

Minutes

Administrative Services Committee

October 15, 2019, 5:00 pm, Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Scudder, Starks, Proctor, Muldowney, Davis

Others: Ames, Tampio, Dennison, Nazzaro, Wisniewski, Crow, Caflisch, Quattrone, Sanderson, Stearns, Bentley

Chairman Scudder called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (08/19/19)

MOVED by Legislator Starks, SECONDED by Legislator Proctor.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time.

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Early Voting Aid to Localities Grant Award from the New York State Board of Elections

Mrs. Dennison: As we are aware from a previous resolution the Board of Elections has been tasked with a lot of additional work and expenditures due to early voting. So there was previously a resolution before you to increase the budget by around \$114,000. This is a second resolution, additional funding from the State in the amount of \$85,012. The Board of Elections needs to spend all of that money on mostly electronic poll books, on implementing electronic poll books for the early voting. Now you can see from the time line of the award, there is an option to spend this money next year rather than in 2019 but in talking with the Board, the Commissioners indicated that the expenditure for mostly the electronic poll books is going to be incurred this year. So their preference is to put all of the grant funds into 2019 and not increase the local share in 2019. So this, as I said, will do essentially the same thing that the previous resolution did allow them to fully implement the process with grant funding. No affect on local share in 2019.

Legislator Davis: As I understand it, it's just for 2019 and after that we will be absorbing any additional costs?

Mrs. Dennison: That is correct, yes.

Chairman Scudder: Unless something comes along.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. I cannot speak to the chance of something else coming along, I don't know the answer to that. But yes, you are correct Mr. Davis, we are anticipating an increase in local share in 2020 due primarily to expanding the hours of the poll workers for early voting and extended hours on primary elections.

Legislator Proctor: You are saying they are buying these electronic books this year.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes and they won't need to buy them next year.

Legislator Starks: Until they are obsolete.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Chairman Scudder: Didn't the \$114/115,000 would have sufficed for this voting year, am I correct? That would have gotten them enough of the poll books.

Mrs. Dennison: No, that's why –

Chairman Scudder: Did they ask for this or did the State offer this?

Mrs. Dennison: I think maybe the Board of Elections didn't know they were supposed to be here this afternoon or they would be helpful if they were. My understanding is that, they are buying what they need for the electronic poll books and they don't believe that they need to buy any more next year.

Chairman Scudder: Anything else? All in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Mrs. Dennison: I will follow up with the Board of Elections and just verify that that this takes care of all the electronic poll books and that there is nothing going forward, as Christine indicated, until they are obsolete or break or whatever.

Chairman Scudder: Yeah, see if it satisfies next year.

Ms. Sanderson: Apologies for being late.

Chairman Scudder: Our question is the monies we are assuming is going for extra poll books?

Ms. Sanderson: No, this is a second grant that is coming in and it's for any expenditures related to implementing the early voting.

Chairman Scudder: So in the first grant that we got, was there enough money there to get us enough electronic poll books that we were looking for?

Ms. Sanderson: Yes.

Legislator Davis: So this will cover the hours for people or what is it?

Ms. Sanderson: That is one of the eligible expenses, yes. Other eligible expenses would be anything that is related to it like our signage, our communications, which we're already well passed by just making the budget for the State itself.

Chairman Scudder: If there was extra money could you buy poll books with it, extra ones?

Ms. Sanderson: We could, yes. I don't foresee that there is going to be extra money.

Chairman Scudder: The number of poll books that we bought –

Ms. Sanderson: A 110.

Chairman Scudder: Will that be enough to carry us for a few years?

Ms. Sanderson: We hope so, yes. That's taking into account so many at each site throughout the County. We have 50 poll sites, say two or three, depending on the size of poll site itself.

Chairman Scudder: I mean there was some math involved.

Ms. Sanderson: Yes there was.

Legislator Proctor: But that's not just for early voting (*inaudible*).

Ms. Sanderson: Correct. This year it will just be for early voting and then next year we'll go full board but we were able to – they were going to discontinue the model that we had purchased and that was approved by the State so we actually got a better price for them so we went ahead and bought all of them, 110 now.

Chairman Scudder: So you are saying in the future, we're not going to stand there and then flip the the book around?

Ms. Sanderson: No.

Legislator Starks: When you said it was a discontinued model.

Ms. Sanderson: That the Apple wasn't going – they are going to their next best you know so they are going to continue with that model and of course the company will continue servicing the ones that we have purchased. There is no problem with that.

