

Minutes

Public Safety Committee

October 20, 2021, 4:00 pm, Legislative Chamber

Gerace Office Building, Mayville, NY

Livestreamed on Chautauqua County's Facebook

Members Present: Niebel, Pavlock, Whitford, Hemmer

Member Absent: Bankoski

Others: Tampio, Ames, Chagnon, Dennison, Telford, Swan, Schmidt, Guttman, Riley, Crow, Contiguglia, T. Thomas, Engstrom

Complete video of meeting can be viewed on the County's Facebook Page

Chairman Niebel called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

Approval of Minutes (9/15/21)

MOVED by Legislator Whitford, SECONDED by Legislator Pavlock

Unanimously Carried

Privilege of the Floor

No one to speak during the privilege of the floor.

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Acceptance of Criminal Justice Discovery Reform Funding

Mr. Schmidt: The discovery funding program is something that I don't know how much everyone is aware of. It's actually a fairly interesting process. I don't want to hold everybody up but there is large amount of money that is being overseen as administrative by the Manhattan D.A.'s office. Where it arose from is where there are criminal corporate bad actors in the State, in lieu of prosecutions, they agreed to pay hefty fines and those are now some of them in the millions and millions and millions of dollars. They were being held by the State administered by the Manhattan D.A.'s office and eventually there was an authorization to release that money, to help offset some of the burden associated with Discovery compliance that we had discussed. Chautauqua County was allocated \$703,000. That money went not just to the D.A.'s office but to all the police agencies across the County with Probation, with our responsibility to work with them and oversee that. We provided a budget, I believe, it's been submitted. The budget is

mostly for equipment. I've already discussed with most of the Legislators here that we took our share and we wanted to dedicate it towards personnel so that we can fund additional personnel to help us with Discovery compliance going forward.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., out of this \$700,000, approximately \$400,000 for the District Attorney's office?

Ms. Contiguglia: Yes.

Chairman Niebel: Just roughly, it doesn't have to be exact.

Ms. Contiguglia: Yes, roughly \$400,000 went to the District Attorney's office, about \$250,000 went to the municipal police agencies, all five of them. About \$26,000 went to Probation and if my math is off, the rest of that went to the D.A.'s office.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., and some of that \$400,000, you are going to use to hire those other two people?

Ms. Contiguglia: Yes.

Mr. Schmidt: The Discovery compliance personnel that we were talking about.

Chairman Niebel: That we discussed during budget hearings?

Mr. Schmidt: Yes.

Ms. Contiguglia: The funds have actually been deposited by New York State already so they are in our account. We have the money.

Chairman Niebel: But we don't have it here in Chautauqua County quite yet.

Ms. Contiguglia: We do though.

Mr. Schmidt: I believe that the Department of Finance might have it.

Ms. Contiguglia: Yes, they have been deposited into our accounts already.

Mr. Schmidt: As soon as we can have access to it.

Mrs. Dennison: As Madeline said, it has been, well, I haven't checked but she's told me today that it's been deposited so right now it's showing as a revenue in 2021 but at the end of the year, we will treat that as a deferred revenue which means we'll essentially back it out of the 2021 revenue, hold it in a deferred account and then realize the revenue as it is needed in 2022 and 2023. But Madeline was correct, the cash has changed hands and it's in our hands.

Chairman Niebel: We have it?

Mrs. Dennison: We have it.

Mr. Schmidt: Do you have any sense of when we'll actually have access to it? A lot of the police agencies have been asking because they are using it for body cams, interview rooms, that type of stuff.

Mrs. Dennison: What you proposed during the budget hearings was that you would not enter into the contracts with the police agencies until 2022. I mean, you could do it differently if you want but the way you structured it right now, you would not have the authorization to pay them until after those contracts are executed and presumably after January 1, 2022.

Mr. Schmidt: Thanks for the clarification.

Ms. Contiguglia: A portion of the resolution also includes the authorization to enter into the contracts and agreements with the municipal police agencies as well as a memorandum of understanding with Probation so that we can give them their portion of the funding.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions for Jason in the District Attorney's office?

Legislator Hemmer: So everything gets started in 2022? There is no new hires until then, right?

Mr. Schmidt: Well, I don't know. We're certainly putting us in a position so that we can advertise. The hiring process will take a number of months so I don't anticipate that we'll have people on board. We did put ourselves, approximately, I don't want to misspeak but maybe \$180,000 in the black so we're sitting on some money for 21' which we are gladly giving back to the County but at the same time, we're anxious, we're chomping at the bits to make some new hires. It takes a while.

