BUDGET & FINANCE

COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012.

Members Present:

Legislator Lou D'Amaro - Chairman
Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Vice-Chair
Legislator Sarah Anker
Legislator Tom Muratore
Legislator Wayne Horsley

Also In Attendance:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Legislator John Kennedy - 12th Legislative District
Legislator Kate Browning - 3rd Legislative District
Justin Littell - Aide to Legislator D'Amaro
Legislator Ricardo Montano - 9th Legislative District
Legislator DuWayne Gregory - 15th Legislative District
Barbara LoMoriello - Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Gail Vizzini - Director Budget Review Office
Robert Lipp - Deputy Director - Budget Review Office
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory
Dennis Brown - County Attorney's Office
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Fred Pollert - County Executive's Budget Director
Jon Schneider - Deputy County Executive
Connie Corso - County Exec's Budget Office
Dot Kerrigan - AME
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:15 A.M.*)

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Ladies and gentlemen, welcome and good morning to the meeting of the Suffolk County Legislature's Budget and Finance Committee. Please rise and join the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Sarah Anker.

SALUTATION

Once again, welcome. Normally on our agenda, we would go to the -- well, there's no correspondence, but we would go to public comments. We do have four cards here this morning, but I'm going to ask that we skip that portion of the agenda and first go to the presentations, because I know that Fred and Jon are busy and need to get back to their offices as well.

So this morning, we're going to go right to presentations. We have with us this morning Fred Pollert, welcome, and Jon Schneider, good morning, as well as Gail and Rob from the Budget Review Office. Fred, I guess we're going to do a presentation this morning, give us an update of the current state of the County budget. I know it was reported in Newsday today that there was some more bad news with respect to the deficit reported for last year. It's reported now at 60 by our Comptroller as opposed to the 33 million that was reported or projected by the Blue Ribbon Panel put together by the County Executive.

And also, we look forward to hearing from you on the state of the mitigation plan that was recently released and presented, or at least the Phase 1 of our mitigation plan that was recently announced. And also, if you could get into the pending layoffs and the analysis of that list, we would appreciate hearing from you on that as well. So once again, good morning and welcome. Please, go ahead.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. Thank you very much. The County's Operating Budget is continually being monitoredby both the Budget Review Office and by the Budget Office. We are using, as a base number, the Blue Ribbon report. We have been updating plus and minuses off that Blue Ribbon Report. Most recently, what was announced, I believe yesterday, was that the projected General Fund Police consolidated fund balance was worse than originally anticipated when the Budget Review Office and the Budget Office provided the data to the Blue Ribbon Group. The Blue Ribbon Group has forecast that there would be an approximate shortfall of approximately $33 million carrying into 2012. The reason the 2012 projected shortfall was so tremendously important is it becomes the beginning fund balance for Fiscal 2012.

So if there's deficit in the preceding year, in 2011, it flows through as a starting fund balance in 2012. It basically means that for a dollar-for-dollar basis, there is an increase in the projected shortfall. Yesterday, we also learned, dealing with the Department of Social Services, that they are tracking far higher than budget with respect to the caseload for children with daycare stipends, and that there is a projected shortfall in that area that they project to be a $9 million net cost. Part of the contributing factors for the 2011 shortfall was that that cost line item was also exceeded last year.

On the good news, or at least on positive news is that the most recent sales tax was up substantially higher than it was in previous years; however, this morning in reviewing the sales tax, a significant portion of that increase was associated with previous period's adjustments, so the number really needs to be mitigated by the fact that it was unusually large because of previous period's adjustments that played catch up. So it's currently a moving target. We are carefully monitoring the shortfall for all intents and purposes. Because we have a moving target, we are staying with the $530 million with the pluses and minuses.

Tracking along with the projected shortfall is obviously continued problems with the cash flow. The cash flow situation is extremely tight. We have had regular meetings between the Budget Office, the Budget Review Office, the Comptroller's Office and the Treasurer's Office with respect to cash flow. Earlier this year, the Legislature had approved a Revenue Anticipation Note borrowing, which we have not done in the last 20 years, and it provided the authority of the Comptroller to up to $90 million. It was originally anticipated that the borrowing would be approximately $70 million.

As the cash flow has continued to tighten, that number increased to 80 and then to $85 million. We are currently anticipating closing on it so that we have cash at the beginning of May to be able to meet payroll. The anticipated RAN borrowing is $85 million, very close to that total amount allowable by the Legislature of $90 million. What a Revenue Anticipation Note is a borrowing against future State and Federal aid. It is an 11month borrowing. As the State and Federal aid comes in, the last dollars coming will need to be reserved to repay the note.

So part of the Comptroller's cash flow, like, analysis clearly has to roll into 2013 to look at what measures are going to be required to repay this $85 million borrowing. They had to make a number of assumptions with respect to how the 2013 Operating Budget is going to look. We currently believe that we can, you know, do a repayment on the RAN, which we are borrowing; however, there were some implicit assumptions in the borrowing, including preserving intact the County's reserve funds, which we currently have in place. So the budget outlook has, you know, improved in some areas, gotten worse in other areas, has definitely not improved in the cash flow area.

With respect to the mitigation plan, the County Executive has spoken with the Legislators about a Phase 1 of the mitigation plan. The Phase 1 of the mitigation plan will not address the entire projected budgetary shortfall. The Phase 1 of the mitigation plan will not significantly impact the County's ability to improve cash flow. It is approximately $162 million. It includes a variety of different actions, including some authority granted to the County to increase the number of red light cameras in the Traffic Violations Bureau. There was authority that was given with respect to the OTB declaration of bankruptcy, which will preserve at least some minimal revenues coming into the County from OTB.

It includes some management type of initiatives, which can unilaterally be undertaken by the County Executive with a performance management team, including relying upon the performance management group to be looking at Workmen's Compensation, including medical cost rebasing, termination of leases; restacking of County facilities; coming up with other management type of initiatives as they go out to departments; consolidation of some functions or transfer of functions to the private sector, including the possibility of doing yet another clinic with FQHC. There are no savings anticipated in 2012 for that, in part, because Hudson River indicated that they really didn't have the capability of taking on two centers at one time. So that's a savings forecast in 2013. Looking at alternatives to service deliveries in the health area, and embargoing 10% of available funds in the budget.

With a declaration of a financial emergency, the County Executive directed the Budget Office to begin transferring funds into a reserve area of the budget so they would not be able for expenditure by departments, that is underway. The County has decided to not renew the contract on -- for the Health Smart Program. We are anticipating that because of the budget crunch and because of the lack of appropriations for the replacement of Public Safety vehicles, we will probably have to bond some of those Public Safety vehicles. We are currently going through a detailed list, primarily focusing on marked vehicles in the Police Department as well as in the Sheriff's Department.

We are anticipating doing a pension amortization in 2013, not just for budgetary reasons, but for cash flow reasons. The pension payment needs to be made first two months of next year. At this point in time, there would be inadequate cash reserves to be even able to make the pension payment, so there are not too many degrees of freedom there from cash point of view. We are looking at charging third-party insurance for Medevac Services. We are looking at a transportation increase for the paratransit system actively. And we are actively engaged in attempting to collect revenues owed to us for red light cameras and -- or exploring other accounts receivable to us.

The two year savings of that entire group of options is about $160 million, of which about $20 million falls into 2011-'12. The bulk of it, $142 million, falls into 2013. So clearly with the larger projected shortfall coming in from 2011, Phase 2 of the plan will be required to more aggressively address projected shortfalls in 2012 and attempt to improve our cash flow.

With respect to the termination of employees, the adopted budget included the layoff of approximately 462 employees that were funded for one half of this year. In addition to that, there was a step-down in the number of employees that were projected in the County Nursing Home. The County is moving ahead with the layoffs. They will be taking place at the end of the June. The County Executive and a representative group of Legislators representing leadership have been going through the major departments focusing on the projected layoff plans in the major departments. Yesterday, we spent over eight hours with the County Executive drilling into excruciating detail in a few of the departments, especially where there's offsetting aid. The Executive's Office anticipates that for Tuesday's meeting, there will be a Certificate of Necessity which will recalibrate some of those layoffs. And I will defer to Jon if he had any additional comments in this area.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes, thank you. It is currently our hope -- as Fred said, we've been drilling down in a couple of departments, especially DSS, you know, where there's a lot of aided positions. Our hope is that we will have something to bring forward for folks to look at by hopefully this Friday. And we are going to need to move forward with a CN for Tuesday's meeting so that we can effectuate any changes prior to the letters needing to go out at the end of this month.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you very much for the update. I appreciate that. I had a couple of questions, and then, of course, we are joined by members of the committee and some members who are not on the committee. And I appreciate you all being here today. But I did have a few questions preliminarily. Okay, first, is the RAN. So it's anticipated now -- the Legislature did authorize up to $90 million in borrowing, and originally, I think we were targeting a lower figure than what you presented today. I think we were looking more at 70, but we're up to 85 now. So what's driving that?

