WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2009

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING
TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS OF WARREN COUNTY:

You are hereby notified that, I, FREDERICK H. MONROE, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Warren, pursuant to the power vested in me by Rule A.3 of the Rules of the Board of Supervisors, hereby call and convene a special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Warren County to be held in the Supervisors' Room in the Warren County Municipal Center, Town of Queensbury, New York, on Monday, November 30, 2009 at 11:00 a.m., for the purpose of considering, and if determined by the Board to be appropriate, voting on, or otherwise taking action on, the following matters:

1. Review, consideration and action if determined appropriate by the Board with regard to proposed 2010 budget reductions/amendments, the tentative budget for 2010 and other matters related to the 2010 budget including, but not limited to, a determination as to whether to set a hearing on the budget; and

2. Discussions regarding a sales tax increase.

The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is hereby directed to call for the meeting and give written notice to all members of the Board of Supervisors of such meeting.

Dated: November 24, 2009

FREDERICK H. MONROE, CHAIRMAN
Warren County Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Warren convened at the Supervisors' Room in the Warren County Municipal Center, Lake George, New York, at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Frederick Monroe presiding.

Salute to the flag was led by Supervisor Geraghty.

Roll called, the following members present:

Supervisors Simmes, Monroe, Girard, Sheehan, Taylor, O'Connor, Kenny, Bentley, Goodspeed, Tessier, Merlino, Stec, Strainer, Champagne, VanNess, Sokol, Thomas, Pitkin, and Geraghty - 19.

Absent: Supervisor Belden - 1.

Chairman Monroe welcomed everyone to the meeting today and announced that important decisions needed to made with respect to the 2010 Budget. He reminded the board members that a conference call had been held on Wednesday with Moody's Investors Service. He noted that Jeanine Caruso, the County's Fiscal Advisor, was present to discuss that, as well as the County's general financial status with the Supervisors. He added that for the last year, there had been discussions from time to time concerning the possibility of an increase in sales tax. Chairman Monroe asserted that the board members had worked very hard on the budget in the meantime, reducing the amount to be raised by tax by $7 million; however, he said, the County still faced a $4 million deficit.

Frank O'Keefe, County Treasurer, requested to address the board. He asserted that Chairman Monroe had asked him to provide comments on the proposed increase in sales tax. He reminded the board members of the warnings he had issued for at least the past four years relative to the County's finances and reliance on using surplus funds to balance yearly budgets, with no reductions in programs or spending. He added that warnings were issued about potential cash flow problems. He said that in 2009, it had been realized that the County had serious financial problems. Mr. O'Keefe noted that the Board of Supervisors had taken drastic actions to reduce the budget deficit facing 2010 by approximately $7.1 million; thereby leaving an additional $4 million deficit to close. He expressed his opinion that the deficit could not be reduced much further without affecting the general welfare of the residents of Warren County. The only solution, he said, was a tax increase in either property tax or sales tax. He reiterated that the County had serious financial problems to address, such as the 2010 budget and reducing such by cutting expenses to a bare minimum. He stated that holding a tax increase to .5% or less would not address the real problem which was cash flow and fund balance. Mr. O'Keefe remarked that the fund balance, or surplus, must be returned to a level that would support the County operation. He noted that this had been brought to the board members attention over the past six years by Moody's Investors Service, reported yearly by the private auditors and the auditors from the New York State Comptroller's Office. He advised that during the conference call with Moody's Investors Service, he was informed that the County was in the bottom three financially of all counties in New York State, which in all probability, would effect the County's bond rating, resulting in costlier borrowing. In the past, he continued, the County had the luxury of relying on surplus monies to pay expenses before reimbursement was received by the Federal and State agencies. Mr. O'Keefe said that the County's delinquency in collecting property taxes was now causing cash flow problems. He noted that the County must develop long term solutions to the fiscal problems, which could not be solved in the 2010 budget. He stated that a tax increase could not be avoided. With regard to property tax, he reported it would take large increases each and every year to restore the County's fund balance to the proper levels. He asserted that a 1% increase in sales tax would generate $6 million in a six month period, or approximately $3.5 million for the last quarter of 2010. He added that for 2011, about $14 million could be realized for the full year and it was his recommendation to return to a 7% sales tax in 2012. He further stated that if the sales tax increase was approved, a separate tax stabilization fund must be established by law and the funds could only be used to finance specific expenditures which Chairman Monroe would outline in detail. Mr. O'Keefe pointed out that any violations of that statute could be considered a misdemeanor. As the chief fiscal officer of the County, he continued, he would abide by the limitations of this law. He summarized that in order to return this County to financial stability, it would require some Supervisors to change their previous public positions on a sales tax increase. Mr. O'Keefe recommended approval of the sales tax option. He concluded that the County had excellent and professional Department Heads and loyal employees and he believed that the County could return to fiscal stability in 2012 and beyond.

