

Minutes

Public Safety Committee

October 16, 2019, 4:15 pm, Room 331

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Members Present: Niebel, Whitford, Bankoski, Pavlock, Vanstrom

Others: Tampio, Ames, Griffith, Dennison, Wendel, Quattrone, O'Connell, Knear, Swanson, Crow, Wisniewski

Chairman Niebel called the meeting to order at 4: 15 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (9/18//19)

MOVED by Legislator Bankoski, SECONDED by Legislator Pavlock

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one chose to speak at this time.

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Acceptance of the 2020 Stop Violence Against Women (VAWA) Grant Program

Chairman Niebel: Is there anyone here to speak to that? This is a grant that I think we've had before. We had it in 2019 and it looks like we'll have it in 2020, January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020. You can read the rest of the WHEREAS's. Does anybody have any questions on this resolution?

Legislator Bankoski: There is no local match.

Chairman Niebel: There isn't Bob. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Haz Mat Grant Program FY2018

Mr. Griffith: Before I get started, you should all be proud of the volunteers in this County given the last three days to search for the poor Chase woman in the Watts Flats area. It's been quite a project.

Chairman Niebel: Any luck so far?

Mr. Griffith: No. We'll be there tomorrow and we'll be there until we're done.

Chairman Niebel: I've seen it work, that's a good thing.

Mr. Griffith: This grant is a \$94,000 grant under the Federal Hazardous Material grant program. The acceptance of this is a 2018 grant which we just received information on today. This grant will be spent periodically for training supplies, exercising and equipment during the next several years. There is no local match.

Chairman Niebel: John, our resolution says October 1, 2019 through August 31 –

Mr. Griffith: 2021. Nineteen through 21', three years.

Chairman Niebel: Right. Any questions of John?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Fiscal Year 2019 Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant Program

Mr. Griffith: This is a \$15,516 dollar – you have an addition?

Mrs. Dennison: I do. I do have a surprise that John doesn't know about so I will let you say your peace and then I'll see mine.

Mr. Griffith: This grant program is funded by the US Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. There is no local share.

Mrs. Dennison: Mr. Chairman, I would like you to possibly entertain an amendment to this resolution. Valerie Hayes the Principal Account Clerk for Emergency Services and I realized yesterday that normally Emergency Services puts a clause in their resolutions to say that the budget will be amended when the department is ready to spend the money. We realized that this resolution, number 3, doesn't really say anything about when it will be used, how the budget will be adopted and so I would like to suggest that we add a WHEREAS clause. It would be the same WHEREAS clause that's the 4th WHEREAS clause from the preceding resolution. And so, we would add a WHEREAS where it would say; WHEREAS, upon acceptance of application and execution of the contract, funds will be allocated as necessary to the proper accounts in subsequent resolutions once the County is ready to expend them.

Chairman Niebel: So Kathleen, this will be the 4th WHEREAS just above the last RESOLVED?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, so the 3rd WHEREAS clause, instead of ending with, “therefore be it” it would be “and” and then the 4th WHEREAS clause would be inserted after that point.

Chairman Niebel: Would somebody like to make that amendment?

Legislator Bankoski: I will do that.

Legislator Whitford: Second.

Chairman Niebel: Those in favor?

Carried

Chairman Niebel: On the resolution as amended? All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried as amended

Other

Proposed Resolution - Confirm Appointments – Emergency Medical Services Council

Mr. Griffith: We have Dave Thomas who represents WCA Services, Paul Miller represents the President of the Fire Chief’s Association, Pricilla Barns representing UPMC Chautauqua, Sharoyne Ruby representing Lakewood Fire Department, and Amy Romanik representing Brooks and Lake Shore Hospitals.

Chairman Niebel: Are some of these re-appointments too John?

Mr. Griffith: Some are, not all of them.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions of John?

Mr. Griffith: Actually to be honest with you, none of them are re-appointments. They are all new.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Agreement with Cassadaga Valley Central School District for School Resource Officer

Sheriff Quattrone: This proposed resolution is for an SRO for Cassadaga Valley Central School. Starting as soon as possible in 2019 through the school year of 2020. See for the 2019 budget, that would be – we’re looking for an increase in the personal services of \$9,669 and employee benefits of \$3,257 for a total of \$12,926. Then we would increase our revenue account the \$12,926 from reimbursement from the school.

