CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

----X

May 24, 2010 Start: 10:07 am Recess: 02:27 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

DOMENIC M. RECCHIA, JR.

KAREN KOSLOWITZ ROBERT JACKSON Chairpersons

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.

Gale A. Brewer

Leroy G. Comrie, Jr.

Lewis A. Fidler
Helen D. Foster
Robert Jackson
G. Oliver Koppell
Darlene Mealy
Diana Reyna

Joel Rivera Albert Vann

Fernando Cabrera

APPEARANCES

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Julissa Ferreras Karen Koslowitz James G. Van Bramer Vincent M. Ignizio James S. Oddo Charles Barron Daniel Dromm James Vacca Mark Weprin Brad Lander Margaret Chin Michael C. Nelson Jumaane D. Williams David Greenfield Stephen Levin Jessica S. Lappin Elizabeth Crowley Deborah Rose

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

Jonathan Mintz Commissioner NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Michael J. Mansfield Commissioner NYC Business Integrity Commission

Eric Dorsch Deputy General Counsel for Legal Affairs NYC Business Integrity Commission

Ilene Chin Deputy Commissioner for Operations NYC Business Integrity Commission

Joel I. Klein Commissioner NYC Department of Education

Photeine Anagnostopoulos Deputy Chancellor for Finance and Technology NYC Department of Education

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Good morning
and welcome to the sixth day of the City Council
hearing on the Mayor's Executive Budget for Fiscal
Year 2011. My name is Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.,
and I am the chair of the Finance Committee of the
New York City. I welcome everyone to the hearing
this morning.

We're going to begin with Consumer Affairs, and then we'll go to Business Integrity and then Education. On Friday, we heard from the Department of Transportation, the MTA and the Taxi and Limousine Committee and the New York City Housing Authority.

Today, we will first be joined by
the Committee on Consumer Affairs, chaired by
colleague and Council Member Karen Koslowitz, to
hear from the Department of Consumer Affairs and
the Business Integrity Commission. Then the
Finance Committee will be joined by the Committee
on Education, chaired by my colleague Council
Member Robert Jackson, to hear from the Department
of Education and Joel Klein.

Before we hear from Commissioner

Jonathan Mintz from the Department of Consumer

2.0

Affairs, I just want to welcome everyone to the
City Council Chamber. I'd like to recognize my
colleagues who have joined us this morning. We
have Leroy Comrie, Council Member Cabrera and I
want to thank the staff from Consumer Affairs and
the staff from the Department of Finance for all
their wonderful work they have done putting this
together this morning.

At this time, I'd like to turn the microphone over to Commissioner Mintz. Welcome, Commissioner.

much. Good morning, Chair Recchia and members of the Consumer Affairs and Finance Committee and talented staff. I'm Jonathan Mintz, Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Affairs. I'm pleased to have the opportunity today to highlight some of the important and exciting work of the department, especially as our anniversary year draws to a close, marking four decades of empowering consumers and businesses in a fair and vibrant marketplace.

Throughout the past year, our focus and our success is clustered around three

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

strategic goals: educating, empowering and 2 3 protecting New Yorkers. Our first strategic 4 priority is educating New Yorkers. Our tri-part Taking Control of your Finances public campaign to 5 6 educate New Yorkers during the economic downturn 7 began in 2008 and continued through 2009. 8 campaign included first, debt stress, focusing on our Office of Financial Empowerment's financial 9 10 education network which is a 311 accessible and 11 online searchable database of every free and low cost financial education and counseling service 12 available in all five boroughs.

> Second, it's tax time, go get your refund. You might guess what that was about, publicizing eligibility requirements for the earned income tax credit and the city's childcare tax credit as well as our citywide network of free tax preparation, or VITA sites.

Third, Money Worries, directing consumers to our network of financial empowerment centers which provide free professional, confidential, one-on-one in English/Spanish financial counseling, addressing issues such as credit card debt, budgeting, mortgage foreclosure

2 and much more.

These three components of our Take

Control of your Finances campaign drew in more

than 42,000 inquiries to 311, more than 85,000 web

visits and the distribution of more than 1.3

million palm cards, posters and tip sheets through

our staff, through Hot 97 street soldiers,

community-based agencies and the 16 presentations

which were part of our Pass it On clergy campaign.

The 2009 Tax Time component yielded total refunds coming directly from those 77 VITA partners, totaling more than \$114 million, including \$51 million in EITC refunds. If you think about that for a moment, that's just a couple of thousand dollars a person in their pockets. It's a significant amount of money.

Preliminary data for this year indicates that our Tax Time coalition partners filed 72,000 tax returns on behalf of New Yorkers. This year we piloted an additional option in order to help New Yorkers claim every penny that they've earned and deserve through a free online tax preparation which was available to anyone earning \$58,000 or less. For this first pilot year,

approximately 3,600 New Yorkers took advantage of the option, including many hundred who went to receive guidance on how to do this online at 9

sites that we established in the city.

Two other major education initiatives included DCA's 7th annual Business Education Day and our 3rd annual shred fest. Our Business Education Day, held in October, was by far the biggest and most successful education initiative for businesses yet. We put away our violation books for the day and some 75 staffers visited close to 1,600 businesses in 30 different neighborhoods across all five boroughs advising businesses directly on how to do right by their customers.

Yesterday, DCA conducted the third annual Shred Fest in partnership with the Criminal Justice Coordinator's office and with the help of the Parks and Sanitation Departments. This was to raise awareness about how to prevent identity theft. We provided free paper shredding at 11 locations throughout the city and thanks to the generosity of Staples, even gave away free paper shredders to the first three participants at each

2 location.

Our shredding services, coupled with multilingual identity protection tips, underscored the importance of shredding documents that contained personal identifying information before throwing them away. And yes, we recycle.

Next is our second strategic goal, empowering New Yorkers. We're particularly proud of our ability to go to scale with the gold standard of financial education and counseling through our network of approximately 20 financial empowerment centers.

Our trained and professional counselors have provided more than 8,800 individual counseling sessions helping New Yorkers in need to reduce their debts, for example, by over a million dollars. With the city's 311 operators receiving over 13,500 inquiries, our counselors are more than just available to the public; they are booked solid for two weeks out.

A second empowerment priority, as part of Mayor Bloomberg's aggressive anti-poverty strategy implemented under the Center for Economic Opportunity, is our SaveNYC Account initiative.

It was first launched in 2008, to encourage savings at tax time in communities with low incomes, through a privately funded city matching program. It's been a resounding success proving that individuals with low incomes both can and will save when given straightforward safe banking products at the right moment.

During the 2009 tax season, our partners opened accounts for over 1,000 New Yorkers who saved more than \$387,000. Eight out of ten participants saved for the full year, accumulating over \$470,000 which included about \$142,000 in the private match money. In the midst of such a different economy, the average income of the 2009 savers was just \$17,000.

During the 2010 tax season, we opened 1,300 accounts. Participants have already contributed over \$950,000 with potential match savings of another \$470,000. The average contribution is approximately \$700 which is 89% higher than the combined average contribution made during 2008 and 2009. We are also sharing our experience and our data with Capital Hill, where a national replication of this account initiative is

2 under consideration.

A third major empowerment initiative was creating and launching citywide the NYC SafeStart Account in partnership with five banks and five credit unions. The initiative was highlighted by the Mayor in his State of the City address as the first of its kind in the nation.

Now open to all New Yorkers in 40 bank and credit union branches throughout the city, this completely safe ATM starter account requires only a minimum balance of \$25 or less and completely eliminates costly fees like overdraft and monthly fees.

This unique account was created in response to startling evidence revealed in a study that we had commissioned that 825,000 New Yorkers are un-banked, in large part because of fears about hidden and costs fees like overdraft.

A fourth empowerment priority was aimed directly at businesses. This year, DCA in partnership with Small Business Services and DoITT, empowered businesses to apply for and renew their licenses online rather than having to come into our licensing center in person, although it's

2 a very nice place.

Currently, more than 93% of perspective licensees can apply for new licenses online in dozens of industries including home improvement contractors and salespeople, debt collection agencies, cigarette retail dealers, laundries and temporary street fair vendors. By August, 100% of our businesses will be able to apply online.

is protecting New Yorkers. DCA protects New
Yorkers through legislative advocacy and
enforcement efforts. Two key legislative efforts
this year to protect consumers focused on process
servers and on debt collectors. We worked closely
with the City Council to enhance DCA's regulation
of process servers who deliver legal papers to New
Yorkers that are being sued. Without proper
service of critical court documents, consumers are
unaware of the claims made against them and suffer
such dire consequences as having their wages
garnished and their bank accounts frozen.

The new legislation requires process servers to provide an electronic record of

their work using a GPS equipped device to verify
that process was actually served, thereby
eliminating, we hope, what is know as sewer
service. This is perhaps the most potent tool to
help us crack down on fraudulent service of
papers.

excellent bill on debt collectors, which included the regulation of debt buyers for the firs time, Mayor Bloomberg and I announced new debt collection rules last week. These rules are meant to protect consumers from wrongful debt collection attempts which can cause serious and long-term damage to a family's finances, again including seized bank accounts as well as damaged credit ratings.

We also took on major advocacy initiatives on legislation to provide greater fairness and transparency in the consumer financial marketplace now moving its way through Congress headed towards the president's desk, by developing strong working relationships with relevant committees in Congress, the Treasury Department, the New York delegation and the White

2.0

2.3

2 House.

DCA serves a model for what a large and effective consumer protection agency can do in the financial services sector. So we've been working with the White House and the Treasury Department on the proposed Consumer Financial Protection agency, although last I looked it may be called a bureau.

At the same time, we have worked diligently with law makers to ensure that whatever the ultimate legislation turns out to be, it will not prevent cities like New York from exercising local enforcement authority.

Other specific issues of DCA advocacy include written or oral testimony to Congress or federal agencies on overdraft protection. In March, I declared deceptive enrollment in so-called courtesy overdraft protection a top fraud of the year at an FTC press conference on top consumer frauds. The Federal Reserve Board's final regulations requiring banks to obtain customer's permission before enrolling them in fee-based overdraft programs closely mirrors the comments that DCA submitted to the

2.0

2.3

board and is a huge win for consumers.

Mext is halting aggressive

marketing techniques to consumers. After we met

last month with a prominent communications firm

which has been promoting text messaging as a

solution to banks for enrolling customers into

overdraft protection programs, the company

conceded that it would not tout text messaging but

instead use direct mail, telephone electronic

communication or offer enrollment in person.

We have asked banks and their marketing firms not to undermine new federal overdraft regulations with aggressive solicitations to enroll New Yorkers into expensive overdraft protection services.

In our letter to Federal Reserve
Chairman Ben Bernanke, we asked the Federal
Reserve to prohibit financial institutions from
using text messages to obtain consent from their
customers to enroll them in these services. Such
a tactic would eliminate consumers' opportunities
to make informed choices about overdraft
protection services.

DCA advocated for credit card

legislation and this summer the Credit Card Act of 2009 was passed and signed into law. The act will reform some of the most predatory practices in the credit card industry, requiring credit card companies to give cardholders 45 days notice before changing their interest rates, restricting credit card access for people under the age of 21 unless they actually have the ability to repay the debt, or have a co-signer, and many more protections.

Last April, I testified before the House Judiciary Committee to propose solutions to mortgage fraud scams, calling for a federal ban on fee for service foreclosure prevention businesses, the creation of a national enforcement task force to coordinate local tips, and utilization of 311 and 211 services across the country as the single incorruptible conduit for legitimate mortgage refinancing services.

In February, I joined the mayor and Neighbor Works America for the official local launch of a national loan modification scam alert campaign offering at-risk homeowners free resources to recognize scams, report them and find

the free help that they need all by calling 311.

In fact, you may have seen this message blasted on
an animated billboard in Times Square from January

through the end of March.

In an effort to be brief, which I think somebody wrote here as a joke, here are some of the most significant DCA enforcement initiatives over the last year. Let's start with our income tax preparers' sweep. In March, I announced the results of our sweep of more than 800 tax preparation businesses during which our inspectors issued 2,000 charges for violations that primarily involve deceptively advertising costly, high interest refund anticipation loans, or RALs as merely rapid or instant refunds. The total fines from the sweep could reach almost a million dollars.

Next, let's look at employment agencies. In 2009, DCA continued its aggressive enforcement crackdown on employment agencies launched in 2008 by the mayor to ensure that prospective job applicants were not taken advantage of.

One of the biggest successes was an

undercover investigation that led to finally shuttering Dalia's Service Agency in Brooklyn, an agency that repeatedly and illegally charged New Yorkers upfront fees rather than getting them jobs.

Overall, from January 2009 through February of 2010, the department settled employment agency cases totaling \$119 million in fines and restitution. That includes \$53 million in fines and \$67 million in consumer restitution.

We also conducted our third annual multi-county home improvement contractor enforcement sweep. Working in partnership with Westchester and Nassau Counties, during a ten-week sweep, we conducted over 1,500 inspections, issued 450 violations, made 17 criminal summonses or arrests and seized 175 vehicles owned by unlicensed contractors. Together, regional officials also reclaimed \$8.6 million in restitution for consumers cheated by illegal or unscrupulous contractors.

Let's also not forget about used car dealers and illegal bait and switch tactics.

DCA conducted a two-month long investigation of

used car dealers' illegal advertising tactics. We inspected 18 dealerships in all five boroughs and issued 63 violations to 10 dealerships for fines that could total tens of thousands of dollars.

We've also gone after and taken licenses away from the worst of the worst, those charging customers illegal fees, refusing to refund deposits on canceled transactions, changing contract terms after a customer has signed and left and other egregious practices.

In March, I announced our sweep of funeral homes. DCA conducted over 500 inspections to ensure that funeral parlors were making it as easy as possible, as required by New York City law, for those with lower incomes to easily and quickly choose affordable services. We issued 275 charges to 87 businesses, which could result in hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines.

Under the city's new pedicab law,

DCA ensures that only inspected, insured and

appropriate pedicab vehicles and drivers are

licensed to operate. DCA conducted 1,130 soup to

nuts safety inspections before issuing 889 pedicab

registration plates and licenses to 172 different

pedicab businesses. To date, we've licensed more than 500 pedicab drivers.

When is comes to money returned to New Yorkers, in response to the thousands of complaints filed with us, I'm proud to announce a new agency record. Consumer restitution climbed this year to nearly \$10 million, up by \$1.5 million from our record the year before.

Before turning to the fiscal details, I'd like to add two notes regarding our agency efficiencies. In the midst of our education empowerment and protection efforts and while struggling to cope with a tightening budget, DCA made great strides.

For example, we streamlined license approval procedures to shorten processing time from five days to only three. This held true for newly licensing pedicabs as well, by the way, despite an 11th hour massive onslaught into our licensing center before the deadline.

We also cut the median time to resolve a consumer complaint by more than a third. We now address 95% of all consumer complaints in less than 60 days.

2.0

In addition, DCA is replacing it's new outdated database system with new technology. This technology will allow for faster access to data about our licensees, yield increased accuracy and efficiency for all users. We expect to see increased activity in collections, enforcement, legal services and consumer services. The new database system makes it significantly easier to share data with other city and state agencies as well as increase the department's ability to interact with the public online.

To support the wide range of activities that further the department's mission to ensure a fair and vibrant marketplace for consumers and businesses, I focus now on the fiscal year 2011 budget.

The department's fiscal year 2011 budget projects expenses of \$20.7 million, which includes \$16 million for personnel costs and \$4.7 million for OTPS, and that includes \$1.9 million budgeted for our Office of Financial Empowerment.

Mindful of both the difficult economic times for New Yorkers, the constraints on the city's budget and the accompanying predatory

businesses that unfortunately can go hand in hand, our plan in the coming fiscal year is to target enforcement to industries and issues particularly injurious to consumers with the short-term goal of realizing additional revenues and the long-term goal of achieving greater compliance.

Toward meeting those goals, and the additional PEG requirements of the executive budget, DCA will bring on an additional 14 inspectors and 4 support staff who will bring in an additional \$1.6 million in revenue in the new fiscal year. These staff additions will enable DCA to focus undercover inspections of employment agencies and immigrant service providers as well as additional focused inspection of tobacco dealers to address falling compliance regarding illegal sales of cigarettes to children.

The fiscal 2011 executive budget projects revenues of \$21.8 million, compared to the fiscal 2010 executive budget's projected revenue for fiscal 2011 of \$18.5 million. The additional projected revenue includes the PEG revenues of a million in youth tobacco enforcement and the \$1.6 million in focused inspections.

DCA remains confident that we'll meet the fiscal 2010 budget projection of \$25.8 million, given robust licensing activity.

Departmental managers and staff are understandably proud of our many successes and innovations, particularly contrasted with the tightened budget. New York consumers are certainly the better for it which is, of course, the point.

However, the department's ability to protect consumers remains quite significantly hampered by the delay in the Council's passing of hearing authority legislation. In essence, while DCA is charged with enforcing the nation's strongest local consumer protection law, or CPL, which bans deceptive sales and marketing practices, we have one hand tied behind our back because of an outdate loophole that I call upon the Council to finally close.

Hearing authority doesn't expand

DCA jurisdiction, or newly obligate businesses to

adhere to any new rules of fair conduct. It

merely provides the department with the ability to

hear or adjudicate the violations of laws we

2.0

already enforce. Rather than having to identify and utilize significant attorney resources to take these violations to state court to be decided using legal proceedings that are more complex and expensive for all involved.

Due to an old yet significant loophole, DCA currently can hear and decide violations of the city's aggressive and comprehensive CPL in its own tribunal only if the businesses against which we issue the violation also happen to be in an industry licensed separately by the department. That means that some businesses are more directly answerable to the department and the public than others which creates not just an unacceptably uneven playing field, but it effectively means we cannot fully do our job.

