



Onondaga County Legislature

JAMIE McNAMARA
Clerk

DAVID H. KNAPP
Chairman

MELANIE VILARDI
Deputy Clerk

401 Montgomery Street • Court House • Room 407 • Syracuse, New York, 13202
Phone: 315.435.2070 • Fax: 315.435.8434 • www.ongov.net/legislature

WAYS & MEANS COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE 2022 TENTATIVE BUDGET CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN – OCTOBER 7, 2021 TIM BURTIS, CHAIRMAN

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. May, Mr. Rowley, Mr. Ryan, Mr. McBride, Mr. Williams, Mrs. Ervin
ALSO ATTENDING: Mrs. Tassone, Ms. Cody, Mrs. Abbott-Kenan, Ms. Kuhn, Dr. Chase,
Mr. Holmquist, Mr. Bush, Dr. Kelly, Mr. Kinne; also please see attached

Chairman Burtis called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN: Rustan Petrela, Financial Analyst

- 2022 – 2027 CIP focus on maintenance, economic development, and environment 85%
- 2 projects increase sewer capacity: (1) Oak Orchard & (2) providing sewer services to White Pine Industrial and surrounding areas
- Scope in dollars is \$893 mil; last year was \$670.6 mil; \$222 mil increase or 33% increase
- Countywide funds - \$22 mil increase (8.4%); special funds - ~\$200 mil increase in sewer funds (50%)
- Previously had plans that were \$822 mil or \$783 mil; bigger than the past; factors for increase are 4 projects
- (1) Parks – Zoo mechanical systems and roof replacement for \$4 mil
- (2) County Multi-Sports Complex increased \$20 mil in debt to \$25 mil; \$5 mil increase
- (3) OnCenter rehab project – added \$5 mil in fed aid
- (4) Education and creation of center in Hillbrook - \$2 mil in state aid
- Sewer fund - major change in cost of Oak Orchard; last year in CIP for \$65 mil; updated to \$250 mil
- 13 new projects in sewer fund for \$92 mil; exceeds \$200 mil increase; net effect with projects is \$200 mil
- Last year in 2020, asked for \$50.4 mil for 2021; \$43 mil debt, ~\$7 mil in cash
- This year asking for \$169.5 mil; \$158 mil debt, \$11 mil cash; debt not only including debt seeking new authorization, but also debt authorized; total debt planned to be spent in 2022

CIP 2022 -2027 Presentation

Presented to CIP Committee on 9/10/2021

Presented to Planning Board on 10/27/2021

Planning Board adopted the resolution endorsing the CIP 2022-2027 on 10/27/2021

The focus of this CIP is on maintenance, environment and economic development (85% of funds). There are two projects increasing the capacity of sewer infrastructure. One of them increases the capacity of Oak Orchard WWTP and the other will provide sewer service to White Pine industrial park and surrounding areas.

Comparative information

Scope of Plan

(\$ in Millions)

	CIP 2021-2026	CIP 2022-2027	Increase/ Decrease	% Increase/ Decrease
Plan (\$)	\$670.6	\$892.9	\$222.3	33.1%
County Wide	\$269.9	\$292.5	\$22.6	8.4%
Special Funds	\$400.7	\$600.6	\$199.9	49.9%
Proposed Projects	47	63	16	
New Projects	7	17	10	

CIP 2009-14	\$757
CIP 2010-15	\$783
CIP 2011-16	\$822
CIP 2015-20	\$629
CIP 2021-26	\$671

Main contributors for the increase in County Wide Funds are:

1. Zoo Mechanical Systems and Roof Replacement at Parks (\$4M)(NEW)
2. County Multi Sports Complex at Parks (Increased from \$20M to \$25M in Federal Aid)
3. OnCenter Rehabilitations at Facilities (Added \$5M in Federal Aid)
4. Educational, recreation and vocational center at hillbrook detention center (\$2M in State Aid) (NEW)

Main contributors for the increase in Special Funds (Sewer) are:

1. A major change in the cost of Oak Orchard WWTP Upgrade (from \$63M to \$250M)
2. 13 new projects for a total of about \$92M

CIP request for expenses in the upcoming year (Local funds only)

	Total	Debt	Cash
Local Funds Requested last year for 2021	50.37	43.4	6.97
Local Funds Requested this year for 2022	169.5	158.2	11.3

Percentage of debt limit exhausted is 17.75%

List of new projects for 2022 - 2027 (\$ in Thousands)

Pg.	Department	Project	Total cost	Our cost	Year
50	County Clerk	Records Digitalization	\$360	\$360	2022
53	E-911	OCICS Radio Fleet Template Refresh	\$442	\$442	2022
87	Parks	Zoo Mechanical Systems and Roofs Replacement	\$4,000	\$4,000	2022-23
88	Sheriff	Radio Replacement	\$4,665	\$4,665	2022-23
89	Hillbrook	Education, Recreation and Vocational Center at Hillbrook	\$2,000	\$0	2022
113	WEP	B.ville S. Knolls and Oak Orch. WWTP Oxygen Syst. Repl.	\$10,000	\$10,000	2024-25
116		Comprehensive Asset Renewal at Baldwinville WWTP	\$4,236	\$4,236	2026-27
117		Comprehensive Asset Renewal at Brewerton WWTP	\$3,120	\$3,120	2023-24
118		Comprehensive Asset Renewal at MBLs WWTP	\$13,576	\$13,576	2023-27
120		Comprehensive Asset Renewal at Metro WWTP	\$2,545	\$2,545	2022-26
122		Comprehensive Asset Renewal at Oak Orchard WWTP	\$1,727	\$1,727	2023-27
123		Comprehensive Asset Renewal at Wetzel Rd. WWTP	\$1,605	\$1,605	2024
126		Dept. Wide Building and Site improvements	\$13,819	\$13,819	2022-27
130		Dept. Wide Mechanical, Electrical and Process Improv.	\$17,849	\$17,849	2022-27
136		MBLS & Brewerton WWTP - Drum Replacement	\$2,396	\$2,396	2022-23
137		MBLS WWTP Fine Screen Replacement	\$1,000	\$1,000	2022
138		Meadowbrook-Limestone WWTP Large Scale Upgrade	\$4,600	\$4,600	2026-27
143		Route 81, Sanitary Sewer Betterments	\$15,400	\$15,400	2022-25
TOTAL COST OF NEW PROJECTS for 2022 - 2027			\$103,340	\$101,340	

