Chautauqua County Legislature
Live Streamed on YouTube
Wednesday, February 25, 2026 6:30 p.m.
Mayville, N.Y. 14757

Chairman Chagnon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Chairman Chagnon: I will call to order the meeting of the Chautauqua County Legislature on February 25, 2026. Would the Clerk please call the roll?

Clerk Lee called the roll and announced a quorum present. (Absent: Harmon, Scudder)

Legislator Larson delivered the prayer and Pledge of Allegiance.

MOVED by Legislator Bankoski, SECONDED by Legislator Gustafson and duly carried the minutes were approved. (01/28/26)

1st Privilege of the Floor

Chairman Chagnon: That brings us to our first privilege of the floor. Members of the public may comment on any subject relating to any local law, resolution, or motion appearing on the agenda. Individual comments are limited to three minutes and comments representing a group shall be limited to five minutes.

Greg Carlson, County Clerk: Can you hear me? I'm Chautauqua County Clerk, Greg Carlson. Since taking office last month, I've repeatedly heard the County's thirty-five-million-dollar general fund reserve used as a political talking point. The reserve has been mischaracterized as a slush fund, and its purpose misrepresented to make ad hominem attacks. County Executive Wendel just convened with two thousand county leaders from across the country at the National Association of Counties legislative conference in Washington DC. This nonpartisan organization and many like it, recommend a minimum two month or 16.7 percent general fund reserve. 16.7 percent of the county's three hundred plus million budget is just over fifty million. I fully understand the reserve is the tax-payer's money and I'm not saying fifty million in reserve is required here or dismissing returning some reserve to county taxpayers. My point is, thirty-five million is not excessive and in the absence of revenue, only keeps county government operating for about six weeks. The reserve is a safeguard against economic downturn, natural disaster, and public safety emergencies, like COVID. In crisis, absence of a reserve hurts vulnerable citizens who rely heavily on our service, as well as the tax payers. Local governments who lack reserves and run deficits cause their taxpayers millions in compounding interest when they require loans to stay afloat. The recent fiscal crisis in Dunkirk, requiring an emergency loan, with interest from New York State is just one example. Regardless of how this body manages reserves moving forward, a substantiative reserve is an asset to county taxpayers and a credit to county government, not a negative or a detractor. This brings me to last month's proposed resolution to increase the senior real property tax exemption without first going to committee. The usual protocol for non-emergency resolutions is consultation, discussion, and evaluation in committee to assess impact. This diversions from protocol facilitated a public tabling of the resolution, which I believe was expected. Setting the stage for political theater, where I heard claims and I quote, "Some legislators don't want to vote to help seniors while sitting on a thirty-five-million-dollar slush fund." Those types of statements are untrue as I don't believe any elected official, Republican or Democrat, has intent to harm seniors. It was a simple, procedural tabling and the resolution has since been reviewed in committee. After consultation with the tax and finance department on impact, the resolution was amended but carried. The amended resolution will still raise the exemption, helping seniors with a less aggressive increase mitigates downstream impact on municipalities and undue shift in tax burden to real property owners not qualifying for the exemption, who by the way deserve advocacy from their elected officials, too. With this fiscally responsible amendment, I highly encourage the legislature to vote 'yes' on Resolution 19-26 to amend the senior real property tax exemption. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Anyone else to speak to the first privilege of the floor? Anyone else for the first privilege? Seeing no one, I will close the first privilege of the floor.

____

PROCLAMATION:

Proclaiming March 16th -20th as

"Agricultural Literacy Week in Chautauqua County"

By

Legislator Tom Nelson, District 13

and

Legislator Fred Johnson, District 19

____

Clerk Lee: There are no veto messages from County Executive Wendel from the January 28, 2026.

VETO MESSAGES FROM COUNTY EXECUTIVE WENDEL
NO VETOES FROM 01/28/26

____

Clerk Lee: There are five communications on the agenda, if you would like a copy of any of these items, please let our office know.

<u>**COMMUNICATIONS:**</u>

1. Book – 2026 Chautauqua County Adopted Budget
2. Letter – County Executive, Paul M. Wendel, Jr. – Emily A. Woodard Esq., Appointment as County Attorney
3. Letter – Kristen M. Wright, First Assistant County Attorney re: Legal Services for the County Legislature - 2026
4. Letter – Department of Planning and Development re: Chautauqua County 2026 Agricultural Inclusion
5. Report – Kitty Lyons, Director of Finance – December 2025 Investment Report

---

<u>**LOCAL LAW INTRO. 1-26 (Print 3) –**</u> A LOCAL LAW AMENDING THE CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY CHARTER

Local Law Intro 1-26 (Print 3) – R/C Vote: 17 YES; 0 NO; 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) – UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED

<u>**LOCAL LAW INTRO. 2-26 –**</u> A LOCAL LAW PROVIDING FOR A MANAGEMENT SALARY PLAN FOR COUNTY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Chairman Chagnon: Are there any comments, any discussion on the local law? Legislator Nelson.

Legislator Nelson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I will be voting against this local law. I understand that the proposal does not impact the budget this year and not one employee will see an increase in their pay yet. In the future? Yes. As I said in audit and control committee meeting, I just think it’s wrong that these salary ranges will sail through without debate or discussion or question and at the same time, we’re fighting for seniors to give them a partial tax cut. Additionally, when you look at the salary ranges, we don’t have anyone in the first three ranges, but on—in range four, the range starts at fifty thousand dollars. There is a huge span between the starting at fifty thousand and then, goes up to seventy-six thousand, nine hundred, a span of over twenty-six thousand. In range eleven, where we have fifteen positions, a county officer or an employee could make between seventy-one thousand and one hundred and thirteen thousand, a forty-two-dollar difference. In range seventeen, you could earn between ninety-four thousand and a hundred and fifty-four thousand, a difference of merely sixty thousand. In the final range, range twenty-four, you could earn between one hundred and eighteen thousand dollars and two hundred and seven thousand, a range of almost eighty-nine thousand dollars. So, what determines if you make one hundred and eighteen or two hundred and seven? Experience was one of the answers I got, but not much else and it just seemed very subjective. I don’t see the criteria, you know, I want to be fair to county employees, but I was sent here by the tax payers of the city of Jamestown, so I have to be fair to them, too. I think our county employees do an outstanding job, this is not a critique of them. But I think what I would like to see is this tabled and I'd like an explanation as to, or at least to give me some clarity as to how we pick someone making one hundred and eighteen thousand, or two hundred and seven thousand. So, again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we table this motion.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, so, you're making a motion to table Local Law introductory 2-26?

Legislator Nelson: Right.

Chairman Chagnon: Is there a second to the motion?

Legislator Bankoski: I'll second that.