Legislator Pavlock: Is this a one-time payment or are we using it for two years? No other funds expected at this point?

Mr. Schmidt: That is how we're treating it. There has been no promises for additional money. My understanding is that this is a very large amount of money that the State is sitting on so there may be a further distribution down the road but nobody is talking about that.

Legislator Pavlock: Nothing worth speculating at this point.

Ms. Contiguglia: They haven't confirmed that we would get any additional payments but they also haven't said that that is off the table as well. They haven't committed themselves to anything but like Jason said, we're treating it as a one-time deal that we spread over two years.

Chairman Niebel: Any other questions?

Mrs. Dennison: I do have a question or comment. In the last WHEREAS clause, I suggest that we need to add a couple of words because it says that, “revenues and expenditures associated with this award are expected to be included in the adopted 2022 budget”, but only a portion of the revenues and expenditures are in the 2022 budget.

Chairman Niebel: Some of them extend to 2023.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. During your budget hearings, you have some pending amendments to the 2022 tentative budget but of the award of \$703,000, approximately \$284,000 of that is not budgeted to be used in 2022 so it would be deferred until 2023.

Chairman Niebel: So Kathleen, you would like to see, in the adopted 2022 budget and the 2023 budget?

Mrs. Dennison: Well, it could be that or I was going to suggest that we, after the WHEREAS, we insert the words, “a portion of the” revenues and expenditures. Or, that’s a good idea too, it could just be revenues and expenditures associated with this award are expected to be included in the adopted 2022 and 2023 budgets.

Mr. Schmidt: That clarifies it because we have budgeted out to fund those two Discovery compliance positions for approximately two years.

Chairman Niebel: Kathleen, that might be better because -

Mrs. Dennison: Yes, it’s a good idea.

Chairman Niebel: O.k.

Mrs. Dennison: So that would be after 2022, to add, “and 2023” and make budgets plural.

Legislator Whitford: I will make a motion to amend.

Legislator Hemmer: Second.

Unanimously Carried – amendment

Chairman Niebel: Those in favor of the resolution as amended?

Unanimously Carried as amended

Chairman Niebel: At this time because Emergency Services is here and they have two quick resolutions, I would like a motion to take their resolutions out of order.

Legislator Hemmer: So moved.

Legislator Whitford: Second.

Chairman Niebel: All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Emergency Services 2021 Budget Amendment

Mr. Guttman: This is concerning the CME, Emergency Medical Service, program position. As we know, that was a position that was held by an agreement of services and we had to convert that to an actual employed position and this is to help cover the transferring of funds to help cover that position.

Chairman Niebel: This is for \$5,000?

Mr. Guttman: Yes.

Chairman Niebel: Committee, any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend Emergency Services 2021 Budget for Vehicle Accident Claims

Mr. Guttman: Back in December when one of the medic fly cars had a pretty significant accident. There was a process getting that back in to service and we've received an additional check in the amount of \$3,056.33 and those repairs have already been done and that vehicle is back in service.

Chairman Niebel: And that is Medic 71?

Mr. Guttman: 74, that is the car positioned in Falconer.

Chairman Niebel: Committee, any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2021 Budget for Capital Project: Server & Storage Replacement

Under Sheriff Telford: We'll do our best to explain this one because it has to do with I.T.. We got a server upgrade capital project for 2022. There is a need to upgrade our office licenses and licensing for Microsoft which was not included in the capital project so we are looking to reallocate some leftover funds from previous capital projects to cover the licensing costs.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Amend 2021 Budget to Implement the New Handguns Project within the Chautauqua County American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Spending Plan

Under Sheriff Telford: Part of the ARPA funding request on behalf of the Sheriff's office, we initially requested \$64,000. We are looking to replace the handguns of our officers that are I believe are currently 8 to 10 years old. They are starting to wear down, parts are breaking, so we were looking for part of the ARPA funding to cover that. The good news is, that an agreement with the Deputy Sheriff's Association union, they have offered to cover part of this cost so we would actually be looking for a total funding of \$28,603 from the ARPA funding.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions?

Legislator Whitford: Just for my information, what do we do with those weapons that are wearing down? Are they just destroyed?

Under Sheriff Telford: Actually they are being traded in to the dealer for a credit to this purchase. So several of the handguns were previously purchased by the deputies by themselves. They will obviously keep those guns. But the ones that were purchased by the department will be traded in and credited toward this transaction.

Chairman Niebel: These are new glocks, you are going to trade in the old ones for these glocks?

Under Sheriff Telford: That is correct. We're going to glock 9mm, yes. Very popular gun in law enforcement.

Mrs. Dennison: I have a comment if I may. As the Under Sheriff indicated, the good news is that they are requesting less from the ARPA spending plan than originally anticipated. We do have at least one other project that I'm aware of that is going to be slightly more than anticipated so I have – I just started keeping a running list of how the requests are, if they are different from what was included in the ARPA spending plan so I'm sure there will be more ups and downs to come but we'll bouncing that out as we get through all of the projects.

Chairman Niebel: Kathleen, we don't have to make adjustments at this time, it's something in the future.

Mrs. Dennison: Correct. As we actually implement the plans, as we get towards the end of the spending period, we'll know if we're over or under overall. If we have extra funds, we can always add another project.

Chairman Niebel: Hopefully we're under.

Mrs. Dennison: Absolutely. So far, it's always so far, a generous donation.

Legislator Hemmer: On the shared services charges, that comes from the deputies –

Mrs. Swan: The union, yes. The Deputies Union.

Legislator Hemmer: Oh, the Union is –

Under Sheriff Telford: Yes. Honestly, give credit where credit is due, the Deputies Union had talked to the Sheriff about upgrading the handguns and they offered to cover part of this to assist and make this happen.

Legislator Hemmer: Very nice.

Under Sheriff Telford: And the Lieutenant's Union which is much smaller, they are also doing something similar where they are contributing a smaller amount but yes, I think it's a great credit to those two unions for stepping up and volunteering to help out with us.

(Cross talk)

Legislator Pavlock: ... extra funds and that's great and we're putting it in the kitty. I'm sure that you've obviously looked at other areas that, I mean, are there other weapons that you have not upgraded that you said well you wouldn't have initially thought you could have?

Under Sheriff Telford: Well, we kind of looked at and the biggest thing was the age that our handguns are at and also the cost of ammunition. We current carry a 45 caliber handgun and because it's a bigger bullet, the ammunition is more expensive than 9 mm's and 9 mm is much more common and easier to access so it was kind of a couple of different factors, but, otherwise, our tasers are fairly new, our rifles are in good condition so we thought it best to look at replacing the handguns.

Legislator Pavlock: No additional, I just say sometimes when you have the extra funds, it's good that you just didn't come up with reasons to spend it but sometimes there are some areas that you say, well, we probably could add a couple rifles or a couple of tasers but you've done that.

Under Sheriff Telford: So overall, knock on wood, I think we're in good condition with any of the extra weapons or tools.

Chairman Niebel: And if these guns are more expensive that what you thought, I think Sheriff Quattrone said he'd pick up the difference. Or maybe I didn't have that quite right.

(cross talk)..

Chairman Niebel: I knew I didn't hear that right.

Under Sheriff Telford: I know that he is buying Mrs. Swan and myself dinner for being here tonight. Depends on how the vote goes.

Chairman Niebel: Or how long the meeting lasts. Thanks. All those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Amend 2021 Budget to Implement the Body and Mail Scanners
Project within the Chautauqua County American Rescue Plan Act
(ARPA) Spending Plan

Under Sheriff Telford: These are two separate pieces of equipment that we are looking to purchase. One is a mail scanner. Both are for the jail. One is a mail scanner which is exactly what it sounds like. That incoming mail to inmates would be sent through this machine. I've seen a demonstration of it, it is pretty impressive. It can detect if there are narcotics inside of the package so it alleviates – currently we have correction officers that check every piece of mail that comes into the jail. So it would alleviate the burden on the correction officers and the safety of them opening every piece of mail. People out there are ingenious when they want something done or they want to try to get a narcotic into their friend or family member in the jail, they find ways to do it. This piece of equipment and is very impressive will scan the piece of mail and it will alert if there is a detection of a narcotic inside.

(Speaker inaudible)

Under Sheriff Telford: Absolutely and we've had some instances where a correction officer opens a piece of mail and a white powder or a liquid is found inside.

Chairman Niebel: It's a safety issue.

Under Sheriff Telford: Absolutely, initially for the correction officer but once that piece of mail, if it does get to the inmate, it's obviously a safety factor for them also.

Mrs. Swan: If I could actually jump in on that really quickly too. It also decreases our exposure on the expense side for when inmates overdose because we do have that happen periodically so when they are taken to the hospital, they are transported, you have to have security there, if there is correction officers on scene so it helps save on those costs as well.

Under Sheriff Telford: The second piece of equipment is a body scanner. I would compare it to the new age at the airports in TSA where visitors to the jail can step inside this body scanner and it will scan them for any metal materials. Currently that is being done by a hand wand or a metal detector walking into the jail. Again, it's just an added step of security. Also as the Sheriff has pointed out in some of the paperwork, we have inmates that tell the CO's that they've swallowed something or they've injected something whether on purpose or on accident, we can use this as an initial step to rule in or rule out if they do have any metal in their system internally. So here again, it will save a safety factor for our correction officers but also illegal contraband -

Legislator Whitford: For inmate also.

Under Sheriff Telford: And for our inmates also, yes.

Chairman Niebel: Any other questions?

Mrs. Dennison: There is one typo that I would like to correct. As I said Monday night, when a lot of these ARPA resolutions, when we were writing them, we had not completely decided on the correct accounting methods and we now know what that is. So we need to make changes in accordance with that. So almost the last line under the establish and increase revenue accounts, the second line should be A.9950.----. So the four nine's should be replaced with four dashes as we are using a different sub account for the revenue from the APRA plan.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., Kathleen so the last line, take out the four nine's and replace those with dashes?

Mrs. Dennison: Correct.

Chairman Niebel: You think we can just treat that as a typo?

Mrs. Dennison: I'm not the expert on that. I would suggest that that would qualify as a typo.

Clerk Tampio: Yes, that's fine.

Chairman Niebel: Thanks Kathy. That will save us some time. O.k., any other questions on this resolution?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Lease Agreement with Erie 2-Chautauqua-Cattaraugus
BOCES at Hewes Educational Center

Under Sheriff Telford: This is a renewal of basically what we consider a substation at the actual BOCES complex. They provide office space for us where we have computer, breathe test instrument, place to do paperwork and the good news is that they do not charge us rent for this space so it's an agreement to continue to use that office space, free of charge.

Chairman Niebel: I like the cost although it's only 350 square feet, it's not very big.

Under Sheriff Telford: It's not very big so more than one or two officers and they have to find somewhere else to do their paperwork but –

Chairman Niebel: But it is free.

Under Sheriff Telford: It is free and it does come in handy, especially on the midnight shift. They can run an arrestee down there to do their breath test and process them and get them out a lot sooner.

Chairman Niebel: Committee? Those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Lease Agreement with Erie 2-Chautauqua-Cattaraugus
BOCES at Phillip J. LoGuidice Educational Center

Under Sheriff Telford: Similar agreement. This is the BOCES facility, commonly known as the Fredonia BOCES, just outside the village limits on the Fredonia/Stockton Road. This one is much bigger, a 1,000 square feet but again the same set up where we have office space, computer, radio, facilities to use and again, for the right price of zero dollars.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Agreement with Forestville Central School for School
Resource Officer

Under Sheriff Telford: In previous years, Forestville Central had contracted with the Sheriff's office for a school resource officer. Unfortunately when COVID hit, they had to drop that contract with us but as things are steadying out, they have reached out to us and requesting an SRO again. So we will start that service and it will run between now and the end of the school year 2022 but the dollar figures included here are for the remainder of 2021.

Chairman Niebel: Any questions?

Legislator Whitford: These are actuals?

Under Sheriff Telford: They are actual costs, yes.

Legislator Pavlock: That was going to be my question is, the cost, I know last year or the year before we looked into the cost and the actual cost of what we were charging and what it actual costs us. So this is less than I thought we had thought it was a couple of years ago so are they not utilizing a car over there or are they?

Under Sheriff Telford: They'll utilize a car. I think the biggest thing is, because it is starting in October and not September 1st, it's a little bit less so really we're only looking at the last three months of the year.

Mrs. Swan: Actually these contracts typically start July 1st, so there is a few months' worth shaved off of that so what you see isn't the actual full amount. The current SRO contracts are at \$98,700, somewhere around there.

Legislator Pavlock: I thought it was around \$96 or \$98,000, that's what I remember.

Mrs. Swan: It's in the high 90's and it's obviously going to go up as our costs increase.

Chairman Niebel: And this is roughly for 9 months instead of 12.

Under Sheriff Telford: Yes.