**Capital Spending by Fund
(In millions)**

	General	Sewer	Total
2021-2026 CIP	\$269.9	\$400.7	\$670.6
2022-2027 CIP	\$292.5	\$600.6	\$893.1

In %

	General	Sewer	Total
2021-2026 CIP	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%
2022-2027 CIP	32.8%	67.2%	100.0%

Funding Sources (General Fund)

	Borrowing	State Aid	Fed. Aid	Cash Cap.	Other
2021-2026 CIP	48.2%	16.6%	13.2%	22.0%	0.0%
2022-2027 CIP	39.8%	15.7%	19.9%	24.6%	0.0%

Mandated vs. Non-Mandated

	Mandated	Non-Mandated
2021-2026 CIP	42%	58%
2022-2027 CIP	24%	76%

New Projects:

- County Clerk – records; continuation of project previously approved for \$600,000; digitalization happened, but only up to a certain point; will digitalize where ended and will complete
- E-911 project – Radio fleet template refresh; computer program regulates protocols of communication; installed more than 10 years ago; state and federal gov't issued guidance for protocols; accumulated experience on how to do better; change to be better and to guidelines of state and federal government - 2022
- Zoo mechanical systems and roof replacements – 2022 - 2023; \$4 mil in project; seeking authorization for \$2 mil; 2 phases; roof first replacement, second will be mainly HVAC systems; roof for energy savings, as well as HVAC
- Sheriff Radio replacement – mobile, handheld, and stationary radios installed in 2009 when did communication system; unreparable; age is 10 years, will be 13-14 years old when project complete
- Hillbrook Vocational Center – expanded Hillbrook, but did not expand area of education and recreation; applied for state funds; will do project if they get funds
- WEP has multiple projects:
- (1) Baldwinsville / Seneca Knolls and Oak Orchard oxygen system replacement – requires use of fewer oxygen; generate at plant; tanks 40 years old and beyond repair - intend to remove facilities, remove old tanks to bring in new tanks, replace controls and valves; have someone supply oxygen for new tanks; hope to have vendor take ownership and maintain tanks; county only user; 2024 -2025
- 6 comprehensive asset renewal projects; each for WWTP; change structure of Capital projects; each WWTP is different from the other; do maintenance every year
- Comprehensive asset renewal projects include assets that are not major in cost or scope – small projects bundled together; use Maximo (asset management program) which provides reports that show likelihood of failure and consequence of failure of each asset; go to work force in the field and get opinion on assets, also management
- This year cost the assets in house, not hired out; these will be continuous projects seen every year
- In addition to comprehensive asset renewal projects there are 2 department wide projects
- Each WWTP has assets in common – i.e. roofs, paid surfaces, overhead doors; do specific projects everywhere, there are projects everywhere; doing large amount together, there is less bureaucracy, less resources
- CIP page 116 – read through project description applicable to all comprehensive asset renewal projects
- 2 department wide projects: department wide building and site improvements and department wide mechanical and electrical process improvements; building and site is the host for technology, and the other is the technology
- CIP page 126 – read the definition of department wide project
- There will be standalone projects too big and complex to be included in catch all; seek authorization for state funds; need to have standalone resolution, because state wants it that way
- Looked at old projects; large number financed with cash and borrowing; looked at cash balance and made sure only kept money needed now; if money did not have scope, then took money away; will ask when it is needed
- Used \$4 mil of old money in CIP; money spread in 7 projects and 14 assets; using old cash for mostly engineering (usually borrow 5 years); in book see funding sources marked as cash on hand; pre-2022
- This year trying to do cost in-house; not paying people to cost and scope projects; can do that in-house with asset management system; can cost each asset labor and material; getting software very cheap
- Try to do some design in-house; for emergencies cannot wait to go through bureaucratic process; people have CAD license for small projects; standards for project management and design to help with all departments
- Big picture for WEP, have over \$600 mil for 6 years; \$371 mil are only 2 projects: Oak Orchard and White Pine
- Remainder is \$229 mil; avg for 6 years is \$257 mil; not for those 2 projects, ask would have been below 6 year avg

Projects to be authorized in fall 2021 (DEBT ONLY)

	Projects by department	Requested	Recommended by Ccounty Exec
	County Clerk		
1	Records Digitalization (NEW)	\$360	OK
	Sub Total	\$360	OK
	E-911		
1	OCICS Radio Fleet Template Refresh (NEW)	\$442	OK
	Sub Total	\$442	OK
	Facilities		
1	Community Plaza and Walks Renovations	\$300	OK
2	Facilities Various Capital Improvements	\$4,595	OK
3	Oncenter Rehabilitations	\$500	OK
	Sub Total	\$5,395	OK
	Office of Environment		
1	Ash Tree Management	\$525	OK
	Sub Total	\$525	OK
	Parks		
1	Long Branch Park Improvements	\$1,000	OK
2	Oneida Shores Park Shoreline Rehabilitation	\$100	OK
3	Parks Various Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Improvement	\$2,685	OK
4	Veterans Cemetery Lawn Crypts	\$1,000	OK
5	Zoo Mechanical Systems and Roofs Replacement (NEW)	\$2,000	OK
	Sub Total	\$6,785	OK
	Sheriff Police/Civil		
1	Radio Replacement (NEW)	\$4,665	OK
	Sub Total	\$4,665	OK
12	GENERAL FUND TOTAL (Excludes DOT, Library and OCC)	\$18,172	OK
	Library		
1	Mobile Library Outreach (2021)	\$260	OK
2	Petit Branch Library addition and improvements (2021)	\$950	OK
	Sub Total	\$1,210	OK
14	COUNTY WIDE FUNDS TOTAL	\$19,382	OK
	WEP		
1	Comprehensive Asset Renewal at Metro WWTP (NEW)	\$800	OK
2	Davis Rd Pump Station and Forcemain Improvements	\$10,200	OK
3	Department Wide Building and Site Improvements (NEW)	\$2,370	OK
4	Department Wide Mechanical Electrical and Process Improvements (NEW)	\$2,135	OK
5	Meadowbrook Limestone WWTP Fine Screen Rplacement	\$1,000	OK
6	Metro WWTP Thickner Rehabilitation	\$1,000	OK
7	Oak Orchard Wastewater Treatment Plant Major Upgrade Project	\$30,000	OK
8	Route 81 Sanitary and Sewer Betterments (NEW)	\$11,000	OK
9	Sewer Consolidation	\$3,650	OK
10	Wastewater Transportation System Improvements	\$1,250	OK
11	White Pine Industrial Park Conveyances	\$16,000	OK
	Sub Total	\$79,405	OK
25	ALL FUNDS TOTAL	\$98,787	OK