Mr. Taylor referred to the overpayment mentioned by Mr. O'Keefe due to a down grade in the County's bond rating and he questioned how much that would be and over what period of time. Mr. O'Keefe responded that according to the County's Fiscal Advisor, it would be approximately $350,000 over the life of the bond, which was twenty years.

Mr. Pitkin noted the reason stated in a handout relative to a sales tax increase that read "to lesson or prevent any projected increase in excess of 2.5% in the amount of real property tax levy", and he questioned if this meant that if the proposed budget had a 5% increase in property tax, the tax stabilization fund could be utilized to balance that and Paul Dusek, County Attorney, replied affirmatively.

Mr. Kenny stated that he appreciated Mr. O'Keefe's advice; however, he said, the Treasurer's advice was to pass a sales tax increase for two years and return to a 7% tax after that, which he did not believe would ever happen. Chairman Monroe pointed out that previous legislation that had been passed concerning sales tax included a two year sunset clause. Mr. Dusek clarified that one County Board, during a two year term, could not restrict a future County Board for their two year term. He added that the State legislation could always supercede anything done at the local level.

Mr. Stec said the conversations had centered around an assumption that the increase in sales tax would be 1%, although it did not have to be 1%. He questioned what the other options were and Mr. Dusek apprised that he had seen legislation providing for 1/2% and 3/4%; therefore, he said, he would preliminarily presume a 1/4%, or some fraction involving a 1/4%, would be acceptable. Chairman Monroe added that Ontario County had adopted a 1/8% increase in sales tax.

Mr. Taylor questioned if there was an inclusion in the Tax Stabilization Law that required a specific amount go into the fund. Mr. Dusek explained that it could be included as part of what the law provided. Under law, he continued, the Tax Stabilization Fund could not exceed 10% of the County's General Fund and after it did exceed 10%, it would automatically be applied to offset real property taxes. Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Dusek to explain the advantage of a Tax Stabilization Fund compared to the use of the Surplus Fund. Mr. Dusek expounded that a Surplus Fund was unrestricted, whereas a Tax Stabilization Fund could not be used for anything other than unanticipated revenues, unanticipated expenses or to offset at the end of the year as part of the budget process, a tax increase over 2½%. Mr. Dusek read a portion of the Law concerning unanticipated expenditures as follows "Unanticipated expenditure means an expenditure for a specific purpose for which there is no or insufficient appropriation of which will cause an appropriation to be insufficient that is necessitated by a change in federal or state laws, rules or regulations, a court order, judgement or decree, a public emergency, or an industry-wide price, rate or premium increase, which takes effect or occurs after final adoption of the annual budget and which could not have been reasonably anticipated prior to final adoption of the annual budget."

Mr. Kenny questioned if a public hearing was required if the board was in favor of implementing a 1% sales tax increase and Mr. Dusek responded in the negative. Chairman Monroe interjected that the budget required a public hearing and if the sales tax increase was approved, that would be part of the budget. Mr. Kenny asked how anticipated revenues from a sales tax increase could be included in the 2010 Budget when it was unknown if and/or when the State Legislation would approve the request.

Mr. O'Keefe announced that according to the Real Property Tax Services Department, if the Budget was not passed by December 4, 2009 the tax bills would be delayed, leading to more of a cash flow problem. Chairman Monroe noted that by law, the budget must be adopted by December 20, 2009.

