

The Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Warren met in Budget Session in its offices in the Wayne Dumont, Jr. Administration Building, Belvidere, New Jersey on January 25, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting was called to order by Director Gardner and upon roll call, the following members were present: Freeholder Jason Sarnoski and Freeholder Richard Gardner. Also attending were County Administrator Alex Lazorisak and County CFO Kim Francisco. Freeholder James Kern, III was absent.

Following the flag salute, Mr. Gardner read the following OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT statement: “ADEQUATE NOTICE OF THIS MEETING *OF JANUARY 25, 2020* WAS GIVEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT BY FORWARDING A SCHEDULE OF REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS TO THE WARREN COUNTY CLERK, THE STAR-LEDGER, AND DAILY RECORD AND BY POSTING A COPY THEREOF ON THE BULLETIN BOARD IN THE OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS. FORMAL ACTION MAY BE TAKEN BY THE BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS AT THIS MEETING. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IS ENCOURAGED. IN ORDER TO ASSURE FULL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, THOSE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO WISH TO ATTEND THE MEETING SHOULD SUBMIT ANY REQUESTS FOR SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION ONE WEEK IN ADVANCE.”

Mr. Francisco provided revised spreadsheets for both the budget worksheet and Capital Improvement Program, based on budget decisions thus far. Updates included changes to appropriations for the Fire Academy, insurance and ambulance squads. Further discussion ensued regarding the Fire Academy. Since it did not deplete its budget last year, the Board decided to keep its appropriation flat and monitor it in the coming year. The EMS call comparison summary provided by Public Safety revealed that in addition to Belvidere, Knowlton and Lopatcong squads help cover calls to county-owned buildings in the Belvidere area. The Freeholders decided to double Belvidere’s appropriation (an additional \$1,000), and give Knowlton and Lopatcong another \$500 each for the current year. The insurance line item that included property, casualty, liability, and workers compensation was increased by \$37,250. The Sheriff’s budget had not yet been altered, as there was still much to be worked out.

The overview concluded at 9:10 a.m., at which time Roads Division Supervisor John Tate approached the Board. He began by bringing attention to three individuals he had recommended for merit raises. He said they were overachievers who have been

here for many years, and are working out of title.

Mr. Tate provided details on some of the special vehicles and equipment requested under the Capital Improvement Program. He ordered a new Ford Escape for the motor pool. There seem to be more requests for vehicles than in the past, and it is sometimes hard to accommodate everyone. He requested a new asphalt recycler, which utilizes millings (recycled asphalt), a material that is available in abundance. This will be more cost-effective than cold patch.

The Dossier Fleet Maintenance Program is a yearly license renewal program, so it was determined that this line item needed to be moved out of capital and into OE. Mr. Tate hoped to order a new Ford Mason dump truck, as the truck it will replace is costing too much in repairs. Also requested were a diesel melter crack tar machine and mobile column lifts

The Roads Division has been doing much more paving and leveling work than it used to, hence the request for a LeeBoy asphalt paver. The machine is wider and has increased features (extended gates, heated gates, automatic lift, temperature control, etc.).

Mr. Gardner inquired about any shared agreements with municipalities. Mr. Tate said the only requests he normally gets are for oil and chip or sweeping. He said he doesn't mind helping people out, but he can't be without his equipment for a month. Mr. Lazorisak suggested going through the agreement next time it is up for renewal, and eliminate items that can't realistically be accommodated.

Regarding projected truck replacements, Mr. Tate had four trucks for which he was ordering new stainless steel bodies. The cabs and chassis are still okay on these vehicles. This will be about \$26,000 per body versus about \$190,000 per truck. Then when these trucks start going, he can remove the bodies and use elsewhere.

Planning ahead for next year's budget, Mr. Tate wanted to pursue obtaining saddle tanks. We are currently using outdated systems in which calcium and magnesium have to be mixed with salt for anything below 25 degrees. Saddle tanks allow for a ratio setting from juice to salt in the spinner. This method uses less juice, achieves better application, and is more efficient.

Mr. Sarnoski asked about the status of a wash station. Mr. Tate said he needed a wash bay; much of his repairs are due to corrosion. The cost would be about half a million dollars. Mr. Lazorisak said it wasn't off his radar, "But we need to bring these garages up to speed before we can think about that." He said perhaps next year or the year after that. "I'm trying to space this out," said Mr. Lazorisak. Mr. Tate said Mr. Lazorisak has done a lot for the garage areas during his tenure as Public Works Director, and he was appreciative. Once we do have a wash bay, Mr. Tate said we can charge the municipalities \$10-\$20 per truck to use it. "Absolutely," said Mr. Sarnoski.