MR. POLLERT:
What is driving it is really a reflection of the negative caring fund balance among other things. You know, generally, the relationship between cash flow and the County's Operating Budget, you know, is clearly -- they're on a day-to-day type of basis. However, when the County was running significant fund balances of 130, 140, $150 million as we had in the past, cash flow was not quite this critical. Now that we don't have large amounts in reserve funds, now that we don't have a large positive fund balance, cash flow is excruciatingly tight.

Part of the last increase from 80 to $85 million was able -- was done to be able to accommodate the payment on incentive leave for Sworn Personnel that will be participating in a retirement system so that we can make the payouts in a timely fashion. That, in turn, will mitigate the need for having a reduction in sworn personnel in the Police.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Right. Okay. So those are some of the factors that are driving that. The point I think I hear you making also though is that as we increase that borrowing up to maybe 85, or who knows, maybe we'll get to the full authorized amount of 90 million, it's important to keep whatever reserve funds we have in place. And I guess that's a function of assuring that we have the ability to repay the borrowing in the short term.

MR. POLLERT:
That is absolutely correct. Clearly, if we need to borrow $85 million for cash flow problems, being able to continue operations and be able to pay back the $85 million at the beginning of next year, means we have to have reserves to continue operations as we start to put that State and Federal aid monies that were borrowed into a reserve account for the repayment of the RAN. So implicit in the borrowing is maintaining for both 2012 and 2013 the level of reserves that we have so that the County can continue to do interfund borrowings to meet payroll, Social Services costs, debt service and all the other obligations that we have to different vendors.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Fred, are you comfortable -- now that we have increased the borrowing or anticipate increasing borrowing, I think you said we're closing in early May, up to 85 million, are you comfortable with the level of reserves that we have, and I guess a conservative estimate of the revenue that's anticipated to make the payback, are you comfortable that the County will have the ability to meet the obligations as they come due?

MR. POLLERT:
If we were not -- if the County did not have a high level of assurance that we could pay back the Revenue Anticipation Note seamlessly, we should not be incurring the borrowing. So the Comptroller, the Budget Office, the Budget Review Office have all reviewed the cash flow, we acknowledge that there are assumptions embedded in the cash flow --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Right, and I understand that.

MR. POLLERT:
-- and based upon those assumptions; keeping the reserves, having a balanced Operating Budget in 2012 and '13, I feel that we can move ahead with the borrowing. The cash flow projected is, however, razor tight in Fiscal '13. So under the best of circumstances, implicit in it is continued growth in sales tax, which we feel, at this point, is achievable. It assumes that we will be carrying out the 2012 Operating Budget as adopted, which includes the savings from the layoff have been programmed in for both 2012 and '13, that the reserve accounts remain intact, and that we finally have a resolution on the County Nursing Home, whichever way that we're going to go that we either raise, you know, revenues for the continued operation or that there not be a continued unanticipated drain from the General Fund.

If an extraordinary event happens, like a hurricane or something of that sort, short-term, we should be able to accommodate that with the current reserves that we have, but it's not an overly-optimistic cash flow, it's -- you know, it is, in my estimation, a very reasonable cash flow, which projects the repayment of the RAN.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. I appreciate that answer. I know it's very difficult to respond to that definitely, because it's based on projections. But I always want to raise that issue only because it's really unprecedented to be borrowing that amount of funds. I know I wasn't here, but I think you were the last the County did this, and I just get concerned that it's okay to borrow for cash flow as long as we have

the wherewithal and we're comfortable that -- reasonably comfortable that we'll be able to pay it back. So I appreciate you even addressing that question and giving us at least some level of comfort that that will be repayable.

I wanted to ask you -- you know, a little more rain on the parade. You talked about the sales tax. We did get some good news about the quarter, but then again, you know, that good news didn't last too long from what I'm hearing today, that it really was more based upon -- the increase in the sales tax was more based upon just some adjustments to previous periods than maybe an indication that the sales tax numbers are going up along with an improving economy. So how less optimistic should we be now on the sales tax, which is another moving target? Obviously, it seems to change almost on a daily basis.

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So the growth for the first quarter on the cash, which is good news of 6.3%. It is what it is. So we got that revenue in, so that's good. That being said, number two, the first quarter is the smallest of the four quarters, so it will take some time to see what goes on in the future. And number three, if you take out the adjustments that Fred was talking about, probably in terms of vendor sales, instead of 6.3%, you're talking three and a half percent, which is not bad. That being said --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Rob, how does that compare to the same quarter last year, just for comparison purposes, if you have it handy?

MR. LIPP:
But of course I do. Actually, the opposite happened last year. About 1.6% was the cash growth, which is what we actually received. But it was, like, 5.4% was the adjusted growth. In other words, we wind up getting monies moved around by the State for various reasons; late filers, assessment penalties that have nothing to do with the vendor sales. They look back a half a year and they say, "Wait a second. There's money that should be coming to Suffolk County that we gave somebody else or vice versa. So we wind up doing better or because of these adjustments.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
But the point that even at the 3.5% adjusted number for this quarter, we do see an improvement over the same quarter of last year; is that correct?

MR. LIPP:
Yes. That being said, also, we budgeted 3.95% growth for the year, because as expected, 2011 came in less than what we budget. The effective growth rate we'd need to meet the budget would be 4.6%. So we're talking -- we're ahead of the game now in terms of cash, 6.3, but in terms of economic activity, it's 3 1/2%. Are we going to make it through the rest of the year? Stay tuned.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. Just a couple of other quick questions, and then I'll turn it over to my colleagues. The mitigation plan, which was announced, I guess about two weeks ago now, which addresses about $162 million in revenues or savings to help with the $530 million projected deficit over three years in budget, Mr. Pollert, you were kind enough to go through measures yet again for all of us. I know there have been a lot of discussions about them, and I know that you are bringing in the Certificate of Necessity on Tuesday, I mean, some of those measures will require legislative action. And we can anticipate seeing that on Tuesday; Mr. Schneider, correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
No. We're going to lay it on the table. But given that there's another Legislative Meeting within

two weeks, our thought has been that we'll simply present it to the Legislature, and then we can have -- it can go through committee, and we can have a vote at the next Legislative Meeting.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
All right. I appreciate that. So we'll have an opportunity to discuss that in committee, whatever --

MR. SCHNEIDER:
I'm sorry. This is the Phase 1 Mitigation. Now, the positions will be brought forward for this Tuesday with a Certificate of Necessity.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Right. But the mitigation measures that require legislative action will be laid on the table on Tuesday?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. That's good. So we can really continue that discussion in the next committee meeting. I appreciate you doing that.

And finally, I just wanted to ask about the pending layoffs, which are very difficult for all of us. I know that when the budget passed, I mean, I sat here and listened to the debate last year, and it really wasn't fully intended that that list be the layoff list. I think it was more viewed as a list put into the budget to present a what-if scenario for other reasons. I know that my position on this, and I know some of my colleagues have very serious concerns about what positions at least are on that list and what it's doing to County Government, and rightfully so. But my feeling is that it's the County Executive who is running day-to-day operations of County Government and who needs to really focus on that list and make sure that's something that County Executive Bellone can live with as well. I know that you have been doing that very diligently. Is there anything that you can tell us today with respect to the list and what we can anticipate on Tuesday with the Certificate of Necessity?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
I think what I can tell you in the broadest terms; a couple of things. First of all, as you noted, I understand that it was not the intention from a lot of folks maybe that this were to go forward. That said, I'm also fairly confident that it was also, at the time that that thinking was in place, people also did not think that we were going to be inheriting a $60 million deficit. So facts have changed.

I can tell you that the County Executive and his performance management team along with members of this Legislature have been drilling down, particularly in areas where we are dealing with a lot of aided positions, in areas where we're under mandates to perform specific services, and we are doing everything possible to make improvements in those areas. That said, I think as you can tell by Fred's presentation and by the magnitude of the 2011 number, you know, the facts have changed.