Mr. Dusek explained the process for the sales tax increase and said that a resolution needed to be approved either by a 2/3 vote or if it was the desire of the Chairman of the Board to proceed with the request for legislation on his own, it would require a majority of the board to vote in favor of such. He apprised that the Legislature did not require a written resolution until such time that the bill was numbered and returned to the County, which could not occur until next year; therefore, he said, the formal vote on the resolution would occur next year. He reported that his research on the area of revenues was that it was allowable to include in the budget revenues as long as it was in good faith and reasonable to believe that the revenues would be received. Mr. Dusek further stated if the sales tax increase was supported by the board this year it could be part of the budget process, but that vote did not have to happen until after the public hearing on the budget, because the board had a right to amend and revise that budget after the public hearing, as well. Mr. Stec concluded that following the Legislative action, approval for the sales tax increase would return to the board for action, which would not happen until 2010, and he added, that four new members would be on the board at that time.

Chairman Monroe extended privilege of the floor to Jeanine Caruso from Fiscal Advisors & Marketing, to provide her view as the County's financial advisor. Ms. Caruso advised that the County currently had a rating of A2 from Moody's Investors Service, which was downgraded from a 2007 rating of A1. In the conversation held the other day with Moody's, she continued, they were now talking about potentially downgrading the County's rating two notches, which would reduce the County's rating to a BAA1, thereby landing the

County in a different rating category. She listed the rating categories as follows: A1, A2 and A3; the next level was BAA1, BAA2 and BAA3 followed by non-investment grade. She confirmed it was not a good thing to be in the BAA1 category. She noted that Moody's had mentioned several times throughout the call the fact that the County had continued to erode its General Fund balance. Ms. Caruso added that the current General Fund balance was only 4.9% of revenues, which was extremely low. She asserted that the medians for other counties in New York State was approximately 30%, which was a significant difference from Warren County's balance. Her recommendation was for the County to pass a 1% sales tax increase in order to rebuild the General Fund balance reserves. In response to an earlier inquiry from Mr. Taylor regarding the cost of borrowing, she explained that she had done an analysis of a $23 million bond over twenty years, and it would cost approximately $350,000 more to service the debt if the rating was reduced.

Chairman Monroe noted that in reviewing the analysis provided by Moody's, it appeared as though the County was in good standing in all other categories other than fund balance and Ms. Caruso agreed. Mr. Taylor asked if the County were to be downgraded, when that would occur and Ms. Caruso replied this week.

Mr. Goodspeed asked Ms. Caruso what her recommendation would be for a breakdown of the anticipated revenue from a 1% sales tax increase. Ms. Caruso expounded that she would not spend the money on debt service, rather she would put it into reserves and establish a percentage necessary to restore the General Fund Balance. She noted she would also apply some of the funds to a Tax Stabilization Fund, which in effect would remain as part of the General Fund Balance until it was spent down. She concluded that she would not designate the funds to pay down debt service until the County restored itself to a 20-30% General Fund balance as a percentage of revenues and then, if the decision was made to keep the tax in place, some of those monies could be used to pay down debt service.

Ms. Caruso clarified that the County did not go to Moody's for a rating upgrade; however, she reported Moody's Investors Service had advised her that they were instituting an entire review of all counties ratings in New York State, which they began in November.

In response to questions concerning the County sharing revenues with the City of Glens Falls due to a sewer contract, Mr. Dusek announced that it was specifically stated in the agreement that if there should be an increase in the sales tax, that it would not be considered part of what was allocated to the City.

Chairman Monroe thanked Ms. Caruso and said at this time the board members would continue with the Agenda and commence review, consideration and action if determined appropriate by the Board with regard to the proposed 2010 budget reductions and/or amendments.

Mr. Stec referred to the handout from the Budget Officer containing the recommendations, a copy of which is on file with the minutes, and suggested that page one of the handout, which included administrative reductions totaling an adjustment amount of $281,728, be approved as one item.

Chairman Monroe asserted that the County Attorney recommended that a motion to waive the rules be made relative to all resolutions in connection with the Budget.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. Thomas and carried unanimously to waive the rules of the board requiring a resolution be in writing relative to all resolutions in connection with the Budget. Clerk noted it would be Resolution No. 784 for the record.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Pitkin to approve the Budget Officers recommendations of reductions totaling $281,728. Mr. Dusek advised a roll call vote was necessary. Following the roll call vote the motion was carried unanimously to approve the Budget Officers recommendations as outlined above.

Chairman Monroe directed the board members to page 2 of the handout which outlined further departmental reductions as recommended by the Budget Committee. The first department listed, he said, was DPW and a suggested reduction of $250,000.