Regarding salt reserves, Mr. Tate said prices are currently down, and we are in good shape for now. Mr. Gardner asked about beet juice. Mr. Tate said he gets whatever is available in bulk. It's a commodity; it may be cranberry, pickle, or something else, depending on the year. During prolonged ice storms, we have to keep at it, and that uses a lot of material.

Mr. Sarnoski asked about how the repairs to Spring Valley Road have been holding up. "That thing hasn't moved since we put it in," said Mr. Tate. The water level has receded, but it's going to come back up. The road is traveled, but not heavily traveled, and the local drivers are courteous to each other. Roads has invested \$148,000 in the project so far. This portion of the meeting concluded at 9:33 a.m.

Superintendent of the Bridge Division, Rich Frinzi, was next. "The few and the proud – the Bridge Department," he said, adding they got a lot of work done this year. Mr. Gardner said the bridges really look good; he receives positive comments from the public. Mr. Frinzi appreciated the compliment and said he would pass it on. His budget has been kept in line.

Mr. Lazorisak pointed out that Mr. Frinzi had plans to retire in 2020; they hoped to fill the recently created Assistant Superintendent of Bridges position before he leaves. Specific personnel requests would be determined near the end of the budget process, and Mr. Lazorisak saw no issues with Mr. Frinzi's recommendations.

Mr. Frinzi went over his special vehicle and equipment requests under the Capital Improvement Program, providing justification and details for a new F-150 FWD pickup with a good hitch; two generators, which he said they use all the time; a Honda Wacker vibratory plate; a mortar mixer; and welder. He said these items should last 20 years. These were replacements for older equipment that he sent to the auction.

Mr. Frinzi returned to the topic of personnel. Mr. Lazorisak said he gave the division credit. “Whenever I need something done outside the box, they’re the A-Team,” Mr. Lazorisak said. Just recently, the team repaired a chimney in half a day, saving the county at least \$5,000. Mr. Gardner complimented the crew for the work done on Shippen Manor. “These guys are top-notch,” Mr. Lazorisak said. “I hate to see you go, but I understand,” he said to Mr. Frinzi. Mr. Gardner said, “All your knowledge from over the years is going to be missed.” “Keep your phone on,” said Mr. Sarnoski. This portion of the meeting concluded at 9:46 a.m.

Liz Zukoski, Superintendent of the Building & Grounds Division, briefly came before the Board, saying she had no personnel requests; she was just trying to stabilize what she had and fill the existing vacancies. “It’s difficult,” she said. There was only one capital request, an enclosed trailer to replace one that is falling apart. The budget was mostly flat, with a few COLA increases for vendors. Mr. Lazorisak said Ms. Zukoski was doing a good job and ran a tight ship. He reminded everyone that a new building maintenance worker was to be added to the B&G budget to be responsible for the libraries. “That will be a big help,” Ms. Zukoski said. This portion of the meeting concluded at 9:48 a.m., followed by a short break.

Upon reconvening at 9:57 a.m., County Engineer Bill Gleba came forward to discuss the Engineer’s Office budget. He began with a personnel update, noting the loss of two valuable employees in 2019: a longtime administrative assistant to retirement, and a Senior Engineer to the private sector. The clerical position has since been filled and is working out well, but a Public Works Inspector position remains vacant, and the current Assistant County Engineer is slated to retire in May of this year. Mr. Gleba sought to add a Senior Engineering Aide position to his roster, which he hoped to fill with someone right out of college to have a long future with the County. Consultants are currently helping with the workload. Mr. Sarnoski asked if hiring consultants was the trend. Mr. Gleba said yes, but there has to be someone on staff to manage the consultants. Mr. Lazorisak recommended lifting the ban on out-of-county and out-of-state applicants, instructing Mr. Gleba to interview Pennsylvania residents, with plans to apply to the State of New Jersey for waivers to the residency requirement.

Exacerbating matters were more onerous requirements from the NJ DEP. The office is required to obtain environmental regulation permits to do its resurfacing work, even when not going outside of the pavement. “Fines and fees,” said Mr. Gardner. “Our county aid projects and our local bridge funding future needs projects are under much greater scrutiny now,” Mr. Gleba said.

Regarding OE, increases included the cost of an updated traffic trip generation manual from Institute of Transportation Engineers, and each department is now responsible for purchasing its own toner and ink.

