CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE JOINTLY WITH SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET

----- X

May 6, 2019

Start: 10:12 a.m. Recess: 2:17 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

B E F O R E: Daniel Dromm

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Adrienne E. Adams

Andrew Cohen

Robert E. Cornegy, Jr.

Laurie A. Cumbo Vanessa L. Gibson

Mark Gjonaj

Barry S. Grodenchik

Rory I. Lancman Steven Matteo Francisco P. Moya

Keith Powers

Helen K. Rosenthal James G. Van Bramer

APPEARANCES

MELANIE HARTZOG OMB

KENNETH GODINER OMB

LORRAINE GRILLO DDC

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER DDC

JUSTIN WALTER DDC

DAVID VAROLI DDC

2	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: [Gavel] Okay, good morning		
3	and welcome to the City Council's first day of		
4	hearings on the Mayor's Executive Budget for Fiscal		
5	2020. My name is Daniel Dromm and I Chair the		
6	Finance Committee. We are joined by the		
7	Subcommittee on Capital Budget chaired by colleague,		
8	Council Member Vanessa Gibson and the Speaker of the		
9	City Council Corey Johnson. We have been joined by		
10	my colleagues let me start over here with Council		
11	Member Margaret Chin, Council Member Jimmy Van		
12	Bramer, Council Member Mark Treyger, Council Member		
13	Carlina Rivera, Council Member Keith Powers, Council		
14	Member Helen Rosenthal, Council Member Barry		
15	Grodenchik, and others will probably be joining us		

Today marks the first day of the Council's

Charter mandated responsibility to review the Mayor's

fiscal 2020 Executive Budget. This morning we will

begin with testimony from the Office of Management

and Budget and then we will hear from the Department

of Design and Construction.

On April $25^{\rm th}$, the Mayor released the Fiscal 2020 Executive Budget totaling \$92.5 billion. The

shortly.

2.2

Executive Plan includes \$1.4 billion in new needs spending between Fiscal 2019 and Fiscal 2020.

Most of the new needs are as a result of cuts implemented in this years state budget or our education related. Some of the new needs included in the Preliminary Budget are \$125 million to replace a state cut for temporary assistance for needy families; \$304.7 million for Carter Case to place student needing special education services in private schools; \$88.3 million for increased Charter School cost ad \$59.4 million for Energy Management associate with the Mayors recent announcement of a green new deal for New York City.

While the Administration was able to find sufficient funds for these items and for its other priorities, the budget is noticeably lacking significant input from the Council because the Administration largely ignored the Council's budget response, which we are required to produce pursuant to the New York City Charter to respond to the Mayor's Preliminary Budget.

I am pleased to announce that there has been some movement on this issue, but I will turn it over to the Speaker now to talk about that in more detail.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you Chair Dromm and Chair Gibson and I want to thank the entire Finance Division team for making today's hearing happen, only ten days after a release of the Executive Budget.

Before I begin my prepared remarks, I want to thank Director Hartzog for her very great help and partnership over the last week. Her team, along with our team have worked really closely to try to achieve a bunch before this hearing today. So, the remarks that I am going to deliver are no way personal to you Director Hartzog. I really appreciate the work that you have put into the last week of us getting down to the nitty gritty and the details that match the Council.

So, I am really appreciative. The remarks I am going to deliver are generally about the Administration and how I feel this budget response was handled. So, to be honest, I was prepared to start off my remarks at today's hearing by expressing my extreme displeasure with the Executive Budget. I was ready to tell the Mayor that this Budget was unacceptable and that the road to adoption he initiated was untenable.

2.2

2.2

The reason I was going to say this is because the Executive Budget included nearly none, none of the proposals. None of the proposals from the Council's budget response. Rather I should clarify, the Administration saw fit to implement our ideas from the response for how to save money, almost \$600 million. And then took the savings that we identified to fund even more of the Mayor's priorities.

The Council as a whole found this incredibly insulting because the budget response was deliberately crafted with input from the entire City Council. As it should be as the Mayor's partner in government. The Budget Negotiating team and the Council deliberated for days and weeks about which proposals to include. And the final product clearly laid out our priorities. Pay parity and wage equity, increasing the city's reserves, achieving 100 percent of fair student funding, having a more transparent budget. These have been our priorities as delineated in our budget response and they should be the Mayor's priorities to as he strives to make New York the fairest big city in America. That's what he likes to say.

One of the critical items that we highlighted in the Budget Response, was the failure of the Administration to include continuing funding for approximately \$155 million in one shot funding that we negotiated into the Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2019. These one shots funded vital programs on which our constituents rely and enjoy including adult literacy to teach English to adults across the city; the extension of beach and pool season to a week past Labor Day, bridging the cap social workers; who provide services for homeless students in our schools; the addition of \$5,000 summer youth employment program slots; and post arrest diversion programs which will help reduce the city's jail population.

So, I am happy because of your hard work,
Director Hartzog, with Latonia McKinney and both of
your teams to announce that today, thanks to the
advocacy of the Council, which remain united in our
position to the Mayor that \$77 million of these
Fiscal 2019 one shots will be restored for Fiscal
2020. That's about half of the one shots that we
funded last year.

2.2

2.2

The impact of avoiding these service cuts can't be overstated and I want to thank you personally for your help in working with us to protect the city's social safety net.

I am happy with this process, but I do not think this is the time for celebration. The restoration of the one shots was only one item, one item, in our budget response. And speaking frankly, they never should have been left out of the budget, the Executive Budget in the first place. And I would still like us to recognize that there is still a lot of work ahead. There are many, many other proposals that we feel like were entirely ignored.

I don't think the failure to be responsive to us was about a lack of resources. This budget is a record \$92.5 billion with a B, billion dollars. As the Mayor is fond of saying these days, there is plenty of money in the world and there is plenty of money in New York City. But even if resources were an issue, the Council put out many proposals that would cost the city nothing. New units of appropriation are free. More transparent reporting for cross agency initiatives like Thrive or otherwise opaque park to the budget like the fairies of shelter

2 spending don't cost a dime. Yet even these ideas
3 were rejected from the Administration.

So, I am glad that we were able to make some headway this week between the release of the Executive Budget and today's hearing. But we are a long, long, long way away from budget adoption. The Council is ready to roll up its sleeves and continue to work together with the Administration to get this done. I hope the Administration is willing to do the same.

You know, typically we try to get this budget adopted by the first week in June, I doubt that's possible and I am willing to wait until just before July 1st to negotiate this and get this right. I feel under no time restraint or that this needs to be done quickly. It needs to be done the right way and again, I am grateful for our partnership, our relationship, our over communicating with other now, but I think you will hear, not just from my opening statement but I think you are going to hear from almost the entire membership of the Council, how disappointed they were with this Executive Budget and I look forward to this hearing today.

2.2

2.2

So, Chair Dromm, I want to turn it back to you and thank you for your hard work on today's hearing.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Another highly anticipated Executive Budget item is
the savings package. Now that we have the details of
the PEG in the Citywide Savings Plan, that we didn't
have for the Preliminary Budget hearings, the Council
is struggling to understand the purpose of the PEG.

Typically, PEG's are implemented during periods of tough economic conditions in order to identify true efficiencies and recurring savings. Until this year, the de Blasio Administration which has benefited from a relatively robust economy for its entire existence, decided to move away from PEG's in favor of voluntary citywide savings program.

Since the implementation of that program, the Council has been urging the Administration to search for savings more rigorously because the majority of the program consisted of accruals, re-estimates and increased revenue projects that would have occurred even in the absence of a savings program.

So, when the Administration announced a mandatory PEG this year, the Council was hopeful that the Mayor was finally getting serious about reining in

2 inefficient spending. To quote the Citizens Budget Commission, the PEG is in line with the 3 4 Administration's prior savings programs and a 5 majority of the savings are from expense reestimates, increased revenues, funding shifts, and a 6 7 debt service savings rather than from improved efficiency. And even where the PEG does make true 8 cuts, the Administration chose to make them in the 9 exact areas that the Council identified as priorities 10 for an increase in our budget response, such as 11

The PEG was couched in the context of a potentially worsening economic position for the city and the need for us all to tighten our belts in anticipation.

funding for cultural institutions, youth services and

So, what is truly baffling, is that in light of this sentiment, the Administration has chosen not to add even a single dollar towards our reserves. As the Mayor grows the budget and increases spending, it is even more important to concomitantly and proportionally increase reserves. By not doing so, the Administration is irresponsibly increasing the

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

senior centers.

2 likelihood that deep programmatic cuts or tax
3 increases will have to be made.

2.2

The Council reiterates the appeal it has been making to the Mayor for years. Save more now while times are good, so we are prepared for whatever the future has in store.

And with that, I will now turn the mic over to Council Member Gibson, Chair Gibson, to speak about the Capital Budget.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you, Chair Danny Dromm and good morning to each and every one of you. I welcome our OMB Director and our First Deputy Director. Thank you for being here. I want to thank our Speaker Corey Johnson for being here this morning and for his incredible leadership as we begin this Executive Budget process.

I am Council Member Vanessa Gibson and I am proud to serve as Chair of the Subcommittee on the Capital Budget and I am honored to Co-Chair this hearing today with Speaker Johnson and Chair Dromm.

While I'd like to focus most of my remarks this morning on the Capital Budget. Before I do so, I certainly want to reiterate everything that Speaker Johnson and Chair Dromm expressed that I to am

2.2

pleased that the Administration heard our many, many, many concerns at being ignored through this process.

And today's announcement of the \$77 million of one shots in Fiscal 2019 are going to be restored will truly ensure that there will not be cuts to these vital important programs.

As our budget negotiations continue towards adoption, I am hopeful that the Mayor and OMB will continue to work with the City Council to ensure that even more of the items that were outlined as priorities in our budget response will be included in the adopted budget. And in addition, the \$77 million is a great start but we are obviously expecting that we can get to \$155 million, which would be the full amount.

And on this note, one of the key requests that the Council has made throughout the Preliminary Budget hearings and in the Preliminary Budget Response, was that the Administration present the City Council with a true ten-year capital strategy. While the \$116.9 billion strategy presented with the Executive Budget did increase slightly from Prelim. It still fails to live up to its intended purpose. The exercise of putting together the strategy should

2.2

honestly be a serious attempt to layout a comprehensive footprint, a blueprint for the long-term capital priorities of our city, well beyond five years.

But that is not what is reflected in this strategy. The strategy presents low levels of spending that are planned in Fiscal 2025 through 2029 that are beyond unrealistic. With average annual spending amounts of only \$6.5 billion dollars and no plan spending in critical, capital categories, such as new schools.

So, our question has been, why even engage in the creation of a ten-year strategy if you are not making real attempts to take long-term capital planning extremely seriously.

At the Preliminary Budget hearings that we held this year, the Council spent a lot of time discussing the need for our city to have a better comprehensive system for tracking capital projects. We appreciate that to this date, OMB has at our request, put the Capital Project Detailed Date Report on its website; very happy about that. And we worked with agencies to ensure that they are filling out all of the information.

2.2

I hope to see further progress made towards an accurate capital project, tracking document that is useful to the Council, that also looks at capital projects that are less than \$25 million as the threshold and other fiscal monitors as well as being available to the public.

While we are making progress, I expect for us to continue in this collective work. The Executive Capital Budget for Fiscal 2020 through 2023 totals \$52.8 billion. And the Executive Capital Commitment Plan for Fiscal 2019 through 2023 totals \$86.2 billion. These are significant and necessary investments in our city's roadways, sewers, schools, housing, parks, playgrounds, and much more.

My focus as Chair of this Subcommittee, continues to be ensuring that the city's capital program is efficiently implemented in order to give New Yorkers the infrastructure improvements they rightly deserve. And I look forward to working with the Administration to achieve just that. And I thank the Finance division led by Latonia McKinney and all of the staff for their tremendous work through this process and as we begin today's hearing, I want to thank OMB for your partnership and we certainly look forward to a

lot more. This is a start. I want to keep moving

forward, I know we are making baby steps of progress,

but I really appreciate the work that you have been

committed to do on Capital Commitments and making

sure that we are really actualizing a real ten-year

plan beyond five years. We want to make sure that in

the next generation of Council Members and the

and priorities are realized over a ten-year period.

So, I thank you. Looking forward to today's

hearing and now, I will turn this back over to Chair

Administration, a lot of these capital commitments

13 Danny Dromm. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you Chair Gibson.

Before we hear from OMB, I'd like to thank the entire

Finance Division Staff led by Latonia McKinney for

putting today's hearing together.

I'd like to remind my colleagues that the first round of questions for OMB will be limited to three minutes per Council Member and if the Council Members have additional questions, we will have a second round of questions at two minutes per Council Member.

We will now hear from OMB after they are sworn in my Council. Excuse me, Speaker.

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.2

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Yeah, I apologize Chair Dromm.

I was remis and also not acknowledging the fact this morning Director Hartzog and her team got us 28 units of appropriation, which I am grateful for. That was part of our conversation this past week and before she began, I wanted to acknowledge, because I didn't acknowledge in my remarks that we are grateful for that progress as well.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you and I am going to ask Council to swear in OMB.

COUNCIL CLERK: Do you affirm that your testimony will be truthful to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I do.

KENNETH GODINER: I do.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, please begin.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Good morning. Thank you,
Speaker Johnson, Chair Dromm, Subcommittee Chair
Gibson and Council Members, for the opportunity to
testify today about the Fiscal Year 2020 Executive
Budget. I also want to thank Latonia McKinney and
Council Finance staff for their positive and
collaborative approach to the budget and the work

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 that we've done over the last ten days to reflect the Councils priorities. 3

I am joined at the table today by OMB First Deputy Director Kenneth Godiner. And our dedicated and hard-working OMB staff is here to assist me in answering questions.

The Fiscal Year 2020 Executive Budget is \$92.5 billion. It remains balanced, and out-year gaps are manageable. This budget was crafted in light of threats to our fiscal stability.

We continue to face uncertainty related to economic conditions at home and abroad. Despite job growth nationally, there are reasons to be cautious. The housing sector continues to be weak, and aggregate consumption, the main engine of economic growth, slowed in the first quarter of this year. Also, the yield curve, a reliable indicator of recessions, is still flat, with spreads close to zero.

We also face pressure from Albany. The State Enacted Budget imposed \$300 million in cuts, shifts, and unfunded mandates on the City. The impact could have been much worse. During the state budget process, we worked with our partners in the

2.2

legislature to push back on more aggressive cuts. We are grateful for their help. State hits include: \$125 million in TANF costs; \$96 million to support election reform mandate; \$59 million designated for healthcare services; and a \$25 million shortfall in education funding.

Ultimately, more than one-quarter of our Fiscal Year 2020 agency spending went towards filling these gaps.

In addition to covering hits from Albany, the Executive Budget accounts for other pressing funding needs. This budget adds \$100 million in Fiscal Year 2020 to meet existing Carter Case demand. We also deepened our investment in special education by adding \$33 million to increase DOE's capacity and reduce reliance on non-district schools.

State-mandated charter school payments have also increased. The State did not cover this liability in its Budget. In early April charter school enrollment numbers became more concrete, and OMB was able to determine the extent of next year's liability. This budget adds \$88 million to meet this mandated need, bringing total spending on charter schools next fiscal year to \$2.3 billion.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2 23

24

Finally, the State informed us earlier in the year that it would no longer split the cost of criminal pre-trial mental health evaluations. As a result, we had to add \$65 million over this fiscal year and the next. Despite economic uncertainty and increased costs due to state budget actions, we must continue to fund critical government operations; this includes paying fair wages and benefits to employees, educating our children, and maintaining and improving our infrastructure.

At the Preliminary Budget presentation, the Mayor announced a mandatory Executive Budget savings target of \$750 million. It would include the Administration's first Program to Eliminate the Gap and an expansion of the hiring freeze. The target was on top of the \$1.5 billion in savings we achieved over Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020 since the November Plan.

In the Executive Budget we surpassed the original \$750 million target achieving \$916 million in savings over the two fiscal years. This includes \$629 million in agency PEG savings; \$84 million above the \$545 million target.

2.2

The PEG differs from previous savings efforts in both process and outcome. Agencies were given mandatory targets based on specific characteristics.

OMB had discretion to impose savings if an agency was noncompliant. And unlike in prior savings plans, we did not rule out service reductions. Due to the hard work of OMB and the Agencies we exceeded our PEG target which allowed us to balance Fiscal Year 2020 budget.

The PEG contains nearly 200 individual agency savings initiatives, the most this administration has ever included in a single savings plan. Also, the mix of savings categories in the PEG varies substantially from prior plans. For the first time in this administration service reductions were enacted as part of the savings plan, including: Eliminating Extended Time Learning at Renewal and RISE schools; reducing and operating grant subsidies for members of the Cultural Institutions Group; eliminating DVD purchases for the New York Public Library and; cutting vacant lot cleaning operations by nearly one-third.

Agencies also achieved high levels of efficiency savings. In Fiscal Year 2020, the first full year

impacted by the PEG, efficiencies account for twothirds of the savings. To achieve these savings
agencies streamlined and improved practices yet
maintained service levels. This includes DOE
procurement reforms that will save \$27 million per
year. DOE has now achieved \$50 million in annual

2.1

2.2

And by lowering central administrative spending, ACS will save \$2 million every year.

procurement savings since the Preliminary Budget.

Finally, we expanded the hiring freeze. By permanently reducing 1,600 positions across agencies, we saved \$116 million over Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020. The hiring freeze expansion builds on the \$50 million in savings we baselined in November by reducing 1,000 vacancies. And, for the first time in this Administration, we reduced the citywide net annual headcount.

In addition to our aggressive savings plan, we maintain \$5.72 billion of budget reserves in Fiscal Year 2020. This record level includes \$1 billion in the General reserve, \$250 million in the Capital Stabilization Reserve, and \$4.47 billion in the Retiree Health Benefits Trust. Last June, we worked with you to add \$125 million in General Reserves, and

\$100 million to the Health Benefits Trust, in the current fiscal year. We look forward to discussing next year's reserve levels with the Council as we head towards adoption.