William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, requested permission to address the board concerning the additional reductions to his Department. Mr. Lamy explained that over the past several months he had met repeatedly with the Budget Officer and the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, Supervisor Belden, to review the departmental budget line item by line item to determine where additional savings could be realized. He noted that substantial reductions had been made not only to programs, but also to personnel. He expressed his concern with the impact that another $250,000 reduction in his budget would have on operations. The main concern, he said, with another $250,000 reduction was that it would increase the County's liability and decrease the safety of motorists and pedestrians that used the road and bridge systems. He noted that it would also adversely effect the snow and ice operations within the County. He announced that staff in his Department had been reduced by eighteen positions over the last fifteen months and currently there were five employees on the payroll that were out of work on either disability, long-term illness or injury. Mr. Lamy added if another $250,000 was reduced in personnel, he could not continue to deliver the same level of service as had been provided in the past. He explained that DPW contracted with most of the Towns in the County to provide approximately 60% of the snow and ice control on all County roads; and he added, included in the 2010 Budget was a 5% reduction in contracts with the Towns. He further stated, that currently, there were five tandem trucks that serviced the Town of Queensbury and five tandem trucks that serviced the rest of the County. With reductions in funds and staff, he said, he would have to review the potential of not having five tandems service the Town of Queensbury for snow and ice. He apprised that they would continue to plow all the County roads, although he would have to re-map the routes, leading to longer routes and longer time periods to accomplish the plowing, and at a lower level of service than had been provided in the past. He reported that over the past year he had eliminated a construction crew, which had resulted in many town projects being placed on a waiting list. Mr. Lamy listed the vast implications that further reductions in his departmental budget would have on many operations in the County.

Chairman Monroe pointed out that the County Attorney had advised that a specific object code needed to be identified in the Public Works Department budget in order for reductions to be approved.

Mr. Goodspeed commented that he could not vote in favor of these substantial reductions until a vote on a 1% sales tax increase was held. Mr. Champagne countered that he would like to make sure that everything possible was done to reduce the budget prior to entertaining a sales tax increase discussion. Chairman Monroe interjected that he understood Mr. Champagnes' concept; however, he said, that would not address the County's fund balance problem.

Motion was made by Mr. Goodspeed and seconded by Mr. Merlino to approve a 1% increase sales tax. Mr. Pitkin suggested that the motion include a 2% cost of living cap and if the cap was exceeded that the County face a penalty for such. Mr. Goodspeed amended his motion to include a 2% cost of living cap and if the cap was exceeded that the County face a penalty for such, and Mr. Merlino seconded the amended motion.

Mr. VanNess asked Mr. Dusek to explain the procedure for the implementation of a 1% sales tax increase. Mr. Dusek stated that if a resolution was adopted by the board in favor of a 1% sales tax increase, the first step would be to request Home Rule Legislation from the State. He noted following the approval of the request, the board would then have the option of implementing a sales tax increase. He reported that the issue was whether or not the board members would choose to include any of the revenues from a proposed sales tax increase in the 2010 Budget; therefore, he said, an agreement needed to be reached as to what the legislation would include. Chairman Monroe reiterated that the structural problem with the Budget and the County's finances was that there was not a plan in place to restore the fund balance, which was desperately needed.

Chairman Monroe announced a roll call vote on the previous motion was necessary. Prior to the roll call vote, a number of Supervisors voiced their opinions both in favor and in opposition to a sales tax increase.

Mr. O'Keefe commented that he and his staff had provided the Supervisors with the best advice that they could. He added that even if an additional $1 million was removed from the budget, it would not address the underlining problem, which was cash flow and fund balance. He reiterated his belief that the only way to restore the fund balance was through a sales tax or property tax increase. Chairman Monroe commented that the County had made substantial cuts this year and he commended the Budget Officer for the tremendous job that he had done, along with the Budget Committee, in cutting expenses. He stated that even with all the work that had been accomplished, it did not solve the fund balance problem.

Chairman Monroe requested the concurrence of the board to request legislation for a 1% sales tax increase. Following the roll call vote, the motion to approve a request for Home Rule Legislation for a 1% sales tax increase was carried by a majority vote, with Messrs. Taylor, Kenny, Stec, Strainer, Champagne and Pitkin voting in opposition. Clerk noted it would be Resolution No. 785 of 2009 for the record.