A discussion of vehicles ensued. Some needs were to be taken care of out of the motor pool, and there was a request for one new Ford F150 pickup. "We're kind of caught up," Mr. Lazorisak said.

Capital projects were reviewed. Mr. Gleba had identified two bridge projects budgeted for years earlier and unexpended (one was completed in-house for substantial savings; the other mired in environmental review for years). This will result in about \$550,000 being returned to the general fund.

Noteworthy road and drainage improvement projects for 2020 include a retaining wall design to address a washout issue on CR 622 in Harmony, and preliminary design work for the Spring Valley Road (CR 659) problem. The NJ DEP appears to be amenable to having some type of drainage system from the flooded area of CR 659 down to Blair Creek, which is different than elevating the road system. Further detailed technical discussion followed. Mr. Sarnoski asked if there would be any construction in the coming year. The answer was no; it would take five to six months just to get the DEP permits.

With guiderail replacements and improvements being a major budget item, Mr. Lazorisak had asked last year about having more simple repairs done in-house, and inquired about the status. Mr. Tate said every year we seem to be spending more on repairs without getting any insurance money back (\$5,000 deductible per claim/incident). The majority are hit and runs, he said. This is a problem that keeps increasing.

The road resurfacing schedule was discussed. Mr. Gleba had provided the Freeholders with an updated list. "The reality is, to try and keep up, we're looking at about 16 miles of road for the next three to four years and then I can get back down to 15 miles... then ultimately 14 miles a year," Mr. Gleba said. Mr. Sarnoski wanted to keep looking at transferring smaller roads to local ownership.

Mr. Gleba very recently found out that the NJDOT was planning to replace the Route 31 bridge structure in downtown Oxford. A detour would bring increased traffic to County Roads. We had plans to redo CR 624 from end to end. Mr. Lazorisak said Mr. Gleba may have to consider pushing that project off. He said we are about to spend

\$3 million on a road with drainage, restructuring and curbing, only for it to get beat up due to a state detour. There were many unknowns regarding this project, and it could be years in the future. Any detour would be problematic.

Back to the general resurfacing program, Mr. Gleba said some roads have been resurfaced so many times that we have to mill them to keep them to their proper elevation so as not to create drainage problems. Mr. Sarnoski said we have received a number of complaints in recent years from private property owners on County Roads having drainage issues, but the fault is on their own properties. Mr. Gleba was aware of the complaints, and said he thought many of them were unfounded. A drainage system had been put in, some property owners didn't like that it was coming on their property, and took their own corrective actions. Then we have to go back and reestablish our right or find an alternate alignment to make them happy, Mr. Gleba said. The County did not place these houses below the elevation of the roads.

Mr. Sarnoski said he continued to work with the NJDOT regarding the intersection of Routes 519 and 57. He asked if there was any work still to be done by the County on our road. After Mr. Gleba provided a review of recent work completed there, the short answer was no. Mr. Lazorisak said he hoped the NJDOT was aware of potential truck traffic coming down this corridor with all the planned development. Mr. Gleba said he thought the next time he met with the NJDOT he should inform them. "I don't want to throw this into another redesign," Mr. Sarnoski said. Mr. Gleba said the DOT may factor in some kind of future allocation, but it normally only looks at what is happening now. He didn't think it would be too much of an issue for them. "I think it's going to be a bigger issue for the County; our road network and our intersections," Mr. Gleba said.

Mr. Gardner complimented the Engineer's Office and Road Division for their work on South Lincoln Avenue in Washington. He said it was a great project in a difficult area. He thought it worked out very well, and noted there is more traffic than ever before at that connection. Mr. Gleba said that was a good example of a road that had formerly been in the Road Division's oil and chip program, but was put into the road resurfacing program because the area has seen much more traffic.

The group took a short break, from 10:52 a.m. to 10:57 a.m.

Upon return to Open Session, County Planner Dave Dech joined Mr. Gleba to talk about traffic study options. Mr. Lazorisak began the conversation by reiterating concerns about ongoing development within the county, particularly warehousing. The

Freeholders, along with County Administration, Public Works, Engineering and Planning Departments, share concerns regarding the potential impacts on the CR 519 corridor. He said we have discussed bringing a traffic engineer on board as a consultant to move forward. Mr. Dech, Mr. Gleba and staff members had met with WSP USA, a professional services engineering firm, so he turned it over to them for a status report.