Now, I would like to discuss investments. Most agency spending in the Executive Budget is related to funding ongoing needs. These investments are necessary to maintain basic City operations. Over the two years will spend: \$57 million to fund Board of Elections needs for upcoming elections; \$56 million to maintain water and sewer systems; \$38 million to fund DOE's rent and operating costs; and \$23 million to address NYPD's critical IT infrastructure needs.

Because of our aggressive savings plan, we were also able to fund a number of Council priorities. To increase energy efficiency with green technology, we invested \$60 million to support retrofits for public buildings. We added funding to support outreach and public awareness campaigns for the City's 2020 Census efforts. This brings the total Census investment to \$26 million. The Bridge the Gap program for students in shelters is now baselined at \$12 million.

2.2

2.2

Finally, we invested \$6 million to refurbish NYCHA

Senior and Community Centers.

In addition, as the Speaker mentioned at the beginning of the hearing, the Administration and Council have agreed to fund \$77 million in Council priorities next fiscal year. And in addition to that, as the units of appropriation, we're actually up to 34 Speaker and hope to grow that number more.

This will support a range of initiatives, the \$77 million from adding 5,000 Summer Youth Employment slots to expanding adult literacy programming.

Along with the Executive Budget, we released the Ten-Year Capital Strategy. The \$116.9 billion plan supports the City's infrastructure needs. The plan funds critical projects like adding school seats, expanding Housing New York 2.0, and improving our roadways and sewer systems. Further, the Capital Strategy now reflects \$8.7 billion in funding for borough-based jails. In this capital strategy, we continue to prioritize state of good repair. Three-quarters of capital funds are invested in maintaining or improving the City's capital asset base.

As part of our ongoing efforts to reflect more realistic capital project timelines, we redistributed

\$3.9 billion from Fiscal Years 2019-2021 into the outyears. We also proposed \$2.3 billion of rescindments from prior Capital Budgets.

Finally, we want to continue to work with the Council to improve transparency, in the capital program. As requested by Subcommittee Chair Gibson at the last hearing we added the Capital Detail Data Reports to our website. Also, OMB recently met with Subcommittee Chair Gibson and Council Member Lander to discuss the path towards developing a capital project tracking system.

In conclusion, I look forward to meeting with you over the next few weeks to discuss our mutual priorities and work towards adopting the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify today. And I now, look forward to taking your questions.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you, Director Hartzog for your testimony. So, the budget process as envisioned by the City's Charter is an iterative one that mandates a comprehensive and lengthy public discussion of budget priorities.

2.2

2.2

First, as you know, but the public should know, the Mayor releases a balanced Preliminary Budget.

The Council has hearings. Listens to the public and then produces an official response. After that response, the Council's Preliminary Budget response, the Mayor is tasked with releasing an Executive Budget.

In this way, the Executive Budget is supposed to reflect the Mayor's formal reply to the City Council's Budget response.

The process is laid out in the Charter and it reflects the intention for a back and forth, a conversation.

As I mentioned in my opening, the Council is grateful for your hard work and getting the \$77 million in one shot restorations for this morning. But the fact remains that is only a portion of one of our many budget response proposals and we should not have had to wait until after the Executive Budget was released to have one portion of one of our proposals included.

So, my questions, I'd like to know whether you and the Mayor agree with the description of the back and forth budget process in the Charter that I just

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

laid out and if you don't, then why do you suppose

the Charter requires a budget response from the City

Council prior to the Mayor's Executive Budget?

MELANIE HARTZOG: The Mayor and I fully agree with what the intent of the Charter is, and I think that as you pointed out, in the Executive Budget we did reflect in fact several of the Council's priorities.

To your point going forward, that was not sufficient, and we've worked over the last several days to add another \$77 million. But in addition to reflecting several of the Council's priorities in the Executive Budget, the Census funding, the students and shelter. In Preliminary Budget, we also reflected our commitment to fair fares at \$106 million and at adoption of last year, we also baselined \$55.9 million of Council priorities at that point and time for items such as the child care vouchers, runaway homeless youth, nurse family partnership and crisis management and moving forward, the fair student funding to get to a citywide average of 93 percent. The \$125 million we added at the Executive Budget of last year is baseline and that's also a Council priority.

2.2

So, there are several things that we did over the course from last Exec until the current Executive

Budget that reflect the Council priorities, but we also acknowledge that we need to go further, and we've done so, and we also acknowledge there is more to do as we get to Adoption.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: I appreciate that acknowledgment. Does the Fiscal 2020 Executive Budget that the Mayor released on April 25th reflect his official reply to the Council's budget response?

MELANIE HARTZOG: It is the official response, but we also have what we have just committed to moving forward which is the \$77 million.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Okay, so I want to go increased personal income tax collections. When the Mayor released his Preliminary Budget, he noted that he was releasing the budget in the midst of very uncertain times. You will see this quote on the screen. He said, there is a pretty strong debate right now about whether a recession is coming in 2019 or 2020 but there is a very high likelihood that it's going to be one year or the other.

And the biggest challenge in developing the budget he cited was the economy. He specifically

2.2

noted that revenues from personal income tax were weakening. Though he did acknowledge that part of what happened was a drop from a one-time bump in Fiscal 2018 due to the federal tax law changes in creating a small windfall for the city at that time.

The concern about this was so great that the Mayor cited it is a major reason why he called for the PEG program for the first year which we adopted this year, which you all put forward this year. But now we are at the point where we can see PIT collections from April. When most people have filed returns, their tax returns and we get a good sense of how the year will end up for this personal income tax and it looks very good. The numbers are encouraging, in fact, it looks a lot better than you might have expected when you released the Executive Budget only ten days ago.

At that point, you raised your PIT forecast for Fiscal 2019 by only \$284 million at that moment and time when the Executive Budget was released through the end of April. But we see PIT collections are actually \$758 million, more than OMB projected as part of the Preliminary Budget. In other words, there is probably \$474 million more in the Fiscal

2.2

2019 PIT collection not reflected yet in this budget. So, my question as you see from the chart right here, my question is at this point, how much do you expect to raise your PIT forecast from Fiscal 2019 to when we adopt the budget a little more than a month or about two months from now?

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, I will answer the question.

I think it's important to give come context. Even with the job growth numbers coming out, Francesco and I have had several conversations about the fact that there are still reasons to be concerned overall at the economy. As I said in the actual testimony, while growth is up in the first quarter, there is still cause for concern because consumption is making up less of that and that gives us a reason to be cautious moving forward.

In terms of personal income tax, I think what we talked about back in prelim had to do with — I'm sorry, what we had to do back in the Preliminary Budget had to deal with the fact that we had a combination of two factors. The December volatility in the stock market that really slowed down estimated payments but there was also an issue of timing. It's a very unpredictable environment with the Trump tax

cuts to understand what's happening with behavior.

Meaning, as the salt cap was implemented, there is

1

2

3

4

5

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

less of incentive for filers to file earlier and that's exactly what happened in April and what we are

6 seeing. Which is people waited until April to

7 actually file their personal income tax. There is no

8 advantage to filing earlier because of the salt cap

9 and we weren't actually the only ones to experience

10 this. We started talking to numerous states for

11 | those who have personal income taxes were also

12 experiencing this as well.

At the point and time that we locked the forecast for adoption, you Speaker noted what our forecast is as of the Executive Budget and it was early in the April month, where personal income tax collections were continuing to come in. As we move forward from now through the Adopted Budget, collections are coming in further. We will be working with you over this course of the next couple of weeks to update our forecast.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Do you all disagree with the chart on the screen?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I do not disagree with the fact that there are personal income tax collections coming

in higher at the point and time now of where we locked our Executive Budget forecast and moving forward, we will have an updated forecast when we adopt the budget with you.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: But I mean, from the information that you have, again, at Exec you put in \$284 on the PIT. We are projecting at this point just from the numbers that we saw for the rest of the month up to \$758. Do you all disagree with that number? Do you think the number is inaccurate or off at this point?

MELANIE HARTZOG: You know, as it related to your forecast, we would say we don't see that level coming in. The actual collections you know, to date, I don't have that number on me.

Francesco was telling me the actual \$758 is the actual collections year to date. That there are a number of different components to it including refunds that can come in and out and I apologize, I thought you were asking me about moving forward.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: That's okay, okay.

MELANIE HARTZOG: There is no difference.

2.2

SPEAKER JOHNSON: You have to dig down a little bit more and do the specifics of that \$758 but there is an agreement that that's where we are as of today.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Yes.

2.2

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Okay, great. So, I know one of the issues that we spoke about even with the PIT collections coming in higher than projected was the unincorporated business tax collections fell. They did not come in as strong as we wanted, which could be potentially a small offset on higher PIT collections but lower UBT collections. Do you have any projections at this point on unincorporated business taxes and how far the drop has been as of today?

MELANIE HARTZOG: As of today?

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Or as of the last couple weeks, as of April, as of whatever the latest numbers you have.

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, our current forecast for the plan assumes that the actual collections are down, we are taking down our forecast by \$52 million and in 20 and out, it goes down \$189 million.

This is one of the more challenging I think, and Francesco would agree with me, one of the more

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET challenging taxes to forecast because there is so much volatility. You are correct that there is a number of different offsets. PIT is going up and property taxes are also going down. What we are seeing there and experiencing there, is a number of refunds is higher abatements. Higher than anticipated, so that's also taking down overall the revenues.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And does this change in PIT collections give you a different sense of the city's economy than what we were projecting at the beginning of the year after the stock market volatility in December and in January when the PIT numbers were down quite a bit. Has this changed your overall opinion of where we are from the beginning of the year now, four and a half months into the year?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Well, as I said, I think we have seen first quarter growth high and the concern there is what is actually driving that which is not consumption. I think overall, we would say the economy is flowing, the revenues are not coming in as they had in prior years and Speaker, we have talked about this on numerous occasions and you have questioned me as well on last year's significant one

2 time increase in personal income tax revenue that is
3 not reoccurring. But revenue growth is modest.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: One of the top recommendations including in our budget response was to fund salary parity and wage equity across the city's public sector workforce. We have called for pay parity within the early childhood education system for school nurses, for EMS staff at FDNY, and republic sector lawyers. We understand that adjusting wage rates across all sectors is a huge and expensive undertaking.

The Administration has made incredible investments in the city's workforce by setting labor contracts, agreeing to retroactive salary increases and funding across the board increases for the human services sector. However, at the same time, the contracted work force has been largely ignored. This contracted workforce primarily consists of women of color who provide vital public services across the human services sector.

Why has the Administration approached the issue of wages differently between the government workforce and the contracted workforce and does the

2.1

2.2

Administration agree with the concept of equal pay for equal work?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Absolutely believe with the concept of equal pay for equal work and as you pointed out Speaker, we have given contractual coalesce to the not-for-profit sector that also includes the attorney's as well. That follow the pattern of the city's collective bargaining and those are conversations moving forward we can continue to have with the entire sector.

And have a process set up through the nonprofit resiliency committee where the deputy mayor's meet with the nonprofit leadership and have ongoing conversations about what the priorities are of the sector.

In terms of the early childhood sector, there has been very good progress over the last several days.

As you may recall there was a concern around a strike. There has been several meetings now where that has been called off because the sector believes that there has been movement and we're going to continue to have conversations moving forward around addressing their concerns and their actual proposals

2.2

2 that they have presented. Kenneth, do you have 3 anything to add on that?

2.2

KENNETH GODINER: Just to reiterate that when this Administration came in, there hadn't been raises in the early childhood contracted service since 2006. Shortly after we resolved the UFT and the seven contracts, we entered as a mediating agent into discussions with Local 205 and the daycare council as a result was a voluntary contract five years in duration. That contract provided wage increases for all the employees in Local 205, but specifically for the certified teachers with master's degrees. Over those five years salaries increased by over 20 percent. For those with bachelor's degrees in certified teachers over 27 percent. So, this was very significant raises. Larger even than those that were given to our city unionize sector.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you for that context, it is helpful. What steps is OMB taking to start addressing the pay parity issues that the Council called for in our Preliminary Budget response? Do you have an estimate on how much it would cost to bring pay parity for all city workers both contracted and none contracted?

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 MELANIE HARTZOG: We do not have an estimate overall, but we have been working. We talked about 3 the early childhood piece and last plan cycle, we 4 actually worked on the District Attorney's on pay 5 parity and we started that work from less than one 6 7 year up to five years of service and looking at aligning those salaries to that of the city's 8 attorney's and we still have work to do. We have 9 worked with the Council on that at Adoption. 10 still have work to do on parity and looking at the 11 12 issues for beyond five years. I think and Chair 13 Dromm, you will recall this as well. There is just a 14 number of things in fact, as we have to consider and 15 you know, what's happening with the overall staffing 16 as it relates to Raise the Age and now, we have other 17 changes that are happening, bail reform etc.

So, we need to look it at holistically but very committed to doing so.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Thank you. So, I am going to turn it back over to my colleagues. Director Hartzog, you made a reference in your testimony. You said, at the end of page two, you talked about the budget reserves that we have, \$5.72 billion dollars in budget reserves in Fiscal Year 2020. \$1 billion

J

in general reserves, \$250 million in the capital stabilization reserve, \$4.47 billion in the retiree health benefits trust. In last June, as you mentioned, we worked for an additional \$125 million in general reserves and \$100 million additionally in the RHBT. And you said, we look forward to discussing next years reserve levels with the Council as we continue toward adoption.

I asked you I believe at the Preliminary Budget hearing if you thought we needed additional reserves and at that moment and time, there wasn't a call for reserves. And in the Executive Budget, we don't see a call for reserves. Does that mean that you think that there should not be reserves, additional reserves or is it something that we should have a conversation around and negotiate on what that final number should be?

I just want to get a sense from you on where you think we should head on reserves as we move towards adoption.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We believe that we have adequate levels for reserves. We also know that and in my testimony what I reflecting is that this is priority of the Council's, it's a priority of the

Administrations. At lost adoption, we did in fact decide jointly to add more of the reserves. Always want to have that conversation with the Council in partnership moving forward about what the level of reserves should be. But at this time, yes, we do believe it is adequate. Moving forward, do we want to have conversation with you and the Borough Council about reserve levels? Absolutely.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: I appreciate that. I mean, the reserves is important to us. We do think that we need to still keep growing the reserves. Given the context that I've heard many times, both in the hearings here at the Council as well as what the Mayor said on the screen about his concern about the economy slowing down even further and us needing to tighten our belts a little bit. Given the PEG program that was in stood in this budget, we think that we need to keep planning for the future. So, if and when that downturn comes, we do not have to cut or slash core city services in a way that would adversely impact our constituents who live in neighborhoods all across the city.

2.2

And so, the reserves are really important to us moving forward and we are going to continue to talk about that.

I think you are going to hear from almost all of the members here today. Both members who Chair specific committees but members who have just a greater concern about the issues that we laid out in our budget response. A real disappointment, that might be a diplomatic way of putting it and anger towards again none with the exception of the bridging the gap social workers and the census which I am not sure where gigantic wins, but any of our proposals that we put into the Executive Budget Response, we saw show up in the Executive Budget.

I think you are going to hear that today from many members and I share those concerns as I laid out in my opening testimony. It doesn't mean we wont continue to communicate and work together and figure out areas that we can find out. But again, I found the Mayor's briefing and response a little more than a week ago to be totally unacceptable. And I think you are going to hear that today from the membership and with that, I am going to turn it back to Chair Dromm.

2.2

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Let's talk a little bit about social workers, it's an issue that I brought up at the briefing with the Mayor. In our Fiscal 2020 Preliminary Budget response, the Council called for the DOE to dedicate \$13.75 million to hire 110 social workers for high needs schools.

There are more than 700 schools that do not have full time social workers on staff and for those schools that do have a social worker and guidance counselor, the ratio of these support staff to students are often egregiously high.

So, why wasn't this included in the Executive Budget, especially when the Administration exceeded its \$750 million target in identifying cost savings and the Administration was able to add over \$350 million to the DOE's Executive Budget?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Chair, we hear you on the social workers and guidance counselors and I think we have worked together very well to ensure that at least in every school we have a resource. Either guidance counselors, social workers or a combination of community-based organizations that are providing a level of resource. Understood that more needs to be done there and as you know, at the Adopted Budget, we

_

add another \$2 million with the Council for the Bridging the Gap program to provide for additional social workers and it is part of the \$77 million that we announced, that we came to an agreement to that includes that additional \$2 million to get to the full amount that is added in the current year for the Bridging the Gap program.

In terms of what we could do in the Executive Budget, was a very challenging budget. Yes, we did overachieve our PEG target, we also had mandated cost that we just could not, we had to fund. And that included the Carters cases; this is providing special education service to children who are in need.

We also wanted to invest in providing some sort of Special Ed inhouse within our public schools.

With the idea that over time, we can actually provide more of the service within the public-school system that children need versus providing them outside of that system through the Carter cases and we have the Charter's that we had the challenge of. The tuition now rising to the level of the lowest public school is the average and also the enrollment going up, where we had to add those costs in.

So, this was just a matter of and all the basic operations that I talked about, that we had to add, IT needs and NYPD. There is always room to have conversation moving forward. I think just to address your question about the Executive Budget, that was the challenge. Modest revenue, the need to come up with savings to fund mandated ongoing basic operations of governments and additional mandates that came down from the state.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: And before I just go to my next question, I forgot to announce that we were joined by Council Members Constantinides, Lavine, Cornegy, Rodriguez, Perkins, Adams, Lander, Matteo, Moya, Menchaca and Miller and Kallos as well.

Okay, so, even with the Bridging the Gap social workers, the Council had requested more. We are grateful that you put in the additional two to bring us up to about \$13.9, almost \$14 million if I am not mistaken. But we still were asking for more in the Bridge the Gap as well. And so, as we go through the negotiations, we want to continue to talk about that because we feel very much that that type of support is desperately needed in our schools, especially with

2.2

the number of homeless students that attending our schools.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Understood Chair.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you. Is there any type of a plan moving forward about addressing that issue?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Other than our conversations with you around what our needs are, again, I emphasize the challenge that we have around where we were at the Executive Budget in terms of resources. But what we've done in working with the Council is at least make sure that there is a resource in every school and acknowledging that there is more work to do. There is definitely more work to do there.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Alright, so that brings me a little bit to renewal and rise schools. The DOE far exceeded its PEG of about \$104 million dollars.