Chairman Niebel: So the total is \$64,630?

Sheriff Quattrone: Correct. That would be from November 1st to the end of the school year, August 31st.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions?

Legislator Pavlock: I would like to excuse myself from voting on this one just because of a conflict of interest. I serve on the school board there.

Chairman Niebel: Alright. Anybody else have any questions of the Sheriff? Those in favor?

Carried w/ Legislator Pavlock "abstaining"

Chairman Niebel: If it's alright, we'll take the District Attorney next. He's here. This should be a lot shorter than the Sheriff's contract plus you have a lot of things going on.

DA Swanson: Yeah, we've been busy.

Discussion – 2020 Budget Review – District Attorney - Swanson

(Discussion took place)

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

Chairman Niebel: This resolution did come to us late. What is your thoughts? Would you like to discuss this with the folks that are here now or would you like more time, would you like to have this tabled, what is your prerogative?

Legislator Vanstrom: What's the expense going to be long term if it's increased?

Chairman Niebel: Well, if we get into this, I think Finance and I think Human Services will address that. Do you want to take this up now or do you want to table it? What would you like to do?

Legislator Vanstrom: If we table it, can we talk about it?

Chairman Niebel: We can.

Legislator Vanstrom: Well then let's talk about it and then maybe we'll talk about tabling it.

Legislator Bankoski: Maybe should we get like their input first and then we can discuss the tabling issue?

Chairman Niebel: Exactly, we can. Jess, give us some sort of overview. What are the implications of this contract, settlement?

Ms. Wisniewski: What I will do is give you just a quick summary of what the outline is and Kitty does have the financial piece that she can go over.

Ms. Crow: Do you mind if I make a comment first just on the timing of the prefile. The union voted last Wednesday so as soon as they did and we were notified, we prepared the resolution and prefiled it on Friday. I think that might have been just a day or so short of your prefile but certainly met –

Chairman Niebel: Ours was noon on Thursday.

Ms. Crow: So it met the prefile for Audit & Control and it did go under “other” at Admin Services yesterday so it’s important for us to, in regards to open enrollment and other things that are coming up, the timing was, we felt, was necessary to bring it and request that it be considered under “other” today.

Chairman Niebel: Thanks Kitty.

Ms. Wisniewski: So for this agreement, it is for Corrections. It’s mainly full time and part time Correction officers but it also includes cooks, dispatch, and should there be navigation employees. If you look, there is about 128 employees in this bargaining unit, CSEA previous contract did expire December 31, 2017 and I believe that they were all on the email, I think you sent it to all Legislators.

Ms. Crow: No, just to Administrative Services.

Ms. Wisniewski: Oh, o.k.. Just so you know, it did expire December, 2017, and we did start the negotiations March of 2018 and that’s because they had a change in union representation and it does take an amount of time to do so. We had to go to Buffalo, it has to be approved by the State and it did change from CSEA 6323 to CCSEA. So we sat, when they were ready with their new team, on March of 2018 and then we met monthly. There was an impasse that as declared at one point during that year and then they switched over to a new lead negotiator on their side and new Sheriff’s Administration came in as well. Again, we met monthly and then we reached this tentative agreement August 8th with the mediator. So there has been a lot of back and forth with this union and what we’ve tentatively agreed on is the following. With the wages; again 2018 because it expired in 17’, we tentatively agreed on a one-time payment of \$900.00 for full time employees who were active in 2018, and a one-time payment of \$450.00 for part time employees in 2018 that are still employed. So for those full timers that did retire, terminate at any point, as long as they were active, they do still receive the \$900.00 but the part time, it was agreed to that they still have to be employed today to receive the \$450.00 for that 2018 payment. In 2019, it’s a 2% retroactive wage and then 20’ on, is 3% and I’ll talk about why in regards the high deductible now being the sole option as of the first of the year, 1/1/20. Longevity increments, it was always \$40.00 and it has been for quite some

time. It was agreed upon to increase it to \$50.00. Good attendance bonus, it was \$115.00 and now increased to \$200.00. The reason why that was agreed upon is because the good attendance bonus, since implementing this bonus, the previous Sheriff's administration stated that they've seen better attendance because they are striving to get the bonus and of course, any time that people do not call in, it helps with forced overtime. Which can be much more costly if they are calling off versus driving towards a bonus to be there. The physical fitness bonus, this was always an option for them. There wasn't an increase at all, there was a Wellness screening of \$300.00 if they participated. If they passed the physical fitness, they received \$500.00. The only difference is, they can now participate in both, instead of one or the other. Again, we do think that these physical fitness bonuses is a good thing for them to participate in.