Mr. Dech said WSP did submit a proposal to review traffic analysis. In this case, WSP will review traffic studies prepared by the developer, in accordance with applicable sections of the Warren County Highlands Bridge Standards. Mr. Lazorisak said we are talking about the three parts: 1) Reviewing the applications coming before the County; 2) The Highlands involvement/funding is a separate study looking at 15 areas that are zoned industrial throughout the county for a site-specific traffic analysis; and 3) The third step is taking the first two components and theoretically putting it all together to look at the big picture. Further, Mr. Dech explained, we will be going out to bid to update our Transportation Plan, with money to be received from the NJTPA.

Regarding what WSP will be reviewing, Mr. Sarnoski asked, “They are looking based on our current statutes and engineering standards, correct?” “Yes,” said Mr. Dech. “And zoning,” said Mr. Gleba. Mr. Sarnoski asked if WSP would be able to make recommendations regarding updating our own statutes and standards to reflect more of how we want this county to look like, and to give us more control over the use of our road system. Mr. Dech said the Transportation Plan would certainly provide recommendations regarding changes to design standards. Further, Mr. Gardner asked, how much legal weight does it carry for the county if we say the appropriate standards are not being met to handle the traffic flow, based on the review and recommendations? It was a good question. Mr. Sarnoski said, “There’s a lot of moving parts, and a lot of pieces that need to be put together with this overall plan.”

Mr. Lazorisak asked what can we do immediately to our planning standards to try to address both getting reimbursed for this type of work to be done by consultants, and the issue of some of these properties being on municipal roads outside of our jurisdiction. Mr. Sarnoski said while we are seeking a bit more control over large scale projects, we don’t want to be so restrictive that we inhibit some desirable redevelopment.

Mr. Dech pointed out two key points in the wording of the County Planning Act. Regarding subdivisions, it says that the County Planning Board has jurisdiction over subdivisions that affect the county road system. For site plans, it states it has jurisdiction over site plans that abut a county road. He said these key wording points

could be applied to the Strykers Road application as well as Foul Rift Road. Discussion followed regarding major and minor roads. Can we redefine in our laws the difference between minor and major and the description of each?

Mr. Gleba said there is nothing that says an applicant can't work with us, and so far, we have seen applicants willing to work with us. "They may not want to do everything we're asking for, but that's why you have a pro rata share contribution," Mr. Gleba said, "I don't know if you can go further than that. Do you want to go further than that? If you're putting 10 percent of the traffic to a situation, well, you should probably be paying 10 percent of the cost to fix that situation. That's the way our standards are." It is both a legal matter and a policy decision. Mr. Gardner added that owners are going to have certain vested rights in their properties. Mr. Lazorisak said he thought the fees should be reevaluated immediately. Mr. Gleba thought someone should be retained to examine the "massive projects" coming into the Planning Board. He said that information needs to be put into the big picture plan in order to figure out how to proceed. "To try and forecast it, it could be 20 years before some of these projects are truly fully built out," said Mr. Gleba.

Currently, when an applicant submits its traffic report, it is initially reviewed by staff of the Warren County Engineer's Office to see if they agree with it. Going forward, Mr. Lazorisak asked, "WSP will be doing that, correct?" "On certain projects, I think," Mr. Gleba answered, "It would be the discretion of the Planning Department." Mr. Lazorisak said, "With all this warehousing coming in, I don't know if you have the ability and the time to start looking at all these traffic reports." Mr. Gleba said, "Make no mistake about it, this is a significant endeavor... we cannot absorb." Mr. Sarnoski said, "We need to look at this holistically." He said we can't look at this as just one project; we have to look at the impact of all the projects - minor and major - and how they all affect the big picture. Mr. Gleba said that was the point of bringing in WSP, to perform these other aspects. WSP is also doing the NJDOT traffic counts for this section of the state as well, which is an important feature of this.

Mr. Gleba said WSP is looking at things for the county, for the Highlands, and for the DOT. They are gathering all this information, and are involved in the development review process. He agreed there should be a holistic approach. We have to look at it and understand where we are in the scheme of things. Once we nail it down and know what the concept project is, then we go out and get another consultant on board to do the survey, preliminary design, come up with all the things that need to occur to make the project happen. "That's a capital function," Mr. Gleba said, "Some of that, can you put it on to the developers? Yes," said Mr. Gleba.

“But we’re not even talking about the capital side just yet,” Mr. Sarnoski said, “We’re just talking about understanding what our current road system can handle, and what the impacts are going to be of development along that road system.” Mr. Gleba said that’s why it makes sense to have one consultant with all this information in the file.