We continue to lack hearing
authority over critical industries which threaten
or harm millions of vulnerable New Yorkers with
low incomes, like immigrant service providers,
funeral homes, furniture stores, travel agencies,
supermarkets, tax preparers, foreclosure
prevention businesses and more.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

incomes.

1213

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

Hearing authority dramatically impacts the department's ability to protect consumers, to hold wrongdoers accountable and to collect fine revenues owed to the city. The results of the recently completed enforcement sweep of income tax preparers mentioned earlier,

authority stymies effective enforcement of laws

graphically demonstrate how the lack of hearing

that impact most negatively on consumers with low

While the total fines for all the

violations we issued, including those for

misleading consumers about refund loans, in our

sweeps could reach more than a million dollars.

It is unlikely that the department will collect

more than \$100,000 unless we initiate court action

to pursue cases against preparers who do not

settle, with resources I frankly do not have.

dropped from two-thirds in 2008 to one-half in

Settlement rates have predictably

2009 and to only one-third so far in 2010. The

amount of fines paid dropped by 56% from 2008 to

2009. And even more disheartening than a revenue

perspective is that we found that 40% of the tax

with the predatory lending schemes that by the way

25

JONATHAN MINTZ: Commenting on the latter part of your remarks.

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I'd like you to address the former one first.

JONATHAN MINTZ: You're absolutely right. You're right in your assessment of what

2.0

2.3

led to the crisis. You're right in identifying
one of the ways that many with low income end up
getting routed into inappropriate loans. In fact,
there is an industry practice which I know the
federal government is struggling to try to make
illegal that actually rewarded brokers for
bringing somebody in on a subprime loan when in
fact they could have qualified for a prime loan.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right.

JONATHAN MINTZ: It's specious.

There are many approaches to trying to solve that problem, some of which we can do at a local level, many of which I think will take powers larger than mine.

One of those is to make sure that people are up to date and as current as possible with their credit reports. So in the financial empowerment centers I mentioned earlier, one of the very first things we do with all of our clients is run their credit reports to make sure that if there's anything on there that can be fixed, we fix it. If there's anything on there that's wrong, which happens all the time, we get it off there. Because it's that credit report, as

you know, this is usually the bellwether for whether or not somebody can qualify for a prime loan or a subprime loan. That's one of the ways to try to be constructive about it.

Another, of course, is education and outreach. You can never say it enough, but it never is enough, I realize that. And the third I think is to continue to push our financial institutions to be making appropriate loans.

We've been working with the state. They have something called a banking development district which essentially has been rewarding financial institutions that moved into communities that seemed underserved by those banks.

Our research and our experience has suggested that that really is not the reason that people don't have access to good banking opportunities including prime loans. In fact, it's about whether or not the right products are being marketed and sold. We have urged the state, and we have seen proposals that suggest that they have taken our advice, to stop rewarding brick and mortar, and instead to start rewarding actual good financial products and services. I think that's

2 part of the mix as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: A real problem with the consumer is that sometimes when they get with these lawyers who are maybe lawyers for the bank as well as for the consumer, trying to work it together, which is a real rip-off, they have these thick packets of documents that they have to sign.

Oftentimes you can get somebody
that has a \$30-\$40,000 year salary getting a
\$500,000 loan and then the projection in the
public is they shouldn't have taken that loan that
they couldn't afford. As a matter of fact, they
have to take two loans out because the first loan
only covers 80% and then the second loan would be
a 20% loan.

On the top page of that oftentimes the salary that was put in is higher than the actual salary. But the person may not have read through the whole document and they signed the last page and then the lawyer says well who said \$60-\$80,000? Did the bank say that? Did the mortgage company say that? Or did the consumer put that in? So they can't hold anybody

accountable. How do we deal with that?

news about that terrible problem is that lending has so dried up that that's not really the experience anymore. Now we're dealing with the aftermath of those problems. So that's where we are now. I think that the council's help on process servers makes a big difference. I think that the council's help on debt collectors makes a really big difference.

able to not only push back on how people are being treated now when they're running into trouble, but a lot of this work pushes upstream requirements that original debtors are paying much more attention to the paperwork because they're being held responsible for having that paperwork downstream. So I'm hopeful that that will make a difference as well and I'm very grateful for those new regulations.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I've gone to the foreclosure courtroom. It is sad. A lot of people in general, but to see elderly black senior citizens in this process and just losing

their homes. Some of it is because they don't want to restructure loans, which I really think should have happened rather than bailing out Wall Street. They should have bailed out the people in foreclosure.

That would have helped the banks because the banks would have gotten the money if they would have put more money to the principal. How about some subsidies on the principal? We could have gotten out of this mess from the bottom up as opposed from the crooks down, I mean the top down.

What about that? What can we do for those that are in the foreclosure process? They're losing their homes. They're losing their life dreams. It's just so sad to be in that situation.

JONATHAN MINTZ: It's really sad, I agree with you. I would point to three things.

It may sound trite, but number one, people should call 311. That will connect them to legitimate services rather than scammers. So the city is working with what we created the Center for New York City Neighborhoods to provide targeted free

professional help in dealing with potential foreclosures. That's number one.

Number two, if you think that you might be in trouble, in addition they should be hooking up to our free professional financial counselors. It's one-on-one; we're going to sort through people's mess.

The third thing is it's big but it has yet to realize its full potential. This state actually has one of the strongest state laws in the country when it comes to trying to prevent foreclosures. What it requires is that somebody who can renegotiate the mortgage sits down with the consumer in a settlement conference before they actually proceed to pursue that foreclosure. It's an incredibly powerful law.

My sense is that it is, as they say, honored more in the breach. I know that the state is struggling. They have already revised that law to try to put even more pressure on the financial institutions. But if that law was well enforced, I think that could make a really big difference, because at the end of the day, if the banks can't yank the rug out, then they're going

2.0

2.3

2	to	have	to c	come,	as	you	say,	with	more	
3	CO	nstru	ctive	e ways	s to	dea	al wit	ch cor	nsumers	

4 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you very much. I want to sit down with your staff to see if some of these empowerment ideas can come to east New York. I didn't know you did all of this stuff. You need to bring it to the hood, man.

JONATHAN MINTZ: We're in the hood.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: They're in the hood. First of all, I just want to follow up on something that Charles Barron said. What you said Commissioner is true. We do have some wonderful laws and the case law that's been coming down from the Supreme Court has been in favor of the consumer.

But a lot of consumers have to know that unfortunately you have to fight it because a lot of these documents they're not able to produce the originals and there's a lot of problems with that. That's a conversation for another day. But I want to thank you in helping people and we have to try to help them even more.

One other area I just want to bring to your attention is the other day I was driving

2.0

2.3

and I heard on the radio an advertisement for a
loan. There are companies out there that are
advertising loans for more than what the house is
worth. That is something that I think we have to
focus on. Because right there is a big problem
that goes into what Charles was talking about.
That's what gets people in trouble are those
advertisements. I just want to know if you heard
that and what you're doing or if you've have any
complaints about that.

JONATHAN MINTZ: I haven't heard it. I had to get to work on my own that day.

Next time, if you give me a ride we could listen to it.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: I'm mad at myself that I didn't write down the name of the company.

JONATHAN MINTZ: We actually have an advertising review unit that's on the lookout for all sorts of things. At the end of the day, the best way to stop a lot of that activity is for consumers not to solicit that business. Of course that's easier said than done, particularly when you're preying on people in the middle of a tough

time.

3	I do say that even when things get
4	desperate, consumers have a gut. They know when
5	something is too good to be true. As much as
6	possible, all of our offices need to work together
7	to send the message out not to fall for it.
8	Ideally, alert us by calling 311 or you've got my
9	number as well. We continue to prosecute when
10	people are deceptively advertising. We don't have
11	the hearing authority to pull them into our
12	tribunal, but we have happy to bring as much
13	attention as we can at least with the power of the
14	press.
15	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Before I turn
16	it over to my co-chair, I just want to bring out
17	one thing. You say you have 20 financial
18	empowerment centers around the city.
19	JONATHAN MINTZ: That's correct.
20	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Could we get
21	a list of exactly where they are located?
22	JONATHAN MINTZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: I never knew you had one. I'd just like to know where they are throughout the city so we can notify those Council

Karen Koslowitz, if you can get us the list and exactly what they do. Because I think many of our

members are not fully aware of this. To be quite

23

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 38							
2	honest with you, I wasn't aware until this							
3	morning.							
4	JONATHAN MINTZ: It would really be							
5	our pleasure. For consumers that are listening to							
6	this testimony at 3 in the morning, you can call							
7	311 as well and our 311 operators will tell							
8	consumers where the closest center is and what							
9	their hours are as well. I'd be happy to get you							
10	that. Thank you.							
11	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Co-Chair							
12	Karen Koslowitz is next.							
13	CHAIRPERSON KOSLOWITZ: Thank you,							
14	Mr. Chair. I'd like you to explain to the							
15	committee about the state tobacco fine revenue and							
16	how much would the department generate in revenue.							
17	JONATHAN MINTZ: The city receives							
18	a grant under an MOU with the state in order to							
19	perform over 10,000 undercover inspections with							
20	minors where we go out with our inspectors and							
21	test whether or not a tobacco retailer essentially							
22	asks for ID. Those revenues have now been							
23	baselined into the city's budget. We project in							
24	the neighborhood of about a million dollars. So							
25	we have baselined that into our revenue							

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 39
2	projection. Unfortunately, there are revenues to
3	be had here. Compliance has been slipping and so
4	we're going to be upping our inspections as well.
5	CHAIRPERSON KOSLOWITZ: Thank you.
6	Also, the consumer fair licenses fee revenue?
7	JONATHAN MINTZ: We have projected
8	incorporating an increase in that revenue. So far
9	activity has continued to pace, particularly
10	sidewalk cafes have shown a real robust investment
11	in this economy which has been terrific. So those
12	have also been baselined into our increased
13	revenue projects.
14	CHAIRPERSON KOSLOWITZ: Thank you.
15	By the way good morning, I had a fire in my
16	district, so my head's all over the place. Good
17	morning to you.
18	JONATHAN MINTZ: Good morning. I
19	hope everyone's all right.
20	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Leroy Comrie
21	is next.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Good
23	morning, Mr. Chair and Madame Chairman. Before I
24	ask the commissioner a question, I just read in my
25	email that I understand you ran a half marathon

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 40
2	this week around Prospect Park. I just want to
3	congratulate you.
4	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Prospect
5	Park, it ended in Coney Island. That's right.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: It ended in
7	Coney Island. So I just want to say how impressed
8	I am with everything that you're doing with these
9	all day hearings, you're having the ability to run
10	a half marathon 13 miles.
11	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you
12	very much, greatly appreciated.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Very
14	impressive. I drove 13 miles, that's about it. I
15	agree with you.
16	JONATHAN MINTZ: You can't see the
17	bucket of Epsom salts under there.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE:
19	Commissioner, I want to applaud you for everything
20	you're doing, but I need to charge you for not
21	doing the outreach. You're doing some great
22	program, the financial empowerment, the Save New
23	York Account initiative, the other things that
24	you're doing. But as the chairman said, we don't
25	know about all of these things and the outreach

and the opportunity to market and promote these programs I think is critical to make sure that we have more than 45,000 people responding or 35,000 people looking at the website.

In this critical time, when we have more and more families that are undergoing financial stresses, especially now with the loss in Wall Street which is affecting the outer boroughs because the secondary jobs are lost and we have a lot of people that are struggling because they're over/under in their mortgages.

As you know, the projection is that we'll have more people dealing with mortgage issues because they can't afford to maintain their homes. It's more important than ever that we do outreach and notification. Especially to the members that could put it in newsletters or help expand your outreach base. And the ability to actually invite us to when you're doing these programs so that we could let it be known in our local communities as well.

That's been a consistent complaint from me since I was chair and I want to say that you haven't improved that. So I'm disappointed

2.0

that the outreach hasn't been improved, especially when you're doing innovative programs, to make us a real partner in promoting this so people can know about these things.

million that you're putting into the center for the city of New York is not enough to continue the Office of Financial Empowerment and also to continue the Financial Empowerment Centers and I forget the name of the other program that you've got in here. To continue the opportunities to make sure that the foreclosure information and the agencies that are providing the foreclosure services can maintain their staffs and budget and outreach. Is that in addition to what was last year? That seems to be a lower number than what was in last year's budget. Is that correct, and if so, why?

JONATHAN MINTZ: Let me clarify a little confusion. First of all, the \$1.9 million that I referred to was the internal number that accounts for our Office of Financial Empowerment, not the City Center for New York City

Neighborhoods. The Center for New York City

Neighborhoods, which is what addresses the foreclosure prevention services, is done in partnership with the Department of Housing

Preservation and Development. They have a significantly greater budget, as I think is appropriate. I don't have those numbers in front of me. I'm sure the HPD team will. But those are separate services.

The Office of Financial Empowerment which is actually a very significantly sized pilot from the Center for Economic Opportunity is now no longer a pilot. In fact, that money has been baselined into the department as a reflection of its status of being such a significant enterprise actually in the department. The \$1.9 million reflects the public funding for that work. As I mentioned in my testimony we have also raised significant private dollars in order to provide a lot of the services and some of the studies and the pilots, the tax time savings as well that I mentioned.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Isn't the Office of Financial Empowerment, I know it's separate from the Center for New York City

2.0

2.3

Neighborhoods, but it is working with th	.e
foreclosure prevention programs and your	
empowerment centers, correct? And isn't	the
city's contribution less than it was pre	viously
for that particular office?	

JONATHAN MINTZ: There is a slight decrease in the funding for the Office of Financial Empowerment. That was I last year's budget. I think it was in the nature of \$500,000. We have addressed those issues through increased private fundraising efforts and as I say, by baselining the office within our department in order to recognize greater leveraging of resources that the department has already.

In terms of its cooperation with the Center for New York City Neighborhoods, generally speaking, when a client comes into one of our financial empowerment centers for one-on-one counseling, or if they go to the web, or if they call 311, if they're presenting issue is a crisis with their mortgage, we quickly triage those customers directly over to the Center for New York City Neighborhoods to address that issue first and foremost.

2	What we are now also experimenting
3	with is integrating financial counseling beyond
4	the mortgage workout into that experience because
5	I'm sure it surprises nobody to know that people
6	who are in the middle of a foreclosure problem
7	have other financial difficulties as well. So
8	we're very excited about that. We're hoping for
9	some state funds, which at the moment don't seem
10	to be flowing, that will further integrate those
11	services. I think that'll be significant as well.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So you're
13	telling me that even though there was a loss of
14	\$500,000 that every office or every link or every
15	partner that was set up under the Office of
16	Financial Empowerment will be maintained expanded?
17	JONATHAN MINTZ: In fact that's
18	true. We haven't stopped expanding.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And the
20	financial empowerment centers, the 20 that exist,
21	none of those will be cut?
22	JONATHAN MINTZ: That's correct.
23	We continue to grow them. We're also
24	experimenting with a new model this year that

we're calling a virtual financial empowerment

center. We're trying to work with some homebound client bases to figure out whether or not we can provide specialized phone based counseling. It's very difficult to do when you're talking about somebody's finances, but at least as a first step. So we've raised some private dollars in order to experiment with that model. I would reiterate that the financial empowerment centers, those 20, are currently privately funded and not publicly funded.

The last thing I just want to throw in there is I couldn't agree with you more about the need for outreach. We continue to allocate as many dollars as we can. In fact, I have sitting on my desk the next year's outreach campaign called Protect Your Money campaign which will be showing up in the coming weeks in subways, buses, et cetera. We hope that will do a lot to drive traffic as well. Any office support that we can get from you all to spread the word is always welcome.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Again, I think that we could do more in contacting our office through email about these programs and

inviting us to attend so that we can make sure our community links are available to you as well, you know, the opportunity to attend these.

JONATHAN MINTZ: I know you love my press conferences. Chairman Koslowitz was invited yesterday as well.

to stay focused, but I've got somebody yapping in my ear and it's just starting to get on my nerves. The need to link up with the members so that we can increase your outreach and increase the individuals and communities that really need the help I think is critical. Sending an email to our offices about all of the programs that you're doing, as I said in the beginning, which I think are good and strategically forward thinking, I think it could triple your efforts and triple your calls.

Because I know there are a lot of people that are hurting that are looking at these placards because a lot of people that were predatory lenders are now claiming to be mortgage repair specialists and that's something we need to deal with. They're claiming to be credit repair

specialists. If we could do these outreaches ourselves working with you, we could triple those numbers and really get people to move away from that.

I hope that together this year we did do a law to get rid of the debt collectors, but now we need to work on getting rid of anyone that puts up a placard claiming an expertise in an area without having it approved by the city. I hope that we can create some legislation that anyone that puts up a street sign has to get it approved by the city. I think we could work on that. Mr. Chair, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you,

Council Member Leroy Comrie. Council Member Jimmy

Oddo is next.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Commissioner. I'd
like to start by saying thank you for the very
detailed testimony and thank you for all the work
you and your staff do. I think you do important
things. I know as part of your function,
enforcement and fines are integral to getting
compliance.

11

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

۷	I want to ask you a solt of
3	overarching question but do it by asking you about
4	a particular industry that you reference in your
5	testimony and that's the paragraph on the funeral
6	homes. Council Member Comrie and I, Speaker Quinn
7	and Mayor Bloomberg had a press conference in the
8	last month about the regulatory review and the
9	small business panel that we were part of. We
10	very proudly announced that we're trying to change

12 businesses. So when there are opportunities, 13 instead of leading with a fine, we educate small 14 businesses.

the way the city goes about fining small

I'm troubled because in March of this year, the Staten Island Advance did a story about the sweep that DCA did on funeral homes. There were 27 funeral homes on Staten Island. There were three violated. The quotes from the owners of those businesses were troubling.