We find ourselves having inherited an incredible hole, and we are going to get out of it. A lot of painful things are going to be necessary to do that. Unfortunately, that is going to include realizing a substantial amount of savings from this plan, understanding that doing that, simply means that we are not digging the hole deeper, not that we have filled the hole by doing so.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. And I appreciate that. I know it's painful to anticipate that. It's very difficult facing these layoffs. Can you tell us, based on what you plan on doing on Tuesday with the CN, how many layoffs we're looking at on Tuesday? Do you have the number yet?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
I don't have that number. The intention -- and then, you know, there needs to be, you know, some bump and retreat analysis. But the intention is to bring that forward for folks by this Friday. You know, it's certainly not our intention to bring this forward on Tuesday, you know, where you are seeing it for the first time along with the CN. But, again, you know, I think everyone appreciates the -- you know, look, no one certainly wants to move forward with this, but, you know, we all understand now the magnitude of the situation, and that, you know, we have a desperate need for recurring savings to get this County out of this.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Jon, do you know what the anticipated savings from the anticipated layoffs may be at this point, or will that be also released on Friday?

MR. POLLERT:
Clearly numbers are going to have to be fine tuned based on what the latest numbers are. What is embedded in the cash flow is implicit savings of about $11.7 million dollars in '12, and approximately 24 to $25 million in 2013. That is net of State and Federal aid.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Again, I think it's important to note that those are -- the numbers that Fred's talking about are not the -- the model that essentially produced the $530 million assumed that those layoffs and thus the savings would be realized.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Right. I understand that. Yeah. And that's why we are moving forward. Those are already included in all of the discussions that we've been having about the budget. So even with the Phase 1, as we call it, of the mitigation measures and the anticipated layoffs, we're still not even remotely close to being out of the woods yet with respect to the number that was projected. And I know that although that's not the topic of discussion here today, we do look forward to working with the County Executive, I'm sure on a bipartisan basis, in helping to continue to close that gap. Gentlemen, I appreciate you responding to my questions this morning. What I'm going to do now is go to some of my colleagues starting first with the Deputy Presiding Officer Wayne Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator D'Amaro. I appreciate your questions, because some of them are spot on some or all of our concerns. Bringing them forward is important.

I just wanted to first comment on the relationship of the Legislature to the County Executive's Office in that when we came to you with some of our concerns about the layoff list that you reacted in such a positive way on, "Let's get together, let's see if we can iron out some of our concerns," the aided positions, the issues of layoffs to sworn officers and those types of things that were critical to this Legislature, that you guys stepped forward and reexamined the list so that we can have this by Friday.

And I just wanted to let you know I appreciated to see that interaction between the two levels of government. It is a good thing that's, and that's important to all of us. Let me also say that I appreciate from the Legislative side the fact that some -- that the mitigation efforts have been bipartisan in nature, that we are all in this together realizing how difficult the situation is.

That all being said I just wanted to quickly rehash some of the concerns that the Legislators originally had; the issue of sworn officers, that there wouldn't be any layoffs to sworn officers, that the aided positions, whether State or Federal are going to be wrung out of the layoff process to make sure that we are not, at the end of day, laying off people, rehiring them and the like. Are those issues now been addressed, and the list that we get on Friday, as we say, will make sense?

MR. POLLERT:
The list which you get on Friday will be much more coherent than the list that was originally included in the budget. To be able to restore all aided positions, some -- you know, quite a few of the aid levels are significantly less then 100% or 80% or 50%, so clearly, it will not be possible to restore all of the aided spots. We are working diligently trying to restore the most highly-aided spots.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
So are you saying then that there would be loss of that aid to the County because of that, say the 80 percenters, 40 percenters, whatever it may be? There's not going to be any loss of aid to the list?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
In the main, our goal has been to restore -- I mean, we have found, for instance, going through this process, that there were, in fact, some things like 100%, 80 percent-aided positions that were originally on the list. So what we bring back, I think, will reflect that we've delved deep into the numbers. And one of goals has been -- you know, obviously, everything is a moving target with the bump and retreat analysis -- to make sure -- you know, to understand sometimes the difference between whether the aid is attached -- you know, what aid is in the department, who it's attached to, because sometimes you may find that you know -- well, you say, "Gee, this person is aided," but actually, that aid would sort of migrate to another position that's then County funding. So our intent in this is, to the maximum extent possible, to preserve services, to preserve aid, and to preserve workers while understanding that fundamentally, we need to preserve the interest of County taxpayers and whittle this stuff down.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
So what you are saying is that an aided position, though it may not be the person that was originally in that title as an aided position, the aid would go to someone who was bump and retreated to that position, and there wouldn't be the loss of the aid to the County itself.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
That's correct.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
And as well as the sworn officers, that has been addressed, and there will be no sworn officers on the list?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
That is presently being addressed, yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I just wanted to get that out on to the record. I want to just quickly address another issue that Legislator D'Amaro brought up earlier about the commitment that we can back the RANs. I just wanted to -- I know that, you know, when you're dealing with a number such as $85 million, it's so huge and, you know, our ability to pay it back and all the like, are there any underlying commitments that the County has made to the rating agencies that we would -- we would have to agree to before they are able to go to the bond market; you know, i.e., maybe the stabilization fund or something like that, are there any commitments that we are making to the rating agencies to

make sure that we can pay this back?

MR. POLLERT:
The financial section of the preliminary offering statement as prepared by the Budget Office includes that the disclosure that we anticipate savings from the current layoff in the amounts that I just articulated to you. It also is based upon the assumption that there were adequate interfund transfers available to the County. Discussions with the Comptroller's Office means that -- let me translate it -- that all of the reserve accounts; Tax Stabilization, Assessment Stabilization, Water Quality need to be maintained and cannot be used to balance either the 2012 or '13 Budget. They need to be available to meet ongoing cash flow requirements. Implicit in there is that the 2012 Budget will be resolved as adopted, which includes some sort of resolution on the nursing home, you know, as I had previously talked about. And it is also predicated upon there being a reasonable growth in sales tax revenues in 2013, and obviously, that the Legislature and the Executive carry out their fiduciary area to come up with a balanced 2013 Operating Budget.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
So what you're basically saying is the County is on hold.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. The number one priority really needs to be the repayment of a Revenue Anticipation Note. So whatever it takes, it's a legal obligation. The County is going to have to carefully monitor not just the budget situation, but the cash flow situation to make sure that it does not continue to get any tighter.

As the Chairman had mentioned, it's been more than 20 years ago since the County has issued a Revenue Anticipation Note. Gail was here and I was here, but I don't know if anyone in the Comptroller's Office was present that had to deal with the budget and trying to doing a RAN. It is something that is generally done as a last resort by a municipal unit when cash is very tight. At this point in time, according to our financial advisor, it is Suffolk County and Rockland County that is doing a RAN. It's a different animal, because it's easy to borrow the money, but we really need to make sure that we can pay it back.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Right. And I can see your concern over putting all the puzzle together to make sure that this occurs. But I want to emphasize that this layoff lift that we are going to receive on Friday is part of the agreement.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, it is.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
So that lays heavy on the shoulder of this Legislature in making that decision by its members whether or not to approve the list or not, because the financial success of this County may be dependent on it, would you say that's true?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, it is.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. I have just one more quick question, and I guess it's a request. I want you to address an issue that I see is on the list down the road as one of the possible mitigation efforts, and it seems to be such a big nut that I want you guys to look at it seriously over the next month or so after we get beyond the layoff lift issue, is the -- the jail is expected to come on line and -- this year. And I

see -- and one of the mitigation -- future mitigation issues is that -- the possible savings of $14 million if we delay the opening of the jail for a one-year period. I know there's State Corrections issues and there are issues involving the State, whether or not that's a possibility or not because and all those other issues. Is that something that you will look forward to? Because I would very much into it. Fourteen million is a lot of dollars in the possibility of savings, which are your numbers, Fred, I understand. Could you maybe give us a hint of, you know, going -- moving forward, will that be on your agenda? Is that something you are going to be looking at?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. A couple of weeks ago, perhaps up to three weeks ago, I was called out to a meeting in Yaphank. The Commissioner of Corrections was down and wanted to know what the progress on the jail opening was at that point in time. I discussed with them that we had very serious financial problems, we had serious cash flow problems, and it was that at that point in time, I couldn't give a commitment outside of recognizing that it was an important mandated cost that the County would be able to adhere to a specific schedule for being able to open jail.

