

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: SOCIAL SERVICES - INCLUDING COUNTRYSIDE ADULT HOME & YOUTH PROGRAMS

DATE: APRIL 23, 2010

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS PITKIN
KENNY
BENTLEY
STRAINER
LOEB
MCDEVITT

OTHERS PRESENT:

REPRESENTING THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES:
SHEILA WEAVER, COMMISSIONER
SHAWN MILESKI, CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
REPRESENTING COUNTRYSIDE ADULT HOME:
DEANNA PARK, INTERIM DIRECTOR
FREDERICK MONROE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY/COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE
& FISCAL SERVICES
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
KEVIN GERAGHTY, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS MCCOY
SOKOL
STEC
TAYLOR
THOMAS
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
THOM RANDALL, *THE ADIRONDACK JOURNAL*
AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR MERLINO

Mr. Pitkin called the meeting of the Social Services Committee to order at 11:00 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. McDevitt, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the March 26, 2010 Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Sheila Weaver, Commissioner of the Department of Social Services (DSS), who distributed copies of the DSS agenda to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda is also on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the agenda review with Item 1, Ms. Weaver presented the Overtime Report which was included in the agenda packet. She noted that the Report had been revised to include the number of Child Protective Services (CPS) reports as their increase was directly related to the increase in overtime use; she added that in comparing the number of CPS reports received in 2009 and 2010, she had found there was an increase of 8 reports for the month of February 2010 and almost 50 for the month of March 2010.

Mr. Pitkin pointed out there was a new contract in place which would help to limit the overtime costs incurred and Ms. Weaver agreed, expounding that the newly acquired contract with Berkshire Farms for preventive services would reduce the number of intensive aftercare cases the CPS staff was responsible for. She stated there were 11 such cases currently being reviewed and she hoped their transfer to Berkshire Farms would alleviate some of the CPS staff workload and reduce overtime costs.

Moving on to Agenda Item 2, Budget Status Report, Ms. Weaver advised the agenda included reports for all of 2009, as well as for January 1, 2010 through April 16, 2010. She said she was pleased to announce that they had received 115% of projected revenues for 2009 and had realized only 96% of the anticipated expenses, leading to an

overall savings of 19%. When questioned as to what impact the savings would have on the County Budget, Ms. Weaver apprised that this represented a \$3.7 million difference. However, she noted, some of the offset was attributed to Federal Stimulus funds received through the Medicaid program, which lowered the amount paid weekly in Local Share, as well as through the Food Stamp and HEAP (Heat and Energy Assistant Program) Programs. Ms. Weaver cautioned the Committee that they could not count on similar budget savings for 2010 as the same Stimulus funds would not be available. Mr. Geraghty questioned whether the \$3.7 million savings would be transferred to the General Fund and Ms. Weaver replied affirmatively. Mr. Pitkin noted that he had recently spoken with Frank O'Keefe, County Treasurer, who indicated that the \$3.7 million savings had not been accounted for in the Fund Balance figures previously reported and would serve to further increase the Fund total. Mr. Geraghty questioned whether Stimulus funding was expected for 2010 and Ms. Weaver replied affirmatively, but noted that the level of anticipated funding was not the same for 2010 as what was received for 2009.

Referring to the Budget Reports for 2010, Ms. Weaver advised that overall expenditures were at 22% and revenues at 3%. She said they had expected low revenue figures for the start of 2010, but anticipated increases throughout the remainder of the year.

Ms. Weaver addressed Agenda Item 3, apprising that one of the initiatives she had assigned to Suzanne Wheeler, Deputy Commissioner of the DSS, was to work in conjunction with the County Attorney's Office to get the Department's Non-Reimbursable Services Expenditure Report under control. She noted the Report was directly related to Court orders and placement of children in Foster Care. Ms. Weaver said that the report reflected expenditures of \$236,000 for January 1, 2008 through January 31, 2010, with the month of January 2010 alone totaling \$57,771. Ms. Weaver announced that through Ms. Wheeler's cooperation with the County Attorney's Office the monthly total had been reduced to an average of \$32,396 per month which was a savings of \$25,000 monthly. When questioned as to whether housing the DSS Attorney staff in the County Attorney's Office had helped to achieve these savings, Ms. Weaver replied affirmatively, noting that the Court orders were being received in a much more timely fashion, although they did have some that were still being received late. She added that there were now more attorneys available to address Court cases and file petitions and she noted that Paul Dusek, County Attorney/Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, was very responsive if there were any unresolved issues to be addressed.