One person said I didn't do it but it's easier for me to pay the \$500 fine than go into Manhattan and fight this. That's something we've heard not only specific to your agency but other agencies. One other person said that I was

2.0

2.3

told I wasn't entitled to a hearing and he would have fought it but was told he didn't have a day in court. The third was the Bedell-Pizzo owner who was adamant that he hadn't done anything wrong. They were cited for failing to provide prices over the phone or failing to give price for an alternate container.

going to reconcile the work that you are mandated to do, the enforcement work, and the fact that as part of that you have to give out fines. How are you going to reconcile that with the administration's sort of pronouncement that we're going to change the way we do business a little bit? If you want to comment on the specific industry, that's fine. But I want to know how you reconcile the sort of changing of the culture that the Mayor and the Speaker announced with some of the work that you have to do.

JONATHAN MINTZ: Thank you. You absolutely put your finger on one of the real delicate balances when it comes to working backward from making sure that the marketplace is fair. What you want is to make sure that

2.0

businesses are following the law. Ideally, what you want is for them to be following the law in the first place rather than being caught either because a consumer complains or an inspector finds out or somebody gives a tip.

So we spend a good deal of our efforts purely in business education, making it as easy as possible for businesses to get all the information that they need specific to their industry, both in person and online. To do events like the Business Education Day where in fact we walk around in a very well publicized way to let people know we're not walking in with a violation book; we're walking in to give you essentially a free audit of what's happening in your shop to point out where there might be problems and also to answer questions.

Because a lot of times businesses will have questions that they've never really reached out to ask and we'll answer those questions. We also tend to answer questions more from home as well. We get a number of inquiries from businesses or their representatives or industry representatives that ask for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interpretations of certain laws and so we try to help people spell that out as well.

Part of it is also consumer education. The better educated the consumer is, the more likely they are to make sure that their rights are protected. So for example, when a consumer knows that if they walk into, for example, a funeral parlor that they are due by law to have a menu sheet there, et cetera, or that when they make a phone call they know that those are their rights, then they are more likely to push back to a business that isn't following what the law requires and say I know you have to give this to me. I don't want to call 311. That can speed compliance as well.

But as any enforcement agency will tell you, and I'm sure that you agree that part of compliance is meaningful enforcement. That sends a signal in two different ways. Number one, it sends a signal to the industries that you mean business and that they are taking a risk if they are violating the law, particularly purposefully.

Second, you get a bullhorn with the media when you announce an enforcement sweep, and

that's a way to go back to the first measure that

I talked about earlier which is in education. The

best way for me to get the word out to consumers

sometimes is to make a big deal about an

enforcement sweep. That's proven very effective

across dozens of industries, as I'm sure that

you've seen.

I was part of the announcement.

I'm in fact part of the working group that's looking at this question of how you balance making it as easy as possible to do business with the city, to make sure that you understand the laws that you're required to follow and it's something we've worked very hard on.

I'm never going to tell you that we're going to stop issuing violations. You wouldn't me to, nor would your constituents. I'm never going to tell you that every violation is just because somebody didn't know the law. I don't know the people that you mentioned, but I can tell you that their responses are essentially universal responses we hear anytime we write a violation to anybody. I'm sure that you can appreciate that as well, whether they're true or

not.

inspectors to make sure that and in fact in writing, not just in person, we advise all businesses of what their rights are. We make it possible for businesses to hear the matter where we have hearing authority. In the funeral parlor case, we unfortunately don't have hearing authority. We could not provide them with a trial. I'm hoping the council will rectify that.

We are going to be experimenting in the future with the ability to settle online as well as already by mail. For some, that's the right way to do it. For those who want their day in court we absolutely make that as easy as possible. Plenty of people take us up on it. We have very clear plain English how to navigate our tribunal. The tribunal is one of those where there aren't formal rules of evidence. Nobody needs to bring a lawyer if they don't want to. The judge walks them through getting their story and whatever evidence they have to give them their day in court. In fact, plenty come and they win.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: I appreciate

that, Commissioner. I appreciate you talking about that balance. There are many of us and we've echoed this on numerous occasions in this body, many of us who believe the balance and pendulum has swung the other way. I eat in restaurants and my constituents eat in restaurants and we want as clean establishments as possible, but I can take you to a whole host of businesses on Staten Island who will tell you that when the inspectors come it's all about revenue.

That's a cry that we've heard from this council and other legislators, frankly, across the state that the pendulum has swung the other way. Not so much in the businesses that fall within your purview. This is the first time with the funeral parlors that I have been contacted about someone falling under your purview, but certainly DOH and the other agencies.

I have so many, and my colleagues have so many small businesses who feel that on top of every other challenge they're looked upon by the city as the cash cow. So I do think that you're aware of that balance and I appreciate the efforts to date.

I think Council Member Ignizio is going to have some questions. I guess to really flush this out, we probably would need to have a discussion about the process itself and how the phone calls are made. I'm not sure if this is the right time, Mr. Chairman, so I won't abuse my liberty here. But exactly what went down on those phone conversations resulting with businesses that Council Member Ignizio and I represent saying this absolutely didn't happen; I didn't give this information and I knew right from the time I got

I think somewhere along the line
we're going to have to have a conversation about
that process so that I'm more comfortable in
believing that these folks, no matter what was
said during that phone conversation, it wasn't set
up that they were going to have to pay a fine one
way or another.

the phone call that I was going to have to pay.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Commissioner, let me interrupt before you answer that question. We have a special guest with us. We have P.S. 64 from the Lower East Side, from Margaret Chin's District. We want to welcome the children here.

We are having the executive budget hearing. The Commissioner of Consumer Affairs is sitting to my right and to your left and he's testifying to a question that Council Member Jimmy Oddo from Staten Island just asked. So Commissioner, you can answer the question and then we'll move on to Vinny Ignizio after that.

at protecting those with low incomes. The law, as you know, usually ramps up those protections in those scenarios where consumers lack power. So the idea behind this city law is that when a consumer with a low income is beset by family grief, that they should have the ability to essentially disclosure plus. It's not just like regular when you walk into a store and the prices are supposed to be posted or you can talk to the clerk.

The funeral home law is actually quite strong. If it's not the strongest in the country, it must be one of them. It requires that not only must the low income options be as prominently displayed in the parlor as all the

were.

others, which is one of the violations we saw several times. But in addition, there has to be phone-based disclosure of the lowest cost options. We performed a multipart enforcement sweep in part by going into the funeral parlors to see what was happening there as well as in making those phone calls. We had a protocol, an internal working document that talked about what it was you were supposed to say and to record what those responses

When people didn't give the information that the inspector had been trained to accept as complying with the law, we then issued those violations. After issuing those violations, obviously the businesses had the choices that all businesses have, whether they wanted to come in and settle them, whether they wanted to fight them. Again, with all due respect, you have to know almost nobody we write a violation to ever steps forward and says anything other than what you quoted them as saying. It's the name of the game in enforcement.

I will say one other quick thing. For all the disagreement about whether or not we

2.0

were appropriately enforcing this law. I will say that this is the first sweep of this industry I think in over 11 years. I will also say that like it or not, and believe or not that every violation we wrote the guy was innocent; the truth is we drew a lot of attention within the industry about complying with these laws.

The industry association itself, which was part of the passing of these laws professed to not know about them. That certainly is no longer the case. We have done what we wanted to do, which is draw attention to these protective laws for consumers with low incomes.

And I believe your constituents are better off for it.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: It will be
Council Member Vincent Ignizio, Lew Fidler and
then the Co-Chair Karen Koslowitz. Then we have
to move on to the next hearing because we're
running a little bit behind. I want to recognize
Council Member Daniel Dromm, Council Member Oliver
Koppell and Council Member Darlene Mealy.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief.

2.0

2	Just	to	dovetail	on	what	my	colleague	was	saying.
---	------	----	----------	----	------	----	-----------	-----	---------

These calls, these sweeps that you make, are they recorded?

JONATHAN MINTZ: I don't believe that in this sweep we recorded the calls. We did what we do in all of our inspections, which we have inspectors take notes and then testify.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: I just think with very cheap technology, I think that would certainly put someone like me at ease.

Obviously a constituent, whether it be a business owner, they're going to reach out and say they don't believe they did it, that they're innocent. I agree that most people do it.

But when you have the objective tape to say here is what was said, I think that would relieve you of any criticism going forward. I would encourage the agency to utilize that tool going forward. I think without having that it does lack the credibility on the side of the business owner where if he would hear his own staff member or himself saying it, then that would diffuse your agency of any culpability of targeting.

JONATHAN MINTZ: It's a great idea.

I don't disagree. I will note, however, in other contexts where we use other sort of actual proof like photographs, you'd be surprised at how many businesses can tell you that the photograph isn't what the photograph is. So it's complicated, but I do appreciate your suggestion. I actually agree with you.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: I think to the objective observer, if I'm put in that role or somebody's put in that role to clearly say.

That's not the context of my question here.

Sometimes as legislators you have this little thing that sticks in your craw as you go throughout your day to day life and one of those things is when I watch television, particularly when I watch with my grandmother or my grandfather and they're watching the new latest infomercial on the greatest thing in the world and it says, "If you call now, you can get it for \$20 less."

The truth be told, if you call then, you call an hour later, you call two days later, you call a week later and it's still \$20 less. You go in the internet; the same deal is

still there. I don't think that the language is tight enough with regards to special deals, if you will. Some of them have a clock on the infomercial that has a countdown.

Perhaps to the more educated consumer, they look at it and they flip the channel. But perhaps to those that don't know, and in particular I'm referencing one of my grandparents. I won't say which one because I don't want them to get mad at me. They say I like this thing and I really want to get the deal. And I say grandma or grandpa, it'll be there later. Don't worry about it. You think about it. Think if you really need it, this shoe accessory or whatnot.

How can we tighten up the language?

Perhaps we need to bring in the attorney general's office of the state. I believe that these companies are legitimately preying on people's impulse buys. They know it's not two minutes to go. They know that that it's not that you can only get this deal if they call now. They know that it's not "we can't do this all day". They are legitimately lying to the consumer public. I

believe additional action needs to be taking place.

Can you advise me and work with me on how we can tighten up this language? Perhaps with the Council, the attorney general's office and whoever else wants to be involved in this process. I know it's somewhat of a minor issue in the context of 60 some odd billion dollar budget, but people are being preyed upon and that's what government I think is here to stop.

JONATHAN MINTZ: I agree with you.

It sticks in my craw too. I'm going to have my seven-year-old watch TV with your grandparents.

She says, "They're lying, Daddy, aren't they?"

There is actually something you can do. The question isn't tightening the law. New York actually has a very strong law about the fact that if you offer something for a sales price, that in fact has to be a sales price. We do this kind of enforcement on the streets quite often. You have to prove to us that in fact it was offered at a higher price for some appreciable period of time, not just like an hour before. And you have to, in fact, show people on the sign what

2.0

that old price was.

The problem, at the risk of

sounding like a broken record, is I don't have

hearing authority. So I can write those

violations but I cannot meaningful enforce them.

If I had the ability to pull them into our

tribunal, problem solved.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: I'm going to defer this conversation for perhaps a meeting with Chairwoman Koslowitz and myself and perhaps any interested parties in the state. It's not that important, it's not the highlight of anybody's agenda, so it kind of gets pushed along. But I feel that this is a scenario that we're dealing with every day, more and more as we turn on the television, particularly on Sundays and late at night. I think government can be additionally helpful here and hopefully the Chairwoman will agree to sit down and work with me on it. Thank you very much, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Thank you,

Madame Chair. I share Council Member Ignizio's

outrage on behalf of one of his grandparents. I'd

like to be at that meeting. I think we can

probably include mail solicitations that we receive every day.

One of my pet peeves is the one that suggests that if you don't write in and send a check now you'll never get a copy of your deed. It has the vague look of being a government agency that's writing to you. I can't tell you as an attorney how many times I've heard from clients who've called and asked if I had a copy of their deed because they would never get it again. That to me is just an outright fraud.

I do want to congratulate you on receiving the highest amount in restitution for consumers in the agency's history. I just want to ask you, what's the process by which you do that? Are these refunds of down payments? What is this?

Thanks for asking.

JONATHAN MINTZ:

There are two primary ways that we get restitution for consumers. One is on a consumer by consumer basis. If a consumer contacts us either through 311 or online to file a complaint about a particular matter, then what we do is we reach out to the business and we say here's the complaint of the consumer, please advise us essentially on your

2.0

side of the story and what you want to do about it.

We assign individual mediators who then on the telephone go back and forth a few times with the consumer and the business to reach some agreement. Those agreements involve sometimes canceling contracts. They involve completing work that hadn't been completed. They involve returning money. The full range of ways that consumers find themselves frustrated sometimes by and experience with a business. That's one way.

The other way is through
litigation. We will sometimes with our lawyers
take businesses to court, for example, with
egregious car dealers. There it's not just one
consumer at a time. We'll go in and we'll examine
all the books and records of that particular
industry and get a full accounting of all the
customers that were affected or may have been
affected by a particular violation of the law. We
will leverage as either part of a settlement or
part of a decision if we win in court if they
fight us. We will then leverage a pot of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

any compulsion.

restitution dollars that we then return to consumers as well. So those are really the two primary ways that we help people get their money back.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: In the first scenario, are you ever in a position where you're compelling a business to return the money? JONATHAN MINTZ: No. Mediation is about a voluntary agreement. Now that having been said, I think particularly when your licensing agency is on the phone saying we need you to sort of explain this, it tends to have a little bit of heft. I want to be clear that not all consumer complaints are legitimate. Some of them are wrong. Sometimes a business will provide proof that they're wrong. So we think it's important to provide that equal opportunity for the businesses to say so as well. But mediation never involves

Sometimes if a mediation is unsuccessful and what we have found is that the underlying activity that led to the complaint was illegal, we will then refer that consumer case over to our lawyers who will either send out an

2.0

2.3

inspector or issue a subpoena or whatever it is to figure out what else might be going on.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: In the second scenario where you go in and find a particularly egregious business, a group of businesses and you litigate, do you recover more than the consumers' money? Is there a recovery from the business to the city?

JONATHAN MINTZ: Yes, another delicate question. We always do both fines and restitution. We have made a determination many years ago that I have not changed which is that we prioritize restitution over fines. First and foremost, we want to make sure that the consumers get their money back.

But when we're settling the violation as opposed to having to prosecute it, sometimes what that means is in order to get the consumers their money back, we end up reducing the fines a little bit in order to coax the business into settling. But don't get me wrong, we are still realizing many fines from businesses that have been found to violate the law and when settling we seek to strike that balance.

are not.

council Member Fidler: Where I'm going with this is that there's obviously a budgetary cost to the taxpayer to collect this money. I recognize that not every consumer complaint is valid and I'm sure that many of them

But when city taxpayer money and your time and effort is expended on collecting this restitution, there ought to be some mechanism, even in the mediation level that requires or at least holds the sword over the head of the business saying you have to pay us for that time. Perhaps that might even help your mediation saying we'll waive that fee if you return their money promptly. Would that be a useful tool for DCA?

JONATHAN MINTZ: It's very smart.

We do have essentially a carrot and a stick type training approach that we use with our mediators where in many cases, with due respect to the consumer's frustration in the middle of the case, on some of the smaller individual consumer cases, where what we do is we leverage the possibility that we would bring a fine to make sure that they

2 do right by the consumer.

Where we run into truly egregious, particularly repeatedly egregious behavior, in those circumstances we don't bargain away on the fines and we let people know that maybe we'll try to exercise some discretion on how much of the book we throw at them depending on how well they do by the consumer. We're pretty successful in our efforts to get those complaints.

But I also have to reiterate that a lot of these businesses, even when a consumer complaint is legitimate, it doesn't necessarily mean that the business broke the law. In those cases, obviously, I'm sure you're not recommending that we would somehow punish the business as opposed to merely bringing pressure on them to make the consumer happy. It's a delicate balance. I'd love to talk to you about it more.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER:

Commissioner, I know we're running late, so I'm going to continue this conversation by putting in an LS request that would give you further power to seek compensation for the time and effort the agency expends in these mediations. It might give

JONATHAN MINTZ:

Thank you.

25

2.0

2	CHAIRPERSON	RECCHIA:	Thank	you,

Co-chair Karen Koslowitz. At this time, this ends the Consumer Affairs hearing and we will go right into the Business Integrity Commission hearing. I want to recognize that Al Vann has joined us. Commissioner, thank you very much.

We are running a little bit behind schedule. We will from the Business Integrity

Commission and then we'll go right into the

Education and spend the rest of the day with

Education.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: We will now resume the City Council hearing on the Mayor's Executive Budget for fiscal year 2011 with the Finance Committee and the Committee on Consumer Affairs, chaired by my colleague Council Member Karen Koslowitz. We'll now hear from the Business Integrity Commission.

I welcome you Chairman Mansfield and thank you for your testimony. It's kind of lengthy, so could you summarize this for us instead of reading 14 pages? Or just give us the highlights? It would be greatly appreciated.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 73
2	MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: Sure. Good
3	morning, Chairman Koslowitz and Chairman Recchia
4	and members of the Consumer Affairs and Finance
5	Committee.
6	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Could we
7	please keep the noise down and the conversation
8	outside the chamber please. Thank you.
9	MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: I was
10	actually getting a little excited. I saw the room
11	filling up and I thought it was for the testimony
12	about the Business Integrity Commission. But I
13	understand you have Education next, so I will try
14	to be brief.
15	Actually, the 14-page document was
16	my testimony before the Consumer Affairs Committee
17	and Chair Koslowitz. I have reduced it to five
18	pages for today's testimony, so with your
19	indulgence I will run through that.
20	I welcome the opportunity to
21	testify today regarding our revenue capital and

testify today regarding our revenue capital and capital budgets for fiscal year 2011. Seated on either side of me is my Deputy General Counsel for Legal Affairs Eric Dorsch and Ilene Chin, my Deputy Commissioner for Operations.