Legislator Pavlock: The attendance bonus, is there time that they can miss? I mean, can they take their personal days and still get the bonus?

Ms. Wisniewski: Yes, they get personal days or vacation time, yes, but if they call in and use a sick day, then they start all over their timeframe and they won't get it for that quarter.

Legislator Pavlock: So that is per quarter. Two hundred per quarter.

Ms. Wisniewski: It is per quarter, yes. So the total could get up to \$800.00 per year if they meet it.

Health insurance. Effective January 1, 2020, we have come to an agreement that the high deductible will be the sole plan so they will no longer have the choice of the PPO option. The County will be responsible for the full cost of the deductible for the first year. So similar to CSEA 6300, the first year, fully funded, it is the same. They did not have the prior, this option. They are aware that 6300 had this option but they have not had this before so this will be new to them.

Legislator Whitford: So the first year is 19' or 20'?

Ms. Wisniewski: The first year will be 20'. Then after the first year, the employee's share of will be 10% of the total plan costs. So what that means is, the premium plus the deductible, that total cost, they have to pay 10%.

Legislator Rankin: What's the premium cost?

Ms. Wisniewski: It depends on the selected –

Legislator Bankoski: I will change because of your single, married, or family.

Ms. Wisniewski: Yes, there is a three tier.

Ms. Crow: The family of 3 plan is about \$15,000 and the deductible is \$5,200.

Legislator Pavlock: What is that percentage difference? Was it in place before, was it 8%, 10%?

Ms. Crow: It wasn't based on a specific percentage before, the calculation was essentially kind of completely different. The change does result in a bit of an increase to what the current formula provides but, with all of them going to the high deductible versus having a choice between the PPO and the high deductible, the value to the County is significant in moving everyone to one plan.

Ms. Wisniewski: Then effective January 1st, all part time employees will no longer become eligible for health insurance after reaching 1040 hours. For those of you who are not aware, currently and for quite some time, if a part time Correction officer reached 1040 hours, they would receive insurance for the remainder of the year. We were able to negotiate that out. It was an additional cost to the Sheriff's office because the Affordable Care Act is the law to where if they go over approximately 1560 hours a year, they get it for the following year. This was an additional benefit that the Sheriff's office was having to pay 1040 for that same year for the remainder of the months, that will be less cost of an insurance and also administratively getting someone onto an insurance and then back off at the end of the year was a lot.

Legislator Bankoski: Was there many that you saw that did that?

Ms. Wisniewski: There was at least 10 if not –

Sheriff Quattrone: (*Cross talk*) was 15.

Ms. Wisniewski: Yeah, I was going to say up to 20.

Legislator Vanstrom: There is 20 part time people?

Ms. Crow: They didn't all reach the 1040 hours. They have to reach 1040 hours to become eligible but not all of them work that many hours in a year, as part time.

Sheriff Quattrone: She's saying 15 of the 20.

Chairman Niebel: So roughly half.

Ms. Crow: Yes, a lot of them do and then those that reach – since the Affordable Care Act came into place, we had the added cost now a whole another year for those who reached the threshold of 1560 hours. So, since that Affordable Care Act came into play, we were able to negotiate with them to remove the benefit for the 1040 hours for the current year but also gives an incentive for those part timers to stay on board and continue to come in for shifts that we need them to. So it's beneficial for us too.

Legislator Bankoski: Do you have a number of what we paid for those part timers?

Ms. Crow: I have a financial analysis on all of these items that we'll go through afterwards. Jessica just wanted to give you an overview of the main points.

Ms. Wisniewski: Lastly, the retirement. What that means is that all future retirees, as of 1/1/20, the only option that they have is the high deductible. So another, again, insurance savings that we will have. The Sick leave credit and Service credit benefit, we did have to increase duration of the benefit to keep parity because as you are probably aware, if someone, let's say for example, went to go cash out when they retire, the formula was based on the PPO premium which is a lot higher. The high deductible isn't. So we had to increase the duration just to keep equity there amongst the union. Lastly is, upon ratification but this is expiring as of the end of the contract 2023, they can use a full 100% of their sick leave as time to their retirement. So right now, it's only 25%, it is 100% but it does sunset at the end of the contract and it is a part of a potential retirement incentive for those who have the sick time. They can use that towards retirement.