Chairman Chagnon: Legislator Bankoski seconds. Is there any discussion on the motion to table Local Law 2-26? Legislator Johnson?

Legislator Johnson: So, I sympathize with Legislator Nelson's sentiments, but I'm going to vote in favor of this. I think the right thing to do is to outside of this immediate legislative session, to study this with the HR department and the executive at some depth and have a more systemic look at it, rather than just take a quick vote this evening.

MOVED by Legislator Nelson/SECONDED by Legislator Bankoski to table Local Law Intro. 2-26

Chairman Chagnon: Any other questions or comments on the motion to table? Hearing none, will the Clerk please call the roll?

Local Law Intro 2-26 – R/C Vote: 7 YES; 10 NO (Anthony, Gustafson, Heiser, Johnson, Merritt, Pavlock, Penhollow, Proctor, Vanstrom, and Chagnon); 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder)

Local Law Intro 2-26 - Motion to Table Fails

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, further discussion on Local Law Intro 2-26? Legislator DeJoy.

Legislator DeJoy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too will be voting no on this resolution. I think it's a little ironic that we aren't going to take a better look as to what—how these salaries, how, how any given employee would, fit into that range. Haven't been given clarity on that and, you know, I think it's ironic that we're saying how much of a budget buster it is to give seniors a higher, exemption, and yet, we're voting to—to give significant raises and pay salary grades to our county employees, which, again, I—I believe that they're doing a fantastic job. I think that they're doing a great job and in just about every one of those offices. But, it, it just seems very ironic to me, and I, too, want to help the seniors remain in their homes and age in place and be able to afford to live here in Chautauqua County. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Larson.

Legislator Larson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Legislator Johnson and I often have a similar view of management, county finances. We both spent our lives in the private sector. And, just for Legislator Johnson's information and—and the new Legislators here, it was a year or two ago on a local law for a management salary plan, I voted yes but my seventy-four-year-old memory is not failing me yet. I stated that evening that it is my hope, my request, that some committee take a look at the size of these ranges. I was a County Legislator when County Executive Goodell in—instituted these kind of ranges and in theory, I support the notion that a county department head, be it the county attorney, the head of the department of public facilities, any department head, within their budget be able to decide that a given manager should be paid ninety thousand instead of eighty. I respect that. But I—I made a try, Legislator Johnson, a year or two ago to beg this Legislature and its committees, some committee, to take a look at these ranges seem to be excessive when you have an eighty-nine-thousand-dollar difference between the bottom of the range and the top of the range-that just seems excessive. In our collective bargaining agreements, where people have ranges and steps, I haven't looked at it closely, but I don't think you would find that, from the top to the bottom, there is that kind of huge, huge difference. And, I believe all Legislator Nelson was asking for was that the matter be referred back to a committee or two and just to give the administration a chance- personnel department, HR department, somebody give the administration a chance to prove that there are objective criteria as to whether a new assistant, whatever, starts at eighty thousand, or starts at a hundred and twenty. Without some objective criteria, Legislator Nelson was concerned about the huge range in a—in each of these levels. So, I tried that politely a year or two ago, it didn't accomplish anything, which, so be it. But, that's where we're at tonight with that question, unanswered, as to why are the ranges so huge and tonight the question from Legislator Nelson goes unanswered, are there any objective criteria for putting someone on a range and once a person is put on the range if the department had-- decides to give that person a thirty thousand dollar raise next year, within their budget, they can do that. So, it's disappointing that we would be voting blindly. I will vote for this, as I did a year or two ago. But, the concern is the same and even bigger due to Legislator Nelson's question of wanting an opportunity for the administration to demonstrate that there is some objective criteria where people are placed on these huge ranges. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Are there comments, questions, on Local Law Intro 2-26? Legislator Pavlock.

Legislator Pavlock: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. You know, through committee we had discussed this and learned some information regarding, this local law, introductory. I'll be voting in favor for this, this evening because I feel that it—it has a need to move forward in the sense of some of the current employees have not been able to receive a raise because they are at the top of the salary, those ranges, and making those adjustments I think is beneficial for those employees that they've, they've deserved that increase. But I do so reservingly because I think that the process in which we determine those ranges is—does need to get looked at with some more scrutiny, I feel that we can define those ranges a little more clear and also how an individual is placed within that range. I know some of the work, this has been done but, just to help clarify or—or introduce to the body, but also to understand that better. And if—if improvements are needed to facilitate what those improvements are. So, I'll be voting in favor of this but I also am an advocate for some future resolve with some of these questions that were raised tonight, so, thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Johnson.

Legislator Johnson: To take that just one small step further, if I'm not out of order, I would like to suggest that at the next Audit & Control meeting, and perhaps Representative Pavlock who's the chairman can do this. Ask the head of HR to come and make a presentation to us on how we got to where we are and what kind of steps we might like to discuss in terms of systemically fixing or improving this.

Chairman Chagnon: I think that's a good suggestion. I don't know that you need to make a motion to that effect. I think that the Chairman of your committee would be happy to follow through on that.

Legislator Johnson: Thanks.

Legislator Lewis: I have a question.

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Legislator Lewis: You mention that some of the employees are at the top of their salary and their grade level. I know that when I worked for SUNY Fredonia, what we use to do is see—look at their duties and see if they could move up a grade. So, my question is, do they have grade levels that you can put them in a new category and then work with that?

Chairman Chagnon: I don't know that I can answer your question specifically, but would the HR director like to take that question?

Debbie Makowski, Director of Human Resources: Good evening. So, if I understand your question, I believe what you're referring to is a—a reclassification. So, looking at job duties, what is currently assigned in a job description and how—whether those duties or responsibilities have changed to the point where it may rise to a higher salary range? We—we do have that option available. Yes. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Any other questions, comments on the proposed Local Law 2-26? Hearing none, will the clerk please call the roll?

<u>Local Law Intro 2-26 –</u> *R/C Vote: 12 YES; 5 NO (Bankoski, DeJoy, Lewis, Nelson, and Whitney); 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) - Adopted*

<u>LOCAL LAW INTRO. 3-26 –</u> A LOCAL LAW PROVIDING FOR A MANAGEMENT SALARY PLAN FOR COUNTY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES: DIRECTOR OF REAL PROPERTY TAX SERVICES III AND DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Chairman Chagnon: Are there any questions or comments on Local Law Intro 3-26? Legislator Nelson?

Legislator Nelson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't repeat what I just said, but for those same reasons, I will be voting no.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, thank you. Are there questions, comments on Local Law Intro 3-26? Legislator Whitney?

Legislator Whitney: Did I hear Mr. Nelson say none of these will take effect this year? Is that true? I thought I heard you say that in your speech.

Legislator Nelson: I did not say that, no.

