that the final adopted Budget would be amended to include the contribution of each of the Towns and Mr. LaMothe agreed that this was correct. Mr. LaMothe clarified that if all of the Towns contributed to the costs of the aerial imagery, the total impact to the County would be \$25,000.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the Planning GIS Program (A.8022) Budget proposal, authorize the Committee Chairman to sign it and refer same to the Budget Officer.

Mr. Stec stated that it was very important to notify each of the Towns of their share of the aerial imagery project costs. Mr. LaMothe reiterated that they were currently in the process of doing this and all of the Towns should be notified by the close of the week.

Concluding the Budget review, Ms. Tatich apprised that the proposed 2008 Planning-Local Waterfront (A.8029) Budget request was \$20,000, identical to the 2007 appropriations, and represented the Local Share of the First Wilderness Heritage Corridor Project costs. She said that it was important to note that this amount of money reflected the Local match for the current contract with the Department of State and in no way represented matching funds for any grant the Department might pursue. However, Ms. Tatich added, they would utilize the commitments outstanding for the present year and carry them forward to 2008, thus avoiding the need to raise the County Budget to include funds that they were not sure would be received.

Mr. LaMothe pointed out that although the 2008 Budget request reflected no 2006 expenditures, in actuality, the funds were appropriated and transferred to a Capital Fund to meet the local share of the grant and he was unsure as to why the expenditure was not reflected.

Mr. Belden asked what the total grant amount received was and Mr. LaMothe explained that the grant had been for a total of \$150,000 over a three-year period with the Local Share being \$20,000 per year and they were currently in the third year of the grant agreement. Mr. Belden then asked what the grant funds were being used for and Mr. LaMothe replied that all of the funds were being used in connection with the First Wilderness Heritage Corridor Project.

Motion was made by Mr. Tessier, seconded by Mr. Mason and carried unanimously to approve the Planning - Local Waterfront (A.8029) Budget, authorize the Committee Chairman to sign it, and refer same to the Budget Officer.

Ms. Tatich commented that they had received the LDC 2008 Budget proposal for presentation to the Committee; however, she said, she was unsure as to when it should be discussed as the LDC had to act on the Budget first. Mr. Stec advised that the Budget proposal would be forwarded on to the Budget Officer at the close of the LDC meeting, which was scheduled to follow the present meeting.

Three items remained on the agenda for discussion, Ms. Tatich apprised, the first of which pertained to the Restore NY Community Program and requests to assist communities. She explained that a number of communities had decided to complete grant applications for this program independently, many of them contacting the Planning & Community Development Department for assistance. Ms. Tatich noted that they would provide such assistance where appropriate for completion of the applications, which were due at the end of September.

Ms. Tatich apprised that the second discussion item listed referred to potential projects for the LWRP (Local Waterfront Revitalization Program) and she asked Mr. LaMothe to update the Committee members on the telephone conversation he'd had with the Department of State. Mr. LaMothe explained that the Department of State had requested a meeting with the Planning & Community Development Department to discuss their interest in funding projects within the First Wilderness Heritage Corridor and he would be meeting with them in the near future with respect to the matter. He asked the Committee if they would like him to introduce the possibility of the Department of State providing funding for the proposed Hadley Train Station in those discussions, although, he said, he was not sure that the project would be eligible for funding.

When asked, Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, apprised that \$2 million had been granted by the State for the train stations; however, it had not yet been received. She added that the Parks, Recreation & Railroad Committee had determined that they would not make a decision as to whether the funding would be used to build both the Thurman and Hadley Stations, or only one of them, until the grant funding was appropriated to the County. Ms. Sady noted that in the meantime, authorization had been given to seek bids for the construction of either one or both of the Stations.

Discussion ensued with respect to the proposed Hadley Station.

Returning to the topic, Mr. LaMothe advised that the current First Wilderness Heritage Plan, as adopted by the Board of Supervisors, identified 214 different goals and he would be addressing those with the Department of State to determine which they would entertain for funding in 2008. He said that he would return to the Committee with the results of the meeting.

Mr. Tessier asked if any grants awarded by the Department of State would require the County to supply matching funds and Mr. LaMothe replied affirmatively, adding that there would be a 50% match.

Proceeding to the final discussion item, Mr. LaMothe apprised that he had recently received information on the upcoming Outdoor Drama Theater (ODT) Conference, to be held October 17 - 19, 2007 in Ohio. He said that although all discussion on the proposed ODT had been delayed pending an agreement for use of land with the Village of Lake George, Paul Dusek, County Attorney, had suggested that Patricia Nenninger, Second Assistant County Attorney, be permitted to attend the conference in light of the importance of the seminars they were holding and their subject matter. Mr. LaMothe stated that the conference fee was \$300, would require lodging for two nights and Ms. Nenniger could drive to the conference. He added that Quality Communities Grant funding could be used to cover the entire cost of travel and conference fees.

Mr. Stec asked Mr. LaMothe for an estimation of the total conference costs and Mr. LaMothe apprised that he felt the total would be approximately \$1,200.

Mr. Mason stated that he had attended two past ODT Conferences and he asked if there was much more to be learned than was discussed at those meetings. Mr. LaMothe replied that the October conference was scheduled at a different facility and therefore they would see how that facility operated differently from the others. In addition, he noted, there was a new director and this would be a good opportunity to establish a connection with him.

Mr. Tessier advised that conference attendance was very important and because the project had advanced as far as it had, they should keep going forward and authorize the attendance.

Mrs. Nenninger apprised that she had attended one of the prior conferences and had found it extremely informative. She noted that the correspondence received indicated that this year's conference would include a seminar specifically detailing the development of operating boards and Mr. Dusek had felt that it was a good idea for someone to attend and receive this valuable information.

William Thomas, Chairman, entered the meeting at 12:13 p.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Gabriels, seconded by Mr. Tessier and carried unanimously to approve the request for Ms. Nenninger to attend the ODT Conference scheduled for October 17 - 19, 2007 in Ohio, with all travel and conference registry costs to be paid through Quality Communities Grant funding, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the September 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the resolution request is on file with the minutes.*

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, on motion made by Mr. Tessier and seconded by Mr. Monroe, Mr. Stec adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Legislative Office Specialist