

CHILI TOWN BOARD  
October 30, 2009

A meeting of the Chili Town Board was held on October 30, 2009 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:00 p.m. The October 21, 2009 meeting was resumed by Supervisor David Dunning.

PRESENT: Councilwoman DiFlorio; Councilwoman Ignatowski, Councilman Slattery, Councilwoman Sperr and Supervisor David Dunning.

ALSO PRESENT: Richard Brongo, Town Clerk; Jordon Brown, Deputy Town Supervisor; Dawn Forte, Supervisor's Secretary; Sandra Hewlett, Stenographer; Dianne O'Meara, Director of Finance.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I would like to resume the meeting of October 21st, 2009. Would everyone rise?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Quick question. We're doing the Pledge. Why didn't we do a prayer?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Sorry. I figured we would move through this a little bit. I thought the Pledge was a little bit of a formality for a brief meeting, but...

The Pledge of Allegiance was cited. The fire safety exits were identified for those present.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: This is a continued from the October 21st meeting.

---

TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Supervisor, I apologize. I thought I was taking notes during our workshop session, but I -- account 1410.4, which is Dick (Brongo)'s budget, I thought we were removing \$3,000. I have a note here that says -- I am just not remembering it.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: This isn't something --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Office supplies, I believe, vouchers, because based on previous year's actual amount spent, it was budgeted for 4500. I have a note here that says, "reduce by 3,000." I don't know if it was my own note to myself or what we decided at the workshop.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I thought we were set for vouchers. I don't recall adding any additional funds to that account. I didn't --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It was Dick (Brongo)'s comment that his cost have come down.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The comments that were made at the workshop were exactly along with the new vendor for the vouchers and the vouchers are costing us less money.

RICHARD BRONGO: Actually, we're putting in an order this week with Dawn (Forte) for getting vouchers because we're down to one box again. We may want to increase the size of that order because we're going through them quite quickly.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That is still this year, not 2010.

RICHARD BRONGO: But I may not need much in next year's budget for vouchers.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I have in my pen color -- my color is based on the notes I was taking during the workshop session -- that we agreed we were going to reduce or at least discussing it, and I had in any mind we were going to reduce that particular line item by 3,000.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I have the same thing.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Let me see what I wrote.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We can revisit that before the -- before the prelim -- or before the budget goes to Public Hearing.

RICHARD BRONGO: Just as long as there is extra money in contingencies in case I run short I can borrow a couple hundred for something like that.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I was thinking we could amend that, amend the resolution to include A1410.4. Let's see here. So instead of the 1.9994, we would reduce it by 3,000.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: 9,824? Or by 1,000, so it would be 11 --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: His total would be 146,994. So it would be amending.

DIANNE O'MEARA: You use the contractual figure.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Contractual. It would be amending it to 146,994.

DIANNE O'MEARA: No. That is not contractual. That is the total of the personnel, equipment.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. So the 12,824 would be -- so it would be 8 --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Did we miss that one?  
DIANNE O'MEARA: I didn't have in it in my notes.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I didn't have it written down.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I didn't write it down either.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: You're only taking 1500 off, not 3,000.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: What is your proposal to make it to?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I had reduce by 3,000.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I have it written to make it 3,000. I don't know. I don't know which is right.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Oh, boy. I'm trying to remember what our conversation was.  
Dick (Brongo), would it be okay to -- to reduce it by 3,000 or reduce it to 3,000?  
RICHARD BRONGO: I prefer you reduce it to 3,000.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Reduce to 3,000. I do have that now.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: So you would take 1,500 off. So it would be 11,324.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So the -- I mean, if I have this right, we would add number 16 which would be account A1410.4, be amended to \$3,000 from the 2010 tentative amount of -- go ahead.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Not amended by 3,000.  
RICHARD BRONGO: Amended to.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Amended to \$3,000.  
DIANNE O'MEARA: No.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Amended to 11,324.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: From the 12,824.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So amend it -- give me the number again.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 11,324.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So you take 1,500 away from it?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Correct.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Now, I'm confused. You're saying take -- you want -- I don't have the book in front of me.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The budget is \$12,824. Supervisor's modified line.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So the line item -- but these are --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Dick (Brongo) is okay with taking 1,500 from the contractual --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So 2 from 12,824.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes. It was just the one that I had found that I thought wasn't captured.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Let me redo this. We're adding the amendment to be number 16, A1410.4 to 11,324 from the 2010 tentative amount of 12,824; is that correct?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Correct.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Correct.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm okay with that amendment.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Are there any other amendments? Are there any other amendments?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Let see if there is any other question. I just don't remember, and I apologize if this is something I did not write in my notes there, Number 5, um, I don't remember why this was being reduced.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Change of personnel. Because --  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: This was just because of what just recently occurred?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I had a feeling that might be it, but I just wanted to make sure.  
And the same thing again with Number 8, parks and equipment, because I don't remember the discussion surrounding why we're reducing that.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I thought --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Increasing.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Or increasing.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Baker Park sign is going in there. I can't remember the exact amount, about \$3,500.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is about the cost of the ones last time.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: And then -- I don't know. We just still need to have some discussion on the library. I was going to -- kind of taking a look at just keeping that at what you had proposed. Because they came in even less than what you proposed.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Because they're taking more out of their surplus. So they're moving dollars around but their total revenue is changing.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: What you have here reflects that modification that they had made of the surplus?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Uh-huh.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So in order to -- so we would have to add money in

