

Minutes

Public Facilities Committee

February 16, 2021, 4:00 p.m.

Virtual Meeting via Zoom and Live-Streamed for public viewing

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, N.Y.

Members Present: Hemmer, Davis, Nazzaro, Gould, Scudder

Others: Tampio, Ames, Dennison, Bentley, Zafuto, Carrow, Cummings, Almeter Walsh, Button, Almeter

Chairman Hemmer called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (1/19/21)

MOVED by Legislator Davis, SECONDED by Legislator Scudder to approve the minutes.

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

Clerk Tampio: We have not received any comments.

Proposed Resolution – Confirm Appointment & Re-Appointments – Parks Commission

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions? We do have one new appointment, Mr. Jacob Bodway and I think he's going to be a great addition to the Parks Commission. He's a mountain biker and he is working hard to secure some grants to help us to do some trail work. I think he's got a lot going for him and I think that he's going to be really a great addition to our Parks Commission and of course our regular members are all doing a fine job. Any questions or comments about this?

Mr. Bentley: *(Cross talk)* on our newest member there and glad to see the reappointments of the existing members and I just want to make note of an additional effort that's being under taken by myself and the legal department with Steve Abdella. We're actually looking to expand the Parks Commission. There is some concern and I agree with a couple of the members concerns that, a lot of our members seem to be towards the southern part of the County and

we're looking to expand the Parks Commission by an additional two members so that we can get some additional representation. I don't want to exclude anybody that want's to help the Parks because we need all the help we can get. I think this is a really good way to keep the members who are really doing a great job, getting an additional member, Jacob here and also meet the concerns of making sure we have enough representation throughout the County. I think our effort to get the additional language to extend the Parks is getting tied in with the overall DPF language which hasn't been updated for many, many years so, Steve and I are continuing to work through that. I want to make sure that (*inaudible*) was recognized and I'll probably be coming back with that additional language probably next month. I'm in favor of the appointments here.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you Mr. Bentley. Any other comments or questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Acceptance of WIIA Grant with EFC Financing for North Chautauqua County Water District

Clerk Tampio: This resolution recognizes that the North Chautauqua County Water District was awarded a \$3 million dollar grant through the New York State Water Infrastructure Improvement Act. Through that award, it is then administered by the Environmental Facilities Corporation and we're at the point that we need to accept that award and authorize the financing through EFC and to do that we have to complete an SRF application and it has to have the signature of the County Executive. So this will authorize the County Executive to process the paperwork necessary to receive that grant funding.

Chairman Hemmer: That's fantastic, thank you. Any questions or comments? I think the water project is coming along really well and glad to see that we're getting some grant funding here. Thank you Kathy.

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – South & Center Chautauqua Lake Sewer Districts (SCCLSD)

Mr. Walsh: This resolution is to increase appropriation in accounts of personal services, 8110, 8110 employee benefits, 8130 personal service, and 8131 employee benefits. Some of these increases are due to contractual raises and insurance benefits. The one significant is the adjustment due to pension funding at the cost of \$178,000. I'd ask Kathleen to give a brief description with her expertise on this topic for you all.

Mrs. Dennison: I'm going to comment on this resolution but this commentary also applies to changes (*inaudible*) PPD and the North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District as well as the landfill. You may recall we talked about this in year's past that every year we are assessed a charge to fund the future, anticipated future liability of (*inaudible*) costs for enterprise fund employees and we also have to fund other post-employment benefits. We do our budget based on the most recent actual for these items but the actual results vary widely and we do not know what

the expense and so we're advised by New York State Office of the Comptroller so that's where we get the figures. Unfortunately the advice from New York State is that we have a large (*inaudible*) liability for all of the enterprise funds. So that's why the adjustment is so large. In 2020 for the first time, we did start charging a monthly assessment for these items based on our budget and so you may recall in December we adjusted the budget for the sewer districts based on the information that we had at that time because the monthly amounts were putting us over the budget they had for the year but we do not receive the total annual expenses until after the end of the year, until January. So we did do an adjustment in December based on what we knew at that time and then got the news and bad news in January. So, that is why we have such a large adjustment to the employee benefits for the administrative department. The adjustment for all of the South & Center employees is all made in their administration department, ESS8110.