Legislator Whitney: I was just going to say, if no like the last one, if none of these are going to affect anyone right away, it sounds like we're going to take the test tonight and then at the next committee meeting, we're going to do the studying. Seems like a little backwards, so. *(inaudible)* going to come talk to the committee after we vote.

Legislator Nelson: I think what I said was that no one would receive an increase in their wages this year and that's, again, from our committee meeting with uh, the HR Director.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you for clarifying that. Address your question?

Legislator Whitney: I just—that just seems funny. We're going to—we're going to take the test tonight and then they're going to come to the committee next month and explain their salary ranges. We're taking a test before we study. Just seems a little backwards to me. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Vanstrom.

Legislator Vanstrom: I believe I was privy to some commentary from our HR Director at our Administrative Services Committee and she did an excellent job explaining the whole process where these were coming from, and where they were going, so thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Pavlock.

Legislator Pavlock: Could I just have a level of clarity in the sense that you know, Legislator Nelson had reported that he had learned in committee that there were going to be no increases this year but as to my understanding, that there will be? And just for a form of clarity, what is the correct answer to that question and I believe that we are going to have some increases this year. Is that correct?

Chairman Chagnon: The correct answer is that this will not change any of the budgets, any of the department budgets so if a department head has room in their budget, they can make salary changes as they do every year.

Legislator Pavlock: Okay.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay. Other questions, comments about Local Law Introductory 3-26? Hearing none, will the clerk please call the roll.

Local Law Intro 3-26 – R/C Vote: 12 YES; 5 NO (Bankoski, DeJoy, Lewis, Nelson, and Whitney); 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) - Adopted

---

RENEW & AMEND RES. NO. 221-24 – Accept FAA and NYSDOT Funds to Rehabilitate Runway 13/31 Pavement and Reconstruct Runway 13/31 Lighting and Signage – Design

Chairman Chagnon: Legislator Bankoski.

Legislator Bankoski: Yes, I'd like to make a motion to renew with the resolution that's on everyone's desk in front of them.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, we have a motion to renew and the second by Legislator Gustafson. Any discussion on the motion to renew Resolution 221-24? Hearing none, all of those in favor, please say, "Aye." Opposed? It is renewed.

MOVED by Legislator Bankoski, SECONDED by Legislator Gustafson to Renew – Unanimously Carried to Renew

Chairman Chagnon: And now, Legislator Bankoski or Legislator Nelson, thank you.

Legislator Nelson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to amend by substitution with the resolution that was provided on our desk.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, we have a motion to amend and a second by Legislator Vanstrom.

MOVED by Legislator Nelson/SECONDED by Legislator Vanstrom to Amend by substitution – Unanimously Carried to Amend

Chairman Chagnon: Is there any discussion on the motion to amend Resolution 221-24? Hearing none, all those in favor, please say, "Aye." Opposed? It is amended. Now, any discussion on Resolution 221-24, as amended? Legislator Gustafson.

Legislator Gustafson: Just as a point of reference, when they apply for these grants, there's always a difference of a dollar one way or another and that's why this is in front of us again, is because the dollar (*inaudible*) to the state, which we're only adjusting it from $473,000 to $472,000. So, the only reason is because that can't be determined prior to applying for the grant.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, thank you for that explanation. Any other questions, comments? Hearing none, all of those in favor of Resolution 221-24 as amended, please say, "Aye." Opposed? It is carried.

RENEW & AMEND
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
RESOLUTION NO. 221-24

TITLE: Accept FAA and NYSDOT Funds to Rehabilitate Runway 13/31 Pavement and Reconstruct Runway 13/31 Lighting and Signage - Design

BY: Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees:

AT THE REQUEST OF: County Executive Paul M. Wendel, Jr.:

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Resolution 221-24, previously approved by the Chautauqua County Legislature, incorrect Capital Project accounts were referenced; and

WHEREAS, Chautauqua County submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") a project application and anticipates receiving a grant from the FAA to pay 90% of the allowable costs incurred in accomplishing the design phase of the Rehabilitate Runway 13/31 Pavement and Reconstruct Runway 13/31 Lighting and Signage ("Project") with a 5% local share and 5% provided by the New York State Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, Chautauqua County anticipates receiving a grant from the Federal Aviation Administration to pay 90% of the allowable costs incurred in accomplishing the following project at Chautauqua County/Jamestown Airport:

~~Reconstruct Terminal Building - Design~~ ***Rehabilitate Runway 13/31 Pavement and Reconstruct Runway 13/31 Lighting and Signage – Design*** FAA AIP Project No. X-XX-XXXX-XXX-2024 NYS PIN XXXX.XX

; and

WHEREAS, the New York State Department of Transportation is offering a matching grant to the federal grant for 5% of the non-federal share of eligible costs; and

WHEREAS, Chautauqua County has committed funds for the local share of project costs. Funding shares for project costs are as follows:

~~Federal~~	~~$~~	~~425,700~~	***424,800***
~~State~~	~~$~~	~~23,650~~	***23,600***
~~Local~~	~~$~~	~~23,650~~	***23,600***
~~Total Project Cost~~	~~$~~	~~473,000~~	***472,000***

; and

WHEREAS, if Chautauqua County and/or the FAA notifies the NYSDOT that Chautauqua County has requested and received an increase in federal funding for the project based on increased eligible costs, and has authorized the proportionate increase in local funding, the New York State share noted above shall be increased proportionately up to a maximum increase of 15%; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that Chautauqua County is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the United States Federal Aviation Administration and State of New York for financial assistance for the project described above for Chautauqua County/Jamestown Airport; be it also

RESOLVED, that the County Executive of Chautauqua County be authorized to execute all necessary documents on behalf of Chautauqua County with FAA and NYS in connection with the project; be it also

RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be filed with the FAA and New York State Commissioner of Transportation by attaching it to any necessary documents in connection with the project; be it also

RESOLVED, that A Fund Balance is appropriated as follows:

INCREASE THE USE OF FUND BALANCE:

A.----.----.917.0000	Fund Balance, Unassigned Balance—Unassigned Fund Balance	~~$24,100~~ ~~$23,650~~ ***$23,600***

; and be it also

RESOLVED, that the Director of Finance is hereby authorized and directed to make the following changes to the 2024 Adopted Budget:

INCREASE APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT:

A.9950.----.9	Interfund Transfers—Transfer to Capital	~~$24,100~~ ~~$23,650~~ ***$23,600***

~~INCREASE CAPITAL APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT:~~

~~H.5610.25296.4~~	~~Contractual – Chautauqua County Airport, Reconstruct Terminal Building – Design (2024)~~	~~$ 473,000~~

~~DECREASE CAPITAL APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT:~~

~~H.5610.25296.4~~	~~Contractual – Chautauqua County Airport, Reconstruct Terminal Building – Design (2024)~~	~~$ 473,000~~

~~*ESTABLISH & INCREASE CAPITAL APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT:*~~

~~*H.5610.xxxxx.4*~~	~~*Contractual – Rehab Runway 13/31 Pavement and Reconstruct Lighting & Signage (design)*~~	~~*$ 473,000*~~

ESTABLISH & INCREASE CAPITAL APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT:

HH.255610.25341.4	***Contractual—Rehab Runway 13/31 Pavement and Reconstruct Lighting & Signage (design)***	***$ 472,000***

~~ESTABLISH & INCREASE CAPITAL REVENUE ACCOUNTS:~~

~~H.5610.25296.R503.1000~~	~~Interfund Transfer – Interfund Transfer~~	~~*$23,650*~~
~~H.5610.25296.R359.7001~~	~~NYS Aid – Airport Capital Grants~~	~~*$23,650*~~
~~H.5610.25296.R459.2000~~	~~Federal Aid – Airport Federal Capital Grants~~	~~*$425,700*~~
	~~Total~~	~~$ 473,000~~

~~DECREASE CAPITAL REVENUE ACCOUNTS:~~

~~H.5610.25296.R503.1000~~	~~Interfund Transfer – Interfund Transfer~~	~~$ 23,650~~
~~H.5610.25296.R359.7001~~	~~NYS Aid – Airport Capital Grants~~	~~$ 23,650~~
~~H.5610.25296.R459.2000~~	~~Federal Aid – Airport Federal Capital Grants~~	~~$425,700~~
	~~Total~~	~~$473,000~~

~~ESTABLISH & INCREASE CAPITAL REVENUE ACCOUNTS:~~

~~H.5610.xxxxx.R503.1000~~	~~Interfund Transfer – Interfund Transfer~~	~~$ 23,650~~
~~H.5610.xxxxx.R359.7001~~	~~NYS Aid – Airport Capital Grants~~	~~$ 23,650~~
~~H.5610.xxxxx.R459.2000~~	~~Federal Aid – Airport Federal Capital Grants~~	~~$425,700~~
	~~Total~~	~~$473,000~~

ESTABLISH & INCREASE CAPITAL REVENUE ACCOUNTS:

HH.255610.25341.R503.1000	***Interfund Transfer – Interfund Transfer***	***$23,600***
HH.255610.25341.R359.7001	***NYS Aid – Airport Capital Grants***	***$23,600***
HH.255610.25341.R459.2000	***Federal Aid – Airport Federal Capital Grants***	***$424,800***
	Total	***$472,000***

Unanimously Carried As Amended

RES. NO. 17-26 – Amend Rules and Regulations of the Chautauqua County Legislature

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, for a little bit of information, this resolution is back on our agenda because last month, the Legislature referred it back to committee. So, this resolution was discussed in the Administrative Services Committee and at this time, I would like to ask Vice Chairman Heiser to give us a report on what transpired in the committee when this resolution was being discussed.

Vice-Chairman Heiser: Thank you Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the Administrative Services Committee, we had four out of five in attendance at our meeting. Legislator Scudder, Vanstrom, Anthony, and Heiser. We had a few individuals come before us to speak during the

Privilege of the Floor on the resolution. Those included two Legislators, Mr. Nelson and Mr. DeJoy, asking us to vote "no" on the resolution. Also, another individual addressed the committee and urged us to vote "yes" on the resolution for purposes of making this body and these meetings more efficient. When we got to the specific resolution on the agenda, Chairman Chagnon addressed the committee and discussed and put in suggestions he had received to improve the resolution and research he had done with other counties on the same matter. The Chairman reported that the Legislator that originally had proposed and drafted the resolution did not speak to the motion at the January 28th Legislature meeting and did not come to address the Administrative Services Committee on February 17th. Chairman Chagnon went on to recommend that the committee postpone indefinitely. The committee unanimously voted to postpone this resolution indefinitely.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, thank you. And now, I will ask if there is anyone wishing to bring this resolution back to the floor for a discussion. Hearing no one, Resolution 17-26 is dead.

RES. NO. 17-26 – No Action is Taken – Resolution is Dead

And now, I would like to make an adjustment to the agenda. I would like to consider Resolution 19-26, prior to the consideration of Resolution 18-26.

RES. NO. 19-26 – Amend Senior Real Property Tax Exemption

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, so this resolution, again, is on our agenda because last month we referred it back to committee. And, it was presented in Administrative Services Committee and in Audit & Control Committee. At this time, I'd ask Vice Chairman Heiser to again, report on what transpired at the Administrative Services Committee and then we'll hear from Chairman Pavlock from the Audit & Control Committee to see what transpired in that committee. So, Legislator Heiser, please.

Legislator Heiser: Thank you Mr. Chairman. There was no one who spoke on the resolution on the committee so we discussed it. Legislator Anthony discussed the process of the Legislature increasing this exemption to 30,000 with the issue being brought to us from the property tax department and this resolution was not suggested or proposed by the property tax department. Legislator Heiser, myself, stated that this resolution was only one side of the equation and more information is needed. Mr. Scudder felt that there was several unanswered questions, such as how many seniors would be affected by this, what is the financial impact to the county, should the exemption be even higher than what the resolution states? Kim Meleen, Director of Real Property Tax Department, was called before us. She detailed to us several issues with the resolution. Chiefly, that residents would need to apply for a possible exemption change by March 1, which does not give seniors adequate time to apply for the change. Ultimately, the Committee unanimously voted, "No" on this resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Pavlock.

Legislator Pavlock: Alright. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the Audit & Control Committee—Committee meeting we discussed this in some detail. During that time, we had the director of Real Property Tax in front of us, Kim Meleen, and also in an assessor that represents quite a few towns and cities within Chautauqua County. Through conversation and comments from members on the committee and through discussion, we heard a lot of good rapport from both sides. I think that we came under the conclusion that having a—a, the effects of which it was going to be doing to—to all residents so this wasn't necessarily a tax break, but more of a tax shift and it would burden the rest of the tax payers and said since we had a discussion around what that burden looked like. A comment made is that there's quite a few seniors that fall maybe just above this proposed adjustment that then would be burdened even more. They don't meet the requirements now, but now they would be burdened on top of this and it would actually negatively effect them even more. So, we'd actually maybe be hurting more seniors. Through this conversation, the committee had come up with an amended amendment and we made an amendment that was based on some actual information regarding what inflation would have driven this to be over the last few years and that amendment brought forth, instead of raising this by $2,000 to match what inflation would just have accumulated through those last couple of years. So, an amendment was made and seconded and it was voted upon through the committee three "yes" votes and one "no" vote and the correction from previous publications the one "no" vote was Legislator Nelson, not Legislator Johnson, so.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. And now I would entertain a motion to bring this resolution 19-26 back to the floor for discussion. Legislator Gustafson.

Legislator Gustafson: I make a motion that we amend by substitution.

Chairman Chagnon: We have to bring it back to the floor first for discussion.

Legislator Gustafson: I'd like to make a motion that we bring it back to the floor.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, we have a motion to bring it back to the floor. Is there a second? Legislator Vanstrom? Discussion on the motion to bring Resolution 19-26 to the floor for discussion? Legislator Larson.

Legislator Larson: Mr. Chairman, I semi-apologize to the attorney to advise us this evening for this question. Under our rules, any legislator can have the audacity of writing a piece of legislation. Doesn't happen often, but under our rules, any legislator can write a piece of resolution. Any legislator under our rules can have it go directly to the floor. Once it's on the floor, it could be voted up, could be voted down, could be referred to committee, could be tabled. We understand that this resolution was—had it been passed last month, there would have been time for the March 1 tax status date communities and their assessors to have dealt with the fact that more seniors would be eligible for this exemption. That's not my question tonight. I'll spare you that one. It went to two committees. Hypothetically, if Administrative Services has settled on 35,000 as their amendment in committee and Audit & Control had settled on amending to

32,000 which resolution would come to this floor? And while you're thinking about that, it occurs to me that Legislators Bankoski and Nelson are entitled to a vote on their resolution of 38,000. If, on the floor, somebody wants to amend the 35,000 or 32,000 or 34,999 dollars, like a car dealer, they can do that on the floor. But these Legislators are entitled to have their resolution come back with a report from committees, that's fine. But, I don't think the majority party in this Legislature has considered the possibility that there could be a difference of opinion within their own party. The one committee could have amended to 35, another one to 32 and then the questions is council, which resolution or resolutions are in front of the body tonight? Thank you.

Nathan Harp, Legislature Parliamentarian: Yes, thank you, Legislator Larson. I think you raised very sensible and valid points. I did my best to come up with a procedure in this situation that in consultation with former County Attorney, Steve Abdella, the Legislatures rules and Roberts rules but, what you're saying strikes me as correct because I know that in rule 7b, regardless of committee action or inaction, an item can reach the full Legislature. So, in the event that one of these items, someone wants to bring it up and the body does not allow that to happen, I would – I could only recommend that we take a brief recess to convene about that procedural point if that should become an issue. That would be my recommendation.

Legislator Larson: Mr. Chairman, appreciate that answer. I have a simple suggestion for you to get this meeting progressing, allow the – Bankoski and Nelson, do you accept $32,000 as a friendly amendment of your resolution?

Legislator Bankoski: I do not.

Legislator Larson: Okay, so we don't have that acceptation. I suggest you just let the $38,000 come on the floor, you've had your reports from the committees, somebody's going to make a motion to amend it to $32,000 and we just proceed that way, thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Yes, thank you, that's exactly the path that I was on. Okay, so any other discussion on the motion to bring resolution 19-26 to the floor for discussion?

Legislator Buchanan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Should we ask the Director of Office for the Aging if she has those type of numbers? It's like 40,000 – I believe 40,000 seniors in the County? Would you have those numbers with you? That meets the guidelines that we're looking for?

Dana Corwin, Director of Chautauqua County Office for the Aging: I do not have those figures tonight. I wasn't brought in on the formation or the conversation, so I'm not prepared with those numbers. But, if it's something that you need, generally speaking, we're about 39,000, just under 40,000 older adults. Where they stand as an income or property value, I don't have that information this evening. Thank you.

Legislator Buchanan: Okay, I was just thinking that would probably help us all here if we had that information.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you, any other questions, comments on the motion to bring the resolution back to the floor? Hearing none, all those in favor of bringing resolution 19-26 back to the floor for discussion, please say “aye”, “opposed”?

MOVED by Legislator Gustafson, SECONDED by Legislator Vanstrom to bring resolution 19-26 to the floor – Unanimously Carried to bring to the floor

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, now we are back on the floor with resolution 19-26 to amend senior real property tax exemption. Discussion on the resolution?

Legislator Gustafson: Are you looking for a motion to –

Chairman Chagnon: Now would be the appropriate time if you wanted to propose an amendment.

Legislator Gustafson: I make a motion that we amend by substitution, resolution 19-26.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, and a second by Legislator Vanstrom

MOVED by Legislator Gustafson, SECONDED by Legislator Vanstrom to amend by substitution

Legislator Larson: Mr. Chairman, point of order, it’s not amending by substitution, its amending $38,000 to $32,000, thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, I believe what Legislator Gustafson was referring to was the action taken in the Audit & Control Committee but

Legislator Larson: But, it’s not a different resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: It’s not a different resolution, its not a substitution of the resolution - right, it’s a motion to amend.

Legislator Gustafson: Motion to amend.

MOVED by Legislator Gustafson, SECONDED by Legislator Vanstrom to Amend $38,000 to $32,000

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, any further discussion on the motion to amend resolution 19-26? Hearing none, would the clerk please call the roll?

Legislator Larson: Point of information, Mr. Chairman. Are we voting on amending to $32,000?

Chairman Chagnon: Yes.

Legislator Larson: Do the legislators understand that have already voted that you're voting on to amend down to $32,000?

Chairman Chagnon: Please continue.

<u>RES. NO. 19-26 –</u> R/C Vote: 15 YES; 4 NO (Larson, Lewis, Nelson, Whitney); 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder)

Legislator Buchanan: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to change my vote.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay. Legislator Buchanan, you are voting how on the motion?

Legislator Buchanan: "No"

Chairman Chagnon: Legislator Bankoski, you're voting how on the motion?

Legislator Bankoski: "No"

Chairman Chagnon: Okay.

Legislator DeJoy: Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend my vote to "No" also.

Chairman Chagnon: Legislator DeJoy changes his vote to a "No" also. Sorry to the confusion to the Clerk.

<u>RES. NO. 19-26 –</u> R/C Vote: 10 YES; 7 NO (Bankoski, Buchanan, DeJoy, Larson, Lewis, Nelson, Whitney); 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) – Carried to Amend

Chairman Chagnon: Resolution is amended. Now, for discussion on resolution 19-26 as amended.

Legislator Nelson: Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank Legislator Johnson for proposing that amendment. Its not as high as we wanted, its something and I'm going to support this because it's not exactly what we wanted but I think we're willing to compromise on this for now so, again, thank you to Legislator Johnson for making that amendment.

Chairman Chagnon: Other comments, questions on resolution 19-26 as amended?

