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SUPERVISOR FEINER: So now we have the budget, to consider the adoption of the 2007 budget. Would anyone like to make a motion?

COUNCILWOMAN JUETTNER: I'll move that we adopt the 2007 budget that was amended by the other members of the Town Board.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Any discussion?

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: I will second that.

COUNCILWOMAN JUETTNER: Which is what our preliminary budget was.

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: No.

COUNCILMAN BASS: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN JUETTNER: Preliminary budget. And then there were some additional changes at the last public hearing. To include all of those.

COUNCILMAN BASS: Right.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Anybody like to make any statements before we have a vote?

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: Well, I just -- I know that there were some concerns that came up at the last meeting, which was the reason we did not vote at the last Town Board meeting. And, you know, I certainly want to thank Councilman Bass, who emphasized the fact that we do listen to the public and, you know, take whatever comments that are made by the public into account. That's not to say that everything would be changed, but we do want to consider and I think there were a couple of things that we wanted to look into.

Did we get any feedback response regarding the county contract?
TOWN ATTORNEY LEWIS: I did take a look at the contract, and I sent an e-mail to the Town Board. I didn't see any explicit provisions that require the county to pay for police services in that area or for the Town to do so. It just says that they will address any matters of public safety to the satisfaction of the civic associations, but it's not more explicit than that.

COUNCILMAN BASS: I read your e-mail. I think you're right. I read it similarly. There may be some gray areas of discussion which we can have during the year. If we need to change something after we really thoroughly go through the legal aspects of the contract, then we can do it at that time. I don't know if there is a budget matter to change at this point in time.

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: I think that was something we certainly did need to look into, but I guess we are pretty much sticking with the budget as prepared. And I want to certainly thank Jim and Bart for the hard work and the many hours that you guys put in. Certainly to thank all the department heads, and I know you guys put in a lot of long hours as well. And it was certainly a cooperative effort in getting this budget through. And I'm happy that we are able to put forth a budget where we are not going to have a tax increase and we will still be able to provide the quality of services that our residents are so accustomed to.

COUNCILMAN BASS: I would like to say that, first of all thank the Board for agreeing to do this at a separate time after a public hearing. I think that was a right choice that all of us made together. And as Eddie May says, it's important to have the public hearings and really consider carefully and do the research that the community provides us as we participate through this process. And for -- During the time that I've been on
the Board, I think we have been able to do that. We've made a lot of improvements to our budget because of things we hear from the public along with consulting with department heads and staff here. And we do thank all of you for all the work you've done with us, and it's always appreciated, and we're very grateful.

The other issue that I think we talked about was regarding fund balance. We did receive a memo from Jim Heslop regarding the fund balance. And I thank him for taking the time for doing that. And I'll just state here, he says in reference to the amount of fund balance -- fund balance appropriated in the 2007 preliminary budgets for the A fund and the Town outside village B fund, both funds, based upon the revenue and expenditure estimates for 2006, and the appropriated fund balance amounts for 2007 preliminary budgets would be within the ranges of the general fund Town outside village fund as indicated in the draft fund balance policies respectively. However, a substantial amount of fund balance is being appropriated in the Town outside village fund. I trust the information in this memo is helpful. I appreciate that.

And I think one of the other things you also mentioned here is that the deputy comptroller has worked diligently on this issue. And the Town is far ahead of many other local municipalities in attaining an actuarial study to be consultant be performed and provide the Town with the information requested by Gaspee statement number 45. A request for RFP for actuarial services has been prepared and has been contracted and mailed, the RFP, to six actuarial firms, who are awaiting responses to the RFP and will then begin the review process of the submission. So, that's been ongoing from what I understand from the memo.

MR. HESLOP: I think it's contact as compared to contracted.
COUNCILMAN BASS: Did I read it incorrectly? Yes. Yes. I stand corrected for the record. They have been contacted. And that is an important process that I guess we're going to be undergoing as time moves forward. And, you know, we have been advised that there is plenty of fund balance as they exist. We had those conversations with our comptroller and deputy comptroller at our work session late one evening. And we were careful to not use too much of it, because we knew how important it would effect the entire Town.