Legislator Bankoski: Use it towards credit (*inaudible*).

Ms. Wisniewski: For the retirement, yes. Yes, we are struggling with recruitment for Corrections, however –

Legislator Bankoski: I would say it encourages them to come to work.

Ms. Wisniewski: Yes, encourage them to come to work and then also too, that if they do end up retiring before 2023, that they can –

Ms. Crow: Use more of their sick time than they otherwise would be able to.

Chairman Niebel: Just one quick question. Accrued sick days, leave days, accrued sick leave days above 180 shall be credited at 100%. Is there any limitation? Five hundred or a 1,000 sick days.

Ms. Wisniewski: There is not.

Ms. Crow: There is very few people that have sick time even over 180 days. If it's 5 people, it's a lot. All five are unlikely to retire all at once.

Chairman Niebel: Well, it's a possibility. Because we're talking about 20, 25, 30 years.

Ms. Crow: But there are restrictions on how much they can accrue in a year.

Chairman Niebel: Understand. What I was asking Kitty, this isn't capped?

Ms. Crow: Correct.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., sick days above 180.

Ms. Crow: Yes, and it expires at the end of this contract. Then it reverts back to, I think it's 25%, otherwise it's only 25% of the time over 180 days.

Ms. Wisniewski: So in 2024, it will be reverted back unless it's negotiated differently.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., do you have the financials.?

Ms. Crow: Yes I do. This breaks down the category of wages, health insurance, and retirement, like Jessica's summary has as well. So, starting with the wages, the highlighted rows are kind of the net cost or savings lines. So for the wages, that shows you by year, the incremental costs, year over year for the wage increase as well as longevity, the PT and Wellness bonus and then the increase in the amount for the good attendance bonus. Then with health insurance, there is two categories here. One is for those people who are already on the high deductible. As we stated, they will get one year fully funded and then thereafter the calculation of their share of the plan is different than what it is now. If we kept just that piece the same, the County would pay somewhat less but having everyone on the high deductible plan is significantly more of a savings than the increase for the existing plan design. So, I did delineate that by the increase in those already enrolled and then what would be the decrease for those who are converting from the PPO plan. That savings represents the difference between what we would be projected to pay on the PPO plan to what the new projected cost of the high deductible plan is. The opted out then calculated at 25% versus the current language which was \$1,000, \$2,000, and \$3,000 so it's a little bit more than what it is now but it is important to insure that everyone that is still opting out, continues to opt out as well as potentially some people may choose to opt out that are not opting out now. We had some minor changes in the dental and vision plans that were a small incremental costs to the County but administratively they do provide benefit administratively to the County which I did not quantify but that does save us a lot of time in terms of administration. Eliminating then the benefits for the employees who reach that 1040, so that's based on and in this estimate here is only based on 10% reaching that threshold each year. I believe my estimate of savings here is a little low but I'd rather be on the lower side than over estimating there. Then retirees, with them, this unit has about 3 retirees at any given time. So, that is the projected savings from those retirees having the only option of the high deductible plan. There will be out years savings as well in terms of the cash out and the duration of the benefit. The duration of the benefit will be extended but we'll also believe that we'll see people being able to retire from this job a little sooner because they will have health care for a little bit longer. That helps us with our turnover savings in terms of the high cost, long time employee at the highest retirement tier, once they retire when we have a new person at the beginning of the salary range with the Tier 6 retirement, so, while that's not going to happen during this contract term, it is something that will occur over time. So that will be a future savings. Then in regards to the bottom line. Obviously, you all know that we're contemplating the tentative budget right now, that you'll be voting on next week, so, I do have already prepared ready to present to Audit & Control tomorrow, what I would propose as amendments to the 2020 budget to cover the increase costs for 2020.

Chairman Niebel: How does that effect the rate?