Legislator Bankoski: Yeah, just kind of echoing what Mr. Nelson said and I appreciate what Mr. Johnson has done. It's not what I wanted but it's something and like when we talked in leadership today, maybe this is something we can revisit in a year or two from now because I did bring up about how social security changes yearly and stuff like that. Like I said, its going to go up 2.5% so that's $800 difference already going to be for next year so it's going to change these numbers but I appreciate – we're heading in the right direction, not quite what I wanted but somethings better than nothing so I will support this.

Legislator DeJoy: Mr. Chairman, I echo Mr. Bankoski and Mr. Nelsons and again, thank Legislator Johnson. I think we could have done better for the seniors here in Chautauqua County but I will be voting "yes" because a little bit more of an increase is better than no increase and I think that we could probably reach a few more families that struggle to stay in their homes here in Chautauqua County, thank you.

Legislator Anthony: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I think its important to note that, you know, this was discussed in detail during the Audit & Control committee with like Mr. Pavlock had said with a City Assessor who has multiple Towns and we agreed that, you know, this was a fair number for the cost of living. And the rate of inflation to go up to support senior citizens without a drastic effect. Another point that I think is important is that this doesn't help every senior. This only helps senior citizens whose income level is 32,000 or less, who owns a house. And, you know, the other point of reference I'd like to point out is, the city of Jamestown's limit is only at a $20,000 income rate where we are now 12,000 over the city of Jamestown and the city of Jamestown is struggling to look at a $2,000 income increase because of what it will put on the rest of the tax payers in the City. So, I'm all for helping senior citizens. I think this was a good move and I'm all for looking at this again in the future to see where, you know, inflation has us to keep up and make sure we take care of our senior citizens but this is helping a one demographic of many in Chautauqua County and I think we've done well to assess this. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Buchanan.

Legislator Buchanan: Being on the Committee for the Office for the Aging so I'm not trying to be really biased, but I'm happy for this, you know, because these seniors, they just—I speak with them on a regular basis, when I go around talking to folks and I hear the struggle with the economy growth and stuff like that and the price of groceries is just—it's touchy with me. So, yes, I was pushing for 35, but I understand we have the rest of the folks in the county that pays taxes and it may burden the younger group or whatever, but I'm glad we got this through. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Any other questions or comments on Resolution 19-26, as amended? Hearing none, would the Clerk please call the roll?

<u>RES. NO. 19-26 –</u> R/C Vote: 17 YES; 0 NO; 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder)—Unanimously Carried As Amended

---

RES. NO. 18-26 – Affordability Act of 2026

Chairman Chagnon: Are there any comments, discussion on 18-26? Legislator Nelson.

Legislator Nelson: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to begin by addressing the recent headline in the Jamestown Post Journal which read, "Dems plan would equal 6 million hit to county budget." Respectfully, that same headline could have as accurately been framed, Democrats propose returning 6 million to county taxpayers. I'm not criticizing the paper or reporter. Headlines are often written separately from the story itself. I simply want to point out that how something is framed, shapes how it is perceived. It is not until the 14th paragraph on the following page that readers learn that the county currently holds $35 million in reserve funds. Context matters because when taxpayers understand that even under the most conservative scenario, we would retain roughly 29 million in reserves, the question becomes, why is this proposal considered extreme or reckless? For perspective, under County Executive Greg Edwards, the county maintained a reserve of 13.5 million. Under Vince Horrigan, reserves were approximately 12.6 million. No one at that time suggested the county was fiscally unstable. The Affordability Act does not dismantle our financial foundation. It uses a modest portion of historically high reserves to provide direct tax relief to the very people who funded those reserves in the first place, our taxpayers. This is not a hit to the budget. It is a policy choice. And the choice before us is simple. Do we continue to accumulate surplus funds or do we responsibly return a portion to the residents who are facing rising costs in nearly every aspect of their daily life? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. And with my apologies, I neglected to ask for a report from the Vice Chair of the Administrative Services Committee and the Chairman of the Audit & Control Committee to tell us what transpired in their committees. So, Legislator Heiser, if you would be so kind.

Legislator Heiser: Certainly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was no, excuse me, there was no one who came to speak to the committee on the resolution. Our discussion consisted of Legislator Anthony expressing concerns with the unknown effect this resolution would have on the fund balance, especially in the backdrop of possible New York State budget changes and expected increased expenses of the county itself. He felt this resolution was premature. Legislator Scudder had additional questions on the resolution and asked Kitty Lyons, Director of Finance, to come and speak to the committee. Legislator Scudder asked Kitty if she knew what impact the resolution would have. At that point, she detailed that the county would lose approximately 1.8 million in sales tax revenue and municipalities would lose approximately 1.3 million in our municipal sharing agreement. Mr. Scudder had additional questions that went unanswered as to how the plan would make up for the lost municipal funds. No one, at any point, labeled it as extreme or reckless, just very much incomplete. The committee unanimously voted "No" on this resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Pavlock.

Legislator Pavlock: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through the Audit & Control Committee meeting, we discussed this thoroughly. It was discussed at length regarding fund balance and fund balance strategy and policy. We discussed sales tax in depth and you know, ramifications of adjusting either or utilizing either. We were presented with a lot of informational numbers—of number of multitude of scenarios of what the decision could be. We found that through those conversations, you know, we have recently approved a sales tax rate which is in good standing until 2027 in which it will be revisited. And I think that the question about what the percentage rate should be in—in question is going to be considered at that time. It doesn't need to be in this sort of a resolution. The other things that a point of action would be that the Audit & Control Committee is actively discussing the fund balance and in fact that we do have an upcoming meeting that we will be discussing the fund balance in great detail and that, you know, more resolve may come out of that particular meeting and that information. So, you know, no action was taken during the committee meeting and we didn't—we took a vote and we all three voted, "No" and one voted, "Yes."

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Now, further discussion on the resolution? Legislator Johnson.

Legislator Johnson: I'm sorry, I think I was perhaps one of the troublemakers on the Audit & Control Committee, but, I don't think this is appropriate to do now. Number one, this isn't germane until 2027 anyway. Number two, if we're gonna give money from the fund back to the taxpayers, and there's nothing wrong with that, I would prefer to do it in something other than sales tax because a great portion of the sales tax is paid by non-residents. So that, to me, would not be an efficient way to do it. And then third, I think we really do need to strategically discuss what we think the fund balance should be and why. And then, based on that, we can decide how much we'd like to return to the taxpayers, if anything.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Legislator Whitney.

Chairman Whitney: According to communication number five tonight, there's $6.4 million in investment earnings. Is that included in that 35 million slush fund or is that above and beyond?