Given that, why did OMB cut an additional \$19 million from DOE's Budget that is used to provide extended learning time and renewal and rise schools and the Mayor and the Chancellor have both made prior commitments that schools would not lose service and support as the renewal program was discontinued.

2.2

2.2

So, can you please explain why you cut that particular support. It seems to me in some ways that you are pulling out the rug from underneath these schools that desperately need that additional support.

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, I want to be clear, upfront and I appreciate the question and the opportunity to clarify that every former renewal school that's a community school will continue to receive 100 percent of fair student funding. So, there is no reduction in their total school budget. It's \$100 percent for fair student funding and the community schools provide a number of different opportunities for students including tutoring.

The extended learning time, I think the

Department of Education found that it was not as

impactful and in tight times where we need to make

tough decisions, these were one of the things that we

in evaluating its impactfulness decided that we could

discontinue that because there are other

opportunities within the community schools for

students.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: I would disagree on that because I think extended learning time was a time

At the Preliminary Budget hearing, I requested that OMB provide an estimate of how much violence in

negotiations, I am sure as well.

23

24

ا ک

jails has cost the city between lawsuits, medical cost, overtime, etc. In your response to a follow up letter after the hearing, you noted that the violence is not getting worse, but it did not provide a cost estimate of the violence.

Since the last hearing, two reports have been published contesting that assertion. On March 4, 2019, DOI sent Commissioner Brann a memo alleging that the Department of Correction under reported the number of inmate fights by more than 1,000 over a three-month period in 2018.

On April 18, 2019, Southern District of New York, Federal Monitors published its seventh report on the Department of Correction. And in the 256-page report, Federal Monitors conclude that while the use of force rates have dropped in select jails, the overall use of force is 79 percent higher in 2018 compared to when monitoring began in 2016. And then today I hear this the report of Corrections officers being arrested on charges of violating the right of visitors to Rikers Island by illegal searches. So, what's happening there?

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So, we have as you pointed out in the letter that we provided you in response

have invested more than \$200 million to address jail violence.

We have seen certain indicators that show that there is actually a decline, slashings and stabbings have declined by 21 percent overall. There have been numerous conversations that I have had in most recent weeks with the Commissioner who has expressed some additional needs that we would be discussing with her and reflecting in future plans to address those concerns moving forward.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, so in the letter you did say that you spent \$205 million in investments to reduce violence in the jails, so given what we're now learning about the higher levels of violence in jails, do you think those efforts are paying off? Have they worked? And do you have plans to reassess the effectiveness of the money already spent?

MELANIE HARTZOG: We do believe that they have actually had an impact. As I said, one of the indicators that we looked at is stabbings and slashings are down by 21 percent. So, we do believe they are impactful. Is there more that we can do? That's the question that I am assessing as we speak.

2.2

2 CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So, will you now commit to assessing the cost of violence in the jails?

2.2

MELANIE HARTZOG: Yes, I think we've been working on it since you last ask us for it. We are working on it, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, in the budget response, the Council called for supplemental budget reporting particularly for programs and initiatives that exist outside of the traditional budget reporting structure and a part from our request for additional units of appropriation.

Examples of these areas include Vision Zero,
Thrive, the Ferry system and the New York School
support of services for the custodians in the
schools.

In addition, we are continuing to request transparent reporting for areas where the budget is particularly opaque, such as in the DHS shelter funding budget.

Will you commit to providing the supplemental reporting that the Council requested in the Budget Response?

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, I appreciate the question and we are always looking to be as transparent as we

possibly can without disrupting the actual agency services. That's why we have worked over the last several weeks on the request by the Council to add more units of appropriation and as we announced today, we are looking at 34 as of now, and working to do more as we can.

The Supplemental Reports, I am happy to sit down with Latonia and her staff and go through the reports and what's needed. And whatever we can provide in terms of transparency that helps the Council gain greater visibility into our budget in financing the City. We are happy to do that, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So, with Thrive and I think with the Ferry System as well, units of appropriation don't necessarily show us exactly where the money is coming from because it's across so many agencies.

How can you give us better transparency on that within the different agencies?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I believe that's what you are asking for in the Supplemental Reports and that's what I am saying, we are happy to sit down and provide that level of information and give you the transparency, the insight that you need into the actual budget and spending.

2.2

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, Fair Futures, a coalition of over 80 foster care and childrens groups is pushing for Fair Futures, Comprehensive Supports for foster youth for middle school to age 26. Foster care providers say that one in five foster youth enter a homeless shelter within three years of aging out of foster care.

Given the high cost of sheltering adults and individuals, do you think an investment in Fair Futures would provide savings to the City in the outyears perhaps even savings that exceed the cost of implementing the program?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Understand the concept on the financing side, we haven't actually run the numbers and so, we will do that. But I think more importantly, the idea that we can provide services to youth that prevents them from entering the shelter system, is one that we should absolutely consider moving forward. Aside from the cost, it is a good policy and program priority to have.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So, you know, we included this in our budget response, and we did ask for a consideration of what the cost would be. So, hopefully moving forward, we can take a closer look

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

at that and as you can see up here on the screen is some of the priorities that we have moving forward.

Okay, good, I am going to turn it over to my Co-Chair Council Member Vanessa Gibson.

CHAIRPERSON VENESSA GIBSON: Thank you. you Chair Dromm and Speaker Johnson and thank you once again for being here and before I get to the Capital specific questions, I just wanted to echo the sentiments of something expressed by the Speaker when he was talking about the PIT, the personal income And while I know we projected about \$284 million in revenue, and then the numbers are much higher than we projected. You talked about a series of uncertainties and certain things that we have to Mandated costs, understanding cost shifts from Albany, but I didn't get a clear answer on the Speakers question in terms of the fact that we should have some idea of how much additional revenue that we believe will be able to use in this conversation of this Executive Budget process.

So, the number that we came up with was \$474 million and you acknowledged that you believe the revenue to date is about \$758 million. So, do you agree with our number of \$474 million and if not, do

you have an idea of what we potentially could be looking at in terms of additional revenue?

2.2

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, there are numbers of pluses and minuses within the Executive Budget forecast and at any point and time, I am happy to have myself and Francesco sit down with the Council and brief you on the different components of the forecast and the different taxes.

So, as I mentioned property tax is down \$70 million in the current year. And we talked about the fact that abatements refunds are up. PIT is up \$284, the business taxes \$60 million \$11 million positive, UBT down \$52 million, sales is a positive \$18 million. The RPTT is \$30 down and MRT, the Mortgage Recording Taxes, is down \$254 million.

So, there is a number of different pluses and minuses, I can go through them all but the net affect on our total taxes and the add was about \$200 million.

So, yes, there is increase in the personal income tax but there is also decreases in other taxes.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, so would it be a fair statement to say that we do project that we will have additional revenue that we can use during this

2.2

process to discuss a number of the budget priorities that we included in our budget response as well as finishing up our one shots to get to \$155 million. Would that be a correct assumption to say that we do have additional revenue that we can use to negotiate during this process to ensure that our collective priorities are addressed?

MELANIE HARTZOG: It is a clear indication that in the current year for personal income tax, at the point in which we have locked the Executive Budget that there are collections higher than where we forecast, in the current year.

As it relates to an overall forecast, I want it to be clear and that's why I mentioned all the different pluses and minuses because a number of different ups and downs happen from now until the next forecast at the Adopted Budget including certain risks. Property taxes going down on a base of you know, over \$27 billion, \$70 million is not a significant decline but it is a decline that affects how much overall revenue that we can add within any given Adopted Budget.

I am committed to working with the Council from now until the Adopted Budget to not only look at if

later five years. And so, what we've continue to

2 ask, and I ask once again, is do you believe that 3 this strategy is a true assessment of capital

4 investment needs over ten years, not five years, but

5 ten or is it just an extension of the Capital

6 Commitment plan? And if it's only an extension of

7 | the Capital Commitment Plan, honestly, what is the

8 point of producing a ten-year plan that's not

9 reflective of full ten years? So, would you be able

10 to elaborate a little bit on that?

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MELANIE HARTZOG: The ten-year plan reflects the ten-year commitment overall. I think the challenge is and you have acknowledged this, and we have been working on it is that the Capital Plan for the first five years is in fact front loaded and we've been working on reforecasting and redistributing and in this plan, we did multiple years instead of just one year in terms of cascading out.

I think it's important to not if you look at 2018, that was our banner year in terms of spending on the Capital Plan of \$12 billion. 2019, as of this plan, I know it's a little hard to see on your chart, but I believe your chart reflects our numbers. 2019 is at 16.4, 2020 is at 18.4, 2021 is at 16.2, 2023 is at 18.3. So, if you look at \$12 billion against 16.4

for instance in 2019, we have more work to do with actually reflecting the plan as the spending and the commitments will actually occur.

And so, as we move forward, we will start to see the leveling out of the plan. It's a challenge that you know we have been working on. I appreciate you continually raising this with us as a concern to actually as much as we possibly can in each plan, do the role and cascade out appropriately where other commitments will be.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, from Prelim to Exec, the only changes that we saw in the Capital Plan was the full funding of the four borough-based jails. And this Council has been talking about a number of other capital commitments that we believe the Administration should be looking at as it related to school seats and acknowledging population growth in the City of New York. We've talked a little bit about capital and housing. Homeless New Yorkers and some of the set asides and the projections that we have met in terms of targets for middle income, low income, but falling short on extremely low income.

2.2

Doing very well in preservation, but not necessarily the targets at the lowest end of the spectrum as well as homeless New Yorkers.

So, is it our expectation that we should see any more changes in the ten-year capital that would be more reflective from our perspective of more needs in areas like education and like housing. The only changes that we saw were the funding of the four borough-based facilities that are fully funded at \$8.7 billion.

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, we added a number of different items to the Capital Plan between Prelim and Exec and I just want to give you a highlight of a couple.

We added in addition to the borough-based jails, \$1.5 billion and that breaks out roughly state of good repair in Department of Transportation for six bridges of \$191 million. State of good repair for transportation again on the reconstruction projects for \$128 million. Street resurfacing for lane miles at \$125 million for Department of Transportation. State of good repairs for Fire Department for \$58 million. Ongoing storm water management projects in

2.2

owned waterfront assets for \$106 million.

So, there are a number of different, I am just giving you a couple of highlights of what additional adds were made between the Preliminary and the Executive.

Staten Island for \$52.3 million. Maintenance of city

In terms of your priority Chair that you have continually raised on the affordable housing front, I just want to add, there has been \$1.9 billion that we added in the Executive Budget, Fiscal Year 2018 Executive Budget to make 10,000 units more affordable.

HPD has had in their term sheets now, 10 percent homeless set aside and we're always looking for ways to increase that. And on the support of housing front, last Adoption, the Speaker at the urging for us to really look at who we could accelerate the support of housing plan, we accelerated that by 200 units to bring the total unit production up to 700. There is more to be done, the Mayor has made that clear and with the Deputy Mayor for Housing Economic Development coming on, Vickie Been. He has charged Vicki and I and the Commissioner Banks with coming up

New Yorkers would acknowledge and would appreciate

seeing some level of more priority given for people and for homeless people or for vulnerable New Yorkers that are living in shelters and on streets. If that was acknowledged in the Executive coupled with all the numbers that you described, I think that would be a good thing.

Recognizing that it takes a while to build housing. And so, the numbers you described are currently being financed. That doesn't mean they were yet in construction when people are obviously in need of this housing today.

So, I guess my question is, what is the expectation that we expect in the Executive Budget to further accelerate our housing New York Plan, and accommodate New Yorkers that are living on the streets and in shelters today beyond housing and why?

I do not believe Housing NY is enough and that's my personal opinion and I want this

Administration to go further and so, I would have liked to see something in the Executive that acknowledges that this is a priority coupled with the work that we are already doing. I am not taking away the numbers you described but I am recognizing that we are doing very well in preservation, but we are

not doing well for New Yorkers at the lowest end of the spectrum. That's my concern.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We believe that Housing 2.0 is extremely robust. As I said, there is more work to be done. In coming weeks, you will hear more from us on what more we plan to do.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, I hope we hear good things. Okay, I just want to keep pushing because it's very important to many of us that represent constituents that are living on the streets and it seems this Administration will quickly give us a shelter before we get new housing. And that is not the conversation I want to have today, nor is it the conversation I want to continue to have during this Budget process.

So, I am asking, and I will keep asking to make sure that we are talking about the important priorities that we know New Yorkers really care about.

I wanted to ask, in terms of moving forward to ensure that ten-year strategies are more accurately reflected in the later part of the ten-year plan.

The measures that you are putting in place for this particular ten year, are you looking at other reform

2 measures that will also look at future ten-year
3 capital strategies as well.

2.2

So, is there a longer-term plan beyond this tenyear capital?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Do you have ideas Chair that you would like to recommend.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Oh, sure, yes, we'll talk.
Yes, we have ideas. We have ideas.

MELANIE HARTZOG: I am happy to have that conversation. I think you have been a wonderful partner in both pushing us on the cascading out, greater transparency and the tracking system, which we really want to put in place, and we got the Mayor's Office of Operations involved. If there is more that we can do to better reflect the ten-year planning before we get to the next ten year, I am happy to have that conversation with you.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, so you have acknowledged I have talked a little bit about the Capital Project Detail Data. And now, it's available online, which we are grateful for. I think it's a good start. Understanding that this is a long-term process that we are embarking on, but I also think that there are short term goals that we can look to

2

1

4

6

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

do as well as long term goals. And our recent conversations we have seen not just it being online, but we've talked about having an actual tracking system that can look at tracking capital projects that are not just at the \$25 million threshold. But also, many of our capital projects that we fund collectively in the Council that are far less than \$25 million.

Recognizing that New Yorkers, our constituents care about the playground, the park, and the library which are a few million compared to the \$25 million threshold.

So, I wanted to ask, what quality control measure do we have in place that can make sure that the information that agencies are gathering is reflected in this tracking system accurately but also up to date and in a timely fashion to provide any improvements to the overall process that we can make going forward.

So, during Prelim I had a slide that was shown, and it was a particular general FDNY project and there were a couple of blank lines that should have been filled in. So, my question is what is OMB doing to make sure that agencies are providing accurate

timely information, so that the tracking system

that's online is most up to date for New Yorkers?

KENETH GODINER: So, three times a year we update our Commitment Plan and in updating our Commitment Plan we update the Project Detail Report.

This last go around, we took the Council's suggestion and we worked closer with the agencies and tried to get them to comply with filling out every single tracking form and I think your staff, the Council Finance Staff looked at that and showed that we in fact, had a very, very high compliance rate.

And when we met with you personally, we showed you some of those details that laid out design, construction, construction management and completion and so forth. And it is our intent as we go forward to even strengthen this process so that those project milestones and details are helpful to everyone.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, thank you. We look forward to working with you more on that and I certainly want to thank Council Member Lander for his leadership as well.

I just have a quick question on the borough-based facilities, and we acknowledge the Council called for a full funding of the four borough-based facilities

2.2

at \$8.75 million. But it's all in one budget line, so I wanted to ask, could we get some specifics on details of how much each borough will get? Does that include some of the community amenities that we know each borough has been asking for? Do you have an idea of how we arrived at this particular number? And is it possible that through this process we could get more of a specific budget line?

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, we arrived at the overall number based on what we know at the present time about the scale of the buildings coming down as well as the overall projection of the Census, which is lower than we anticipated when we started the process. Because of the most recently enacted bail reform. I think the challenge for getting any further granular detail at this point is that we are still going through the ULURP process, which will not be completed until the fall, which also includes the points that you brought up Chair regarding the additional community amenities.

So, at that point and time in the fall when we have a better sense of where we are overall through the ULURP process, we will be able to further delineate the actual cost per each of the jails. And

I'm assuming that that will change to some extend as you go through the ULURP process and you are engaging, and we have been engaging with the community. More engagement happens, that the plan will change but we felt and wanted to be responsive not only to the Council but the fact that we have the ten-year plan and the window open to reflect as much as possible what we could around the estimated cost at this point and time.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: And what about community amenities?

MELANIE HARTZOG: At this point and time, their still, as I said, going through the ULURP process.

As we close that down and we have a better sense of what those are, we would then update the Capital Plan. Both for any changes through the ULURP process to the scope of the project, the actual facilities themselves, as well as the community amenities.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, thank you. I will turn this back over to Chair Dromm and all of my colleagues. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you very much. We are now going to go to questions from Council Members.

2.2

2

by Mark Treyger. 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Thank you very much. Chair, I want to just start off by saying that I think your budget response particularly as it relates to things that this Council has cared about and

First, up is Council Member Jimmy Van Bramer followed

fought for, for decades is disrespectful to the body.

I also want to say as an overview, when Donald Trump became the President of the United States of America, one of the first things that he did was to complete propose eliminating funding for the national endeavor for the arts, the national endeavor for the amenities and the institute for museum and library services.

So, given where we are at and given the numbers that we saw with the increase in PIT, I think it's shocking that this Mayor is proposing reductions to cultural organizations, institutions, and libraries. Downright cruel to say that children that visit the New York Public Library should have fewer educational DVD's, given what we're facing here. And I have been with the Mayor himself. I have watched him speak at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where some of his Commissioners will be tonight, and talk about the

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE JOINTLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET

70

importance of culture. But I have also been with the Mayor and with Chair Gibson at the Bronx Museum of the Arts and heard the Mayor talk about the importance of some of our smaller cultural organizations in the outer boroughs. Those that serve immigrants and public housing residents, homeless children and the formerly incarcerated. is not acceptable to make reductions to over 900 cultural organization. Many of them small, many of the out of borough, many of them serving people of So, my question to you is do you believe, color. does the Administration and not you per say, personally Director Hartzog, but the Mayor of the City of New York, do you believe that culture and the arts is important in driving tourists to the City and billions of dollars in revenue for the City of New York?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Absolutely.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: So, why are you, not you per say, but the Mayor of the City of New York, cutting the budget? Right, there is a big event at the Museum tonight, you might have heard about it and yet we see the largest reduction to the Metropolitan

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE JOINTLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET

Museum of Art. Now, I realize they have a large
budget, but -

MELANIE HARTZOG: You knew that I was going to say that?