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you for that great explanation. Any questions from the committee members on this resolution?

Legislator Scudder: Is that \$178,226, all pension funding, the entire amount?

Mrs. Dennison: That is certainly the lion's share of it. Looking at the GASB expense for 2020, the actual expense just for that one item is \$219,000, but that won't account the GASB68 is over budget – I'll give you the exact variance for that one item, \$181,000 for that one account. So, as I said, the vast majority of it is just for the GASB liability. As you can see, the adjustment is a little bit less of \$181,000 so other benefit expenses in that particular department were actually under budget.

Legislator Scudder: Thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Portland, Pomfret, Dunkirk Sewer District

Mr. Cummings: The same stipulation that we had with South & Center. The PPD District and the North District had the same budget to go through so it's pretty much the same thing that Kathleen just explained to you for our district also. The percentage is different because it's a smaller department.

Chairman Hemmer: Very good. Thank you for the explanation. Any additional questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – North Chautauqua Lake Sewer District

Mr. Cummings: Again, the same thing as the other sewer districts. We just moved funds around from other parts of the budget to cover that shortfall so that's where that comes in.

Chairman Hemmer: That's great that you're able to find enough to cover the expenses.

Mr. Cummings: I think that all the sewer districts and all the departments are careful on their expenses this past year and we needed to just for a situation like this. Can't do it every year but we were able to do it this past year.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions on this one?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Public Facilities
Road Machinery and Debt Service

Chairman Hemmer: Mr. Bentley, do you have any additional information for us on this particular resolution?

Mr. Bentley: Yes I do. I'm going to lead in with the next seven resolutions all pertain to the DPF and the budget. For the A, D, and DM funds, tremendous news, we are all self-balancing. There is a lot of information that we're going to cover in the next 7 resolutions but the net effect of this is that we are self-balancing. Certainly any item that you want to cover, I'll certainly provide as much detail as I can and I have Kathleen and Sam here to help with anything that I might not be able to answer. The landfill again, (*cross talk*) enterprise but I think that's a tremendous effort to the team to have all these funds self-balancing in a year that we've had. So, I think there is a lot of credit to all for that outcome this year for 2020. With that, this is the road machinery debt service, again, the big item on here is the debt service for the principal and interest for the bonds that we're issued for the heavy machinery in early 2020. The reason why it (*inaudible*) budget was if you recall, by the time the budget is sent in, we put it in the middle of 19', and by the time the decision to bond for the heavy equipment was made late in the year and by the time the bonds are issued, it's probably early 2020. We didn't have the schedule so this accounts for that schedule and puts it in there and again, we were able to cover that expense with the cost control measures that we have in place with the under runs we had. To the decrease in appropriation accounts for the personal services and contractual, (*inaudible*) a couple of things. With personal services, in addition to the furloughs and again, there is a lot of stuff going in and out and I'll let Kathleen talk to the extent you want her to talk about it but the furloughs, the unemployment and all the other stuff that goes into that, the net, we also had some retirements and some cost savings there. Then in the contractual, we did have savings for heavy equipment like buying the new equipment, we (*inaudible*) save money on shipping out vehicles because we didn't have to. They are either under warranty or because they didn't break down. So, there is a lot that goes into that but, the net effect is, we are seeing the benefits of buying new or heavy machinery and not having to repair it. That is an expected outcome and we are seeing that in our accounts.

Chairman Hemmer: That sounds real good. We love it when a plan comes together.

Mr. Bentley: Yea, I think it's intuitively obviously but it's bearing the fruit in the numbers here.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions on this resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Public Facilities
Admin and Snow Removal: Co Roads (D Fund)

Mr. Bentley: This one is the personal services and employee benefits again. This is a lot of the COVID type issues that we talked about previously. So there is an increase in the amounts there. For the contractual snow removal, that's really the timing of some of our salt deliveries. We (*inaudible*) as close to the best we could and we had a slight overage. The timing of one, so this is to reconcile when that was delivered and paid for. We're using interest and earnings to pay for that overage. The interest earnings I think was about \$282,000 so we're only proposing to use \$60,000 of that. We're self-balancing so we don't have to use it all, just use what is needed.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions about this resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Public Facilities
(A Fund)