22

23

24

25

between the executive budget and the current modified budget. That increase reflects budget allocations for collective bargaining and managerial salary increases that took place in fiscal year 2010 and additional funds for an attorney position.

When compared to fiscal year 2010 current modified budget, BIC's OTPS budget for fiscal year 2011 reflects approximately a \$67,000 decrease. This is due to the fact that we received additional funds in 2010 to cover onetime costs related to agency vehicles that are not recurring in 2011.

In fiscal year 2011, BIC's budgeted headcount is 82. Going into fiscal year 2011, BIC will have two vacant positions that being a community associate line and an associate investigator line.

Our revenue budget for fiscal year 2011 is \$5 million, an increase of \$782,000 from fiscal year 2010. This increase will be from license and registration fees.

As I testified on the preliminary budget in September 2009, BIC increased trade

2.0

waste license and registration fees which had not been raised since 1996. As the members of the committees are aware, the agency has a Charter obligation to cover its costs for administering our license and registration investigations. The increase in revenue from license and registration fees reflects the new trade waste license and registration application fees.

The increased fees allow the agency to meet gap closing programs. The current new biannual fees are as follows. Our license fees are \$5,000 and \$500 per vehicle. The old license fee was \$1,000 and \$500 per vehicle.

Our registration fees on the construction and demolition side of our process is \$3,500 for the fee and \$500 per vehicle. The old fees were \$600 and \$500 respectively.

Our self-hauler registration fees are at \$1,000 and \$400 per vehicle. The old fees were \$320 and there was no fee for the registration.

Our broker registrations went from \$600 to \$5,000 and BIC also increased the background investigation fee from \$350 to \$600.

2.0

2.3

This is a one-time fee that is only applicable to licensees, not our registrants.

Another BIC initiative to close the gap in fiscal 2011 is the commencement of enforcement action against registered trade waste brokers. A trade waste broker is one who negotiates agreements between commercial establishments and carters or conducts analysis of the waste generated by commercial establishments in order to recommend cost efficient means of waste disposal.

A trade waste broker regulated by BIC cannot negotiate waste removal charges by the carter that is over the maximum rates and must disclose on every bill or invoice to the consumer the amount that is going to be paid to the carter.

Under our trade waste rules and regulations, trade waste brokers are required to maintain certain books and records for inspection. This will be a new enforcement initiative that we will undertake in fiscal year 2011 and it will be conducted by our audit unit. BIC has no applicable capital and contract budgets for fiscal year 2011.

With the budget as set forth in

2011 executive budget, BIC will continue to carry

out our statutory mandate of regulating and

conducting criminal investigations on the private

carting industry and the wholesale business that

7 operate in the city's wholesale markets.

Just briefly, BIC will continue to work on criminal cases with the Organized Crime
Investigation Division of the New York City Police
Department, the United States Department of Labor,
the Internal Revenue Service, all five district
attorneys, the Port Authority of New York and New
Jersey, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority
and our state and federal homeland security
partners.

We will continue to vigorously conduct background investigations on all applications to ensure that the applicants meet the standards of good character, honesty and integrity required of all BIC licensees and registrants. We endeavor to perform these background investigations in a timely fashion.

We will continue to pursue regulatory enforcement against unlicensed and

2.0

2.3

unregistered carters. We'll continue our
regulatory enforcement against our licensees and
our registrants to assure that they abide by the
city's rules and regulations and that they also
maintain the requisite standard of good character,
honesty and integrity.

We intend to develop a more efficient case tracking system, including the creation of web based submissions for carters to submit customer service and waste disposal information and the annual financial statements that are required under our rules.

We'll continue to work with our

Trade Waste Advisory Board, community groups,

police precincts, trade associations and business

districts to educate the public about the private

carting industry.

These agency initiatives were discussed more in depth in my preliminary budget testimony. Again, rather than go through it, I've included a copy of my previous testimony.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you very much for that.

25 MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: However,

2.0

since the preliminary budget testimony, I'm

pleased to announce additional initiatives BIC

will undertake. One is that BIC will work closely

with the New York City Department of Environmental

Protection to ensure that restaurants and fast

food establishments have properly licensed carters

to remove and dispose of their yellow and brown

grease and that the grease is not disposed of

through the city's sewer system.

in that initiative is that we will commence enforcement against the numerous unlicensed grease haulers that operate in the city of New York.

Secondly, BIC will work with DoITT to produce public service announcements to be broadcast over the New York City channels. This will enable us to get the information to the public concerning the customer bill of rights when negotiating waste removal contracts with carters as well as have a means to communicate important and timely information to BIC's licensees and registrants.

In fiscal year 2011, BIC will look to increase license and registration fees charged to wholesalers and market businesses operating in

2.0

instituted in 1997.

the city's public wholesale markets. The current fees for loaders, unloaders, wholesalers and market businesses in the New Fulton Fish Market has been unchanged since they were first conceived in 1995. And the registration fees for wholesalers and businesses operating in the other produce markets and meat markets throughout the city have remained unchanged since they were first

The agency, as members of the committee are well aware, has a statutory obligation to cover the costs of administering our license and registrations. With the current fee schedule we do not do that.

As a result of the positive feedback that BIC has received for our Trade Waste Advisory Board, BIC is instituting a similar board with the wholesalers operating in the city's designated public markets. BIC is currently constituting the market advisory board which will be a group of representative registered wholesalers and businesses selected by the commission.

At these meetings, the wholesalers

2.0

2.3

and market businesses will have a forum where the
will be able to voice their concerns to the ager
and in turn we will be able to bring up legitima
problems and issues that we have seen in the
markets and be able to bring our wholesalers and
our registrants into compliance with city rules
and regulations.

In the interest of brevity,

Chairman, I have limited my testimony and I'm

happy to take any questions that the committee may

have.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you.

At this time we have a question from the Co-chair

Karen Koslowitz.

Very much. How many licenses are out there now?

MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD: On the trade

waste side of the house, we have approximately

1,800 registrants and we have 251 licensees. The

difference between the licensees and the

registrants is the licensees are the ones that are

basically the private sanitation haulers. The

registrants are more on the construction and

demolition side. They do the hauling for the

Finance Committee has now been joined by the

25

Education Committee, chaired by my colleague and good friend, Council Member Robert Jackson, to hear from the Department of Education.

Before I turn it over to Rob

Jackson, I just want to make all the committee

members aware that tomorrow our executive budget

hearing will begin at 9:30. I repeat that, at

9:30 with the Committee on Youth Services, chaired

by Council Member Fidler and then the Community

Development chaired by Council Member Al Vann.

And then at 11 a.m. the Finance

Committee and the Community Development Committee

will be joined by the Committee on Economic

Development chaired by Council Member Tom White,

then the Committee on Small Businesses chaired by

Council Member Diana Reyna to hear from the

Department of Small Businesses.

At noon, the Finance Committee and the Economic Committee will hear from the Economic Development Corporation. So tomorrow is another busy day here in the City Council for the executive budget hearings. We'll begin at 9:30. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday there are no executive budget hearings. At this time I turn it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

year that it handed out two plans, the bad and this one, the horrid. Again, the outlook is uncertain, even as of today.

But this time around, we don't have two versions of the budget. We only have one

version and that's the horrid. The horrid cuts schools by \$395 million and it sends as many as 4,400 teachers to the Unemployment Insurance rolls. It cuts the equivalent of 276 full time cafeteria workers. It eliminates 295 school support and administrative staff. It doesn't bother to estimate the number of school age cleaners or other part time employees of schools who will lose their jobs or have their hours cut.

The horrid takes a hatchet to the schools rather than a laser to the department.

With over 100,000 employees, 1,600 or so schools, hundreds of programs, offices and responsibilities, and with an \$18.4 billion to spend, budgeting should be a careful and deliberate process.

When necessary, budget cutting should be a trimming that removes the excess and waste from all parts of the department. What the horrid does is allow for draconian cuts to the personal services side of the Department of Education's budget while it let's the other side, the OTPS, the other than personal services, continue to grow.

When comparing the adopted budget for fiscal year 2010 to the proposed budget for fiscal 2011, the personal services budget dropped by \$478 million while the OTPS budget grows by \$544 million, more than half a billion. Since the department allocates most of its PS budget to schools, where it pays for teachers, that's where the budget ax will fall.

From the administration's perspective and from our perspective, the budget cutting proposed by the horrid really is just hurtling a hatchet at our schools and blindfolded at that. It's a blindfolded act because the department can't tell us what the impact of firing 4,400 teachers will be, other than to agree that it will be horrid.

Schools don't even have their preliminary budget for next year, even though it's May 24th. When the school cuts are known, principals will be left to make the difficult choices about how to take these cuts. Class sizes will continue to go up, way up. Academic intervention services will be cut. Saturday academies will be shuttered. Arts partnerships

will disappear. Cuts of the magnitude proposed in the horrid will be devastating to our schools and students.

The state has failed to adopt its budget. There are no indications at this time that the state will shoulder its responsibility to provide an adequate education to all public school students in next year's budget. There is tremendous uncertainty about how large the state cut will be, there certainly will be state cuts.

In the two months since our hearing on the preliminary budget, the preliminary plan, and the four months since the mayor released it, the department has come up with an outline of a plan for implementing the horrid.

As I've already explained, most of that plan is blindfolded attack on school spending. Then it's a deep cut to school support officers. The Department of Educate is restructuring again and firing 90 people in the process. School lunches will be cut. Even the Central Administration faces deep cuts under the horrid.

Basically, the horrid takes aim at

the Department of Education's direct employees
while it leaves the thousands of employees paid by
the Department of Education through contracts
untouched. I've asked before and I will ask again
today, why is it that the Department of Education
contract budget is untouched? Does anyone believe
that the department can or should only lay off
public school teachers while contract spending
continues to grow?

At our hearing on the preliminary expense budget, I asked a slew of questions. For example, are teaching jobs really the only place left for budget cuts? Has the Department of Education again looked at its spending on services contracts? Is there no limit to the cuts that schools can suffer?

Today, I will be asking those same questions. There is a lot of material to cover today, so I would like to introduce all of the members that are present here in Finance and Education and then turn it over to our chancellor for his opening statement.

Down in the front row we've got Jumaane Williams of Brooklyn, Gale Brewer of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Manhattan, Deborah Rose of Staten Island, Karen Koslowitz of Queen, Vincent Ignizio of that small borough Staten Island, Jimmy Van Bramer of the great borough of Queens, Brad Lander of the largest borough in New York City Brooklyn, Margaret Chin of Manhattan and our newest member David Greenfield of the great borough of Brooklyn along with Oliver Koppell of the great borough of the Bronx, and to my right on the upper dais is Al Vann of the great borough of Brooklyn, Mark Weprin of Queens and Regina Poreda-Ryan our finance policy analyst and Aysha Schomberg who's the counsel to the committee and of course, the chair of Finance Domenic Recchia and to his left the assistant counsel Juliana Hon and Danny Dromm of Oueens.

Is that the Bronx over there?

Jimmy Vacca of the Bronx and Fernando Cabrera of the Bronx and holding up the left side is Charles Barron of Brooklyn and behind me holding us all accountable is Lew Fidler of Brooklyn. Of course, we've been joined by other staff over to the left and behind us.

Let me turn to the chancellor to

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

introduce himself and the other members of his staff and we'll begin by reviewing and listening to his opening statement. Chancellor Klein, good morning to you.

JOEL I. KLEIN: Good morning,

Chairman Jackson, Chairman Recchia and members of
the Education and Finance Committees. Thank you
for inviting me today to testify about next year's
budget. I'm joined by Deputy Chancellor for
Finance and Technology Photeine Anagnostopoulos.

Before I get into the very difficult and challenging budget situation that Chairman Jackson discussed, let me just take a few moments to mention some bright news. Last week, the 2009 NAEP Reading Scores for Urban School Districts were released. The results show, as you can see on this chart up here and in your materials, our fourth grade students gained four points while the rest of the nation was flat. The rest of New York State actually went down one point. Our eighth grade students turned a corner after having gone down, they're now up by three points. The rest of the nation went up one point and there was no gain by the rest of New York

2 State.

Let me show you the second chart.

It's a little more exciting. Look at how our free and reduced lunch students did. We went up basically five points, outperforming the rest of the state and the nation. Looking at the eighth grade, we went up four points, outperforming the rest of the state and the nation. The rest of the state in the eighth grade went down three points.

From 2002 when the mayor took over until 2009, we're up 13 points, which is a huge number. Ten points represents about a year's worth of learning here. So that shows real change.

Now the last slide on this, and then we'll get right to the budget. This is the most important slide I want to show you and walk you through it. This shows where we are from when the mayor took over. These are 2003 when we started taking these tests, fourth grade reading 2002.

If you look at this, and it's important, as you all know, the rest of our state is more affluent and has far fewer minorities. I

just told you about ten points, about a year's worth of learning. The national board identifies which changes are statistically significant. What you see is in three out of four, we went up big time with those blue marks. The rest of our state didn't go anywhere. In fact, in the fourth grade while we went up 11 points or more than a year's learning, the rest of the state went down almost a half a year's learning.

The only place where, as I said, we still have to turn and we turned the corner this year and went up three points is in reading in the eighth grade. We have more work to do there. But it shows you that our city is significantly outperforming the rest of our state, not only on state tests, as everybody acknowledges, but on federal tests as well.

Now let me turn to the budget testimony. As Chairman Jackson said, this is a bad situation and I wish I could tell you that it had changed dramatically since my testimony in March. The picture remains very uncertain and very challenging. Based on our best estimates, which could shift as Albany has yet to pass its

own budget, we're planning for an estimated cut of \$500 million in state aid for 2010-2011.

think there's an important point. The city has put in an additional \$800 million in the budget.

Now the state is cutting us \$500 million. I'll explain how we get to the overall deficit. But an enormous problem here is that the state fundamentally has failed to act. And in the executive budget, which we have no choice to follow right now, there's a \$500 million real cut.

Not cut in terms of value but real dollar cut.

As a result, because our costs rise and they rise in ways that we can't control, the actual budget deficit projected now is \$750 million. Our situation has improved slightly since March, but the fact is we're now looking at loosing more than 6,400 hard working school staff, mostly teachers next year and over 4,000 of them through layoffs.

Over the past several months, the mayor and I, along with many members of this

Council have made it clear that the governor's proposed budget is in a word, "unacceptable". It

treats our city unfairly when compared with other communities across the state and it's particularly egregious when you consider that the budget cuts of this magnitude will cause real pain to our children. It's wrong to ask children to bear the brunt of a fiscal crisis that they had no part in creating.

The mayor and I will continue to fight for a rational and equitable budget that restores funding to our schools, but given the economic realities that everyone in this room understands, it looks to us like some significant reduction in state education aid is likely unavoidable.

As much as I'd like to be able to provide definitive details about how the situation will affect our schools, and I understand the Council's frustration about that, it's difficult to speak with complete certainty when state lawmakers have failed to pass their own budget.

Considering our own city's fiscal calendar and the urgent need for principals to begin planning for the coming school year, which starts a few short months from now, we have no

2.0

remain in play.

choice but to move forward. It's our current

intention to get our budgets by June 1st. But I

want to be clear with the Council. The situation

is very fluid and many issues, or at least some,

In 2010-2011, if we assume we get a \$500 million cut from the state based on the executive budget, the department will have a total budget of \$22.8 billion. That includes some items like debt service and pension costs that Chairman Jackson didn't discuss when he discussed our operating budget.

So that budget, all in, is \$306 million greater than our current budget. However, because of non-discretionary spending expenditures, they're outpacing the increase and therefore the overall gap is \$750 million.

Let me give you some examples of our uncontrollables. Our expenses grow by nearly \$1.2 billion. \$370 million for pension and other compensation obligations; right there is a big chunk. \$140 million for the city's portion of mandated instruction for special ed students.

That's required pursuant to individual education

plans. \$80 million for debt service, \$40 million to pay feeding our students and leasing and operating our buildings.

Also included is \$125 million to cover an increase in charter school enrollment of almost 10,000 students. Let me note here that we would incur these costs for these students whether they were in a district school or a charter school. So this is a transfer of funds but these are students we would have to serve or the charter serve. In fact, a recent IBO report illustrated that charters actually receive less money per students than the students in our public school.

Additionally, we estimate another \$100 million will be needed to cover enrollment growth, which we anticipate will be significant. So far none of the state budget proposals has taken this into account.

This school year, the current one, our schools enrolled 14,000 more students than had been projected and about half of them require special education services. This was the first enrollment increase in public schools since at least 2001. It is therefore difficult for us to

determine if this growth will continue. It may
have reflected the economy. It may have reflected
that more people are happy with the schools and
want to come here and put their kids in public
schools. But for whatever reason, we saw our
first significant increase.

Our best estimates for the 20102011 year include an increase of about 5,000
general education and 7,300 special education
students. However, as we noted in the mayor's
executive budget, actual enrollment figures could
end up significantly higher. We're currently
working to determine the best way to factor this
potential increase into school budgets.

To cover a good portion of the growing expense, and this is important and I want to underscore it. The city is increasing funding to our department by more than \$800 million and we've reduced non-school budgets by \$130 million. Yet those dollars aren't enough to fund our expenses. When you consider the combined \$500 million cut, as I've been saying, all in, we're down \$750 million.