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Yes, that's why I answered it for you. But we cannot be reducing, what's shocking about this document and so unacceptable is that in one big cut here, the Mayor is cutting the largest cultural organizations, right, that are really important in driving tourists and billions of revenue, which you yourself know is coming into the City's coffers.

The Museum of Natural History, half a million children in the City of New York visit every year for free and you are proposing huge cuts to them. But then you are also whacking the smallest of small.

Ayazamana Folk Dance Center in Queens. All of that, why would you do that if this Mayor believes in culture and the arts. It is a fundamentally progressive thing to do to fund the arts, culture and libraries.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Let me start with culturals and then I will take libraries.

2.2

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So, culturals overall target was a little over \$6 million and I think we worked very hard with the Commissioner and his team to come up with a savings plan that meets their PEG target, that while it does have reductions, those reductions are relatively modest.

So, if you were to look - I hear you and I know we are going to agree to disagree, but I would like to be able to explain the rational. That if you look overall at where we are in terms of the total reduction, \$2.85 million off of a base of \$139 million that we give to cultural institutions. relates to the specific PEG that you are concerned about Council Member. In the past, Administrations have cut just across the board without taking into any consideration the size of the overall institution. That is not what we did here. actually took into consideration the size of the institution, so that the cut looked at their overall budget and I understand we are going to again, agree to disagree, but saying to the smaller institutions, we are looking at a minimum of 1,300 versus the MET at 180,000 for a budget of \$139 million is the MET's total budget.

So, there was consideration taken and in fact, we were looking at overall subsidy that we give to MET and we're able to identify about a million dollars in expense dollars that we could actually put up as capital.

And so, there was no reduction. We worked very hard on that front.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Right, I would just arque -

MELANIE HARTZOG: On the libraries - I just want to get this piece out.

We had several meetings with the libraries and our main goal with the libraries was not to reduce hours of service. We know the Council's priority in terms of the hours of service, we believe that as well and we actually had conversations where the libraries told us that they had taken efficiencies of their own. They had taken down staff lines, they are doing more with less, just like we are in the city and so, we actually said, you know what, there is savings related to centralized pension and healthcare costs that we budget centrally and we wanted to give them actually the credit for taking on their own

2.2

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE JOINTLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET

efficiencies prior to us even coming up with a PEG target.

So, there is a number of different things that we did to mitigate what the impact are and again, I am not disputing the fact that there is a reduction, that there is going to be a service reduction on the cultural side.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Well, there isn't if the City Council and the Mayor agree not to do that. And it is shocking that you are still saying at this hearing that there will be service reductions to cultural organizations. When you yourself just said, that billions of dollars in revenue flow to this city's coffers which allow the City of New York to pay for all of the other services and that's the MET, that the Museum but it's also the smaller outer borough cultural organizations.

MELANIE HARTZOG: I don't believe I said billions of dollars flows. I think that they are a very important component of the city's infrastructure. Very much believe in it, we've made investments there.

2.2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: So, don't cut it. Don't cut it and I am not just talking to you. talking to the Mayor of the City of New York.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Appreciate you position Council Member.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: We cannot be the progressive bastion that claim to be and then whack small cultural organizations that serve immigrant populations all over the City of New York. absolutely unacceptable. It is against our values.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Council Member, I just want to introject and say that I hundred percent agree with you and I think that this is fundamentally a progressive issue and an issue of gaining access for all communities across the city and we actually called for a greater investment in libraries and in cultural institutions in our budget response.

So, for me, and I think there is near unanimity in the Council, any PEG cuts to these important vital institutions, I think we would call dead on arrival.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Thank you and I know my time is up. I want to thank the Chairs. I just want to say also, we have as you know, a situation with the retirement system for our cultural

2 institutions that has created an awful lot of instability. And so, to propose these cuts on top of 3 that instability is really rubbing salt in the wound.

So, maybe you can talk a little bit about how were going to stabilize the system and make sure that these cultural organizations aren't taking another huge hit and then destabilizing the retirement system. Because I know the Mayor has spoken so much about the retirement benefits and how much he believes those are important to maintain.

KENNETH GODINER: Right, just to speak briefly about the current situation in CIRS. Their plan is an accurately funded plan under Arisa, as such, it's reviewed by an independent actuary for soundness each year. I am happy to say that the last actuary report shows that the cultural institution retirement system plan in well-funded. It is as they classified under a green, yellow, red, sort of scoring that is green not only in the current year but green throughout I think it's a five-year forecast period. We've been you know, in discussions with both the cultural institutions and DC37 have said this same thing I just said to you and said that you know, should there

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

be a time when the plan is not in that condition.
That we would meet and discuss what to do.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you. We are going to move on to our next Council Members, Council Member Treyger followed by Rosenthal.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Thank you to the Chairs and Speaker. Good morning Director Hartzog. You know, I just want to open up very briefly by saying I am having a difficult time trying to reconcile the language and the vocabulary being used today.

I have heard you more than one refer to the budget circumstances as challenging. In normal circumstance when cities are siting on hundreds of millions of dollars of additional revenue, I wouldn't define that as challenging, I would define that as promising. And so, we have just heard, and you have acknowledged, which I appreciate, that there are hundreds of millions of dollars in additional personal income tax revenue that's come in "unexpectedly" into the City Budget.

But the same Administration is referring to this time as challenging. No, this is promising. And speaking of promising, the Mayor promised this big campaign on schools, not jails, schools, not jails.

2 Let's see how our schools are faring Director
3 Hartzog.

We don't see as far as our budget response, \$89 million for pay parity for early childhood educators. Which by the way, just for the public to understand, 60 percent of the services provided by UPK are done by CBO providers. They are at the brink of financial ruin, because they cannot keep up with cost.

And so, the Administration is looking to expand 3K when UPK right now is really being threatened in terms of its finances and we're losing people constantly in our CBO community.

There is not one dime, not one dime proposed in this budget for a fair city funding increases. And just to put that into context, the City

Administration leave it to school budgets to pay for salaries of staff. And there have been contract negotiations and contract advancements.

So, schools have to pay for higher salaries for teachers, counselors, social workers and all the case staff titles. If you don't increase the school budgets, key folks will be excessed from those schools.

2.2

2.2

So, if you are a brand-new special education teacher that was hired to better meet the needs of your students, you most likely will be excessed. If you are a new social worker that was hired to meet the needs of your kids, you are most likely to be excessed because we have a last in first out system when it comes to our school budgets.

And let me go on. The Chair talked about \$13.75 million for 110 additional social workers. Director, I visit schools as much as I can. During Budget it is very hard right now, but our schools are pleading with us to hire additional social workers. Pleading with us.

They don't need the school mental health consultants that are not licensed social workers.

They need direct services provided in the schools.

We also don't see \$11 million for the mental health continuum, services for students with significant mental health needs to provide them with mental and behavioral supports and as the Chair noted before, there are over 700 schools that don't have one dedicated social worker. I am not sure what the term resource means respectfully. They are looking for a social worker to be housed in their schools.

No funding for title nine coordinators. We just had a hearing that was painful to experience. Where some folks were not even sure what that meant. But we are seeing increases in cases of sexual assault a violence committed against our students and staff in our school system.

No funds for busing for kids in foster care. No funds to baseline teachers choice, which covers key materials, day to day operations for classrooms.

How can you say that this a schools not jails budget. When quite frankly, we have failed. We have failed our schools. I would like for you to respond initially because my time has run out. Just a quick follow up.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Let's first talk about the revenues, because I want to be really clear. The Council and Speaker questioned my overall on personal income taxes. The entire revenue forecast is not based on solely personal income tax revenues. As I responded to Chair Gibson, there are a number of negatives and a number of positives that happen within the forecast and then that effected that in the Executive Budget as adding \$200 million.

2.2

2.2

So, while I am acknowledging that collection for personal income tax are coming in, there is also a number of different revenues that are going down.

That the offset we will have to see as we move forward with the Adopted Budget, it will be reflected in that forecast.

As it relates to our education investments in the Executive Budget, I explained earlier that we had significant challenges. As I am sure you know Council Member, we have no choice but to fund Charter Schools. It is mandated by the State; those tuition payments have increased, and the number of students enrolled increased.

That brings our total spending on Charter Schools to a little over \$2 billion annually. There is no choice but to fund them. That is what we had to do in the Executive Budget to reflect both the number of schools increasing and the tuition increasing. And the second biggest investment that we had to make which is the Carters cases, we made that investment \$100 million in 2020. We also made the investment of over \$33 million for special education to continue to build on our infrastructure of special education service within the public-school system with the goal

of ultimately over time being able to provide more

2.2

3 special ed service inhouse.

As I said on the guidance counselors, I did not say resources, I said there is a combination of community-based organizations, guidance counselors and social workers.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Respectfully, I know my time has run out. I acknowledge the fact that Albany in their budget failed our school system. No one should be taking a victor lap in Albany based on our education budget. It is disgraceful of what those numbers looked like. But respectfully, when the Mayor went up to Albany a number of times, the key focus areas for him this year was mayoral accountability or mayoral control and specialized high schools.

MELANIE HARTZOG: That cut would have been over \$300 million if it had been enacted. And so, that would have meant we would have to redirect \$150 million of existing school aid to a certain portion of our schools as well as an overall cut in school aid and we were able to avoid that, but we still had a \$25 million cut. That is exactly what the Mayor talked about.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Right, I'm not discussing the Governors -

MELANIE HARTZOG: And he did ask for fair student funding. To get to 100 percent, it's over \$750 million and we always talk about the need to get there with additional state support.

COUNCIL MEMBER TREYGER: Respectfully, I don't think the Mayor affectively organized and prioritized school budgets up in Albany this year. But we have to right this wrongs now, especially in light of the fact that there is hundreds of millions of dollars of additional revenue in our city budget. This is not acceptable. The Budget as we've heard is a reflection of our values. We value schools, we value our children. The Mayor is not going across the country talking about UPK.

The stability of the system is at risk. know even how the Administration could even think about advancing 3K when UPK is the brink of financial collapse because they cannot hold on to educators.

So, I am going to have additional follow up questions, but Mr. Chairs and Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work to do. I am deeply disappointed in this

education budget. This is the beginning of the process; this is not the end. Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you Council Member Treyger. Council Member Rosenthal followed by Grodenchik.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you so much.

Thank Director Hartzog, great to see you. I really want to pick up on a comment you made earlier, I think to Speaker Johnson when you said that the Deputy Mayors are meeting regularly with the nonprofit resiliency sector working group. And what you said, is that they are meeting with them regularly and hearing their concerns.

That is true. So, now let's say the second part of the sentence. What they are not doing is responding to those concerns.

At each one of those meetings, the Executive Directors of the nonprofit organizations that are serving our New Yorkers, that are doing the work of the city, they are begging for money. They are begging for funding for inflation for the cost of personnel. As Council Member Treyger has pointed out, personnel are leaving our CBO's in droves because they can get better funded jobs elsewhere,

2.2

thereby hindering our ability to provide services to

New Yorkers.

So, what the nonprofit Executive Directors are telling me, is that yes, they raised those concerns at those meetings and then the Deputy Mayor says no, and by the way, we have a PEG program and you are going to have to eat the cuts.

So, there is a real disconnect between the Mayor saying that they have a working group. And the Executive Directors that are telling me, the working group is not getting to the solutions. And let me point out one simple way that the City could be funding our nonprofit sector and that is the inflation adjustment reserve. So, we have a reserve for contract inflation. Why have we never dipped into that reserve to pay for inflation in our human service contract budgets?

And I have looked back now over the last five years, so during the de Blasio Administration and what I am seeing is that every year that reserve is simply emptied out and taken as I think it called in the Budget, procurement savings, and at the same time, the nonprofit Executive Directors are begging that the City cover the costs of inflation.

2.1

2.2

So, what's going on with all the disconnects there?

MELANIE HARTZOG: We seem to have this conversation I think routinely and maybe it's time for us to have a meeting with you and I, with the Deputy Mayor to really get to the bottom of this. I think my position has been very clear on this. We have made significant investments.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: \$150 million over time. Yes, and every time at the budget meeting with the Mayor, I thank him for the \$150 because the prior \$20 years we have starved these organizations. \$150 million is a lot. They need \$250 million more just to be able to provide services.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We have done model budgets for the preventive programs. We have done model budgets for senior centers. There is more to do on that front. We have done model budgets for homeless shelter providers and I personally worked on the indirect rate increase that we did.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yes, the indirect costs, they can now calculate their cost.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Council Member, we can't do it all.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: It won't be funded but

they can calculate the cost.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We funding 10 percent.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yes, you are at 10 percent. The actual cost is 17 percent.

MELANIE HARTZOG: I can't answer you question if you don't let me finish speaking. I am trying to answer the question. We funded 10 percent and originally what we did was say we are going to phase it in over time. The nonprofits came back to me and said, we want this funding now. Fully annualized at \$110 million and we said, yes.

So, there have been years, more than decades, where the not-for-profit sector did not get that, and we were able to do it. We can't do it all though.

to agree to disagree on that and lastly, you have in

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay, so we're going

the Budget procurement reform savings from Fiscal

Year 2018 and the current Fiscal Year 2019 was

expected \$20 million in savings. I would imagine

that would come out of individual agency budgets or ${\tt I}$

don't know where that comes but you have \$20 million

that you took out of Fiscal Year 2019 and \$30 million

the layout of where the agency spending was reduced.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Oh, I would really

3 like to see that. Thank you very much.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you Council Member. Council Member Grodenchik followed by Rivera.

COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: Thank you Chair

Dromm. I think it's morning, good morning Director

Hartzog. As Parks Chair, I have got to raise my

voice. The Parks Budget continues to go sideways and

actually is deteriorating as a percentage of the

overall New York City Budget.

Over the past year, I visited about 100 parks.

Our parks are in pretty decent shape, but they are not going to continue to be and they could be in much better shape with more money. And I am not talking about hundreds of millions of dollars in investment.

I am talking about much more modest and targeted investments that we need to make for our parks system.

We can not depend upon the private sector for every they have been and will continue to be quite magnanimous. But for millions of New Yorkers, the Parks are the only vacations they get, and you've heard from my colleagues this morning about our

2.2

progressive values and we need to move forward on that Parks Budget. Hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers have joined in this quest and I will continue to push for that over the next month or so.

I also want to add my voice to Chair Dromm and Chair Treyger about fair student funding and about funding overall for renewal schools. Martin Van Buren High School, which is in my district, is the only renewals school I have. We have made tremendous progress there. So much so, that the Mayor visited for a Town Hall in the Fall of 2017.

I am worried that the progress that we have made that there, where we have turned around graduation rate from 45 percent to almost 80 percent in just six years will be eroded.

So, I will be calling you if I get complaints from the school community. Okay, is that fair?

Okay.

Lastly, I don't have any waterfront and I don't have any Ferry's. So, unless I build a canal to my district, which I really don't want to do. I am asking this Administration to seriously consider one card, Metro Card swipe for people who use the Long Island Railroad and Metro North in New York City.

2.2

This would be an absolute game changer. The people out in Eastern Queens cannot wait 20 or 30 years for a subway to be built. We need access at a fair rate.

I know that Councilwoman Adams will tell you what a game changer that would be for the 6,000 plus families that live at Rochdale Village and so on and so forth. So, as we go forward, during the rest of this Mayoral Administration, I am going to continue to press this. I am told it's about a \$50 or \$60 million investment, but we need to do that now. And I thank you. I don't have any questions, but we will be talking. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield the rest of my time.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you Council Member Grodenchik. Council Member Rivera followed by Lavine.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Thank you so much. I'll take Barry's time. Thank you so much for being here. Good morning. I just want to of course, stress and underline everything my colleagues have said.

We come together, we meet in committee, we have thoughtful conversations about the budget. People poured hours and hours into our response. Because we

take this so, so, seriously and we want to be thoughtful and we delivered a balance budget. So, to see the savings that we described be served back to us almost as your own idea and then for our ideas and what we know is critical to the foundation of a strong New York Economy that serves everyone, that was disturbing, and it was offensive.

So, I have to let that just let that be known, because when NYCHA senior centers are threatened and fully funding bridging the gap is in question, I feel like they are low hanging fruit for us to feel good about when we win them in budget negotiations. And I feel like that's unnecessary and a waste of everyone's energy.

So, I also want to stress cross agency transparency because a lot of the agencies work together to fund programs and sometimes, we don't have all the information to know where the money is coming from and where it is going.

Having said all that, speaking of transparency, the first question is about H&H, we've had some issues over the years on transparency. Why couldn't H&H turn in an Executive Budget when they could a Preliminary one? And I say that because Dr. Katz

recently made some comments about if dish cuts came

to New York City, H&H facilities would be in jeopardy

and I am wondering why financially this isn't so

urgent that we have to prepare when a federal

6 government is no friend to New York?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I believe you are asking for the H&H cash plan for the Executive Budget. We are in the process of updating it and I believe my staff is meeting with you tomorrow to go through it and all the different components of it and what our assumptions are as it relates to the cash plan on the Dish reduction. Which from a cash plan basis, we have to actually prepare as though that's not going to happen.

Meaning that we are not going to get Dish cuts delayed. Has it been delayed in the past? Yes, it has at least four times. Hopeful that that can happen again, but obviously from a financial management, a good responsible planning perspective, we can't assume that that's going to happen, but we can walk you through all the components.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Thank you. And I only ask because we typically have hours or a day with the

2.2

∠ 4

documents and the information you give us and it's not fair. I have to move on to my next question.