Ms. Crow: It doesn't. It's neutral. Our sales tax, our latest payment which just came in last week which is our single highest payment of every year, continued to show strong trends. We've been trending at a surplus this year and based on that one single payment, I do feel comfortable that continuing on the same trend, that would increase our sales tax projections for

2020 enough to cover the cost of this contract. So, one thing I think is a positive is that we can project recurring revenues to go along with recurring expenses. That we wouldn't be putting ourselves in a further financial hole, so to speak, if we were just going to say, let's use fund balance to cover this cost. That with that sales tax, assuming nothing changes drastically in the economy, if our trends continue, we should reasonably expect to meet that sales tax. In similarly for 2019, assuming this contract does pass the Legislature, our projected surpluses for this year for sales tax should be enough to cover the retroactive and the one-time payment that would occur this year.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions of Kitty or Jess? What are your thoughts? Would you like to vote on this? Would you like to table it for further study? What would you like to do? Before we discuss that Kitty, o.k., so there really isn't any urgency for us to do something here tonight?

Legislator Vanstrom: I think she said there is (*cross talk*)....

Chairman Niebel: O.k., but that is by the end of the year, right?

Ms. Crow: No, I mean, open enrollment usually begins in November and the first payroll is being set up in the middle of December. So, having this adopted in October is ideal. If we're pushed out to November, no, it's not the end of the world but it allows us a more comfortable timeframe to – we have to set up our electronic open enrollment system with new calculations and new language and employees need to start to get through the enrollment process and a lot of them, this will be a new health insurance benefit for them and they need time to get their information, get to meetings, and things like that.

Chairman Niebel: That would be December, not January.

Ms. Crow: The first payroll for 2020 starts getting set up in the middle of December because the first pay date is early in January.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., so like December 15th or whatever it is?

Ms. Crow: Yes.

Legislator Bankoski: I thought her presentation has pretty much answered any questions that I might have. (*Inaudible*) kick this down the road any longer. Why make it difficult on all our staff to – unless I'm missing something here and you think that we should change something.

Ms. Crow: Technically speaking it's still going to go to Audit & Control tomorrow.

Legislator Whitford: As long as you say there is no adverse effect on the 19' budget and 2020 budget, because you already know what the recommendations of the Audit & Control are at this point and to throw a curve at them right now – I'm comfortable with voting on it and certainly comfortable with accepting it. It's already two years in arrears.

Legislator Bankoski: If Audit & Control finds something, they can address it.

Ms. Crow: Your choices in terms of voting on the agreement would be yes or no, really. If it were to be –

Chairman Niebel: Tabled.

Ms. Crow: Or tabled, yes. Once you get to the full Legislature, already one committee has passed it so it will automatically go to the full Legislature next week. So if there was a consensus among the Legislature that you felt it was important to table it for any reason, I mean you still have that option next week.

Chairman Niebel: Bob, I tend to agree with you. I think the presentation was excellent. I think Jim, Kitty, and Jess covered this pretty well. The only thing is, we are just getting this, this afternoon and this is the first contract that is coming up. So, whatever we do now does have implications for the other negotiations we have with the other bargaining units.

Legislator Bankoski: I think one of the key things that they negotiated is the high deductible health thing. Getting everybody on board on that is a win/win.

Chairman Niebel: I think that's positive but there are some fiscal implications. Personally, I would like more time to study this but that's just me.

Legislator Pavlock: This is a good increase for the employees. I mean, 3% is a big increase. You look at that over that period, if they have two contracts like this, it's a third of their salaries that they've increased. It's generous contract also.

Ms. Wisniewski: We looked at that. As we were talking briefly that there has been recruitment issues with the Correction officers, it's almost a necessity for us to be competitive with wages, as part of it. But, as we said, it's big with the high deductible and they knew that and so there wasn't, we're going to be able to give smaller wage increases be able to (*cross talk*)...

Sheriff Quattrone: I think that it's important to note that the CO's are earning every penny of their wage. They deal with more garbage than we do out on the road. And when I say garbage, having people throw stuff at them (*cross talk*).....

Legislator Vanstrom: Then deal with the people that actually got arrested.

Sheriff Quattrone: When I worked the road, I got to deal with good people, a lot.

Chairman Niebel: Folks what we'll do is, we'll entertain a motion on this resolution. Look, I'm going to vote no not because I'm opposed to it, just because I would like more time to study this. So would somebody like to make a motion to accept the resolution as read.