We are actively looking at costs associated with the jail. The costs at least $14 million increased costs. When the jail was constructed, that was really not contemplated. That's in the personnel area. There are additional costs with respect to heat, light and power, which may not have been properly included in the budget. So part of the followup with the COC is we had promised them that we would get back to them, talk to them and update them on our financial outlook. It's our intention to do that and to work with the COC to find out if we can come up with some sort of a plan to both reduce our out-of-County placements, which continue to cost us in excess of $8 million dollars a year, and perhaps work something out between that and the phased opening of the jail, or try to come up with some sort of a hybrid so that we're not faced with both the out-of-County costs as well as the cost of trying to open and maintain the jail.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much for that answer. I realize -- I wasn't looking for a definitive answer at this point in time, but I certainly think that it's something if we're looking at all options, that seems to be such a big one that is hung out out there in the future. And if we're just talking about the delay for a year, you know, that's something that this Legislature as well as the administration has to look at. Again, guys, thanks a lot. I know you guys are under a lot of pressure, and I appreciate the fact that we are in this together.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
All right. Thank you, Legislator Horsley. Just to remind the committee, the presenters here with us today had originally asked to be out of here by 11 o'clock, which it now is. I know I took a little extra time myself. Just to remind my colleagues, if something has been asked and answered, maybe just keep moving it along. I would appreciate that. Gentlemen, can you stay a little longer for some more questions? We do have a list of Legislators that are interested. Second is the Vice-Chair of this Budget Committee, Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me start actually with BRO. When we adopted the 2012, Gail, I believe there was some discussions at that point about closing 2011 not with a fund balance, but with a deficit. Do you remember? I feel like the scale was around 11 million or so at that time. Do you remember how much that was? I know now it's being projected at 60 million, but it's quite a difference from when we adopted the budget. Do you have that? And then I know the Blue Ribbon Panel put in the 33 million, and then the Comptroller put it $27 million higher.

MS. VIZZINI:
Well, in light of the shortfalls we expected in '11 and the shortfalls implicit in 2012, during the

deliberations, it was more focused on 2012. So I think we were guessing at that point. The 33 million was actually a consensus number from the two Budget Offices that was provided to the Blue Ribbon. The Blue Ribbon basically went from our consensus shortfall numbers and then made their own determinations as to where they may or may not have under or overstated certain expenditures or revenue. And they had concern fiscal actions, such as reestablishing reserves and things like that, which are important, but we didn't have those things in our model.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I realize that came months later, the Blue Ribbon Panel. I imagine the shortfall from 2011, at least when we were doing the budget, there was the Hurricane Irene money and there was some sales tax that was coming in under. But the reality is that we're probably 50 million than that -- what we believed at that point and at least close to 30 million higher than what the Blue Ribbon is. Do we have a sense of how we could be off by that much? It seems like a lot.

MS. VIZZINI:
We discussed that. This process was very different this year where we knew that 2011 -- it was the first time in a long time, first time since 1991, that we were going to end the General Fund in the negative. We knew that. Our own financial systems don't even have the revenue and expenditures entered that represent 2011 until probably March or so, because you can still be spending 2011 money in February of 2012; whether it's contract agencies, deferred salary agreements or whatever the reasons are, you're still spending 2011 monies. You know, with our staffing levels and everything else, we really don't close, close the books until the end of February, the beginning of March, and there's other exceptions to that. So don't forget, the Blue Ribbon Commission presented to us March 6th.

So, you know, Robert and I were frantically, as were Fred and Connie, frantically doing the best we could with the data that was entered into the system. And as we shared with many of you, let's fast forward to solutions, let's talk about solutions, because the budget shortfall problem is going to be big.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I do want to move to that. I don't want this to seem like criticism, I think you guys do a phenomenal job. Some of those numbers that came in higher than anticipated were based on caseloads, daycare, etcetera. So it just makes me wonder about our forecasting methods and whether we can tweak them in any way that in the future maybe we could get tighter projections -- maybe Robert could answer that -- so we don't end up in this situation again.

MR. LIPP:
We have a method to forecast that we've chosen not to use this year because it was too labor intensive for me. And at the end of the day, for instance, we came out very early with review that there was $135 million shortfall over the two years. We knew that that was, like, a minimum. Then we came out with the Budget Office with the $33 million hole in the '11 portion of the budget knowing that it may not be exact. And the fact of the matter is there's a lot of expenditures that should have been been paid, but the IFMS System, the financial system, didn't reflect that at the end of the year, and a lot of those bills had to be paid only when the cash was available early in the year, but they were accrued back to the previous year.

That being said, things were so bad, as Gail said, we morphed to solution phase, because whatever we were saying was going to be a minimum, number one; number two, I'm very comfortable with the original models that we use that we would morph back to next year when we didn't have to do this approach.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me move on to Fred and the RAN. And when we originally approved the $90 million RAN, that was at a point where we thought the hole was 33 million, now it's 60 million. You had mentioned earlier that this will help us make all of our payment in May. I'm wondering, though, two things; do you anticipate an additional cash flow later in the year -- the RAN is based on State and Federal revenue, do you see either RAN or a TAN coming up against sales tax or another revenue source that will help us meet payroll and other expenses later in this year?

MR. POLLERT:
The County is scheduled for two more regularly scheduled borrowings, which we traditionally do. The RAN is the only thing which is really unusual. We have a DTAN, which is scheduled for September of approximately $90 million and another TAN, Tax Anticipation Note, borrowing in December of approximately $400 million. That's the same amount of the previous year. The DTAN is slight actually slightly smaller. So the cash flow is going to remain tight throughout the end of the year with two more cash flow borrowings anticipated.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Those are typical. I'm just wondering, because we're $30 million short, according to the Comptroller, that there might be some other mechanism used to close that hole by advancing revenues from 2013 into 2012. And you're saying no?

MR. POLLERT:
No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. The layoffs, if we could talk about that for a moment. You said roughly $12 million savings this year and 24 million. I think you had included State and Federal aid in those numbers. I'm wondering though, has overtime been included, because that's something that the committee, the Blue Ribbon Panel, had said that there might be some additional overtime costs based on staff shortages.

MR. POLLERT:
That was, in fact, a recommendation of the Blue Ribbon group that said that there's going to be some slippage involved. As part of the budget mitigation measure, the County Executive directed the Budget Office to exercise an extraordinary amount of overtime oversight. So we currently are having departments report back to us on a daily basis, get authorization for overtime in areas like the public safety area. We are not constraining their overtime, but we are carefully monitoring their overtime.

We were ahead of track prior to the brush fire with respect to the Police overtime. So at this point in time, we feel that we are carefully monitoring the overtime situation, that we won't have another negative impact because of the layoffs. That's not to say that overtime was properly budgeted in the 2012 Operating Budget. It was short as it tends to be, because we try to constrain what departments are going to be expended in overtime. It's kind of if you include the overtime, they will spend it.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So it is factored in, though. That's the main question. So my one last question, and this is kind of particular to my district and to Ed Romaine's district, you talked about borrowing for cars, some of those cars are in the Police District. I just want to make sure that the debt service is going to stay within the Police district and not go against the General Fund. That will be segregated; is that the case?

MR. POLLERT:
What we will be doing is segregating where the cars are. So the blue-and-whites, if we bond for, the patrol cars will be in the Police District. If we do the borrowing for the Sheriff vehicles, that will be in the General Fund. And the same thing is true of the Probation Department, if we need to borrow for Probation vehicles, that would also be in the General Fund. But, yes, we are going to segregate that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you, Legislator Schneiderman. Next is a member of this committee, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
Thank you for coming here this morning. It's unfortunately the bad news. But again, it seems like it takes money to make money, it takes money to save money. I'm concerned again with, I guess, the retirement. So basically we're putting out a certain percentage. What percentage is it that we're putting out, I guess, create the retirement situation to prevent layoffs?

MR. POLLERT:
There is no incentive per se. What we are allowing employees to do, let's say in the PBA, is to retire. In all probability, they would be retiring by the yearend. We are allowing them to retire now, receive their time accruals and be held harmless from any retiree impact on an Employee Medical Health Insurance payment in postretirement. But there's no dollar incentive where we're incenting people to come off the payroll. It's just if they want to save someone else, they can leave now, get their time accruals and be held harmless if there's a charge for postretirement health benefits.

LEG. ANKER:
Again, no additional cost. We would pay it anyways, retire whether they retired this year, next year, whenever they retire?

MR. POLLERT:
Right. So basically, the only thing we had to do is that we had to increase the size of the cash flow, because it's moving cash from the end of the year to cash now.

LEG. ANKER:
The performance management team, how does that work. Evidently, the first list, the large list that we originally heard about, wasn't -- there wasn't information contributed by the Commissioners to understand layoffs that needed to be done. How is that working at this point?

MR. POLLERT:
Currently, the Office of Budget and Management is working cooperatively with Performance Management. So we had a number of meetings with them, we're working in an adjoining office. We're coming up with areas and opportunities that the Budget Office looks at and could identify they do the followup to find can we change processes, can we reduce overtime. So if we have chronic overtime in an area, if there's something we come up with, we turn to the Performance Management Group that goes out to try to look at those areas. In addition to that, they have a group of projects like Workmen's Compensation that they're working on totally independently.