Census money was provided but only at half of what we requested. When this is a national competition and I know you, Administration is very interested in national politics. Why aren't we looking at how we fund the Census when California has already allocated 100 million? This is billions of dollars online, so I am asking why that money and why that amount and how much actually will go to the community-based organizations we are so relying on to do the work and getting the numbers?

MELANIE HARTZOG: The Mayor and Deputy Mayor

Thompson believe that the \$26 million in addition to

what the states allocation will be is sufficient for

the plan to roll it out. If we move forward in

implementation, given the commitments to ensure that

every New Yorker is counted, both the Mayor and the

Council consider this priority. If we need to add an

additional plan, we will add but at this point and

time that's sufficient funding.

In terms of your question about how much goes to the community-based organizations of the \$26 million, it's about \$8 million is for community basic

2.2

organizations. There is a significant amount of funding for a robust media and communications plan.

And then there is additional staffing.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: You said \$8 million?
MELANIE HARTZOG: \$8 million for grants.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: So, there has been a number of assessments as to how much money we need. So, I understand that's you kind of — you have analyzed that that \$26 million is sufficient. I think we all disagree with you, so we ask that you revisit that number. And just the last plug is for the bridge programs that are for job readiness. We really want to make sure that that's fully funded. That is for people who have been historically underserved educationally and have lacked access, the economic opportunity just throughout the years and so, we hope that you will look to increase that funding and we would like demographic breakdowns of who that program is serving.

And lastly, with the personal income tax revenues up, you know, you can fund a lot of these programs.

And so, I just want to say the discretion that you use is astounding to me and I know I am knew but I hope that we can work together and increase that

2.2

transparency. Thank you for being gracious with the time.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you very much.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: Chair Dromm, I just want to reiterate, again I appreciate the good back and forth we are having today with the OMB Director and her staff. I just want to say, again, from a process perspective and from a working together perspective. You know, if the Chair or a particular committee and the Finance Division of the Council is not given an Executive Budget for H&H before this hearing today, I mean, that's problematic and I say that with the upmost respect for Dr. Katz, who I think is amazing and I am super grateful that he is in that position. He is doing an incredible job.

But again, if we having this hearing today, the Finance Staff and the Chair should receive that information before the hearing, not the day after the hearing because we have to do work in a public setting like this and be able to ask questions.

So, again, it is disappointing that that didn't happen, and I don't know what the reasons are, but we want all the information before we have these hearings.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 MELANIE HARTZOG: We have been in the process of updating the cash plan. It's one of the reasons why 3 I wanted to make sure that the Chair before the 4 hearing had a full briefing along with Council 5 Finance because we were providing the cash plan after 6 7 the hearing, my hearing. But it will be well in advance of the H&H hearing and again, it will be a 8 full briefing on all of the major changes, so that 9 that Chair is fully ready for the H&H hearing and has 10 an opportunity to ask my staff questions about all 11 12 the changes that were made and that is not something we normally do but we can do that again moving 13 14 forward each time. I do apologize for the delay.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And the hearing is on Thursday?
MELANIE HARTZOG: Yes.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: And I also just want to say that I hear you on the Deputy Mayor. Deputy Mayor Thompson and the Mayor believe that the is it \$26 million is an appropriate level. Of course, we don't agree with that. I mean, all the advocates, the Hispanic federation, name any of the groups that have working on the Census, they've said \$40 million is the bare minimum. That they would want more than that. So, we are going to continue to fight for the

2.2

2 full \$40 million and I want to turn it back to you 3 Chair Dromm.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. We've been joined by Majority Leader Cumbo and Council Member Deutsch.

Council Member Levine followed by Council Member

Chin.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: Thank you so much Mr.

Chair and I want to reiterate the point that the

Speaker made earlier about stronger than expected tax

receipts. So, we're not talking here about spending

money that doesn't exist. We are talking about

spending money which does thankfully appear to come

in and with that in mind, I want to bring up a few

health priorities.

First, Council and its response as prioritize funding safe injection sites, otherwise known as overdose prevention facilities. This is one of the biggest public health emergencies we are facing in the city with more people dying from overdose then die from homicide, suicide, and traffic crashes combined. We've lost a year in this fight, largely thanks to delays in Albany. But we want to make sure that the resources are there to start this immediately.

J

Why is the Administration which supposedly shares this priority not yet funded safe injection sites?

MALANIE HARTZOG: It sounds like on this one we are waiting for the state to give us approval from the state Department of Health.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: But if that approval comes after the budget, the City Budget's approved, then we have no money.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Council Member, there is always an opportunity once we get an approval to add funding in a future plan and the agency could actually start a roll out and then we can add the funding in a future plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: Okay, I want to move on to some other matters, but I strongly feel we should put that in the budget now. That was the Council's position, so that we lose no more time in a crisis which is taking one New Yorker, one fatality every seven hours.

A not well known, but important stream of funding is Article 6. This comes out of the state; I asked the Mayor and your team about this in the briefing a week or so ago. It really was apprehensible that the state cut this money only to New York. It means \$59

2.2

million of a hit for programs which really affect the
people who are suffering on the margins in New York
City and I asked in the briefing about this and you
all said that all \$59 million were restored in your

6 Executive. That didn't turn out to be exactly true.

The portion of that money, which is so critical, which is going to community-based nonprofits in efforts like combating HIV/AIDS and efforts like combating viral hepatitis is not in the Executive Budget and the channel by which this passes through the CBO's isn't matching funds off of Council priorities. But it would mean millions of dollars lost on a couple of efforts in the case of the epidemic, HIV/AIDS, we cannot slide back on. And in the case of viral hepatitis, I wouldn't even say slide back because the big progress is yet to come on that fight, but we don't want to be detracted from that critical priority either.

Can you clarify, you said all \$59 million were in there. So, are you going to produce money for these CBO's doing that critical work?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I think it's a matter of when timing of when the cut takes effect. The \$59 million that was included in the state enacted budget is

MELANIE HARTZOG: That is correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: You don't need the detail that we put in our City Council breakdown listing the

4 | individual nonprofits for that?

2.2

MELANIE HARTZOG: If you are referring to adds
that we made in the current year that are not
reflected in 2020 that's different. I thought you
were referring to where the baselining program that's
in Department of Health that is funded by Article 6
dollars. There is funding that we add at adoption
with partnership with the Council that's funded in
Fiscal Year 2019, that is not reflected in the Fiscal
Year 20 Budget. Some of that may be included in the
\$77 million that we most recently came to an
agreement on, but if there is funding that is added,
that is not —

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVINE: Okay, I will let this go because my time is up. The fact is as of now, the CBO's which are providing services, and, in the epidemic, a viral hepatitis will face a multimillion dollar cut for the Fiscal Year that starts July 1st unless we find a way to fill that gap. And we are asking the Administration to do that so that we do not slide back in these critical fights. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you, we are going to take a five-minute break and then we will return after that.

Okay, we are going to reconvene now and we're going to start with Council Member Chin followed by Rodriguez.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you Chair. Thank
you, Director, and thank you for the meeting that I
had with your staff and it was very productive. But
I was very disappointed that the money for senior
meal, congregate meals and food service worker did
not get into the Executive Budget.

So, I hope by the time we finalize the Budget that it is in included because I wanted to say again, that seniors are part of our future. We cannot ignore them. We help build a city and we have to continue to invest in our senior as we invest in our young people with K3 and K4, seniors are still part of our future. Don't ignore them and the seniors that go to our senior center according to DFTA's Report that they did, they are healthy and stronger. So, we got to continue that investment and in the Executive Budget, the way that you try to get DFTA to take the PEG, because the Mayor when I asked him, he

2.2

said, well everybody has to have one and what had happened was that you decided to close those centers at DFTA. And I think in the Executive Budget, there is 12 of them that the Administration is proposing to close and then get the senior to take a bus or take a van or whatever to get to other senior centers close by.

But a lot of these social clubs are actually over utilized and now we are crowding the senior centers that are already crowded and we're not giving the senior center any more money and when you mentioned earlier about the Model Budget. You know, how I feel about the Senior Center Model Budget, that we didn't put enough money in there, right David. And I am still waiting for the money because we had the meeting.

\$10 million was put in two years ago for Fiscal 2018, because that was the year of the senior in 2017 and we were very happy at that time that you finally recognize the importance of senior center and \$10 million was put there. But now two years later, that budget did not get increased and there was a promise and they said, well, we're going to put it in next year. Lets not hold it off until next year. Let's

2.2

put it in this year to make sure that our senior centers are supported. The increases are in there because the last increase was in 2014 of \$0.25 per meal and I say that in the one shot that you did add some back for home delivered meal but that's not enough.

So, I hope that before we sign on to the final budget that that money better be in there for our senior center because I told the Mayor if it's now, I am very, very unhappy and it's unacceptable.

So, Director, I look forward to continuing to working with you to make sure that money is put in.

MELANIE HARTZOG: There is no better advocate for the senior community in New York City then you Council Member and every year is the year of the senior, thanks to your work.

So, a couple things and I will try to be quick because I know we have other questions that we want to get addressed, but on the actual food redesign, we said late spring. And so, we have a report that's due to you and I know that we've been in conversations with DFTA on that, and so, we owe it to you to have a follow up meeting on that to circle back on where we are with that.

2.2

And yes, it has been a component that we pulled out of the model budget specifically because we needed more time to take a look at it and it is now time that we actually look at that and access where we are and what we need to do.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Does that mean adding the funding in there?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I myself have not been briefed on the report yet. And so, I don't know what the implications are, what we are looking and if there is any room for what the implementation timeline is.

So, just like we phased in the model budgets, we have to look at what those costs are and what the implications are.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: There is increase in revenue. So, there is no excuse saying that there is no money.

MELANIE HARTZOG: There is declines in revenue as well. That your also reflected in the fact of our forecast which was just \$200 million up.

But committed to having that conversation with you. I want to just clarify because I think there has been a lot of you know, the senior clubs and the centers.

So, we really firmly believe when we accessed the

3 senior clubs, the 12, that there were better

4 opportunities within close proximity for seniors to

5 have a full-service center versus the clubs. As you

6 know, that are smaller, they don't offer meals and

7 more comprehensive planning and service because of

8 the physical space constraints and for these

9 particular 12 sites, it was with the intent in mind

10 that we can better service those seniors with full

11 service senior centers that are very close in

12 proximity. And we did provide the transportation

13 | within DFTA's budget to do that.

We want to work with the Council on the implementation of that and the timeline. We have been out, not me personally, but the city in looking at these sites and we also want to look at opportunities to better maximize the space at the NYCHA facilities and if that includes as Chair Gibson has pointed out, more affordable housing within NYCHA. That's something we are open to looking at with NYCHA. And we want to make sure that there is a transition for the seniors that is reasonable. That

they have time to do that. They are aware of what

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1

the services are that are being offered at the centers.

2.2

We believe that the centers do not need additional funding with exception of the transportation for the services to offer but if they do, we are more than happy to do that, and this is about providing a better service to those particular seniors within those 12 clubs.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Well, we're going to have an opportunity tomorrow at the Executive Budget hearing with DFTA to really go into this in more detail.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We do, and I look forward to having ongoing conversations with the Council and implementation of this moving forward. Not just in the hearings but also details on the plans for each of those clubs and the centers that the seniors will be able to access.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: But according to our data that we got, a lot of them, at least seven of these clubs are over utilized.

MELANIE HARTZOG: I'm not sure how you are defining over utilized. We did look at attendance as a factor. They tend to have lower attendance than

the others, but again, that wasn't the driving factor. The factor was looking at the resources, the senior centers, within close proximity and providing those seniors with better services.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: But I don't think we are looking at the other, because we have a lot of what we call NORC program, where the are at NYCHA. And they are connected to a senior center and that senior center provides the meals there and the programs there. And it's a wonderful model and it's happening all over the city especially; I know the one in my district that's working. And I think DFTA needs to look at that rather than forcing the senior to have to travel.

I mean like, the reason why they like where they are at socialization and everything, that their friends are there, you can't force them to go to somewhere else. If the center was close by, they could have gone there already.

So, we really need to look at individual centers and how to make that connection, how to make the services better. And not just say, oh, you have an option, we'll just bus you over to the closest

2.1

2.2

center. So, lets have more discussion on that before we start implementing it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. Council Member Rodriguez followed by Cornegy.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Thank you Chair.

Look, I believe that there is a lot that we still have to do to restore the funded to the \$154 million dollars.

I hope that conversation will continue and that you guys continue negotiating with our team so that we can get there. But you know the \$77 million is small progress but that's not close to where I hope that we will be by the time when we speak with Mayor, the handshake take place. I feel that where this Administration has a lot to celebrate, police reform, education, housing, but still we also have to realize that we inherit a city that a lot more has to been done. That probably the changes that we need will not happen even in our generation and that is sadness of our time.

That we live in two cities, that it is better go and get the guy in the white house because we can see his color than approaching the city that we have here. Because we have many schools that they don't

2.2

have after school programs at elementary level. It's not mandatory, it is not included in this project. I think that and I hope that we can continue to working on it.

I believe that when we look at housing, I have some issues on HDC. I don't know if they have all the funding in order to honor all the agreements related rezoning's. Because what I heard is there some areas and I can tell you even in the Inguinal area, there is some developers that they were supposed to be there two or three, go affordable that they are saying that now they are being told that probably there is not enough funding now for them to do any structure of the big project as we agreed. And I don't think that is not only Inwood, I think that this is something that I hope that in this budget there is enough funding to ACT for finance the affordable housing.

I believe that on Vision Zero, as we have seen the data, speaks for itself. You know, this has been one of the babies. This Administration and the we as a Council, myself, Chair of the Transportation have been very grateful to be working together. But every year, for the last three years, you the

2.2

Administration have refused to put the money for Education of Learners Initiative. What we have seen now at the beginning of this year is that there is an 11 percent increase of injuries in the City of New York and I think that area is another one that I hope that you guys can come back to us and be able to increase dollars when it comes to the education of learners, Vision Zero initiatives so that more New Yorkers get involved.

So, those for me are concerns. I know that we have been trying to do the best we can, but there is an area that we have to tackle. The investigation of the squad unit. How can we double the number of men and women in charge? We only have 24 to investigate more than 40 cases of hit and run every year in the city of New York. 4,000 of those and we individuals incurred a condition and the average of one person dying every year and only 24 people are assigned at NYPD to investigate those cases.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Okay, there was couple different components. I think I got them all. On the first, on the Inwood rezoning, I believe this is sufficiently funded. We should have a follow up with you immediately after the hearing to make sure that

we have addressed any concerns you have. And on the overall neighborhood development fund, we believe that there is adequate funding both between HDC, the affordable housing as well as the NDF, the dollars

6 that are existing.

2.2

There is going to be more rezoning's moving forward and we will have to re-access at that point and time the level of NDF funding. But for the existing, that funding is there. So, any problems really to Inwood, we should follow up with you immediately on.

On Vision Zero, we know that the Department of Transportation has done some work within their existing budget. We think that there is an opportunity for us to go back and have a conversation in light of what you just said and the statistics that you pointed out, for us to revisit that with the agency and come back on what more needs to be done, particularly on that front.

And on the collision staffing, this is the first

I am hearing of that. I appreciate you bringing it

to my attention, the NYPD collision staffing, we will

take a look at that and get back to you as well.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you. Council Member Cornegy followed by Miller.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you Chairs. Good afternoon Director Hartzog. So, in keeping with the theme that's been today, I got to say that the constituents of New York City have a reasonable expectation that the budget is going to reflect the priorities of the City and the Administration.

I think that this budget has failed to do that and in particular around MWBE. So, my questions today will be focused around the MWBE program. Even though my district holds of the twelve senior centers and very disappointed in the idea that we would cut those, and it happens to be a very viable senior center by the way. But my colleagues touched on that in a great way. My two questions are around MWBE performance and MWBE lending's.

I'll start with the lending. SBS administers the \$10 million contract financing loan fund. A revolving loan fund which provides low interest loans to MWBE's. Has this been a successful program? How many MWBE's have accessed this fund over the last three years and being that this is a revolving loan

fund, is this something that you feel we could expand?

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, the City has awarded close to \$12 million out of the loan fund for a total of 61 loans and two awards. It think we would say the program has overall been successful. Is it something that we could expand? And Terra is pointing out that we raise an additional \$20 million in private funds in addition to what the city has put forward for the loan fund.

So, for me as the current Chair of the City
Council's WBWE Task Force, every time I speak with
MBWE's they are saying that the \$10 million reflects
one tiny fraction of whats actually necessary to be
successful and compete in this marketplace for those
contracts.

So, I asked you kind of facetiously did you think you could expand it. I know that there is an expansion that is necessary. Are you willing to expand it should have been my question.

MELANIE HARTZOG: I'm willing to have a conversation about what you envision the expansion to be. I think we have to have that within the context

2.2

of where we are overall in the financial plan, but I am happy to have that conversation with you.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you. And so, MWBE performance in Fiscal Year 2018 roughly \$1.1 billion was awarded to MWBE's. Now, while that sounds like a tremendous number, it demonstrated little growth in the value of MWBE awards from Fiscal Year 2017. What efforts is OMB contributing to increase the value of MWBE awards with City agencies if any?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I think that this is a question on the participation that's best answered by Deputy Mayor Thompson, because the work of the MWBE's comes out of his office. Encouraging agencies including OMB to participate in the MWBE program. So, I am happy to take that back and get an answer for you.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Okay, last question, is when NYC set a goal of achieving a 30 percent utilization rate for MWBE's by the end of Fiscal Year 2021. Is the City on track to achieve this goal? And what measures are the Administration or agencies taking to prioritize MWBE's in City contracting?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I will get an answer to you on that from the Deputy Mayor's shop.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: So, I want to ask, is

that meeting that you will facilitate between myself

and the Deputy Mayor and the task force or are you

going to ask those questions and get back? I'm not

trying to be — I just want to be direct on what will

be the methodology for getting that information,

because I think it's important.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Of course. We will ask the questions and get back to you with the answers in writing and we can channel that through the Council Finance Staff as we normally do for the hearings.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you, I would appreciate that.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Yes, of course.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you. Council Member Miller followed by Adams.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Thank you Chair and Madam Chair, and Director. Thank you for being here today, I know it has not been easy and it's been long but that's the job.