Legislator Whitford: So moved.

Legislator Bankoski: Second.

Chairman Niebel: Those in favor?

Carried with Legislator Niebel voting “no”

Ms. Crow: Certainly if there is any follow up questions, let us know.

Chairman Niebel: Is there any other, other?

Mrs. Dennison: In the budget hearings, your Committee had asked for projections on the Fly Car system and I'd like to discuss that.

Chairman Niebel: Folks, we're going to have some updated projections on the Fly Car from Kathleen.

Mrs. Dennison: I did, obviously, discuss this topic with Director Griffith and he was planning to stay for the discussion but obviously he had a lot of stuff going on right now. So, I can talk to you about the financial picture and I'll fill in as much of the operation information as I can based on what John and I discussed.

What John and I discussed was obviously what has happened so far in the year and what we were expecting for the fourth quarter. So what you are looking at would be, first starting with the budget for 2019 and as you are all aware, we did budget it at local share neutral. No local share but have been having difficulty with that since the beginning of the year. So the first column or the second column is the year to date actual results. We currently have a local share of \$360,000 through September. The next column it says year to date collectable, that is an attempt to estimate what we have – calls that we completed but monies that have not been paid. What you are looking at there is Medicaid. Now that we have the ambulance, we are able to back bill for Medicaid calls back to the first of July. So that \$15,784, that's an estimate of the Medicaid calls for July, August, and September. Then the \$195,000, that is an estimate of how much has been billed that we have not collected. As you can see in the comment section, we have billed \$787,000 so far, through September. We've been paid about half of that. So, I estimated that the part – I did an estimate and just said, “o.k., take everything that we've been billed, we'll assume that we would get paid 70% of that in total and then backed out what we've already received”. So that leaves with approximately \$195,000, maybe \$200,000 that we are expecting to receive for work that has already been completed. So that's the revenue side. Then going forward to the 4th quarter, the revenues are based on the call volume that we're currently doing which is about 12 calls a day and one and a half of those calls are in Jamestown so we do not collect any money so those are taken out of the mix. So we took the remaining 10 ½ calls and split it up based on how the 2020 budget is distributed between Medicare, Medicaid, private insurance, and then other payment opportunities.

Legislator Vanstrom: You said 12 calls a day?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, 12 calls a day.

Legislator Vanstrom: And 1 ½ (*inaudible*)?

Mrs. Dennison: Approximately yes and the ones in Jamestown because of the City's billing situation –

Chairman Niebel: You can't bill.

Mrs. Dennison: They are uncollectable.

Chairman Niebel: So far, we're in negotiations.

Mrs. Dennison: So we're expecting that the 4th quarter, that we could earn \$354,000. When you look at, we have nine months, it's almost equal to what we booked in the first nine months, looks a little bit high but the call volume has been increasing and also keep in mind that in the first 9 months, there is revenue that we earned that is not on the books. At the end of the year, we will make an accrual, an estimate, we'll book revenue for everything we think we're going to get. For every call that's been completed. We only do those accruals once a year so there is no accruals in the year to date results but in the full year results we will make an estimate of what is ultimately collectable for the calls that have been completed. So we're expecting revenues of \$922,000. You can see that is down from the budget, about \$200,000 off the budget and a couple of reasons for that is, one; the budget assumed that we would be doing transport for most of the year in 2019. We now know that transports are not really viable. First of all, it took six months to get the ambulance but the second issue that has come to light since we've had the ambulance is that, it needs to be staffed or the plan was to staff it with part time EMT's and Emergency Services really is having difficulty finding part time EMT's to staff transports. Also, we now know that any facility to facility transport has to be pre-authorized by insurance carriers and the time to get that done and the administrative personnel needed to get those pre-authorizations is really not practical to do them. So, looking at the 2020 budget and at the projections, the projections assume that we don't do any transport revenue but the ambulance does benefit us because we can do standbys, like the recent standby at the building in Westfield and also it makes us eligible to bill for Medicaid. So that's the revenue side. Any questions before I move onto expenses?

Legislator Pavlock: My question that I raised when we were in our budget hearing was, this coming year we've estimated our revenues based on similar (*inaudible*).

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Pavlock: And last year, try to do it conservatively so it wouldn't come under and my concern was, this year we weren't –

Mrs. Dennison: We're not making it this year.