LEG. ANKER:
Thank you. And again, my analogy would be of some of the former Executives seem to be pulling back the rubber band and they let it go, and now we're feeling the pain, because I can't believe the

amount of debt that we have. I personally am not a borrower. It's just overwhelming for me to understand how much debt we have been in, we are in and we will become part of.

One quick comment, if there's any way that we can, as a County, help provide some type of services either support services, job fair counseling, for those who are going to be laid off, because it's not their fault that they are going to lose their jobs. And it would just contribute to the County's financial crisis; they could go on DSS, they can lose their homes. It's a huge concern, of course, from everyone here, but are there options that we can provide them?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes. The County Executive shares your concern on that subject. He has asked our Labor Commissioner Sammy Chu to put together a plan there. And I will make sure that Commissioner Cho reaches out to you to bring you up to speed and to see, you know, if you have any thoughts on how we can enhance those efforts.

LEG. ANKER:
Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you, Legislator Anker. Next is one of our colleagues, Legislator Stern. Please go ahead, then Legislator Montano.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Going back briefly to the RAN. At this point, what do you anticipate specifically utilizing the money for? And I ask the question, because, as Mr. Schneider says, you know, facts have changed, numbers have changed, perhaps immediate needs have changed. And with pulling down this money, maybe you can more specifically talk about how we utilize that money. Is it simply a line of credit that we utilize on an as-needed basis? Is there any flexibility built into that? And as we start utilizing that money, is what we had originally intended the money to be used for, is that going to change in the near term? And I ask those questions going to Legislator D'Amaro and the concern that he had raised and our ability to pay that back. Does there come a time when given this change in circumstances and what we might need to be utilizing that money for, does there come a time when we say, "Well, going forward, our ability to pay that back is becoming more of a concern"? And do we have the ability to not utilize all of that money upfront, but be able to spread it out over a longer period of time. Do we have that kind of flexibility built in?

MR. POLLERT:
Part of the reason that we're doing the borrowing is that we have very little flexibility. So based upon the Comptroller's cash flow, we will be borrowing $85 million in May in addition to getting normal revenues in sales tax. And we will use approximately $83 million of it by the end of the month. At the end of the month, we will have a net cash available of $1.3 million. So it is not an option to downsize the size of the RAN.

I will defer to the Comptroller who is not available at this point in time, I don't think they were invited to the meeting. But looking at the Comptroller's cash flow, it is primarily to meet payroll, it is primarily to meet the obligation for the weekly shares reports that go up to the State of New York on Medicaid. There's a debt service payment which is coming due. That is to meet all the normal type of obligation that the County incurs; getting food in the jail, paying heat, light and power, you know, all of those items. So even with the borrowing, by the end of May on a $2 billion County, we're going to only have $1.3 million of net available cash.

LEG. STERN:
Pulling it down in May and utilizing it all by the end of that same month.

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct. And the following month, our cash flow begins to improve, because in June, we start to get in real property taxes. So a part of our cash flow in the County -- have always had cash flow problems, the TAN borrowing is already a function of the Suffolk County Tax Act. We don't get real property taxes until the second half payment.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you, Legislator Stern. Next on the list is Legislator Montano. Please go ahead.

LEG. MONTANO:
Thank you. I'll be very brief. Fred, are you going to be available on Tuesday to discuss the issues when they come before the full Legislature or not? Will you be here on Tuesday for the meeting, so if I have questions then?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, I will.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Very quickly. On the RAN issue, you said we're up to 85 million from the authorized 90 million. Why not borrow the amount then? Is there a particular reason why you're not taking the full amount?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. Number one, we don't want to overborrow. Number two, when a RAN was anticipated at the end of last year with the OS was only $60 million. And we felt that to be as conservative as possible, we only needed 85, so we borrowed the bare minimum.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Because you can't go back after, that's the issue. One statement you made, you said that the repayment of the RAN was based on future State and Federal aid. Now my understanding, and just correct me if I'm wrong, was that the money that would be used to pay back the RAN was money that was already appropriated by the State and simply not received by the County. Your statement seems to apply the opposite; am I incorrect in that?

MR. POLLERT:
Part of the County's cash flow problems is the receipt of cash in a timely fashion from the State and Federal Government. That has improved. Basically what we're doing is we're borrowing against future revenues and bringing them to get the cash today. Almost like tobacco securitization, "I know I'm going to be getting State and Federal aid, I have an immediate cash flow problem now, I'm borrowing against that future State and Federal aid."

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Future State and Federal aid that you're going to be using to pay it back has not been appropriated is what you're telling me?

MR. POLLERT:
It should be appropriated, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Should be, but has not been yet.

MR. POLLERT:
Well, because it spans two years with the State we are going to be paying it back -- currently, the revenues that we are borrowing against have been appropriated by the State of New York. So part of the discussion early on in the RAN is if we had to enhance the RAN by pledging a portion of the sales tax. The decision was made not to do that. We felt that as we had adequate previously programmatic revenues that normally come in to be able to borrow against. So it's just against State and Federal aid.

LEG. MONTANO:
I'm going to move on, because this is technical, and we'll discuss that later. Jon, with respect to the CN that's coming in on Tuesday, that CN is going to deal with the switch in the layoffs; is that my understanding?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. And solely that.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. Dollar amount wise, in other words, we already have a certain dollar amount anticipated for the 462 positions that we're going to layoff in our current budget, once we make this switch, are we getting a dollar-for-dollar switch here or are the layoffs going to save more money or less money than what we would be dealing with if we simply went with the list that exists now?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
That's something that we're going to have to price out over the next couple of days.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. So you haven't done that yet, but you will.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Correct. We're still --- as I said, we're still drilling down into departments and trying to align aid, figuring out the bump and retreat. But, you know, clearly the goal here is we need to realize as much of the savings as possible given the situation we find ourselves in.

LEG. MONTANO:
Understandable. With respect to the bill you are laying on the table for $162 million phase one savings, you talked about a performance management group and the transfer of certain authority or the delegation to the County Executive certain responsibilities that I believe now currently lie with the Legislature, such as termination of leases and a number of other terms that were annunciated. Is that what we're doing ? Is that what that bill is going to say?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
What we will be asking for is -- essentially that, like, ultimately has to come back to Legislature. What we will be asking for essentially is sort of a buy-in from the Legislature to allow us to explore those areas, you know, essentially make it clear that the Legislature is supportive of our efforts to

find savings in areas like leases, like Worker's Compensation. I'm sure we'll be coming back multiple times as we move forward on these issues. But, no, we're not asking for the delegation of essentially any new authority. Simply more of a buy-in on finding savings in specific areas of the budget.

LEG. MONTANO:
I don't think you have a problem with the buy-in of finding savings, we all know we're in a fiscal situation. But the way it was verbalized, it gave the impression that this bill, which I haven't seen, would delegate certain authority to this performance management group, which, I believe, currently lies with the Legislature. So we would be abdicating certain responsibilities. And that's what I want to ascertain; are we going in that direction? Are you asking for certain emergency powers to deal with certain issues or you haven't formulated that yet?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
I don't believe we're going to be asking for any delegation of authority. It's simply for us to look into these areas. Again, knowing of your concern with the Certificate of Necessity process, we would like to go through --

LEG. MONTANO:
I don't have a problem with a CN, as long as we have a need to do it on that day. And I think you understand that clearly. Thanks a lot, Jon. Have a nice day. I'm sorry I kept you longer.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you, Legislator Montano. Next is Legislator Gregory. Please go ahead.

LEG. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. A lot has been addressed already. I've been getting a lot of calls and e-mails in my office from constituents and employees. And inevitably the first thing or one of the first things that comes out of their mouths as we go this process is utilizing the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund to save jobs. I would like you to address that. I know that -- just to preface that, I know that the Treasurer has used some portion of the Reserve Fund to collateralize operating expenses, but there is, I guess, approximately 25 million in the Reserve Fund now.

MR. POLLERT:
To begin with, I'm not sure that it would be legal to use the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund to transfer funds to avoid a layoff.

LEG. GREGORY:
That was going to be my next question.

MR. POLLERT:
It's under 60, I think, of the General Municipal Law you can use it for unforeseen events. This is something that has been talked about a long time. I haven't seen the last two daily cash flows from the Treasurer's Office. The last time I had looked, the Treasurer had already borrowed 25 of the $50 million from the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund to meet payroll.

Gail, I think, had a conversation with a Comptroller's Office, and I'm going to defer to her, but just in general, we need all of the reserves during both this year as well as next year until we can do out DTAN borrowing. We're going to be borrowing funds from those reserve accounts.