Mr. Bentley: I'll try and summarize a bunch of these areas. So in the increase appropriation accounts, on the engineer side, the services and benefits, as you recall we had deferred work on a number of capital projects that the engineers typically work towards. So, if they are not working on capital they're doing the operating side in the year so you're seeing the out cropping's of that decision. In our budget we allocate a certain percentage of their time to capital projects so when we set the budget we obviously didn't anticipate COVID and the impacts that fell out from that. So this is just a reconciliation of that outcome. For Buildings and Grounds, a couple of things in these line items. There is extra cleaning costs due to COVID, there are some extra cleaners that were needed to work COVID and some of that is FEMA reimbursable and we're working with Kathleen and the team to make sure we're getting all the reimbursements that we're eligible for in that regard. But there is another item in here which is in the budget, there's (*inaudible*) to offset some of the essential air service for the airports. There is an offset in the Buildings & Ground and it was in this area. While we didn't get essential air service, part of this is the unwinding of that budget decision, if you will. So you are just seeing the reconciliation (*inaudible*) below decrease in appropriation accounts. You'll see the favorable on their side of the airport because they didn't have the employee expense although the employee expense was really kept up in Buildings and Grounds because that budget decision was (*inaudible*). Jamestown Airport, small amount there. Again, that's personal elections and benefits. For the personal services, employee benefits in CARTS, we had some COVID costs that was due to extra hours by some of the drivers. They had to cover for drivers that went out so we had drivers run more hours than we anticipated and that incurred some extra costs. For the

Parks, that is again, some of the COVID costs. Some of their time is allocated to capital and some of its benefits just elections. The decrease in appropriations accounts, the first set of them under contractual Buildings and Grounds that is really miscellaneous work, contract work, throughout (*inaudible*). We try to be discretionary on what we spend stuff on and (*inaudible*) the budget so I think there is recognition of a lot of efforts of different areas to deal or keep work in house (*inaudible*) or make sure it's only stuff that we need to do. So that's why I think there is a lot of items in here, small little pieces and parts. The Jamestown/Dunkirk airports, again, that was the unwinding of that budget decision I mentioned before plus there was an admin clerk that was not hired for a full year. So that real cost is in those savings as well. On page 2 of this are the increase revenues due to the FEMA reimbursements and I think (*inaudible*) sale of property revenue recognition. A long resolution, a lot of explanations, again, self-balancing.

Chairman Hemmer: Is that all of the FEMA money you are expecting or will there be more or don't you know?

Mr. Bentley: I'll let Kathleen speak to that.

Mrs. Dennison: There probably will not be a lot more in Buildings and Grounds because the rules for what is eligible for reimbursement changed on September 15th so the general disinfecting work that the Buildings and Grounds people are doing, is not reimbursable as of September 15, 2020. So when you look at Buildings and Grounds, if you look at it for all of the Buildings and Grounds sub-departments combined, that that endeavor was over budget by approximately \$32,000 in 2020 and it's all because we are doing this extra cleaning that is not reimbursable by FEMA. What they need to be mindful of and as we get into 2021 or we're already here is that we're still doing that cleaning. It's not the extra expense not budgeted and it will not be reimbursed as far as we know. However, there is a possibility with some new presidential directives that have come out this year so FEMA rules continue to change. It's possible that the general disinfection efforts will again be eligible but right now they are not. So that is a long way of saying, I don't anticipate any future revenue for Buildings and Grounds from FEMA unless the rules change again. There are still, this does not relate to this particular resolution but just in general, there are a lot of efforts that we are doing that are reimbursable from FEMA. For example, current information is that any vaccination expenditures that we incur are fully reimbursable but those are in other departments. For Buildings and Grounds, I think this is it as far as we know.