So, my questions are three full. First, it's the Black, Latino, Asian caucus by representing 4.5 million New Yorkers. Our theme for our budget response this year is equity and it is difficult to

be able to assess whether or not this budget is equitable, as my colleague said, in serving the most vulnerable and the entire city holistically if the information on the budget is kind of trickling out.

And we were hoping to have an immediate response or at least an intelligent response but without the information within the budget is impossible to do so.

So, I hope that we can count on that information being released in its entirety and available in its entirety.

There is some things about equity and specifically I am always — as was mentioned about my colleague from South East Queens, the Ferry, certainly that is a service that is not necessarily equitable in how those services get delivered and it is questionable whether or not it is necessary.

Whether or not it is just a way of providing a leader service to a particular group of New Yorkers serving Wall Street and the business area. And whether that is the consistent with the investment and transportation options such as fair fares or as my colleague said, the contributions to Metro North and Long Island Railroad which would bring greater accessibility to many more New Yorkers.

2.2

So, again, Equity. And then finally, not

finally, I want to put on labor hat and talk about

the human capital and look at the impact on the

workforce considering attrition. And the numbers

have diminished particularly mentioned in the budget

was the traffic enforcement and how there is

So, certainly that is a contention because the services that our public servants deliver that make us safer, that make us healthier, that make us more educated, that give the city value. That I hope the budget is reflecting.

intentions to increase the number of fines, which I

don't see how to do it with less bodies.

And then finally, as a representative of the 27th Council District, specifically, 5 percent home ownership. What is in the budget to ensure that we are protecting those homeowners throughout the city? Particularly those African American immigrant homeowners that depend on this opportunity to build wealth. They are consistent taxpayers. That revenue is there. It is not reflected here. The only program that we have seen coming from the Admen's support in the past had been foreclosure prevention, which we have to get beyond that. We are asking that

that be consistent because we are seeing that occur throughout the city again as well as distressed mortgage, buy back and any other systems that you have for homeowners. I will listen.

MELANIE HARTZOG: There are several different components. I want to see if I got them all. The first was you were talking a little bit about the overall workforce and where we are on the traffic enforcement agents. We are taking down vacant positions. But year to year, they are actually increasing overall, which is why we are able to look at where we are with our revenue and reflect additional revenues as a result of that.

So, there is a slight increase from year to year even with the reduction and it's based on that and looking at their total traffic enforcement and the mixture of different positions that we are able to re-estimate the revenue on that front.

It think you asked several questions about the investments that we're making overall for property owners. We have made investments in the green infrastructure overall in South East Queens. You are right, we have made investments in various discreet programs, small programs on the foreclosures front.

2.2

I think there is more to say as we move forward overall in the property tax commission that we are partnering with the Council on, on what additional resources supports relief we can do all with and I must say this, with keeping revenue neutral within the process.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: So, let me just respond by saying that is woefully insufficient. It has been in the past considering the critical crisis that we continue to find ourselves in around foreclosure.

It is certainly something that we need to be able to address and love to have a more substantive conversation about what that support looks like and certainly, respectfully disagree with your analysis of traffic enforcement and I know you didn't touch on the other piece but certainly, again, equity in the budget is very important that we are serving communities and subsidizing communities greatly. At the same time, we are not subsidizing housing, but we are subsidizing Fairy service. I'm not saying that it doesn't make sense.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We've made significant investment in the MTA and I think the most recent enacted budget is an acknowledgment that there needs

to be additional resources. It's what the twelve

point and the congestion pricing plan is and that is

I think, a partnership that we have between the

legislature and the Governor to actually do that and

we cannot, the City, afford to finance the entirety

7 of the MTA.

2.2

The Ferry's in particular, the Mayor has been very clear about this, which is that it is an additional source of transportation that is actually serving communities in which they are isolated from other means of transportation. And it does hit certain communities that are low income. Coney Island was one of our most recent adds and in the Bronx, we added an additional stop to reach communities that are isolated.

So, that is a priority of the Mayor. We have made those investment and we believe they are effective.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: Just one second, that's probably a conversation that if you want to have in public, I would love to engage, but certainly coming from a community that has a transportation desert, someone who lives 4.4 miles from the subway. Takes a bus from the first to the last stop and a train from

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the first to the last stop, anywhere from an hour and a half to two hours is our commute in South East Queen. And the Administration, we have asked them for the past four years to consider investing or supporting commuter rails so that we can access that, that would not just cut the commute in half but what you can't quantify giving people five to ten hours a week back to their communities and their families and there has been absolutely no response, no investment. But yet, we invested in that and Far Rockaway, it doesn't go too Far Rockaway and it has yet to go to Coney Island and it has yet to the Bronx. The fact of the matter is it will end up College Point in the other communities before it ends up in those places there and as I said, it is not equitable. It is not serving communities, low income communities, and certainly, it is not the most efficient way to deliver those services at more than \$10 in subsidies per trip.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We are going to have to agree to disagree on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: And I would love to whomever on that side thinks that that is more efficient way to deliver services, I love to -

2.2

MELANIE HARTZOG: Council Member, I am happy to meet with you to have a conversation about our Ferry investment and what we are doing in the routes and the benefits of those investments. I just think we are agreeing to disagree.

about that is as was displayed, the Administrations initiatives. Whether it was Vision Zero, whether it was the Ferry and others, those services that get delivered, there was I think it was 200 and whatever million dollars towards secured bike lanes and other infrastructure and \$2 million. \$107 towards secured bike lanes and other infrastructure from DOT and \$2 million toward secure bus lanes. Over \$2 million people ride buses every day. How many people are riding bikes? Where is the equity? Where is the equity to those outer boroughs communities that absolutely depend on buses? Where is it?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I am not sure if you are referring to just incremental adds that we made between the two plans versus our total investment in the infrastructure. We are happy to get you those numbers. But I think what you are adding are just incremental adds that we've made, not the full amount

of funding that we have dedicated in the financial
plan towards that transportation overall. I am happy

4 | to provide you with those numbers.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER: You know what, this is what we had at the last Transportation hearing. You should be able to provide those numbers now. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, thank you Council

Member. And I know we are running on one o'clock and
we have another hearing. So, I am going to ask

Council Members to make sure that they are short with
their questions. Council Member Adams followed by

Majority Leader Cumbo.

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this hearing. Thank you,

Ms. Hartzog, for being here today. I know it's a

long day with us as usual.

I don't want to redundant, but I also have to echo my colleague expressions of disappointment. In the Mayor's initial Preliminary Budget, as it yielded none of the Council's recommendations, zero recommendations.

So, I am just going to ask just a couple of questions. Hopefully I can get them in. And in echo

as well, that the PIT is stronger then expected and
at least a \$474 million increase in PIT revenue. I
think that needs to be revisited when we go back to
the drawing board with this information but there has

6 been a lot of interest and a lot of conversation

7 citywide conserving Thrive NYC.

2.2

And in the Fiscal 2020 Executive Budget, the

Administration reduced the funding for Mental Health

Service Corp \$9 million in Fiscal 2019 only. Out of

a \$50 million total request from the New York City

Council. However, no Thrive NYC money has been

reduced in Fiscal 2020. Why did the Administration

only reduce \$9 million in Thrive NYC funding?

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, I am going to continue to say this as the Council continues to bring up PIT.

And that the collections are up, is that there is an overall revenue forecast and there are taxes that are going down. And so, in the Executive Budget, the net effect of taxes going up and down in terms of our forecast. Clearly in the current year, it's based on actual collections was a net of \$200 and so as we move into the Adopted Budget, we will have conversations overall about the forecast, not just isolating on personal income tax.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Understood, understood.

MELANIE HARTZOG: To your question about Thrive, there is two pieces to this, I think the \$50 million was looking at where spending has been. We believe that Thrive and with the right sizing of the Mental Health Service Corp, where we took down the \$9 million was to actually reflect where their spending will be in the current year and so, moving forward, we are revisiting overall the Mental Health Service Corp in particular and Thrive and will reflect further changes between now and the Adopted Budget.

But the adjustment current was to actually reflect the spending. So now, we are on track to spend a little over 90 percent of the Budget for Thrive.

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: We are looking at almost \$1 billion in funding for Thrive NYC. One of Thrive NYC signature initiatives, Public Health Diversion Centers is still not operational. But it's budgeted for \$9.5 million in both Fiscal 2019 and 2020. Why did OMB not reduce the funding for this particular initiative and part of the reduction in Thrive NYC services?

2.2

2.2

MELANIE HARTZOG: We did. We actually reflected the funding in the years in which it will be spent as the diversion centers get ramped up. And so, we can give you the numbers for Fiscal Year. So, it's 4.5 down in this plan, this is the action that we took. So, it's 4.5 down in the current year and 4.5 up in the next year.

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Again.

MELANIE HARTZOG: It has been a challenge on actually getting the diversion center cited, and now that they are, we are ready to move with that.

know that my time is up. We are talking about transparency a lot lately. I really, really think that we need to revisit this. \$1 billion is a lot, where we see in our city right now, so many different areas that are in need. We are speaking about education, we're speaking about transportation and again, I didn't want to be redundant. My colleagues have spoken about the transportation desert in South East Queens over and over again. There is no equity there.

So, there is just a lot of disappointment. We feel very, very disrespected in this presentation of

_

this Budget and again, my hope is that and I know that we work well together with you. My hope is that we can really, really get someplace palatable for the people of New York for this New York City Council because New Yorkers deserve better than this Budget. Thank you for you time.

MELANIE HARTZOG: I am always happy to have a conversation with you about any additional information you need on Thrive. The Budget is \$250 million annually. I think you referenced \$1 billion number. So, it's \$250, we have provided the Council with a breakdown and anytime that you would like to have conversations about the different components of it, happy to do so.

COUNCIL MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you. Majority Leader Cumbo followed by Council Member Deutsch.

COUNCIL MEMBER CUMBO: Thank you. I just wanted to begin with just informing you that tomorrow Metro IAF, which will be comprised of hundreds if not thousands of our seniors will be on the steps of City Hall tomorrow in regards to senior housing. And to this date, we still have not seen where it has reflected the \$500 million in the City's Budget.

Where seniors with wheelchairs, oxygen tanks and

2.1

2.2

walkers came to City Hall on the steps to fight for senior housing for themselves but also for everyone in this room who will so fortunate to become a senior in their life.

So, this is an issue that has been persistent to say disappointing would be a severe understatement in terms of thousands of seniors went home after the handshake in the budget believing that through the handshake deal, that \$500 million was going to be in the budget devoted to senior housing. Has the \$500 million appeared?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Council Member, I know this is a top priority. You have been consistently bringing it up in the hearings. You also mentioned it when we had our briefing on the Executive Budget. There was a meeting scheduled and I believe due to scheduling conflicts, it had to be rescheduled to discuss this matter with you and at your request with the advocates as well. And so, I believe we need to get it back on the calendar to discuss where we are with the \$500 and the additional units.

COUNCIL MEMBER CUMBO: No, I am very aware that the money was not going to reappear, but I want to be on record that I have asked the question, that we've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

continued to pull back the curtain in terms of the fact that thousands of seniors who came up here to fight for senior affordable housing were essentially duped. And so, we want to have an understand of how that's actually going to be made right and how the seniors and their goals and their promise are going to be kept whole.

I think when I am sitting back and listening to all of my colleagues ask their questions, it's really more on the basis of us coming to the City Council with an understanding that we are equal branches of That the Council is an equal branch of government. government with the Administration but yet, what we see is that we all have priorities. You have 51 members with priorities, you have a Mayor with many priorities but what consistently happens is the priorities of the City Council, 51 members, were all term limited. We want to see certain things happen. Such as summer camp opportunities for middle school students, such as our senior housing. All of these different programs that we fight for every year, including now, the senior housing, our culturals and libraries which are the foundation of the City of New We are the International Cultural Icon City of

4

1

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the World and to have a significant cut come to the culturals and the libraries which attract people from all over the world, is unfathomable to me.

How do you see us as branches of government when the priorities of the Mayor are put forward and resourced and funded and very basic things that the Council comes for every year and I'll give you an example, because I feel like this is strategy. is no way this Administration could not believe with all of the work that we have been doing that a summer, a free summer opportunity for middle school aged students, that are too young to be at home, but not old enough to get a job should be left to their own devices for the summer.

I believe it's a bargaining chip. It keeps us at a place where every single year we come away with a victory because we restored it and were kept limited because we are fighting for the same thing over and over again, and we're never able to propel forward because we are fighting for something so basic as summer camp for middle school students. understand that.

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, Council Member, we feel that between the Executive Budget of last year we

2.2

added \$125 million in fair student funding that's in the baseline to get to the 93 percent citywide average. We then in the Preliminary Budget of this year and we skipped at Adoption of last year, we baselined \$56 million worth of Council priorities that are continuing on. Right, not just one year.

At Prelim of this year, we added \$106 million for Fair Fares. At the Executive Budget, we added \$11.6 million for Students in Shelter. As the Speaker mentioned, he felt we did not go far enough. We had conversations and came back to \$77 million.

So, we have been having multiple conversations. We are going to have multiple conversations moving forward, but we have added Council priorities. I understand that it is not to the level of the Council's response, but we have been responsive in adding a portion of those priorities within the Budget.

COUNCIL MEMBER CUMBO: And just to conclude, the \$77 and one shots, are obviously noted here but what the Council and the Speaker have to go through just to get one shots restored, it would appear that we could come to a better place of negotiation if in acts of good faith, this is like the baseline of what

you come back with and then we can negotiate from

3 there.

2.2

you.

I think it's always very difficult for us to be at a place where we are operating at such a baseline deficit that to get one shots restored, and this is only half of what was actually asked. Double was actually asked for in terms of the restoration of the one shots is really disappointing. So, we want to continue to work in good faith but this sheet that we got, the \$77 million in one shots restored should be

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you Majority Leader.

Now, we have Council Member Deutsch followed by

Menchaca and then Chair Gibson and then that will be

it.

the baseline of where the negotiations begin.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Thank you Chair. So, as Director of the Mayor's Office of Management and Budget, do you have regular meetings with NYPD regarding the safety of New Yorkers?

MELANIE HARTZOG: My staff is in regular meetings with NYPD.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Regular meetings. So, in the wake of recent attacks of houses of worship

2.2

throughout the country and throughout the world. It became a frightening time for religious New Yorkers attending churches, mosques and synagogues.

Although to my knowledge, there is currently no credible threats. Does the Administration believe that houses of worships are vulnerable to attacks here in New York City?

MELANIE HARTZOG: That question is best answered by the expert who would be the Police Commissioner and the Mayor. To the extend that, we need to — if you are asking a question on resources, we are always monitoring, having regular conversations with PD around their resource needs. Obviously, if there was any need to add funding to make sure that houses of worship are protected, we would do so most certainly.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Thank you. Now, you had in the school security funding for the Budgets Fiscal Year 2019, how much funding was put in, in the budget for 2019 for school security?

MELANIE HARTZOG: I am sorry you are you referring to school safety agents or are you referring -

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: No, for school security guards in private schools.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE JOINTLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET 136
2	MELANIE HARTZOG: It is \$14 million.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: How much of that \$14
4	million was spent in 2019?
5	MELANIE HARTZOG: That's what we believe the
6	spend will be.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: You will be able to
8	spend \$14 million?
9	MELANIE HARTZOG: The current year to date is
10	\$10.7. Sorry, current year to date is \$10.7.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: I am sorry?
12	MELANIE HARTZOG: \$10.7.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: In the current and
14	Fiscal Year 2020?
15	MELANIE HARTZOG: Yes.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: So, in Fiscal Year 2019?
17	MELANIE HARTZOG: Fiscal Year 2019, is the budget
18	is \$14 million and I believe you were asking of what
19	the year to date spend is and that's what we are
20	answering. It is \$10.7 in Fiscal Year 2019.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: \$10.7. So, I got
22	numbers like \$16 million for 2019. Is that not
23	correct?
24	MELANIE HARTZOG: The budget is \$14 million.

New York City?

2.2

MELANIE HARTZOG: Again, that's a question that's better answered in terms of assessment of what any security risk is by the expert, which is the Police Commissioner and consultation obviously with the Mayor. I have no sense of what that is. It is their expertise. If there is some resource need related to what the Commissioner is telling us, then we could assess that but that is best suited for the Commissioner to answer.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: Okay, so as we are having budget talks, as of now, you have not received any information in regards to -

MELANIE HARTZOG: No.

COUNCIL MEMBER DEUTSCH: No, alright. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. Council Member Menchaca and I'm sorry, I made a mistake Council Member Kallos also.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you Chair and thank you Director Hartzog for being here with us today.

I just want to get a sense of the folks that are in the room. How many of you here are working for the office of Management and Budget? Raise your hand. OMB Team, that's incredible, awesome. I want

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 to say thank you for your work. This is not easy work and clearly there is a lot of agreeing to 3 4 disagree. And I want to just push a little bit of I think whats driving me right now and a lot of the 5 Council Members is a sense that this is a moral 6 7 document. At the end of the day, this puts the priorities of the New Yorkers that we all represent. 8 You have mega boss, that's real but I hope that in 9 the midst of these conversations that are happening 10 in closed doors that you get to push as much as you 11 12 can to things that you hear. If any of these things inspire you that you push as much as possible. 13 14 Because not only do you have a mega boss, I think 15 that you live in the city and you get to see and hear 16 from people in your neighborhood, on the trains, in your schools, or you have kids. 17

So, that's a push for you to just keep making this better. Director, what I am concerned about most right now is the census and the money that has been put into the census.

You recently just a couple hours ago talked about \$8 million going to organizations to do the work when we know that organizations are going to be the best equipped to make the message heard in our

plan to disperse this money for the \$8 million?

communities, immigrant communities. What is your

2 3

1

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 2.2

23

24

25

is this?

the dollar can get on the street? Whats preventing you from making this a Council component? A kind of Council discretionary dollar allocation. What is the other money going to be used for and we will start there. MELANIE HARTZOG: Start there.

quickly can you get it out once the first moment that

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Yeah. We are going to start there.