MS. VIZZINI:
Thanks, Fred. This is really the crux of this presentation. It is not uncommon for the Treasurer to borrow over $251 million from the collective reserves; sewer, water quality, tax stabilization

reserve, to meet the County's expenditures for payroll, Medicaid, Social Services program expenses, debt service, etcetera, etcetera so that we don't have to go out to the market for cash.

Because we have been borrowing more than ever and sooner than ever and because we have been taking money out of the Tax Stabilization Reserve is why we have the $90 million dollars RAN, is why we have to have yet another borrowing. So, you know, Fred is probably right, it's not legal to take more money out of the Tax Stabilization Reserve, but if you are going to do that, let's not do the RAN and the County will not be able to make payroll. That's the simplest explanation. Someone will have to make a decision in terms of who is not going to get paid; employees, those on public assistance, those receiving Medicaid. You'd have to fast forward into that mode, because there is no cash. Cash is different than budget, but there is no cash.

LEG. GREGORY:
I knew the answer. That's what I was looking for. I just wanted it on the record. My understanding is there are only two ways you can access it; if there's an unforeseen fiscal emergency or during the budget process, but you have to raise taxes by a minimum of 2%.

So now that being said, we are going to have layoffs. I think Legislator Montano's question touched on my question a little bit. You guys are looking at not necessarily the same number of bodies, but the same like amount in dollars in savings, because anything less would mean more of a deficit, right? So you want to at least match that number.

How is that process going? I wasn't here last week. One of my aides went to one of the meetings. Are certain departments given priority based on State and Federal aid? Are you looking for the same contribution, if I can use that term, in each department that's on the quote, unquote, Levy list? How are you guys working that?

MR. POLLERT:
Clearly, the number one priority was the reflection of the Legislature's wish to retain sworn personnel. Priority two number is we are going to departments, we are looking at what they are legally mandated to do, how we can carry out the functions, and then we're also looking at programmatic aid; whether or not there is additional programmatic aid available, what percentage they are being reimbursed at. We are attempting to mitigate and reduce the number of layoffs, at the same time, keep the same amount of savings that we were originally looking for. And at the same time, trying to meet what our Legislative priorities are with respect to public safety.

LEG. GREGORY:
Now, as far as sworn officers, we have the negotiation that you guys had worked with. That wasn't a freebie, they have come to the table with something. So, you know, I think there's a little bit of a perception out there from some of the employees, the "Well, the PBA or the sworn officers are getting, you know, kind of this free ride and they're able to leave service without having some type of skin in the game," if I can use that word. You know, what's going to happen with the other employees as they go through their negotiations with the administration.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Right. Well, essentially, I think in the case with the police, the thought was -- you know, again, no one wanted to -- it was the will of this body and then the concurrence of the County Executive to minimize the impact on sworn. And, you know, as Fred was pointing out earlier, really, what we did was, you know, you had a number of more senior officers retiring maybe a little bit earlier than they otherwise might. You know, essentially to the good, it's that the time between when they are retiring and when they would be retiring now we're realizing savings on that differential. To the bad, you know, really it's more a cash flow situation in terms of you have this group of people all essentially exiting at once, whereas maybe it would be more spread out under normal

circumstances.

But again, I think the thought was to have 38, I think was the number, 38 people come out of the academy only to be handed a pink slip several days later wasn't -- you know, wasn't something that either this body or the County Executive wanted to see. And then really, the incentive, if you will, for those folks involved around the future potential of health care contributions to retirees, you know, obviously that's a more theoretical goal at this point in time.

LEG. GREGORY:
Thank you. Now, you know, I know there's a lot of concern about how this process has kind of unfolded; it seems to be rushed given the time constraints. Just talk a little bit about, you know, what's the affect of any further delay?

MR. POLLERT:
The process has really been undergone for a period of time before we actually knew what was happening. We had to get some indication from the Department of Civil Service who was actually going to be impacted. So from the time that we knew that, we absolutely had been thinking what were the alternatives, where was the layoff actually going to take place.

Key to trying to move this as quickly as possible is to bring it across with a Certificate of Necessity so we can continue to meet the deadline on the layoffs. If we don't meet the deadline, we are estimating that you are going to have to add another 40 layoffs per month of delay. So Gail had looked at it slightly differently, but my recollection is that she was forecasting that there's an associated cost of $3 million per month. So, you know, it's either the 40 or the $3 million, whatever it is. But those are kind of benchmark-types of numbers. So delay just increases the number of layoffs. We have already represented in the preliminary offering statement that these savings are going to be realized. So to the extent that there are delays will require 40 to 50 more individuals being added on a monthly basis.

LEG. GREGORY:
So it's incumbent by us to -- needless to say, it's incumbent upon us to revamp this list as quickly as possible, meet our deadline by the end of the month to get the letters -- the notices out, because if not, it will have the countereffect of adding more people to the layoffs, which we don't really want.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Correct. Right. Again, just to reiterate a point, you know, not having been here in 2011, you know, look, obviously this is a remarkably painful process for everybody. It's not anything I think any member of this body wanted to see move forward, nor did the County Executive. Again, that said, I don't believe at the time, you know, this process began, anyone thought there was going to be a $60 million deficit for calendar year 2011.

You know, obviously, again, the facts have changed. Obviously, that severely hamstrings the options available to us other than say that you have a County Executive and I think we have a Legislature here who's committed to get out of this as quickly as possible, you know, save as many of the services as we possibly can and restore this County back to fiscal health as quickly as possible.

LEG. GREGORY:
Okay. And to just address the public health nurses in this first phase of the mitigation. Again, I received e-mails and calls in my office that the public health nurses are being laid off. Just for the record -- I know that's not true -- just explain what's happening in 30 words or less.

MR. POLLERT:
There are a variety of vacant spots in Fund 360, which is 100% funded Medicaid. We have had conversations with the Department of Civil Service matching job descriptions with qualifications. The layoff list currently anticipates a layoff of public health nurses. The remaining group of individuals will be able to be ported to Fund 360.

LEG. GREGORY:
As a part of the mitigation, Phase 1 of the mitigation plan, there will be zero layoffs of public health nurses, they will be transferred to Medicaid.

MR. POLLERT:
The layoff list currently includes a large number of layoffs of public health nurses. The remaining nurses in the estimation of the Health Department could not carry out the functions of public health nursing. So part of their mitigation plan was closing public health nursing. We have found a way to do it gracefully by transferring the remaining nurses into the Medicaid area. But the first group of layoffs with public health nurses, there are scheduled layoffs of public health nurses.

LEG. GREGORY:
Oh, there are?

MR. POLLERT:
That was part of the Adopted Operating Budget.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes, I'm aware of that.

MR. POLLERT:
And one of the difficulties is whether or not the could continue to operate public health nursing with a reduced staff. They had concerns that they would not be able to do so. We have found an opportunity to be preserve the remaining individuals and move them to the Medicaid Program.

LEG. GREGORY:
Oh, okay. My recollection was that there were 14 public health nurses -- there were 14 on the layoff list, but as part of the mitigation, those 14 or 11, whatever, would be transferred to Medicaid. But you are saying that there are some outside that number -- or some that would be laid off, and then the rest would be transferred to Medicaid.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. I don't have the numbers currently with me, but I believe that there are 39 public health nurses, of which about half are being laid off. The remainder we can pick up in the Medicaid Program.

LEG. GREGORY:
That's good. Thank you for that clarification. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you, Legislator Gregory. Next, gentlemen, we have just two more Legislators on our list. The first is Legislator Kennedy followed by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. Although I'm not a member of this committee, as you know, I've been involved in some of the budget work that been going on to this point. I need to try to see if we can get an accurate snapshot of where we are now for a process that actually has gone on some eight

months.

Deputy Presiding Officer Horsley and I are part of the Budget Working Group that last September made a series of policy decisions that we then tried to go ahead and put together with the Adopted 2012. And you gentlemen are correct, there have been a number of subsequent issues that have occurred when we, you know, look at the loss.

But let me first go to an area of public safety of which sworn officers are a component. I first want to commend the County Executive for bringing forward that initiative with our PBA, our SOA and our Detectives. My understanding is that all of the Police Officers, they separated effective Sunday, and the Detectives and the SOA members will be off the payroll by the 30th, I guess it is; is that correct?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. How many people do we have that left?

MR. POLLERT:
The last e-mail I saw I believe was 67.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I've heard a variety of numbers; as high as 75, somewhere in the middle.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
We will get you the final that we received. I had 72 the other day, but I think they were still processing a couple of forms.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So at the very least, suffice it to say we have enough to protect the cadets that are coming out in June?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, you do.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Let me speak next then to Public Safety, because, as we know, there are other categories of folks that are in that Public Safety category; like our District Attorney who is here with us today, Probation, Parks Police, all of which are on that list that harkens from last September, which is one point where I think everybody around this horseshoe is in agreement, that that list lacked any kind of logical reduction in areas or policy decisions about what we do. That being said, where are we at with those other Public Safety functions right now?