- Facilities various - \$4,595,000 (pg 59) – this year asking more than usual due to renovations to (1) Civic Center: 8th floor CFS is \$1.2 mil; (2) 3rd, 4th, 5th, & 13th floor – 3rd full renovation; others are partial; \$1.8 mil in debt, \$235,000 in cash; (3) improvements in basement for Health Dept in basement; (4) building Army Reserve Center, transform into Emergency Operations Center – \$2.1 mil with \$1 mil in federal funds included
- Oncenter – every year ask for \$500,000 for various repairs; this year have \$5 mil in federal funds, which have; seeking authorization for \$500,000; \$5 mil is to build 5 additional meeting rooms and technology improvements
- Ash tree management - \$525,000 asked every year

- Parks – Long Branch improvements; ongoing; received funds previously; did shelters, bathrooms and maintenance building; this \$1 mil is for paving lot
- Oneida Shores Park Line Shore rehab – used money for boat launch ramp; \$100,000 for pay gate for people that use boat launch; scope elements for future years
- Parks various - \$2.7 mil; includes all parks and variety of issues (pave surfaces, roofs, mechanical systems); scope every year is well defined relying on studies
- Each scope element has precise amount of money; discussed manpower for scope; projects for 2022 are those implementing
- Veterans cemetery lawn crypts – sought authorization last year; discussed scope; increases capacity of certain area of land; seeking authorization for \$1 mil for first phase
- Library projects - sought authorization last year; postponed (1) mobile library for \$260,000, has not changed
- (2) Petit Branch improvements – last year asked \$1 mil; asking for \$950,000 after getting some money from state
- WEP – asset renewal at Metro – seeking authorization for 1 this fall; in other projects found assets that did not need replacement right way; have some existing projects and some proposed standalone taken care of with other assets
- Davis Road Pump Station and Forcemain improvements – pump station and conveyance connecting Davis Road and Oak Orchard; comprehensive improvements; almost everything in pump station will be repaired; \$10.2 mil
- First phase of project; another year will be second phase
- Department wide building site improvements – determined some assets that need repair, replacement or improve
- Same for department wide mechanical – assets needing to be done
- Meadowbrook-Limestone – state mandated; improve capture of solids at beginning of WWTP
- Metro WWTP thickener – received authorization; need additional funds because of COVID; cost increase
- Oak Orchard WWTP upgrade - \$30 mil for engineering; familiar with project
- Route 81 sanitary and sewer betterments (pg 143) – taking advantage of state project exposing pipes; needed to do improvements to pipes; had done without project exposing, would have been more expensive
- State project will intervene with pipes and would have to fix; some pipes county wants to fix anyway; total cost is \$80 mi; \$65 state; \$15 mil county
- Had county done under other conditions, would cost \$50 mil versus \$15 mil; save money by avoiding 75 mil gallons of combined sewer overflow
- Sewer consolidation – used \$1.5 mil cash on hand; do some improvements; for engineering
- WW Transportation system – ongoing project; includes pump stations, forcemains, sewers, and facilities; based on Maximo; every year will prioritize and cost/scope in-house
- White Pine Industrial Park Conveyances – \$16 mil, same project, same money
- Total amount seeking is \$98.7 mil; general fund is \$19.4 mil; WEP asking for \$79.5 mil; last year was \$21 mil, and year before was \$125 mil goes up and down

Mr. Petrela responded to Mr. Rowley that the debt service projection for countywide funds is in the book on pages 33 and 34, and WEP is on pages 103 and 104.

Mr. Petrela replied to Mr. Ryan that the Emergency Communications fleet template refresh is part of the upgrades with interoperability.

Mr. Ryan asked for more information on the Army and National Guard facility the county owns on Electronics that is being converted. Mr. Rustan answered that the county will have \$1 million in Federal, \$1.1 local for a total of \$2.1 million. This will be a state of the art center for Emergency Management.

Mr. Petrela agreed with Mr. Ryan that White Pine includes a road project (pg 93). There was \$530,000 to do the study, and the rest will be borrowed; it is not ongoing.

Mr. Ryan asked what departments will be going into Carnegie, and Ms. Primo:

- Plan to bring Economic Development, who has a lease that has been extended; extension ends, they will move there
- Also want to bring complimentary departments: Community Development, SOCPA, and ASM
- Need more room in Civic Center; JobsPlus wants to move in (partially there and outside of Civic Center)

Mr. Wixson:

- Want to expand entire west side of 13th floor; push Purchasing out of that area; encroaching on Personnel
- Children and Family Services needs majority of 8th floor; balance would go to Personnel
- Moving SOCPA and Community Development – opens up 11th floor to move Personnel to 11th floor, they are being squeezed out by Purchasing due to JobsPlus
- Very intricate “musical chairs” for departments; primary instigator is JobsPlus, where county gets revenue for any space they occupy; cost comes back from rent through DSS
- Losing opportunity for Economic Development; need space; do not have space in the buildings
- Had to rearrange all office environments due to new protocols from pandemic
- 10 years ago were cramming everyone in and now have to spread out; 9 different department moves involved in renovation of Carnegie

Mr. Primo:

- Economic Development out of lease; JobsPlus will come and enter into lease; no one else out of lease
- Talk a year or two ago about bringing city departments over; did over 10 tours of Carnegie with city; now with pandemic, would not work; need to spread out more

Mr. Ryan asked for more information on the radio replacement for the Sheriffs (pg 88). Mr. Petrela:

- Life cycle is 10 years and radios are unrepairable; beyond useful life; part of big system project in 2007 – 2009; \$30 mil project; aware of this; all equipment has a life cycle; radios are computers
- Capital project - purchasing procedures; funds approved, process with bid; hire someone to provide; i.e. Motorola

Mr. May asked if the \$525,000 for ash tree management is consistent with what has been budgeted and forecasted. Mr. Petrela responded it is consistent. They started with a larger number, but as time has gone by, it has been reduced to what it is now.