Legislator Pavlock: Yeah, we're not going to do it again this year.

Mrs. Dennison: That's is obviously a valid concern because we've been saying, it looks like we can make it breakeven and it's not happening. A couple of comments on that. The call volume has been increasing and that 12 calls a day, I think has been pretty constant for the last couple of months. But the other big factor is that, the projections or budgets, they are a numerical situation. They make sense numerically but with the revenues, we cannot control how many people have an emergent medical situation, we can't control where they live, and we can't control what kind of insurance they have. Those are a lot of variables and they are completely out of anyone's control. So we can say, we expect our mix to be 45% Medicare, 15% Medicaid, 10% private pay, and we expect to do 12 calls a day and that is what the revenues are based on. The only thing that we know in there is what we can charge for each of those calls. So we know like Medicare costs or private pay it's \$585.00, so we know how much the revenue is per call but we don't know whether they are going to pay it and we don't know –

Legislator Pavlock: And last year this budget was assuming well visits, correct?

Mrs. Dennison: It was, yes.

Legislator Pavlock: You didn't mention them so –

Mrs. Dennison: That is taken out.

Legislator Pavlock: How much do you think – well –

Mrs. Dennison: That was only budgeted at \$12,000. The revenue component was small. The bigger component was that the budget was based on one full time paramedic being paid for by those - by that Well visit program in Social Services. So, that is completely out of the projections, it's out of the 2020 budget.

Chairman Niebel: Kind of quickly on the expenses.

Mrs. Dennison: The expenses are a little bit more straight forward. Just that we have the year to date and then for the personal services and benefits, I just calculated how many payrolls are left – I took, what we're spending in September and say, o.k., we have approximately 8 more payrolls to go at that rate. I did use a little slightly higher, 10% higher rate because right now, we're in September and still now, we don't have the Senior Paramedic position. That's a little bit higher graded position and that person does some administrative work that's kind of been farmed out to other employees. So when that position is filled, the expenses could go up a little bit more. So it's based pretty much on current, it's extrapolating current personnel costs. The same thing with the operating expense, taking what we spent in September. September we had a big expense on car repairs. I guess they had some major – had a couple of accidents, major repair costs, so I took those out because they are unusual. So without those, figured out what we were spending for operating and also for our billing service. So bottom line, we are at this point, looking at a local share of \$177,000. That's very consistent with what we forecasted in the 1st quarter. At the end of March, we did a projection and for March we expected that the first quarter local share would be \$42,000. Forty two thousand dollars times 4 is pretty close to \$177,000. The main difference is it's off by about \$10,000 and the main difference is that Medicare, the Well visit

component because in March, we still thought we were going to be doing that. So, that's where we're looking at right now. The only other comment that I would make is that, we have a proposal for the Audit & Control, with your input, to reduce a number of Fly Cars to three instead of four. But, when we redrafted the budget for 2020, with only three cars, what happens is, in order to breakeven, the revenue per car has to be higher with three cars than it was with four. That honestly makes me a little bit nervous. At first, it was kind of wondering, does that make sense? But it does make sense because there is a lot of fixed costs for this program. We have the same insurance, whether we have three cars or four, we've got John's salary, we've got Valerie's salary, we've got a Senior Paramedic running the program, so you've got these fixed cost that now you have to spread out over only three cars instead of four.

Legislator Pavlock: Question and I doubt you will be able to answer but, maybe John could. If there was four cars, would the availability to pick up more billable calls be possible? So a car gets tied up in Jamestown all the time, it misses a call that is going on outside of the city that they can bill for, was that the potential also?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes it is. We talked about that in my discussions with him because I was saying, yeah, exactly what you said. They've got this one car that gets stuck in Jamestown, we don't get paid for that car. The other reason they are kind of keen on the four cars is that, we already have four cars. We have the three, one in each area, then the fourth car is right now kind of a floater. The Senior Paramedic, after the position is filled, he or she is assigned to that car. So there is very little additional vehicle expense because cars is already there. That's what I can tell you about three versus four cars.

Chairman Niebel: Folks any further question of Kathleen? Kathleen, thanks. This is exactly what we need. Motion to adjourn.

Legislator Bankoski: So moved.

Legislator Whitford: Second.

Unanimously Carried (5:20 p.m.)

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