Discussion ensued concerning a public hearing, the date for such, and a location large enough to accommodate the general public to discuss a sales tax increase. Mr. Dusek interjected that technically, the hearing needed was for the adoption of the 2010 Budget, and at the time all possibilities for revenues and expenditures would be available to discuss. He explained that following a public hearing on the Budget, a decision could be made as to whether or not a plan for sales tax revenues would be included in the 2010 Budget.

Returning to the Budget Committee recommendations for further reductions, Chairman Monroe referred back to the first department listed, which was the DPW with a suggested reduction of $250,000.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Kenny to direct the DPW Superintendent to determine an additional $250,000 in reductions in the Departments budget prior to the public hearing for the 2010 Budget.

Mr. Dusek clarified that in order for that reduction to be included as part of the Budget, a specific object code needed to be identified. Mr. Lamy advised that a Public Works Committee meeting was scheduled for the following day and he requested the opportunity to review this request for a $250,000 reduction with the Committee. Mr. Taylor requested Mr. Stec amend his motion for a reduction of $125,000 as opposed to $250,000. Mr. Stec amended his motion to direct the DPW Superintendent to determine an additional $125,000 in reductions in the Department's personnel code (.1) prior to the public hearing for the 2010 Budget and Mr. Kenny seconded the amended motion. Chairman Monroe advised a roll call vote was necessary. Following the roll call vote, the motion failed due to the lack of majority vote.

Chairman Monroe identified the next department, which was the Information Technology (IT), with a suggested elimination of a Computer Programmer and a reduction in the salary of the Director of IT. Mr. Goodspeed stated that this had been his recommendation; however, he said, he was not aware that the Director of IT had volunteered to reduce his salary by 20% and he suggested that the reduction in salary satisfy the Budget Committees request; thereby not eliminating the Computer Programmer.

Motion was made by Mr. Goodspeed and seconded by Mr. Pitkin to accept the Director of IT's proposal of a 20% reduction in the Directors salary. Chairman Monroe added it would require a roll call vote. Following the roll call vote the motion was carried unanimously to accept the Director of IT's proposal of a 20% reduction in the Directors salary.

Chairman Monroe referred to the next department listed, Planning & Community Development, and the recommendation to eliminate one position for a reduction of $59,470. Mr. Taylor announced that when this was discussed at the Committee meeting, it was advised that $70,000 should be removed from anticipated revenues because this position was a revenue generating position.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne and seconded by Mr. Kenny to approve the recommendation to eliminate one position for a reduction of $59,470 in the Planning & Community Development Department.

Mr. Geraghty questioned where specifically the County would lose revenue if this position was eliminated. Pat Tatich, Director of Planning & Community Development, explained that the position was essential for securing grant funds; however, she advised that her Department would continue to apply for grant funding when opportunities were presented.

Chairman Monroe noted this required a roll call vote as well. Following the roll call vote, the motion was carried by a majority vote to eliminate one position for a reduction of $59,470 in the Planning & Community Development Department.

Chairman Monroe apprised the next department was the Public Defender and a recommendation to eliminate one Assistant Attorney, for an estimated total savings of $55,035. He noted that concern had been expressed that if the Assistant Attorney was eliminated it may put the County in a situation where continuity of effort was not maintained which could result in the County losing State funding. Mr. Goodspeed concurred and suggested that an effort to save approximately $50,000 would cost the County over $100,000 to compensate for the loss of an Attorney within that Office.

Motion was made by Mr. Pitkin and seconded by Mr. Stec to approve the recommendation. Chairman Monroe stated this required a roll call vote. Following the roll call vote, the motion failed due to the lack of majority vote.

Continuing, Chairman Monroe expounded the next item listed was the Sheriff's Law Enforcement, with the recommendation to eliminate four Patrol Officers and one position in the Civil Division, resulting in a savings of $269,636.

Mr. VanNess reiterated that six road Patrol Officers had been eliminated in the last three years. He commented that gang and drug related activities were increasing in the County and would continue to increase given the state of the economy. He added that the County needed to take care of the citizens. Regarding the Civil Officer position, he noted, that position brought in more revenues than the cost for the salary.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. Bentley to remove this recommendation from the list.