Mr. May stated the 81 project saving \$35 million and being opportunistic with road replacement is exciting.

Mr. May:

- Records at Clerks office – talking about for long time; eating up real estate; needing place to work and spread out;
- Records taking up space; time to move on this
- Proposing to spend ton of cash on 2 capital projects, but think the county could use cash for this as well
- Talking cash spends and how; these are minor issues in scope of things

Mr. May requested any financials associated with the Carnegie process. An awareness of how the money will change moving forward. Ms. Primo said yes.

Mr. Wixson replied to Mr. Rowley that the rehab of the County Office Building is done, and it is fully occupied.

Mr. Kinne:

- For 30 years heard nothing except do not touch fund balance; last year asked for \$2 mil; could not get it
- This year spending \$115 mil in fund balance? Why not bond for the aquarium? Room to bond for it
- People, Infrastructure, and Employees (PIE); citizens talked to are not in favor of aquarium
- Been in favor since 1997; think it would be a boom for this county
- Do not like how it is being paid for; glad to see the projects in WEP
- i.e. building 600 new homes in Onondaga; put into pipes at 6 or 7 years old; houses now with sewage in basement; no one in this room offering to pay the \$15,000 – \$35,000 for fixing basement; new law have to declare there was sewage in basement
- Who will buy these homes that are paying taxes?
- Town of Onondaga do not worry because it goes downhill, but people in city and town of Geddes have to worry about it; do not see anything to resolve those issues

- Talked with former Legislator Jim Corbett - enlightened about issues in Geddes; kicking this can down the road for future legislators to deal with is “shame on us”
- Employees of county have worked hard and carried the load in pandemic; lot of mental stress; do not see anything in this budget to deal with that either
- In favor of aquarium and think it will work, even though have plenty of projects in community that thought would bring in tax dollars and cost millions
- i.e. Oncenter – when built, the former County Executive was told, if they were to build Convention Center, they had to build a hotel next to it; did not think they could do it, so it was not done; now paying price
- Amphitheater may be great project, but think it was built on toxic waste dump; guess it is helping; hard to know – using funds from Casino to pay for it; no way to prove its impact
- Budget has glaring problems

Mr. Morgan:

- Talked about in length yesterday in regard to staffing - proposed budget funds up to 270 newly funded positions
- Certainly thoughtful of work county employees doing; recognize need to shore up operations
- Conversation about priorities - can do both and have resources to do both
- Investing significant amounts of money in base operations, at same time proposing investing in projects like aquarium to generate economic activity that funds county government
- Mandated costs required to spend exceed property tax levy by \$12 - \$13 mil; budget does both those things and can do both going forward

Mr. May:

- One of those concerns stems from capital yesterday; perhaps break and figure out where to go from here or segway into discussion based on presentations heard yesterday; whether done discussing capital
- Talked about ARPA use and funds; been discussed and edging towards how to receive information over and above what is available
- Projects – lot to learn about aquarium; got feasibility study Monday; look forward to reading it
- Economic impact claims are compelling; do due diligence
- Sports complex – 3 priorities
- (1) Try to respect and be considerate of private sector investment and involvement already – one way is to put off construction of bubble
- Committed to development of tournament market, very important county and operator stay away from business paying bills for local operators; leagues and practice times; goal to drive sales tax; new people coming in
- (2) Local activity is considered in operations of event; try to integrate what is being done in fair and considerate way
- i.e. Baldwinsville has massive lacrosse tournament; some fields smaller than this room;
- How does the county support that? How does the county support booster clubs that cultivate and raise money for these events? Should be part of business model
- (3) Softball - 25 years ago played in leagues; not what it used to be; fraction of the participation that used to have
- Tournament activity is still here; challenge administration alongside complex proposal to also present an interim plan for softball, instead of giving up for a year; perception is that the county does not need it or want to play it
- There are facilities and it does not have to be perfect; possibly Dewitt, good partner? Remains to be seen; function of negotiation; what will happen when snow melts next year

Mr. Kinne:

- Relate to all of Mr. May’s concerns; would like to believe economic numbers; support project, but 2 more concerns
- (1) Legal to use that money, but not ethical; money meant to help people recover from pandemic; Why not bond?
- (2) Placement - should look holistically; not zero in on one site that is an appeasement for hotels; very distressing taking away something that is appreciated by constituents
- To ruin something so positive to put in something that may have impact the county would want is concerning
- Last – heard from certain operators, that they do not like competition, but agree with concept; think it is too small
- Wondering why not building a hockey complex; people travel over northeast and PA; go this route and build hockey
- Make clear that these 2 projects show imagination; like that; however in both cases, these are not homeruns; at best it is a long high foul balls; not doing it the right way

Dr. Chase:

- Heard more from people about sports complex than a lot of other things; economics is an issue, but thing people keep saying that when promoting these things, county is leaving out the people that live here; promoting tourism
- Feel like they are being kicked to the side; need to feel that the county is doing this for their good and quality of life
- Lot of them do not get long term with sales tax and more money in budget; they are looking at the county is taking softball fields away and giving to people from who knows where
- If going to present this in a way that people want to buy into it, one thing need to look at is constituents and say they're important to the county; trying to make their lives better