Last year, as this Council will

2.0

recall, we faced a similar situation and President Obama and Congress passed the stimulus package that averted as many as 14,000 teacher layoffs here in New York City. Indeed, the president, the vice president and Secretary Duncan have talked about that many times.

Nevertheless, we lost roughly 1,800 teaching positions last year during the current school year because of attrition. Because the state frontloaded stimulus funding, the ARRA funding into the current school year to plug in its own budget, we will have \$300 million less in federal stimulus funding for this coming year.

Although we continue to utilize stimulus dollars to blunt layoffs and help spread the cut across schools as equitably as possible, these funds are nowhere near enough to prevent layoffs as they did last year. Next year we'll face an even greater challenge when the stimulus program ends and \$815 million of stimulus funding drops out of the department's budget.

Now let me say about absorbing the cut. As budget negotiations continue in Albany, we will keep fighting for more money for our

schools and I know this council will be fully behind us in that effort. In addition, we're aggressively advocating in Washington to support the Keep our Educators Working Act. It's a \$23 billion education jobs bill sponsored by Iowa senator Tom Harkin. I've lobbied lawmakers in Washington about this legislation, and if it passes, it could bring another \$400 million to our city which would help us significantly in offsetting layoffs.

As you know, our agency has endured several rounds of belt-tightening over the past few years. Each time we've worked to minimize the impact on schools and students. Between 2008 and this year, we have cut the central budget by nearly 20%. Let me reiterate that. We've cut our central and field budget by nearly 20%. That's more than double the reduction to the schools.

It's included a headcount reduction of 550 positions in central and the field. And it comes on top of already have redirected more than \$500 million in savings to school budgets over the course of this administration during brighter economic times. Through these cuts, our central

and field budgets, which cover essential functions such as payroll, human resources, school support, and tech support, have been whittled down to just 3% or really under 3% of our department's operating budget. If you compare that around the country, you'll see how small that is for the bureaucracy compared to the overall budget.

For the coming school year, we have to cut an additional \$38 million from our central administrative budget. We'll achieve the cut through an additional 5% headcount reduction, along with significant non-personnel cuts in such areas as software development, hardware purchases and printing costs. This goes to the contracts that Chairman Jackson was talking about.

We'll also have to trim another \$50 million from other non-school budgets by finding improved efficiencies in areas like food operations, where for example many of our students who are not Title 1 have not been paying for their meals.

You can be sure that we remain steadfastly committed to cutting central and field budgets before we touch the schools.

Unfortunately, a \$750 million funding hole gives us little choice but to find significant savings in our schools and classrooms where a significant portion of our budget is.

budget, as you know we allocate the bulk of the unrestricted dollars to schools based on our fair student funding formula. That money supposedly funds basic classroom operations including special ed and English language learner instruction. The fair student funding formula also provides supplemental funding for additional instructional services for students who are struggling academically.

But as a result of the significant budget cuts we've been forced to absorb over the past two years, all schools have seen their fair student budgets reduced by more 25%.

Nevertheless, through the implementation of fair student funding, we've moved relatively more dollars to traditionally under funded schools, enabling them to manage recent budget cuts better than they would have under historical patterns.

However, for a number of our

schools, especially middle schools, the fair student funding budgets are now well below what is needed to cover basic operations. One reason for the disparity is that many middle schools started out very close to or well below their formulas.

And as you know, for other schools we had hold harmless provisions.

A second reason is related to the improved performance of our students entering middle school. A greater number of proficient students are graduating from our elementary schools and entering middle schools. Middle schools therefore will get fewer fair student funding dollars because they got more dollars for students who were not performing well and that number has gone down significantly.

Funds from our other sources, other than fair student funding, that help support operations for our schools in declining budget times, we must bring these school's unrestricted budgets closer to a basic operating level before implementing another large cut to next year's budget.

We plan to do that by shifting

dollars from schools where fair student funding combined with other unrestricted funds are above a minimum operating threshold and redirect them to severely under funded schools. Then once all schools have unrestricted funding that meets a truly basic minimum operating level, we will work to reduce school budget by the same across the board percentage.

As I mentioned, we're aiming to get school budgets out by June 1, but things are fluid now. Given Albany's continued inaction, I can't provide a precise figure with respect to the budget cut but we're still working through the details, and we've advised principals in a recent webcast that I did to brace for a substantially larger cut than the 4.9% they saw during the current year.

The kind of cut we're talking about, especially coming after previous reductions will obviously be painful. I remain confident that our principals will be able to make wise decisions that preserve their school's most important programs and services. But with 85% of the dollars in our school's budget tied up in

compensation costs, principally teachers as well as administrators and other staff, it'll be necessary to layoff thousands of teachers. As I said, we're talking about losing 6,400 with 2,000 being through retirement and attrition and an additional 4,400 through layoffs.

So let me be clear, we don't want to layoff teachers. We're taking every step to minimize the staff cuts. We hope Albany will come through. We hope Washington will come through.

We've put in place hiring restrictions that remain for virtually ever licensed area.

So contrary to what's been reported, we're not hiring. The only area where we're certain we're going to have a shortage is for licensed special ed, particularly the special ed licenses with English language learner where every year we have some shortage. So we're working to retrain some teachers facing layoffs so that they can serve in the areas where we have need, like the special ed area.

Let me say it again, none of us want to lose any teachers. Not now, not ever.

This is really not good for our schools and I wish

we could be growing the teaching force, not diminishing it. But if we are forced to layoff teachers, we need to ensure that we protect our very best. I know this is a difficult issue but we've got to be candid about it.

Currently under state law, we will be forced to do layoffs based solely on seniority without regard to the effectiveness or expertise of an individual teacher. As a result, for example, almost all elementary teachers hired since the fall of 2007 are at risk for layoff.

Experience in the classroom is indeed important, but it is not the only criteria that should or could be considered.

Think about it. Currently, even if a teacher has multiple unsatisfactory ratings, if they aren't currently teaching in our classrooms or if they have poor attendance records, chronically poor, we'd be forced to keep them over newer teachers who might be achieving terrific results because of outdated state laws and current union rules.

Just to be clear and so my views are not misrepresented, many of our longest

inspire our students and mentor new teachers. I certainly want to keep them and all of the highly effective teachers where they belong in our classrooms. My concern about seniority based layoffs is not just theoretical. Rather, I know that if our newest teachers are the ones laid off, the impact on low income students will be devastating because their schools have the most of these teachers.

We've made great strides in narrowing the achievement gap. I showed you the gains our low income students made recently on the fourth grade NAEP and our last in, first out policies threaten to undo the significance of the gains we have made.

Take, for example, P.S. 86 in

Cambridge Heights section of the Bronx. According
to our analysis, approximately 27 classroom
teachers would be laid off based on seniority
alone. By contrast, at P.S. 53 in Staten Island's
Bay Terrace neighborhood, no teachers will be laid
off.

I attached to my testimony a newly

released study by the Washington University Center for Reinventing Public Education which describes in detail the harmful effects of seniority-based layoffs on schools with poorer students.

Losing upwards of 6,400 teachers also will result, as the Chairman pointed out, in considerable class size increases, with growth ranging from two to five students or possibly even more at particular individual schools. That is undesirable.

Last in first out has the potential to trigger a chain reaction of seniority bumping throughout the city's schools. We would be forced to layoff our newer teachers and remaining teachers will be shuffled from school to school to fill vacancies without regard for their skills, strengths or the school's particular needs. So if some school wanted to get rid of a math teacher, that math teacher would have bumping rights versus other math teachers and this could lead to an unfortunate series of musical chairs among our teaching force.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chancellor?

JOEL I. KLEIN: All right.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Let me just say to you, and I don't like to interrupt you, but the issue of seniority is not here being discussed today. That's not a hearing. This is a hearing on executive budget.

Even though you may wish that this will be changed, this is the way it is as per the contracts that you have negotiated with the various unions in the City of New York. So for you to wish this and to spend a whole page discussing it when you know that this has no impact right now on the executive budget is not right. Let me just say that to you.

I totally disagree with that

because if you had a right to change it, then you

could change it. But right now there are laws.

There's a contract. The City of New York agreed

to this as to the way. If you want to change it,

go to the table and change it. Don't come here

and espouse that. So I'm going to say that and

I'm not going to say any more.

A communication was already sent to your office that the issue of seniority last in last out right now is not in this executive

budget. Do that at the contract table, or take
them to court. This is not the forum for that.

Just like I told my colleagues at the capital
hearing, the expense hearings are not appropriate
for capital. Save those questions for the expense
hearing.

So I say to you, Chancellor, please, let's talk about the reality of where we are now as far as the budget, not the way that you wish to as far as contracts that have been negotiated with the various labor unions.

Mr. Chairman, and I'm happy to abbreviate my comments. Let me just make the following point. It may not be on this budget hearing, but it is going to be on our schools very shortly. This is a matter of state law and state law could be changed. I'm asking the Council to support me in getting the requisite changes so that our schools don't pay the price.

Just as I'm asking you to help me in Albany on our budget and to ask you to help us support getting Race to the Top money for New York City and our state. Right now, we're in a

J

\$700 million of which we would get \$200 million and we need your help in Albany on that as well.

questions. Just to point out that obviously all of us agree that the current funding in our budget is not adequate for the needs of our schools. We look forward to working with this Council to get all the money we can, whether it's from Albany in additional budget, whether it's from Race to the Top, whether it's from Washington, D.C. and the Harkin bill, but we need to work together and do it very rapidly in order to help our schools deal with what for them is going to soon become an enormous challenge. Thank you for your patience. I appreciate it and look forward to your questions.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chancellor, thank you for your testimony. I appreciate the preliminary part as far as the Power Point concerning the scores of our students.

But let me turn to some questions, and as I said in the beginning, my colleagues were asking questions on expense during capital and I

told them that was no the correct forum. Those questions are more appropriate today. So I'm going to ask everyone, if you have capital questions, this is not the forum for that. This is expense operating budget, so let's keep the questions specific to the executive budget.

We're going to ask our colleagues, since there are many colleagues that have signed up, we're going to do a first round of five minutes questions and responses. Then if you want to come back for a second round you can.

Chancellor, let me just ask you, I read in the newspapers approximately two weeks ago, and especially at a time of expected severe budget cuts, why is the Department of Education creating a move from three deputy chancellors to eight deputy chancellors when everybody else is cutting back.

From what reports say, that's going to cost at least a half a million dollars. I'm saying, "What, are you serious?" When everybody is cutting back and you're considering laying off thousands of employees you're increasing from three deputy chancellors to eight and it's going

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: But
Chancellor, with respects to that, it was reported
in the papers that you're bringing on two deputy

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Can you tell us, at the time when we're considering laying off thousands of employees, how much is this going to cost the Department of Education as far as the new

The record is what the record is.

21

22

23

24

25

did.

2.0

2.3

2	employee or employees and the adjustments from
3	those employees that were directors or other
4	positions to deputy chancellor, the increase in
5	salary, the total package as far as increase in
б	salaries? Is it going to cost a half a million?

JOEL I. KLEIN: The two employees are approximately around \$400,000 and the other adjustments were probably \$50,000. But I can get you the exact numbers.

If not, is it going to cost \$300,000, \$400,000?

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: So give or take about \$500,000 in total?

JOEL I. KLEIN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Let me just say that as far as have you considered at all, knowing the situation with the state and you know and I know the state situation is not good. In fact, Domenic Recchia, myself and other colleagues went up to Albany approximately a month ago to lobby for education and other matters for the city of New York. Obviously it wasn't looking good then. Have you considered offering a retirement incentive to senior staff, meaning seniority, meaning years of service, to various education

department staff in order to help reduce the
number of layoffs in the department?

JOEL I. KLEIN: It's not up to me.

It's up to OMB, and they're evaluating that very option. So far there is no law that has been passed. But they're looking at that because they've got to balance what the incentives are in terms of the costs of pensions. Because if you only look at the operating budget and you don't look at the increase in pension as well as the buyout and OMB is doing that.

I'll tell you what we have done,
Mr. Chairman, and we're the only agency in the
city that did it. As you may recall, about eight
to ten months ago, every city agency for its nonunion employees got a 4% and a 4% pay hike. We
were the only one that took 2% and 2% and capped
it at \$70,000. We were the only agency. That
saved us during the current financial year
approximately \$10,000 that we're able going
forward to keep in the budget. The only city
agency that took 2% and 2% and capped it at
\$70,000 and above 70% you got the 2% up to 70. No
other agency in the entire city did that. So I

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 117
2	think our agency is acting entirely responsible.
3	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chancellor, I
4	heard when that came out and I believe the mayor
5	announced it along with you. Is that in place or
6	that is to be negotiated with the various unions?
7	JOEL I. KLEIN: I'm talking about
8	the management.
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay,
10	management.
11	JOEL I. KLEIN: I'm just saying my
12	management, approximately 1,000 people took a \$10
13	million cut that no other city agency took, so net
14	of net. In terms of the unions, that's obviously
15	something the city has to negotiate.
16	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:
17	Congratulations to you and with respects to your
18	managers, especially those that are at the higher
19	level versus the ones that are at the lower level
20	of the salary scale.
21	JOEL I. KLEIN: I agree with you on
22	that.
23	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Let me just
24	ask this question on the restructuring and then
25	I'll turn to my colleague, Council Member Recchia.

Restructuring school support services, on June

1st, the DOE will replace all of the integrated
service centers and school support officers with
the new Children First Network. The Children
First Network will be staffed, from my
understanding, with instructional and operational
support personnel. The new support model will
require fewer staff as many will assume
responsibilities previously held by more than one
individual.

The restructuring will lead to the elimination of 50 employees, mostly through layoffs. How much is this going to cost? Can you explain how the restructuring of the field offices will lead to budget savings and what jobs will be eliminated and how many people will be terminated? In essence, explain the details of that.

JOEL I. KLEIN: Sure. I can give you much of it and maybe Photo can fill in. What we were trying to do is we looked at every piece. Because, you're right, that the last place you want to cut are schools or teachers. So we look always at where we are outside of the school.

What we found is we had created in

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 12
2	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: Yes, for
3	fiscal year 2011.
4	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: And then
5	rising?
6	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: And it
7	will rise, and we may actually garner more than
8	that in 2011, but we're trying to be conservative.
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: So, in
10	essence, the transition this year, the estimated
11	minimum of about \$6.8 million as a result of the
12	PEG increasing in fiscal year 2012 to maybe in
13	totality when you look at 2011-2012 maybe about
14	\$20 million with a total of about 100 staff.
15	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: That's
16	what we believe. But again, we're being
17	conservative, that's why we only put the \$6.8
18	million on.
19	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chair of
20	Finance Domenic Recchia.
21	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you,
22	Chair Jackson. Before I ask my question, I'd like
23	to recognize Council Member Steve Levin and
24	Julissa Ferreras for joining us.
25	Good afternoon Changellor

2.0

JOEL I. KLEIN: Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: I think it's great to see we're making progress in our schools. That is something that we've been working on for a long time. During these cuts that we're being faced with there are many concerns. There are many places that I think that we could cut that were not.

One area that I'm a little bit
puzzled about is that there are about 1,000 ATRs
out there who are looking for jobs. We also have
many graduates from colleges who are certified who
are looking for teaching jobs. The DOE, you are
paying the new teacher project and other
recruitments, other people to do recruiting for
the DOE. I'm a little puzzled. Why do we have to
pay to recruit and have that outside contract?

At your May 18th meeting on the panel for education policy, there's a stack here of outside contracts that the board approved.

Knowing the budget cuts that we are facing, you should have held off on these contracts and we could have made a 10% or 15% cut on some of these. These are of great concern.

about and discussed at the panel at length.

25

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't want to spend a penny. I'm not obligation to spend a penny but here's the reality I face and I tried to allude to this in my testimony. Despite the cuts, every year we tend to be short in two areas. Particular short in high school special ed where they need dual certification. So you need to be certified in math and certified in

special ed. And oftentimes in district 75 for our 10 highest needs kids.

> If I don't give those people a certified teacher, I'm in violation of the law. I'm not looking to recruit. I'm looking to retrain. If I lay off somebody who wants to get retrained in those licenses, I'm happy to do it. But if in fact I'm short teachers in those areas in the next two or three months, I can't abandon my special education kids and I can't give them somebody who's not licensed. That's why we entered this.

It wasn't a no-bid contract, contrary to what was said in the paper. were bidders on it. In fact, the winning bid was about half the cost of the other bid. Second, we committed to the panel that before we spend a

in that area and I'm ordered by law to produce a licensed teacher. That's the only reason we did

10 it.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: With those

ATRs, with the possible 1,000 ATRs, did you go to

these ATRs and say which ones want to be retrained

and explain to them that if they don't do this

they could be in jeopardy of losing their jobs?

JOEL I. KLEIN: They're not in jeopardy of losing their jobs. That's the problem. If they were in jeopardy then we could incentivize them to be retrained. The people who I think have the greatest incentive to be retrained are people who may get laid off. We may be able to pick up some of them.

Again, I'm just telling you, we haven't spent a penny. I don't want to spend a penny. I'm trying to--

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: [interposing]
But I just think with those 1,000 teachers, have
you reached out to them and asked them if they
want to be retrained for special needs.

JOEL I. KLEIN: Some of them won't even apply for a vacancy. I'm not going to force them on schools, but I am prepared and I've asked the union repeatedly to negotiate with us so that after a fixed period of time if they don't find a job that it's time for them to be able to move on. But I'm not going to force them on schools. If they want to be retrained, we will entertain that.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: But have you asked them if they wanted to be retrained?

JOEL I. KLEIN: I haven't

personally asked them, no.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: But don't you think that we should do that? Ask them if they want to be retrained? Maybe because some of them who have been out of work for a year, maybe they would say I'm going to be retrained because I want to work.

JOEL I. KLEIN: They haven't worked under the system where we've been hiring people in

Commissioner Robert Doar testified before us that he spoke to your administration in telling them that he's eliminating this program, worth about \$3 million. Now he's eliminating this program. You're laying off 122 workers that could do this same work. How are we going to fill in this gap and could we not lay off these 122

22

23

24

25

there and programs that are going to help the children, especially guidance counselors. In the interest of time, I just want to bring that up.

Many of my colleagues have other questions. I'll come back at the end. Chair Jackson.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you,

Chair Recchia. We're going to turn to Council

Member Lew Fidler of Brooklyn. I'm putting on the

five minute clock for our colleagues and if we

come back for the second round I'd be glad to add

your name. Council Member Fidler.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Thank you,
Chairman. Good morning, Chancellor Klein. I want
to start by saying that on what should be the main
point of your testimony today I'm with you 100%,
which is that I do believe that the governor of
the state of New York has lost leave of his senses
in terms of balancing disproportionately on
children. In that respect, we stand with you and
hopefully Albany, the Assembly and the Senate will
see to it to right that wrong.

I do believe, however, that your comments about Race to the Top are in fact a red herring. As we all know that \$700 million spread

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 131
2	programs?
3	JOEL I. KLEIN: Do not?
4	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Do not?
5	JOEL I. KLEIN: In the United
6	States?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: In the City
8	of New York. I'm not all that concerned about
9	Ohio.
10	JOEL I. KLEIN: A handful I think
11	is the number. I can get you the precise number.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: But there
13	are those without it?
14	JOEL I. KLEIN: There are some that
15	don't.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Is there
17	anyone here with you who could tell me, for
18	example, whether district 4 or district 16 or
19	district 23 or 32?
20	JOEL I. KLEIN: I think district 4
21	does. There was a program, the tag program in
22	district 4. I don't know about district 16, but
23	I'm happy to get you all of the answers. It's a
24	matter of public record.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: I would

appreciate that. Not that's not. Everyone's showing me this response that you gave to two questions that were asked during the preliminary budget hearing. Chancellor Klein, what it doesn't include is which districts don't have programs.

My colleagues were showing me this.

The reason that I asked the question is, frankly, I believe there's a bit of a self-fulfilling prophecy going on here in terms of the number of kids who apply for these programs in districts where there are none. If you're a parent and you're being encouraged to have your child take this test and then told if you succeed you're going to have to get on a business for an hour to get to that program, you're going to say what the hell, I'm not doing it.

I think that explains and continues to explain those districts that have the extraordinarily low numbers of kids applying for gifted and talented programs. This is a chicken and egg kind of deal. If you build it, they will come. Frankly, the numbers in these districts that are low are still inexcusable. I recognize they're better than they were two years ago. But

several years ago that we use a uniform cutoff so that kids in one part of the city who are gifted and talented won't be subject to different

23

24

25

2 standards and criteria than others. We did that.

As a result of that, and we've done a lot of outreach in every community school district. There are some school districts where three or four kids pass the gifted and talented program at the 90% level. As a result of that, we can't build a program. It's not a question of people coming, there's just not enough people to make up a gifted and talented class.

We've actually in some instances done this for a relatively small number of children. So what we do in addition is to create both borough wide and citywide programs so that people, at least if they can't do it in their district, but if only four people pass the gifted and talented test, you can't create a program for them in their district.

COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Chancellor, just one comment here, you mentioned half of what I asked for. The other part that I asked for was that there be a program in every district. I think we all learn from our mistakes. Doing half of it was insufficient because in fact we are discouraging parents from taking the test and

doing this. I have no desire to do it. What we did was by law we're required to provide bus service through the sixth grade. That's New York State law. We had been providing bus service for several seventh and eighth grade classes, not just in Staten Island but a couple of other places.

We looked at it and determined that not every kid but some of those students will be able to benefit from public transportation. There are buses for various schools in other boroughs. So what we decided to do is eliminate the seventh and eighth grade school ride bus program, but we will entertain individual exceptions or variance, we call it, for those kids who have no alternative. That's what we're trying to do.

That should cut down the overall.

It won't eliminate but cut down on the overall busing costs. Again, it's just the situation we're in where we're firing people, et cetera, et cetera, we thought that was a cut we had to take. I wish we didn't have to take it.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Does this number include special ed students?

JOEL I. KLEIN: No, it doesn't.

JOEL I. KLEIN: What we're going to do is give them Metro Cards just like we do for

receiving free bus service right now.

the other 98% of the students.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: So the school

Metro Card, that brings me to my next point. Is

that not one of the cuts that we have to sustain

right now in terms of Metro Cards for students?

JOEL I. KLEIN: Well, I understand

the MTA is going to make their announcement about

But if we're talking about having to cut

all of the Metro cards, then we've got a problem well beyond what you're talking about because significant numbers of our middle and high school students take public transportation in this city. I continue to believe that that will be negotiated. I'm not sure who's going to have to pay what, but that our kids will get their Metro card. These children will also be eligible for them.

Question, Chancellor. There are still many universal pre-k seats left vacant in CBOs and in our schools but DOE is still paying for them.

What do you plan to do in terms of increasing efficiency and saving money around those universal pre-k seats?

JOEL I. KLEIN: The way to do this, and the council has been enormously supportive, starting with the Speaker who has helped us directly on this. Here's the biggest problem, the pre-k money we get from Albany, a significant chunk of this money gets earmarked for half day programs.

In our city, half day programs for

right. They really ought to get to work and get this budget rolling. That being said, some concerns and issues that I may have, first and foremost, is the bussing situation. With regards to 98%, with all due respect Chancellor, but 98% of the city has access to a public subway. Those 98% have adequate bussing service, and they have adequate sidewalks.

The reason why we were given busses for the seventh and eighth grade wasn't because out of fun, here you go, we'd love you to have buses. There was a decision by the DOE that there was not adequate public transportation to get kids to and from schools. That is still the case.

That has not changed.

That's why I think that this

decision to save \$3.2 or \$3.4 million is really a

difficult one for me to accept because I believe

that ultimately it wasn't give out for reason

because those kids can't take the bus. Well they

do it in the rest of the city, but in the rest of

the city they have an enhanced if not a very good

public transportation system.

2	Op
2	So my question to you in regards to
3	that, has that decision way back when been
4	reviewed and say why did we grant these in the
5	first place and how has there been an appreciable
6	change which will alter ultimately this decision?
7	JOEL I. KLEIN: I think you're
8	right. I think for some of these communities
9	there was some challenges. What we found when we
10	reviewed it was that there were children even in
11	Staten Island who could take public
12	transportation. So instead of having a school
13	wide variance we decided to move to individuals.
14	We will grant some variances.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: On a
16	waiver basis.
17	JOEL I. KLEIN: Look, if we get
18	restorations in our budget, this is one of the
19	things that I'm eager to look at as well.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Well I
21	appreciate that, sir. My question is do you now
22	have a criterion which you determine too long to
23	be in the process of transportation to a locally
24	zoned school?

JOEL I. KLEIN: We don't. You say

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 144
2	to a locally zoned school.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Because if
4	you go to a specialized, then you incur that
5	scenario.
6	JOEL I. KLEIN: And obviously
7	special ed kids. But we don't have a fixed
8	number. I mean, most people who go to their zone
9	school in terms of time to get there usually do it
10	within a half an hour if it's a zoned school.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: You see my
12	concern. I represent the largest district in the
13	council. It's one and a half times the size of
14	Manhattan, my district alone. So the schools are
15	few and far between, unlike my other colleagues
16	where an elementary school or intermediate school
17	can be within ten blocks, ours can be within miles
18	of each other.
19	So if you don't have the adequate
20	public transportation to get to that and then get
21	to the school whereas potential in other districts
22	may take 20 minutes or 25 minutes, in my district
23	that could take as long as 45 minutes to an hour.
24	My question, is there any criterion
25	which you as the chancellor say that's not

Τ	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 145
2	acceptable, we have to bring that bus back?
3	JOEL I. KLEIN: I don't have a
4	specific criterion but we will review for any
5	individual student and grant variances where that
6	occurs. I mean, take for example, in Staten
7	Island, which you're much more familiar than I am,
8	high school kids are not bused.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Yes, sir.
10	JOEL I. KLEIN: But high school
11	kids get to school in Staten Island.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: With
13	specifically designated MTA buses though, not with
14	standard routes. They're actually buses waiting
15	outside the schools or whatnot.
16	JOEL I. KLEIN: So maybe we'll be
17	able to do some of that, ways to try to cut down
18	the expenditures. And for some kids they could
19	take public transportation. That's what our
20	review found. So if an individual kid cannot
21	within a meaningful time, and I don't want to
22	commit today to a half an hour because my busing
23	people aren't here.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO:
25	Understood.

place?

2.0

2	JOEL I. KLEIN: The answer is a
3	combination of two things. I said in my testimony
4	it will vary significantly at different schools.
5	Some schools have much lower class size that
6	others and those schools will see a larger growth.
7	Some schools will see a growth, and it will depend
8	on the grade, of two, some of three, some of four.
9	None of these will be good. But until we see the
10	individual school numbers which we present to this
11	council every year, we're making our best
12	estimates.

As I say, it varies significantly in different schools. A lot of schools had a lot of Title 1 money; other schools might not have.

So those things all impact this. Some schools in the past were quicker to reduce their teachers by not hiring. So they may already start with larger sizes. They may cut after school or other programs. All no good, but those are the options.

The numbers that I gave you, probably a minimum of two and probably as many as five in some grades or classes.

COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Chancellor, you would expect that the increase in class size

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 151
2	SAPIS workers were laid off.
3	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: My
4	understanding is that the SAPIS money is gone.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: All the
6	money is gone?
7	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: Yes. We
8	can check that for you, but that's my
9	understanding.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: What do you
11	anticipate with school aides and paras? Will
12	there be layoffs of school aides and paras? My
13	concern is that school aides especially do a lot
14	of the support staff, getting our children on and
15	off buses, manning the cafeteria, the school yard
16	and things of that type. What do you expect from
17	the support staff cuts?
18	JOEL I. KLEIN: First of all, let
19	me be clear that I share your concerns. We've
20	already seen a fair number of school aides who
21	were cut this year. So we're getting down to a
22	minimum on that. On paras, we have relatively few
23	paras except for special ed paras. I'm talking
24	about pedagogical paras and you can't cut the
25	special ed; they're via IEP. So I don't expect

2 we'll see major cuts in that area.

The problem we have is if you let the schools make individualized determinations you get all the bumping and the other things and that's its own challenge. So it's not entirely clear. My guess is you'll see a few more of both paras and aides cut this year.

is yours, is that when it comes to the school aides, we're reaching a floor. I worry because and I'm sure you do because you're the chancellor but I remember what the school aides did and what they do now. I know that they do important chores. So I bring that to your attention. I don't want to go beyond a certain floor.

You mentioned special ed. My concern here is that you have plans where the special ed children starting in September will be getting services in their home zoned schools and that that will be phased in over a two year period. There's going to be a realignment of the non-citywide special education children's programming options. Knowing of that, my question to you is how is that impacted by budget realities

that you've spoken about today? Are we going to have the fiscal resources to provide those children with the services in their home zoned schools as opposed to taking many children out of self-contained classes?

JOEL I. KLEIN: The answer is yes, we're working with the 200 schools that volunteered and Photo and her team have been working closely with Laura Rodriguez. We believe we'll be able to fund those consistently with our budget. We hope over time two things, and we work very closely with the advocates on this. That we stop this notion of bussing special education children, except in rare instances, all over the city.

I was talking to Council Member

Ignizio just a few seconds about general ed, but

we have special ed kids bussed all over the city.

Second of all, we're trying to create, working

with the advocates, an environment where we really

start to mainstream and that becomes the

presumption. Not irrebuttable, but the

presumption. I do think we can make it happen

financially, particularly if we work carefully

2.0

with our schools as Laura Rodriguez has beendoing.

question, chancellor and then I have my colleague Councilman Cabrera. Many of us are aware of the CFE settlement and the terms of that settlement which was a lawsuit brought, as you know, and you know the history better than I. Do you see that any of the budget cuts that are being proposed go against the intent? I would say of course the intent, but against the legal mandate of the CFE decision?

Wasn't that decision meant to put a floor on education based budgets that could not be touched? It seems to me that that decision may be something that would help use because we certainly want to protect what we gained out of that decision, yet we see ourselves going backward. I wonder if that's something that the court would be interested in.

JOEL I. KLEIN: I'm not in a position to render legal views on this, but I certainly agree with you that the current budget situation is not moving us in the right direction.

There's no question. The concerns you've raised and your colleagues have raised are all real concerns that we share, whether it's aides, whether it's paras, whether it's bussing, whether it's teachers, SAPIS workers, whatever it is, it's not like we don't need these things. There are some things that we're able to cut that don't have a large impact but you're talking about things that are impactful for our children.

That's why I'm hoping we get some relief out of Albany and quite frankly, that the Harkin bill passes and that brings us another \$400 or \$500 million to our city. At some point we've got to address all of these issues, but the problem for us is unique. Any other budget you can change January to February. Our schools start in September and you can't keep moving the teachers. You know, the kid can't have a different teacher.

If you have a different fire person or a police person or something in the precinct, the community adjusts to that. But our kids can't have a whole new raft of teachers different in January from February from March from April.

be the most affected.

is I agree with you and I think this is a mistake.

That's why I raise the issue. I know the chairman doesn't want me to get in the weeds on the issue or probably address it at all. I would prefer for a school in the south Bronx, let's just say under this budget cut they have to cut three or four.

They make their determination so it has as little impact as possible at the individual school. But because many of those schools have done a lot of hiring in the last two or three years, they will

I wish we could do it otherwise.

I'm concerned about it. I've been talking about

it. But as Chairman Jackson pointed out, that

will require legislative relief in Albany. There

are bills that are pending but whether those bills

will muster the necessary political support I

don't know. We would welcome your support as

well.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Good, they haven't put my five minutes. I see the scores that you have up and I'm always amused by the scores that come up but not by the scores that I'm really interested about. As a college professor

and a former school counselor, I'm always interested in the SAT scores. From 2003 to 2009, we have seen an 18% decrease. Reading scores down 13%, which is out of pace with 70 points from what I understand from the state.

I'm just curious to know if you could let us know what impact and effects as a result of the budget do you expect in this pattern of scores going down. In light of the fact that the SAT score is about the most important comprehensive exam the students will take in order to enter into college.

JOEL I. KLEIN: Again, first of all let me say, on ACT and on advanced placement, our scores have gone up and gone up significantly in the city. On SATs it's not like these scores because we've got a lot more kids taking the SATs now which is a good thing, and more kids going to college.

But none of these cuts are going to be helpful to the things you're talking about. I still believe our teachers will work harder with our kids. I think there are things we can do with technology better than what we're doing. But

Τ	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 180
2	percent of the produce they consume?
3	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Like
4	lettuce, tomato?
5	JOEL I. KLEIN: I don't know that.
6	I'd be happy to find out the answer. But I'm sure
7	a lot of product comes from out of state. Some
8	comes from upstate.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: I would
10	welcome the DOE to explore to see if there would
11	be significant savings buying locally or even
12	within the state since it's not coming from far
13	away. It's something to look at.
14	The other question that I have for
15	you
16	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: [interposing]
17	Council Member, it's your last question.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: I'm sorry?
19	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: This is your
20	last question. We have to move on.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Oh that
22	was my last question?
23	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: No.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Okay, one
25	last question. What is the per school cost of

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 161
2	opening and closing? What would these costs total
3	next year?
4	JOEL I. KLEIN: Of opening and
5	closing schools?
6	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Yes.
7	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: In terms
8	of the new schools that we're talking about, the
9	additional costs when you still have some schools
10	open and others phasing out is about \$20 million
11	in total.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Thank you
13	so much.
14	JOEL I. KLEIN: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you.
16	Council Member Karen Koslowitz and Gale Brewer
17	will be next.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER KOSLOWITZ: Thank
19	you, Mr. Chair.
20	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Before you go
21	further, I want to recognize Council Member Reyna
22	and Council Member Council Member Lappin.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KOSLOWITZ: Good
24	afternoon, Chancellor.
25	JOEL I. KLEIN: Good afternoon.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOSLOWITZ: Thank

you. Also, in many areas they want to put the

sixth into the middle school. Will that have any

fiscal impact?