Mr. Bentley: To expand on what Kathleen just said to give you an idea of what it is costing us for some of this extra cleaning, the Graf Building is \$115 per day of extra cleaning, Dunkirk DMV is \$30.00 per day extra, and then we also have a number of extra cleaners at the Mayville campus cleaning commonly touched services and going around wiping stuff down during the day, so there is between 3 and 4 people every day doing that at the Mayville campus, those are some of the higher costs. You have cleaning supplies enough to go along with that so it's not a lot of money but it's not an insignificant amount of money either. But until the rules change, I don't see any way that we'd be able to say we shouldn't do it at this point. I continue to have the discussions with (*inaudible*) folks here to figure out what else we could do. Maybe at some point we'll be able to reduce some of this extra cleaning. As we know it's probably more of an airborne disease as this point but the CDC guidance hasn't really changed so it's really

hard to go in and say we shouldn't do this anymore until we have better guidance saying that maybe this thing isn't as needed as once was. My two cents is, you don't see them cleaning them shopping carts as often as you did early on so, I don't know how they are changing things but maybe we need to revisit this and probably have some additional thoughts but it's difficult when you have the CDC guides out there.

Mrs. Dennison: Just to add to that, I just want to stress that it cost us \$30,000 in unreimbursed efforts in the 4th quarter of 2020 so if we continue what we're doing, we're looking at \$120,000 overage for 2021.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., that's not a good prospect. That's totally not budgeted for in 2021, that overage?

Mrs. Dennison: That is correct. We originally had budgeted extra cleaners, at least for the first 6 months of 2021. We had the extra cleaners budgeted as well as FEMA revenue for those but then when the rules change in mid-September, we took out the revenue but we felt that most of that incremental expense – I'm sorry, and we took out the incremental expense as well. So it's not in the budget but we did discuss whether or not we need to continue doing it and as Brad said, when we've had these discussions in general, the direct from P.J. and Human Resources is that, and from the Health Department is that we, at this time, we need to continue operating those services.

Chairman Hemmer: Better to error on the side of caution than go the other way. Any questions?

Mrs. Dennison: Before we move on, I potentially have some amendments to this resolution that I would like to get your input on. We made a late adjustment to our unemployment expense and so some of those expenses recently were reduced and that reduction would affect the resolution. We don't have to make these changes, they are not huge but I would suggest that we do. A little bit of background on this is, we got our bill for the 4th quarter unemployment expense which we booked and we did not record any anticipated reimbursement from New York State of those expenses. Legislator Nazzaro asked a question about this, Todd Button and I did some additional research with HR and the current information is that the Federal government and through New York State will be reimbursing us for 50% of all unemployment insurance expenses through the end of 2020. So, just a couple of days ago, I think Friday actually, Todd booked that reduction in the unemployment insurance expenses. That reduction in the expenses changes the required amendments a little bit. So, it's kind of a hassle but I guess my recommendation is we should make the changes because in general, if you take the Engineer Department as an example where the resolution proposes to increase the employee benefit expense, \$47,470. It really doesn't need to go up that much. So I would suggest that we modify it because otherwise in the future, we'll be looking at the budget and say, why did we take it up \$47,470 when it only needs to go up \$47,375. So if you would entertain the amendment to this resolution, I do have the numbers that need to be changed. But I would also caution you that this change in the unemployment insurance expense, it affects about 8 different resolutions Countywide. We have to change them all to capture that additional expense and then we have to change them all to modify it.

Legislator Nazzaro: So Kathleen, only 8 departments, I thought it might be more than that because I was just going to say, you couldn't do just one blanket resolution to do it? I mean, I'm trying to make it easier on you.

Mrs. Dennison: I suppose we could.

Legislator Nazzaro: Instead of amending each one.

Mrs. Dennison: We could do it that way. I could probably (*inaudible*) one resolution to do all the changes in one resolution.

Legislator Nazzaro: I would recommend that. Would you be able to have that for Audit & Control?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Legislator Nazzaro: If it's o.k. with the committee, make one blanket resolution and we'll just run it through Audit & Control so we don't have to amend all the others.

Legislator Gould: I would support that. That's a great idea Chuck.

Chairman Hemmer: It is.

Mrs. Dennison: That's fine, so I'll get that together in time for Audit and Control. We're not talking about huge dollars here. Overall the savings that affects the resolutions is probably about \$10,000 altogether. O.k., so I'll do one for Audit & Control so we'll leave this one alone.

Legislator Nazzaro: Perfect, thank you.

Chairman Hemmer: I like that idea also. It seems like it would be good to keep that old change in one resolution. Easier to keep track of. Any other questions or comments? Thank you Chuck, that's a great suggestion. All in favor.