It was challenging to get a handle on the multiple funding sources all coming into play, with so many different aspects of this endeavor (the Highlands site-specific study focusing on 15 identified areas; the NJTPA transportation plan, which will be conducted over the course of this year; the DOT traffic counts; and the overreaching traffic study concept, involving everything within our borders). Mr. Francisco asked if some of this could be paid for out of developers’ escrow. Mr. Dech wasn’t sure, as that is not currently built into our development regulations. He was aware of only two other counties that have exercised that option (Union and Hunterdon), and he understood they only used that escrow provision once over the last 15 years.

Mr. Gardner said it still has to comport with state laws. Often there is a barter situation between the municipality and the developer. “We want less subjectivity here, and typically the developer wants more subjectivity,” Mr. Gardner said. He hoped WSP could lead us to a more firm understanding and bolster our case. Mr. Lazorisak thought Planning Board attorney Guy Wilson needed to examine what Hunterdon County has, and work on getting information to the Warren County Planning Board and this Freeholder Board, to make some changes. We have to determine how we’re going to budget. It’s one thing to try to get the costs out of escrow, it’s another thing if we don’t. “We still want to do the work even if we can’t get the developer to pay for it,” Mr. Francisco said. “Right, we have to do the work,” agreed Mr. Lazorisak, who went on to say he thought we had to budget money in Planning to cover any additional costs we may not get back, and also put money into Engineering for them to start looking at putting all this together as one plan.

As a stopgap, Mr. Dech asked about the feasibility of having the Freeholders hire WSP as a contractor and collect escrow instead of the Planning Board, since that provision is not built into our regulations. It was surmised that it should come from the Planning Board and its attorney to have it built into its standards. “I know, but that’s going to take a long time,” Mr. Dech said. Changing the standards would have to go through a review, approval, and public hearing process. “You’re making your case before us right now,” Mr. Gardner said, “And I think it’s a strong case.” Mr. Lazorisak thought it could be done that way. He said he would talk to County Counsel and look into preparing a resolution.

Since Freeholder Kern was absent, Mr. Gardner requested that Mr. Dech, Mr. Gleba, and the County Administrator apprise him of what had been discussed here.

Then discussion turned to how much to budget, and where. Mr. Dech and Mr. Lazorisak thought \$100,000 to start. Mr. Gleba was trying to understand how this was going to work. "How much are we going to try to put on to the applicant's engineer and collect that on escrow, and how much do we want to pay for out of our coffers to do the review?" he asked.

"I think in theory this board is very concerned about our traffic impacts over the next few years," Mr. Sarnoski said. While there are many unknowns, we know that there's going to be a significant impact on our county roads. From a philosophical standpoint, "We have to start doing this," he said. Even if the cost is higher than we would like, and we still have to figure out precisely how to recoup the cost, "We have to start now regardless of which direction we go, and put money in now." Hopefully we can recoup it somehow, he said, but even if we don't, we will gain a better understanding of what the long-term costs will be and learn how to attribute those costs.

"I think this is a new norm for the county," Mr. Lazorisak said. "It is. It's scary," said Mr. Sarnoski. This will be an ongoing issue for many years. Mr. Gardner said municipal land use boards unfortunately get too political at times; or buckle under the threat of potential liability issues. Mr. Lazorisak thought lack of communication was also to blame. "We find out about these developments when they get approved and it hits the newspaper," said Mr. Lazorisak.

Mr. Sarnoski agreed we should budget at least \$100,000 just for what we are looking at in terms of transportation plan and traffic study impact. Mr. Lazorisak suggested putting it in Engineering. "Is it a capital expense?" Mr. Sarnoski asked. "I don't think so," answered Mr. Francisco. Efforts would be made to try to collect escrow to offset the costs of this.

Mr. Sarnoski returned to the question of why this couldn't be classified as a capital expense. "Is it for a specific project?" asked Mr. Francisco. "Yes, it's the project from Route 22 to Route 80," said Mr. Lazorisak. "The immediate and necessary focus is on the hotspots, for lack of a better term," Mr. Gardner said. Mr. Francisco asked for time to think and check with the auditor. For more specificity, Mr. Sarnoski said he thought there should be focus on truck traffic through the center of Hope (Route 46 to

Route 80). “The only way we’re going to do that is we’re going to have to send a traffic study to DOT... and maybe with the historic nature, the buildings that are on that road, the width of the road which cannot be widened any more because of the historic nature; maybe we can get some restrictions there,” Mr. Sarnoski said. But they won’t do it without a study. “I really think we need to do a specific study just for Hope, now,” said Mr. Sarnoski. Mr. Lazorisak agreed.