Bud York, Sheriff, addressed the board members concerning the recommendation to eliminate four Patrol Officers, as recommended by Supervisor Stec, and noted that he felt it was his duty to advise and clarify some points that were made by Mr. Stec at the last Budget Committee meeting. He stated that there were two Warren County Sheriff posts designated exclusively for the Town of Queensbury, that he tried to fill on a daily basis to provide the best protection for the citizens, as well as Officers safety. He explained the services provided by the New York State Police posts located in the Town of Queensbury. He reported that he could not forfeit police protection for the citizens in this County. He provided statistical information pertaining to the number of police calls and reports received in Warren County. He concluded that if the Patrol Officer staff was reduced by four positions, it would most certainly jeopardize public safety and the safety of the County's Patrol Officers. Mr. Stec clarified that he had stated that he was open to any suggestions from the Sheriff to reduce his budget approximately $250,000.

Chairman Monroe said a roll call vote was needed for the motion to remove the recommendation to eliminate four Patrol Officers and one position in the Civil Division. Following the roll call vote, the motion was carried by a majority vote to remove the recommendation to eliminate four Patrol Officers and one position in the Civil Division.

Chairman Monroe asserted the next item listed was for the Treasurer's Office, with a recommendation to eliminate a Senior Account Clerk #4 after retirement.

Rob Lynch, Deputy Treasurer, expounded that since 2008 two positions had been eliminated within the Department. Mr. Champagne asserted that he did not analyze the need for the position prior to making the recommendation and he was no longer in favor of eliminating that position.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny and seconded by Mr. Taylor to eliminate a Senior Account Clerk #4 after retirement. Chairman Monroe advised this would be a roll call vote. Following the roll call vote, the motion failed due to the lack of a majority vote.

Chairman Monroe reported the last item list was a recommendation to reduce the contract with the City of Glens Falls to the amount of $49,000. He noted that the original amount of the contract had been $150,000, which was reduced to $100,000 and further reduced to $99,000.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Thomas to reduce the contract with the City of Glens Falls to the amount of $49,000.

Mr. Girard expressed his opposition to this recommendation and noted it was an inappropriate time to make such a reduction, due to the City of Glens Falls having already affirmed their budget. Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Taylor expressed their opposition to this request, as well.

Chairman Monroe noted this would be a roll call vote. Following the roll call vote, the motion to reduce the contract with the City of Glens Falls to the amount of $49,000 failed due to the lack of a majority vote.

Chairman Monroe announced that concluded the list of recommendations to reduce appropriations. He directed the board members to a proposal to increase revenue in the County Clerk's Office by implementing a motor vehicle use fee. Pam Vogel, County Clerk, explained that currently there were thirty-five counties in New York State that imposed this fee of $5 per passenger vehicle and $10 per commercial vehicle, per year. She further stated that this was a surcharge that was included in the tax law, as well as in the Commissioners Regulations. Ms. Vogel noted this was an option for a revenue stream and this could generate $300,000 in revenues per year in Warren County.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty and seconded by Mr. Pitkin to approve the implementation of a motor vehicle use fee. Chairman Monroe added this would be a roll call vote. Following the roll call vote, the motion was carried by a majority vote to implement a motor vehicle use fee.

Mr. Kenny announced that those that were opposed to a sales tax increase had feared that if it were approved, this board would be reluctant to reduce expenses. He reported that $797,398 worth of recommended reductions in expenses was presented, of which only $75,000 was approved.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. Taylor to authorize a Public Hearing to adopt the 2010 Tentative Budget for December 10, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. in the Supreme Court Room. Chairman Monroe advised this would require a roll call vote. Following the roll call vote, the motion was carried by a majority vote to authorize a Public Hearing to adopt the 2010 Tentative Budget for December 10, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. in the Supreme Court Room. Clerk noted it would be Resolution No. 786 of 2009 for the record.

Mr. Champagne reminded the Supervisors that contributions were needed for the Adirondack Community College Regional Higher Education Center and he noted that he had forms with him if anyone was interested in pledging funds.

Mr. Tessier questioned if the percentage for the amount to be raised by tax would be available for the Public Hearing and JoAnn McKinstry, Deputy Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, replied that currently the amount to be raised by tax was 9.3%, not including any anticipated sales tax revenue.

There being no further business, on motion by Mr. Stec and seconded by Mr. Strainer, Chairman Monroe adjourned the meeting at 2:15 p.m.