Chairman Chagnon: Well, we don't have a slush fund, Legislator Whitney—

Legislator Whitney: Well, *(inaudible)*

Chairman Chagnon: —but does, do all of the earnings and all of the revenue and all the expenses of the county ultimately wind up in the fund balance? The pluses and minuses are all the actions that go on through the year in the county. But, Kitty Lyons would like to address that, so.

Kitty Lyons, Director of Finance: Regarding the question on the investment earnings, that report reflects the earnings of all funds of the county. So, that includes the sewer districts, landfill, etc. And the investment earnings are allocated to each fund on a monthly basis, based on their ending cash balance at the end of that month. For the general fund, as per our financial management policy, investment earnings are dedicated toward county capital projects. So, right now, the investment earnings are only used for capital projects.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Better answer than I gave you. Other questions, comments on Resolution 18-26? Legislator Larson.

Legislator Larson: I want to commend individual Legislators that introduce legislation. If those gentlemen had not introduced this piece of legislation, there would have been no resolution tonight to increase the senior citizen exemption at all. That's clear. That was one of the three planks of the Affordability Act of 2026. On the issues of what it might cost, the sales tax portion, there's been some reference to it. The sales tax portion was an aspirational statement. We will not be in a position to ask the State Legislature to continue the 8% or to lower it to 7 and ¾ or 7 and a half or whatever 'til 2027. The way the State Legislature works, and the Governor signs it, there would be no reduction in state sales tax presumably until late in 2027. So, it would not be a full year impact, but that was an aspirational part of Legislator Nelson and Bankoski' s resolution. It was nothing that would go into effect in 2026 or January 1 of 2027. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you.

Legislator Lewis: I have a point to make. I believe I heard that we would lose 1.6 million if we put the sales tax down to 7 ¾. Is that if the spending stays the same? I know when we reduced the sales tax before, personally, I was spending more. So that's just something to keep in mind, as well, when you look at this again.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Any other questions or comments on Resolution 18-26? Hearing none, will the Clerk please call the roll?

Clerk Lee: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Proctor had his hand up.

Chairman Chagnon: Oh, Mr. Proctor does. Down in the corner, sorry.

Legislator Proctor: That's fine. I just wanted to point out that, I believe that next month we will find out exactly where the fund balance is at for 2025 due to some of the actions that we're going to be taking later and spending some of this fund balance down. If I'm—if that's not correct, please correct me.

Chairman Chagnon: That is correct.

Legislator Proctor: So, discussing this is a bit premature when we don't even know where we're at yet exactly from all the adjustments made for 2025.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Now -

Clerk Lee: I'm sorry, was this to bring to the floor?

Chairman Chagnon: I've completely lost it here. So, we would need a motion, then, to bring Resolution 18-26 to the floor.

MOVED by Legislator Bankoski, SECONDED by Legislator Nelson to bring Resolution 18-26 to the floor - Unanimously carried

Chairman Chagnon: Discussion on the motion to bring Resolution 18-26 to the floor? Hearing none, would the clerk please call the roll on the motion to bring Resolution 18-26 to the floor for discussion?

Clerk Lee: Mr. Anthony

Legislator Anthony: No

Clerk Lee: Mr. Bankoski

Legislator Bankoski: Absolutely

Clerk Lee: Mr. Buchanan

Legislator Buchanan: Yes

Clerk Lee: Mr. DeJoy

Legislator DeJoy: Yes

Clerk Lee: Mrs. Gustafson

Legislator Gustafson: No

Clerk Lee: Mr. Harmon is absent. Mr. Heiser

Legislator Heiser: No

Clerk Lee: Mr. Johnson

Legislator Johnson: No

Clerk Lee: Mr. Larson

Legislator Larson: Point of order, Mr. Chairman, back to our council. This is the same thing. This was introduced by individual legislators. I believe it was referred to committee. These sponsors apparently want it. Our rules indicate that it comes back to the floor, regardless of committee action. I believe that was the opinion of about 25 minutes ago. So, there should—there is no need, there is no role for a roll call or a voice vote on whether this resolution comes back on this floor tonight unless the sponsors were to ask that it be sent back to some other committee for further investigation. So, I'd ask for a ruling from our council.

Legislature Parliamentarian Nathan Harp: Well, I would advise under these circumstances, I think that the legislature—legislators who brought the resolution are entitled to a vote. I think that the result of either vote is going to be identical anyway. So, I think that it would be appropriate under these circumstances to frame the vote as a vote on the merits of the resolution.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. So, I was going in the right direction. Even though I had it wrong.

Legislator Larson: First instinct.

Chairman Chagnon: First instinct. So, we will now terminate the discussion on the motion that was made to bring the resolution to the floor for discussion. And we will consider that the resolution is still on the floor for further discussion. Is there any further discussion on Resolution 18-26 before I try and have a vote again? Hearing none. Now, would the Clerk please call the roll?

RES. NO. 18-26 – R/C Vote: 7 YES; 10 NO (Anthony, Gustafson, Heiser, Johnson, Merritt, Pavlock, Penhollow, Proctor, Vanstrom, Chagnon); 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) — Resolution fails

---

Chairman Chagnon: Legislator Bankoski

Legislator Bankoski: I'd like to make a motion to block Resolutions 21-26 through 25-26.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, we have a motion to block Resolutions 21 through 25. Is there a second to the motion? Legislator Gustafson. Any discussion on the motion to block Resolutions 21-26 through 25-26? Hearing none, all those in favor of blocking, please say "aye." Opposed? They are blocked.

MOVED by Legislator Bankoski, SECONDED by Legislator Gustafson to block Resolutions 21-26 through Resolution 25-26 - Unanimously Carried to block

RESOLUTIONS:

21-26 Confirm Appointment – Airport Commission, by Public Facilities Committee – UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

22-26 Confirm Appointment – Chautauqua County Land Bank Board of Directors, by Planning & Economic Development Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

23-26 Confirm Re-Appointments – Parks Commission, by Public Facilities Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

24-26 Confirm Appointments and Reappointments – Chautauqua County Fire Advisory Board, by Public Safety Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

25-26 Confirm Appointments and Reappointments – Chautauqua County Emergency Medical Services Council, by Public Safety Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Chairman Chagnon: Is there any discussion or questions on any of the Resolutions 21-26 through 25-26? Hearing none, all those in favor of the blocked resolutions, please say, "aye." Opposed? They are carried. Legislator Bankoski.

Legislator Bankoski: I'd like to make a motion to block 26-26 through 50-26.

Chairman Chagnon: And resolution—the motion has been made and seconded by Legislator Gustafson. So, discussion on the motion to block Resolutions 26-26 through 50-26. Hearing none, all those in favor of blocking the Resolutions, please say, "aye." Opposed? They are blocked.

MOVED by Legislator Bankoski, SECONDED by Legislator Gustafson to block Resolutions 26-26 through Resolution 50-26 - Unanimously Carried to block

26-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – Environment - Landfill, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

27-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – South Chautauqua Lake Sewer District, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

28-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations-Portland-Pomfret-Dunkirk Sewer District, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

29-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations-North County Industrial Water District No.1, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

30-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations-North Chautauqua County Water District, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

31-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Public Facilities – DM Fund, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

32-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year-End Reconciliations – Public Facilities – A Fund, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

33-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Public Facilities – D Fund, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

34-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Information Technology, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

35-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – County Clerk, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

36-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – County Attorney, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

37-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – M Health Insurance Fund, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

38-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Department of Finance and Miscellaneous Department, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

39-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Unified Courts, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

40-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Energy Fund, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

41-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – CS Liability Insurance Fund, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

42-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Human Resources-BENE Health Insurance Benefits, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

43-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Legislature, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

44-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Emergency Services, by Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

45-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Office of the Sheriff, by Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

46-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Office for Aging Services, by Human Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

47-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Chautauqua County, Department of Mental Hygiene and Social Services, Mental Hygiene Division, by Human Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

48-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliation – Department of Mental Hygiene and Social Services, by Human Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

49-26 Amend 2025 Adopted Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Chautauqua County Health Department, Public Health Division, by Human Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

50-26 Amend 2025 Budget for Year End Reconciliations – Planning and Development, by Planning & Economic Development and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Chairman Chagnon: Are there any questions or comments on any of the blocked Resolutions 26-26 through 50-26? Legislator Pavlock.

Legislator Pavlock: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through committees, this—the committees that I sat on through this budget year end reconciliation discussion, we found that there were areas that needed adjusting within these departments' budgets. Some were able to do so and balance within their own department, meaning some were—maybe had a surplus in an area of the budget that was able to cover the deficit. That was the case in many of these instances. Some of the instances, though, the department did not have enough money within their department to cover the deficit and had to utilize funds balance. Why, some of these things present—some of the things were in control of—through the county and some were not. Some were regulated—regulations that are state-mandated programs that overran. You know, we do our best to try to plan and budget for these things, but a lot of times, they either will run above or below what you predict. In our instances, we were—they ran above in some of our predictions. There were some mistakes made and those were corrected, as well. And there were just some different things throughout the year that were—would make these changes. But at the end of it, we were able to make it correct and utilize fund balance and cover any of these overages and I'd like to thank the departments for the work that they did in trying to make it correct within their own department, so. That's it.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Any other questions, comments on the blocked resolutions? Legislator Pavlock.

Legislator Proctor: Proctor.

Chairman Chagnon: Proctor.

Legislator Proctor: We look alike.

Chairman Chagnon: It's been a long week.

Legislator Proctor: I just wanted to echo on what Legislator Pavlock said. That, you know, we went through committee with the corresponding adjustments and as I referred to earlier, we're going to use—utilize about $2.1 million of fund balance and one of those is our old friend, safety net, which was a big part of that and as indicated in the committee meeting that they might be coming back next month again. So, it's a mandated program. It's a good program to help those less fortunate. But it's extremely hard to predict and I know at budget time, there was much discussion about it and it's impossible to predict. But, the discussion was how much fund balance do we use for that? Which was from last year but we continue to do that and we will continue even further, I believe. Thank you.

Chairman Chagnon: Thank you. Other questions, comments on the blocked resolutions? Hearing none. All those in favor, please say, "aye." Opposed? They are carried.

51-26 Amend 2026 Budget for the Departments of County Clerk and Motor Vehicles, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

52-26 Amend 2026 Budget for North County Industrial Water District No. 1, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

53-26 Amend 2026 Budget for NYS Community Development Block Grant Award Microenterprise Assistance Program, by Planning & Economic Development and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

54-26 Authorize Agreement with NY State DOT for Performance of Project PIN 5765.48, by Public Facilities and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

55-26 Authorize Acceptance of Violence Intervention Grant Program Funds, by Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

56-26 Authorizing Vehicle Fuel agreement with Town of Hanover for Fueling of County Motor Vehicles, by Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

57-26 Authorize Agreement with the Town of Sheridan for Court Security Services FY 2026, by Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

58-26 Authorize Agreement with Chautauqua Lake Central School for Enhanced Police Protection Services FY 2026-2027, by Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

59-26 Authorizing Grant Applications and Subsequent Agreements for the Creation, Preservation, and Maintenance of Snowmobile Trails, by Planning & Economic Development and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

60-26 Amend Capital Project Accounts—Jamestown Community College, by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

61-26 Authorize Agreement with Jamestown Urban Renewal Agency (JURA) for Occupancy Tax Grant Award, by Planning & Economic Development and Audit & Control Committees—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

62-26 Authorize Transfer of a Tax Foreclosure Property to Jamestown Urban Renewal Agency (JURA), by Administrative Services and Audit & Control Committees

RES. NO. 62-26 R/C Vote: 17 YES; 0 NO; 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) — UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

63-26 Standard Workday and Reporting Resolution, by Administrative Services Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

64-26 Cyber Information Sharing and Collaboration Agreement, by Administrative Services Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

65-26 Authorize Standardization of Paratech Equipment for Office of Emergency Services Technical Rescue Team, by Public Safety Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

66-26 Authorize Agreements with Cornell Cooperative Extension of Chautauqua County, by Planning & Economic Development Committee—UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

67-26 Setting the Salary for the Certified Peer Specialist, by Administrative Services, Human Services and Audit & Control Committees

RES. NO. 67-26 R/C Vote: 17 YES; 0 NO; 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder) — UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

68-26 Reallocating Salary Grade for Crime Scene Analyst, by Administrative Services, Public Safety and Audit & Control Committees

RES. NO. 68-26 R/C Vote: 17 YES; 0 NO; 2 Absent (Harmon, Scudder)— UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Chagnon: And that brings us on our agenda to announcements. Are there any announcements for the good of the order? No announcements.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Members of the public may comment on any subject.
A member of the legislature may speak on any subject.
Individual comments are limited to 3 minutes and
comments representing a group shall be limited to 5 minutes.

Chairman Chagnon: Okay, that brings us to the second privilege of the floor. Members of the public may comment on any subject. A member of the legislature may speak on any subject. Individual comments are limited to three minutes and comments representing a group shall be limited to five minutes. Is there anyone wishing to address the second privilege of the floor? Anyone for the privilege of the floor? Seeing no one, I will entertain a motion by Legislator Pavlock and a second by Legislator DeJoy to close the meeting.

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

Unanimously Carried (7:55 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted and transcribed,
Olivia Lee, Clerk of the Legislature, Kristi Zink, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature & Amanda Guillory, Senior Stenographer