JOEL I. KLEIN: It shouldn't have

23

24

jobs in other schools. Many of them have been

hired in other schools that have vacancies in the

24

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 164
2	city.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER KOSLOWITZ: But they
4	wouldn't lose their job.
5	JOEL I. KLEIN: They don't lose
6	their jobs, no.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER KOSLOWITZ: Thank
8	you.
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
10	Chancellor, forgive us one minute. Take a break
11	for about two or three minutes. We're going to
12	take a vote on a resolution. Is that okay?
13	Committee members, the Committee on Education is
14	going to take a vote on proposed Resolution 157-A.
15	A resolution calling upon the New York City
16	Department of Education to establish a school
17	transformation zone based on the model proposed by
18	the New York City Coalition for Educational
19	Justice to improve low performing schools and
20	prevent school closings. With that resolution as
21	described, the chair recommends an aye vote.
22	We're going to ask the clerk to call the roll.
23	ERIC STEVENSON: Eric Stevenson,
24	Committee Clerk. Jackson?
25	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: I vote ave.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 165
2	ERIC STEVENSON: Barron?
3	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Aye.
4	ERIC STEVENSON: Fidler?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: [No
6	response].
7	ERIC STEVENSON: Foster?
8	COUNCIL MEMBER FOSTER: [No
9	response].
10	ERIC STEVENSON: Koppell?
11	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: [No
12	response].
13	ERIC STEVENSON: Lappin?
14	COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Aye.
15	ERIC STEVENSON: Vacca?
16	COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Aye.
17	ERIC STEVENSON: Cabrera?
18	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: I'm happy
19	to say aye.
20	ERIC STEVENSON: Chin?
21	COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Aye.
22	ERIC STEVENSON: Dromm?
23	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Aye.
24	ERIC STEVENSON: Koslowitz?
25	COUNCIL MEMBER KOSLOWITZ: Aye.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 166
2	ERIC STEVENSON: Levin?
3	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Aye.
4	ERIC STEVENSON: Weprin?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: [No
6	response].
7	ERIC STEVENSON: Greenfield?
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Aye.
9	ERIC STEVENSON: Ignizio?
10	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: [No
11	response].
12	ERIC STEVENSON: Ulrich?
13	COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Aye.
14	ERIC STEVENSON: The vote stands at
15	12 in the affirmative, no negative and no
16	abstentions. The motion carries.
17	[Applause]
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Clerk, can
19	you go back? I don't know if you recorded Council
20	Member Barron and Council Member Dan Garodnick,
21	can you go back and check and see if you've called
22	their names and they have a vote?
23	ERIC STEVENSON: I have Barron.
24	Garodnick?
25	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 167
2	you very much. I vote aye.
3	ERIC STEVENSON: The vote now
4	stands at 13 in the affirmative, no negative, and
5	no abstentions.
6	[Applause]
7	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: With that
8	we're going to hold the vote open. There are
9	other committee meetings where other members are
10	voting and they've asked for me to hold the vote
11	open on this particular matter. So we'll hold the
12	vote open until 2:00 p.m. Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Council
14	Member Gale Brewer.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you
16	very much. First of all, we love Jenny Sobelman.
17	She solves all problems. That's number one.
18	Number two is special education. I know that your
19	staff has been looking very carefully to figure
20	out how to both give parents the options and at
21	the same time I think the budget is increasing
22	15%, millions and millions of dollars every year.
23	So my question is what is the
24	budget now? Some of the schools I know are suing
25	DOE where there have been longstanding challenges

in the city, not the ones out of the city, I think are willing to try to figure out some local solutions. We've had some meetings. I know that your staff has been very responsive. My question is you are coming up with some other ideas. What is the current projected cost of special education next year? What are some of your ideas that could both give parents the options and save money?

PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: Could you qualify, are you talking about the contract schools?

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Contract schools.

PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: Contract schools. I'll look it up here while we're talking. As you know, we've met to try to figure out how we can reduce that. The way that is most effective is when we actually are having more consistency on the evaluation front. So we are putting into place a new information system for special education students to allow us to improve the quality of the evaluations and the consistency of the evaluations and the services that come from those.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: But how is that going to deal with the issues that many parents will figure out a way to, in addition to all of those, find places, other private schools because you don't have room or the appropriate services in the public schools. That is the issue. I know many families who do sue and who do get other options which cost you a lot. There's a lot of feeling that we should be looking locally to try to come up with some public/private partnerships, et cetera. You're still going to end up spending a lot of money on special education.

PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: But it should be a decrease because a significant number of our evaluations are not as adequately done as they should be. We know that. We've been working on improving those. When we get that improvement put into place, it should actually reduce the number of folks going outside to contract schools. It will not stop where it is appropriate and we don't have the funds or the scale of the number of students where they need more specialized help. It will not stop that. Those students should go

Τ	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 17.
2	the lowest possible bid. It's all open and
3	transparent. I don't think necessarily if they're
4	not a large volume supplier, even if they're more
5	local they save a little on transportation but
6	they can't bid at the volumes that we need.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: But are you
8	talking to some groups like something even as
9	small like Wellness in the schools, because they
10	do have different ideas?
11	JOEL I. KLEIN: If you have other
12	groups to put us in touch with, we're looking for
13	ideas.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Then
15	finally, the middle school issue you mention in
16	your testimony is it a cost issue? City Council
17	put in money, et cetera. Do you see some
18	improvement with more money or more efficiency?
19	How do you improve the middle schools?
20	JOEL I. KLEIN: How do you improve
21	the middle schools?
22	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: On a
23	budget, is it more money, is it something else?
24	JOEL I. KLEIN: More money would
25	certainly help us making sure that we attract very

looking at the Department of Education, the focus really should be on smaller class size and making sure our students get the most attention. Looking at that, how will you do everything you can to make sure that we maintain that? Cutting away whatever fat there is to be cut or trimming down.

And I know that there are questions about those contracts, and I really would love you to answer those questions because it's out there in the public. We hear it from the union. As a new Council Member I really want to see could we cut back on some of those contracting costs so that you can spend the dollars back into the classroom?

I just want to give one example about some of these computer contracts. Some of the middle schools and kids applying to middle school and applying to high school, I've been hearing from my constituents that there's kids, good grades, good attendance, good test scores, did not get into any high school because of a computer glitch. Now the parents are trying to find a place for the kids. They're calling us to see how we can help. Also, middle school, the

JOEL I. KLEIN: We look at all of things, but I had a discussion before. People talk about things like contracts and the vast number of our contracts is things like the special ed, things like related services, bussing contracts, food contracts. So people throw numbers around that I think are designed to confuse the discussion.

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

There are some computer contracts but if I don't have contracts to make sure that there's appropriate computer maintenance I won't pay my teachers. Nobody suggests that I cut that. Sometimes you need expertise. So I don't want to hire the people inside.

Let me tell you, I'm happy to go

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Just one last question. In terms of trimming down your central administration, on your executive budget you kind of decreased it by over 676 headcount.

23

24

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOEL I. KLEIN: Right.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: What kind of 4 positions did you eliminate in the central office? 5 JOEL I. KLEIN: I've asked everybody in every part of it. So you'll have 6 7 some of the very people you're talking about. 8 There will because fewer people in the computer section that Photo works with. We talked before 9 10 about realigning something called Children First 11 Network. So there will be people who are doing 12 advising to the schools. There will be fewer of those people. There will be fewer of the people 13 who are doing professional development for the 14 15 schools. Those are all areas and I'm happy to 16 give it to you at whatever level. It's all public 17 and transparent that we're talking about. So 18 those are all areas where we're cutting.

But we can't cut our finances any further without really risking. When I started new teachers on payroll didn't get paid for six weeks. We fixed that and now they get paid immediately. But if you keep cutting the personnel, people aren't going to get paid.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 179
2	JOEL I. KLEIN: thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you.
4	Council Member Helen Foster would like to vote.
5	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chancellor,
6	one second please.
7	JOEL I. KLEIN: Sure.
8	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: On the
9	resolution, several members were juggling between
10	committees. So on the Resolution 157-A,
11	transitional zone for low performing schools,
12	Council Member Rose how do you vote?
13	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Deborah Rose,
14	how do you vote?
15	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: On Resolution
16	157-A, how do you vote?
17	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Aye.
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Council
19	Member Fidler?
20	COUNCIL MEMBER FIDLER: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Council
22	Member Foster?
23	COUNCIL MEMBER FOSTER: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: At this point
25	in time, the vote stands at 17 in favor and none

2003 to 2009, look at our city. This is where you

see, even though it's sampled. Look at us, 11, 7 and 11. Now the last one is 9. But compare that to the state, 1, 1, -4, -1. In every place we beat the rest of our state over a lengthy period of time. Everyone would say to you that shows real power. In fact, that's why I put the asterisk because those are statistically significant gains. So like we were up this year three points in the eighth grade, if we had gone up four points it would have been a big deal. But because of the sample size--

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS:

[interposing] I'm sorry. Let me just clarify what I was saying. When I brought it up last year I was told that because it's a small amount, because it was down, the question I was asking, you told me that it wasn't a good reliable source. But now you're saying it is a good source because it's up. I'm trying to figure out the disparity.

JOEL I. KLEIN: You're remembering something differently from me. What I said is from one year to another, when we were up three points in math it wasn't statistically significant. But when you do it over multiple

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Are all of those contracts open bidding, or are there any no-bid contracts?

JOEL I. KLEIN: There are some nobid contracts, for example on pre-k programs that the council has authorized we have no-bid. I'm happy to show you which ones. Under 3% are no-bid contracts I'm told. A lot of them would be you have a specific contract with a community-based organization. Sometimes the council request that we do, for example with the Museum of Natural History we have a no-bid science contract. So we could show you them. I'm happy to have you look at them.

can tell me if we open up some of the no-bid contracts we might possibly save some money. Why can't we do that? Also, in this time and age of the budget, I think we have to give the appearance that everybody is sharing the pain. It would behoove me to say that perhaps we can cut more out of the contracts. I know you have said that we have cut, but we probably should cut some more before we start cutting teachers and also start

teachers on the contract side that are going to

replace some of the teachers we're laying off on

24

1 COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 187 2 started yet. 3 CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: No, it's 4 going to start as soon as you open your mouth. Go 5 ahead. COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: A couple of 6 7 things. One, on the charter school question, the 8 original intent of charter schools was to have some model schools set up that would experiment 9 10 with curriculum and different approaches to 11 education and then implement that throughout the 12 entire public education system. It wasn't to set another tier, another school system up called 13 charter. I think we run into major issues with 14 15 that question right there. In this budget, it will be about 16 17 \$12,443 per student for charter. The total of it 18 when you put everything together, the special ed 19 money, comes out to about \$545 million for charter 20 and another \$210 million out of this budget for 21 charters on the capital side. 22 So here is something that was 23 supposed to be an experiment. Now it becomes 24 another school system and the contradiction is if 25 you're doing so great, and I'm always questioning

your scores and statistics and the fact that the education system has been turned into a test taking mill, test prep every period as thought students knowing how to take tests is going to help them in life which is not going to happen. So I always question those.

But let's take your statistics. If it's doing so well, the public school system. If scores are as you always say. In my district 20 schools got A's, ten schools got B's and a couple got C's. Then why do we need charter? Since the public schools are doing so great and scores are going up, why do we need to take a half a billion dollars out for charter?

To me if there is a public school that's getting an A, then why can't we duplicate what's happening in those public schools that are getting A's in the rest of the system instead of phasing out public schools so that we can make room for charter schools and then causing a class war in the black and Latino neighborhoods making elitist separations of charter students and public schools.

Like the parents of Harlem, got

them lining up around the corner because they want to get into charter schools because of all of the PR work that you've done. Some of the results are good but just as good as some of the results in the public schools. Here we have this schism with charter and public.

I know that's a mouthful, but I want to know why won't we just stop this stuff around charter schools, because we know what it takes for a school to work. It's simple,

Chancellor, and you know it. It takes teachers that want to and know how to teach. It takes a curriculum that is a 21st century curriculum, culturally relevant to the students. It takes a library that is up to date. It takes science labs. It takes computers in our schools. It takes smaller class sizes. That could happen in any school. There's nothing magic in the word charter, private or public. Those are the ingredients and others that make a school.

So why don't you stop the divide and stop all of the nonsense I think around this charter school system and making it seem like it's superior when in fact it's an incremental way of

people in your community. They like the local

2.0

2.3

2	public school. They want the charter school.
3	Joel Klein shouldn't decide that. I'll just end
4	on this and then you'll have the last word. On
5	this issue, starting with President Obama,
6	President Clinton, Secretary Duncan, Al Sharpton

and now Andrew Cuomo have all come out said what

8 we're doing is exactly the right thing.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: That

doesn't mean anything. None of them are
educators. Al Sharpton is not an educator. He's
my friend, love him. Barack Obama is not an
educator. I love him. But you know who said it
wasn't good? My wife, Inez Barron, who's an
Assemblywoman and 37 years in the education system
as a principal, an assistant principal, an
assistant to a superintendent and a masterful
teacher for 18 years. She says it's a game. So I
will take her word over it, not because she's my
wife and brilliant and beautiful but I will take
her word over the gentlemen that you mentioned any
day because we know what's going on.

Barack Obama being for charter schools, I mean Barack Obama is a great president and he's doing great things, but he's also for

transferring the war from Iraq to Afghanistan and doing a whole lot of other things that a lot of us don't agree with. So just because you got the president and Arne Duncan, who by the way came from Chicago where Barack Obama and comes out of that system that's also trying to incrementally privatize.

So I don't think anything you mentioned validates what they're doing with the charter school versus public school. I think it's a businessman, Mayor Bloomberg, seeing education as a business. Anytime Wall Street is now interested in education and charter schools, we are in trouble. This is more about money than it is about children.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: One second.

Ladies and gents, please, we don't want applause or boos. I just want to perform the hearing. So please keep your applause to yourself if you don't mind.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Mr. Chairman,

I just have to say it's a bizarre day in the

universe when they agree with every word from

Councilman Barron's mouth. And today is one of

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 193
2	those days.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Whoa, put
4	that on there.
5	JOEL I. KLEIN: Maybe you want to
6	rethink your position now, Councilman Barron. The
7	one thing I will say, I'm not going to persuade
8	you, although there are literally thousands and
9	thousands of educators who agree. I think denying
10	parents options in high poverty communities is not
11	a winning strategy. But let me agree on one thing
12	you said. Thank your wife for her incredible
13	service to our school system. On that we do
14	agree.
15	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
16	Thank you, Council Member Barron.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I don't
18	want you to think I'm softening up because you
19	complimented my wife. Don't even try it.
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Council
21	Member David Greenfield of Brooklyn.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Thank
23	you. Of course it's impossible to follow
24	Councilman Barron, so thank you for making my life
25	difficult. First I just want to start off and

is giving us all the short shrift. The bulk of the responsibilities, no question, should be laid in their hands. I want to congratulate you on those very impressive numbers. That's some really, really nice work.

I want to reiterate just for a moment until I get to my question that I think obviously all cuts to teachers are unacceptable.

But if you are going to cut, I definitely appreciate that at least you're considering changes to the last in and first out. I'm very concerned about the impact on our ELL and minority students.

I just want to ask a couple of questions. I took a look over here at this list of gifted and talented kindergarten testers. One of the things I noticed was that if you look at some of the wealthier neighborhoods, the amount of children who are being tested and actually going in the program are in some cases 15 times more than the children in the poorer neighborhoods.

So a question I guess that I have is in the private schools there is a move now to

sort of get away from testing because one of the things that they're concerned about is that a lot of these tests in a certain sense are rigged because parents have the opportunity and in some cases they're paying several thousand dollars for prep tests for these classes.

Are you similarly concerned and specifically in reference to the OSAT test?

Should there be a move to penalize parents as some private schools are doing if they are essentially rigging the system in their favor?

issue that's come up. It's something that I have to look at. I'm not prepared to give you a thoughtful answer right now. Parents feel very strongly. We have the same problem with the SATs. That's why in my answer to Council Member Barron, I think if you give parents choices usually that works out well for children. Middle class communities, understandably, they have more economic choices in life. They're able to get more tests that they can prepare their kids with, whether it's the SATs or others. Trying to be equitable in that environment without penalizing

COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: Aye on all.

2.0

2	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you.
3	We'll still hold the vote open. I would ask all
4	Council Members to make your questions as short
5	and brief as possible. The chancellor has an
6	appointment with children in Tweed and we don't
7	want to keep the children waiting. But he will
8	take the questions from the remaining Council
9	Members who are on the list. That will be Weprin,
10	Vann, Ferreras, Reyna, Levin and Crowley. So
11	Council Member Weprin is next.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Thank you,
13	Mr. Chairman. Chancellor, how are you?
14	JOEL I. KLEIN: Good, how are you?
15	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: It's good
16	to see you. I'm going to bring the conversation

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: It's good to see you. I'm going to bring the conversation back to lunch. I hope it doesn't make you hungry. I was glad to see the other day that the DOE was going after the non-Title 1 kids who are not eligible for free lunch or reduced lunch and had decided to go after that money after for years it seemed like a lot of people were in arrears and we weren't collecting it.

I was not happy and I was glad you changed this idea that you were making the

principals be the collection agency to help get that money. But then I understand that they decided not to charge the principals because they threatened that if they didn't collect the money they were going to dock the principal's budgets the money they couldn't collect. I understand as of Friday they decided not to dock the principals. I was curious how the principals did in trying to collect some of those arrears.

JOEL I. KLEIN: Most principals

don't get in arrears. This is varied all over the
system. One of the messages we're trying to send
is don't get in arrears. If you're feeding people
who are not covered by Title 1 we don't get
reimbursed by it. Principals have collected
arrears. They write their parents. Their PTA
helps them. It is an arduous process. So this
year we were able to cover it but going forward
we're sending a clear message do not get in
arrears and then you won't have a collection
agency problem.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: I heard it was close to a third of the schools. I'm just curious and I wasn't being facetious, I think it

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was \$7 million you said that we've been losing every year, or someone said. Did we get a lot of that back in those last few days, because I know a lot of principals were scrambling.

JOEL I. KLEIN: Not a lot of it.

Once we let them off the hook they won't get it back.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: I actually was surprised to learn that students who were not eligible for free or reduced lunch were allowed to get lunch if they haven't paid. I know that might sound like a grinch kind of feeling. I went online to that mylunchmoney.com and when it gets down to a level, they email you that they're going to dock you some more money. I didn't even realize that if my son didn't have money in his account he could still get a free lunch, obviously we'd owe it, but would get it on loan. Is it mandated by law or is it mandated by DOE policy that you don't want to have a kid not have lunch? JOEL I. KLEIN: It's not mandated by law. It's just that not every parent is as responsible as you are. The kid is hungry and

they give him lunch. It is a grinch kind of an

But it seems to me there should be some system in place. I know in other school districts in other parts of the state, they don't give kids report cards if they're in arrears on their lunches. I think a lot of parents knew that they don't necessarily have to pay. They will owe money and then eventually nobody collects it and you're free. We need to send that message. So I agree with you on that message. I'll be the grinch for a change.