Ms. Abbott-Kenan:

- Agree with Legislator Chase; in this demo and can make it happen; but have to find a home; guarantee for softball leagues and local travel baseball fields for summer; can pick any sport
- Agree with Leader May, talking about Hopkins and Jones Rd; thought bubble would be priced so it does not compete
- Lacrosse tournament in Skaneateles draws from all over state for soccer; competitive play, not scout
- When traveling to (i.e.) Sandusky and Myrtle, they are scout tournaments; hoping that would be different than local that the county would draw from state, but different

Mr. May:

- Have to keep in perspective; what is being proposed does propose to improve quality of life in county, but these are business propositions for sales tax; need to define what that vision is
- i.e. Showcase tournaments (soccer, lacrosse); huge economic development programs; local tournaments are not
- Be considerate of those and a way to integrate them, so quality of life can be there; tournaments support proposed business mission

Mr. May agree with what is being said, and he asked if they will get more into the weeds regarding economic drivers and management. Mr. May responded that they are not sure yet. They wanted to get some conversation in on this for the record and due process, but he is not sure when they will talk about it again.

Ms. Cody:

- Good concerns on competition and other fields; placement would be great for hotels and businesses in Salina, but also from standpoint of drivability - access to thruway, Destiny, ball field, city; quick access; love location
- Concerns for constituents in that neighborhood; one is about traffic impact; Can someone speak to the traffic study?

Mr. Voss:

- In process of reviewing prelim TIS that CNS is doing for Parks Department; helped scope that; feedback from TIS showing there will need to be secondary access, ingress and egress on Henry Clay in process

Mr. Rowley:

- Close to lacrosse community; officiated for 9 years; concern that tournaments held at various schools (i.e. Auburn) by organizations rely on these tournaments to fund them (i.e. booster club or youth lacrosse league)
- They rely on concession sales, selling swag, bring in vendors in and charge fees; source of revenue; cost of running tournament; do not pay for fields; at school – low cost or free custodial help to run
- Organizer concern – thinks these fields are akin to Walmart coming in and wiping out small businesses

Mr. McBride:

- Agree with what was said; represent Camillus that has Jack Pepper tournament for lacrosse; draws lot of people
- Got into lacrosse late in life; amazing how many people into sport; went to tournament, and ran into mother and father from Atlanta, GA; flew a team up to go which includes hotels, food, etc.
- Woman said that in south cannot find referees and coaches; sport growing
- Think complex is good idea; wonderful growing sport; worried about people in Camillus; W. Genesee is hotbed for lacrosse; woman from south said this is epicenter of lacrosse
- Few years ago, SU Men's won National Championship; Lemoyne won National Championship; Cortland won their division National Championship
- Lacrosse a wonderful support; national draw; concerned people in Camillus would suffer; maybe not; hoping for more discussion on this; on record that Camillus benefits greatly from what they have

Mrs. Ervin:

- Concern from people not understanding why spending money on these projects, and not on the people in Onondaga County; there is hidden money used for these issues, but people do not see that
- People complaining that \$85 mil can be better spent on other things; have to find out where those other things are being addressed; most constituents look at this as craziness
- Aquarium conversation from 20 years ago - back then it was not a good idea; defaulted to Destiny doing it, who never did; lot of things being said of what is right and wrong
- Want to know where everything is and how successful they can be; numbers look good, but not correct; hope to talk about projects independently; not saying yes to something not comfortable with

Chairman Burtis recessed the meeting at 10:36 a.m., and the meeting reconvened at 10:52 a.m.

CFO: Steve Morgan, Chief Fiscal Officer; Tara Venditti, Deputy Director

Mr. Morgan:

- When developing 2022 spending plan, looked at department budgets from baseline perspective; took department spending plans from 2021 and 2020, and built in incremental cost increases to maintain current operations
- Baseline budgets – roster and other budget line items and identifying costs mostly out of department control and increase year to year; i.e. contractual wages, fuel pricing; contracts with escalators; identified vehicles as baseline
- Sent out baseline budget to departments; believe what is needed to provide current level of services
- Ran estimates and projections for big revenues; approach also allowed spending over and above the baseline (something not anticipated) – called decision package
- Decision package – put together cost of proposal and programmatic data to send for review and consideration
- i.e. Missed position, new programs, or new investments - have to align with administration’s platform
- Ensure departments have resources needed to provide services at current level; new investments or programs considered based on merit or program; how related to County Executive’s overall platform

Budget Summary

D2365150000-County General Other Items F10001-General Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A695700-Contractual Expenses Non-Govt	6,755,000	7,595,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	7,500,000	(95,000)
A659560-Onondaga Historical Association	187,970	188,000	48,949	48,949	192,885	4,885
A659570-Erie Canal Museum	71,138	73,000	19,007	19,007	74,897	1,897
A694100-All Other Expenses	77,951	94,929	108,941	121,241	115,618	20,689
A666500-Contingent Account	0	250,000	0	0	0	(250,000)
A668720-Transfer to Grant Expend	450,000	0	6,800,000	7,606,650	400,000	400,000
A674600-Provision for Capital Projects	0	0	0	0	35,000,000	35,000,000
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	7,542,059	8,200,929	13,476,897	14,295,847	43,283,400	35,082,471
Total Appropriations	7,542,059	8,200,929	13,476,897	14,295,847	43,283,400	35,082,471
A590005-Non Real Prop Tax Items	2,514,108	2,656,000	1,287,956	1,287,956	2,517,782	(138,218)
A590030-County Svc Rev - Gen Govt Suppt	0	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500	0
A590047-Svcs Other Govts - Culture & Rec	200,000	0	0	0	0	0
A590057-Other Misc Revenues	74,453	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0
A590083-Appropriated Fund Balance	0	0	0	606,650	0	0
Subtotal Direct Revenues	2,788,561	2,669,500	1,301,456	1,908,106	2,531,282	(138,218)
Total Revenues	2,788,561	2,669,500	1,301,456	1,908,106	2,531,282	(138,218)
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	4,753,498	5,531,429	12,175,441	12,387,741	40,752,118	35,220,689