Mr. Gleba said if you want to look at specific intersections, not necessarily related to one particular development, we can commission a study from our consultant to give us a capacity analysis and come up with a design as to what the future may look like. “But I don’t want a design of what the future might look like to improve that intersection,” Mr. Sarnoski said. “Well, this intersection can’t be improved, this is your capacity,” Mr. Gleba said, this is an intersection that we can make a recommendation regarding what can be done there.

Mr. Lazorisak instructed Mr. Francisco to confer with the auditor regarding the legality of budgeting this under capital versus OE. “From there, we will work the numbers and see what we can do. We’ll try to get it out of the escrow fees. While it was going to take some time, Mr. Lazorisak thought the Planning Board needed to look at the regulations. “Oh, I agree,” Mr. Dech said, adding that they do collect development review fees for every application, and he wasn’t sure exactly where that money goes. Mr. Francisco said it went into the general fund. Whether moving forward or as a lookback, Mr. Dech asked if we could dedicate money that has been collected for future needs. Mr. Lazorisak thought it could be done, but it would be more of a capital improvement-type fee or permit, but it would have to be set up by resolution.

Regardless of what the auditor says regarding whether this is capital or OE, Mr. Sarnoski emphasized, “I still want to see these as specific line items under our budget, and the reason why is I want to be able to show the public we are addressing these concerns specifically within our budget,” he said. “We still have to have a number,” Mr. Francisco said. “I think \$100,000-\$150,000 easy,” Mr. Sarnoski said.

Further discussion regarding the center of Hope ensued, with truck traffic having been an issue there for years. Now, with the impact of future development, Mr. Sarnoski said he thought we really needed to protect the downtown historic area and we have to study that specifically. This portion of the meeting concluded at 11:35 a.m.

Regarding other capital needs, Mr. Francisco went over updates made to the schedule since the previous budget meeting, as had been discussed, mostly pertaining

to special vehicles. The overall amount had been reduced by about \$20,000. In a quick recap of this year's unique capital expenditures, Mr. Lazorisak pointed out voting machine replacements, video surveillance for the Sheriff, video system for Corrections, technology and network upgrades for I.T., equipment needs for the Prosecutor, and Communications Center upgrades. The \$3 million for the Communications Center will be split over two years, and is all coming from tax dollars. Discourse regarding the state's pilfering of 911 fees ensued. Mr. Lazorisak said a portion of the fees are supposed to go to municipalities and counties for those improvements. "That's the way the law is," said Mr. Lazorisak. However, Trenton is keeping this money for its own budget.

Other capital improvement items included solar field reserves for decommissioning and carpet replacements, and a Public Safety sewer line (currently in the design phase). Hopefully this year Public Safety will get hooked into the sewer treatment plant and no longer have to rely on its failing septic system.

Regarding Warren County Technical School, while it requested \$512,400 for the current year, Mr. Gardner and Mr. Sarnoski decided to keep it to \$250,000. "Honestly, there needs to be better financial oversight there," Mr. Gardner said. "I agree," said Mr. Sarnoski. Mr. Lazorisak expressed concern that WCTS did not appear to be preparing for changing dynamics and demographics in the field of vocational education, as the Community College has been doing.

Other capital budget items included Courtroom #1, which, in addition to money previously saved, should finally be taken care of. A portion of the \$1.5 million budgeted for the TASS addition will be reimbursed by the state. Mr. Lazorisak explained that there will be more security surveillance systems on exteriors of county facilities.

Next for review was the new buildings/land acquisition section (Alpha garage, Belvidere salt shed, Hope fuel pump upgrade, and saving for a new building behind Mosquito/Weights & Measures), with Mr. Lazorisak providing details.

Mr. Sarnoski asked if it was okay to accept donations to the Addiction Task Force. Mr. Francisco said yes; there was a trust account set up through Human Services for donations for specific purposes.

Regarding the Sheriff's budget, it was decided to invite the Sheriff to attend the February 1 budget session to finalize his numbers, after having the opportunity to meet

with Mr. Francisco and Mr. Kern on January 31. “We’re going to go up to the cap, and we’ve got to make it work, got to live with it,” Mr. Francisco said, noting the PBA Local 280 contract will not be settled prior to budget adoption.

On motion by Mr. Sarnoski, seconded by Mr. Gardner, and there being no further business before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 11:52 a.m.