Chairman Scudder: Any other questions? We already passed the resolution so thanks.

Proposed Resolution - Quit Claim Deeds

Mr. Caflisch: The properties here are properties that did not sell at the auction this year. We have two parcels that have multiple offers on because we take an RFP at this stage of the process. It would be my recommendation that we take the higher of the offers. There is nothing that would differentiate the bottom or lower offers as superior to the offers with more money offered. So for PA293, that would be the \$8,000 offer and for PA403 it would be the \$500.00 offer.

Chairman Scudder: So there were four offers on that.

Mr. Caflisch: Yes. There is four on PA293 and two offers on PA403.

Chairman Scudder: Is this total number reflect just the highest or is that all the bids?

Mr. Caflisch: The way it does is, it puts all the bids in so we'd have to –

Chairman Scudder: Change that number.

Mr. Caflisch: Yes.

Legislator Davis: It did the same on the taxes owning side, correct?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes.

Chairman Scudder: So those two totals would have to be adjusted?

Mr. Caflisch: Yes.

Chairman Scudder: So do we adjust that before we vote on it because the math works? Shall we amend to take the highest –

Mr. Caflisch: There has to be some action. You have to formally accept the offer you want to accept.

Legislator Davis: Do you need a motion to that effect?

Chairman Scudder: Yes.

Legislator Davis: I would make a motion that we except on the PA293-2018 property the \$8,000 offer and on the PA403-2019, the \$500.00 offer as they were the highest offers submitted.

Legislator Starks: Second.

Chairman Scudder: All in favor of amending it?

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Scudder: Any other questions or comments?

Unanimously Carried as amended.

Other -

Proposed Resolution - Approving Labor Contract with Chautauqua County Sheriff Employees' Association (CCSEA)

Ms. Wisniewski: Most of you are familiar with my handouts. I have some handouts here. This is CCSEA which is mainly full time Corrections and part time Corrections. That also includes cook, dispatchers, I'm saying navigation patrol but they are still in limbo. So what that is, is, Corrections, like I said, and dispatcher mainly and cook. So the CCSEA Corrections bargaining agreement expired December 31, 2017 so we've had been out of contract. It was due to a change in union initially. They went from CSEA 6323 to CCSEA. We began negotiations once that was finalized in March of 2018. Then the County union met monthly until there was a change, a negotiator as well as the Sheriff administration the first of this year and after negotiations resumed a tentative agreement was reached August 8th with a mediator. So there was a lot of conversations, there has been a lot of sign offs, separate to this, but this is the main points and also the financial points that were tentatively agreed on. So the first is the wage. Again, this one expired December 31, 2017, so, the agreement is for 2018, a one-time payment of \$900 for full time members and a one-time payment of \$450.00 for part time members. In 2019 it's a 2%, retroactive wage, and the remainder of the years, which I'll get into, there has been an insurance change, is 3%. Kitty has prepared a financial spreadsheets for you to look at for numbers, what this means for us and she'll go over that after the summary.

Chairman Scudder: Question for you. On that one-time payment of \$900.00 in 2018, can you put a percentage on that?

Ms. Crow: We don't have that right now but I could calculate that and give you what that is.

Legislator Davis: I have a question on that as well. It's kind of irrelevant to the conversation but maybe it isn't. For individuals who retired during 2018, will they receive that one-time payment because it's retroactive, correct?

Ms. Wisniewski: They will receive it yes. That was negotiated. The Union felt very strongly that if, let's say we ratified for the contract in 2017 or the beginning of the year, they would have received, whether it's a one-time payment or the percentage so that was the agreement, yes.

Legislator Starks: A similar question. If they were hired part way through that year, is that \$900.00 pro rated?

Ms. Wisniewski: It will be retroactive.

Ms. Crow: The \$900.00 will be for anyone who was a full time member during 2018.

Legislator Starks: But even if it was less than a full year?

Ms. Crow: Yeah, anybody who was an active member whether they terminated or started mid-year, will receive the \$900.00, correct?

Ms. Wisniewski: Well she was saying that would it be –

Legislator Starks: Like if they started in June, is it half of \$900.00 for six months? Do you know what I mean? No, it's \$900.00 no matter what.

Ms. Crow: It wasn't addressed specifically in the language so the way the tentative agreement is set is that if they were a full time member during 2018.

Legislator Starks: You know, if I was hired in November, then it's yea me.

Ms. Crow: One benefit to a lump sum payment, this is lump sum payment that is not added to their base wages so any future percentage increases are not compounded from that number so it's just a one-time payment.