JOEL I. KLEIN: I'm happy to say that I did this because you urged me to do it.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Weprin says no free lunches. You want to help with the gap

between the Title 1 and non-Title 1 kids because all the non-Title 1 kids will be hungry and they won't do as well on the tests. But I really think it makes sense. That seems like an enormous amount of money to be giving away every year.

We should be collecting it. I just don't think it should be the principals who have to collect it. They've got enough troubles and enough responsibilities to be out there at the lunch asking if they've paid. The technology is there to make it that parents know that your son or daughter won't get lunch if they haven't paid.

JOEL I. KLEIN: No, that's the message for next year. Next year we're not covering it.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: All right.

One other question, I had talked to you about this briefly at another hearing and I asked you about school trips, about free busses. The city will give you a bus to go on a school trip within the five boroughs of the City of New York. But if you wanted to go outside of the city of New York, the city won't pay for that. I asked if, indeed, a

school district can show that this trip outside
the city of New York is cheaper, shorter and more
convenient for the school district, shouldn't they
be allowed to do it. You weren't sure if there
were legal reasons. I sent you a letter and I
spoke to someone but I didn't get an answer yet to
that letter and I'm just curious because it seems
to me that if we could show it's cheaper and saves
money it should be something we're allowed to do.

JOEL I. KLEIN: It's my fault that you didn't get an answer and we'll get you the answer. I don't know the answer to the legal question sitting here. But if what you're saying is correct then we should be able to work it through.

just us in eastern Queens but obviously the Staten Island people and the Bronx people can go to Westchester and it actually works out better. In my case you're not against traffic anymore.

Actually going to Long Island sometimes is easier for us and quicker. And some school trips are just not done because you could never get back in time for pickup.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 205
2	JOEL I. KLEIN: We'll get you the
3	answer.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you.
6	Council Member Al Vann is next.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: Good
8	afternoon, Chancellor. We don't want to keep your
9	kids waiting. I'll be very brief. The inquiry
10	around charter schools, is there a goal that you
11	have relative to that? At what point will you say
12	that we have enough charter schools to do whatever
13	your objective is? Is it open-ended?
14	JOEL I. KLEIN: I don't have an
15	objective. What I would say what I'm trying to do
16	is create choices for parents. So today I have
17	50,000 parents who are on a wait list. I want to
18	serve those parents. I don't have a preference.
19	I just want them to make sure. In my experience,
20	parents in high poverty communities have been told
21	historically you get one choice. I don't think
22	that's a winning strategy. So we're trying to
23	create options.
24	Overwhelmingly in our city and in
25	every city T know children are overwhelmingly in

traditional public schools. But where you see

parent saying they want an option for their kids

that we can provide, I'd like to provide that.

say they want the option I think they say they
want something better, right? I say that because
I think it was around three weeks ago there was a
rather extensive article in The New York Times
where they touted this study that was done by this
credible organization which essentially said there
are good charters and there are bad charters. It
essentially stated that they're no more effective
than the public schools for the most part.

That being said, having an option is not necessarily a panacea or it does not necessarily give them what they say they want.

What they really want is a better school. So there is no guarantee that you get a charter that it's going to be better according to those studies. Is that correct?

JOEL I. KLEIN: That study was about a national study based on 16 states that did not include New York. The woman who did that study, we asked her to come to New York and do the

exact same study in New York City and she found that our charters, both in math and in English were getting significantly better results. It's all been published. I'm happy to supply it to you. I also think not every parent has the same perception. We have some parents who like a particular school and other parents who don't.

I've just always thought that it's unfair to people who grow up in high poverty communities that they get only one choice. When you don't have choices you don't create an environment where schools feel the need sometimes to do the hard work that they need to do to turn things around.

So what I've seen with parents is they want to be there to get the options for their kids. I think our charter schools as a rule are generally performing higher than anyplace else in the country right now.

COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: I agree. I think parents rely on those of us who are supposed to know, whether it be educators or those who are in leadership to provide them with the options and the alternatives that make sense that are indeed

better. All my kid and grandkids went to public schools and I had to navigate. My wife and I, we navigated the system because every school is not good in our community but there are good schools in our community. Our kids got a good education, college and so on and so forth. So I never want to put down a public school because they have proved that they are very effective.

As you've indicated when we've spoken on different occasions all the schools in New York City, they win national honors and so forth. So we have some great schools. Charter schools have not risen to that level as yet.

So we have an option. They say you can make one hand like the other, a good hand and a bad hand. You don't want to make the good hand bad. We want to make both hands good. Charter is not a panacea and I think parents have to be aware that there may be good charters but there are some charters that are not necessarily good.

JOEL I. KLEIN: I agree. I've sat several of them down. In fact, I met just last week with one of the Council Members about one we're shutting down in Brooklyn.

CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA:

Council Member, I don't mean to cut you short but

[interposing]

24

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 210
2	we have other members.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: Just let me
4	get this clarified point.
5	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Just sum up,
6	thank you.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: Just this
8	clarifying point. If you have a charter in
9	district 13, a child comes from district 16 to
10	that charter in 13. So the money that would have
11	gone into 13 for him goes into 16 where he attends
12	the charter?
13	JOEL I. KLEIN: We don't flow money
14	into 13. There are kids today in 13 who are going
15	to gifted and talented programs, et cetera. The
16	money goes with the child. The money doesn't go
17	to a district, it goes to the school. That's a
18	big change from the old days.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: I'll follow
20	up later.
21	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: Thank you.
22	Council Member Julissa Ferreras is next.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: Good
24	afternoon.
25	JOEL I. KLEIN: Good afternoon.

2.0

2.3

2	COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS: I have
3	two questions. One of them is in reference to
4	your change from ACS daycare shift to
5	kindergarten. In my district, there's actually an
6	article today, P.S. 143 is actually now the school
7	with the longest kindergarten waiting list. So my
8	question is how are you planning to address the
9	situation? Oftentimes when it's time to register
10	for kindergarten, my schools look like Black
11	Friday outside of a mall. Parents are there at
12	the crack of dawn with a great deal of anxiety
13	hoping to register their kids into kindergarten.

JOEL I. KLEIN: We've tried to do
this in a systematic way so that parents don't
have to wait on lines. What we're doing, as much
as we can, clearing those waiting lists. If not,
just last week we gave parents other options.
Some of them have taken those options already.
Others prefer to stay on the waiting list.

Last year we were able to clear not every single waiting list but many of the waiting lists. We'll continue to do that. This year we got way ahead of the process giving parents who are on a waiting list an alternative choice. As I

2 say, some have taken it and others have not.

to work with you on that to help give some options because those parents are coming directly to my office, oftentimes very confused because unlike other parents who have the opportunity to deal with the system because their kids may be in first or second grade, these are parents that their kids are just going into and establishing a relationship with the DOE.

Now I was a former Beacon director for six years and extended use is something that's important in our community. Oftentimes the public schools are the only place where young people can use the gymnasiums or community groups can have their meetings. If you can just explain to me the school use hours and the potential fees and how that would affect. Are there certain groups that'll be affected more than others?

PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: That's the PEG that you're referring to, right. What we're doing is we don't use the programs very efficiently in terms of the after school hours. So we are going to be working with the schools to

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, Chancellor. I just
wanted to make sure that I understood concerning
the issues on the costs that you mentioned in
relation to the teacher reassignment centers.

23

24

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 214
2	You've reached a decision and agreement where
3	there will be a \$20 million savings you said over
4	time.
5	JOEL I. KLEIN: Right.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: There is
7	going to be an initial cost to the department
8	concerning investigators because you're going to
9	be hiring for the sake of making sure that you are
10	closing cases.
11	JOEL I. KLEIN: Correct.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: If I'm not
13	putting words in your mouth. What is the cost?
14	You did not mention the cost of the investigators
15	and how many positions.
16	JOEL I. KLEIN: I think right now
17	it's somewhere around \$6-\$8 million in terms of
18	lawyer time and investigator time. The overall
19	projected savings would be significantly higher,
20	like over \$20 million.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: You
22	mentioned lawyers and you mentioned investigators.
23	So what would be the personnel breakdown as far as
24	lawyers versus investigators?
25	JOEL I. KLEIN: I don't have that

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 215
2	but I'm happy to get it and submit it to you,
3	Council Member.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: What is the
5	budget right now concerning your investigating
6	team and how many positions?
7	JOEL I. KLEIN: I don't have that,
8	but I'm guessing overall we could be talking about
9	somewhere around \$20-\$22 million for the
10	investigative team.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: How quickly
12	will this be implemented as far as the hiring is
13	concerned?
14	JOEL I. KLEIN: We're in the
15	process right now of doing the hiring.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: How do you
17	publicize for that particular hiring?
18	JOEL I. KLEIN: We have numerous,
19	numerous people who are applying for it.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: The
21	criteria?
22	JOEL I. KLEIN: Fundamentally,
23	background in investigation. We get people from
24	law enforcement. We get people who are
25	investigators at district attorneys offices, et

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 216
2	cetera, et cetera.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you
4	very much. I just wanted to make sure that we
5	understood what type of investigation
6	implementation concerning the efficiency of making
7	sure that the centers will be shut down, not
8	completely shut down according to your testimony.
9	You said that they're not going to be eliminated
10	but there will be a significant reduction of who
11	is in that center.
12	JOEL I. KLEIN: Our current
13	intention in working with the UFT is by the end of
14	this calendar year, December 31st, that'll be the
15	last reassignment center.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Fabulous.
17	I'm sorry, Domenic, I've been waiting quite some
18	time.
19	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: I know.
20	We're running short on time, Council Member.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I have 43
22	seconds. How many gifted and talented programs
23	will you be approving?
24	JOEL I. KLEIN: I don't have the
25	exact number but I can give you by district how

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 217
2	many.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I know how
4	many you have already. I'm asking the expansion
5	as far as beyond that number.
6	JOEL I. KLEIN: As many as we have
7	people who pass the exams at the 90 percentile.
8	This year we had more people passing the exams and
9	we'll open programs for those children.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: So there
11	will be an additional set of programs that will be
12	opening up in different districts starting this
13	fall.
14	JOEL I. KLEIN: If people are
15	applying for them. As I say, sometimes we only
16	get three or four people apply so we can't open it
17	up. But if there are enough people to open up a
18	program, we do open up a program.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: My last
20	question, it's concerning the
21	CHAIRPERSON RECCHIA: [interposing]
22	Council Member, I'm sorry, we have to move on.
23	Council Member Levin is next.
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: My
25	colleagues Council Member Levin I mean if you

have specific questions about specific programs, you can talk to counsel and we can ask DOE. I ask everyone to stay focused on the executive budget which is \$18.4 billion.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you,
Chairman Jackson and Chairman Recchia. Thank you,
Mr. Chancellor. I have a couple of very quick
questions for you. Chancellor, I'd just like to
ask you very quickly about the status of arts in
our public school system as the son of a public
school art teacher and as someone who has
benefited from arts in my education I can say that
I believe that it is a very important part of our
public school curriculum.

In 2007 we took \$67 million
earmarked specifically for the arts and gave that
money to the individual schools. Can you tell me
what percentage of that money is actually being
used for arts programming? Do we know? Do we
have an assessment of that?

JOEL I. KLEIN: The last several years what we do know is the amount of money in our budget that is being spent on the arts has gone up significantly. I can get you the exact

numbers. What I'm concerned about this year is in the course of budget cuts how that'll affect us.

But since the time we cut the \$67 as an earmark and put it into the schools, and we do this through our arts connect and all the data, we put it out there. The amount of money being spent on the arts has gone up significantly.

tracking to see if all of the money that was earmarked that was given to each individual school, is that all being tracked so that we're sure that that is indeed being used. I can understand the pressure on principals when they're facing budget cuts to direct that money towards programs that they may be tested on for example instead of art programs.

JOEL I. KLEIN: The amount has gone up by several million dollars. It's up to \$313 million last year despite budget cuts. Several years ago when we cut the \$67 million earmark, it was lower than that by about \$7-\$8 million. So the overall spend has gone up, even in a tight budget time. I am worried about next year.

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Then just to

Τ	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 22
2	decided exactly. So it's an admission process
3	going on. It won't be a big change. The number
4	will not be significantly different from last
5	year, but there could be some small differences.
6	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: So as far as
7	the amount of money from a rough point of view
8	you're talking about if you expanded five programs
9	in five districts, what would it cost, give or
10	take?
11	JOEL I. KLEIN: It could be a half
12	a million, \$100,000 for a program.
13	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Is it about
14	\$100,000 per program more or less?
15	JOEL I. KLEIN: More or less.
16	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
17	JOEL I. KLEIN: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Council
19	Member Crowley.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you,
21	Chairman. I have a question as it relates to new
22	schools that are opening and they have to be
23	staffed. No new teachers will be hired for
24	September for those schools, is that correct?
25	JOEL I. KLEIN: Those schools we

will make a decision. In the past we have allowed them to hire some new teachers as well as hire other teachers from the system. Right now, depending on their licenses, if they hired a new teacher and there was somebody else who was laid off, they would bump them out anyhow. So we're going to work this through with each individual school, whether it's metropolitan or any other.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: That's the question really because if there's going to be over 3,000 layoffs then the Department of Education is not legally allowed to hire new teachers. Isn't that correct?

JOEL I. KLEIN: No. There may be some that, depending on their licenses, where they'd be able to hire a few. But they won't be able to hire a lot, even in a new school.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The next question has to do with school breakfast. I was at a hearing recently where I heard over \$100 million is potentially lost every year that we could gain from the federal government if more students had breakfast in school. Because approximately something like only one-third of

students who are eligible for free breakfast take advantage of it because they're getting to school just when school is starting. If they had this grab and go breakfast that we'd be able to gain \$100 million plus, maybe \$140 million a year if principals agreed to institute the grab and go after the school day actually begins. Are those accurate numbers? Are you following that? Is that something that you would suggest I should encourage principals to do, this way we could save money and the kids could actually have a healthy breakfast?

DHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: It

doesn't actually add money to the budget except to

cover the cost of the food. So we don't make

money off of the food so we can then go use it to

buy textbooks or pay for more teachers. But it's

a good program in the sense that you would

actually be feeding more kids from a nutrition

standpoint. So it's a good program and we'd like

to have more. I know that Kathleen is working to

have more schools take advantage of it. But it

only brings in money to pay for the food that gets

produced.

have your staff get briefed because first of all, whoever said one-third of the kids, we serve many more breakfasts. It would help if you can grab the breakfast. There are some concerns about all the issues of food in the classroom and everything like that, the custodians, et cetera. I know Kathleen has been working on it. Budgetary wise, it's not going to affect our budget one way or the other because we only get reimbursed for the meals we serve.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chancellor, I know that you're going to a meeting and I'm going there also. I have a couple of questions and hopefully we can get out of here and both go have a glass of water and wipe our foreheads before we go to this next meeting.

You testified today that you will not make across the board cuts to FSF allocation, the fair student funding allocations this year, but that some schools will have deeper cuts than other so that all schools meet some minimum operating threshold.

1	COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH EDUCATION 227
2	programs.
3	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Those schools
4	that you may consider well funded, aren't those
5	the neediest schools?
6	JOEL I. KLEIN: No.
7	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: They're not.
8	JOEL I. KLEIN: We've actually
9	looked at this and in terms of student need or
10	poverty, it's exactly flat. We've done analysis
11	of it. It's not based on that. It's just based
12	on a historical pattern.
13	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: From an
14	executive budget point of view, who will be
15	determining the minimum operating threshold?
16	JOEL I. KLEIN: We will.
17	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Is there a
18	formula for that?
19	JOEL I. KLEIN: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Do we know
21	what that formula is? When I say we, I mean our
22	Finance Division at the City Council.
23	PHOTEINE ANAGNOSTOPOULOS: This is
24	all based off the fair student funding formula.
25	What we're looking at is if you look at how fair

student funding works, it's basically covering two things. One is your basic operating costs, as the chancellor described, and supplemental dollars for academically needy students.

So we've actually looked at what does it cost for the teacher in the classroom, some additional OTPS to help support the teacher in the classroom and some materials, et cetera. That's your basic operating budget in a classroom which FSF is supposed to cover.

Because of the severe budget cuts over the last two years, it has dropped below that. So if you were very close to the formula when we started FSF, you came down. If you were over the formula, you're probably still in decent shape. If you were below formula before, you're probably hurting pretty badly right now. That's really how it breaks out.

I just want to clarify. Nobody is going to have their fair student funding cut because of this shifting in the funds. Everybody will have their fair student funding cut when we do the overall budget cut, just as we have in former years.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: We've talked
in the Finance hearings and Education hearings
about schools that were going to be hold harmless
Are you going to cut or eliminate the hold
harmless allocations for those so-called schools
that were over funded?

JOEL I. KLEIN: Some of them may feel that in their overall budgets. Some of them were, relatively speaking, over funded. But it's going to be tied to a formula that says basically this is the basic necessity.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Give or take, Chancellor, how many schools are we talking about that will be in that category?

are about 422 schools that are significantly below what we would consider an operating threshold.

They've been using other funds. It's not like they can't operate. It's just they've been using other funds. Given the size of the budget cut that we could potentially be talking about here, it's prudent to get them back up to a better level of stability.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Chancellor,

I, Donna Hintze certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Donna dente

Signature_____

Date __June 23, 2010_____