We were also advised by our auditors previously that we would be able to provide fund balance back to citizens for money they had pretty much overpaid in the past not only last year but this year. We had been advised about that previously.

There were a number of other issues I believe came up at the public hearings. I did want to touch on a couple of them. One was regarding Cable TV. There was some requests for some citizens that would like to see us spend more money to improve Cable TV here and at schools.

I have looked into that matter as the budget process has been going on. I would like to be able to see more revenue provided for these services as we move forward. I hope at some point in time we can maybe separate these lines out. We should work towards that. Maybe for the next year we will be in a good situation with our -- hopefully in a better situation with our cable companies after this coming year when we have the -- hopefully have a Cablevision contract on board for us.

I'm trying to remember some of the other issues that we had. I think I'll leave it at that. And again I want to thank my colleagues, everybody here on the Town Board for working together on this budget. It really was a lot of hard work. We really went through these budgets very
diligently and carefully line by line and really made sure that taxpayers' money were well watched, well taken care of, and we're doing the responsible thing we have to do, that the public is expecting of us to watch taxpayer dollars.

COUNCILWOMAN JUETTNER: Okay. I would like to echo some of the points that have been made by my colleagues Councilwoman Barnes and Councilman Bass. First, thank you to our comptroller and deputy comptroller for all of their hard work, the tireless hours and for their help in helping us to look at the budget and to understand it so that we could try to put in what was -- what some of the issues that the public had raised. One of which is dealing with our police issues and how to address over -- police overtime and whether that was the best way to handle it or whether we should be adding police officers. And with a lot of assistance from our police chief and from other department heads as well who helped us by finding places where they thought they could save some money so that we could add the additional two officers to the budget, so that we are adding three officers, which will bring up the number of police officers for the Town. I would -- And I believe it will help to not only strengthen the patrol and the concerns of the people from Mayfair Knollwood, but for the concerns of people from all over the Town. So that we have a -- we will be able to have more police presence.

I also would like to thank all the department heads who came and spent time with us to the wee hours of the morning so that we could get this budget done on time. We have a statutory responsibility about when we have to have the budget done by, and it doesn't give us a very big window. And so we appreciate all that was done by the department heads and their staffs who assisted them. So, we appreciate it. It was really a team effort, and the other members of the Town
Board I think, that we worked together to try to make this happen. So that I'm happy that we don't have to have a tax increase at this time.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Francis.
COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Well --
COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: You don't have to.
COUNCILMAN BASS: You're not required.
COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: I don't mind. I'm proud of the budget.
COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: You can just say ditto.
COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Well, ditto. I'm quite proud of this budget because it was a difficult budget. We were handed a budget which overstated revenues and understated expenses, particularly the B budget. And to get a budget that cuts taxes and also is much more transparent than the one handed to us was certainly an accomplishment.

The West Help funds now are in our document for all to see. The number of additional footnotes added to the budget will make it much easier for anyone whose looking at this budget to understand what the budget is all about.

Part of the reason we spent so much time going through this budget is that it wasn't as readable as we would like it to be. We've improved on that this year. I'm sure we will continue to improve on that next year.

The public has commented regarding the need for SAT programs, which is basically a social service. Even in advance of the request, we have been working with the Community Center to
increase the number of social services that are provided by the Community Center, and I think we're going to make great strides towards improving that area of the Community Center very soon.

The police have told us that they were understaffed on a per capita basis. We made a commitment to them last year that we would hire two additional police officers this year. The supervisor cut that to one police officer. We were able to not only restore that one police officer, but we were able to add one additional police officer who will contribute to community policing to address the concerns of those in Mayfair Knollwood but also in other parts of the Town. We were able to do that and still cut taxes.

We were asked about Cable TV. We have conducted a study to look at putting a studio in Town Hall. The cost is quite large, more than a quarter of a million dollars. And we are looking at alternatives to doing that project so that the cost will be reduced. But we were committed to having a quality Cable TV studio and actually sending out a signal that has a good video and audio signal.

We were asked about something, improving leaf collection in the Town. The Town Council has recommended, and it is in the budget, that we add some additional money for overtime. We will then give the discretion to the Commissioner of DPW to how that additional overtime will be utilized.

So, I think we have looked at the budget after -- before and after having public comment. The time for public comment has closed. And we have now taken the recommendations. And even if we couldn't implement them right now, we can certainly factor them in into the future budgets. And I think this is a very reasonable, responsible budget.
Since last week there has been considerable discussion regarding unfunded liabilities, and the supervisor has suggested not spending as much from the fund balance than what he wants to spend from the fund balance. However, there has been no data or documentation to support whether or not his amount is the correct amount. We are doing an actuarial study I understand.

MR. HESLOP: Correct.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: And we need that data in order to determine the correct use of -- the correct coverage that we would need for the underlying liabilities.

The council has decided that it is better to give back the taxpayers' money than to have it stored in the government's bank account. It is better to store it in the taxpayers' bank account.

We have what appears to be a surplus in our fund balance. We were advised by the accounting firm that represents us last year, as a matter of fact, I remember their term for a long time and I am guided by it, that we have a choice of either giving back the taxpayers' money now or we can give it back later. We chose to give back a good part of it last year. And we are choosing to give back a good amount of that surplus this year.

I'm also guided by a fund balance policy proposal that was given to us by the supervisor, which laid out the criteria for using the fund balance. And the Town Council, in developing this budget, has followed those guidelines. And so here we are, able to provide additional police protection. We're able to increase social service programs. We're able to increase leaf pro -- leaf allocation money. And at the same time give the taxpayers a desperately needed break. I'm proud of the budget.
SUPERVISOR FEINER: And my comments. I'm planning to vote for the budget today. I'm pleased that out of a total combined budget of $72,000,000 the Board only reduced expenditures by $37,000.

I would like to thank the members of the Board and the department heads for their efforts scrutinizing, you know, the budget. And again I'm pleased that, you know, in terms of expenditures, we're pretty much in agreement. In the B budget, unincorporated Greenburgh, the Board reduced expenditures by $111,000 from a budget of $57,242,815. In the A budget the Board increased expenditures by $76,000.

Obviously the Board is able to reduce taxes by cutting into the fund balance. And in the B budget you cut into the fund balance by about $750,000. Cutting into the fund balance surplus is not really a right answer and a wrong answer. It's a policy decision. The question is, do we use up our fund balance now and provide residents with a very slight tax cut or would it be more fiscally prudent to have a very small tax increase this year and hopefully be able to keep tax increases very low during the next few years rather than have fluctuations and tax rates as we have seen at the county level and other levels of government.

I remember a couple years ago the County Executive and the County Board of Legislatures for three or four years, consecutive years, they had zero percent tax increases one after another. And then it was followed by a whopping whopper. I think it was over a 20 percent, you know, tax hike. And people were unprepared and it caused a lot of aggravation. And my concern is that if he would eat up into our fund balance and we have a faith based budget, as Elliott Spitzer says, he uses a term space base, where you're relying on a lot of luck that sooner or later there will be a tax, you know, bigger tax increase.
And I think people want predictability and stability. But again right now we do have the surplus. And by voting for a tax -- very small tax cut now, you know we have to let people know that there is a good chance that in the next few years there will be a tax increase. And, you know, the question is when are people going to pay for it.

I want to and, I mentioned to Mike Kolesar that I would put some of his comments from an e-mail in the record. I got an e-mail from Mike yesterday.

COUNCILMAN BASS: This is not a public hearing.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: First of all, let me say this.

COUNCILMAN BASS: No. No.

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: No public comments.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: There is no public comments, but I have the right to say anything I want. So, I am going to be reading a statement, which I said -- I don't tell you what you could say. You can't tell me what I can say. This is part of my comments because, you know, I want it on the record, because I want the record to show the concerns, to highlight the concerns in terms of the unfunded liability issue.

He indicates first Mayor Bloomberg recently announced, and he said last two or three months if my memory is correct, that rather than expand new or existing programs and reduce taxes, he was recommending that three billion of the city's recently discovered surpluses be earmarked to begin to address the City of New York's problem.

Second, as a trustee of the Village of Ardsley, I had a concern about
this issue and its impact on our little community. With little research I was able to determine that for the existing police department of only 19 individuals, the present unfunded liability, without a complete actual valuation, but in my view a reasonable approximation, is between two and $3 million. That is more than the village of Ardsley fund balance as presently reported. And when the village does the proper accounting, that the commercial sector of our economy has been doing for years, will wipe out the fund balance.

I then made a very simple projection, since I'm not privy to any employee census data for the Town. That since the Town's police department staff is more than six times the size of Ardsley's, this year's budget was 116 I seem to recall, excluding other support personnel. The present unfunded liability for existing professional staff is probably in the range of 12 to 18,000,000. That does not include any liability for retired police officers. In addition, it does not include all other active employees of the Town nor existing retirees.

I don't know what progress the Town has made since Wednesday night in attempting to put an estimate together. Any work short of a formal actuarial valuation, and there are many complex variables to be considered, which I have dealt with in the past in the commercial sector, is just an estimate. Nevertheless, if this estimate indicates that the unfounded amount say north of 25,000,000, is the Town Council ready to use 4,000,000 as a refund to taxpayers when there is no future benefit of this cost. By that I mean, employees have rendered their services and have earned the benefit so they owe the Town and taxpayers nothing more. This is the question that the public will be watching.

Under the laws the Town has to
start addressing the issue of unfunded liabilities I believe in, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, Jim, in 2009.

MR. HESLOP: You have to identify what the amount is by 2008.


MR. HESLOP: And start funding by 2009. The way it's set up right now.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Right.
So, basically we have to identify in 2008 and then we have to start funding this in 2009.

MR. HESLOP: By no later.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Now, we have, I believe, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, about 30 years to pay. So, if it's a $30,000,000 unfunded liability issue, it doesn't all have to be done, you know, immediately. I mean, it's not going to kill people all at once with huge increases, but it's -- the best case scenario is this is an additional expense that the Town will have to, you know, pay for.

There is other expenses. We haven't paid yet the bulk of the library. There are other expenses. As I indicated, the borrowing for the bulk -- for a good chunk of the library construction, that's a $20,000,000, you know, bond that was approved by the voters. It's going to come due in two -- with the 2008 budget. So that's, you know, before you even start, there is an additional expense that people are paying for the library. And then that's 2008. And then the following year we're going to have to start paying not only for the library, which we're doing, but also the unfunded liability issues. And that's assuming, that means we have additional, you know, expenses that we don't have, you know, right now.
So, my feeling is that it's going to be very, very difficult in the future to avoid a zero percent tax increases or tax reductions. In fact, the fact that we're eating into the fund balance by more than I had hoped, I predict, you know, there could be, you know, bigger tax increases than people would want. It's going to be harder for people to predict. But again when you look at this budget right now, if you take this budget and you say, is this budget fine for 2007, you know, I can vote for it. It's acceptable. It's just, I would have preferred being a little bit more fiscally conservative. And I also would like to avoid the fluctuations.

I should also mention that although I'm critical of the fund balance issues, there are some positive changes that I believe the Town Board made. I'm very pleased that the Town Board has decided to add additional police to the budget. And I feel that expanding the community policing in Mayfair Knollwood is extremely important.

I also am very pleased that the Board will be funding increasing the funding for leaf collection, overtime funding for 20,000 -- by $20,000. I think that's very, very good public policy. I think that will help us pick up leaves, you know, faster. I think with some additional tweaking and modifications we can have a better leaf collection, you know, leaf collection, you know, process. That's one of a number of things that we could do next year.

I also am very pleased that the Board is open minded regarding the SAT summer business camp and appreciate the fact that the members of the Board have indicated to the community that there are adequate funds in the budget to set up the camp, provided the Community Center Advisory Board endorses the concept.
Again, we are very pleased, because a graduate of the summer police camp is now a police officer, as Councilwoman Barnes indicated earlier, you know, earlier this year. And it shows the success of these educational camps. Because when you provide education to young people and opportunities, it pays very, very big, big dividends. I think the SAT camp and business camp will pay enormous dividends and get people off the street and hopefully will be creating future Bill Gates and Noble Prize winners.

I also am very pleased that the Town Board decided to keep in the budget the proposal for a review of the Tappan Zee Bridge. I think that's, you know, that's -- that's a good move. And I know that people who live along the 287 corridor appreciate the fact that the Town is providing some leadership in terms of the bridge.

Finally, I feel that the Board, we all compromised a little bit on the Comprehensive Plan. Mark originally recommended $300,000. I originally wanted $50,000. The Board included $2,000 for the study for 2007. I think that's a good, you know, a good compromise. So, I am grateful for the scrutiny. And I'm pleased the budget will be approved unanimously with very little controversy.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Since you read an e-mail from Mike Kolesar, I'm going to read the responses to that e-mail.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: That's fine.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: As you're aware, you asked Mike to come up with -- either come here today or tell us what would be an appropriate fund balance. And he said that he does this kind of thing for a living, and that he would have to be paid to do that.
I sent you several e-mails over the weekend, because you kept e-mailing many people regarding this unfunded liabilities, asking you as the chief fiscal officer for information as to what would be the appropriate amount. I wrote to you on December 15th at 3:00 o'clock, what is your comfort level with how you use the fund balance based on if -- based on if it is -- Let me read it again. What is your comfort level with how you do the fund balance. What is it based on. If it's not based on a reasonable fund balance policy.

I took it for granted that if we stayed within the thresholds of your fund balance policy that you proposed, we would be all right. Town Council stayed within the fund balance policy quote unquote that you sent us. I'm not pointing fingers, a characterization that seems to be made whenever I question, when I ask questions that require answers that you don't want to give. That statement by the way is in response to him, when I asked him for data, you said I was pointing fingers. I am looking for some reasoning as to how we approach matters. We have that reasoning by following your fund balance policy or proposal, whatever you want to call it.

So, I asked you specifically to give us data to say what would be the appropriate fund balance policy, if not what we're doing, what is it. And the only response that you sent back was, you feel more comfortable with the amount you proposed than what we're proposing. But there is no data to support that. And until we do an analysis, we will not have that data.

You then kept stating again that the fund balance policy -- the fund balance usage that we were doing is not appropriate. And you used terms that I took exception to. So, I then wrote back to you stating Paul, you as supervisor of a
town are also the chief fiscal officer based on New York State law. If I didn't know the law, it wouldn't matter, because you frequently remind the rest of us that you are the chief fiscal officer. Yet you have failed to respond to my request for data regarding your prior alerts that you have e-mailed others about potential over use of the fund balance. Instead you responded in e-mail to others using phrases such as quote, "we can get away with" close quote, quote "the free ride will end" close quote and quote "the lack of fiscal discipline" close quote.

While you may believe that these terms apply to your actions and to others, you need to exclude the Town Council from your pronoun "we". I assure you that the phrases do not apply to the actions of the Town Council. I, along with Eddie Mae Barnes, Steve Bass and Diana Juettner, my fellow council members, do not believe in collecting or keeping more of the taxpayers' money than is necessary to meet the needs and reasonably projected needs of the Town.

The Town Board, you were present with the Town Council, has been advised that the Town has a very healthy fund balance, surplus money in the Town's bank account. During last year's budget review process we called in our financial consultants, and in a direct response to my question regarding the healthy fund balance, we were told, you can return the money to the taxpayers now or you can return it later. You wanted to return the taxpayers' money later, proposing a nearly four percent tax increase, even though it wasn't necessary.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Four percent.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Four percent last year. The Town Council wanted to return the taxpayers' money then and in a responsible way. We did not reduce the
fund balance drastically in one year. We returned some of the taxpayers' money last year, dropping the tax increase from your proposed four percent increase to approximately zero. And we are returning more of their money this year, changing your tax increase for the unincorporated area to a tax decrease and returning more of the village taxpayers' money.

Do we expect to reduce the fund balance each year? Absolutely not. If the use of the fund balance was important to you, you should not have gone home when the Town Council was reviewing the budget and the use of the fund balance recently with Town comptroller Jim Heslop at a work session. Yes, it was a long work session, extending past midnight, but all four of the council members had quote unquote "other" full-time jobs to go to for the next day.