Legislator Proctor: I noticed in the resolution it says for the \$450.00 for the part-time members and it say for each part-time member active during 2018 and still employed in the resolution. Your summary doesn't say still employed.

Chairman Scudder: So does, "and still employed" is that end of the sentence after the full time and the part time, or just the part time.

Ms. Wisniewski: Just the part time.

Ms. Crow: So if the part time person came and left, they have to still be here as a part time member or maybe they may have converted to full time by now but yeah.

Ms. Wisniewski: Longevity increments, effective the year of ratification after 10 years or continuous service, the employee shall receive \$50.00, previously \$40.00 for each year of service with the County. This was agreed upon because - it's been \$40.00 for a couple of contracts and

quite some time since it has been increased and it's something that they felt was very important to them. Good attendance bonus, it is paid out quarterly and currently they receive \$115 if they have perfect attendance in the quarter and they received \$115.00. It has been increased to \$200.00 and so at the \$200.00, it was a mutual agreement between the Sheriff's office and the Union. There is of course benefits for people who don't call off and it really would go into forced overtime a lot and very costly so this was a benefit to both the County and the Union to increase the perfect attendance. They do take it seriously, the previous administration was saying that they saw that once this was implemented, the good attendance bonus, they noticed a change in people's attendance. It was something for them to strive for.

Chairman Scudder: That's perfect attendance for the year?

Ms. Wisniewski: So they get it quarterly. So after three months they would receive.

Legislator Starks: The \$200.00.

Ms. Wisniewski: Right, going forward.

Legislator Starks: So they could get \$800.00 a year?

Ms. Wisniewski: Yes. Physical fitness bonus. Previously they could do either/or. They could do the Wellness screening or the physical fitness and as long as they participate in the Wellness screening, they would receive a bonus or if they participated and passed a physical fitness, they would receive it. They have asked and we agreed to allow them to participate in both. It still doesn't change the fact that if they take the physical fitness they have to pass it to receive the bonus. Similar to 6322, the part time Deputy Sheriff's (*inaudible*) benefit to the Sheriff's office for employees to strive and be able to pass this physical fitness.

Chairman Scudder: What is that bonus?

Ms. Crow: They are both existing bonuses. The only change is to allow them to be able to earn both of them in a calendar year versus one or the other. I would also note because I'm an advocate for the Wellness screening that people – we allow people to get the bonuses because you probably know some people that they work out all the time and they might seem healthy but they never go to the doctor so they might not know that there is an issue, so, some people are taking the PT bonus and in doing that and not taking the Wellness bonus so they are not getting that health screening because they think they are not going to do that if – I don't want to say, not get anything for it but, I think this will just help incentivize people more to do both.

Legislator Proctor: So they can get two \$500.00 bonuses?

Ms. Crow: The Wellness bonus is \$300.00.

Legislator Starks: So it could be a total of \$800.00?

Ms. Crow: Correct. All of our other contracts include an incentive for them to participate in the Wellness screening.

Chairman Scudder: And this is annually?

Ms. Crow: Yes.

Ms. Wisniewski: The health insurance effective January 1, 2020 which you can see is the same year that we agreed to the 2% , is the only option of health insurance will be the high deductible health plan. So the PPO will no longer be an option as of the first of the year. There is no going back to it. That is the only option that they have going forward as of January 1, 2020. The County will be responsible for 100% of the deductible and premium for the first year. The same thing with the 6300, of the first year being able to fund their HSA. Again, the impact to the employee is, it was very difficult to sell the high deductible health plan to a lot of the employees and then for them to know that it can be a good plan. This would help with their HSA. They could put the money in their HSA and if they don't use it, it can roll over for another year and keep going. After that first year, the employee share of the deductible will be 10% of the total plan cost for the elected level of coverage. So, the unions were asking for a simpler way to explain what they would pay and what they wouldn't have to pay. So basically this 10% is to say, the total amount of the high deductible health premium plus the deductible, they have to pay 10% of that. So each year if it goes up and we're going to be paying more of that increase and that's why we are doing that. To be able to have, instead of just saying a flat dollar amount, there is going to be responsibility on the employees part too should there be, when there is, increases in health insurance.

Ms. Crow: So if the premium goes up each year, which more than likely it does, they have an increased contribution to their HSA - an increased responsibility on the plan.

(Cross talk)...

Ms. Wisniewski: .. if it's \$15,000 then 10% is even more.

Chairman Scudder: I think we all got that. Is 10% not low? Why does that sound low to me?