MELANIE HARTZOG: So, the \$8 million is for community-based organizations. It's in DYCD's budget as it relates to the timing and the roll out, the agency is better suited to answer those questions along with the Deputy Mayor.

The balance of the funding is going towards staffing and then there is about \$10 million that is going towards communications and media outreach, that's a big component of the plan that the Deputy Mayor felt was really critical to making sure that the message is received.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: And what Deputy Mayor

2 MELANIE HARTZOG: Thompson.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thompson, okay cool, we are going to meet with him soon.

Great, so I am going to be requesting for Julie

Mennen to come before my Executive Budget hearing to

talk more about it. Clearly, that is not enough for

us to kind of get a sense. If anybody from DYCD need

to be there; I think we really need to dig deep.

The advocates statewide have given us a charge, \$40 million for the City of New York. Twenty of those should go to organizations. And so, we are severely underfunded for something that's going to impact this budget and the rest of the ten-year plan for New York. And I hope that you can kind of hear that loudly and if there is anything else that you want to say right now in terms of the Census and how we can make it go out quickly, I'd like to kind of hear that.

MELANIE HARTZOG: No, I think we believe that the \$26 million is sufficient. Moving forward, if there are additional needs, we will assess them as we go. We understand that this is a tight timeline to get the work done. And as I said before, we need to make sure that every New Yorker is counted. It matters

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

significantly. I appreciate that you are going to have Julie Mennen come speak to you because I think as the lead of our charge here, she is best suited to answer your questions on roll out and timeline and what effort she is making, especially around the community-based organizations.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENCHACA: Thank you so much for that support.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you. Council Member Kallos.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Thank you to Chair Dromm for all the great work in leading these hearings, to our Budget Director.

At the Preliminary Budget hearing, I asked you about performance budgeting where we would actually say that we are going to spend X-number of dollars to achieve wide results. And also, about making the budget a truly transparent document instead of just putting things up in PDF. Having them in open formats, even excel, so that folks can actually crunch the date on their own. You had promised to get back to me, it has been a couple of weeks since then and that still has not happened, so I wanted to know when that will be available to the general

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

23

24

25

times wrote, New York City will offer free preschools for all three-year old's and I quote, "Mayor de

public? And then I think you know the other thing I will be asking about because I have asked about it at every hearing for five years, now it is my sixth.

In 2014, my district started with only 154 Pre-Kindergarten seats for more than 2,000 students. This year we are on track for 1,122 Pre-K for all seats and 180 are in construction as we speak and slated to open in September.

I want to thank the Mayor for this huge increase. I also want to thank his office for getting me the number of children who applied this year.

Now as I understand as offers are being made today, we still don't have enough seats in the neighborhood where folks on Roosevelt Island will be asked to find a place off Island. And I can tell you with a one-and-a-half-year-old at home, it is not easy to travel with a baby. It just not work well with the strollers on public transit. Do we have the funding in the Executive Budget to meet additional needs such as adding new classrooms to existing schools.

Along the same lines, in April 2017, New York

Blasio announced on Monday that New York City will offer free full day preschool to all three-year old's within four years. That was in 2017 with a full roll out expected for 2021. Which incidentally is when my daughter will turn three.

In a neighborhood where childcare expenses easily exceed \$30,000 a year. With 20,000 children in 3K, are we still on track for 2021 and how much funding do we need?

MELANIE HARTZOG: There was a lot of questions.

So, let me start with the top. On the Local Law 218 which you asked about, in terms of providing greater transparency. We had a meeting with Council Finance Staff. We made adjustments based on that meeting.

All the reports are now linked to opened data files and the format has been adjusted as you requested.

So, I believe that we have taken care of that. I can't answer the specific questions about the enrollment that was provided to you or how many four-year old's applied and how that lines up. You just got that information; I would have to go back. I don't think DOE is the agency to ask for that.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: I'm not asking you for that, I am just asking about if we have funding in

2.2

2 the budget for additional seats since there is a
3 shortfall.

MELANIE HARTZOG: We have funded specific sites in the budget and that funding exists. To the extent that we need additional funding and added, we are always working with DOE on that and adding it as needed. But we believe it's there and anything else related to specifics in your district, Council Member, I really do ask that you ask DOE.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And in terms of the 3K, are we on track for 2021 full roll out as the Mayor promised in 2017? If so great, if not, how much money do we need and from where?

MELANIE HARTZOG: We are on track with our roll out. We did release the citywide RFP. We have always said that for us to keep moving forward we are going to need state and federal resources. We continue to say that and push for that.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: So, how much do we need?

Listen it's \$30,000 at stake for me and countless

other families. How much do we need by when in order

to make sure that we roll out by 2021?

MELANIE HARTZOG: Let me get back to you with the actual breakdown. We will.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, Chair Gibson.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, to close this out.

And thank you again to the entire staff for being here. I know its been a long morning. But I wanted to echo the sentiments of Council Member Chin and just clarify a couple of things.

So, we had a slide that focuses on the Administration senior club closure plan and we've looked at DFTA's own data in terms of analyzing the centers that are nearest to the NYCHA twelve centers that the Administration is looking to close, and we believe that there are at least seven today that are over the 100 percent utilization rate.

And so, while I understand the proposal is to provide transportation, which is important. I also want to just say because I represent two NYCHA's senior centers that are underutilized, and they are in public housing. It's much more then transportation. It's about the continuity, it's about the comradery that seniors have. And so, I want the Administration to really work with us on this process because it's much more than providing transportation.

2.2

We believe that theses DFTA centers that will be asked to absorb more seniors will in fact need more money in their budget. So, I am grateful that you acknowledge that if that is the case, then you are willing to do that. So, I just want to reiterate that we are not talking about the current utilization of the NYCHA twelve centers, but we're talking about the nearby DFTA centers that we are looking to bring more senior to, that we believe are over the current utilization.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Yes, happy to have that conversation with us. I want to work very closely as we move with this transition and to the extent that the centers that these seniors now can access, need additional services to provide the comprehensive services that we want to do. We can most certainly look at that. We did add a little bit of funding on the margins within this plan because we haven't seen the level of utilization in the centers or I should say in the clubs, that you are referring to. Again, happy to revisit that. But we did add some marginal funding within the plan, assuming that additional seniors from the clubs go to the centers and we can

walk you though that in detail in addition to the transportation dollars.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, in addition to that, I mean, we also should expect that those DFTA centers as well may increase their own numbers as well, notwithstanding the seniors that may be coming from the senior clubs at those twelve NYCHA's.

So, I just want to make sure that we are covering all of our bases in having this conversation. I want to keep them open, but I understand you know, as we go through the process, we have to make decisions, but I also think we have to look at some of the other variables that are in this conversation.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Most certainly.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, so I wanted to ask a question about the cluster sites. You and I have had this conversation before. The city recently closed on its acquisition of 22 cluster building at 17 different locations. I want to recognize that 14 of those locations are in Bronx county at \$173 million. And during the Prelim Budget hearing, we asked Commissioner Steve Banks and he acknowledged that the Administration would continue to explore purchasing

2.2

2 additional cluster site buildings and converting
3 those units into affordable housing units.

With this particular acquisition, I understand it's going to cover about 70 percent of our existing cluster housing portfolio, which is very significant. But of course, I remind you of the remaining 30 percent. Because I represent many of those buildings.

So, my question is, what is the update today on the acquisition? How many clusters remain in our portfolio? And is Commissioner Banks in fact correct when he says that we are going to continue looking at additional purchases of cluster buildings?

MELANIE HARTZOG: He is correct. We are continuing to look at purchasing of additional cluster buildings. I don't have the number of clusters on me, we can get that to you. How many units is your question, we will provide it.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, and are we on target to phase all of our clusters out by 2023?

MELANIE HARTZOG: We are on target. The 2023, I am not sure if that is the correct year. Let me confirm that with Commissioner Banks.

2.2

2.2

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, and in addition we acknowledged that once the acquisition takes place, there are significant capital needs that each of these buildings will need. Both the cluster families that are phasing our as well as the traditional tenants that remain in these buildings. So, have we started to look at what amounts we believe that the Capital will cost in terms of additional need for these buildings once we turn them over to a not-for-profit provider?

MELANIE HARTZOG: We are not going to know until the not-for-profit actually gets in and does an assessment and as those assessments are done, we would then reflect those costs in the Capital Plan.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: So, the city's not going to do the assessment, we are going to go through the process of identifying a not-for-profit and then do the assessment?

MELANIE HARTZOG: The not-for-profit who is actually managing the development would actually be responsible for managing the site, but also working with us around the assessment of what the rehab needs are for the facility.

1

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, and this is fairly new, that's why I am asking these questions and I 3

have a lot of cluster housing in the Bronx.

4 5

Is it at all similar to the TPT program where there will be an intermediary that will take over the deed and then it be transferred to the not-for-profit

7 8

6

or does it go directly from the former landlord to a

9

not-for-profit?

MELANIE HARTZOG: It's going directly from the

11

10

former landlord to the not-for-profit.

12 13

want to keep talking about that because I do

14

recognize there will be costs, and obviously we are

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, okay, I definitely

15

expecting that if there is an estimated number, that

16

should be reflected in the Adopted Budget, so that we

17 18

can continue to move forward. I think these families

19

have been living in extremely substandard conditions

20

for quite some time. Both the cluster families that

did not get the sufficient social service that they

21

2.2

needed, and we acknowledged that as well as the

traditional tenants that have lived there for some

23

24

time too.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Thank you Chair, we agree.

_

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, thank you very much and we look forward to working with you. I will turn it back over to our Chair.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you very much Chair.

Excuse me, Director Hartzog, we appreciate you coming in and giving us, information and we look forward to continuing to work with you and your whole team.

Thank you very, very much.

MELANIE HARTZOG: Thank you Chair Dromm.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, and we're going to take a five-minute break and then we will start with DDC.

[GAVEL] Okay, thank you. We will now resume the City Council's hearing on the Mayor's Executive Budget for Fiscal 2020. The Finance Committee is joined with the Subcommittee on Capital Budget, chaired by Council Member Vanessa Gibson.

We are joined by Council Member Andy Cohen,

Council Member Steve Matteo and we just heard from

the Office of Management and Budget and will now here

from the Commissioner of the Department of Design and

Construction Lorraine Grillo.

In the interest of time, I will forego and opening statement, but before we hear testimony, I

will open the mic to my Co-Chair Council Member
Gibson.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you Chair Dromm and good afternoon everyone. It's great to have you here. To our Commissioner Lorraine Grillo of the Department of Design and Construction, welcome. I am Council Member Vanessa Gibson; I am proud to serve as Chair of the Subcommittee on the Capital Budget. I want to thank my Co-Chair, Chair Danny Dromm for hosting our hearing today. We started early morning, ten o'clock with the Office of Management and Budget and now we have DDC before us this afternoon.

At our Preliminary Budget hearing earlier this year, the Council expressed our concern about DDC's capacity to tackle an expanding workload, including the Design and the build out of the borough-based jail facilities, and taking the lead with improving pedestrian ramp accessibility.

I want to commend DDC as well as OMB for listening to the City Council's concerns. While the budget has not changed very much since the Prelim, we were very pleased to see that the Executive Budget now includes money for staff. 66 new positions in key strategic areas. 12 positions for the frontend

2.2

planning unit to review sponsor agency proposals, which is very important to avoid accepting projects with questionable scopes and funding levels and will really help DDC deliver more projects on time, more efficiently and more expeditiously.

42 positions to deal with the borough-based jails program, to oversee the design, the construction management, the procurement as well as safety. And this is in addition to the funds that were included in the Preliminary Budget for a design build specific program management consultant.

There are 13 positions to coordinate the installation of pedestrian ramps at many of our street corners to improve accessibility and bring our city into compliance with the ADA. One area where we remain hopeful that DDC would add additional capacity would be one of my favorites, the not-for-profit procurement program. This uses City Council discretionary funds to reimburse not-for-profit organizations for certain capital eligible purchases of equipment, vehicles, mobile units, property or construction projects that really aim to assist in the provision of the organizations public services.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

LORRAINE GRILLO: Yes.

COUNCIL CLERK: You may proceed.

Presently, the timeline can stretch out for up to four years, which is beyond frustrating. So, I thank you. I recognize when DDC issued its blueprint with all of the internal changes, not just the frontend loading but change order unit and really making sure that we can pay our vendors on time, is really a great step in the right direction and through this conversation, during this Executive Budget process.

We obviously want to talk a little bit more about the staffing, their responsibilities and how we can continue to further implement a lot of the vision that was put forth in our blueprints.

So, I look forward to working with you. you, Commissioner to you and your team at DDC and I will turn it back over to our Chair, Danny Dromm.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, and we are going to ask the Council to swear you in and then provide testimony.

COUNCIL CLERK: Do you affirm that your testimony will be truthful to the best of your knowledge, information and belief.

2.2

LORRAINE GRILLO: Okay, well, good afternoon

Chairman Dromm, Subcommittee Chair Gibson and members

of the Committee. My name is Lorraine Grillo, I am

the Commissioner of the New York City Department of

Design and Construction.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on DDC's Fiscal Year 2020 Executive Budget. I am joined today by member of DDC's leadership team. The Executive Capital Plan expands on the January Plan increasing to an historic \$11 billion over the next decade. The majority of this work \$8 billion is focused on core water, sewer, and transportation infrastructure.

That commitment to infrastructure is a testament to the city's foresight and planning. While officials in Washington can spend years debating a national infrastructure bill, we are not waiting. We are making the necessary investments now, so that future generations can enjoy the benefits of reliable infrastructure, beautiful public spaces, and quality public services. In FY 2020 alone, DDC's commitment plan includes nearly \$3 billion in new commitments. Again, focus largely on water, sewer, and streets.

The portfolio for DDC's Public Buildings Division is also forecast to grow. The Executive Budget

2 in

includes \$436 million in commitments for NYPD facilities and \$375 million for Sanitation facilities over ten years.

DDC will also being doing a lot of work for our three library systems in the coming years.

Committing \$411 million through FY 2023. Working with OMB, we have also taken steps to flatten the Capital Plan to more accurately reflect Capital commitment rates.

DDC's Fiscal 2020 Operating Budget is \$189 million. This includes \$141 million for personnel services and a budgeted head count of 1,555. The Operating Budget includes \$145 million in IFA funds, \$13 million in federal funds and \$30 million in the City's Expense funding. The DDC budget also includes \$48 million for OTPS needs.

Finally, DDC has worked closely with OMB to identify \$2.4 million in FY 2019 and FY 2020 for PEGs to help the City meet its current cost control objectives, as well as \$627,000 in baselined outyear reductions to its budget for any future efforts of this nature.

DDC continues to aggressively pursue its Capital program and increase industry participation. Since I

last appeared before this committee in late March, we celebrate with the Mayor and Council Member Borelli, the completion of the new Joseph A. Rodino Jr. Field of Dreams at the Southshore Little League in Staten Island. This beautiful new facility include a new grandstand with covered seating areas for 275 people. Energy efficient lighting and a range of other first-class amenities.

With Council Member Richards, we kicked off our latest South East Queen infrastructure project. An \$84 million effort to alleviate flooding in Brookville. Adding more than two miles of new sewers and improving streets. Part of a \$1.9 billion long term commitment of this Administration to building out stormwater infrastructure for South East Queens.

Working with DOT, we also reopened the fully renovated West 229th Step Street in Council Member Cabrera's district. Which connects Heath Avenue at the lowest point to Kings Bridge Terrace at its highest in the hilly terrain of the Western Bronx.

DDC also joined the SCA in April to host a joint MWBE procurement fair. More than 700 businesses were represented at the fair. Which had also 60

2.2

O 1

exhibitors including 20 city agencies seeking to fulfill the Mayor's MWBE goals.

In the coming months, I will have the pleasure of participating in several more ribbon cuttings and ground breakings for DDC projects, as well as steam events, including resiliency training for DOE teachers and DYCD after school providers at the lower east side girls club this June.

Also, a high school and college graduate summer internships will begin. As I made clear in March, before this Committee, DDC is working extremely hard on several fronts to change the way it does business to deliver projects more reliably. A major part of this effort and one the Council has heard about is to better control the project initiation process. And enhance our planning efforts to ensure that every project has all the necessary elements in place to be successful before we take it on.

The days of DDC excepting a project that is not fully scoped or adequately budgeted are gone. We are also in the process of hiring staff to enhance the AIMS program.

This staff will take a hard look of reviewing city assets and helping develop sensible long-term

2.2

Capital planning strategies. This is the buildingblock of creating a better Capital planning process.

We are also making important progress on moving key parts of our strategic blueprint forward. Among other things since I appeared here in March, we have established standardized design and construction durations in our infrastructure and public buildings divisions. Finalized our initial four pilot projects for the expanded allowance for work, streamlining the change order process. And worked with OMB to increase the threshold for blanket certificates to proceed for DEP projects.

These efforts, we can actually measure to determine if we are moving the needle. And measure them we will. We are building out a key performance indicator program that will allow us to hold ourselves accountable.

We will continue to enact our plan on many other fronts and aggressively change how we do business. I encourage you to keep our blueprint on your desk as a measuring stick for our progress. And please continue to make suggestions and ask questions. This effort will require continual collaboration with the Council and other oversights. With our sponsor

agencies and the communities where we work. But we remain committed to seeing it through.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today and I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you and before we get started, I just want to say we've been joined by Council Member Rosenthal.

In the Executive Plan for Fiscal 2020, DDC added \$685 million to its Capital Commitment Plan, bringing it to a total of \$10.9 billion over five years. This represents more than 12 percent of the City's total Capital Plan.

With this increase of \$685 million, does the agency have the capacity to complete all of the projects in a timely manner?

LORRAINE GRILLO: I believe we do. As we continue through these major projects for example, our Ped Grant Program and the Over Rikers Program, if the needs arise, we will continue to work with OMB to get the additional headcount.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So, have you asked OMB for additional numbers?