Continuing to Agenda Item 4, Ms. Weaver announced that April was Child Abuse Awareness Month and she introduced Shawn Mileski, a member of the CPS staff, who had recently received an award at the Crime Victim's Breakfast for her exceptional work with the Child Advocacy Center. She noted that when presented with her award, Ms. Mileski had been commended for her ability to work with people as though she was a seasoned staff member of more than ten years experience, rather than only three. Ms. Weaver said Ms. Mileski was a valuable asset to the DSS and certainly deserving of the award she had received. A round of applause was held in recognition and appreciation for Ms. Mileski's efforts.

Ms. Weaver presented Agenda Item 5 which pertained to an update on the CPA (Certified Public Accountant) contract secured to review self-employed Medicaid cases. She said from April of 2009 through March of 2010 the CPA firm had reviewed 24 cases, 19 of which were closed or denied leaving only four to be approved for Medicaid benefits. Ms. Weaver noted that the CPA contract was cost effective for the County as the associated cost was \$10,575 annually, equating to an average cost of \$440 per case which was less than the monthly premium for one person on the Family Health Plus health care plan associated with approved Medicare benefits.

Moving on to Agenda Item 6, Ms. Weaver presented a request to fill a Caseworker position on a temporary basis for a four-month period to fill in for a maternity leave in the Preventive Care Division. She noted that this was a

mandated position which received 75% State reimbursement.

Motion was made by Mr. Strainer and seconded by Mr. Kenny to approve the request to fill vacant a position.

Mr. Bentley questioned whether there was anyone available to fill the position who was already trained to provide the associated work and Ms. Weaver replied that she had contacted a former employee who had retired from the same Division who was considering filling the position on a temporary basis. Mr. Strainer asked if the temporary work would affect the retirement benefits of the person in question and Ms. Weaver responded that she did not believe they would be affected, but said she would be sure to research this issue before finalizing the request.

Mr. Pitkin called the question and the aforementioned motion was carried unanimously to approve the request and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *A copy of the Notice of Intent to Fill Vacant Position form is on file with the minutes.*

Agenda Item 7, Ms. Weaver announced, included two travel requests, which she outlined as follows:

1. Elizabeth DeVit to attend the 19th Annual NY State Third Age Providers Conference being held at the Holiday Inn in Saratoga Springs, NY on May 20 - 21, 2010; and
2. Katherine Lambert to attend the 2010 NY State Police Sex Offense Seminar being held at the NY State Police Academy in Albany, NY on May 24 - 28, 2010.

Ms. Weaver noted that funds appropriate to cover all of the related travel costs were available within the existing Budget.

Motion was made by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to approve both travel requests as outlined above. *Copies of the Authorization to Attend Meeting or Convention forms are on file with the minutes.*

Concluding the review with Item 8, Ms. Weaver presented the 2009 Annual Report, a copy of which is on file with the minutes. She noted that the Report included a section on Countryside Adult Home and reflected increases in the Food Stamp, Medicaid and CPS programs. Ms. Weaver said the Report was easy to read and informative and she encouraged each of the Committee members to review it at their convenience and contact her with any questions they might have.

Mr. Pitkin reminded the Committee that in prior meetings they had discussed issues with housing sex offenders in local motels. In an effort to determine a solution for this problem, he said he and Mr. Taylor had considered the possibility of moving the remaining WIC (Women, Infants & Children) staff occupying Annex Building #11 to the Human Services Building and subsequently renovating the structure to allow for the housing of sex offenders. Mr. Pitkin further noted that the excess capacity at Countryside Adult Home might allow for housing those homeless women and families that should not be located with sex offenders. He stated Annex Building #11 was connected to the co-generation facility, which would save utility costs, and was located in close proximity to the Sheriff's Office, which would assist with monitoring issues; he added that the building was not located near a school or other such facilities which would interfere with probationary restrictions. Mr. Pitkin advised that the savings attained by refraining from seeking public lodging would allow sufficient funds to hire a staff member to monitor the facility and those housed within.

Mr. Geraghty questioned whether the County was mandated to fund housing for sex offenders and Ms. Weaver replied affirmatively, advising that this provision was included in the constitution for the State of New York. She added that the County received 50% State reimbursement for these expenses.

Mr. Stec stated that although he was in favor of using a County-owned and operated facility to house sex offenders to alleviate costs and issues arising from housing them in public facilities, he did not feel that the solution presented by Mr. Pitkin was feasible as there was a major Town of Queensbury park and swimming facility located near Annex Building #11. Mr. Bentley added that the County's detention home was located next door to Annex Building #11 and would make the proposed use impossible as youths were housed in the facility.

Mr. Kenny said he felt the housing issues were going to become increasingly difficult as more towns were adopting laws intended to limit the number of sex offenders that could be housed in lodging facilities by charging considerable permitting fees and instituting rating provisions and limitations. He noted that such laws had already been adopted in the Towns of Lake George, Lake Luzerne and Queensbury which made sex offender housing more difficult as the majority of Warren County's lodging facilities were located in these areas. Mr. Kenny stated he was in favor of using a County-owned property to house the homeless sex offenders and he suggested the retention of a property acquired for delinquent taxes to suit this purpose.

Chairman Monroe questioned the costs associated with housing sex offenders and Ms. Weaver apprised that the current cost was \$400 per week, but noted that they intended to begin housing sex offenders in tandem, which would reduce the costs by half. Chairman Monroe responded that a considerable amount of money could be saved by housing the sex offenders, as well as other homeless residents receiving such benefits, in separate County-owned facilities. Mr. Thomas questioned whether they would continue to receive the same levels of State reimbursement if County-owned facilities were used to house sex offenders, rather than public lodgings and Ms. Weaver replied that she felt they would. Mr. Stec noted in light of the prospective savings, they should not limit themselves to choosing a location from the foreclosed properties list, but should also review any other appropriate options available through the real estate market.

Mr. Sokol questioned if the old jail space could be renovated to provide temporary lodging space for sex offenders and Mr. Kenny replied that this had been considered in the past at which time it was determined to be cost prohibitive due to the removal of hazardous materials and the cell bars.

Subsequent to further discussion on the matter, it was determined that the issue should be referred to Mr. Dusek to determine the options available for housing sex offenders in a County-owned and operated facility, as well as the possibility of renovating Annex Building #11 to house homeless women and families apart from sex offenders.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Deanna Park, Interim Director of Countryside Adult Home, who distributed copies of the agenda to the Committee. *A copy of the agenda is also on file with the minutes.*

Beginning with Agenda Item 1, Ms. Park apprised that the current resident population at the Countryside Adult Home was 41 persons, comprised of 28 women and 13 men with an average age of 74.2. She said 10 referrals had been received for the month of April; however, she noted, two were not appropriate for the level of care available and three others were from other Counties and agreements could not be reached to appropriately fund their care. Ms. Park stated that one of the referrals had been admitted that week and three others would be evaluated for placement during the following week, while the final referral was now on a waiting list. She noted that there had been one admission and two discharges for the month of April.

Ms. Park announced that Agenda Item 2 consisted of a request for permission to fill an Institutional Aide position, which would function as a per diem floater, due to resignation. She advised that the position included a salary of \$23,390 and received 50% State reimbursement. Ms. Park explained that there were currently three Cooks on staff

at Countryside, one of which would be out of work on medical leave in the near future and overtime costs would be incurred to cover the shifts of that employee. Ms. Park stated that she would like to use the floater position to fill the Cook duties, as well as to compensate for other unfilled positions of similar grade as necessary.

Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, questioned whether all of the duties performed by the floater position were of the same grade and Ms. Park replied that she was unsure. Mrs. Sady advised that it would not be possible to incorporate such a position if the associated grades were not the same because differing rates of pay would be used depending on the duty performed; furthermore, she noted that they could not hire someone for an Institutional Aide position and direct them to work as a Cook. Ms. Weaver asked if a Personnel Form 426 could be supplied to change the salary of the employee each time the job responsibilities changed and Mrs. Sady replied that it was possible, but might be required on a daily basis depending on where the employee was needed. Ms. Park interjected that she would be willing to complete the necessary paperwork daily if required.

Mr. Pitkin suggested that the issue be tabled pending further information as to the ability to implement a floater position, pending further information from the Civil Service Department. He then asked how soon the position was needed and Ms. Park replied that they were already incurring overtime costs due to vacancies and wanted to fill the floater position as quickly as possible. Mrs. Sady advised that regardless of when the position was needed, it could not be filled until the approval of both the Personnel Committee and Board of Supervisors was received, which would not happen until after the May 21st Board meeting. She noted that if the Committee approved the request, they would have time to contact the Civil Service and Human Resources Departments to determine whether the request for a floater position was feasible.

Subsequent to a brief discussion, motion was made by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Loeb and carried unanimously to approve the request to fill the Institutional Aide position with a base salary of \$23,390 and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *A copy of the Notice of Intent to Fill Vacant Position form is on file with the minutes. (Note: Subsequent to the meeting it was determined by Todd Lunt, Human Resources Director, that the duties associated with the position would be of the same pay grade.)*

Ms. Park announced that Agenda Item 3 included a request for permission to apply for an NYSDOT (New York State Department of Transportation) Section 5310 grant in the amount of \$56,800 to purchase a 10-passenger vehicle that would be used to transport Countryside residents. She noted that the grant would require a 20% Local Share and that the grant application had a deadline of May 4, 2010. In response to a question posed by Mr. Kenny, Ms. Park advised that four vehicles were currently being used by Countryside, one of which was a 1995 9-passenger van that had become undependable and required a significant amount of time to warm up before it could be driven. She noted that they preferred to retain the 1995 van and use it incidentally as it was a large capacity vehicle which would be used for five to six events per year when transporting large numbers of residents to events in order to lessen the number vehicles used for each.

Mr. Pitkin questioned if there was a way to receive 100% grant funding for the purchase of the new van and Ms. Weaver replied affirmatively, noting that if the vehicle was used for medical transportation they could obtain the 20% Local Share through Medicaid reimbursements.

Mr. Strainer asked if there were other similar vehicles within the existing County fleet that could be used when transporting large groups of residents and Ms. Park said she was unsure whether these vehicles would be available for their use. Mr. Kenny said that whether they chose to retain or sell the 1995 van, they should have the mechanical issues diagnosed and repaired. Meanwhile, Mr. Bentley opined that if a new van could be purchased

using 100% grant funding, he felt they should proceed with the grant application.

Motion was made by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Strainer and carried unanimously to approve the request to apply for grant funding as outlined above and the necessary resolution was authorized for the May 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Continuing to Agenda Item 4, Ms. Park presented a request for approval to apply for ENABLE (Enhancing Abilities and Life Expectancy) grant funding in the amount of \$130,500 through the New York State Department of Health Office of Long Term Care. She noted that this was a two-year grant which would require no Local Share contribution and that grant application and approval were required to receive funds. Ms. Park said one facility per County would be approved for funding and that the application deadline was May 4, 2010. She advised that if received, the grant funds would be used to reintroduce the Activities Director position and fund 50% of the associated salary, with the other 50% being funded by State or Federal grant monies. In addition, Ms. Park stated that the grant funds would be used to purchase activity supplies, as well as to update the furnishings in the residents' rooms to introduce items such as televisions and privacy curtains.

Mr. Strainer pointed that the ENABLE grant had a two-year limit and he questioned whether the Activities Director position would be reintroduced based on the provision that it would be eliminated when the grant funding ceased and Ms. Park replied affirmatively. Mr. Strainer then questioned the total of the grant funds expected and Ms. Park explained that there was a total of \$4 million available, of which each facility could obtain a maximum of \$300,000, although the granting agency preferred that each applicant request as little as possible.

Following further discussion, motion was made by Mr. McDevitt, seconded by Mr. Kenny and carried unanimously to approve the request to apply for grant funding as outlined above and the necessary resolution was authorized for the May 21st Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Ms. Park apprised that Agenda Item 5 consisted of a request for authorization to pursue a Social Adult Day Care Waiver from the State. She explained they were considering the implementation of a Social Model Day Care Program for six individuals which would lead to an estimated gross revenue of \$52,620, not including transportation costs, after creating one full-time position with benefits and changing the hours of another existing staff person.

When questioned on the logistics of the positions involved, Ms. Weaver apprised that the hours of the existing position would be altered, leading to a \$6,000 salary increase, and the Aide position being created would include a salary of \$23,000. She noted that they were able to charge a fee of \$45 per person per day for the Day Care Program which would generate estimated revenues of \$92,600, based on six program participants, and this figure would be further increased if transportation services were provided. Ms. Weaver explained the gross revenue figure of \$52,620 was the result achieved when decreasing the estimated revenue figure by the associated salary costs. Mr. Kenny pointed out that because the position to be created included benefits, the gross revenue amount should be adjusted to account for this additional expense.

Mr. Strainer asked if there was a demand for adult day care services and Ms. Park replied affirmatively, advising that they had received several inquiries. Mr. Strainer noted that although he was not opposed to introducing this position, he was wary of the image that would be created for the County if new positions were introduced when the County had recently instituted job eliminations in order to reduce the 2010 Budget. Ms. Park responded that this would be a revenue generating position which would benefit the County.

Mr. Kenny pointed out that the estimated revenues were based on a certain number of program participants and he noted that decreased participation figures would lessen the amount of revenue received, possibly leading to increased expenses for the County. Ms. Weaver advised it might be appropriate to seek the Waiver from the State and institute a per diem position, rather than a full-time, which would be used only when full program capacity was reached, utilizing the current staff to cover necessary shifts in times with lower participant levels. Mr. Pitkin said he would prefer the use of per diem positions and Mr. Kenny advised that before a decision could be made, the County Attorney's Office should be consulted.

Subsequent to further discussion on the matter, it was the consensus of the Committee that the issue would be tabled for further discussion pending the receipt of factual information relative to the demand for adult day care services.

Paul Dusek, County Attorney/Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, entered the meeting at 11:52 a.m.

Concluding the agenda review with Item 6, Ms. Park apprised that they would be pursuing benefits for eligible residents who were either Veterans or spouses of Veterans. She noted the average monthly pension received for a Veteran was \$1,600, while a Veterans' spouse would receive \$1,000. Ms. Park advised that there were 20 eligible Countryside residents, which would bring additional revenues of approximately \$300,000 per year by seeking out reimbursements the residents were entitled to.

Ms. Weaver noted that herself and Messrs. Dusek, Geraghty and Pitkin would be traveling to the adult home operated by Chenango County on May 19th in order to review the practices used which allowed them to operate the entire facility at a cost of \$248,000 annually, as opposed to the \$500,000 cost incurred to Warren County through the operation of the Countryside Adult Home. Additionally, she noted that Chenango County housed their homeless residents within the adult home and she desired to review the practices employed in this process, as well.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Margaret Sing Smith, Director of Youth Programs, who distributed copies of the agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the agenda is also on file with the minutes.* Proceeding with a review of Agenda Item 1, Mrs. Smith apprised that there were grant funds in the amount of \$13,063 remaining within the Youth Development Delinquency/Prevention Program budget that had not been allocated to a specific program. She said that in light of the loss of STOP-DWI funding in the amount of \$20,000, she was presenting a request to transfer all remaining funds to the Youth Court program, contingent upon the contractor's efforts to reduce expenses while maintaining the core elements of the program. Mrs. Smith noted that matching funds were required in connection with the grant funds which could be supported within the existing Youth Bureau budget.

Mr. Geraghty asked how the Youth Court program would continue to function in the future if all remaining surplus funds were expended and Ms. Weaver interjected that it seemed the program was fated to cease due to a lack of funding; however, she noted, these actions were being taken in an attempt to sustain the program for the remainder of 2010. Mrs. Smith added that there appeared to be sufficient funding to continue Youth Court operations for the first half of the year and they were seeking out alternate grant and funding opportunities for the remainder. Regardless of the efforts to raise funding to sustain the program, she advised there was a significant need to make budget modifications to reduce associated costs to a level commensurate with available resources.

Mr. Pitkin questioned whether the agency in charge of the Youth Court was willing to make budget reductions and Mrs. Smith replied that after meeting with the Executive Director of the Council for Prevention of Alcohol and Substance Abuse and expressing the desire for budget reductions, it was indicated that the Council sought to

continue Youth Court operations through the month of June with a budget reduced by only \$1,900 and were not interested in making further reductions. She said that if authorization was given to allow additional funds to the Youth Court Program as per her request, she would revisit the issue and a decision would have to be made as to whether the Council for Prevention was willing to further reduce the program budget or if a new administrator would be chosen.

In an effort to provide clarification, Mr. Dusek apprised that the annual operation cost for the Youth Court program was approximately \$88,000, which was essentially paid to the Council for Prevention for administration. He said that a portion of the operational costs were used to fund the salaries of the Council staff who worked in connection with the Youth Court program, as well as for small stipends used to offset other salaries, such as that of the Executive Director of the Council. Mr. Dusek noted that although the Youth Court had always been assessed as a County program, in his opinion it was actually a community program where the County, a not-for-profit agency and other contributors, such as the Town of Queensbury and the STOP-DWI program, had joined together to provide the funds necessary to maintain it.

Mr. Dusek said when they met with the Council for Prevention, which was the not-for-profit agency serving as administrator, to discuss the possibility of reducing the program budget, the Council had presented a proposal to reduce the \$88,000 budget by \$4,000 for the year. The problem with this, he said, was the deficit in program funding which was caused by the loss of \$20,000 in STOP-DWI funds and the anticipated loss of TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families) funds received through the DSS which was in the neighborhood of an additional \$20,000; therefore, he noted, they needed to recover approximately \$40,000 in funding to keep the program in operation. Mr. Dusek advised that they had once again approached the Council to ask whether they were willing to either reduce the operating budget further or, as a not-for-profit agency, seek additional program funding; he added that this was a fair request as not-for-profit agencies existed to provide public service. He said the Executive Director had advised that the Council received limited revenues, some of which included restrictive rules for use that governed the ways that those revenues could be spent and included mandates that some of the operational costs be charged against the Youth Program funding.

In order to solve these issues, Mr. Dusek advised they had decided to seek out other organizations able to administer the Youth Court program that might have the ability to access funding sources the Council for Prevention could not and they were currently involved in this process. He clarified that a decision had not been made to remove the Youth Court program from the Council's administration and they continued to confer with the Council to allow them the opportunity to determine alternate options to increase funding or reduce expenditures; however, he added, they were now researching alternate administration options, as well. Mr. Dusek said the prevalent opinion was that the program should be continued and their mission was to find the best way to do so. He expressed optimism that there were alternate avenues to explore and he hoped to provide more definitive cost and operation information at the upcoming May Board meeting. Mr. Dusek apprised there were a number of people involved in the efforts to maintain the Youth Court program, including himself, Mrs. Smith and Kate Hogan, District Attorney, who had submitted requests to the Warren County Bar Association to assist with the matter.

Discussion ensued respective to the purpose and benefits of the Youth Court program.

Motion was made by Mr. Strainer, seconded by Mr. McDevitt and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend the 2010 Resource Allocation Plan authorized by Resolution No. 304 of 2010 to allocate reserve funds in the amount of \$13,063 to the Warren County Youth Court, as well as to approve a request to amend the existing grant with the Council for Prevention of Alcohol and Substance Abuse to increase funding by \$13,063, both

contingent upon the agreement of the Council for Prevention of Alcohol and Substance Abuse to decrease the Youth Court Program, and the necessary resolutions were approved for the May 21st Board meeting. *Copies of both requests are on file with the minutes. (Note: Subsequent to the meeting it was determined that an amendment to the existing Budget in the amount of \$11,000 would be necessary in relation to this matter. The request to amend the County Budget will be presented at the May 12th Finance Committee meeting.)*

Moving on to Agenda Item 2, Mrs. Smith apprised that the Warren County Youth Court was identified as one of the eight programs in the State recognized by the NY State Bar Foundation and included in their "Recommended Practices for Youth Courts" document which was recently released. She said they were recognized based on the practices developed and employed by the Youth Court and it was an honor to be recognized and included.

Mrs. Smith concluded the agenda review with Item 3 which referred to the 2009 Annual Report, copies of which were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy is also on file with the minutes.* She noted that the Report included statistical data based on the number of youths that participated in programs funded by the Youth Bureau during 2009. Mrs. Smith asked the Committee members to review the Report at their convenience and contact her with any questions they might have. She pointed out that the amounts of funding reflected were matched and exceeded by towns, municipalities and not-for-profit agencies to sustain their programs.

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, on motion made by Mr. McDevitt and seconded by Mr. Loeb, Mr. Pitkin adjourned the meeting at 12:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist