CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

----- X

January 15, 2015 Start: 10:18 a.m. Recess: 11:18 a.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Rm,

14th Fl.

B E F O R E:

JULISSA FERRERAS

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Ydanis A. Rodriguez

James G. Van Bramer Vanessa L. Gibson

Robert E. Cornegy, Jr.

Laurie A. Cumbo Corey D. Johnson

Mark Levine

I. Daneek Miller
Helen K. Rosenthal
Vincent M. Ignizio

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Jeffrey Shear

Deputy Commissioner

Treasury, Payments and Operations

New York City Department of Finance

Elaine Kloss Treasurer New York City Department of Finance

Leslie Zimmerman Assistant Commissioner New York City Department of Finance

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE 3
[gavel]
[background comment]
CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Good morning and
welcome to today's Finance Committee hearing; I'm
Julissa Ferreras and I am the Chair of this
Committee. I wanna thank everyone for joining us
today. We've been joined by Council Member and co-
sponsor of today's bill, sponsor of today's bill,
Council Member Rosenthal, Council Member Levine and
Council Member Cornegy.
Today we will consider proposed Int.
0497-A, sponsored by one of our very own Finance
Committee members, Council Member Helen Rosenthal.
The legislation would make several changes to the way
the Banking Commission makes its recommendations to
the Council for the interest rates for the late
payment of property taxes and water and sewer charges
and the discount rate for early payments of property
taxes, as well as change the default early payment
discount rate.
First I'd like to thank Council Member

Member Rosenthal for spearheading this important legislation, which would bring some much-needed transparency to the rate-setting process and help the

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Council have a better understanding of the rates we are tasked with setting.

I'd also like to thank the staff of the
Finance Division for their hard work on this bill;
specifically, my Chief Counsel Tanisha Edwards, Chief
Economist and Deputy Director Ray Majewski, Assistant
Counsel Rebecca Chasan and Principal Legislative
Finance Analyst Emra [sp?] Ediv [sp?].

By way of background, the Banking Commission consists of the Mayor, who serves as Chair, the Comptroller and Commissioner of the Department of Finance. The Banking Commission has two directives under the Charter; it is charged with designating the bank in which the City will deposit money and recommending to the Council the interest rate to be charged for delinquent property taxes and water and sewer payments and the discount rate for early payment of property taxes. Currently the Banking Commission is required to provide its recommendations to the Council no later than May 25th each year. Once received, the Council can act on the late interest rate recommendation at any time, but may not act on early payment discount rate until June In the event that the Council takes no action

2.2

on either recommended date rate, the law sets forth default rates that would apply until the City Council acts. With respect to the late payment interest rate, the Administrative Code requires the Banking Commission to propose two rates, one for properties with assess values of more than \$250,000, the semi-annual taxpayers and one for properties with assessed values of \$250,000 or less for quarterly taxpayers. Since 1991 the Banking Commission has recommended an interest rate of 18 percent for semi-annual payers and 9 percent for quarterly payers. By law, if the Council did not act on these recommendations of default, interest rate would be 15 percent and 7 percent, respectively.

By way of comparison, other comparable cities have just one rate for all properties that is closer to the rates that the City sets for the semi-annual taxpayer; L.A., Philadelphia and Chicago are at 18 percent and San Francisco is at 20 percent.

Here in the City, 95 percent of taxpayers fall below the \$250,000 assessed value threshold and would pay the 9 percent late payment interest rate on delinquent property taxes and water and sewer charges.

With respect to the early payment

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

discount, it is a discount provided to taxpayers who pay their property taxes early; in order to receive a discount on his or her entire tax bill, both semiannual and quarterly taxpayers have to pay the entire tax bill prior to the date of July 1st installment, which could be paid out with interest. For quarterly taxpayers, if the taxpayer does not pay the entire tax bill up front, the discount percentage would be prorated based on whether the early payment is being made with the October 1st or January 1st tax bill. The Banking Commission's recommendations for an early payment discount rate have also remained relatively stable over the years. Between 1984 and 2005, the Banking Commission recommended a 2 percent rate; between 2006 and 2011 a 1.5 percent rate was recommended and from 2012 to 2015 a 1 percent rate was recommended. If the Council does not act on the Banking Commission's recommendation, the current default discount rate provided by law is 1.5 percent.

Proposed Int. 0497-A would do several things; first it would require the Banking Commission to provide its recommendations to the Council by May 7th rather than May 25th, thereby allowing more time

2	for the Council to consider the recommendations
3	before DOF sends out the July 1st property tax bill;
4	second, it would remove the provision that limits the
5	Council from acting on the discount rate
6	recommendations until June 5th so that the Council
7	adopt the rate at an earlier date and provide DOF
8	with more time to prepare the July 1st property tax
9	bills to reflect the Council's adopted percentage;
10	third, the bill will eliminate the 1.5 percent
11	discount rate and link the default discount rate to a
12	statistical report detailing selected interest rates;
13	most significantly, in my opinion, the bill will also
14	require the Banking Commission to provide
15	justification analysis for its recommendations for
16	the early payment discount rate and the interest rate
17	for the late payment of property taxes. Currently,
18	when the Banking Commission provides its
19	recommendation it also provides the Council with a
20	supplement which details the potential effect the
21	recommendations would have on taxpayers; however, the
22	summary does not specify the factors that were
23	considered when determining the recommendations or
24	the rationale for the use of such factors; it also
25	does not explain the need for a discount percentage

2.2

now that the City is not apparently in need for cash
up front each fiscal year. The justification
analysis would provide much-needed transparency about
the deliberations and the consideration of the
Banking Commission when submitting its
recommendations for the interest rate for the late
payment of property taxes and discount rate for the
early payment of property taxes.

I am proud to co-sponsor this bill and I look forward to hearing from the Department of Finance and the Office of Management and Budget who are here to testify on behalf of the Administration. Before we hear from DOF and OMB, I will turn the mic over to the prime sponsor of the bill, Council Member Helen Rosenthal, to make a statement; after the prime sponsor's statement, my counsel will swear in the Administration's witnesses and we will hear their testimony. Council Member Rosenthal.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you,

Chair Ferreras. I wanna thank you from the bottom of

my heart for giving me a chance to take what was just

a tiny issue, and probably still is just a tiny

issue; in all of the hard work that you do as chair

of the Finance Committee there are so many important

and complicated issues, this is just a technical one
and a technical small one and I really appreciate
your giving me the opportunity and your staff's time
to explore this little issue. And the genesis, just
for by way of background of this bill, is simply that
I think a week I guess it was May 25th, when we got
the information from the Banking Committee and the
Department of Finance on what the prepaid discount
rate would be and what the late payment fees would
be, you know, given the timing of when we got the
information and then given the fact that there were
questions in our Committee and within, you know,
questions you raised and other Committee members
raised, we really didn't have the time to explore the
issues, whether they be big or small, we just really
didn't have any time to explore the issues and so
while this bill and the thoughts about them have come
through a variety of iterations, I think we've landed
at such a good place; basically my intent today is to
hear from the Banking Commission, from the Department
of Finance; from OMB about the two biggest issues,
which are what the timing is of when the information
is given to the Council so the Council can review
this information and secondly, what the formula

25

2	should be as a default formula in order to get to
3	just the sweet spot of where we should be given the
4	need for cash and but also given the you know, how
5	the Department of Finance is managing the cash that
6	comes in the door. So I'm really excited to hear
7	everyone's comments at this hearing; looking forward
8	to hearing the suggestions, but at the end of the
9	day, to be honest, I am going to defer to the Counci
10	Finance staff, to Ray, to Tanisha, to Emra for reall
11	identifying and working with OMB for what the right
12	formula should be and similarly, to the Banking
13	Commission and to our Council staff about timing. So
14	I'm looking forward to hearing your testimony and
15	especially again wanna thank Chairwoman Ferreras for
16	giving me the opportunity to pursue what is just a
17	tiny technical thing. Thank you very much.
18	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm that
19	your testimony will be truthful to the best of your
20	knowledge, information and belief?
21	JEFFREY SHEAR: I do.
22	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you; you may
23	proceed.

JEFFREY SHEAR: Good morning, Chairwoman

Ferreras, Council Member Rosenthal and members of the

2.2

Finance Committee. My name is Jeffrey Shear and I am
the Deputy Commissioner for Treasury, Payments and

4 Operations for the New York City Department of

5 Finance (DOF).

A. This bill would amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York and the New York City Charter in relation to the New York City Banking Commission's annual interest rate recommendations to the City Council for the early and late payment of property taxes and nonpayment of water and sewer rents.

I am joined by the City's Treasurer,

Elaine Kloss. On behalf of Finance Commissioner

Jacques Jiha, thank you for inviting me to speak on this bill today.

The Banking Commission is comprised of the Mayor, the Commissioner of Finance and the Comptroller. The Banking Commission has three primary responsibilities. First, by May 25th of each year the Commission recommends interest rates for the early and late payment of property taxes and nonpayment of water and sewer charges. Second, the Banking Commission reviews and approves or denies banks' biennial applications to be New York City

2.2

designated banks. Lastly, the Banking Commission

3 participates in the New York State Banking

Development District (BDD) program and approves City

5 deposits in the BDD branches.

The current interest rates charged for the late payment of property taxes is 9 percent for properties with assessed values of \$250,000 or less and 18 percent for properties with assessed values of more than \$250,000. The City has charged these interest rates for late property tax payments since 1991.

For water and sewer rents, the late payment interest rate is 9 percent for all properties. The City has charged this interest rate for water and sewer rents since 2005.

In making its interest rate
recommendations, the Banking Commission considers the
prevailing interest rates charged for commercial bank
loans extended to prime borrowers, referred to as the
prevailing prime rate. The Banking Commission must
propose an interest rate for nonpayment which is at
least as high as the prevailing prime rate for
properties with an assessed value of \$250,000 or
less; it must propose an interest rate for nonpayment

2.2

which is at least 6 percent per year more than the prevailing prime rate for properties with an assessed value of more than \$250,000. The Banking Commission also compares the City of New York's penalty rates with those of at least 10 other large municipalities throughout the country. We have included as an appendix a table summarizing the comparisons that the Banking Commission performed last year.

The Banking Commission also recommends the annual discount rate for the early payment of property taxes. The City's current discount rate for the early payment of property taxes of 1 percent has been in effect since May 2011, when it was lowered from 1.5 percent.

Property owners receive a discount rate on their property taxes when more than one installment is paid before the due date. The Banking Commission plays an important role in advising the City Council on interest rates for the early and late payment of property taxes and nonpayment of water and sewer charges. As part of that role, the Department of Finance supports the goal of providing more information regarding the recommendations on interest rates and the discount rate to the Council. We

2.1

2.2

believe providing the data requested in this bill will make property tax data relating to both early and delinquent payments more transparent and easier to understand. We also welcome the opportunity to issue a report to the Council containing the Commission's rationale for its recommended interest rates and they're also interested in meeting with the Council staff in early in May to review and explain the analysis used to support the Banking Commission's recommended rates. We therefore support the proposed legislation, albeit with some suggestions. Please allow me to take this opportunity to explain our suggested changes to the bill.

Our first suggestion relates to the proposed May 7th deadline for submission of interest and discount rate recommendations. The Banking Commission's current deadline to submit its recommendations to the City Council is May 25th. We understand the Council's desire to have more time to evaluate the Banking Commission's recommendations and feel comfortable meeting a May 18th deadline, but May 7th is simply too early. The final property tax data for our interest rate analysis is not available until the end of April and our analysis is not complete

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

18th.

until early May. The Banking Commission members must have sufficient time to review this analysis and then hold the official Banking Commission meeting in May to vote on the interest and discount rates. DOF is committed to reviewing its analysis with interested Council Members and staff during this period, but we do not feel we could meet a deadline earlier than May

Our second recommendation to amend the bill's language relates to the default discount rate. As you know, the default discount rate only goes into effect if the Council does not adopt the discount rate. If the Council does not act, property owners who pay their property taxes for a fiscal year by the July due date receive a 1.5 percent reduction in their taxes. We understand the Council's concern that the default discount rate should more closely reflect market rates so as not to provide too large a benefit to early payers. We believe the best approach to achieve closer alignment with market rates is to allow the Banking Commission's recommended discount rate to become the default rate should the Council not act in establishing a discount rate. This approach will enable to Banking

2.2

Commission to take numerous factors into account each fiscal year, including the current interest rates available in the market that are part of the formula included in the current bill draft. We feel that while the formula represents a good faith effort to achieve a similar result, it has not been thoroughly researched and there could be unanticipated consequences should there be large fluctuations in the rate in the future. We welcome continued conversation with the Council on the best method to determine the default discount rate.

In addition, the legislation requires that property tax data be reported by Council District, property tax class and property tax subclass. We currently have data for discounted property payments by property tax class and property tax subclass. We are investigating how quickly we can provide reports on the early and late payment of property taxes by Council District.

We lastly have some technical language changes we would like to make to the bill that will be communicated to the Committee's counsel after the hearing.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on this bill before you today; I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Thank you very much for your testimony; I'm going to ask a few questions and then give my opportunity to the sponsor of this bill, Council Member Rosenthal and the rest of my colleagues and then I'll come for a second round after.

So we've been joined by Council Member

Daneek Miller and Council Member Rodriguez. So

council members, if you have questions and you wanna

be put in the queue, please let counsel know.

So just by way of background, the City began offering discounts for early payment of property taxes in 1976, the year of which I was born; [laughter] when the City was fully enthralled in a fiscal crisis. The City was in dire need of cash and therefore wanted to incentivize taxpayers to pay their property tax bills up front by providing them with a discount for doing so. Now that the City is not in such need of cash up front as it was in the 70s, it is unclear to the Committee why the default discount percent should remain set at its current

2.2

level of 1.5 percent. I understand that DOF does not
manage cash flow and that this is a function of OMB
and the Comptroller; does OMB or the Comptroller
perform a cash flow analysis to assist the Banking

6 Commission in making interest rate and discount rate

7 recommendations?

[background comments]

ELAINE KLOSS: Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Good morning.

ELAINE KLOSS: It's the Department of
Finance's Treasury Division... [interpose, background
comment] oh I'm sorry, I'm Elaine Kloss; I'm the
Treasurer of the City... and it is actually the
Department of Finance's Treasury Division that works
closely with OMB and the Comptroller's office and we
manage the liquidity of the City. And what I mean by
that is we monitor the funds that come in and are
dispersed and we are responsible for making sure that
every day the City's funds are available for all its
obligations, outgoing payments, we watch what comes
in every day and everything that comes in we turn
over to the Comptroller's office and they invest it
on our behalf. And so it's a three-pronged approach;
we work with OMB hand in hand to watch what's coming

in and to be aware of any shortfalls or you know, what's gonna happen in the future. So we manage the liquidity and the Comptroller's office manages the investments and OMB is overseeing all of it.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: I understand that you may have this conversation, but do you do a formal analysis before you make the recommendations? For example, when you give us the recommendation in May, what happens; what process do you come to the determination that it's gonna be 1.5 percent and other than just a loose conversation, is there an official process by which you come to this assessment?

ELAINE KLOSS: It's not a loose process... [crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Okay.

watching the cash every day, we are aware of where we are and we're fortunate to tell you today that we are in a very, very solid financial position. In fact, as of last night we hit a peak; in my five years with the City we had the highest cash balance on record, so we're financially sound right now, our cash is solid, but we watch it every day, we forecast it

2.2

going out 90 days and we share our information with OMB on a regular basis, every day they see where the balance is and we share our reports with them. That is one of several factors that the Banking Commission looks at when we determine rates. We look at where the economy is, where business is headed, we look at all these factors; we look at interest rates, what other cities are doing and then there's also another piece of this where everybody has an opinion on what these rates should be, and in the past few years we've had both City Council and the Comptroller's office arguing for higher discount rates, not lower. So [background comments] it's a very, very measured approach and we walk through a number of factors.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Okay. And I wanna get back to the cash flow issue and I know that we hit a high point, but I'm gonna come back, 'cause this in particular is about investments and what we're paying out in the discount rate and actually what we're making and that's something that we actually spoke to Ray Majewski yesterday and the cosponsor of the bill just brought up. But I just wanna ask; DOF has explained to the Finance staff the early payment discount is one tool in a toolbox to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

manage cash flow needs; Finance staff was informed that if the cash flow falls below \$1 billion; then this will usually trigger DOF to alarm OMB and the Comptroller, who will decide if borrowing is necessary. To support this argument, DOF provided the Council with data showing the cash balance trends over the 10-year period by showing the cash balance each year in December, the month in which cash balances are usually the lowest in the year; the charts show that in December 2009 cash flow dipped below \$1 billion, yet the City did not borrow. didn't the Comptroller and OMB borrow money in 2009 when cash flow dropped below the \$1 billion threshold, and please explain the other tools that are available to prevent the City from borrowing when cash flow falls below a billion dollars?

ELAINE KLOSS: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: So this is kind of the opposite; that's why I just wanted to ask this question from where we are now.

ELAINE KLOSS: We look very closely at the December cash balance and usually around somewhere between the 12th and the 15th we hit the low point for the year and my first year here in 2010

2 we also hit around a billion and it was considered 3 and we have a number of tools that we can use; we can 4 issue debt, we can hold back and delay payments; we 5 can't stop payrolls, which is one of our biggest 6 expenses, but we can slow down vendor payments, which 7 we did and we can also have other levers, and that is to get people that owe us money to pay faster and 8 that's where this tool comes in; if we had to borrow ... 9 I'm sorry, if we had to get funds in in an emergency 10 basis, we could offer a discount to those paying us 11 12 to get them to pay faster. Corporations do this 13 usually each quarter end if they're strapped for cash 14 and they need money in quickly, they'll offer a deep 15 discount to their largest customers. 16 management tool for cash management and I can tell 17 you that I worked arm in arm, side by side with OMB 18 and the Comptroller's office in the fall of 2010 and 11 when we were getting near that billion dollar mark 19 20 and we did slow down vendor payments and we were on the phone every day and OMB did consider issuing 21 2.2 debt, and we felt that we could get through it 23 without doing that. And so I was not here in 2009; I imagine that everyone that was involved was watching 24 it closely and at some point you make a decision that 25

2.2

holding our cash?

you think you can make it through that period without

3 borrowing and you'll be fine, which is what happened,

4 so.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: So I'm gonna ask because we're in the opposite situation and I know that the co-sponsor of the bill will follow up on this question, but if we are currently strong in cash, we're holding cash, so what are we investing and what is the interest rate in which we're investing; is now the savings... or is now the break that we're giving more costly to the City than

restricted by municipal and where we can make our investments and so our returns are very, very low.

We can only invest in very short-term treasuries and corporates; our return right now is about 18 basis points; last year was about 14, which is almost nothing.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: So then once again, this is where we have the challenge and when we're doing, 'cause this actually comes into us right in the middle of our budget negotiations and if we're trying to find, which we usually are, a couple of

million dollars here and there; to give this savings to taxpayers is very costly to our city, so I think this was the spirit in which this legislation was born in the conversations by Council Member Rosenthal and the rest of the BMT [sic], because in the middle of us trying to figure out the budget, she was very savvy in focusing on this one particular issue.

So I wanna talk about, before I open it up and give it over to the sponsor of the bill, according to the Charter, if the Council does not adopt a discount rate before DOF prepares its property tax bill, then a default discount rate of 1.5 percent will apply until the Council adopts a rate. How many times has a default rate been triggered and if DOF mails out property tax bills with default discount rates, then the Council subsequently adopts a different rate, what is the process to update property tax bills reflecting the proper discount; how long would the process take to reconcile the property tax bills and what costs would be incurred by the City?

JEFFREY SHEAR: Sure. Well we're not aware of an instance where the Council did not adopt a discount rate.

So I think 2 CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Okay. 3 that you should be looking into, if that should happen; this is a new Council, a new day; [background 4 5 comment] we're paying attention. So it would be of concern that these bills go out, and this exactly 6 7 happened last year, I remember speaking to Commissioner Jiha after the bills went out, and we 8 hadn't decided on the interest rate, and to avoid 9 confusion we decided that we would revisit this now. 10 11 [background comment] So I would think that as we're 12 engaging in these conversations moving forward and 13 I'm hopeful that your analysis we will agree, but 14 there may be a situation where the Council does not 15 agree with your recommendations and the Council has 16 the opportunity to change, so then what would happen 17 and do you know how much or what the cost is to send 18 out the bills, so we would think you would have to

[background comments]

send them out again in that case?

JEFFREY SHEAR: So we have with us today
Assistant Commissioner Leslie Zimmerman, who's
responsible for sending out the bills and she can
best speak to that.

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

LESLIE ZIMMERMAN: Yeah, I'm just

thinking that the City mails out about 500,000 bills; each bill will cost us about a dollar to send out with paper and postage and envelopes and handling.

So if the first go around the taxpayer takes a deeper discount than is ultimately decided, I am not sure at what point we would end up billing them again; perhaps not until we have to do a rebill in January because new rates get set. So I think that it would probably be at least another, you know, \$50,000 extra to get the money back. But it's also difficult to say to somebody, well your discount had been \$10 and now it's \$8, [background comment] you know, sometimes they don't even wanna get sent out a bill for a dollar or two, so… [interpose]

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: And again, this speaks to the timing of it all...

LESLIE ZIMMERMAN: Right.

able to engage and I understand that you say that May 7th is really difficult, but I have a lot of faith in you and I think that you can do it by that date, so we're gonna re-engage on the date issue. I'm gonna now open up the mic to the sponsor of the bill and

_	COMMITTED ON TIMEWOOD 27
2	then to my colleagues. Following Council Member
3	Rosenthal we have Council Member Levine and Council
4	Member Miller.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you,
6	Chair and you hit on all the big points, so I guess
7	my only question is; Jeff, on Page 2 you say your
8	second recommendation to amend the bill's language
9	relates to the default discount rate; what is your
10	recommendation?
11	JEFFREY SHEAR: Our recommendation is
12	that the default discount rate be the recommendation
13	of the Banking Commission.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: The default
15	discount rate that the Banking Commission recommends
16	I'm seriously, I just don't understand. [crosstalk
17	JEFFREY SHEAR: Yes. So No, that's So
18	So
19	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: So not 1.5
20	percent… [crosstalk]
21	JEFFREY SHEAR: So right now, as you well
22	know, the default discount rate is 1.5 percent and I
23	think there's some legitimate concern that that is
24	high, given today's interest rates, so we are

suggesting that instead that the Banking Commission

3

4

5

6

7

8

Ŭ

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

recommendation be the default rate, so if the Council does not act, that that rate be adopted.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: So help me think this out. This year, the year that we just went through, that's in fact what the recommendation that the Council took.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: And the

JEFFREY SHEAR: Yes it is.

Banking Commission did its job, they came with a recommendation and we took that recommendation, did not do the default. But I guess, you know... I guess the question really is; why wouldn't you want it to just be a formula that would take into account, you know, how much the City is able to borrow at, which as you accurately point out, we're limited by municipal law in that, and what the demand for cash is, and any other factor that you think is important and our Council staff did make a recommendation on that, [background comment] I know OMB came back with another recommendation that we felt you know really worked; why not just do a formula, it... there is nothing in the proposed legislation that takes out the role of the Banking Commission, the Banking Commission is gonna do just as it did every other

2 year to make a recommendation; all this is saying is 3 that... I'm trying to understand the pushback to [background comment] a simple formula that's not 4 complicated or like a sophisticated economic formula; 5 6 you know, you have the analysis of how your April tax returns and where revenue is; I mean, we're just... I quess why I like the idea of a formula, and I really 8 am getting somewhere on this, but the reason I like a 9 formula is, we don't know if we're moving back to the 10 bad 70s or, you know, where we are today, where we're 11 12 in a situation where we have, you know, \$7 billion 13 cash on hand and that's great, but yet we're limited, 14 as you say, because of municipal law, from investing 15 that cash and really making any serious return on it. 16 It just strikes me that what's so sweet about a 17 formula is it takes politics out of it; I would 18 imagine it would make the rating agencies satisfied because it's a formula, it's not something that's 19 20 gonna be dictated by who's in office. It seems like the fiscally responsible thing to do and so I don't 21 2.2 really understand the pushback on that since we 23 already get the Banking Commission's recommendation 24 and in fact we took that into account. Who said ... you know, next year we'll probably do it again, take 25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

default rate.

their recommendation into account; I think the

formula just keeps it clean.

ELAINE KLOSS: Yes. So let me start by saying that DOF, we are amenable to a formula, so we are not opposed to the idea at a conceptual level and we also acknowledge there has been very constructive conversations going on between Council staff and our staff and also the Office of Management and Budget, so our hesitancy is that the formula has only been developed only relatively recently and we are concerned about the potential for large fluctuations perhaps in the future and we just think there is a need for more time to better understand how well a formula could work and we look forward to having further conversations with you on that. Given what we know today and given the fact that this formula is new, today we're testifying, so today we think it's safer to stick with the Banking recommendation as a

appreciate what you had to say and especially that it did spark a good conversation. Alright, I think our Council staff really, everyone got a lot out of it and it sparked a couple of other things which is

2	really great, so I appreciate that. I guess my
3	concern and why I'm gonna keep sticking with the
4	notion of a formula is because the Banking Commission
5	already does make a recommendation, the Banking
6	Commission's been doing that every year and the
7	Council for the most part has taken the Banking
8	Commission's recommendation; this was my first year I
9	saw that happen and I felt great about the Banking
10	Commission's recommendation; maybe would have dropped
11	it down a half-a-percent, but… or altogether, I
12	guess. This is yes, this is different, but it's a
13	formula that I think… you know, we've sent around
14	people; no one seems to have a problem with the
15	formula, we've checked it with economists, we've
16	checked it with OMB, our economists on staff feel
17	pretty comfortable with it. So given that the
18	Banking Commission already has a role and an
19	important role, I still don't understand why we
20	wouldn't have a fallback that's a simple formula.
21	JEFFREY SHEAR: Well and again, we are
22	amenable to a formula, the formula we know that
23	there's been good research done on the part of the
24	Council and we just think there's a need for further

research to be absolutely certain before it's

2.2

2 embedded in law that it will not have any unintended 3 consequences.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you and 5 thank you, Chair Ferreras.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Of course. And I was just speaking to the counsel, of course there will be deliberations before we vote this out and hopefully we can... we're very confident in Ray Majewski.

We've been joined by Council Member

Johnson, Minority Leader Ignizio and Council Member

Gibson. We will hear from Council Member Levine,

followed by Council Member Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Good to see you both; thank you for being here. In the business world, discounts for prepayment are very common, we've all seen ads, book your cruise by January 1st and save an extra 10 percent. This is done only partly because of the cash flow benefits, the float; there's actually lots of reasons why a business might do this; one is that it gives them early information on how many people are booking the cruise or in this case, rates of tax payment; there's not better forecast than an actual

2	payment, removes the uncertainty. Often companies
3	wanna spread out the logistical burden of receiving
4	and processing payments; they don't wanna have to
5	hire a big spike of staff on the day it would be due,
6	they'd rather spread it out over the year,
7	particularly if there's paper involved, like mailing
8	Also the early payment could reduce the resources
9	they have to expend on billing and collections. And
10	I'm wondering if any of these we've talked a lot
11	about the issue of cash flow and float, but I wonder
12	if any of these other considerations even apply to
13	the City of New York.

ELAINE KLOSS: I think it's fair to say that even if people take advantage of the discount they wait till the last minute to pay, so on the last day of each quarter we see between a billion and a billion-and-a-half coming in and that trend has not changed.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: But on the logistical side though, do you... is there a spike in your staff burden during those periods of payment 'cause it's all electronic, so there's no...

_	CONTILIED ON LIMMOD 31
2	ELAINE KLOSS: Not all of it's electronic
3	and all of it goes to the State to service our debt
4	before it comes to us.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: So do you hire
6	any seasonal staff whatsoever to deal with tax
7	receipts?
8	ELAINE KLOSS: No. No, [background
9	comments] I'm just busier.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: You're personally
11	busier, (laughter) well we feel your pain. What
12	about the mailing of statements; is that all
13	outsourced, is that a fulfillment house or how is
14	that done?
15	[background comments]
16	JEFFREY SHEAR: Yeah, we have a vendor
17	that handles it.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: Right, so there's
19	no motive for you then to spread that out, it's the
20	vendor's problem if they have to do it all
21	[background comments]
22	LESLIE ZIMMERMAN: There's clearly a
23	reduced cost if somebody pays their entire bill up
24	front and then we don't have to send out three

additional coupons to pay.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: As you said, it's about a dollar per taxpayer, [background comment] so not too consequential. Right.

LESLIE ZIMMERMAN: Right, but it's just less work for everybody involved and less cost and then when their one payment comes in, then we pay a bank to process their payment; we only have to pay it once instead of four times. So there's definitely cost-savings... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: And does the prepayment pattern provide any tea leaves you can read that tell you something about the broader tax year, if you saw that certain neighborhoods were paying more than other years, would that indicate good news... is there any data to be mined from that?

JEFFREY SHEAR: We don't think so; we can take a closer look at it, but the proportion of people who early pay is still relatively small compared to the entire roll, so we don't think that by itself is an indication. So to your first question, this is really primarily driven by cash flow considerations, even though there are some ancillary benefits.

JEFFREY SHEAR: Yes, we...

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Okay.

24

25

2.

_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

JEFFREY SHEAR: I didn't mean to exclude the… we will be providing both… [interpose, background comments] better to be safe. We will be providing both types of data by Council District. I believe that we have the early payment data available now for this past July and we will be working on putting together the late payment data as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: So I would be particularly interested in that... on both, certainly, but I'm not so quite sure that there is a lot of early payment coming from my community and I do represent a community that's about 65 percent homeownership; my real concern around the area of late payment is that many of whom are retirees on fixed incomes and the 15-day delinquent period and the appeal period, is there consideration as in what we see in the tax lien process, where certain... there are not only... are there considerations for seeing there's veterans and others, but there's opportunities to make payments without further penalties and that payment arrangements could be made. My further consideration is for those seniors and those retirees on fixed incomes who have to pay such substantial lump sums, I think that a 15-day

2.2

delinquent period is certainly not enough time for them to do that. So within the appeal process, is there a consideration for those individuals' circumstances that allow for seniors and those with mitigating circumstances to pay taxes without such -- 9 percent is pretty steep as well.

JEFFREY SHEAR: So the way the law is written now, we certainly, for people who are in dire straights financially, we do offer payment agreements for people to be able to come up to date, but we do not... other than the 15-day grace period, which you referenced, the interest charges do apply and there is not an opportunity to waive those interest charges.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: So I would certainly like to have that data sooner than possible so we can kinda evaluate that and assess it and make sure that it's equitable to everyone, not just those who could afford to pay in advance. Thank you.

JEFFREY SHEAR: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Thank you, Council
Member Miller. And I just wanna talk about the
actual discount as applied; I know that you said, you
know, I think this is to incentivize people to pay

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

2 early and when you pay the day before it's due, then 3 who's winning, right? And I don't think that's the intention of the early payment discount. I know the 4 Charter requires a discount percentage to be applied 5 to a taxpayer's entire tax bill rather than just the 6 7 portion that is actually prepaid. For example, if a quarterly payer pays his or her entire bill in July, 8 the first quarterly payment is on time, while the 9 remaining three are paid early; however, the discount 10 percentage will be applied to the entire tax bill. 11 12 Wouldn't it make more sense to apply the discount to 13 the tax bill, to the amount that is actually paid 14 early?

that argument; it's our understanding that the City
Charter was amended in 2005 to ensure that it was the
entire bill and the thought at that time was to
provide the incentive that you referenced; we
certainly are willing to have a conversation with the
Council about whether the entire bill should... whether
the discount should be applied to entire bill or not.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: And I mean in some cases we're talking about \$34 here, \$38 and \$22; at the best I think I've seen is \$128 in Council

2.2

District 4. So it just seems that we would be smarter in ensuring that we are giving the proper discount rate to the proper portion that's being paid early; to have someone just pay something the day before -- actually we're incentivizing the June 30th payment is what we're doing, because they get to keep their cash longer and whatever interest they're making and they're able to move their money, so they keep it longer and we're paying for them to keep it longer. So we have to figure that out.

JEFFREY SHEAR: That's a conversation that we're willing to engage in with you.

I wanted to then talk about currently the default discount rate is set at 1.5, but under the proposed legislation the rate would be linked to the rate provided on six-month treasury bills, which changes based on other factors in the economy. Doesn't a fluctuating default rate make sense; shouldn't the discount rate fluctuate reflective to the larger economic reality and the other available options that taxpayers might have for safely investing their money each year? And I think the sponsor of the bill made

2.2

this point also, but if you can just say it again for the record.

JEFFREY SHEAR: Sure. So the Department of Finance is amenable to having a formula for the default discount rate, the rate that the Council has proposed and has done so on the basis of conversations with Finance and OMB staff, has only been put forward in recent days and we just want to be sure that it is a safe rate, that there aren't unanticipated, large fluctuations in the rate that could cause the discount rate to perhaps spike in a way that we wouldn't want it to in the future and so we want to have more time to drill down with Council staff and with the Office of Management and Budget before we back that specific formula.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: And just to piggyback, and to Council Member Miller's point, when we get this data that you're gonna share with us, I would like for you to disaggregate the class of property and as was stated before, both late interest rate, but also the early payments, if you can do that for us.

JEFFREY SHEAR: Yes we will.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: In recent years 3 DOF authorized or exercised its authority when it comes to electronic funds, individuals with tax 4 liabilities greater than a million dollars; this 5 discount can be provided at the Commissioner's 6 7 discretion and does not have to be consistent with the rates adopted by the Council, the Charter also 8 allows this discount to be as much as two times the 9 amount of the discount adopted by the Council; this 10 is on the electronic payments. So has the 11 12 Commissioner used this ability or has it been used in 13 the past?

JEFFREY SHEAR: No.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Okay. [background comments, laughter] That was clear. Great. So we have some additional questions and I don't know if any other of my colleagues have questions.

[background comment] Sure, Council Member Rosenthal.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Just to follow up on the point that Councilwoman Ferreras just made about your concern about the possible fluctuations and if that were the case, that there was something unforeseen, what's so nice about the system is that of course the Banking Commission is gonna make a

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

recommendation and what this bill asks for is transparency in that recommendation, so wouldn't it be the ca... [crosstalk]

JEFFREY SHEAR: And we agree with that transparency.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: So it. Yes. strikes me that we would be protected against any odd fluctuations by the intense oversight by the Banking Commission, by Finance, by OMB; by the Council and we would be protected against anything unforeseen. other point to that is when you made the point about in 2005 the reason that they added in the first quarter to get the discount rate as well was to incentivize people. The beauty of the formula, again, is that if we need to incentivize people; that will pop out from the formula because the formula includes the notion that cash flow is short or projected to be short. So we wouldn't have to keep reamending the law to incentivize or disincentivize or play around with that because it's a clean formula and there's no question; to the Chairwoman's point, people -- you know the City is trying to establish its priorities through its budget and wants to have as much money available in order to make sure its

2.1

2.2

priorities are being funded and it strikes me that despite what people have tried to do with incentives previously it's not working in the situation we're in today and again, that's why I think a formula would take care of that and still we keep in the language of this bill the checks and balances that the Banking Commission continues its role of making a recommendation. So I guess that's to say I look forward to working with you in a fairly expedited way to make sure you have comfort with the formula.