order to be able to -- okay -- to restore it to the funding that they -- that you were originally proposing, minus what --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Uh-huh.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Because, Supervisor, your modification was to \$1,074,701; is that correct?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Correct.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Now it is going to \$1,049,085.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That's their proposal, yes. That wasn't --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Their bottom line is staying the same. It is just where they're getting the money from. They're going to just take more money out of surplus.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: They're taking less out of their surplus so they're short-changing themselves -- what was that difference again?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: 26,000 something.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I believe it was.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 34.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Was it 34?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Because the difference -- the 1,074,000 --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: It was like \$26,000.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: If you added that to the 149, you come up with the 174.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: \$25,616.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know this shifted it around, but they basically took it out of their materials.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Correct.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: They wanted to have some left inside their -- their surplus to give a cushion, which quite frankly the other budgets we have would have a little bit of -- inside there, as well. So they were looking to maintain a little bit of cushion, so they took it out of their materials, which I don't necessarily agree.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I would also like to -- and I believe that certainly this is still a preliminary budget. You have the opportunity to make modifications to this budget after the Public Hearing, after you hear that. It would be my position to hold it the way we are and to have that conversation after the Public Hearing.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I agree.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That would be -- probably be a very good strategy to take. I was just confused how that worked. This was just basically bringing in line what they came forward to us during the workshop session.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One question I would have to in regards to the Town Court, A1110, Supervisor, you eliminated everything under contractual? The final 2010?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: What?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: If you look at the new worksheet we were given, there is nothing there. It goes to zero.

DIANNE O'MEARA: What I did with those worksheets is only put --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm sorry. In the microphone. Just kidding.

DIANNE O'MEARA: I only put -- where you see in the final column, I put the changes that were reflected on here. So you can more accurately see where -- what areas were changed. So in that particular case, on the contractual, everything stays the same under the Supervisor -- for the Supervisor modified. It is just that the personnel area was changed.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is not reflective of the worksheet. The worksheet is showing that their total budget that -- in that account is 181,788. And under the Supervisor's modified, is 212,706. They're -- they're showing nothing at all under that final. So --

DIANNE O'MEARA: Right. Right. The only thing I modified was the personnel area.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But that -- but they're showing their actual budget, total for the account, is to be 181,788, which isn't the total for the account.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yeah.

DIANNE O'MEARA: No.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I understand what you're saying, but it is not -- but it is not reflected on these worksheets.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The worksheets only represent the change.

DIANNE O'MEARA: Correct.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: But the --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: This worksheet represents the budget for that department.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No. The worksheet -- the second worksheets that you got represent the changes that were made.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The work -- the original worksheets that were in place are still the original worksheets because nothing has changed from those until after this meeting. Tentatively after that meeting. So what you're seeing and what you were given is the actual changes from these --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Just because the formula --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Didn't carry the formula over the one column. But the Supervisor modified, if I am correct, is still accurate?

DIANNE O'MEARA: Right.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Um, once we vote on this, then this will be.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Not -- that worksheet is not. The worksheet is not a part -- that is for you, for your reference, so you could look at and see what was changed. That was -- that doesn't go into the total package. What goes in the package is the changes that you're seeing here, to the original tentative budget that is on file --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I understand that.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: With these changes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I understand that.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Those changes will then become -- if we vote on this tonight and pass this, those changes will become the preliminary budget and all those numbers will go back to the way you're normally used to seeing them.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But why do you confuse people with that? Why not carry all of that over and just make those changes at the top?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I guess we didn't see that as confusing.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Because now you're not showing that it -- here. You're removing it and you're reducing the total.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I think this was trying to highlight changes so you could see them.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: To make sure we understood what changes were captured.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is why you got -- that is why you can highlight cells. But with this, now you're just taking it completely away. It is not even visible. I understand that.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: This is a document that was being produced, also, for, you know, to be part of the budget.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No. For your review process. That was for you to review.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So you could review the changes.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: What the changes were and did they agree.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The changes that we did here, the changes we had discussed and everything. That is all it was for.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm okay.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That's all I have.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Um, in regards to the Fire Department budget, how did the meeting go last night?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Um, it was okay. I mean it was not a -- everything was friendly and amicable. We had good information come at us. They gave us a lot of information about what they're doing with their money and how things are being budgeted and the challenges they have moving forward and some of the losses that they have incurred in the reductions based on the ambulance, the ambulance costs and things.

They have lost some tenants that they normally get income from, so they have lost some of that revenue. I think all and all the meeting went pretty well. Didn't change the fact, and I think we made it pretty clear and they agree, the 19 percent increase they're looking at is a bit much. It's a bit hard to take.

They did emphasize that their -- it is one of these situations where certainly if they wanted to try and reduce some of that now, next year they will have to make up for it somewhere, because they are -- especially in their equipment. They do things very similar to the way we do them in the Town of Chili. We have our equipment reserve, our vehicle reserve, building reserve, things like that so we don't have to bond and borrow to pay for things. They're doing some of that, too. The amounts they're putting in there, we did ask that they reconsider those and make some reduction, but again, they emphasized that it is likely that if they did this year, next year they would have to come back with that and even more in order to sustain and maintain their vehicle and equipment replacement policies that they have in place.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Do they have a reserve fund they're putting money into?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Well, there is reserve funds they're putting money into. One of the challenges we have right now is an audit that was due to the Town of Chili several months ago has not been received. It will not be received until Monday or Tuesday of next week.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: An audit by who for who?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: An independent audit is required by law of the Fire Department, that they are to do on an annual basis. That audit is something that we're supposed to get a copy of. Our contractual agreements that we're looking at moving forward into the next year will include clauses and penalties for not receiving this information in the timely manner in which we're supposed to receive it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: They did explain why.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: They have some issues. They have lost their accountant. They have someone else doing their accounting that wasn't involved before and he has challenges coming up with -- working with the auditors that -- someone else who was more experienced and had more time with the Fire Department would have been able to get the information done more rapidly, but they -- but it's -- all in all, it wasn't a good position for us to be going into the meeting, not knowing that audit information. And knowing, again, the audit information we won't find out until next week, I think it is critical to us understanding the Fire Department's budget, what they have, and where money is and things like that, because we don't fully understand that today.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Certainly, we have the opportunity next week to review it and we'll have the Public Hearing. It is not that this is set in stone. We still have the opportunity to make modifications.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Correct.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: If warranted.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: For a budget that is over a million dollars and for a 4 1/2 percent increase that they're looking at --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 19 percent increase.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, from looking at this figure here, the 1,167,350.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 19 over last year's.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: They were very distressed to have to be asking for a 19 percent increase. We asked quite a few questions of them. Had very candid responses, so.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I'm all set.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any other questions?

**RESOLUTION #336 RE: Modifications to 2010 Tentative Budget**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Sperr      SECONDED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the following modifications be made to the 2010 Tentative Budget:

1. A110.1 (Court-Personnel) be amended to \$181,788 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$181,998; and
2. A1220.4 (Supervisor-Contractual) be amended to \$1,750 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$1,900; and
3. A1355.1 (Assessor-Personnel) be amended to \$175,079 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$168,927; and
4. A1440.4 (Town Engineer-Contractual) be amended to \$60,500 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$61,200; and
5. A3620.1 (Building Department-Personnel) be amended to \$242,508 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$247,702; and
6. A3620.4 (Building Department-Contractual) be amended to \$6,700 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$6,100; and
7. A6772.4 (Programs for the Aging-Contractual) be amended to \$52,565 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$48,755; and
8. A7110.2 (Parks-Equipment) be amended to \$51,900 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$48,400; and
9. A7310.1 (Youth-Personnel) be amended to \$47,458 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$45,858; and
10. A7310.4 (Youth-Contractual) be amended to \$51,900 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$48,400; and
11. Amend Library appropriations to \$1,049,085 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$1,074,701; and
12. Amend Library appropriated fund balance to \$34,384 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$60,000; and
13. SF-104-3410.4 (Chili Fire Department contract) be amended to \$1,167,350 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$0; and
14. SF-104-9040.8 (Workers Compensation Chili Fire Department) be amended to \$129,000 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$0; and
15. SF-104-9025.9 (Chili Fire Department LOSAP) be amended to \$140,000 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$0.

**Amendment:**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Sperr  
DiFlorio**

**SECONDED BY: Councilwoman**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the following modifications be made to the 2010 Tentative Budget:

1. A110.1 (Court-Personnel) be amended to \$181,788 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$181,998; and
2. A1220.4 (Supervisor-Contractual) be amended to \$1,750 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$1,900; and
3. A1355.1 (Assessor-Personnel) be amended to \$175,079 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$168,927; and
4. A1440.4 (Town Engineer-Contractual) be amended to \$60,500 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$61,200; and
5. A3620.1 (Building Department-Personnel) be amended to \$242,508 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$247,702; and
6. A3620.4 (Building Department-Contractual) be amended to \$6,700 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$6,100; and
7. A6772.4 (Programs for the Aging-Contractual) be amended to \$52,565 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$48,755; and
8. A7110.2 (Parks-Equipment) be amended to \$51,900 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$48,400; and
9. A7310.1 (Youth-Personnel) be amended to \$47,458 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$45,858; and
10. A7310.4 (Youth-Contractual) be amended to \$51,900 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$48,400; and
11. Amend Library appropriations to \$1,049,085 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$1,074,701; and
12. Amend Library appropriated fund balance to \$34,384 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$60,000; and
13. SF-104-3410.4 (Chili Fire Department contract) be amended to \$1,167,350 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$0; and
14. SF-104-9040.8 (Workers Compensation Chili Fire Department) be amended to \$129,000 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$0; and
15. SF-104-9025.9 (Chili Fire Department LOSAP) be amended to \$140,000 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$0.
16. A1410.4 be amended to \$11,324 from the 2010 Tentative amount of \$12,824.

On the amendment: 4 yes to 1 no (Councilman Slattery)

On the original resolution as amended: 4 yes to 1 no (Councilman Slattery)

---

**TOWN BOARD RESOLUTION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:**

**SUPERVISOR DUNNING:** I would just like to add, as it is today, as the tentative budget is with these modifications, this is -- still is less spending. Turns out about \$3,000 less than we originally had anticipated. Keeps the tax rate basically -- basically the same, so there -- so this has not affected the overall savings that we had expected to incur for this year or the tax rate.

**COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI:** That's a good point to make. There is a lot of different --

**SUPERVISOR DUNNING:** There is a lot of different changes, but there is a lot of things that took place in here.

**COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI:** So the net results are that it is actually 3,000 less?

**SUPERVISOR DUNNING:** So we're about \$3,000 less. What we did with Mr. Brongo's budget may have changed some of that a bit.

**COUNCILWOMAN SPERR:** So about \$4,500 less.

**SUPERVISOR DUNNING:** It is still -- it is still in -- in where we were.

**COUNCILWOMAN SPERR:** Great. Thank you for sharing that.

**SUPERVISOR DUNNING:** Any other questions or comments?

**RESOLUTION #337 RE: Adoption of the 2010 Preliminary Budget**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski**

**WHEREAS**, the Town Board has reviewed the 2010 Tentative Budget and made modifications as necessary;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Town Board approved and adopts the 2010 Preliminary Budget and orders that a Public Hearing be held on November 4, 2009 as specified in September 16, 2009 Resolution #305.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

The next meeting of the Chili Town Board is scheduled for Wednesday, November 4, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. at the Chili Town Hall main meeting room.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.