Mrs. Venditti:

- County General (3-25)
- Contractual Expenses – payment to villages for infrastructure plan at \$5.2 mil, and Visit Syracuse (detailed in packet from CFO presentation)

- Transfer to grant – Land Bank money and housing market study (comprehensive plan – part of SOCPA budget)
- Provisions for capital - \$35 mil
- Remaining of page is ROT to support agencies

Budget Summary

D236518-OnCenter Revenue Fund F20010-Oncenter Revenue Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A659250-War Memorial/OnCenter	0	1,525,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,750,000	225,000
A694080-Professional Services	3,158,995	0	0	0	0	0
A694100-All Other Expenses	5,573,276	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	8,732,271	1,525,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,750,000	225,000
A694950-Interdepart Charges	1,139,192	1,139,192	1,139,192	1,139,192	1,139,192	0
Subtotal Interdepartl Appropriations	1,139,192	1,139,192	1,139,192	1,139,192	1,139,192	0
Total Appropriations	9,871,463	2,664,192	3,139,192	3,139,192	2,889,192	225,000
A590005-Non Real Prop Tax Items	2,639,192	2,664,192	3,139,192	3,139,192	2,889,192	225,000
A590030-County Svc Rev - Gen Govt Suppt	334,407	0	0	0	0	0
A590034-County Svc Rev - Transportation	1,422,700	0	0	0	0	0
A590050-Interest and Earnings on Invest	4,106	0	0	0	0	0
A590051-Rental Income	1,110,085	0	0	0	0	0
A590052-Commissions	587,532	0	0	0	0	0
A590056-Sales of Prop and Comp for Loss	3,311,450	0	0	0	0	0
A590057-Other Misc Revenues	530,632	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Direct Revenues	9,940,104	2,664,192	3,139,192	3,139,192	2,889,192	225,000
Total Revenues	9,940,104	2,664,192	3,139,192	3,139,192	2,889,192	225,000
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	(68,641)	0	0	0	0	0

- OnCenter Revenue Fund (3-26)
- \$1.5 mil subsidy with \$250,000 capital expend; supported by ROT
- Interdepartmental charges – Facilities to support OnCenter building

Budget Summary

D2375000000-Countywide Taxes F10001-General Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A590001-Real Prop Tax - Countywide	142,033,195	147,637,061	152,019,384	152,019,384	158,179,797	10,542,736
A590003-Other Real Prop Tax Items	8,316	0	0	0	0	0
A590005-Non Real Prop Tax Items	276,527,608	286,442,393	264,450,727	264,450,727	300,284,775	13,842,382
A590030-County Svc Rev - Gen Govt Suppt	(20)	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Direct Revenues	418,569,098	434,079,454	416,470,111	416,470,111	458,464,572	24,385,118
Total Revenues	418,569,098	434,079,454	416,470,111	416,470,111	458,464,572	24,385,118
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	(418,569,098)	(434,079,454)	(416,470,111)	(416,470,111)	(458,464,572)	(24,385,118)

- Countywide Taxes (3-28) - budget for property tax levy; deferred, uncollectable and prior
- Tax levy just over \$4.5 mil, increased over last year
- Sales Tax in line called Non Real Property Tax items – forecasted 9% increase for this year, 2% for next

D238500000-Interfund Transfer/Contr Unclassified F10001-General Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A668700-Transfer to Co Road Fund	29,801,119	32,200,494	28,728,274	28,728,274	29,034,157	(3,166,337)
A668710-Transfer to Road Mach Fund	2,663,499	2,770,539	38,942	38,942	1,642,160	(1,128,379)
A668750-Transfer to Comm Coll Fund	9,872,000	9,872,000	9,872,000	9,872,000	9,872,000	0
A668780-Transfer to Library Fund	3,963,523	4,890,236	4,334,542	4,334,542	4,573,820	(316,416)
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	46,300,141	49,733,269	42,973,758	42,973,758	45,122,137	(4,611,132)
A699690-Transfer to Debt Service Fund	4,850,182	5,092,325	5,001,975	5,001,975	5,440,075	347,750
Subtotal Interdepartl Appropriations	4,850,182	5,092,325	5,001,975	5,001,975	5,440,075	347,750
Total Appropriations	51,150,322	54,825,594	47,975,733	47,975,733	50,562,212	(4,263,382)
A590041-Svcs Other Govts - Education	500,000	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Direct Revenues	500,000	0	0	0	0	0
A590060-Interdepart Revenue	11,588,277	11,981,384	12,041,767	12,041,767	12,041,767	60,383
Subtotal Interdepartl Revenues	11,588,277	11,981,384	12,041,767	12,041,767	12,041,767	60,383
Total Revenues	12,088,277	11,981,384	12,041,767	12,041,767	12,041,767	60,383
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	39,062,045	42,844,210	35,933,966	35,933,966	38,520,445	(4,323,765)

- Interfund Transfer (3-29): budget for funds to support other funds – county road, road machinery, OCC, Library
- Includes debt services for OnCenter and OCC, and revenue to support indirect costs
- Library Fund - from 2020 its down; from 2021 it is up; function of operation of Library including adding back staff; anticipated costs and appropriated for this

D30-Debt Service F30016-Debt Service Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A694100-All Other Expenses	799,832	644,521	645,573	645,573	615,509	(29,012)
A681900-Serial Bonds	33,165,000	32,155,000	33,932,390	33,932,390	34,970,000	2,815,000
A681940-EFC Loans - Bonds	14,034,723	15,185,673	14,023,261	14,023,261	14,762,438	(423,235)
A683900-Interest On Bonds	14,950,840	16,441,891	15,277,108	15,277,108	15,185,672	(1,256,219)
A683940-Interest On EFC Loans - Bonds	4,200,015	4,540,564	4,324,639	4,324,639	4,198,859	(341,705)
A690010-Pmt to Refunded Bond Escr Agt	27,471,681	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	94,622,090	68,967,649	68,202,971	68,202,971	69,732,478	764,829
Total Appropriations	94,622,090	68,967,649	68,202,971	68,202,971	69,732,478	764,829
A590082-Other Sources	27,591,121	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Direct Revenues	27,591,121	0	0	0	0	0
A590071-Interfund Trans - Debt Service	57,650,931	68,967,649	68,202,971	68,202,971	69,732,478	764,829
Subtotal Interdepartl Revenues	57,650,931	68,967,649	68,202,971	68,202,971	69,732,478	764,829
Total Revenues	85,242,052	68,967,649	68,202,971	68,202,971	69,732,478	764,829
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	9,380,038	0	0	0	0	0

- Debt Service Fund (3-30): budget is flat

D3975000000-Finance Countywide Allocation F10001-General Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A694100-All Other Expenses	3,271,719	3,091,531	3,512,644	3,512,644	4,102,492	1,010,961
A667110-Certiorari Proceedings	66,632	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	0
A667400-Sales Tax to Other Govts	92,683,159	96,043,621	88,524,193	88,524,193	100,094,925	4,051,304
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	96,021,509	99,335,152	92,236,837	92,236,837	104,397,417	5,062,265
Total Appropriations	96,021,509	99,335,152	92,236,837	92,236,837	104,397,417	5,062,265
A590003-Other Real Prop Tax Items	9,238,546	10,121,914	9,825,920	9,825,920	9,642,544	(479,370)
A590005-Non Real Prop Tax Items	92,723,159	96,083,621	88,564,193	88,564,193	100,134,925	4,051,304
A590050-Interest and Earnings on Invest	1,190,729	667,855	439,240	439,240	92,361	(575,494)
Subtotal Direct Revenues	103,152,434	106,873,390	98,829,353	98,829,353	109,869,830	2,996,440
Total Revenues	103,152,434	106,873,390	98,829,353	98,829,353	109,869,830	2,996,440
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	(7,130,925)	(7,538,238)	(6,592,516)	(6,592,516)	(5,472,413)	2,065,825

- Finance Countywide Allocation (3-31)
- Line items for OCC chargebacks in All Other Expenses; Certiorari Proceedings; Sales Tax – portion shared with other municipalities; revenue side is other real property items including pilots and interest in penalties

Mr. Ryan said they are projecting an increase of \$10.5 million in real property tax countywide (3-28). Mrs. Venditti responded yes, and that is over 2020 adopted; a two year comparison. That includes the levy, prior collections, and deferred and uncollectable.

D39-Finance Department F10001-General Fund

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A641010 Total-Total Salaries	4,591,709	5,008,142	4,709,908	4,695,908	4,854,770	(153,372)
A641020-Overtime Wages	1,003	0	0	14,000	0	0
A641030-Other Employee Wages	55,440	85,300	50,000	50,000	50,000	(35,300)
A693000-Supplies & Materials	18,218	21,680	21,440	22,640	21,440	(240)
A694130-Maint, Utilities, Rents	17,142	22,440	23,490	23,490	23,490	1,050
A694080-Professional Services	187,029	239,400	246,300	248,500	333,700	94,300
A694100-All Other Expenses	39,641	51,255	51,961	59,471	51,961	706
A694010-Travel & Training	6,262	20,820	17,500	17,500	17,500	(3,320)
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	4,916,445	5,449,037	5,120,599	5,131,509	5,352,861	(96,176)
A691200-Employee Benefits-Interdepart	2,616,572	2,772,927	2,110,977	2,110,977	2,040,707	(732,220)
A694950-Interdepart Charges	1,561,686	1,473,609	1,325,343	1,325,343	1,682,745	209,136
Subtotal Interdepartl Appropriations	4,178,258	4,246,536	3,436,320	3,436,320	3,723,452	(523,084)
Total Appropriations	9,094,704	9,695,573	8,556,919	8,567,829	9,076,313	(619,260)
A590005-Non Real Prop Tax Items	114,869	114,869	0	0	114,869	0
A590030-County Svc Rev - Gen Govt Suppt	449,673	469,048	469,048	469,048	469,048	0
A590040-Svcs Other Govts - Genl Govt Suppt	517,111	532,509	509,165	509,165	593,464	60,955
A590050-Interest and Earnings on Invest	340,643	343,883	265,506	265,506	282,847	(61,036)
A590051-Rental Income	107	100	100	100	100	0
A590056-Sales of Prop and Comp for Loss	417,701	653,536	513,536	513,536	513,536	(140,000)
A590057-Other Misc Revenues	74,044	78,250	78,250	78,250	78,250	0
Subtotal Direct Revenues	1,914,147	2,192,195	1,835,605	1,835,605	2,052,114	(140,081)

A590060-Interdepart Revenue	6,147,578	6,344,439	5,268,627	5,268,627	5,510,975	(833,464)
Subtotal Interdepartl Revenues	6,147,578	6,344,439	5,268,627	5,268,627	5,510,975	(833,464)
Total Revenues	8,061,725	8,536,634	7,104,232	7,104,232	7,563,089	(973,545)
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	1,032,979	1,158,939	1,452,687	1,463,597	1,513,224	354,285

- Finance Department (3-54): started with baseline approach; incorporating cost escalators for wages and contracts
- Increase in Professional Services line - bring on more users for eTax software, licensing fees goes up

Mr. Morgan added that there is a new tax delinquent software called eTax, and Mr. Weber and his team did a great job on this. Most towns, villages, and school districts are using this, and as more come on, the county will pay for the licensing for the towns and school districts. Benefit the towns are receiving, and it will set the stage for tax collection to be centralized some time down the road.