Chairman Hemmer: Perfect.

Unanimously Carried

Chairman Hemmer: Do we need to say anything here about the resolution that will go to or is that just going to go through Audit & Control and then come to the floor of the Legislature?

Legislator Nazzaro: It will just go through Audit and Control. We've already made comments on it so it will be in the minutes and the amendment will be in Audit and Control so I think we're set.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., let's move on.

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2021 Capital Project Account (DPF Large Equipment)

Mr. Bentley: We're seeing the insurance recovery from an accident where a vehicle hit one of our plows, the actual plow itself. We recovered the money from that in the form of \$7,077. We've actually ordered the new plow and the new one costs a little over \$9,700 so we covered the majority of the cost on the replacement from insurance funds. This is just in recognition of that revenue and expense.

Chairman Hemmer: This is actually just the plow on the front of the truck. This is not the truck, just the plow.

Mr. Bentley: Just the actual plow.

Chairman Hemmer: Of course, the insurance company wouldn't pay for the replacement (*inaudible*) since the plow had depreciated.

Mr. Bentley: I think that's probably part of it.

Chairman Hemmer: O.k., at least we recovered some of it. Any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2020 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Landfill Environment

Mr. Bentley: I'll say the GASB discussion that you had earlier with the sewer and water district, is the cause of the big increase in employee benefits. So that's up there. Then you have some other small downstream effects from COVID stuff to self-balancing but really it's kind of noise level type stuff for the landfill. Any questions? We're covering it with the out-of-County municipal revenue which we're covering that overages from on the expense side.

Chairman Hemmer: That's good. That money is from other municipalities using our facilities.

Mr. Bentley: In a way it's good and in a way it's bad. We use that money but if we hadn't used that money that would be money that would otherwise go back to the County in the form of a profit. I call it good that we can cover it but I call it bad that we had the expense. But as Kathleen mentioned, it's dictated to us, not optional for us.

Chairman Hemmer: Any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend Capital Project Budget for Landfill Phase IV Construction

Mr. Bentley: We are looking at the Phase IV cell opening up here soon. We're in the process of getting the DEC certification and reconciling the file numbers for the actual construction costs for the cell on the engineering side. That's all ongoing and I've had some preliminary discussions with Kathleen and as of right now, it does not appear that the money that's in there should be sufficient for our use going forward. The money that we're asking for here is, for anybody that's been up there to the power plant, if you go where the booth is at the Ellery Landfill and you go a little bit further, you take a right that goes up the hill to the Phase where the garbage is active, or you can go straight and that's down to the power plant, well that's also the entrance going into the new Phase IV cell. So we need to get that paved for when it opens and that was not part of the original construction. The contractor was never part of the budget, never part of the engineering, never part of the plans to have that paved but obviously we need to have that paved for dust and mud control.

Legislator Gould: Why wasn't it thought of before? (*cross talk*)....

Mr. Bentley: I can't tell you. I wasn't here. Other than the fact that someone missed it. I really don't have a better explanation for it. You would think that would be somewhat part of it but when I look at the contracts, there is no contractual line item for paving a new road.

Legislator Nazzaro: Are we doing the work ourselves or contracting out?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Legislator Gould: Contracting out.

Mr. Bentley: Well, I'm going to try and do as much work as I can in-house but I do have a road/bridge program I also have to prioritize. So to the extent that I have crews available, the weather cooperates and the availability of the equipment, I'm going to do as much of this in-house but in order to budget for the worst case because I cannot have the work done, open the cell and have that all mud, I actually have to plan for it just in case I have to contract it out. So, I don't know if anyone remembers the last time a new road was built in Chautauqua County from (*inaudible*) earth but I don't have a lot of guidance on how much a new road costs. So I looked it up and basically there are guidance from the kind of the Federal organization, gave me a number of about \$2-\$3 million per mile for a rural setting. So that means you are not doing drainage, you are not doing a lot of the side areas and we need about a quarter to a third of a mile paved, so divide that by three, that's about \$750,000 is what I think is a reasonable expectation if we had to contract it out for that distance based on kind of rural setting national standards, if you will. The other \$250,000 is for ongoing wetlands mitigation. As you recall, we had some wetland mitigations obligations as part of building this new cell. Those obligations continue in time for quite an extended period for some of the areas. Those obligations seem to get more and more intensive from the Army Corp so we do need some extra funds to address the DEC requirements and the Army Corp requirements for those wetland mitigations. So, that is what this money is for and again, this is made out of user fees so the impact to the budget is basically (*inaudible*), cost of the garbage will go up because that's our cost.

Legislator Nazzaro: So this is an estimate based on what you know?

Mr. Bentley: This is a very much an estimate but to the best of our engineering ability at this point, (*inaudible*). Again, we're going to try and save as much money as we can going in-house. I want to use my in-house paving crews. I talked to Pantelis about using some of his landfill staff to put down some of the base materials, roll it. The good news is, as part of the cell construction the cross pipes, all the drainage and all the crossings, have been put down so they've had a chance to settle in so when we do pave it, it's actually - you shouldn't have those large humps back there. I think if everything goes according to plan which I have my fingers crossed, we will not have to spend the \$750,000, we should be significantly under it but I do want to plan for the worst case at this point.

Chairman Hemmer: The design is already complete or is that something that we'll be able to do in-house or is that going to be a contract also for the design of the road?

Mr. Bentley: We're doing that in-house. My engineering group is working on it right now. As a matter of fact, again, it's not a public road, so it's a little bit easier. (*Inaudible*) is just doing an existing survey work, knowing what you have and what modifications need to be made to get the right grades, the right drainage, so, I believe that we can do all this stuff in-house from the engineering side design and I'm trying to do the construction all in-house with the combination of the landfill staff and the highway department.

Legislator Nazzaro: Brad, you said the other \$250,000 was for wetland protection? What did you say?

Mr. Bentley: As part of the environmental impacts from the Phase IV cell itself, we cut down some trees in some areas that the Army Corp and the DEC wanted us to replace on those wetland mitigation areas. One such area is actually behind the administration building up at the landfill, that whole huge area that got built up. Basically pertains the water and runoff before it leaves the landfill property if you will. There is also Dutch Hollow Stream mitigation areas that we had agreed to and I can tell you this is the third year in a row we're trying to exterminate the Japanese knot weed in that area. So there is additional costs to do that type of work that seems to keep on going. I think the plan would - we spray it, kill it, it doesn't come back but this is the third year and we continue to have to spray it - we don't want to plant the new plants until we get rid of it because you are just going to kill any new plants because the knot weed will take over whatever you plant. We want to make sure we do it right the first time but it does incur extra costs so the combination of all those things, we're needing some additional funds to make sure we're meeting the requirements that we're obligated to.

Legislator Davis: You indicated that the increased costs would be offset by increase in user fees. I'm just wondering when the most recent increase in user fees might have been and if that's something that needs to be communicated or how that is communicated to people? How much of an increase are you talking about?

Mr. Bentley: Excellent question. Actually what we do each year, Pantelis does this each year, he looks at what our existing fees are, he looks at his balance sheet, he also looks at competitors because what we charge can impact what volume of garbage comes through our County from out-of-County so it's something that Pantelis looks at each and every year. He

signals to our users any increase in those fees, early on to get their appetite and understand potential impacts. So, I believe he increased it last year. I'll get back to you whether there was an increase in 2021. I think Pantelis is listening so he might be able to text me.

Chairman Hemmer: I remember the increase in 2020.

Mr. Bentley: I think it was like a \$1.00 a ton or something like that. But I'd have to check but that was just for out-of-County waste. I think he tried to keep the residential rates stable, subject to check on that one but I think that's what I recall. It is something to look at because it is a very sensitive issue for everybody and we know the pricing is there but Pantelis also has to look at his balance sheet to make sure everything is in alignment there.

Chairman Hemmer: So this will probably be an increase across the board –

Mr. Bentley: Well, he may not need to increase based on this. If he's got enough on his balance sheet and cover it with what he's got, it won't necessarily require an increase but obviously if you spend a million dollars, it has to come from somewhere. It's a question of what his volumes look like at the existing levels and where his profit is. If I lead someone to think that we're increasing the landfill fees automatically by this that is not the case. Pantelis will need to look at that and make that determination and again, we want to communicate that to our customers way in advance so that we understand the impacts to them because we do understand that any kind of change like that, certainly has large impacts to a lot of folks. I apologize if I mislead anybody with my brief statement there.