MR. POLLERT:
As we speak, there are meetings going on. I know the Probation Department came in.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Again, I think the goal is by the time we get an alternative plan to the Legislature by this Friday that we would have dealt with the sworn officer situation. I think there were two -- if I recall, there were two Probation Officers -- three Probation Officers, there were two Detective Investigators in the District Attorney, there were, I believe, six Deputy Sheriffs and four Park Police.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Some of who we saw over the last couple of days, but other areas were not there, we had no dialog. Am I to assume that the Exec has spoken with the Sheriff or with the District Attorney?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So you are working through whatever that process is in those other areas?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes. We have been working directly with the independently elected officials on specific plans for their departments.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Again, what I'm trying to look at it is the broad platform of operations of a $2.6 billion corporation with policy initiatives that we prioritized and identified. And so Public Safety seems, despite what we have as far as an abysmal budget picture for now, to be something that may be able to be satisfactorily addressed for the balance of the year?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes. I think you can safely say that Public Safety is a priority for the County Executive. You know, without speaking for the members of this body, I believe it to be a priority for the members of this body as well.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. I honestly don't recall, did we talk at all -- I know we funded a class of 80 new officers for October of this year, I'm going to BRO now; is that correct?

MS. VIZZINI:
Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Did we talk about this at all in the first phase of this mitigation plan that the County Executive identified?

MR. POLLERT:
No, we did not.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So that's something that remains to be reviewed. Budget Review, what did we tag down as far as a cost associated with that?

MR. LIPP:
I believe it was, like, one million this year and four or five next year.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. All right. Let me then just go to one other area, if I can, Mr. Chair, and I appreciate this. The layoff list, let's talk about that again for a second, because here is my concern, gentlemen: The Public Safety category we just talked about and we're attempting to structure regarding personnel based on a policy decision, but the balance of those positions that we've seen in there appears to be just the opposite of what we struggle to do, i.e., what the Majority Leader just spoke about with public health nursing. Public health nursing is in that list despite the fact that I don't recall anybody

around this horseshoe coming to the affirmative decision that the County of Suffolk should no longer be engaged in public health nursing.

MR. POLLERT:
Currently, there's a meeting going on with the Health Department that is being chaired by two of the other deputies. And I really don't know what the final look is going to look like. I was speaking to the original list and what the mitigation plan would do.

LEG. KENNEDY:
We are on the same page with that Fred, because, as I said at the outset, that list lacked any kind of logic, sanity or anything else that any of us struggles to work with. It was a scattershot design to incite and inflame, and it continues to do that.

The list that we look at on Friday is going to have embedded all kinds of policy decisions in it, because it's going to be areas where people are going to be shed where it will be impossible to perform functions -- and you guys know some of the things that I've spoken about -- well drillers, I talked about them; medical photographers, a whole host of policy decisions that aren't decisions made on policy, but are acquiesced to by lack of staff. That's my biggest concern with how this comes forward.

And then lastly, I'm just going to go to that dollar and cent figure. I'm speaking specifically to what my colleague, Legislator Montano, talked about with the CN, time. Fred, we have gone back and forth between two or three million for a 30-day slice if we push forward the actual date of separation for employees. So we go to -- right now, we're talking about July 1. If we went to August 1, it would be 11.7 million projected savings. To me it looks like, for round numbers, 12 million. Twelve million, six months, that's two million a month. So if we went an additional 30 days, the increase that I see would be two million; is that correct?

MR. POLLERT:
You also would be picking up a step increase for the employees if you slide into the beginning of July, which would increase all the SCAT pay and everything else. We can give you a more exact type of number, but there is absolutely an associated cost of waiting an additional month.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No doubt about it. I'm not disagreeing. As a matter of fact, we have an obligation to pay people who are on the payroll. So if we go another 30 days, that's two more paychecks that we have to pay them. But we may be talking about how we decide to, from a policy perspective, shrink government or back away from where we're at, rather than allowing that process to occur by virtue of a large-scale slice that occurs on June 30th.

Last piece is you spoke about the representation that the Budget Office has to prepare in order to receive the RAN. Do you have to make that representation that personnel are shed by June -- I'm sorry -- July 1st, or would it also work if it was August 1st?

MR. POLLERT:
We made a representation as to a dollar amount.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay.

MR. POLLERT:
And that the budget would be implemented as adopted, that there were going to be layoffs. And we made a representation on what would be required to achieve with respect to those layoffs and that

we anticipated achieving those goals.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So you're answering my question in not stating that it was not a specific date, but it was an aggregate amount.

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Excellent. Good.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
If I can just throw in one thought, which is -- and I certainly appreciate the concerns that have been raised. I think we have to all understand though, fundamentally here, we are making every effort to -- you know, working with the Legislature to make this list make more sense, to align priorities where we can. But I don't think anyone's under the impression that you can lose 400 Suffolk County employees and that there is somehow some list of 400 people that exist in this County that would be in no way missed.

So while, you know, maybe with more time one could do a couple of extra things, I mean, look, fundamentally, this is a very painful process, one I don't think anyone wants to embark upon, and one which will represent real pain, both in terms of services as well as the employees and citizens of this County. Unfortunately, it's a necessary process, and one I think we are making every effort to -- you know, realizing that there is going to be some pain here, we're making every effort to do this as intelligently and expeditiously as possible.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I appreciate that sentiment. I'm not trying to minimize or belittle it. Just as the Exec has put forward some of his priorities which is not only his prerogative, but his job, i.e. with Economic Development and Planning and his decision as to how to reprioritize the tool belt, likewise, we have that responsibility, that if we are going to stop doing a particular function or we are going to take contract agencies and slice them again, or for that matter, pull their funding altogether, it has to be done from a conscious decision of first to step away from that function, and then to realize the funding, rather than to go ahead and lop off the funding and say, "Well, we don't have enough now to go ahead and entertain this." It's the -- I'm trying to think of a nice way to say it, but it's the antithesis of good government, if you will. I'll yield on that, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
All right. Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Muratore, please go ahead.

LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you Mr. Chair. For Jon Schneider, has the County Exec given any consideration to offering the other unions besides the PBA, the SDA and the SOA incentives to retire to maybe save some jobs like they did with Public Safety?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
I do not believe that's been discussed at this point.

LEG. MURATORE:
No thought about it and no discussion on it?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Well, I think -- I guess the fundamental question is, again, there was a specific discussion as to Public Safety between this body and the County Executive. But, you know, again, I think one thing we have all established today is that we do need a savings that comes from this process. And I'm not aware of how through an incentive process we could achieve those savings.

LEG. MURATORE:
My question to BRO, what percentage of the increase in sales tax revenue is due to the taxpayers paying extra at the gas pump because of the removal of the cap on the gasoline tax?

MR. LIPP:
We did an estimate, which remains to be seen how it comes in. Based upon assumptions with prices, we think that we'll get about an extra seven million in during the year. That being said, the budget is so bad off that that's just like a small piece, and we need to do lots of other things.

LEG. MURATORE:
My only concern was how much more the taxpayer was paying. So it's seven million they paid more so far or they will be for the year?

MR. LIPP:
Right. In gross numbers, right.

LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
All right. Thank you, Legislator Muratore. That, I believe, concludes the questioning from the committee. So 162 million down, 370 million to go, I guess we're leaving this committee thinking today. I appreciate how hard, you, gentlemen, as well as our County Executive and as well as the folks on the Legislature are working towards making this all work. I had a really quick question to Fred, can a RAN be refinanced?

MR. POLLERT:
You would have the capability of paying off the RAN and reissuing the RAN so it could be rolled. But the original people that buy the RAN are only buying it for 11 months.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
And the second to, I guess, the Deputy County Executive Schneider. Is that the correct title?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. You know, jokingly talking about another 370 million to go, making light in a very difficult situation, but nonetheless, I know we are going to be working together going forward once we get passed the CN and the mitigation plan, which you are laying on the table Tuesday, and I appreciate that. And I just again want to let you know that this committee stands ready to work with you and the County Executive in going forward and continuing to address those problems and those issues. I had no other questions. The Deputy Presiding Officer had a very brief comment or question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Very brief. Fred, let me just have you clarify something that you just said a second ago relating to Mr. Kennedy's concerns of possibly putting this off for a month and the $3 million versus the $2

million. Could you address that with the longevity pay issues and stuff like that? Is it three million or two million that we would have to increase our debt for it to get another month out of this?