D58-Insurance F55040-Insurance Division

Account Code - Description	2019 Actual	2020 Adopted	2021 Adopted	2021 Modified	2022 Executive	2022 Exe vs 2020 Adpt
A691250-Employee Benefits	75,043,653	87,355,715	77,179,564	77,179,564	75,894,427	(11,461,288)
A693000-Supplies & Materials	1,433	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0
A694130-Maint, Utilities, Rents	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	0
A694080-Professional Services	2,366,401	2,817,456	2,651,908	2,651,908	2,611,556	(205,900)
A694100-All Other Expenses	9,693	9,200	9,200	9,200	9,200	0
A694010-Travel & Training	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0
A694060-Insurance Policies	1,108,711	1,236,450	1,601,394	1,601,394	1,700,000	463,550
A666910-Self Insured Property Losses	72,537	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	0
A667100-Judgments And Claims	(523,703)	225,000	225,000	225,000	225,000	0
Subtotal Direct Appropriations	78,078,727	91,684,821	81,708,066	81,708,066	80,481,183	(11,203,638)
A694950-Interdepart Charges	1,113,953	1,579,399	1,404,017	1,404,017	1,320,700	(258,699)
Subtotal Interdepartl Appropriations	1,113,953	1,579,399	1,404,017	1,404,017	1,320,700	(258,699)
Total Appropriations	79,192,680	93,264,220	83,112,083	83,112,083	81,801,883	(11,462,337)
A590030-County Svc Rev - Gen Govt Suppt	20,858,641	20,481,507	19,830,394	19,830,394	17,045,853	(3,435,654)
A590050-Interest and Earnings on Invest	100,374	98,364	119,135	119,135	20,374	(77,990)
A590057-Other Misc Revenues	638,527	233,658	0	0	0	(233,658)
A590083-Appropriated Fund Balance	0	3,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	10,431,779	7,431,779
Subtotal Direct Revenues	21,597,542	23,813,529	34,949,529	34,949,529	27,498,006	3,684,477
A590060-Interdepart Revenue	70,350,756	69,450,691	48,162,554	48,162,554	54,303,877	(15,146,814)
Subtotal Interdepartl Revenues	70,350,756	69,450,691	48,162,554	48,162,554	54,303,877	(15,146,814)
Total Revenues	91,948,298	93,264,220	83,112,083	83,112,083	81,801,883	(11,462,337)
Local (Appropriations - Revenues)	(12,755,618)	0	0	0	0	0

- Insurance Division (3-67)
- Benefits page - breakdown of \$75 mil; includes workers compensation costs, unemployment insurance, dental insurance, health insurance, and disability
- Change from 2021 to 2022 is on the Health Insurance side - factoring in over 6% growth for claims; offsetting the increase with \$10 mil in fund balance

Mr. Morgan:

- Approach comparing next year to 2020 - justification was to look at most recent year that was not in the pandemic
- 2020 actuals and 2021 budget not clear or appropriate to look at proposed spending plan
- Expenses just over \$31 mil more than 2020; when take out \$45 mil in there related to one time initiatives, everything else are \$14 mil less than spending plan in 2020 was

- Not sure how many organizations and companies have ability to operate that way; mindful of need to reinforce certain aspects of operations; have ability to do it; best seen in longer term projects
- 271 positions – 38 in WEP, rest in General Fund; activity for each
- Additional expense of \$31 mil is next year proposed general fund expenditures over 2020; hold constant the one time initiatives, it is actually \$14 mil below 2020 budget

Mr. Rowley asked if \$13 million for the sports complex was out of this year's budget, and the balance is out of the 2022 budget. Mr. Morgan replied no. The sports complex is funded by ARPA funds, and the \$44 million is in the 2022 proposed budget. It is in the Finance grants page (3-55). Mr. Rowley asked if it is ARPA funds, and Mr. Morgan said yes, and it includes \$25 million for the sports complex, \$15 million for broadband, etc.

Mr. Morgan responded to Mr. Rowley that when the administration appropriated the first funds, they spread it out on a percentage basis. If they were to initiate any of those projects, they could; but hardly any money has been spent. Mr. Rowley is interested in knowing the list of projects being covered in the 2021 budget for ARPA, as well as in the 2022 budget for ARPA. Mr. Morgan responded that they can do that. The ~\$44 million has a breakdown on page 18, and it ties to the number:

- \$25 million for sports complex
- \$15 million for broadband
- \$1 million for Veterans program and balance in Neighborhood Initiatives (both administered out of Community Development) – expect write up from Mr. Skahen on those projects

Mr. Ryan said the \$44,726,082 is for next year and that is a second installment, and Mr. Morgan agreed. Mr. Morgan responded that the funds for 2022 are proposed and listed. Mr. Ryan asked if the county received \$44,726,082 a couple months ago, and Mr. Morgan said yes. Mr. Ryan asked where the money went, and if they have a list. Mr. Morgan responded yes. The second tranche of funds is detailed in the budget book. Mr. Morgan said they can provide a listing of projects by dollar amount. **Mr. Ryan requested a reporting on the first \$44,726,082 that would include when the county received it, what has been appropriated, and what has it been spent to date.**

Mr. Morgan replied to Mr. McBride that the second tranche will be coming within a year of the first. He expects it in late spring/early summer next year (\$44.7 mil).

Chairman Burtis responded to Mr. Kinne that the budget vote is scheduled for Tuesday, October 26th at 1 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



JAMIE McNAMARA, Clerk
Onondaga County Legislature

ATTENDANCE

COMMITTEE: **WAYS & MEANS REVIEW OF THE 2022
TENTATIVE BUDGET – CIP**

DATE: **OCTOBER 7, 2021**

NAME (Please Print)	DEPARTMENT/AGENCY
Bill Bleale	OCSO
SHANNON HANCOCK	WGP
DAVE SNYDER	WGP
Br Kelly	PAIS
LISA DELL	County Clerk
Jackie Norfolk	" "
Eliz Duvett	" "
DAVID BAKER	CMY CPDS
Tenisha Murphy	CE OFFICE
Carl Hammel	Personnel
Yvette Velasco	Law
CAREN JOHNSON	OCPD
Beeby McGuire	OCPD
MARY ROSS	DOT
Jed Foy	Parks / ZON
Mary Beth Prino	CE
Mal Sauter	OCPD
Isabelle HARRIS	CE
Tina Kenic	SUNY
Kevin Spraker	911
Sean Sparks	911
Julie Coad	911
Jennifer Fricano	Fin Ops
Sue Stanczyk	CE
Mark Cantu	OCPD