Chairman Hemmer: Well, it's a pretty good chunk of money and it has to come from somewhere, we know.

Mr. Bentley: The other option, if I don't have to spend it all that means we don't necessarily need to recover it. Again, that's another way that we can keep our costs down so we'll do everything we can do that in-house but it is worth the ask (*inaudible*) open up the cell.

Legislator Gould: How will we know if you don't spend it all?

Mr. Bentley: Well, there is going to be a \$750,000 allocated to it. I'll be charging against it so we'll be able to watch the expense go into that.

Legislator Gould: I would like to know after a while and when you get the road done, what it cost.

Mr. Bentley: Ask me probably July. By the time everything reconciles, I should be able to give you a good number at that point.

Legislator Gould: Good.

Chairman Hemmer: Any further questions on this one?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Authorize Continuation of Natural Gas Lease at Chautauqua County Landfill

Mr. Bentley: There is a couple of actual gas in the ground wells, not the methane gas coming up from the decomposing garbage. These wells do actually produce gas. We have an existing lease with PPP Future Development and that is set to expire on July 31st. We're proposing to extend that lease with the 15% royalty interest in the production. There is an in lieu of option where we can actually get the cubic feet of gas per year from each well. That could be done as well. Just depends on what our option is at that point but this would be for an additional 10 year period.

Legislator Nazzaro: Brad, do you know what it generates per year to the landfill, the 15% royalty?

Mr. Bentley: Kathleen?

Mrs. Dennison: I will try and look it up.

Mr. Button: It's not a lot of money Chuck. It's a very small amount.

Chairman Hemmer: Wil it cover that million dollar road?

Mr. Button: Not even close.

Legislator Nazzaro: Let me ask one other question then. Is 15% the normal or standard percentage that you would receive as a royalty?

Mr. Bentley: I think this is higher than the standard.

Legislator Nazzaro: I don't know what the standard percentage is. I'm just wondering if –

Mr. Bentley: Sam, do you remember what the other one was, wasn't I like 7 ½% or something like that?

Mr. Zafuto: With Kohler?

Mr. Bentley: Yes.

Mr. Zafuto: That sounds right.

Legislator Davis: I think its considerable higher than what a standard percentage would be at 15%.

Mr. Bentley: Yea, I think the standard is about 7 ½%. But we're getting 15%. I would say even though it's not a lot of money, take the percentage and go.

Chairman Hemmer: That's a good percentage on a gas well for the owner of the land, I think.

Legislator Nazzaro: Since it's not a significant amount you don't have to look it up. I was just wondering.

Mrs. Dennison: I'm looking where I thought it would be and not finding it yet so I'm continuing to search.

Legislator Nazzaro: We can move on.

Chairman Hemmer: Any other discussion on this resolution? All in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Other

Chairman Hemmer: Do we have anything under "other"?

Mr. Bentley: It's not a resolution but it's a recognition that the Dunkirk and Jamestown airports, it was recently announced that they were eligible to apply for additional CARES Act funding in the amount of \$13,000 each per airport. So we're going to be applying for that funding and we'll be coming with a resolution when that is awarded to us to accept that award. It's very much needed money. It goes to the operations of the airport and goes to our local share, any reduction of revenue that we might see. It's all good money and I just wanted to let you guys know that that was out there and should be coming to the legislative meeting in the future.

Chairman Hemmer: That sounds good. These are grants?

Mr. Bentley: Yea, this is CARES Act funding so this is a 100% grant.

Chairman Hemmer: No strings attached?

Mr. Bentley: As far as I know, there is are no strings attached other than you have to use it for the airport operations.

Mr. Almeter: In the interest of full disclosure, the money that is coming under these grants is subject to the same grant assurances that the AIP grant when it comes to us under and it has to be used in budget year 2021 (*inaudible*).

Chairman Hemmer: Thank you for Mr. Almeter for the additional information. Any further questions about that possible grants coming in? Anything else under "other"?

Discussion - Salt Update – Mr. Bentley

MOVED by Legislator Gould, SECONDED by Legislator Nazzaro to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (5:15 p.m.)

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