Okay? [laugh]

JEFFREY SHEAR: We look forward to it as well and all I would say is we think that a key strength of this bill is the fact that it makes the Banking Commission analysis and recommendations more transparent so that whatever role it plays, whether it's as the default rate or not, everyone knows where it's coming from, so we think that that is why we are putting forward it as the default discount rate; we look forward to discussions about that versus the formula or perhaps another formula.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay. Thank you very much and again, I just wanna thank the Chair

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

for giving us an opportunity here to vet all these issues. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: So I was just speaking about the wonderful Ray Majewski, who I mentioned earlier, and he shared that if we were to use the formula that was recommended by our team, from 2001 to 2015 there would be some fluctuation in the interest rate, but it really would have been, in 2001, at 1.64 percent; 2008 at 1.4 percent and in 2015, today, it would've been .20 percent, so 20 and you know it shows; I think it reflects the cash flow issue, it reflects the economy, it makes sense and we're trying to get the numbers now on that would've saved our city and I think at the end of the day, as I mentioned when we started, when we're in the middle of budget negotiations, every, every penny counts and this really is what makes sense to us. gonna share this and we'll attach savings to it and the cost.

So my colleagues have no additional questions; I'm gonna have one question to wrap up and this is really about the water and sewer charges. So the Banking Commission provides recommendations for the interest rates charged by the late payment of

2.2

water and sewer charges; over the years the interest rate charged for water has consistently mirrored the interest rate charged for property taxes; other cities, such as Philadelphia, Dallas and Phoenix set different interest rates for the late payment of water charges and property taxes. What analysis does the Banking Commission do in determining the interest rate recommendations for water and sewer charges and which agencies if any do you consult?

LESLIE ZIMMERMAN: I think both groups were looked at as a whole and we don't have readily access to water and sewer information, although we've just started looking into it, so they were taken together as one.

another issue that this Council has; we would recommend and we're gonna be moving forward in thinking that the rate of water fluctuates; we're going through somewhat of a... not somewhat; we're going through increases, we went from metered to, you know, the outside meters and the complexities that many of our homeowners face with the water bill, so it's very likely that you can fall behind on your water bill and if we are just not necessarily doing

2	
3	

4

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

23

24

25

any particular analysis, we could really be hurting the collection of these bills because perhaps it's about putting a zero interest rate or figuring out how can we incentivize people to pay their late water and sewage charges as opposed to just automatically saying these three are the same? I think we can no longer move forward with that. And it may end up that that's the recommendation, but we have to have a system by which we get to it and a system can't be we just look at them together.

JEFFREY SHEAR: Sure. I think one consideration that we do need to take into account is that while we want to be sensitive to the needs of the public during a time when water rates have increased over the years that we do not want to incentivize people in difficult financial positions to pay their property... [interpose]

CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Higher interest rate.

JEFFREY SHEAR: property tax bills because there's a higher rate and that could unintentionally force the default rate on the water bills to go up. So there is a linkage, we agree that it doesn't necessarily need to be automatic and other

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE 48
2	factors are involved, but that is a consideration as
3	well.
4	CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Yeah, of course,
5	but we've taken that into consideration and
6	understand that, but we will continue to engage in
7	this conversation, but I definitely think it's worthy
8	of a separate analysis, even if it is that we get to
9	the same rate, but I've gotta believe that our
10	economies change, as we've seen and we should be able
11	to afford those that have some type of incentive to
12	pay early to do so.
13	JEFFREY SHEAR: Sure. The other thing
14	that I want to mention just quickly is that obviously
15	the Department of Environmental Protection is not at
16	the table today, so certainly they would need to be
17	involved in that conversation.
18	CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Absolutely.
19	[background comments] So at 2015's rate of .20
20	percent, this rate would have saved us \$15 million

at least we know... [crosstalk]

21

22

23

24

25

JEFFREY SHEAR: Yes, I...

because it would've cost the City \$3 million

[background comment] if we used Ray's formula, so we

wanna, you know, consistently remind that we need to ...

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE 50
2	CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: we're gonna have a
3	whole conversation [interpose]
4	JEFFREY SHEAR: Right.
5	CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: about this, but
6	thank you for your point and if we don't have any
7	additional questions, thank you for testifying today.
8	JEFFREY SHEAR: Thank you for having us.
9	[background comments]
10	CHAIRPERSON FERRERAS: Okay. And we will
11	call this hearing to a close.
12	[gavel]
13	[background comment]
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

C E R T I F I C A T E

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date January 16, 2015