Being supervisor is your only job. The budget is a significant part of that job, and yet you went home. Our comptroller advised us, in response to our questions, that the use of the fund balance as proposed by the Town Council is consistent with the -- is consistent with the proposed use of the fund balance you submitted to us, and that is consistent with acceptable accounting practice. Based on discussions with Jim, we know we cannot expect to pull from the fund balance every year, but that is acceptable to return taxpayers' money this year in the amounts proposed by the Town Council. Accordingly, the Town Council wants to return more money so it is sitting the taxpayers' bank account not the Town's bank account.

It appears the Town Council has a fundamental difference with you regarding whether government should keep more of the taxpayers' money than is reasonably necessary. I'll remind you that you proposed a fund balance policy. The Town Council's actions are within the policy you proposed. You know that,
because the Town comptroller told us so at a work session you decided to leave more than two hours before it was over.

    You can't have it both ways. Proposing a fund balance policy that returns taxpayers' money and yell fire when that policy is utilized. I understand that you write such e-mails because you are creating a paper trail to use against Town Council in next year's election. That is my understanding, because you told us so in a work session in those words, that it is -- and that is what you are doing.

    So, by advocating a fund balance policy that only keeps a reasonable amount of taxpayers' money, you can claim you care about keeping taxpayers' money in their pockets not the government's. By complaining there may not be enough money in the fund balance for a rainy day, you can then claim, should the sky fall, that you warned us.

    I would appreciate it if you would please support your position using data. Was the fund balance policy you proposed and the Town Council followed floored. If so, how. I have not received that response yet.

    SUPERVISOR FEINER: Well, all I could say is that time will tell. You know, if we do have fluctuations in future tax increases, as I think we will, because, you know, I do not believe we'll be able to maintain the zero percent tax increases, then, you know, remember what I warned and suggested. I believe that most people -- nobody wants to pay taxes. Nobody wants taxes to increase. But I think that most people in the Town would prefer very small incremental, you know, tax increases. They want predictability. I think they want stability. And although my fund balance policy is a proposal, I do feel that it's only a proposal. It was never adopted by the Town Board. In fact, to the best of my knowledge, the Town Board, you know, has
never indicated a desire up to now to -- I mean, what, would you be willing to adopt the fund balance policy as I proposed it or do you want to make modifications? It's just a proposal.

Right now it has the same value as my proposed sidewalk policy. That's not law either. I proposed it. The Board has to decide, are you going to implement it, you know, or not. You know, I do think that it would be nice in the future, you know, hopefully at the beginning of the year, to adopt a fund balance policy for the Board to have some discussions on fund balance policy. This way it could be a guide for all of us to, you know, to live with this.

As I said before, we do have the unfunded liabilities. We know that's an additional cost that we're going to have to pay for beginning in 2009. We have the library. You know, that's additional costs we're going to have to pay for next year. You know, we know that costs keep going up, salaries keep getting increased. We have some additional union negotiations that will have to be, you know, finalized. And I'm sure there will be increases in union, you know, wages.

So, the bottom line is, there are going to be tax increases, you know, in the future. Again, it's pay now or pay later. And again, how much do you pay later. Would people prefer, you know, a one or two percent increase every year or would they prefer a small dip in the taxes now and then a substantial increase next year or two or three years from now.

And again it's just a philosophy. It doesn't mean I'm right. It doesn't mean you're right. Everybody has a different philosophy about it.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Question.
COUNCILMAN BASS: The difference in what you're hearing here is that -- with what Paul Feiner and Mike Kolesar are advocating for is fewer police officers and higher taxes. And the Town Council is suggesting we need more police officers and fewer taxes. On that I move to call the question.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Second.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: First of all, I'm voting for the budget.

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: We called the question.

COUNCILMAN BASS: We called the question.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: You have to vote on the question.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Okay. All in favor?

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: Aye.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Aye.

COUNCILMAN BASS: Aye.

COUNCILWOMAN JUETTNER: Aye.

SUPERVISOR FEINER: Aye.

COUNCILMAN BASS: On the budget?

SUPERVISOR FEINER: All in favor?

COUNCILWOMAN JUETTNER: Aye.

COUNCILMAN BASS: Aye.

COUNCILMAN SHEEHAN: Aye.

COUNCILWOMAN BARNES: Aye.
SUPERVISOR FEINER: Aye. So, the budget is approved unanimously.

(Time concluded: 5:20 p.m.)

Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the above-captioned stenographic minutes.
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