Ms. Crow: You probably might be thinking it's compared to like on the PPO plan. Our contribution rates were typically 15% of the premium.

Chairman Scudder: That seems low.

Ms. Crow: So, the overall cost value of the high deductible plan is significantly less than the PPO plan. So 10% of that is – it is a little bit less than what their current calculation is but it's still comparable and it still will increase over time.

Chairman Scudder: We're only doing 15% on the other one?

Ms. Crow: No, it wasn't – the calculation was different than that. It was a different type of formula previously but we do now have that significant benefit of all of the members only having the high deductible plan. It's definitely a win/win type of solution for the County. We can overall, reduce costs for the employee and the employer when they move over.

Legislator Starks: So it's a good move.

Legislator Proctor : So this is for everybody, not just new hirers?

Ms. Wisniewski: Correct. Everybody as of 1/1/20. Also effective 1/1/20 is all part time employees will no longer become eligible for health insurance benefits after reaching 1040 hours. For those of you who don't know, currently and has been for quite some time, if a part time employee reaches 1040 hours at any time during the year, they will receive insurance for the remainder of that year. So if it's in August, then the remaining months, we'll be paying insurance for them. That's no longer. So they have other part time that if they reach those hours, they get accruals and different things but we were able to negotiate that they were no longer receive insurance.

Ms. Crow: And that provision is just for this bargaining unit. Other bargaining units didn't have that 1040 provision. It was specific to this group. Since the Affordable Care Act came into place where now they can get insurance if they reach a certain number of hours for the entire next year so once that came into play, it was a longer duration that the County was ending up paying for health insurance benefits so this helps reduce that for us. Also, administratively, as Jessica mentioned, sometimes they are on board for one month's of insurance in December so they go on and they come off. So it has been administratively very burdensome. They also now, by the Affordable Care Act have a different, a new benefit that just came into play a couple of years ago and since then the Sheriff's office has kind of been paying for both so we were glad that they agreed to make this change.

Ms. Wisniewski: Finally is retirements. Of course with the only plan being the high deductible health plan, all future retirees will only have the high deductible health plan as their option during retirement benefits. In lieu of that, sick leave credit and service credit benefit was increased from the duration of benefit to keep parity with current benefit with the PPO plan. What that means is, if someone retires and they chose the cash out option, so we know if they – they have two options. They can choose the cash out option or they can choose to take the insurance. If they take the insurance, it's going to be the high deductible plan which is the only option. If they choose the cash out, what the formula was is what the premiums were for the PPO. They are a lot more, the PPO, so the cash out would have been significantly less for the employees for retirement and of course, you don't want to lose any retirement benefit so we had to increase the sick leave credit and service credit benefit to pretty much match what they had before.

Ms. Crow: It lengthens the amount of time they have the benefit but the value of it is comparable to what they now because it's based on the value of the PPO.

Ms. Wisniewski: Lastly is, effective upon ratification but it does have a sunset, this expires when the contract expires, which is 2023, accrued sick leave days above 180 shall be credited at 100%. So that means if they banked sick time, they could use 100% of that. Currently it's 25%. It was more or less a retirement incentive and also again, I think the Sheriff's office would rather have them bank the sick time and not use it (*inaudible*)..., overtime so there was another reoccurring (*inaudible*)...

Legislator Davis: I imagine a lot of work went into this obviously but I do have a question about how we compare to other departments? There are State Troopers or something that –

Sheriff Quattrone: You don't want to compare to State Police.

Legislator Davis: Right, local departments, are we –

Sheriff Quattrone: This is just for the Correction officers, so really, within this County, this is the only unit – I hesitate to say this because their attorney will use this against me but, I do think this is a very fair agreement. Correction officers, if you would spend any time in there, not as an inmate, but working, the working conditions aren't ideal. I honestly see more acts of violence against Correction officers than I do against police officers out on the street. Not just violence but other things that happen to them in there. Across the State, I would say it's comparable.

(Unknown speaker inaudible)

Sheriff Quattrone: Earlier in the year we were able to get 6 full time positions and it was like pulling teeth to find an employee to take the full time position. We are currently and happily be able to say that we have – we don't have a list now, our civil service list has been exhausted and it just came out in July. They took the test but they don't want the job. But we said we're hiring off the street. We've got some great applicants but whether they take the test and whether they stay on, (*inaudible*) been some of the problem. It's their retention, when they get in there, it seems great for the first few days.

Legislator Davis: But we're not the training ground before they jump to other departments, I guess.

Sheriff Quattrone: No. We do have a few that end up going from the Jail to patrol some place. We will have people who do that.

Ms. Wisniewski: There has also been transfers out, I would say, into different counties because of the qualifications. So the qualifications for the Corrections is, 16 hours of school and some, only require a high school diploma. That has been there for quite some time. (*Cross talk*) and they can transfer out but they can't transfer in because we're the higher level. Other counties are paying more, which there is a recruitment issue with the Correction officers and then going to other counties to be able to work. That was part of the reason of the wage increases and why we're here.

Chairman Scudder: It seems to me you are either going to be a Correction's officer or you are not. I would struggle with a 3% increase keeping me from doing it if it's something that I really – that's just my opinion. You know what I mean? I don't think – maybe you disagree.

Sheriff Quattrone: I know when I interview people, I'm sometimes shocked at the reasons for them going in and taking the job. I would agree with you. I would love to hear people come and say, this is what I want to do, (*cross talk*) but I will be honest with you, I don't know that I've (*inaudible*) anybody's interview that has told me that this is their life goal is to work in Corrections. Many have said that this is a stepping stone until getting a patrol job some place. We're just fortunate to keep some of those good quality candidates in the Jail. This is one of the things I've been trying to stress is the importance of that job. One thing that I tell the CO's all the time is, you may be the only ones that are showing, ever shown the inmates respect. In a network that keep them from (*inaudible*).

Chairman Scudder: Well, if anybody comes to me looking to apply, I'm going to tell them when you get to the interview, you tell them, I feel I was born to be a Corrections officer. O.k., anybody else have anything? Well, two comments. I would love to see this stuff, I would use the term, "on time". I understand there's this whole – it just drives me nuts when things are two years, three years, four years out because I hate the term retroactive. That just frustrates me.

Sheriff Quattrone: You are not going to get a disagreement from me.

Legislator Starks: And it can't be good for morale.

Ms. Crow: There are a lot of factors that go into (*cross talk*).

Chairman Scudder: And I understand that –

Ms. Crow: It's been almost two years that we've been negotiating.

Chairman Scudder: I get that it's just, it would be nice to see it quicker. I personally am going to vote against this in committee just because I'm not smart enough to absorb all this information 10 minutes before and that is not a knock. It's just a fact so it doesn't mean I'm voting against it on the floor. It just means I have to look it over and it has to make sense to me. I just wanted to throw that out there. So, anybody else?

Ms. Wisniewski: Kitty has the (*inaudible*) for the financials?

Chairman Scudder: Do you want to hear the financials?

Legislator Starks: That would help me.

Ms. Crow: Going over the highlights. We did have a lot of sign offs with this group. I went to a little bit – in a couple of areas, kept with the main items and there might be a couple of extra here and there that I have that wrapped it up into the financials. Obviously we've talked about the wages. The agreement is a 6 year agreement. The way this is mapped out is by year.

What would be the cost increase or decrease so the negative amounts are the savings associated with the changes in the agreement and the positive amounts are the cost over the prior year. So the wages, the sub-total there, as you can see, goes across for each period. The change in the longevity is the next one so that that shows you in the increased cost for the additional \$10.00 a year for longevity based on their membership. Allowing both the Wellness and the PT bonus. That's just estimating how many people we think will participate in both of them so that would be the incremental amount. Then the increase and the good attendance bonus estimated at about \$15,000 a year. What I'm not showing along with that good attendance bonus, I'm not showing it offset which we might naturally get in reduced overtime if people aren't calling – because there is an enormous trickle-down effect when somebody calls off in terms of calling in and rescheduling and a lot of work goes into that. There is some offset to that but it is, in the big picture, it's not a significant of cost as some of the other things.

On health insurance, you did mention when you said 10%, there is a change in the calculation to what the current calculation is in the previous contract. So for those who have elected the high deductible plan along, it is going to cost the County a little bit more to keep them on but again, we have the more dramatic cost savings from all of the remaining membership converting to the high deductible beginning in 2020. So you can see those savings building over time. Those saving represent the difference between what we would have paid on a PPO plan if that person had been on the PPO plan to what we will pay, projected to pay, on the high deductible plan. All the health insurance projections are based on a 6% annual increase in premiums which is our projected increase for next year. But also, consistent with our actuarial study that is done every year for our Financial statements for our accruals. So it is in the ballpark of what actuaries are using as well.

We did increase the opted out a little bit. It's always better to either retain the people who are currently opting out or incentivize people (*inaudible*) for not opting out now. We did make a small change in the dental and vision plans. I would say that this is probably a conservative estimate on the savings for the part time employees is that – I think it's probably more than this but, those employees who are now part time but reach and eligibility level of earning health insurance midway through the year, so, eliminating that. That's just assuming 10 but I know there is more than 10. There is 10 that have reached the Affordable Care Act limit and get the health insurance for the full next year so there is even more than that that are going over the 1040 hours.

Then the retirement changes, again, it looks like a small amount of savings in retirement but with retirement, you have to keep in mind that that change in retirement is going beyond this contract term because once they retire, they are retired on the high deductible plan or - and they do a cash out calculation, that will be for the duration of their benefit period. So their benefit period could go longer than what this contract is, so there will be continued savings for that retirement piece.

The next two items, just the sunset, I didn't put a dollar amount here but I will say that it's kind of an incentive in a way for anyone who is near retirement. Retiring during this contract term because more of their unused sick time could be converted to their health insurance benefit. That clause sunsets at the end of this contract so it would revert back to only being able to use 25% of that additional sick time over 180 days. So anytime there is a retirement sooner, while we do have recruitment issues, at the same time, getting that turn over and the staffing can also be a benefit too. You have the new person come in, they are lower wage, lower retirement tier, and

things like that. The toll, I imagine, the employee in that type of work after so many years too, so, somewhat of an incentive there.

Legislator Muldowney: Sheriff, do you have many people that retire from there?

Sheriff Quattrone: A few. I think we're hitting – it goes in cycles. To be honest with you, I don't in the past because I didn't pay attention to it, but, we're getting at the age –

Legislator Muldowney: Where people stay a long time.

Sheriff Quattrone: There is a large group that are getting ready potentially in the next few years be retiring.

Ms. Crow: So that first row under the retirement there, they do have about 3 retirees, I looked back at the history, about 3 retirees at any given time. But again, that (*inaudible*) continues on past this contract term.

I also didn't provide any net change – increasing the duration of their benefit because that will actually impact out years but it also again, would be offset by turn over savings where somebody, because they have a longer health insurance benefit when they retire, they are more apt to, we think anyways, more apt to retire a little bit sooner than rather than continue to work a few more years at a higher pay and things like that. So, even though it's a longer benefit period, we do think there is offsetting savings associated with that.

You may be wondering too about the budgetary impact right now. I can mention that I will be providing to Audit & Control a proposed amendment to their prefiled resolution for amending the 2020 budget. Assuming that the contract passes the full Legislature then I'll bring forth a resolution amending the 2019 budget. Based on our very most recent sales tax payment which is our largest payment of the year, which was about a week or so ago, did see strong results still. Our trends have been very good overall this year and they are continuing. The one payment gave me a better feeling about what our projected surplus is for this year as well as how much I think that would be possible to increase the sale tax budget for next year which we'd be able to offset the majority of these changes. These changes still keep us within our 5 year projections because our 5 year projections included maybe a slightly less of a wage increase but they included higher health insurance costs in those out years in our 5 year model. My projection, I still feel comfortable that we're still within those parameters in our out years.

Legislator Starks: I know that you don't have a number but when you have your proposed amendment after everything passes, is that a significant change to the budget?

Ms. Crow: It will have really no net effect because I will be – the proposal is, I think it comes short of a couple thousand dollars, the increase in sales tax for 2020 to offset the increase here (*cross talk*)...

Ms. Wisniewski: I think it changed a little bit since –

Ms. Crow: I gave you the numbers.

Legislator Starks: So you don't anticipate it to be tremendously significant?

Ms. Crow: It's not going to change the tax rate or anything like that. The other consideration is that, I'm always good when we can align recurring revenues with recurring expenses and in this case we will be able to do that. Had we not had – if that sales tax payment came in like at budget or below, I wouldn't be proposing another solution. I would be saying maybe we do have to use fund balance to amend the 2020 budget but because the sales tax trends have continued to be above our budget this year and our projections for next year could be increased.

Chairman Scudder: Anybody else? Any questions? Do you have anything else for us? If not, let's vote. All in favor?

Carried with Chairman Scudder voting "no"

Legislator Starks: Thank for all your work that you put into this.

(Cross talk)

Other

Chairman Scudder: Any other, "other"?

Legislator Starks: No other, other. I will make a motion to adjourn.

Legislator Proctor: Second.

Unanimously Carried (5:49 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Olivia Ames, Deputy Clerk/Lori J. Foster, Sr. Stenographer