Chairman Niebel: Any other questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution – Authorize Execution of State Interoperability Communications Grant Program FY20

Under Sheriff Telford: As we like to refer to it as the SICG grant. It is a grant that the Sheriff's office has received for several years running now. The bottom line for the usage of this is maintenance and equipment on our interoperable radio system. Again, the total grant for, they call it for funding year 20', but was just awarded to counties, is \$611,000 but again, adjusted for the last few months of 2021, we're looking at \$404,000.

Chairman Niebel: And next year, you guys can put in SICG – *(cross talk)*... any questions on this one?

Mrs. Dennison: In the third WHEREAS clause it says that this grant is not included in the 2021 adopted budget and an amendment to the 2022 tentative budget was proposed. I am not sure we did that unless – it should say it's not included in the amendments to the tentative budget so I guess my question is, did you include the 2022 portion of this grant in the tentative budget before we went through the hearings?

Mrs. Swan: No we didn't.

Mrs. Dennison: O.k., -

Mrs. Swan: O.k., so that still needs to be proposed. We didn't bring that up?

Mrs. Dennison: No. I reviewed the amendments and we don't have any changes to department 3110.GRNT. So what we included for the Sheriff's office would be changes related to the CCSSA contract, the Forestville SRO, the resolution we just discussed, and then just those two changes to your fuel and one other item that you reduced.

Mrs. Swan: Yes, one of the .4's.

Mrs. Dennison: Fuel and firearms.

Mrs. Swan: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: So, I don't think that it is in there yet. The committee might want to entertain a motion to put it in but we would need numbers if we are going to do that.

Chairman Niebel: Kathleen, could we make a motion to include that upon receiving numbers from Finance later or do you have those Jen?

Mrs. Swan: Yes I do. The total amount that would need to be added to the 2022 appropriations and revenue would be \$206,701.

Chairman Niebel: And that's to the 2022 budget.

Mrs. Swan: Yes.

Mrs. Dennison: So in that case, I would say this resolution could stand as it is and I will add that to the proposed resolution for Audit & Control to consider that tomorrow morning if everyone is in agreement.

Legislator Hemmer: So this is going through to December 31, 2022 or going to be taken out?

Mrs. Dennison: If we make this change in 2022, if we add this amendment to the 2022 tentative budget, the WHEREAS clause would be correct that the \$404,627 is going to be amended into the 2021 budget and then \$206,701 revenue and expense would be a proposed amendment to the 2022 tentative budget.

Chairman Niebel: So then the 2nd WHEREAS can stand?

Mrs. Dennison: The 3rd WHEREAS, yes.

Chairman Niebel: Well, I mean the second one.

Mrs. Swan: The second one actually pertains to the grant term so the grant term would remain December 31, 2022.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., that's o.k., but then the 3rd one, Kathleen, would change – well, we can do that tomorrow in Audit & Control.

Mrs. Dennison: Yes. It assumes that amendment is made in which, like I said, is not in there yet but it can be tomorrow.

Chairman Niebel: It will be. This resolution as proposed now is o.k.?

Mrs. Dennison: Yes.

Chairman Niebel: Any further questions?

Unanimously Carried

Proposed Resolution - Approving Labor Contract with Chautauqua County Sheriff's Supervisors' Association (CCSSA)

Ms. Riley: This resolution that we bring before you today to seek approvals for approving the labor contract with the Chautauqua County Sheriff Supervisor's Association. The Chautauqua County Sheriff Supervisor's Association is comprised of approximately 7 members. The current bargaining unit agreement expires on December 31, 2021. Negotiations began on August 10, 2021 and a tentative agreement was reached on September 30, 2021. The union voted on September 30th and accepted the tentative agreement. The main points of the agreement again, I'll go through some of the main items and then Kitty will follow up with the financial impact of the agreed upon items. We did agree to a four year agreement that would begin January 1, 2022 with an expiration of December 31, 2025. There was a minimal increase to the clothing allowance for non-uniformed personnel. It really only affects a couple of people because most of the members in that group of seven are uniformed. We did increase their longevity payments by \$30.00. The salary schedule adjustments, to the DSAC, Step 8, did impact what we presented to the Sheriff's Association Union and there is a progression so when you are a Sergeant, which is in the DSAC, that pool of candidates is typically available for a promotion opportunity as a Lieutenant so the impact of what we did with the adjustments for DSAC and the Step 8 adjustments, impacts what we would offer a Lieutenant to start as we wouldn't offer a promotion opportunity from a Sergeant to a Lieutenant which is from an hourly overtime position to a salaried management supervisor position with no overtime so therefore, you wouldn't want to offer somebody a promotion and advise them that they were going to possibly make less money and possibly have less benefits. So, our proposed rates took that as really what we took into account when we were setting the new Steps for the Lieutenants. This also impacts, just a (*inaudible*) time for – this also impact the management level for the Captain and the Under Sheriff. We would be looking at adjusting where they sit in the management scale because that too, is a promotional opportunity and all sort of fits together. Start from a Sergeant, promote to a Lieutenant, promotion to a Captain and then Under Sheriff. So we had to kind of make that all make sense. So for the salary Steps, I'll get to that last after I just go through the other minor things and then I'll focus on the salary steps. We did add a monthly cell phone stipend that has zero impact. Either you are reimbursing the employee for their own personal phone or we're paying for their phone on a County bill so therefore there is no impact there. That we would give them a stipend if they use their own personal phone instead of a County phone. We added a special assignment bonus, which really doesn't affect too many on that group as well. We did change their benefits, their health insurance benefits as we did with the other units so everybody is on the same plan and has the same calculation and the same funding for their HAS. The retiree cash out, when they cash out as a retiree, for years of service, some of them are only getting three months if they were hired after 2014. If you were hired before, you got 3.25 months for cash out so we just made it 3.25 for everybody. Expense reimbursement, we're going to follow the Executive policy bulletin as we did with the other bargaining units and the Steps is really what we want to focus on here, the changes that we made. So the existing Steps for this group, when they are promoted to a Lieutenant, they would start at a base rate and then based on their years of service with the County, at 18 years of service with the County, they would go to the next Step and then with 20 years of service with the County, they would go to the 20 year Step, so they added a 3 Step system. The fact that we were doing this based on years of service with the

County before versus time in the title, you would have somebody that would be hired and promoted that had maybe 20 years as a Sergeant and then they are promoted to a Lieutenant, making less than somebody that had 18 years of service with the County. So we just dismantled that whole thing and we based the new Steps on time and title which makes the most sense. So we determined by looking at what the Step 8 Sergeant would be, we set the first Step at \$85,586 which is Step 1 so if you are promoted to a Lieutenant, that be where you start. Step 2 would be \$87,298, Step 3, \$89,044 and Step 4, \$90,825. So that would be the new Steps for the 2022 year. That model would present an opportunity for a Sergeant to take a Lieutenant's position and still be financially whole. Thereafter, Steps 1 through 4, these increases and Kitty will explain them a little bit, are kind of odd numbers for percentage of increases but that again is because we're basing it off of what the Sergeant DSAC Steps are and for that again to make sense. The increase for 2023 to the Steps would be 4.36%, 2023 would be 3.89%, 2024 would be 3.89% and for 2025. So it would be 4.36%, 3.89%, 3.89% for the remainder of the contract. That progression keeps the separation between the salaries, the annual salaries of a Sergeant and a Lieutenant.

The terms that we negotiated for progression from a Sergeant to a Lieutenant without any loss in compensation of benefits, we think is fair and equitable in order for the Sheriff's Department to be able to promote internally, from within. So, Kitty is on next with the financials and she has a handout for everybody.

Chairman Niebel: O.k, Kitty before we go to you, as far as this bargaining unit, there is seven members in this unit.

Ms. Riley: Yes.

Chairman Niebel: Roughly what, 2 Sergeants, 2 Lieutenants, 2 Captains, the Under Sheriff isn't included in this?

Ms. Riley: No, these are all Lieutenants.

Ms. Crow: It's the Lieutenant's unit.

Chairman Niebel: Oh, o.k.

Legislator Whitford: The Under Sheriff isn't covered through this?

Ms. Riley: No. The Captains and the Under Sheriff are not in a bargaining unit. They in the management group.

Legislator Whitford: Their salaries (*inaudible*)...

Ms. Riley: That is correct.

Legislator Whitford: Is there a new (*inaudible*)?

Ms. Riley: That the Lieutenants work?

(Legislator Whitford inaudible)..

Ms. Riley: Do you have a minimum hours that you work, Under Sheriff? *(Cross talk)*..

Under Sheriff Telford: It's basically a 40 hour workweek but it ends up 70 – *(cross talk)*...

Chairman Niebel: O.k., so the Sergeants where do they figure in?

Ms. Riley: The Sergeants are the first ranking level, they are hourly employees that is the bargaining unit that we just negotiated. Their contract.

Chairman Niebel: They would go from the Sergeant to –

Ms. Riley: To the Lieutenant.

Chairman Niebel: To this bargaining unit here.

Ms. Riley: Yes and then when you leave the Lieutenant rank to go to the Captain rank, then you are no longer in a bargaining unit, you are part of the management staff.

Legislator Whitford: This has always been *(inaudible)* on longevity or –

Under Sheriff Telford: Promotion to Lieutenant is partially longevity but it is also a Civil Service test so they have to score in the top 3 to be eligible. Captain and Under Sheriff are appointed.

Legislator Whitford: I noticed that. Congratulations.

Ms. Crow: The DSAC contract that was ratified last month or two months ago, that unit includes the Deputy Sheriff's and Sergeant's, so you're Deputy and then Sergeant in that group and then if you are promoted –

Chairman Niebel: To this unit here?

Ms. Crow: Yes, so like Jean said, the other unit is hourly workforce, Lieutenants are salary.

Chairman Niebel: Thanks Jean, Kitty.

Ms. Crow: I'm handing out *(inaudible)*.... I have this outlined and familiar, hopefully, format that you've seen before that outlines accumulative costs over the four years of the agreement. The first section there, just outlines the wage impact for the Lieutenants over the term of the contract. The next section there is the impact on the clothing allowance which as Jean mentioned, only impacts a few individuals and we have the increase for the boot allowance is increased by \$50.00. The cell phone stipend, there is no incremental costs as Jean mentioned

already for either paying them for use of their own phone or we're paying for the cell phone still on the County's contract. It's just a personal preference. Some people don't want to have to carry two phones, they would rather just use their own. Then the longevity kicks in after 10 years of service so we have increased the amount from \$45.00 to \$75.00 per year of service. So that's the calculated effect of that annually. The health insurance, we again, we did the same thing as we did with DSAC and the other more recently (*inaudible*) contracts so now we have the whole County workforce receiving the same contributions to their health savings account and same health plan. Administratively that makes things a lot easier and then retirement. The net effect of our change is just it extends the length of time that somebody has health insurance after retirement. So the cost itself isn't increased on an annual basis. It is increased in terms of like total time so it will go out a little bit longer but the annual amount would stay roughly the same. So, down below just shows the net total and again, it's accumulative over the four years. Then I just like to point out that you all are familiar with our five year model and we included that in your tentative budget books. We do build in a factor for increases in health insurance and increases in wages. We do it across the board, we don't really do it by bargaining unit but, to a certain extent, approximately \$270,000 of the increase is built into that 5 year model. The difference there being this would increase the five year projections, in four years from now, by about \$200 or so thousand.

In your budget amendments during your budget hearings you've already proposed an amendment that would include the effects of this contract. On this page here you might notice that this is a little bit more than what was amended and that is because this doesn't include like other effects of say, revenue reimbursement. Some of them are reimbursed that work under the court security umbrella, there is revenue reimbursement for them and we also tried up to actuals as there was some turn over in staff so that affected the net change that we gave you for the budget hearings so I didn't want you to wonder why this looks more than what you amended in committee.

Chairman Niebel: Thank Kitty. Any questions of Jean or Kitty?

Legislator Pavlock: Is there a certain percentage that they contribute towards insurance and has that remained flat? Is there an increase in that as long as it's not – I don't see that in here. Is there an increase, 2% or 3%?

Ms. Crow: It's a formula (*cross talk*), we have a high deductible health plan so the County does cover 100% of the premium and then of the deductible, the employee contribute – the employee is responsible for a share of the deductible and the County is responsible for a portion of the deductible. So the County pays 90% of the plan costs and we define the plan cost as the premium plus the deductible amount. So whatever that total number is, the County pays 90% and the employee is responsible for the other 10% which is effectively their share of the deductible. That does change every year, just depending on if the premiums go up. That is why I think it is a good formula because it takes into consideration increases in the premiums so 10% of the plan costs, if the premiums go up, 10% is going to be a larger number than it was the prior year so it kind of gives them a little bit of a buy in into the effects of premium changes.

Legislator Whitford: And that is the same through all the CVA's (?), and it's based on which option you give, families, single and so on.

Ms. Crow: Yes.

Legislator Pavlock: After retirement, what does the language read for staying on the health insurance?

Ms. Crow: It's the same plan and same contribution calculation. The only thing is, the other thing that impacted is just the length of time.

Legislator Pavlock: That was my question. The length of time. Probably you are required to seek other options when could, like when they turn 65 you can get on some Medicare and Medicaid but do they have to?

Ms. Crow: They are not required. Most kind of plan their benefit time so that they retire knowing that they have 2 years of coverage and so they retire at 63 so that by 65, they would still be able to go on –

Legislator Pavlock: Sure, when someone can retire at 56 and still ride it out till then and that's what – it just depends on retirement.

Ms. Crow: Once they lost their benefit, they only have a defined period. So if they retire at 55 and have 2 years of health insurance coverage, after those two years, they can stay on the County's plan but they have to 100% of the cost.

Legislator Whitford: But if they retired at the age where they could receive Medicare, wouldn't it –

Legislator Pavlock: So they only have 2 years after they retire.

Legislator Whitford: Wouldn't it be a benefit if they had coordination of benefits if they are on Medicare and this health insurance also. So it would be to their benefit to go –

Legislator Pavlock: Unless they have a spouse that can get on their insurance for a few years too, depending on age and so forth. It's a personal thing and I just was curious. Some contracts that I've seen through my other services and boards that I have sat on, we're paying for coverage for people that are 90 years old and they couldn't get (*inaudible*).. I just wanted to make sure.

Mrs. Riley: Depending on their length of service though, sometimes that conversion can keep them on our plan for 10 years. We see it all the time.

Chairman Niebel: We're going to wrap this up but Jean, just to summarize, the County negotiation team began negotiating on August 10th, we reached a tentative agreement on September 30th, the union approved the contract on September 30th as well.

Mrs. Riley: Yes.

Chairman Niebel: O.k., I know there is only 7 members but can you say, was it unanimous? Or you don't know.

Mrs. Riley: On the 30th it was not unanimous because there is only 7 of them and there are 4 on the committee so, no, there was 3 on the committee that day, there was a total of 4 that had participated on the committee so they had a majority. So the three of them called one of the other members and said yes, I agree, so they have a majority vote. So I don't know what - do you know Under Sheriff if the other three were - if it was unanimous?

Under Sheriff Telford: I don't know but I wouldn't be surprised if it was.

Chairman Niebel: Last question. Jean, as the Human Resources Director, what do you think? Is this a fair contract?

Mrs. Riley: I believe that it is a fair contract and I can tell you, we don't present all the nitty gritty of this but they presented a lot of things, monetarily, and really their main focus, when it was all said and done, it was the focus on the wages. So, I do believe it's fair, I do believe it gives the Sheriff's office opportunities to be able to promote people from within and with again, talking about when everybody is talking about the labor shortage –

Chairman Niebel: And retention.

Mrs. Riley: And retention, so in order for us to do that, we have to make sure that we're paying our people fairly, our Lieutenant's fairly and I think that this is fair.

Chairman Niebel: And this is before the end of the contract which is a good thing. Thank you for doing this. Alright committee, any other questions or discussion? Those in favor?

Unanimously Carried

Other

Chairman Niebel: The only other thing we have is, we could consider the 2022 tentative budget with changes listed below. Does everybody have a copy of that, the 2022 tentative budget? Look, we can approve this or we can just discuss it. I presume that between now and next week, there will be more changes made to this but right now the tentative budget on the second page, calls for a real property tax levy of \$68,155,837 and an estimated full value rate of \$8.25. Is there any discussion on the tentative budget?

Legislator Pavlock: Are any of the changes we discussed today during committee, would that affect this at all? We added and changed a couple of things.

Chairman Niebel: One of them was 2022, but, -

Mrs. Dennison: The change that we discussed for the Interoperability grant would have no effect on the tax rate because equal revenue and appropriations. Then the discussion of the

D.A. grant does not change what's in the 2022 budget and just in the case that some will be budgeted in 2023. So, the short answer is no, no effect.

Chairman Niebel: Any other questions or comments about the tentative 2022 budget? It's up to you? Anybody want to make a motion?

Legislator Whitford: I will make a motion to approve it to be moved forward to Audit & Control.

Legislator Pavlock: I'll second that.

Chairman Niebel: All those in favor? I'm going to oppose this, not for any particular reason at this point but just because I want to see what happens as far as next week, as far as any particular changes.

Carried w/ Legislator Niebel voting "no"

Chairman Niebel: Anything to come before the committee today?

MOVED by Legislator Whitford, SECONDED by Legislator Pavlock to adjourn.

Unanimously Carried (5:09 p.m.)

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