2.2

2.2

LORRAINE GRILLO: Not at this moment, but we will continue to monitor these projects as they move along.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, I just want to talk a little bit about borough-based jail program.

LORRAINE GRILLO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: In Fiscal 2020, DDC added funding of \$3.3 million in the Fiscal 2020 and baselined \$4.5 million starting in 2021 and beyond for 41 positions associated with the borough-based jail program.

What is the scope of work of these new employees and when are you planning on filling these positions?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Again, at this point and Council Member Gibson mentioned our PMC, Project Managing Corporation that we hired recently, and we are just getting up to speed with that consultant who is working with our teams and working with the communities and moving forward in that way.

Certainly, we are looking at ways to design those projects. We are not at the point at this moment where we need additional staffing to implement the program. We are at the very earliest stages.

2 CHAIRPERSON DROMM: So, you feel the \$41 is

3 | sufficient?

2.2

LORRAINE GRILLO: Absolutely, at this moment.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, and in terms of what that planning looks like, is it that they are going to help decide usage for the space? Like first floor will be commercial, retail, or second floor auditorium etc., so forth and so on. Is that the idea?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Exactly correct.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: We've heard that the Bronx
Hall of Justice just opened in 2017. It represents a
missed opportunity where the process failed to
adequately engage the community and users and the
completed project presents significant logistical
challenges for those who work there every day.

At the Preliminary Budget hearing, you spoke in general terms about your plans for the community and elected official engagement with the borough-based jail design. Can you tell us about any specific plans DDC has to work with the community and corrections officers to make sure the new jails rise to this challenge?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Sure.

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: Sure, I would be happy to respond to that Council Member. So, the borough-based jails project is in the ULURP process right now. There has been a considerable amount of work done already in the master plan that was created. As the Commissioner mentioned, once we are through ULURP, we've added substantial capacity project management consultant and we will be adding substantial staff to do the work of preparing the designs for each of the facilities.

There will be community engagement and stakeholder engagement within all of that work and one of the ways that we will be doing that is with a design advisory group that's been established, Co-chaired by the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice and DDC to work with key stakeholders on designs as we move forward and we will be finding other opportunities to do that as well.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: In terms of the height of these buildings, who will be making those decisions ultimately?

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: I think there is a proposal that's in ULURP. It's been subject to environmental review and I believe the Mayor's Office

traditional methods?

That's a really difficult

LORRAINE GRILLO:

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

every project. It's a tool that we need in our toolbox to continue to work. I am going to say, have we estimated, and I'll ask my colleague if we've estimated anything on the Off Rikers Program, any savings on that? JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: In total on the Off

question, it really depends upon the project itself.

Again, design build works for some projects, not for

Rikers program, I don't think we have an exact number, but in the course of setting up that program, we've taken a look and seen that there are precedence where we can save between 12 and 18 months on a project of that scale because of design build.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Important, okay good. you. I am going to turn it over to Chair Gibson now.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Thank you Chair and thank you Commissioner, to you and the team at DDC we appreciate all the work you are doing and certainly as we continue to add more to the capital plan, that means that DDC will have more work.

I wanted to ask about the staffing and the resources for the frontend planning unit that I talked about. The additional city funding at \$1.3

2.2

million in Fiscal 2020 and in the out years for all costs associated with twelve positions for the frontend planning units specifically that's been around since about 2016. Have you identified with these new employees that we will be adding to enhance the efficiency of the overall Capital Budget process what their roles will be within the frontend planning unit and also, do you a timeframe on when you believe that those positions will be filled?

Yeah, first of all, our frontend planning unit really has a number of different things that they do, which a lot of them are investigation, estimating. Just seeing if projects are feasible if they can be done, what are the impediments to moving forward on a particular project. I mean there are a lot of different areas of expertise, engineering architecture, estimating, those kinds of things.

So, at this point I don't know what each and every one of these people will be doing. But I will tell you that we have several hires in the process right now that are moving forward and we anticipate that within the next several months, we will have those positions filled.

_ ¬

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: And before this hiring takes place, what does the frontend planning unit look like today in terms of headcount. Because you described multiple roles and different people that are tasked with just different responsibilities.

JUSTIN WALTER: Hi, Justin Walter CFO DDC. So, the frontend planning unit was originally funded a headcount of about 18. So, this is additional 12 heads to bring us to 30. Staff on budget right now, I believe it is 18 total. We are in the hiring process for the balance effectively now that we've gotten the authorization for the additional 12 heads.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, great and so, I am sure the answer is yes, but I will ask anyway. Do you anticipate that this increase and I would love to understand in terms of how we came up with this particular number of 12, even though we don't exactly know what their responsibilities will be just yet within the unit, but do you expect that this increase in headcount will improve the overall client agency, customer service experience that clients are dealing with DDC in the every day work.

LORRAINE GRILLO: Right, I do agree with that, but I might say that one of the reasons for the

increase or the expansion, is the increase in
projects.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

We want our frontend planning unit to review every single project. So, right now, they are limited in the number of projects that they can review, but they have all those areas of expertise now. What we want to do is expand it, so that they can get into every single project.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, and I'm looking at these beautiful pictures of step streets and museums, pedestrian plaza's and they look gorgeous and just speaking from personal experience, some of these projects take quite a bit of time. Some are better than others and I guess you know, just to understand the projects that the frontend planning unit does take and accept and also, we talked about prioritization, because I wanted to make sure that some of the smaller projects that are not necessarily in the bulk of your portfolio. About 56 percent of your projects are really dedicated to DEP and DOT portfolio, which is important. But what are we doing within the blueprint to make sure that the smaller Capital Projects are the remainder of that 56 percent are also prioritized as well.

2.2

So, I know you know like myself, Council Member
Cohen, Northern Manhattan in the Bronx, we care about
step streets. Because that's really a huge mode of
transit for many pedestrians and a lot of New Yorkers
don't always know what step streets are but they are
gorgeous. Once they are complete, they are gorgeous.
But those are not necessarily like a DEP
infrastructure project but rather still important,
not you know millions and millions of dollars, but
still very important.

So, how does that frontend planning unit prioritize some of the smaller capital projects?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Again, first of all, I had no idea what a step street was until.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: I know, most people don't.

LORRAINE GRILLO: Until we opened the one in the

Bronx in your district and they are beautiful. They

really are.

I think again, as I said earlier, the goal here is that every single project go through the frontend planning process. That everyone of them start with us with adequate funding and a scope that we can all agree on. And once that happens, you will see how much more quickly these projects get done because we

2.2

will not have to stop, start, stop, start every time
there is information about a difference in scope, or

anytime there is additional funding needed.

We want to start on the right foot, and that I think is going to be the difference with an increase frontend planning group.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, recently one of our terms and conditions that the City Council received in the first have of Fiscal 2019, the frontend planning unit at DDC initiated three parks projects out of a total of 51 projects.

So, I wanted to ask specifically about parks. I am bringing up an agency that we've been working very closely with that I know has had many challenges, but I wanted to understand if parks only submitted three parks projects to DDC to manage? And if so, what can we do as DDC to work closely with parks to potentially look at some of their Capital projects.

I'm sure you understand Commissioner our frustration on Park projects. And we love to open parks, but we don't open as many as we possibly can for many reasons. Parks has done a series of different amendments to their internal bidding process, looking at more bidding and other diversity

measures and I have been helpful with that. Because
I have had a lot of projects where the design was
slowed down a little bit as well as the vendor. You
know, basically didn't comply with the contract rules
and so we had to start all over.

I've had some real horror stories, but I wanted to understand specifically with these three, was that initiated by them and what could we do more to work on park projects?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Well, as far as those three projects, the projects that come to us, come at the request of the sponsor agency.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay.

LORRAINE GRILLO: So, for those three projects, they have come to us. And again, we recognize some of the issues that parks has to deal with because we actually deal with similar issues in terms of contractors that are not performing and how we continue and move forward on these projects.

I work very closely with the Commissioner of Parks. Any improvements that we can make, we will share with them and any improvements they make, they will share with us.

2.2

2.2

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, and I just wanted to make sure that we were clear, the three projects that we saw was the Rockaway project at about \$14 million, Coney Island Beach Headquarters at \$47 million and the Tilden Rec Center at \$55 million.

So, at first, when we go the information, we thought these were like huge Capital projects, so we were just wondering if there was some mechanism behind the reason why these particular three park projects were sent to DDC?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Again, we work closely with the sponsor and they asked us to help with these three and we are more than happy to do so.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, so, I wanted to ask as we keep talking about communication with a lot of the client agencies. In terms of communication and our inner agency work, do the client agencies have a project manager on staff for the projects that DDC is completing on their behalf? So, is there a point person that DDC works with at the particular client agency to manage these projects?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Sure, we work with a Liaison from the sponsor agency, but we are managing the design and construction of these projects. We are

2.2

our Capital for goods, vehicles, equipment. I am a big fan of mobile units; I fund those a lot.

I wanted to ask about the staffing levels today in this not-for-profit procurement program in the unit and if you believe we need to add more staff to accelerate these projects. Some of these smaller Capital projects have been outstanding for quite some time and as we add more capital projects, we wanted to understand what the staffing looks like and if there is going to be a request to add more staff to the unit?

LORRAINE GRILLO: Yes, I am going to introduce to you our general Counsel, David Varoli, whose unit actually manages this process.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Yes, we've met, we know you.

DAVID VAROLI: Good afternoon Chair Gibson.

Thank you for the leading questions, but I am actually going to do something that is not normally done. I am going to say, while I appreciate the offer, and just to give you a recap. We have three staff members dedicated to this program and following our last conversation at the last hearing, I went back and spoke to the team and we really talked. We had a good heart to heart talk about what the issues

and the impediments are and while I do think staffing is need, I actually don't think the staffing is needed within DDC.

The organizations, the not-for-profits, both from the large hospital organizations, which may be a little bit surprising to even the very small mom and pop shops, the issue that we have seen is one, it's continuity of the actual staffing. And then two, it's the understanding of what is required, and I think maybe the people that are filling out the questionnaire, working with your office and your colleagues offices, they may not be fully versed on what the requirements are.

So, for example, I brought today a copy of a draft handbook. We have been giving out this handbook over the last couple of years. This one, I'm only saying it's a draft, because we haven't finalized it with the new information for the new Fiscal Year. But within this document are four and I talked about it last time, I am a big lover and believer in checklists, we've got four different checklists that take the not-for-profit through each step of the process.

2.2

Then behind each checklist, are literally samples. We have put together samples of what a payment requisition looks like. We put together a sample what a CP looks like, and we've really spelt it out and I don't know what more we can do.

I mean I mentioned last time Bruce Rudolph, he literally calls up each not-for-profit, talks to them, goes out to their facility to walk them through the handbook. Some times he takes one or two of the other two staff members. There is just a lot that goes into it. And then unfortunately what happens is, things go very dormant, quit. Three, six, nine, twelve months and we all then start following up, but we have a lot of different projects that are coming in the queue and then we will find out that the person that we dealt with was no longer there. And no one had advised us of the transition to who the new person was.

Again, it's not a problem, problem, but Bruce would then go back out and meet with the new person, bring the new handbook and say, okay, lets walk through the steps one more time.

So, again, I appreciate the offer, I understand why you would say hey, maybe we need more staff, but

2.2

in looking at everything we have been doing, I really think the not-for-profits need more help and I don't know what that help looks like.

But before I walked in today, I did speak with

Nathan of your staff, who again, I said last time had
this amazing relationship. We are going to sit down
after this and also talk about some of the ideas and
issues that we have been really kicking around at our
agency as to see what we can do to streamline this
process.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, I appreciate that and I think the handbook is a great idea, but I would also ask that you know, maybe DDC could look at allocating additional resources to help walk our not-for-profits through the compliance process to talk about potential delays and I understand inconsistencies with Executive Directors and the Chairs, the Boards, and you know, just in terms of staff changes.

I get that but I do think you know, we should look at this again to see what we can do as an agency and that doesn't preclude us from if it means adding more to the headcount of four that you described and that one person be dedicated to serving as the

2.2

liaison to help in addition to the handbook. The handbook is great, but I also think you know, we should look at what DDC can do as well to add more resources within the agency to help.

Because this process is only going to be further exacerbated as you have more Council Members adding more Capital projects. And so, if we don't take the opportunity now to address it, I feel like it will get just potentially worse and more projects will be delayed.

DAVID VAROLI: Thank you, yes.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, so yes, we need more staff.

DAVID VAROLI: Yes, I am going to speak with Nathan about the staffing.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Just have to circle back. I had a question about the Red Hook, the Hazard Mitigations Grant Program. Carlos Menchaca would appreciate this.

The Fiscal 2020 Executive Capital Commitment Plan includes \$100 million. In Fiscal 2022, in funding for the advanced resiliency project in Red Hook Brooklyn to protect the neighborhoods against sea level rise and this integrated flood management

2.2

agency project is a part of a larger \$20 billion resiliency plan that the city is implementing really around all five boroughs.

How does the agency plan to spend the \$100 million that's been provided to DDC for this project?

And my second question, always, is do we have a timeline on spending the funds?

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: Right, I am happy to take that Council Member. So, as you say the Red Hook Hazard Mitigation Grant Funded Project is a \$100 million project. We do believe that that \$100 million will fully fund the project. And the project has been the subject of an extensive feasibility study that's looked a scope and engineering questions.

Basically, the preferred alternative coming out of that study has two components. It's raising the grade of Beard Street in the Southern part of Red Hook and raising the edge level of a portion of the neighborhood adjacent to the cruise terminal in the Western portion and the goal of that edge raising is to address a fairly frequent storm and it's flood conditions that are associated with it.

2.2

So, DDC has just received that project and the feasibility study that was conducted and will be moving into design procurement and design and then into construction. Subsequently, we will have more information about exact timing as we move through that design process.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, will design start this year, or 2020?

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: I believe design is starting this year, but I will get back and confirm whether it's this year or early next year.

CHAIRPERSON GIBSON: Okay, great. I will turn it back over to Chair Dromm.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Thank you and I want to turn it over to Council Member Rosenthal.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thanks, I will appreciate that. Commissioner, always great to see you. Thanks for all your hard work and your testimony — whats in your testimony is really exciting because I am particularly drawn to the procurement efficiencies that you are talking about here and what I'd like you to do is just give — these are good bones to new system and I know you are still working on what they will exactly be, but can you

think of one example where you could say like with change orders or something that is a slog where here 3

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

is the slog that currently exists or the competitive 4 process, it's unnecessary. And here is exactly how 5

6 we are going to fix it?

> LORRAINE GRILLO: Sure, thank you for the question. We've recently put together what we call our CACO unit. The acronym?

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: Construction Allowance and Change Order Taskforce.

LORRAINE GRILLO: Correct, okay, so we have a taskforce that consists of folks who review change orders as well as our EAO, as you are familiar with. Typically, what would happen before was these were different units. And if a question arose from the change order unit or from the EAO, for example. They would maybe put a call into the change order unit who could potentially get back to them within a few days, maybe not.

And it was a very long confusing process. Having these folks all sitting together allows that conversation to happen immediately and answers to happen immediately. And so, I think that's a perfect example of how we as an organization can do this

better. And so, you know, there is a million different things. One of the things that we talked about was our construction allowance pilot program that we are working with OMB on right now.

I think that that will absolutely speed up our projects, allow our contractors to get paid and stay solvent and continue working and so, that's a very, very big deal.

about this. On the Human Services sector side, the thought is that when passport is fully implemented, all three phases, that it could save the human service providers almost \$800 million dollars cumulatively annually. Which is the cost of not being paid on time etc. Do you think there would be cost savings in the sense of construction companies will know now with the new system that's coming in or has already been. Five years from now when it's already in place and secure, do you think bids might actually come down because projects, bidders now know that they are not going to have to wait a year to be reimbursed or whatever?

LORRAINE GRILLO: You know, that a very good question. I think that there will, if nothing else,

passport. So, the actual bidding doesn't happen

is around that. If there is an issue with a project

2.2

that was either done incorrectly, I think that that is the contractors responsibility. If there is something different, for example, I don't like that particular surround, then it's no longer the contractors responsibility and that is an item that would not be Capital eligible.

So, it's a question of what the issue is. Is it a defect? Is it something that the contractor did not do correctly and needs to be fixed or repaired? That's his responsibility.

CHAIRPESON DROMM: Just on the same note, you know I have Diversity Plaza in my district also. So, last year, when the trees were planted, the trees were installed, it was very hot. And the tree started to wilt, and the leaves started to fall off. They weren't being watered correctly or something was wrong, but in that case, I was told that there was a year and half guarantee on those trees.

So, is that true with any of those types of projects that you do? And there was arguments between DDC and Parks as to how deep to plant those trees.

LORRAINE GRILLO: I'm sure there was. There are various components of any construction project. For

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

23

24

example, a roof project may have a ten-year warranty. Windows may have a different length of warrantee, but most of those things are packaged into the construction contract. Or if for example, it's a particular piece of equipment, that comes in with a particular quarantee or warrantee.

As far as trees are concerned, it's a year and a half.

CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Well, I think actually the trees are coming in stronger now, so I am happy about that. But just curious to know.

Okay, I don't think we have anything else for you at this point. I'm sorry, one last question.

COUNCIL MEMBER CUMBO: Just one more question. I wanted to ask about the East Side Coastal Resiliency project. Which I understand is a multi-year project and the commitment plan has about \$1.2 billion. wanted to ask, has there been any update on the design phase of the project since the Prelim to date? And can you provide us with any details?

JAMIE TORRES SPRINGER: Sure, Council Member, I am happy to do that. We continue to work our way through design. The entire project is in the

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE JOINTLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL BUDGET 189
2	Preliminary Design stage at this point and we will be
3	moving into more detailed design documentation.
4	The goal is for us to complete design by November
5	of this year, so that we can bid out the project.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER CUMBO: That's an update thank
7	you.
8	CHAIRPERSON DROMM: Okay, well, thank you very
9	much for coming in and with that this meeting is
10	adjourned at 2:17 in the afternoon. Thank you.
11	[GAVEL]
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

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 April 1, 2018