MR. POLLERT:
It really depends upon the individuals going out. It's about $2 million, but there's a inflection point where if you lay them off in July, you've got a step payment for the bulk of the people being laid off, which are AME. So those individuals being laid off are all moving through the step system. There's an associated cost, not just in the salary cost that you're paying out, but also in the SCAT pay. And I really haven't had an opportunity to price it out, because my original model included the Police, I didn't break it down with the bargaining unit. So I will have to do that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Closer to three or closer to two?

MR. POLLERT:
It's probably closer to two plus. It's somewhere between two to three million.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you. Fred and Jon, thank you so much again for coming in today. We appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. Going back to the agenda on the public comments portion. I first want to generally sat to those who have signed up to address the committee this morning thank you so much for waiting and sitting through the presentation that you heard this morning. I hope it was helpful to you in some respect. With that said, I'm going to call the first speaker this morning, Jeffrey Friedman. Mr. Friedman, come on up please. Just to remind each speaker that you will have three minutes to address the committee this morning.

MR. FRIEDMAN:
My name is Jeffrey Friedman. I'm the Executive director of the Retreat. We are a domestic violence organization. And I'm here with my colleagues today, other domestic violence organizations from Suffolk County.

For the last three years, our organizations have been dealing with consequences of the worse recession we've seen in modern times. I'm here today to report on what we have been seeing on the front lines. With people losing their jobs and being foreclosed from their homes, family violence has been on the rise and domestic violence service requests at the Retreat have increased by 56% in the last 24 months. Over that same period, our hotline has increased by nearly 73%.

As people continue to struggle because of our economy, intentions within homes flare up, family violence continues to spike to unprecedented levels. Episodes are becoming more violent and volatile. Recently, a new arrival at our shelter had to be rushed to the hospital from repeated blows to the head and chest just a day earlier. She was diagnosed with a traumatic head injury and a broken rib.

The Retreat feels and acknowledges the impact of our nation's economic downturn and the tough choices about resource allocation that are coming with it. With rumors of more funding cuts during a time of such visibly increased demand of domestic violence services, I'm concerned that organizations like the Retreat will not be able to meet continued demand. As you are aware, domestic violence is a matter of life and death for thousands of women and children in Suffolk

County.   Without agencies like the Retreat, these victims have no place to turn and no safety net. We understand that Suffolk County has been hit hard by this economic crisis, but these domestic violence support services are vital to the welfare of our community and safety of our families. These services need to be sustained.   We can chose a more supportive path.   I thank you so much for your time and consideration and your continued support.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you, Mr. Friedman.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Next speaker, JoAnne Sanders.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
She left.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
She left?   Too bad.   Next, Aileen Fitz, come on up.

MS. FITZ:
Hello.   My name is Aileen Fitz, I'm Director of Brighter Tomorrows.   I came here today for concern for our contracts.   I am a Suffolk County resident, I have concerns for Suffolk County.   I understand the pain.   What I just had to sit through is very painful.

As an agency that provides domestic violence services, the services that we are providing have increased tremendously each year.   Our contracts do not increase.   Since I have been at Brighter Tomorrows, we have had the same amount, same dollar amount each year.   And again, it was cut this year.

While five people have been killed in our County from domestic violence since December, 2011, we need to send a clear message that this cannot go on and stand firm by providing services that have a positive impact on families, young adults and children of Suffolk County.   My hope today is that instead of proposing cuts to contracts that provide critical services to out community, that the Suffolk County Legislature considers ways to reinvest in proven cost-effective programs that are helping families and individuals survive.   Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay.   Thank you.   And the last card I have this morning is from Pam Johnston.   Good afternoon.

MS. JOHNSTON:
Good afternoon.   I'm Pamela Johnston, I'm Executive Director of Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk.   We operate a family violence and rape crisis center.   And I am joining my colleagues here from the other three domestic violence programs.

I'm very sobered by the budget presentation and the herculean task before you.   However, I have the duty to speak on behalf of the thousands of adults and children experiencing domestic violence in Suffolk County.   Already, resources are inadequate to meet the need.   Already, VIBS has experienced cuts.   Already, we have cut administrative costs to the bare bones.   Already, we have lost funds for direct services for victims of domestic violence.

Domestic violence affects thousands of citizens in Suffolk.   Suffolk County has been in the forefront historically of effective programs to eliminate domestic violence and keep families safe.   I would beg you to preserve funding for the domestic violence programs.   Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Thank you. And to all of you, thank you again for waiting out the presentation this morning, I appreciate that. And also, you did hear some discussion this morning about public safety and how concerned we are. I know that what all of you do goes to public safety. Just as a sworn Police Officer would, you are also providing a vital public safety function for us in Suffolk County. So at least speaking for myself, I can assure you that that would always be a priority in my mind. Again, I want to thank you for coming down today, because it's important for you to keep reminding us about how important it is. So thank you again. Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
This is for BRO, because there's a rumor out there that some contract agency funding may be pulled back by as much as 10% from what was approved. Is that -- I know the County Executive has the ability to encumber departmental expenses, non-salary type of expenses. Does the County Executive have the ability to encumber that? I'm just concerned because these contract agencies are told in a budget how much they're going to get. It's reimbursable funds so some of them may have already spent the money. We may have some issue like that. Is that something the County Executive has the unilateral ability to do?

MS. VIZZINI:
Basically what's happening, I believe I forwarded all of the Legislators the list, contract agencies that have a County share, meaning they would be -- you know, if they are 100% reimbursed, it's less likely that they're going to be cut unless we, the Legislature, have adopted additional monies for them that are considered above their 100% reimbursement or they have a County share. Ten percent of that County share is being reserved, held in abeyance, to help mitigate the shortfall, the budget shortfall. And that is pursuant to the Administrative Code and the Charter authorizations for the County Executive to do.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Are these domestic violence agencies, are they -- is there any other State and Federal aid that comes in, or is it --

MS. VIZZINI:
Most of the domestic violence agencies that are funded in Social Services, I believe are 100% aided, but I'd have to double check that for you, and I'll see if any of them are on the list.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'd like to know.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else here this morning -- or this afternoon now who would like to address the Budget and Finance Committee. For the record, there's no response, so we will move on to Tabled Resolutions.

1014, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Charter Law to ensure accountability and honesty in the budget adoption process. (Cilmi)

Motion by Legislator Muratore to approve, is there a second? I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Horsley. Motion to table comes first, and there was no second on the motion to approve, so all those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. MURATORE:
Opposed.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
One opposed, Legislator Muratore. **TABLED (VOTE: 4-1-0-0; Opposed - Legis. Muratore)**

1020, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Charter Law to require timely filing of budget amendments to increase public awareness. (Cilmi)

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Motion to approve by Legislator Muratore, I'll second that motion. Any other motions.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Motion to table by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Anker. The motion to table takes precedence. I'll call that vote now. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. MURATORE:
Opposed.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Two in opposition, myself and Legislator Muratore. **TABLED (VOTE: 3-2-0-0)**

1023, Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Charter Law to improve the process for adopting the County's Operating Budget. (Romaine)

I will offer a motion to table.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
Seconded by Legislator Horsley. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. MURATORE:
No to table.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:
One in opposition. The motion carries. **TABLED (VOTE: 4-1-0-0; Opposed - Legis. Muratore)**

1073, Amending the 2012 Operating Budget to transfer funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund (Fund 404) and amending the 2012 Capital Budget and appropriating funds for the Village of Northport for Wastewater Treatment Collection System Improvements (CP 8193). (Spencer)

I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1121, Amending the 2012 Operating Budget to provide funding for the Medford Chamber of Commerce. (Calarco)

I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Anker. Thank you. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

1321, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and charge-backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature (Control No. 889-2012). (Co. Exec.)

I will offer a motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar, seconded by Vice-Chair Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. **APPROVED** and placed on the **CONSENT CALENDAR (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1322, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and charge-backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature (Control No. 890-2012). (Co. Exec.)

I'll offer same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED** and placed on the **CONSENT CALENDAR (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1325, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature No. 368. (Co. Exec.)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED** and placed on the **CONSENT CALENDAR (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1355, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Charter Law to implement one-year Rolling Debt Policy under 5-25-5 Law to mitigate budgetary shortfall. (Co. Exec.)

This requires a public hearing. I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED FOR A PUBLIC HEARING (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

Next resolution, **1356, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Charter Law to implement two-year Rolling Debt Policy under 5-25-5 Law to mitigate budgetary shortfall. (Co. Exec.)**

Requires public hearing. I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. **TABLED FOR A PUBLIC HEARING (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

No further business before the committee, we are adjourned. Thank you.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 1:00 P.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY