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LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Please rise
for the Pledge of Allegiance as our Presiding
Officer Rich Nicolello leads us in the Pledge
of Allegiance.
Mr. Pulitzer, if you would please
call the roll call for the Budget Review
Committee.
MR. PULITZER: Thank you
Chairman. Budget Review Committee roll call.
Legislator Arnold Drucker.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Ranking member
Kevan Abrahams.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
will be substituting for him.
MR. PULITZER: Thank you ma'am.
That is a Delia DeRiggi-Whitton.
Legislator Howard Kopel.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Vice Chairman
Richard Nicolello.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Here.
MR. PULITZER: Chairman John
Ferretti.
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LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here. MR. PULITZER: We have a quorum sir.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you Mr. Pulitzer. We are going to start off today with public comment. We have one speaker, Mr. Kevin McKenna.

MR. MCKENNA: Kevin McKenna, Edna
Drive, Syosset, New York. I would have thought that public session at a budget meeting would be after you talk about the budget so that we can hear what it is that is taking place so that then we can comment on it. Can we do it that way?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: No, sir, we are having public comment to start the session.

MR. MCKENNA: So what's the public comment about?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: You tell me whatever you would like to speak about the budget.

MR. MCKENNA: Well, I haven't heard about the budget to speak about. You're
kind of doing things backwards with all due respect. I'm sure that if you were on this side of the fence you'd probably agree with me. We are being broadcast live to all Nassau County residents right now.

Also, to my surprise, I checked last week to see when the next Nassau County leg meeting was and this budget meeting was not announced on the Nassau County website last week. Today I happen to notice it. It popped up there all of a sudden and it's a shame that Nassau County residents are not given notice of such an important budget meeting by Nassau County.

It's also a shame that the Nassau County legislators who continually put up posts on their Facebook pages self-promoting themselves at events, especially Legislator Drucker, who continually self-promotes himself at events, I don't understand why the legislators would not post on their Facebook page and alert their constituents to such an important event like a budget meeting. This is a really, really important meeting that
99.999 of the Nassau County residents do not know about.

Do you agree Ms. Phillips? Do you agree that residents don't know about this?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Mr.
McKenna, your comments are to this body right here, not to the comptroller. So please direct your comments to the legislature.

MR. MCKENNA: Is the Nassau
County Board of Elections under the budget of the budget that you're hear to talk about?

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Yes. It's part of the 2022 Nassau County budget.

MR. MCKENNA: I sent in an email to all legislators, as well as the Nassau County executive, suggesting and recommending an audit of the Nassau County Board of Elections because I have proof, documented proof, that there are individuals that have low-show jobs in the Nassau County Board of Elections. And you owe it to the taxpayers to perform an audit of the board of elections because there are people working inside the board of elections that are not working for

```
    the operations of the board of elections.
    They're working for the party leaders. And if
    you guys are concerned about the budget you
    can really, really save the taxpayers money by
    trimming down that board of elections.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you
    for your comments Mr. McKenna.
    MR. MCKENNA: How much time is
    allocated to public comment for this meeting
    since I'm only the one speaker?
    MR. PULITZER: Mr. McKenna three
    minutes sir.
    MR. MCKENNA: How much time is
    allocated to the meeting for public comment?
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Sir, we
    would see how many speakers are here and then
    allocate time. Thank you sir.
    To the comptroller.
    MR. MCKENNA: You know what's
    unbelievable? What's unbelievable is that you
    are showing the public right now that you do
    not want to hear from us. You're showing the
    public that you have no interest in hearing
    from the public. You should all resign, every
```

one of you. Thank you very much.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. We're going to move to the comptroller, Ms. Elaine Phillips. I know you have a presentation.

By the way, thank you everyone for being here today. Thank you to the comptroller's office. I know Mr. Persich is here as well. Thank you. So, comptroller, take it away.

LEGISLATOR PILIP: Thank you very
much. Thank you to the entire legislature that is not here today but specifically the Budget Review Committee. I would like to thank you Chairman Legislator Ferretti, Vice Chairman Presiding Officer Nicolello, Legislator Kopel, Legislator Drucker, Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, who is my county legislator, and Legislator John Giuffre for having us here today.

I'd also like to give Kevin, Frank and Chris and the whole team a shout-out and Mr. Pulitzer up there for making the technology side of this so easy.

One doesn't present our findings without the people that really do the hard work. So, I'd like to take a minute and thank my staff. First and foremost, my deputy comptroller Betsy Hill, who leads our accounting division. And the director of accounting Lisa Tsikouras. And it's Lisa and her team, really your team, that made our midyear report, made all the published reports for year end of 2021 happen. Without them today would not happen.

I'm also blessed to have the whole
front row here. I have my director of communications Wendy Goldstein. I have my summer intern Kevin Judge, who was really instrumental in getting this report together here today. I have my deputy comptroller in charge of overseeing audit Jeff Schoen. Deputy comptroller Beaumont Jefferson, who is in charge of claims, benefits and payroll here. We have my chief counsel Charlie Cassalero. Melissa Marciano and Nicki Benoit. So thank you guys. They have my back.

We're going to take a few minutes of your time today and go through a summary of our midyear report for 2022. We're going to take a step back for a second and if we can go to our first slide and just give you a quick overview of the results of 2021.

As mentioned, on June 30th we published our annual comprehensive financial report. These are the audited finances for Nassau County according to GAAP, under GASBY statement 54. I'm not going to go into a tremendous amount of detail because you have an expert here in the audience and that's Andy Persich. So, we felt it was a better use of your time to let Andy really make the highlights there, and particularly I wasn't in the administration at the time.

I think though the key point that I would like to highlight is that in that highlighted bar that in 2021 Nassau County ended with a surplus of $\$ 479.5$ million. So I want to say to you congratulations. Good job. Really good job.

I'd also like you to look back,
because I think it's important, that you also ended 2020 with a surplus of $\$ 15.9$ million and in 2019 \$150.8 million. We're talking about three consecutive years, three interesting consecutive years when it comes to both national and global events and you ended with a surplus. So let me say once again congratulations.

Let's go on to the 2022 budget.
For the next page -- oh, let me tell you, I apologize. You have a folder in front of you. On the left side is the presentation. On the right side is the midyear report. You probably are not going to need the midyear report for today but $I$ wanted you to have it both in hard copy we sent it to you electronically, but you can follow through on the presentation on the left side.

Go to page three in the presentation, and please, I'm going to apologize, the numbers are small but let me assure you that we are going to go through the highlights, the drivers of what we believe that the actual budget will come in for in

2022 versus what the adopted budget. And the bottom line is, on the very bottom right, is we believe that Nassau County will continue a surplus and based on our analysis it will be $\$ 38.2$ million.

Let us talk a little bit about the difference the way we report versus other reports.

MS. TSIKOURAS: This schedule on this page that has all the risks and opportunities against the '22 adopted budget is -- it mimics the GAAP reporting. So, for our financial statements we report our general fund in accordance with governmental accounting standards board statement 54 which was issued in 2011. And in that we have to consolidate certain funds that from a budgetary perspective and from a reporting and management perspective are reported separately. The general fund that's reported in here consists of approximately ten separate funds.
We also look at obviously the police district fund, which is one of the five
major funds that's also from a management perspective. And we also look at the sewer fund as well as an operating fund of the county. So, our basis here mimics what we report in our financial statements.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you Lisa.
If there are any questions concerning that please either bring them up now or save them for later. But $I$ think it's safe to say it's a more comprehensive way of looking at the county. And $I$ am going to put a plug in right now because you gave me a mic. This is why it is so critical that Nassau County gets a new financial system. The one we have is not GAAP. Doesn't report on a GAAP basis. And the fact is is GAAP is the way to report. It's the way we can evaluate ourselves versus other counties throughout New York State. So, it is crucial that we make the step. And thanks to you, we have funding to go that going. So, we're going to ask for a little more funding eventually too.

> I'm going to ask you to turn to page four. And we were joined by Legislator

Denise Ford. Thank you for coming. We Denise, Legislator Ford, I'm sorry, open up your packet on the left side is the presentation and we were just starting with page four.

So, what page four does is really, because you can't read all those tiny numbers, so what page four does it really just highlights the positive opportunities that are driving our projections and also goes into what could be some of the drivers on the risk side. So, I am going to go through each and every one of them. So, I'm going to start out with sales tax.

Sales tax, we are forecasting that sales tax will come in $\$ 85.8$ million higher than what was budgeted. So, trust me for a second and let's turn the page to page five. How did we get there?

First we look at historicals, right? So what this chart gives you it gives you your adopted budget for sales tax revenues from 2012 to 2022. Those are the orange bars. On top of that we give you the blue
line and it shows you what the actuals were. So, one of the comments that I'm sure that you deal with and $I$ know we deal with is the comment that we hear that sales tax revenue can be very unreliable. I think what this chart demonstrates or one of the things that this chart demonstrates is in fact Nassau County's sales tax revenue has been pretty reliable dating all the way back to 2012. I'm going to let Betsy tell a little story about that in a second.

But I think what's important here is the reliability that we look at that in saying even back in 2012 we had sales tax revenue that was well over a billion dollars. We also know what happened in 2019 is the New York State legislature -- that Nassau County was able to start receiving sales tax from internet sales. How did that impact? It's hard to tell because of COVID. But you have a pretty consistent revenue source here, and I'm going to let Deputy Comptroller Hill just comment on 2012-13 because it's relevant. MS. HILL: I was in the bond
industry for 40 years, and I shouldn't admit that, but $I$ remember being concerned about Nassau County when the sales tax dropped from 2013 to 2014. And I lived here about that time. I was concerned about the drop in sales tax from 2013 to 2014 never looking back and realizing until now if you draw the line directly from 2012 to 2014 pretty straight. What really happened was there was an increase in sales tax only in 2013 and that was likely due to things that had to be purchased after Sandy. Housing, construction work, cars, major appliances, house goods. So that really explains why there was not really a drop so much as a temporary increase in sales tax. MS. PHILLIPS: So we looked at historicals. What's happened with sales tax revenues? Then we looked at today's economy. If you turn to page six it's just a simple, brief snapshot of what's going on today. We know GDP has been negative for two quarters in 2022. Is it a recession? Is it not? We also know unemployment is at historical lows. They're really countering each other. Really
countering each other. Then we know, in going down to the last chart, inflation is still at historical high levels.

But then I'm going to send you over to the personal income, retail sales and consumer spending. So what drives sales tax revenue? It's you and I. It's us. Are we spending money? All $I$ can say is that, at least as of this data, the consumer continues to spend.

I've read things in the wall Street
Journal that says Mastercard is forecasting back-to-school sales. Spending up seven and a half percent from July to September over the 2021 numbers. I'm also hearing maybe we're not buying the high end Bic pens for our children. We might be buying the generic pens for our children. But we are still buying.

So, despite the negative GDP
numbers, positive unemployment numbers, we get an unemployment number again tomorrow, the fact is up to this point the consumer continues to spend. I'm going to give you some actual numbers on Nassau County here

2 also.

Let's go to the next page. We looked at historicals. We looked at the economy. Then we looked at actuals and said what has actually happened to date in 2022 versus 2021? So, I'm going to take you up into the first chart. I'm going to take you into the box of 2022. Then we can go into the white lines.

You can see February through April, May through July, but let's just go to the total. Total in 2022 through April we have received $\$ 673.4$ million worth of tax revenue versus -- keep going over to the right -- in 2021 at this same time we had received \$617.8 million. That difference is a nine percent increase. By chance, good news is -- well, let's go down.

Then we said okay, how does it all trend also? We see actuals and I'm going to point you to the yellow line. That's 2022. Then I'm going to point you to 2021 which is the year where we have received the highest level of sales tax revenue. And the fact is
you see that nine percent difference. But we also see a pretty steep decline in month seven.

But if you look at all those other colors, the fact is it all goes down. So, it really is a cyclical decline that happens probably after Mother's Day. We believe the spike is Mother's Day. Then you get that lull in June, July. Then you start seeing a spike back up, maybe back to school, and then you see your holiday sales at the end.

So, I think there was a lot of talk about the sky is falling because those numbers were beginning to drop. They dropped in July. The answer is they drop every year, at least going back to 2018, in July also.

We also received a check today for predominantly June and July, get a little bit of June some of the tail end stuff, but all of July and that check is an increase of over 2021 of 11 percent. So, we're still staying above 2021 numbers.

The reason I emphasize that is I'm going to take you to the next page, page 8, it
gets into what we're forecasting, that \$85.8 million that $I$ mentioned a few slides ago, and why we got there.

So, 2021 actual total sales tax revenue was $\$ 1.409$ billion. You budgeted $\$ 1.375$ billion. To date as of June, we had \$670 million. We are forecasting \$1.46 billion. The variance is $\$ 85.8$ million. That's 6.2 percent over budget and a 3.7 percent over actuals in 2021.

But I wouldn't be a good analyst if I didn't tell you what if. What if we're wrong? We don't have a crystal ball. We don't profess to have a crystal ball. That's why the next chart is so important for you, for $O M B$, for the county administration. Right? So let me walk you through this chart.

This chart, as it's titled, is possible sales tax scenarios. So, the top line are the scenarios which would be actuals that we have with the exception of the check that we received today and minus ten percent over 2021 actuals. Down ten percent. Actuals
minus five percent, actuals minus two percent. The middle one is our forecast, which is actuals to date and then flat 2021. Even though we know it's coming in around nine percent higher. Okay? But being a little conservative.

Then actuals up two and a half percent over 2021. Actuals up five percent over '21. Actuals over ten percent.

So let's go down the middle.
Actuals flat. We know we budgeted \$1.375 billion for 2022. Our forecast is it's actually going to come in closer to \$1.46 billion. That difference is the $\$ 85.8$ million. That difference is the 6.2 percent.

But let's say our crystal ball doesn't work. Let's go over to the right. Let's go over two to the right and say actuals plus five percent over 2021. Same budgeted number of $\$ 1.375$ billion. But now the projected, our projection goes up from \$1.46 billion to $\$ 1.497$. That's 122 or $\$ 123$ million rounded over budgeted and that's a 8.9 percent increase versus budget. No good analyst is
not going to show you the downside also.
Let's go all the way over to the red, the dark red. Actual to date, because those are real numbers, they're down ten percent from 2021 starting in July through the end of the year. August. Thank you. August through the end of the year actually fall below the 2021 numbers by ten percent. I'm going to repeat myself. We know it's up nine percent but what if? The fact is, we have our same budgeted number. Our sales tax forecast will then only go to $\$ 1.386$ billion. That's still \$11.6 million over what we budgeted for a percentage difference of . 8 percent. So, the bottom line is Nassau County sales tax revenue can afford to drop below 2021 for the rest of the year by at least ten percent and we will still make budget. That's a really important piece of information. Let's move on.

We're going to go back to those positives and those risks and I'm going to ask Lisa and Betsy please jump in.

So, we've talked about sales tax.

Other positive opportunities that we see in our forecast is state aid. $\$ 26$ million in reimbursements. Some various reimbursements. Payroll and fringe savings of $\$ 30$ million. I'm going to take you to the next page on that one because it's important. It's what's really happening here.

So, if you go to Exhibit-A, which
is on page ten, how did we come up with that $\$ 30.2$ million and there's a little variance here. It's not a big deal. We looked at salaries. The fact is the cost of salaries will be lower. Lisa, why don't I let you explain this.

MS. TSIKOURAS: Our projections, our methodology for projecting the salaries is we use the on-boards as of June 30th and then project out. So, we show savings primarily due to vacant positions, the budgeted collective bargaining agreement amount that OMB has in their 2022 budget. Then offsetting some of that are like higher costs that we have for overtime and obviously the longevity payment that just went out. Like the net
effect of all of those for just salaries alone is a positive 2.3 to the budget.

For fringes we are projecting a positive 24.9. It's a little off on there. Sorry, 27.9. What's driving that is we have a lower pension. We're projecting a lower pension expense. We've included the pension repayment that was done in 2022. So those somewhat offset each other.

We're showing higher or more opportunity in health insurance for active and retiree. And offsetting that as well is in the budget there's a positive related to the collective bargaining agreements that are open that we are not projecting. That whole total net comes out to 27.9.

MS. PHILLIPS: Social services. We see an opportunity there. That's one of our positive variances on our forecast. And it really comes down to $\$ 6$ million that we are going to receive probably above and beyond what the state and federal government gives us for early childhood preschool. It doesn't mean they're actually the expenses for early
childhood preschool is actually going up. It's a negative to the budget. But we're showing the reimbursement walls will go up with that.

Medicaid, 21.6 million. Debt service. Basically savings due to the delay in the issuance of new bonds in 2022. Then the other which is the opioid litigation settlement.

On the risk factors, the negative 88.6 million. Let me say, rest assured, because we look at the budget on a GAAP basis, on an actual basis, we know, you know that you are going to use the reserves that you so smartly put aside for property tax refunds. But we don't reflect that in the actual GAAP budgeting basis. So, it is, until you do it, until it's paid, once it's paid we'll reflect it but until that point. So, I don't want to minimize that negative 88.6 million but $I$ am confident that that $\$ 88.6$ million, as long as you use the reserves to pay for that tax refund, we're in good shape.

Let's go to departmental revenues
and I'm going to take you to Exhibit-B. Departmental revenues really have to do with the GIS tax map verification. Your mortgage and deed recordings. We actually just got a report from the clerk's office. We have July numbers now. They were once again down 22 percent for the total number of transactions. That's not in dollar amounts.

Why is it? Because mortgage rates
are higher. I will say the Wall Street Journal reported today that mortgage rates are the lowest they've been since April and they drop below five percent. So, that's a positive news for us when it comes to mortgage and deed recording fees.

The supply, housing supply is way down here in Nassau County and needless to say, the cost of homes have skyrocketed.

So, the good news is when you did your 2022 budget if you look at actuals on mortgage deeds and recording fees for 2021 they actually came in at $\$ 60.6$ million. You dropped it. You were more conservative in budget assumptions of 48.9 , which is a 12
percent drop. It's a pretty significant drop. We still, based on what's happening, think there is some risk and we're risking it $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{million}$.

Bus fares, the fare box fees, are down. People didn't take the bus as much. The revenue from income and expense line there was $\$ 5$ million for that in the budget. We just eliminated it because there's a lawsuit pending to see if you can charge those fees or not.

Examination fees. This is something near and dear to my heart. There are no civil service tests. Let me repeat that. We cannot hire employees because one, there are no tests for certain grades, certain positions.

Two, the tests that were the results aren't coming back even though we just got one this week. Thank you civil service.

And three, some of the grade levels, the starting salaries are way too low. So, examination fees and we're risking that at $\$ 2.8$ million.

Ambulance fees are down. Other
fees just scattered throughout the
department -- correct Lisa? -- are down. So we are forecasting that we could see interdepartmental revenue a net negative to the budget, less revenues of $\$ 32.8$ million.

Fines and forfeitures are the next risk. So, I'm just going to take you right to Exhibit-C. Boot and tow fees. I guess we need an executive order to lift that. Could start in September.

School bus stop camera fees. That has not been implemented. That's something that I know I personally worked on when I was up in the New York State Senate.

Public safety fees we think could be a little downward. Red light camera administrative fees down a little bit based on what we've seen in two thousand --

Then other fines and forfeitures. I know there's an acronym, TPVA, Traffic and Parking Violations. Thank you. It's really based on trends there.

So, those are really the drivers of
where we get to our forecast. I'm going to repeat. We believe Nassau County will end 2022 in a surplus based on GAAP reporting of $\$ 38.2$ million. Please, questions.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: That's great. Thank you so much all of you for that comprehensive presentation. I think it was very informative, and I'm sure my colleagues up here join me in thanking you for that.

I do have some questions, and I want to start with asking about the $\$ 38.2$ million surplus in the context of the computation that is made to determine whether we are in a control period by NIFA.

So, does NIFA calculate -actually, let me ask it a different way. Does a possible surplus get calculated for the purposes of a control period the same way that you just calculated the surplus in 2022?

MS. PHILLIPS: The answer is no.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What is the
formula that's used to determine whether there's a deficit or a surplus for 2022 for control period purposes?

MS. HILL: We started off talking about the three primary funds and the fact that we have a general fund definition for GAAP that's based on the GASBY 54 statement that was executed -- which was required as of 2011. At that time when NIFA formatted and agreed upon their calculation they were still using the old version of the general fund, which is less comprehensive than the one that's in the three primary funds that we use. That GAAP uses.

As a result, many more funds are involved in this calculation. Which you get a $\$ 32.8$ million surplus. But if you go to what they call the five major funds, our surplus would be $\$ 160$ million. Therefore -- this is on page 34 of the longer report -- therefore, when you do the calculation, adding in or subtracting adjustments, it comes down to \$178 million surplus. Which is well over the one percent that would put you into a control period.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Just so I make sure I understand what you're saying. If
you use the formula to be used to determine whether Nassau should be in a control period we would actually have a surplus approximately five and a half times the size of the surplus that your more accurate projection states; is that correct?

MS. PHILLIPS: More
comprehensive.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: More
comprehensive calculation. Going backwards from 2022 to 2021 but using the formula that's used for NIFA control period purposes would there have been a surplus in 2021?

MS. HILL: Yes. I've looked at this over time. It's generally been that where there's a surplus under their calculation there was a surplus under the three primary funds. It's a matter of degree. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What would the surplus have been under that computation in 2021?

MS. HILL: 27.2 million.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: How about
2020?

MS. PHILLIPS: I have the numbers right here. 90.6 million. And in 2019 it was $\$ 76.8$ million.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So under that control period computation it would be four straight years of a surplus?

MS. PHILLIPS: Correct. If our forecast is correct in 2022, yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: We're
talking about the formula that's used I assume by NIFA to determine whether a control period is statutorily permitted, right?

MS. PHILLIPS: Right.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I guess my question is, why does NIFA still have a control period on Nassau County?

MS. PHILLIPS: Let me make a comment here. And if you go to the act for which is that big, thick published report, we have a section -- if $I$ hadn't scribbled over it I could tell you what page it was -- page eight. I can send it to you. Don't worry. You don't have it in front of you.

So, NIFA may declare a control
period upon making one of five statutory findings. I'm not going to read all five of them but they're right there on the page. Probably the three, because two -- the three are ones you just asked us, Legislator Ferretti, for each of the fiscal years 2019, 2020 and 2021 the county did not incur a deficit. Therefore, satisfied the requirements under event two. Event one is if we don't pay our principal and interest payments. That obviously has not occurred.

The second bullet point says the county satisfied event number five. According to NIFA's resolution dated December 7, 2021, which approved the final multiyear plan for fiscal years 2022 through 2025, that included the 2022 budget. So NIFA approved the multiyear plan. Let me repeat that. NIFA approved the plan.

One can always guess what might
happen because what might happen in our homes, in our own budgets, what might happen in Nassau County, what might happen in

Westchester County or what might happen in Albany County are unknowns. But they set the goalpost there. In my opinion they're now moving the goalpost. At some point it will be up to you, it will be up to the county administration to make sure that we continue to have fiscally sound budgets.

But you're elected. I'm elected. The county executive is elected. We represent the people of Nassau County. NIFA is not elected. So, to move those goalposts and to say what ifs in the future of Nassau County I can only ask that they are applying those same variables to every county in New York State not just Nassau County. There will be continued oversight by NIFA because we have debt outstanding until 2035. I am talking about the difference between not oversight but between control.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you. It sounds like NIFA, if I'm reading you right, is making the case that the control period must continue because of future years; is that correct?

MS. PHILLIPS: It's what I've read.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Are they basing that on their projections?

MS. PHILLIPS: You'll have to ask them sir.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I take your point, I agree with it, we're an elected body, you're an elected official. And I would just note that NIFA made some projections about the 2022 and 2021 sales tax. So did we. And I would challenge NIFA as to who was more accurate on their projections, the elected officials or the appointed NIFA body when it came to sales tax. So, I agree with you.

It seems like if they're going with the idea that well, in the future we could have a problem. Maybe at that point, if that happens, okay, they might need a control period. But certainly today it doesn't seem that we do. Would you agree with that?

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes. I would absolutely agree with that.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Speaking of

NIFA, maybe you have some information about this because we can't get it, they have denied us this, do you have any idea as to the work performed by their law firm Dellaverson? MS. PHILLIPS: No. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: My understanding is that they get $\$ 25,000$ a month fee. They have not provided you any type of documentation supporting the work being done by that law firm?

MS. PHILLIPS: No.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: We were talking about sales tax and $I$ think it's a very detailed report the projections of the remaining four or five months of the year in terms of sales tax. Obviously gas prices have increased dramatically and I'm sure that that has had an impact on people spending.

I want to talk about home heating oil because the vast majority of residents that own homes in Nassau County heat their homes with home heating oil. Most people probably, I would think, at least I was, under contract from last year through the winter
portion of 2022 and so you're still paying the 2021 price through the middle of 2022.

I don't think there's a lot of Nassau residents that realize when that first fill up comes in October, number one, the home heating prices are not following the gas prices. Gas seems to have decreased approximately 80 cents to a dollar. Home heating fuel has not. So, if this doesn't decline drastically over the next month or two there's going to be a heck of a lot of Nassau residents that get a 275 gallon fill up at $\$ 5$ a gallon not expecting that.

Was that considered at all in projections? And can you kind of just maybe tell us how you think that might impact sales tax at all?

MS. PHILLIPS: I don't know if we went into that specific. Is was more, I mean, gas tax, the relief that you passed to give the residents of Nassau County obviously was factored in. The home heating oil, just FYI, oil is down significantly again today. It's under $\$ 90$ a barrel. That's good news. Will
the companies that provide home heating oil reflect that? I don't know.

You know, the fact is energy is probably one of the largest geopolitical risks that the United States has right now. And we can only hope that our elected officials do the right thing when it comes to balance for energy needs.

I keep quoting the Wall Street
Journal. Tells you what I read every day. But there was a wonderful, on the weekend, an article in the Wall Street Journal that talked about inflation and talked about gas prices and it went into like the taco truck and the impact of that and another -- various examples. Like real life examples. Farmers. They used a farm example. It was a great article because decisions that are made and, look, you know, could we have prevented Russia from invading the Ukraine? Probably not. Could we have prevented COVID? Who knows?

But the fact is the trickle down effect like you're referencing is tremendous because it's not just, if you own a taco
truck, it's not just the cost of beef but it's taking those tractors out to drop off the bales of hay for the steer that you're going to slaughter to bop, bop, bop, bop, bop and it keeps going down.

So, to answer your question, specifically did we take that into account the answer is no because we did more of a scenario analysis what if versus getting into that much detail. But the answer is you're correct. And the home heating oil companies may have bought futures a while ago which is why they're not lowering that.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Good
point. And it's just something I remind people when I speak to them because there's things you can do about the gas prices. You can get an electric car. You can get a hybrid. You can drive less. You got to heat your house.

MS. PHILLIPS: Got to heat your
schools. Got to heat our buildings.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you for that answer. I have a question about I
saw in your report that there is a reduction in federal aid for the State Criminal Alien Assistance program. So question one is, maybe this isn't a question for you but if you do know, can you describe what that program is?

MS. TSIKOURAS: So, the SCAAP program is something that the county has been participating in for many years. There's a formula, there is an amount that is appropriated at the federal level every year that is shared among multiple, like nationwide, like the municipalities who house illegal aliens in their jails. And the formula is based on, $I$ don't know the exact details at this point, but they take actual costs for like correctional center officer salaries and there's like a prorated amount and then we get a piece.

We don't know how much we're going to get because there's a pie and everybody has to share in that pie but it's allocated.

So over the last few years we've noticed that they've only been reporting about half a million dollars and it's budgeted at a
million and a half. So we took it down as a potential risk.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Do we know why we're getting less money? Do we know for sure.

MS. TSIKOURAS: We don't know for sure.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Is it
possible it's due to the reduction in population in our correctional facility?

MS. TSIKOURAS: It could be. It could also very well be that's there's not as much money appropriated at the federal level to share. So, again, we get only an allocation of that. We're not guaranteed anything out of that.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I think it's something for budgeting purposes going forward we should probably kind of look into because something tells me it's not a coincident that since we've a decrease in population in our correctional facility due to some of the laws coming from Albany that we're getting less funding. It seems to line up
with when that went into effect. So it's possible that it was maybe a reduction in overall federal funding like you had said or maybe it's based on population at the correctional facility. Just something to look into.

MS. TSIKOURAS: There's typically
a lag in when we submit the reimbursement request and then when we get the funding. I know that we haven't received anything in at least a year or two. I thought I had that information with me but $I$ don't think $I$ do. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: My last
line of questioning before I hand it off. Maybe this is something you might ask Andy when he comes up. That's okay. MS. PHILLIPS: Andy is the expert. Andy the expert. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I want to understand the diversion for AIM funding. Is that something that $I$ can ask you ladies about?
MS. PHILLIPS: Diversion for AIM
funding.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Yes? So, my understanding is that two years ago the state reduced the funding they provide to local municipalities and began diverting a portion of the county sales tax to a state fund which they would then turn to the local municipalities to make up the gap in the reduction that they were funding to the local municipalities. Is that fair? Is that what happened?

MS. TSIKOURAS: Yes. AIM, for
the last two years, had been taken out of, withheld from our sales tax collections. Since the county does not pay that AIM directly it was never a gross revenue to the county. We did not report it as revenue correctly because we didn't have an expenditure to offset that. So if we received $\$ 100$ from the state and AIM was $\$ 2$ we reported \$8 in revenue.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So we never even put that into our formula here?

MS. TSIKOURAS: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So this

```
began two years ago, right?
    MS. TSIKOURAS: Yes.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Before that
    they didn't do this?
        MS. TSIKOURAS: Correct.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: For the two
    years that this has occur how much money was
    diverted from the county sales tax that we
    could have computed in this calculation to the
state?
    MS. TSIKOURAS: It's
approximately $11 million a year.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So $22
million over those two years?
    MS. TSIKOURAS: Correct.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: That would
    have been an additional $22 million in surplus
    had that not been diverted assuming we didn't
    spend it, right?
        MS. TSIKOURAS: Yes.
    LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Similarly,
    distressed hospital fund, that's another one,
    right? Same concept? They divert money from
    our sales tax?
```

MS. TSIKOURAS: For a fund for
distressed hospitals and nursing homes throughout the state.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Public
hospitals or any hospital?
MS. TSIKOURAS: Public I
believe. Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When did
that begin?
MS. TSIKOURAS: That was a
two-year program that ended last year.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What about
2022?
MS. TSIKOURAS: No.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So 2020, 2021?

MS. TSIKOURAS: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: How much
money was diverted in '20 and '21?
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: There was
about seven and a half million dollars.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Per year or

```
total?
```

MS. TSIKOURAS: Per year.
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LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So 15
million?
MS. TSIKOURAS: Yeah. The timing is a little off because of how they take the money out. So it wasn't exactly seven and a half each year. For example, we had a residual -- no, we had the residual AIM this year. 2020 had less because the program started later. So 2020 had a little bit more. But, in effect, it was an average of seven and a million dollars a year.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Taken from
the sales tax for Nassau County and diverted into a fund for public hospitals in distress?

MS. TSIKOURAS: Correct.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Where is
that money, do we know?
MS. TSIKOURAS: It's in a state
fund.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Do you know
if any was released to NUMC?
MS. TSIKOURAS: I don't know. I
have no idea.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Maybe I'll
ask Mr. Persich in a little while. But we have no idea how that money has been accounted for we just know it's in a state fund somewhere?

MS. PHILLIPS: That's correct. Can I do a public service announcement here for a second, please? Sorry. In Politico Today there's an article that Governor Hochul is using money for up to $\$ 3,000$-- have you all seen it? -- for health care workers. And good for her.

Let me highlight too at the very bottom of the article that $I$ read there is also an additional \$2.4 billion, assuming this reporter is correct, to upgrade antiquated health care infrastructure and lab capacity and an additional \$4 billion in aid to hospitals struggling as a result of the pandemic. Many hospitals took a huge financial hit during the pandemic when they cancelled elective surgeries and other services.

So if $I$ could ask you as really our voice to the public, residents of Nassau

County, and if there are any Nassau County residents listening out there, if you could all reach out to your state elected officials and implore upon them to get some of this money for Nassau Health Care Corporation. We deserve care in Nassau County.

And as you pointed out Legislator Ferretti, all this other money that we've been shipping up there if it hasn't been given to the Nassau Health Care Corporation let's get it back here. Sorry, I had to do a public service announcement.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you. I agree. If NUMC is not in need I don't know who is.

Presiding Officer, you have some questions? And thank you.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I wanted to first thank you for the presentation. I found it very enlightening. In particular, I wanted to thank you and congratulate you on providing us with this chart on sales tax actuals.

Obviously we all look at what is
coming in and what the checks are and when we saw the dip we're all concerned about what that means for the future of the county. So, I thank you for putting that in perspective. It's good to know that that dip could be just something that occurs each year as you said cyclical around Mother's Day.

MS. PHILLIPS: Right after
Mother's Day.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I see that right after Father's Day it reaches it's bottom. I'm a little concerned about that.

So, we consistently over the years have been advocating for NIFA to step back. We did it with Republicans and Democratic administrations and much of the things that we approved with the past administration was with an eye towards getting to that point. I, along with all of us, are having difficulty understanding NIFA's refusal to leave the control period with this history of surpluses in last three years and with the projections that you are making and the projections that our budget office has made of anticipated
surplus this year.
Could you help me understand a little bit more about the deficit of one percent as a trigger for ending or going into a control period? What time period are we talking about? Is that determined in the current year? Is it determined based on past years or prospectively?

MS. HILL: I was going to read it exactly. That calculation is done every year with the ACFR. So it's done based on the fiscal year and based on the accounting according to GAAP and GASBY.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: That's the prior year?

MS. HILL: So it's the prior year.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: 2021 in which the county had a $\$ 479$ million surplus?

MS. PHILLIPS: Right.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: In NIFA's report they cite a number of concerns that they have. County's long-term liabilities for tax cert refunds. Which actually we're in the
best shape we've been in for years. Noncert litigation, worker's comp claims and continued risk stemming from deteriorating finances of the hospital. I would assume that would be debt related. But here's my point -- go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Can I make a comment on the hospital? We do have it in the midyear report. We can find out what page.

So, the county's liability to the hospital is over the next five years through 2029. And in no case is it more than a $\$ 23$ million debt payment. So, if you want to, in the midyear report on page 7 we clarify that because we've heard that comment made by NIFA. So we highlighted it to make sure that the residents of Nassau County really understand the facts. And the fact is, is that NHCC is a New York State Public Benefit Corporation, it's continuing financial problems, which we all know present an ongoing concern for the rating agencies, they do.

However, the county guaranteed debt of the hospital is limited, manageable and the
financial liability of $\$ 132$ million -- so my number was correct -- as of December 31, 2021 has scheduled payment of no more than $\$ 23$ million in any year through 2029. I say this respectfully of $\$ 23$ million. That's a lot of money. But on a $\$ 3.6$ billion budget if that is the reason we're staying in control $I$ don't understand.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you
for that. Thank you for clarifying that. I think that makes the point $I$ was going to make which is that they are remaining in control because of concerns in the out years. Those concerns have existed with every budget we've ever adopted. They will always exist. If that is the standard the control period will never end. So, if we've gotten to the period where NIFA is perpetuating itself permanently then they have in fact usurped the roles of elected officials and I think that is improper. That's all I have. Thank you. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Deputy

Presiding Officer Kopel. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you

Chairman. First, I'd like to, comptroller, congratulate you and your team on an extraordinary presentation. It's one of the best I've heard in a long time.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you very
much. Lot of hard work.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: We appreciate that because you've shown a lot of in-depth knowledge of subjects that are being questioned which are not even necessarily expected to come up at this kind of hearing. So I thank you for that.

MS. PHILLIPS: It's the acronyms that we're still trying to get a handle on. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Just a couple of things. Not to rain on the parade, the good news parade, but just talking about the sales tax. You're showing a nine percent give or take increase year to date, right? MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Which is kind of equivalent to where the inflation rate is. Wouldn't that indicate essentially a flat degree of spending?

MS. PHILLIPS: I'm smiling
because a lot of reports I've been reading recently they talk about how wages have been going up pretty significantly but because of the cost of inflation the fact is we're all being paid less. But the bottom line is the actual sales tax revenue are the sales tax revenue. The numbers are the numbers are the numbers that are coming in. After inflation, net out inflation, it's still whatever, \$678 million.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The numbers are numbers versus the budgeted numbers. There's no questions that there's an increase but I'm afraid that it might simply indicate a flat degree of spending versus in terms of the goods and services that are being purchased. MS. PHILLIPS: If we have flat we'll be okay.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I understand that. And you're projecting even if we go down a bit we'll still be okay. Which does worry me a little bit as well about the future, about a bit of a risk and that would
be because of perhaps timing. And here's what I mean by that.

We all hope I'm sure that inflation does abate. Comes down a bit. Now, our expenses here in the county, I would think you would agree, tend to lag the inflation rate. In other words, our contracts -- we have forward contracts. We'll sit here once a month and approve contracts. We'll do a lot of that. Actually more than once a month. So, those contracts tend to be for a year, for several years and so forth. Those contracts are going to be going up as hopefully inflation is coming down. That does to my mind indicate a red flag or at least a yellow flag indicating caution for the future. Would you agree with that? MS. PHILLIPS: Yes. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Just one more item which is, I'd love to hear your opinion on it as well, and that would be with respect to the federal aid. The extraordinary amount of federal aid that we have due to the COVID situation. So, we're talking about, give or
take, over a two-year period about \$400 million. Just short of that. MS. PHILLIPS: Correct. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Not that long ago we, this body, approved something of a giveaway, which actually didn't give away quite as much as anticipated, right? It was relatively smaller amount?

MS. PHILLIPS: Correct. The HAP program you are referencing.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Would you agree that the remaining revenue from the first year as well as the entirety of the second year's installment represents a very significant one-time opportunity? If we use that money for permitted purposes instead of borrowed money or budgeted money for those same permitted purposes wouldn't that be very prudent to do it that way so that we ensure ourselves for the future when the federal aid stops and for various reasons?

```
    MS. PHILLIPS: If you're asking
```

    my opinion sir the answer is yes. You have a
    tremendous, each and every one of you, have a
    tremendous opportunity to do good for the residents of Nassau County. I don't know if you read or saw that New York State depleted it's unemployment fund, which was $\$ 9.1$ billion, is now going to start charging businesses across New York State $\$ 27.66$ per employee to recoup those costs at a time when our small businesses lost employees.

So, I guess I'm doing a PSA for
small businesses right now, but there's
tremendous opportunity that you have to put this money to work.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Right. Put this money to good long-term use and perhaps save expenses in the future rather than dissipate it on short term.

MS. PHILLIPS: As long as it's
not expended on expenditures that get embedded.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Right. Thank
you. That's all I got Mr. Chairman.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you
deputy Presiding Officer. Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton.

## LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. You know, continuing with what Howard was speaking of, there is a tremendous amount of money there. I've been trying to figure out how this money gets allocated. Believe it or not, the legislature doesn't have a lot of power with this. We do vote to accept the funding but the prior administration agreed to do a survey, which Hofstra did, and the results were that the Nassau County residents wanted help for our small businesses as well as help for low income families. And that was the results of the survey and that's how we went about deciding how to do that.

The truth of the matter is most of the decision making would rely upon the administration without the legislature's approval. The prior administration agreed to have the legislature vote for it but there's not much we can do after the funding is accepted. It could just be arbitrarily decided just as though the HAP program was stopped without anything in its place to
start.

And the reason that $I$ still would like to see HAP -- and Howard and I may not agree on this -- it took a long time for us to figure out how to give money to low income families during that time. So by the time it really was in place we had this election. We didn't really get a chance to promote it as well.

But we we're going to submit -- I was hoping it was going to be bipartisan and I welcome it to be bipartisan -- but a piece of legislation that would say that money that will be allocated should come to the legislature so we can vote on it.

I think all of us, with all of our constituents, we worked very well together last time. Legislator McKevitt and I were on the committee. It was really interesting and we put a lot of time into it. I think what Howard is saying is true. I do know there are a lot of restrictions. I know we can't use it for salaries. CARES Act money. Salaries.

Okay. If there's an opportunity
for us to use it for salaries these are the things I would like to see. I know that the only capital improvements that we're allowed were for water because somehow the federal government said that that was okay because probably has to do with disease. We were able to do that with a few projects. I would love to see something like that.

I'm going to be submitting that piece of legislation. I would love to have you and anyone else who wants to be part of it. It would basically just say we want to work together to make sure the funding is used appropriately and in the best way. We also only have until 2026 to spend it all and it not so easy. Like, as we saw, HAP we thought we'd spend $\$ 100$ million. We didn't.

There's also Boost Nassau, which helped our restaurants, is depleted. I don't know how much but I hear there's not much left. That's what some people have been told in my office even. Maybe we need to have money switched to there immediately to help the restaurants that are still struggling.

Plus they have all these other expenses now. It's such a whirlwind.

But anyway, $I$ do have a piece of legislation. I believe I have some cosponsors on my side. I would like to get as many as we can. This is not partisan whatsoever. It's just we want to represent all of our constituents and this is a one-time opportunity.

So, I also am concerned about the money that's sitting in the opioid settlement. I haven't heard any plans for that. But $I$ think that would also be something that we should possibly have a hearing for up here. Again, how much power we have is probably not really there but for the best interests of our residents the more we're involved I think the better.

That money, to me, every day it
sits in the bank accounts it's not going out to help people that really need our help at this time. Opioid deaths are up. This Fentanyl problem is just a disaster. The money has to be spent correctly but has to go
out quickly.
We have groups that are -- I was at the national night out and approached by two different groups that really need the money and it's sitting in our bank account. I feel like it's almost, you know, we're going to have responsibility on our hands if we don't extend it as quickly as possible.

MS. PHILLIPS: I apologize for interrupting. A lot of that money is at the village level also. That they have funds that they have not appropriated yet. So.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But we do have $\$ 50$ million plus. Which $I$ would really -- again, even a million dollars goes so far for some of these programs. \$50 million for us -- well, right.

MS. PHILLIPS: I'm just asking to make sure that $I$ can say this publicly. But just so you know, it's the one piece of information that we know at the comptroller's department is the ARPA awards for the not-for-profits. These were not-for-profits that already -- I'm looking at Beaumont back
there -- already had contracts with Nassau County. Those award letters are about to go out.

And the reason we know that, and I don't know want to steal Anissa Moore's thunder here by any means -- is because we're putting procedures in place to make sure that there are checks and balances on how that money either has already been used. Because in many not-for-profits the money has already been spent and it will just be a reimbursement but we make sure we get receipts for lack of a better word. Or that if it hasn't all been spent there's a procedure for them to ask for the money from us. I think that's a little over 16.7 million.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
million out of the 54, 59, has been
allocated. That's a start. Again --
MS. PHILLIPS: And a great cost
to our not-for-profit organizations that really do serve our communities in need. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I agree with you 100 percent. But again,
there's lot more there that we need to do. We're in a crisis mode in my opinion with the opioid situation.

I also read and I don't remember where, $I$ can't quote it right now, but that New York City it's found a way to reimburse students in graduate programs for opioid, you know, social work or clinical psychology type thing through this funding. So I don't know if there's a way to look into that. See if there's some kind of a tuition reimbursement because we need more social workers. There's such a need for them right now more than ever.

So, again, $I$ am going to submit this piece of legislation with whoever wants to join in would be more than welcome. I would also like to include something with the villages as well or any other municipalities just so that, again, this funding is once in -- I said it was a once in a lifetime when we had FEMA funding after Sandy but this is similar. It's something that we have to use correctly.

Again, I've been reading lately about the Jeffersonian type of attitude and it's not trusting government in the sense that we want checks and balances as many times as possible. As many eyes as possible. I really truly can tell you $I$ believe in that. I believe the more people that look at things and the more ideas the better we serve our constituents. So, that was my statement on that.

I also agree with my colleagues that we would love to see NIFA go, and I do see the projections that NIFA gives us for the next three years are pretty grim.

MS. PHILLIPS: I haven't seen the report yet. If it came out this morning I was a little busy prepping for this.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
morning. Did it? So, for '23 they have a deficit of $\$ 42.3$ million. For '24 we have a deficit of $\$ 93.4$ million. For '25 we have a deficit of $\$ 118$ million projected obviously. Everything is projected.

That's the problem with sales tax.

We lived through the Sandy years. It's very hard to project. So those are pretty grim.

So you haven't had -- I'm not going to ask you because you haven't had a chance to review them, but at some point I would love to hear what you think of those projections and if you think it's, you know --

MS. PHILLIPS: It's really going
to be up to you to come up with multiyear
plan, correct? You do that on an annual
basis. So you'll just move it out what you produced and NIFA approved was for '22, '23, and '24 I believe. I don't know have it in front of me. So, I'm speculating, but my guess is you will do one for '23, '24 and '25 and you are the elected representatives of Nassau County.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We were very conservative and actually the Laura Curran administration was very conservative in a lot of ways. There were people that was saying don't worry, sales tax will be great. You have nothing to worry about. But I watched Gary Kantor quite often and he was
very concerned. That was like a good education for me. We really were careful and I want to continue to be careful.

I would like to know where they got these numbers. I'm going to do my own research. Unless like what you just mentioned with the sales tax, it sort of surprises me that their numbers are as grim. I can tell you something about sales taxes, if the Whitton family is any example my youngest is going to college and we just boosted sales tax. Where are you going? Like a desert? She has enough hair product for like the next five years.

So, I just had a couple of other quick questions. As far as inflation, and obviously no one knows what's going to happen, are you concerned about like the county itself with their expenses? Like I saw you had a couple of questions. But like we said, even for our fuel costs this winter is there any debt that we have to worry about as far as that's not locked in? Like do we have any variable or is that all locked in?

MS. HILL: It was all locked in after 2021. The county as an organization is not allowed to have variable debt but NIFA and NUMC or NHCC was allowed and they unwound those variable rates.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So our debt service shouldn't change that much with the interest rates going up. That was a good move.

I guess also $I$ hear that a lot of our savings are coming from not hiring and whether or not that's because we can't get the test. Which I totally have heard before. That's a real problem. But there are some vacancies $I$ understand that can be filled now, and I hope that we do that as soon as possible because I know certain DSS and other, DPW, a lot of our departments are suffering right now. There's always that circular thing. It ends up costing us more money in the long run I believe. If there's any way we can check with that.

One other quick question. When we do the American Rescue Plan $I$ know we're now
including the veterans, much more veteran groups, even the ones that aren't brick and mortar and I know that we put like $\$ 2$ million in. But I would love to see even more of that and more public advertising for that as well. That was pretty much it. But I want to just make one more statement Elaine and that is that I really, number one, appreciate your presentation today. More than that, how responsive you personally have been and your office. It's such a refreshing thing to see. In my opinion, it's a common sense attitude to have because you represent all of Nassau County not just certain districts. As a legislator who happens to be in the minority right now, I can't thank you enough for your professionalism and for your, you know, just your consideration for all of your residents not just those that are in certain districts. Thank you.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you for
saying that.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you
Delia. I'm going to just pass it off to Arnie
but before I do I just want to say a few words.

In terms of the federal money that we receive due to COVID, my understanding is that we do vote on any money allocated for a specific purpose. For example, HAP. We voted for HAP. We voted for the money to the VFWs. It's not that the administration just has carte blanche to do whatever they want with it. We put our stamp of approval on that. I do think that there is a little bit of confusion there.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can
I just mention like just with HAP. We voted to put that money in there and it was just stopped without our consideration. Look, maybe we would have voted to do that anyway. But we don't, from what I understand, we have the right to accept the funding but not so much as to where it's spent. You can do the research yourself. Don't take my word for it.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: But we did vote for HAP. If it was not all spent perhaps you would have to vote to reallocate that
money somewhere else but it cannot be spent without our approval.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I don't believe that that -- I think it was the Laura Curran administration that agreed to that. Unless you can find it somewhere I don't know where that says that. But you can look at it.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: As far as I know, there hasn't been a dollar spent under either the previous administration or this current administration without our approval. Including the money for the VFWs.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Nothing has been -- nothing. However, going forward, unless you can find something that $I$ can't find, there's nothing that says that we have to vote on -- actually there was -- it's just common practice and if it continues without us having to have this piece of legislation great. But the fact that that program was stopped without, number one, us even knowing where the money is going at this point. That money can be reallocated without
our control.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: My understanding is that program was modified by federal guidelines. You indicated before it was for low income. It originally was not. What we voted on was for that payment to be made to any household that can get STAR, which is under $\$ 500,000$. I wouldn't classify that as low income.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But there was an income settlement.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: It was
changed. My understanding is it was changed to households $I$ want to say under $\$ 75,000$. Quite frankly, if that was the rule from the beginning the vote might not have gone the way it did. So, I don't necessarily -- maybe that was part of the -- I don't want to speak for the administration -- but the bottom line is what we voted on did change. It was suspended after it changed.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: The only thing I'm saying, I mean, you can look at it yourself, I'm not claiming to be an expert
on this. But from what I'm understanding, we vote to accept the funding and the HAP money, we appropriated the money but we don't -LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Well, there's a difference there. Accepting it and appropriating.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Accepting and then appropriating to the line but not necessarily to these programs. So, I want to be as careful as we can be with this money. If you want to look at my legislation, if you have any adjustments $I$ welcome it. I would love to have the peace of mind knowing that the 19 of us have a say as to how this is being spent. Right now, from what I can see, there's nothing solid in any piece of legislation that reassures us of that. I think it would benefit everyone.

Again, it goes back to checks and balances. I don't care who would be county executive. We want it to be checks and balances. Again, just take a look at it. Do some research. I'm open. I would give it to you if you want it. I just want the piece to
go through.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Second
point. My last point then you're up Arnie I promise. Because I think it's important in the context of this hearing today. I don't want to seem like I'm being critical of the prior administration in this because there is a point that relates to today.

The idea that there was a, quote unquote, conservative projection from the prior administration as to sales tax I don't agree with that. I don't believe it's a conservative projection when the projection causes an increase in borrowing, deferment of repayment of that borrowing two years because of that lower than realistic projection. So I would not characterize it as a conservative projection.

And why that's important for today is because I think it highlights the necessity for the projections from the comptroller's office and from the budget office to be accurate. That's how we base our decisions up here on what we're voting on. And what we saw
under the last year of the last administration was not a conservative treatment it was a -conservative projection it was a negligent projection. And we had to base our votes on that.

So, I think it highlights the point and why we're so appreciative of the work you put into this because we need these projections to be accurate and I think and I hope that they are. Thank you.

Legislator Drucker.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you
Chairman Ferretti. I was waiting for the introduction.

I'd like to echo my colleagues sentiments. Comptroller Phillips, I think you did a fantastic job. Kudos to you and your team. I'm a lawyer and I always have the utmost respect and admiration for people who can crunch numbers and take out their crystal balls and project what the future is going to be. My eyes glaze over when it comes to that. So I appreciate your presentation that you did.

I think all of us would agree that really we're living in unprecedented times from a financial standpoint. We've never seen -- I don't know if we'll ever see again with regard to the federal aid and the state aid that we have received as a result of COVID and the tremendous uptick in sales tax as a result of being shutdown for a period of time.

So, I have concerns because now we're seeing the federal reserve bank having raised interest rates twice now totaling 150 basis points in an effort to slow our economy down, reduce spending. Which is going to have an increase in unemployment. And they project that there will be less spending and therefore less sales tax.

I appreciate in your presentation that you did factor in or take into account the possibility of having a lower sales tax revenue. But what are your projections -- I didn't see them -- what are your projections for the major funds? Because $I$ know that there was a divergence between what OMB projected, what OLBR projected, what NIFA's
projected. I would like to hear what your projections are for the major funds. MS. PHILLIPS: If you're referencing the major funds the way NIFA looks at the world, which is the major funds, our forecast would say that we will end the year with $\$ 160$ million surplus on a budgetary basis. On a GAAP basis it works out to $\$ 178.3$ million surplus.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Can you explain why that's such a difference?

MS. TSIKOURAS: So, in the three primary operating funds the way we have the report towards the front, we're looking at a lot of these reserve funds as well. They're included as part of the general fund. So the $\$ 362$ million that was allocated to the litigation fund, for tax certiorari, for other litigation, for longevity, all of those expenditures and those projected expenditures are also included.

So, some of the big swings would be we're projecting that out of the litigation fund, out of that tax certiorari reserve,
we're likely to spend about $\$ 100$ million. That's included in the three primary. Whereas, it won't be included in the budgetary. In the five majors as we say. There are some other small swings between like sewer. If sewer gets a transfer in from the Sewer Finance Authority that's another $\$ 144$ million. So, we do look at both because we have to look at the five major funds for the NIFA calculation as well. MS. PHILLIPS: Once again, Legislator Drucker, the three operating funds is a more comprehensive look at the county versus the five major operating funds. I have an amazing cheat sheet that I'm going to share with you because it is confusing, right? You put this together for us. Betsy put it together. It will help you visually see what is in the three operating funds. What is in the five major funds. But NIFA has an another quirkiness to it. What is in what they call the primary governmental activities and then total government funds. When you see it visually you'll see this three operating funds
is more comprehensive.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I've
benefitted from cheat sheets my whole life. MS. PHILLIPS: I got one for you. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: In Exhibit-B and $C$ in your presentation $I$ have a question. I do a lot of real estate. The tax map verification fees and the mortgage and recording fees, which are ridiculous fees to be honest with you, I've been railing against them for years, but you project a variance of $\$ 8.7$ million and $\$ 3.5$ million. I was under the impression that the real estate market has been rather robust until a couple of months ago. At least in my experience. So, I don't really know why the first half of 2022 was such a decline. I would think that it was still rather robust until $I$ would say April, May.

MS. PHILLIPS: Give us one second
here. The assumption in Exhibit-B are in the larger report, the midyear report, on page 15. So allow us to get there.

MS. TSIKOURAS: What we did
primarily for the mortgage and deed recording fees is we got some input from the department about where they --

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Speak a
little louder please.
MS. TSIKOURAS: So, for the mortgage and deed recording fees what we did was we got input from the department about some of their projections and then we looked at the actual trend that's been happening. And the amount of the volume itself has been dropping and it's been dropping significantly. So we applied a percentage to that against last year's. We took whatever the percentage was and the drops from last year and applied it to the remainder of the year.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I don't
fault you. I think you're correct in forecasting a downward trend because I do anticipate the real estate market contracting even further for the next few months anyway until things stabilize. I do agree that you need to forecast downward. I was just curious
first five, six months of this year were at.
Also, all the fines and forfeitures same thing. Why are you forecasting downward on that? The school bus stop camera for one, that's a program I initiated and with the help of my colleagues here we approved and got that going. It's going nowhere. We budgeted \$2 million for it and we still have $\$ 2$ million in there. Any comment on that?

MS. PHILLIPS: Speak to the county administration sir. We know that no money to date has been. So we're conservatively forecasting that if the program doesn't get going soon that the $\$ 2$ million --

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I read that Suffolk County is doing great in their bus camera situation. They are.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I read somewhere that the towns were taking over that program.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: They have the option to it. Certain school districts are like laying back and waiting. That's the problem. They're not taking advantage of it
and that's a loss for the county. MS. PHILLIPS: But that is correct, Legislator Ferretti. The towns can opt in and take it. I believe the Town of Hempstead did.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The program we have isn't it an opt in program by the school districts?

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Yes, it is.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Is that the
same in the town program?
MS. PHILLIPS: I believe so.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: They're opting in with the town not the -MS. PHILLIPS: That's correct. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I guess Suffolk County doesn't have that.

I see large variance in overtime. Is that something -- how are you forecasting that in terms -- that's Exhibit-A I guess. You're forecasting a variance of 22 and a half million dollars in overtime. Can you explain that to me and should we be concerned about that?

MS. PHILLIPS: Give Lisa a second to get to the right page. But $I$ know as an example in our claims division, because there have been no tests or any tests that have come out, there's no results. We have claims -the HAP program is an example -- to process. I know in our department alone that we have authorized overtime in order to do the business of the people. But I'll let Lisa speak.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I think you also mentioned in your report about law enforcement, police and sheriffs and the like of overtime in those departments.

MS. TSIKOURAS: Yes. The main
driver of the overtime, well, it's split probably half an half between the two police funds, police district and police headquarters and correctional center. In the main, in the large report on page 26 we have a table that breaks that out. I'm just looking for my -bear with me. Looking for my --

> MS. PHILLIPS: I will say we did factor, although we factored also in the two
classes, the police classes and the correction officers classes that are coming in still in 2022 also.

MS. TSIKOURAS: We're saying that we believe at this point, based on the trends, that the correctional center is going to be underfunded by about $\$ 11.7$ million and the same amount for the two police funds. That's basically based on trends. We do pick up the projected --

MS. PHILLIPS: That's overtime?
MS. TSIKOURAS: The overtime.
That is just the overtime. That's just overtime for those two. And that's mainly just because I think they budgeted for I believe they even budgeted like for an examination for police officers and that didn't happen. We also have like we're factoring in like the new classes as well. But that's the trend at this moment.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you.
I got a bunch of questions I guess I'll reserve for Andy. He looks likes he's falling asleep there. We'll get him up here in a
little while. Thank you very much Comptroller Phillips.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you
Legislator Drucker. Again, thank you. MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you for your time and your extensive work on this. We'll do it again in a year. MS. PHILLIPS: Actually, we'll do it this fall when you guys work on your budget, and I wish you the best on that because it's not easy right now. You know, Legislator Drucker, you mentioned it and Legislator Ferretti you definitely mentioned it that we are in unprecedented times right now. So, the most we can do to protect the people of Nassau County is not to over tax, not to take more money when we don't believe we need it but to keep Nassau County in the fiscal position, the solid fiscal condition that we're in. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: We are stewards of that money.

MS. PHILLIPS: We are all
stewards of that money and it's our money. So thank you for the great work and thank you for having us.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you. And we're going to have Mr. Persich and the budget team come up. We're just going to take a two-minute break for technological adjustments and then we'll get started.
(Committee recessed at 3:55 p.m.)
(Committee reconvened at 4:05 p.m.)
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI:
Mr. Persich, let's rock and roll.
MR. PERSICH: Good afternoon
everybody. Thank you for having me. I'd be remiss not to thank my staff who's sitting next to me. Chris Nolan, Irfan Qureshi and Irina Sedighi. They're the main core of my, I will say, the story we're about to tell the legislature which I think is a little different since I've taken this role. I have to thank the county executive for continuing my service here and continuing the plan that we have in place. I look forward to working with him and we've been working very hard on
strategically getting rid of some of what $I$ will say are what we've now termed as a different world in which we're living in. Reliability management side of the county. Which is something that we were always chasing revenue. Now we're figuring out how to pay down some of our outstanding obligations. Which is a little different for everybody whose been here. We're in a completely different story line than we were two years ago. So I'm going to go through the presentation.

I always say it's going to be brief
but we know sometimes that it will -- there may be some other questions that may come out of this.

Here's the major accomplishment that I will say which is, you know, would be with the help of $I$ will say the county executive did a road show with me when we went to see the rating agencies. But I would be remiss not to thank this body because how we got here is partnerships and coordinated efforts on how we did the financing. We got
two bond upgrades from Moody's and $S$ and $P$ which were monumental. I think it's been over ten years. Finch was a little remiss but they gave us a stable outlook.

We're heading in the right
trajectory and our behavior has to continue in the path in which we were on. We need to control spending. We need to watch our revenues and budget conservatively as we have been.

So, I will say the comptroller covered I think this pretty well, but we did finish, and I think it's historical if I may say, with the largest surplus in county history. We then took that money and put it into the right places where $I$ think it's going to best benefit us in the future for what may occur down the road. If we hit the recession, other things. We've taken care of some of the cert obligations. We've taken care of some of our litigation obligations. We've put some money into debt service reserves. We've put some money in retirement reserve contributions. And anything we finish with
this year I will say that pattern will continue so that if we do have some type of an event, COVID two God forbid, a Sandy two God forbid or something like that, and we see a downturn in sales tax we will be well positioned not to have to borrow for anything. To have our obligations met with our current resources that we have at our disposal.

Painfully got there as we all know but we're here now and now I think we have to be careful how we proceed. I caution that because, you know, when you see numbers like this you're all like, and I would be too, you know, but $I$ think we still need to be, you know, one thing $I$ do and this is what $I$ will say is, we do micromanage expenses down to make sure that we get the best value for every dollar we're sending out the door. Part of what we do is protect the taxpayers' interest on what we're spending money on.

That's what we do in OMB. You can hear my name. Probably has a lot of different adjectives before it. I'll be kind about that
and some of the department heads but that's okay because that means we're doing our job and I will scrutinize anything that I think doesn't fit what the needs are of the county the county evolves like a business and everything else into different directions. So, that's on the surplus.

As you can see, I just went over
this. This is our fourth straight year and I will go back. Let me just tell you. In 2018 we got hit with RECIVO if you remember correctly. Even though we show a deficit in there, we did move money into the litigation reserve which kind of skews that number. But it will be '18, '19, '20, '21 and '22, if things continue down the path, of years of surplus.

We did pay down the pension amortization which we don't owe the state. Have to keep paying that. It doesn't have a real big fiscal impact but there is savings. It's like amortizing a mortgage. You're stretching the payments over. But it is fiscally prudent that we're not paying the
state additional resources of five percent for the money because theoretically we're borrowing the money from them.

The other thing we did we took out the NIFA swaps and the NHCC swaps which kind of fixed out our debt which is a better way for us to operate.

Moving forward I think we covered this. So, the big drivers as you're aware was in 2021 I will say sales tax clearly. We've had many debates about it. We can still debate where that number lies. But that was the driving force. Plus on top of the $\$ 362$ million we got in we had organic savings I will say from better than anticipated revenues in certain areas. Although not so much on the revenue side but $I$ think on the expense side some of the drivers were some debt service savings, some fringe benefits savings, some salary savings.

So, I think we benefitted from just regular organic operations to the tune of $\$ 120$ million. Again, I said, what we did with the money we put it into all these different
litigation funds and bond indebtedness funds. This chart on page 6 where we're at if you don't mind, this is how we spent the money from the resources in 2021. $\$ 30$ million to retirement reserve. $\$ 20$ million to litigation. $\$ 20$ million to bond indebtedness. We put $\$ 208$ million for certs. I will get to that story later on. We were able to solve the longevity problem which was a huge liability to this county if we lost it in arbitration. And other litigation for other matters that may come up that we may have to be involved in old. There's some old Article 18 cases that are still existing out there which is similar to the Keyspan. We have Verizon and a couple sister ones out there that do have significant dollars associated with it. We will continue to manage and come up with structured settlements that are fair and equitable to both parties. But that's kind of a game plan of where we're at.

And that's one of the edicts that the county executive has given me is keeping
the liability side, controlling the glide slope as opposed to surprises or judgements. So I'm going to get to 2022 which is where we're at now.

The comptroller covered this pretty well. I think we're all pretty close. I read OLBR, Maurice's report. I read the comptroller's report. Some differences in what we think. We're thinking collective bargaining. Hopefully we can settle with all the unions. Whether that happens or not that's going to be a moving target.

Fringe benefits savings. We should
have some additional savings there. We do have some savings in Medicaid and other resources in DSS just as a result of the state funding.

Our biggest revenue driver, which is the source of a lot of $I$ would say contention is is that sales tax right now is on a glide slope that $I$ think even despite all the stuff that's going on out there it's going to be hard pressed for us to go negative at this point.

I think Comptroller Phillips did a great job and I have to thank her for the kinds words and working with her has been a pleasure for the few months that we've done it. But I do think that some of these question marks about where the economy is and to Legislator Kopel about commodity prices and CPI almost you know, mirroring itself and sales tax going up, I do believe that there will be a slow down. But $I$ think there's other things that just people do naturally. They have to buy food. They have to buy books for the kids. I think that's part of the thing.

The luxury items is where we have to be concerned about and the housing market. Which I think Legislator Drucker you were asking about the housing market. I was sitting back there. It's transactional driven and it's not so much -- the inventory's not there to sell. I think that's why we're starting to see the dip. That's what it is. There's not enough inventory out there. Which is creating the anomaly of pricing going up
along with interest rates. So the transactional volume, some of the people who could afford two years ago now just can't afford it. And if you talk to the real estate people they're going to tell you the same thing. The market went from here now it's going all the over the place to like a normalized market.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I agree with
you.
MR. PERSICH: But why the revenue streams are down? It's driven by transactions. I just wanted to cover that. We're projecting in this forecast a five percent growth in sales tax. We've accounted for the disproportionate hospital and AIM payments. We've taken that out. We're getting that back thank you. Because to Legislator Ferretti's point, they were stealing from my money and I hated it but that's just me.

As far as where the money, the AIM money, and there was a question about where the AIM money went, the AIM money goes -- went
from -- they took it from us and gave it to the towns and the villages. They did a gratuitous act that they made believe they gave our money to them.

The disproportionate hospital I do believe that NUMC got a portion of it. What number that is specifically $I$ don't know if they got one dollar for dollar from our money but that's one of the main drivers, that DSRIP money or $\operatorname{DSH}$ money that they get.

The projections also include for sales tax include the reduction of the gasoline holiday we're giving out. We've taken it's approximately eight to $\$ 10$ million we're calculating it at. Although, as the comptroller spoke, oil prices are coming down. I can tell you personally when you saw 3.97 you're driving like a lunatic to try to get in there and fill up, you know what I mean, because it's under four. It's the old days, because I'm dating myself, the '70s where you waited on line and you had to get gas on odd even days.

And as far as contract
negotiations, we are moving forward. The county exec wants to get everything settled so that we can move forward with all the labor unions. We're working diligently to resolve the outstanding issues with some of the bargaining units. I don't want to say more than that because we're in negotiations. So, I will say that it is ongoing and it's an active work stream.

Again, I think I covered this already. I think the comptroller covered this. I don't want to be redundant. Some of the things we've offset is parks revenue, ambulance fees. Red light cameras are diminishing $I$ will say that. But activity is starting to go back up because if anybody has driven in lately you can see the volume of traffic even in the summertime on the highways is still -- it's getting -- which is the worst scenario with gas prices being so high and you're sitting in traffic. It's like, you know, you're watching the needle.

Those are the things we're starting to see declines. But I think you're going to
start seeing the normalization once we get back to September when school reopens in the old fashion manner. Like normalcy if we ever can term it that way. If it comes back to being that. If that happens I think you'll start seeing some of this transactional volume tick back up and we'll get back to it.

Our expense assumptions are pretty
right before you. Mass transportation. We've added a little bit more money for commodity prices. We've taken some hits on the risk side of what's going to happen.

Like I said, we had Medicaid
savings which we're using to fund some of these other issues that we have. The state comes up with a formula, I don't want to get into it, but it's a weekly share thing and there's things for indigent care and everything else that they net out. But our weekly share dropped this year which provided us with a $\$ 22$ million surplus in Medicaid. We've offset that with some early intervention cost that we think are going to rise. And some mass transportation.

I know the Long Island station maintenance agreement went up because the CPI went up. So that was a pretty big hit because CPI was so high. It's contractually obligated.

Now to the liability management which, again, $I$ said this is the whole -- I have to say that this is the position that we're in now. How we're going to manage the future going forward.

One of the steps we did take in this budget is we paid back $\$ 123$ million of approximately $\$ 160$ million. We're working on paying down the police district. It's a little sticky because it's a separate taxing district. I'm formulating an idea which I have to run by the county executive on how to pay down that additional liability. Possible use of fund balance in the district. But I have to make sure because I'll get to the NIFA gap if you want me to. That's not a positive to that but it would make fiscally good sense if we did something like that. I will say stay tuned on that. If we can get that
liability off we'll be moving forward.
The county executive got rid of the LIPA hangover or whatever you want to call that. That cert liability of $\$ 300$ million. We were able to broker and get rid of that liability. That's a big thing off the books in the NIFA report $I$ will say that we have to account for.

Additionally, the longevity
settlement. One thing I guess I was remiss about when $I$ got involved in this was that time wasn't our friend on this thing. The longer we let it sit the greater the liability grew because the retroactivity portion from it would have grown. So we saved -- I mean, if we would have lost in arbitration it would have cost us $\$ 188$ million. We got it down to $\$ 100$ million. Which we funded with reserves. Which gave us a funding stream to get through to the next four years. And any residuals going forward if we see a need to fund that reserve a little bit more for the future maybe we'll have the resources to do that. But it's subject to collective bargaining for future
agreements and we'll move on from there. Tax certs. After we net out I would say the LIPA liability, which is about 447, we have approximately 430 in resources to do that from all these different buckets. Which is we don't have to borrow for this. And that's the key component of the story here is that I believe we have the resources to pay down the debt or the obligations to the taxpayer without using borrowed funds. While I say 447 is the number it's a calculated number when you negotiate these settlements. I don't know if it's going to be 447, 407. It could vary a little bit just based on what the property valuations are. But I do believe we have the resources at our disposal right now between the DAFTs that we had created and the obligations in the special revenue fund which we created here with this body, which was, you know, I think we cured that. Along with the other stuff from the reserves that we put money into kind of a cured some of the liability issues that were -- I briefly read
the NIFA report. I didn't get into it. But to satisfy some of their concerns. We've put reserves away in places that $I$ think will mitigate risk for the future. And clearly litigation liability is one of the biggest things the county is subjected to that's anomalies.

Some counties still borrow for it.
Which is kind of $I$ would say if it were a different spot it's not a bad thing to do. Because if you have to tax the tax base to pay the, you know. I could use the Shoreham as one of those classic examples of what happened there. The Town of Brookhaven had to issue debt to pay that back.

But I would say that we have ample resources to cover what the cert liability is right now. And let's face it, the cert liability is not going to go away annually. We're going to have certs. The question is, as we estimate it, it could be anywhere between I would say between 75 and 100 depending upon the years. Once the roll becomes more defendable it will probably make
the pathway to the future a little bit easier and lower than the 75, which is where I think we got to get to.

That in itself will produce -- we do have resources now. We have 40 in DAFT and we have 30 in operating. So we do have money to pay future obligations for the years going forward. It's built into the plan. It's going to be built into whatever we do in the future. And hopefully, the glide slope for tax cert is something that this body will not have to listen to which has brought us to where the control period has been driven at us. So I can sit here and say that this is the best fiscal shape this county could possibly be in. And I'm just going to summarize what I said. And I am very brief today. Frank's going to kill me. I just want to summarize.

Bond upgrades, key component for this entire organization. I give credit to the county executive for going with me. We did a good road show. And I think the analysts were impressed with what some of the
things that were said.

We have two things. We're financially set for the future and I think our economic base is very strong to sustain any downturns because we are a very wealthy and affluent county. So even on the economic downturns we still seem to survive a little bit better than most. But there are needy taxpayers out there and we have to be cognizant of that too.

I've covered the reserves. The continuity of my team is still here. We're still doing the same thing that we did in the past. I've been ordered, not ordered, I shouldn't say that. I've been mandated to keep the budget structural balanced. That is an order that was given to me day one that this and going forward that I have to keep the budget balanced. The county executive has given me that edict. I will follow it as I've always followed it because it's my job. I hate to say this and nobody wants to hear this but we should finish with surpluses not deficits. So we have to be very careful.

What that number is right now it's in the high numbers. But we should probably finish somewhere in the neighborhood of $\$ 5$ million annually just to be cushioned so we know. Similar to what New York City has because they've been through this already. Not that I want to compare us to them by no stretch of the imagination. But part of the thing they do is they have to finish with a surplus every year. And I think that's something to eliminate some of our friends in another organization NIFA that's probably one of the things we just have to manage to and we can be free and clear of that.

And our cash position, for lack of a better thing, is we have lots of cash on hand right now from all these different funding sources. I caution that we don't use cash in the budgeting world so I don't want to mix the two up because it's going to create a fund balance in the whole accounting thing. But one thing $I$ will say is we're not doing any short-term borrowings. Which is a good thing. We don't need to borrow for BANS and

TANS any more because our cash position is so strong.

I will open it up to questions. I will answer anything that you may have for me.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thanks.
Thanks to you and your team Andy for the presentation. Appreciate it.

As you know, the federal reserve has raised interest rates four times in five months. They went from near zero to two and a quarter to 2.5. How do you see this impacting us, the county?

MR. PERSICH: It's going to impact my borrowing because we're going to have to rethink how we do things. This is a different spot that $I$ would say from years past. When rates were so low you didn't want to spend your cash because you were almost giving, you know what $I$ mean? You didn't want to do that. We're in a different spot now. We have to evaluate what the things.

Look, the bond traders and everybody else will tell you don't use short-term money for long-term things. That's
one thing we have to be cognizant of that $I$ would say. Because $I$ don't know if there's a liquidity crunch coming or anything else but right now I think some of the things I would like to do is keep some of this money on the sidelines for the future. You know what I mean? Some of the ARPA funds. Because everybody forgets, we did lose $\$ 270$ million of revenues during the COVID crisis. The CARES funding was there. We used it. I can tell you that. But $I$ think some of the ARPA funds we need to be strategically placed on how we use those monies.

I will tell you, Legislator
DeRiggi-Whitton, when what $I$ was sitting here, we will come to this body, we have in the past, with any changes. I can't move money unfortunately. In a grant $I$ can't move a dollar from point $A$ to point $B$ without the legislature. We will come with any new programs because we have to appropriate the funds through that. And if $I$ want to move money around the way we structured that ARPA fund is is that we have to go to you guys in
order to shift it around a little bit.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When you say that are you referring to, for example, the HAP and the money for the veterans and all those things we approved?

MR. PERSICH: You've approved those but the HAP program, the guidance was changed by us. Not by us but it was changed by the treasury. They were the ones who told us we couldn't do it. So we had to stop the program. Otherwise we would be in violation of what the federal statute was. So we had to stop it. That's why we did it. But if I wanted to re-spend whatever's left out there, I'm coming to you to say this is the program the county executive has --

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When you
say you're coming to us is that at the direction of the county executive or is that statutory or some rule from the fed that you have to come to the legislature?

MR. PERSICH: No, it's not a
federal rule. I don't think. I'm operating under the charter rules. I know that if I
have a supplemental appropriation I have to come to you.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Just for any supplemental?

MR. PERSICH: Any supplemental. And if I want to move money because the way the ARPA fund is set up it's specific by program. Which is what the previous
comptroller made us do to say that this
program -- because they have to do filings and what the filings say is it's dedicated by a CFDA number. So if we want to change it we've made, I would say, an agreement that we would go back and forth with appropriations. If I change it from this program which has a CFDA number of one to CFDA number two I have to move that money and it will require legislative action.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So that federal money would fall under the same rules as any other appropriation?

MR. PERSICH: I would look at it as if we got grant money for our water quality. We do a lot of stuff with the health
department. We get a lot of money in from the state every year annually. We have to come to this body to move the money around. I'm just used to it.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I got it.
The excess sales tax fund what's the balance in that special revenue fund right now?

MR. PERSICH: I don't know off
the top of my head because we're paying a lot of -- the cert problem is a lot more complex to operate it to get the money out the door. So, we processed approximately $\$ 75$ million of cert money for this year.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: When you
say you processed it what do you mean?
MR. PERSICH: Means we made
payments or adjustments to the roll depending upon what the actual balance was. But I think we've actually processed $\$ 75$ million of cash out the door.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So \$75
million in tax cert refunds?
MR. PERSICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: In 2022?

MR. PERSICH: That's in 2022, yes. And the reason being, legislator, as we all know, the interest component of these certs is one of the components that grows itself.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: How much did we pay back in 2021?

MR. PERSICH: My recollection was it was a small number off the top of my head. I want to say it was probably $30, \$ 40$ million.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: For the entire year?

MR. PERSICH: I have to go back and look.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: How much
does the administration plan on paying the rest of 2022 in tax cert refunds?

MR. PERSICH: We're going to try and get as much out the door. Let me put it to you this way. I'm going give you a range because I can't pick a target. But between 125 and 175. Somewhere in that range.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: What is the current liability?

MR. PERSICH: 447. That's the one that's on the paper. The number I have is what's in the actual report that we're working off of. But, in reality, that liability could be lower because I think we're very conservative in our estimates for some of the liabilities based on when we did the modeling for the cert liability. And we have $\$ 400$ million of resources between the special revenue fund, DAFT and some operating money out there to cover that 447.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you
very much. Presiding Officer.
LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: You just covered the tax cert liability. Liability for tax cert refunds. I just want to touch on the other two things specifically cited by NIFA in their report as it concerns going forward noncert litigation. What do we have? We have reserves. We have operating we have budgeted for.

MR. PERSICH: This one's a little different because we do evaluation. The county attorney's office comes up with what we
call noncert liabilities. They're probably on the high side. But we have $\$ 30$ million in operating and we have approximately 100 and some odd million in this other reserve that we created. Because when we amended the legislation for the special revenue fund one of the components that $I$ worked with you guys on was just opening up a little bit more of a wide window for us to pay things out. So we have ample coverage.

But that liability, a lot of it is tort claims. It could be on the high side. I don't like talking about it because some people will hear that we have all this money and they will come in and say the judgement -I'm worried about judgements and everything else. So I get a little skittish about it for many reasons. But $I$ do think we have ample coverage.

And at the end of this year if we finish with a surplus, $I$ mean, if it's $\$ 100$ million $I$ will figure out when I'm going to address it and where -- because I don't know what the future holds. If I had that crystal
ball I would tell you. But I will put it strategically where $I$ think and this body we agree to with the county executive where that money belongs.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: In terms of the tort liability, do you as a budget man believe that perhaps the attorneys in the county attorney are doing what every attorney always does when they have a case which is inflate the possible amount of exposure so when it comes in --

MR. PERSICH: I would say no
because I meet with them -- I was meeting with them pretty regularly beating them down like what's this case worth. You know what $I$ mean? It's not, you know, -- because there's a proponent of which -- I'm the nonlawyer of this -- which I go how could that be? You guys are crazy. You can't pay that much money out. And then somebody bangs a gavel and it's like that money appears.

I don't think there's an inflated number. I think it's a realistic number. But also think you entice parties to settle when
you give money upfront. You can lower the liability by paying forward some money. LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: We have resources I think which is your main point? MR. PERSICH: We do have the resources and I work very closely with them on managing like what we can afford and not afford. And we did this. One of the things we did do when we didn't have money was do structured settlements. Prevented us from borrowing. We went to the plaintiffs and said would you mind taking a million dollar over five. Or, you know, I'm just using it out there. We did that and I think we're going to continue that pattern because it just makes life a little easier for us in budget land and leave a little bit of money for the unforeseen things because now we have resources.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: The other
thing they mentioned was worker's comp claims. I mean, obviously it's an ongoing issue. Will always be an ongoing issue. Anything in particular that -MR. PERSICH: No.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: -- is
spiking those claims?
MR. PERSICH: No. One of the things we did do which we've been a little remiss is we used to do those whammos. You know what I mean? Remember that Section 18? That's when we buy out certain claims. A few years ago we came here. Remember we had a $\$ 15$ million cash influx that somebody wanted to give to us. It's been sitting around. COVID hit. We kind of got sidetracked. But I think we buy down some of those claims.

I think, me personally, it's an actuarial evaluation. But if they didn't count the fact that in the multiyear year plan I have $\$ 35$ million in operating funds to cover those go-forward liabilities.

And it's a little bit different. It's an insurance reserve, which is a little different than most other reserves. So I think we have coverage in there. You know what I mean? There's a lot of factors with comp. The state, in its wisdom, has raised the indemnity rates over the years so it's
created that liability up. But I think we have coverage there.

And I would say this, as well funded as the state pension plan is the OPEB liability of the state is, $I$ don't know, $\$ 100$ billion. I don't even know the number. We're at eight. You know what $I$ mean? So, we don't have funding for the OPEB liability. So to that point I would argue that we still have -we have pay-go ways of paying those obligations.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Just one open-ended question to conclude. Was anything in the comptroller's presentation that you felt the administration has a different viewpoint on? Not necessarily an out and out disagreement but maybe a matter of a nuances. MR. PERSICH: Not material
enough. We all have different ways of calculating and forecasting numbers. We have a different methodology than they do. But not a lot of things. I think when it comes to heads and fringe benefits we kind of know where we're going to land. Debt service is a
pretty factual thing. And $I$ kind of don't like showing a lot of debt service savings right now because $I$ don't know. I wait until the end of the year before $I$ will show that because just in case $I$ do have to do an immediate borrowing of something I have that money at my disposal.

But, I mean, I work coordinated efforts unfortunately. I have to work with OLBR, I have the comptroller and I also have to still answer to NIFA. I'm the one who's got to be on the phone with them.

But we all I wouldn't say, you know, NIFA and we come to a conclusion but I think with all the other agencies we talk and try to figure out where we have some differences. We can argue over, you know, I don't think we're all far off. I read Maurice's report. I read the comptroller's report. I think we're all in the ballpark. We don't do GAAP. We do budget. And that's the one difference that we manage to. She's got to worry about GAAP. I don't. At some point, and I agree with her, with

Comptroller Phillips, the county should get on to a GAAP basis for results because then we don't have this question mark.

And to the question, I know there was a question about the NIFA gap, if I could just clarify that the way $I$ understand it.

The NIFA gap, without the subjective part of it, which is the one percent rule, which is they assume risk, what goes against us is, which is kind of one of the things because $I$ have a past life in a township where I had fund balance and I used it sometimes in an appropriation, that gets used against us as a funding source. As does borrowing. Which the borrowing piece I get borrowing for operating.

But the fund balance piece just is -- if you have it it's there to be used because it's resources. But it goes against what the stature says.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: I lied. I actually have one more question. You may have mentioned this but we know what the projection is in terms of the surplus from the
comptroller. She spoke about it. And in the OLBR and their report projects a surplus. Are you projecting a year-end surplus for the county? And if so, can you give us an estimate?

MR. PERSICH: Right now, if you
look at my report it's a little convoluted how we're reporting it. It's almost $\$ 80$ million is what I would say. Of which I have said I'm not going to keep it all. I left $\$ 20$ million at the bottom line just in case there's adjustments to GAAP and everything else. That's the way I'm looking at it. But then I took 50 and said we're going to figure out what we're going to do with it and if it grows exponentially any additional resources we have at the end of the year, in April of next year, we'll come and say we're going to put X number of dollars into this reserve, into that reserve to mitigate risk that's looking forward.

LEGISLATOR NICOLELLO: Thank you Andy.

> LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Legislator

Kopel.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you
Chairman. Andy, just a couple of things. Just following on what you just told the presiding officer. I need to understand. Your understanding of the NIFA issue is that if we've got substantial reserves and we use any of it --

MR. PERSICH: Let's not mix
things. Fund balance. There's two buckets. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: If the fund balance is there to cover shortfalls, but if you use it for that shortfall they -MR. PERSICH: -- penalize me, yes. To my point, and I understand the statute and everything else, but my point is though, if you look at most townships what they'll do in their budget they'll take out when they think -- fund balance theoretically is taxpayer money. That's really what it is. So for you not to use it as budget plug instead of raising taxes for argument's sake it makes no sense. It's a resource used against us.

In fairness, $I$ understand the concept what they were trying to do. But now we're structurally balanced where our revenue and expenses kind of meet up. And if we're short a little bit, let's say five or $\$ 10$ million and I need to dip into fund balance on $\$ 3.5$ billion budget $I$ don't think it should be a penalty against me. But I'm in a different position. I was broke four years ago and now I got money.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Let me ask you something. I think everyone seems to be singing from the same book here. We all think that perhaps NIFA is abusing its authority by continuing a control period. Would that be a fair thing to say?

MR. PERSICH: I want to be
careful because I have to work with them. I work with the staff. But $I$ would say from sitting here my answer would be yes. Based on the behavior or where the fiscal position of the county now and what the ratings agencies have told us I believe that we should be in an oversight period.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I'd like to ask if the administration has ever -- and you'd know about the prior administration as well -- is there any legal recourse? Looking at the statute, looking at the facts on the ground here, if NIFA actually continues to refuse to end the control period does the county have any legal recourse to step in and say hey, this has to stop at some point? MR. PERSICH: I'm going to play my I'm not a lawyer here legislator. I would think that --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I know.
You're not a lawyer but what I'm asking is, has anyone looked into this question?

MR. PERSICH: I believe we're exploring what the actual statute says and what our options are.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Right. That's all. I want to make the point that if we're not looking into it perhaps we ought to.

MR. PERSICH: I would say we are look into it.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Now, on the
certs. So, again, if $I$ understood you correctly, liquidated and unliquidated. You feel like we've got enough cover over there that we should no longer have to borrow?

MR. PERSICH: I firmly believe that considering what we've done and what we've put away.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The point that
I made earlier about the sales tax and you
alluded to that at the outset of your remarks as well. That is, as I say, that's something that you're going to watch because of the timing issue. In other words, our expenses will go up later, it lags the inflation, and the sales tax receipts come in higher because of inflation to some extent so there's an imbalance over there.

MR. PERSICH: Yes, I would say that's correct. And I will say this, while I'm popular at some points in the previous years, the conservative approach to sales tax over the previous few years has now reaped benefits I think. Because now we have the ability and the flexibility of upside to where
the number was so low, which was a painful process. But I think if you look forward, I don't see, you know, you'll hear that the Wall Street people talk about the $W$ and the $V$. You know what I mean? We've never seen the $W$ in sales tax that $I$ can remember. We had a downturn. We had that thing. In 2020 we lost eight percent sales tax revenue, which is significant. It was 7.2.

Are we going to go up and then down again? It's possible. I can't tell you that. But I don't think even if we do head to the recession world and where the stock market goes I'm too old to be playing in those arenas, but I will say that I do believe that even if this is a recession $I$ think the fed reloads it's gun in a different manner where they'll start lowering rates again at some point which will -- you know what I mean?

Because I think once inflation is stemmed you're going to have a problem with too high of interest rates which is the cost of borrowing which is going to create the unemployment factor which is going to create a
whole list of other issues that you're going to have.

So they're going to go through the period of bringing it almost to a snail's pace because that's just an economic, you know, cycle. And then what you're going to have is that they're going to start loosening up and then you're going to start seeing a recovery. Because with every recession there's a recovery. There's a down and an up.

This county, where I think it is right now positioned, with the reserves that we have, we can absorb $I$ think a duration of a recession $I$ think for a short period of time. I wouldn't say long term but for a short period we're in good fiscal footing.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Let's just hope that the economy cooperates in there.

Last thing, and again this is something that you alluded to at the outset of your remarks, and that is the ARPA. The prior federal program that was put to good use and a lot of that money you used that to, permissibly, to pay certain salaries because
of the shortfall.
MR. PERSICH: That was CARES
funding.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The initial slug of federal money, right. And you used that to do salaries and you thereby avoided shortfalls and borrowing and so forth and that was great.

Now we've got the ARPA money. This is close to $\$ 400$ million. It goes away after that. It goes away. So, this is an enormous county resource right now. There are permissible uses and impermissible uses. But isn't it true that the county every year spends a lot of money, whether out of current funds or borrowed funds, for uses that are permitted under ARPA?

MR. PERSICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Therefore, it follows that if we would use ARPA money for these particular purposes that would free up A, current county money and B, avoid future borrowing. That's true, right?

MR. PERSICH: We should
strategically place some of this money in -though I would say we have to give some money back to what programs that this body and the county exec has to do. But there is a component I would say that wherever the economy lands or anything else, I personally, because I am the money guy, we have to keep a little something in the back pocket of some of those funds just as additional resources.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And how would you go about doing that?

MR. PERSICH: Well, I wouldn't appropriate it is what $I$ wouldn't do. The one component, and Chris, you can correct me if I'm wrong here, the one component that we do have to act on is revenue loss. We lost $\$ 270$ million in revenue during the COVID crisis. That's a fact. We do have the ability to take -- one of the available uses is to take revenue loss of $\$ 270$ million. I'm not suggesting that. And nor does this budget or future budgets included. But I am cautious that we keep some money back in our pocket just in case we need it.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And the way we would do that is to, as I say, offset some current expenses as well as future borrowings?

MR. PERSICH: It would be a complicated -- I don't want to get into the transaction but there's a way of doing it where we would have to put it into the operating funds or something like that.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I hope that we will all be watching to make sure that, as I say, that's used wisely and not dissipated in short-term expenditures that don't provide a long-term benefit.

MR. PERSICH: I will say this, the administration does have some plans for future ARPA funds. They will be coming to this body with additional programs. Some of the programs were successful. Excluding the HAP. I don't want to get into.

The small business grant program was very good. We're looking at that. We're looking to do a couple of other things with some of our not-for-profit agencies and stuff
like that. I think we will be coming with a plan in September with some of the additional resources.

With regards to I'll get into opioids right now. Look, that was found money and we're looking carefully on how to spend that. I do believe that we will come up with a -- to throw money out the door right away $I$ get a little hesitant. The problem is when you throw it out there the people who you give it to kind of want it again and that's the problem we have. So, we have to be very strategic on how we do that.

There's a lot of components of opioids that I am not a drug and alcohol counselor, nor am I the person who can tell you how to mitigate it. But $I$ think education, curtailing these illegal drugs coming in here. Getting here that's one of the other things. But the county exec does have a plan $I$ think that he'll be unveiling at some point in the near future.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: We'll look forward to seeing that. I have no more
questions.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Let me ask you. The federal money that can or cannot be used for salaries?

MR. PERSICH: Theoretically
cannot be used directly for salaries is what I will say. But there is a revenue loss component that we can claim that we can use to offset any obligations we have as a result of that revenue loss.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: The revenue loss does the revenue loss have to be directly a result of COVID?

MR. PERSICH: It was directly
resulted. It's the fact that -- it is a direct result of COVID.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Let me tell you where I'm going with this. I believe some of the risk that NIFA identified was the pending challenge of the tax map verification fee and the red light camera fee because both are being litigated right now as to whether they're constitutional I believe.

If they were to be found illegal,

NIFA identified that as a risk. If that then becomes a drain, we can't make salary, can we use the money, because that would be lost revenue, can we use the money from the federal government to plug that hole?

MR. PERSICH: I would say yes but
it wouldn't be as direct as that. You know what I mean? We'd say that in 2020 we lost 277 some odd million dollars.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI:
Cumulatively?
MR. PERSICH: Cumulatively.
We're going to take X number of dollars for resources. Because that was part of the funding.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: But wouldn't you agree that that risk is kind of off the table because we have that money right now that is not appropriated that could be used in the event that that lawsuit gets --

MR. PERSICH: The answer is yes,
but --
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Good
enough. Thank you. I'm sorry. Go ahead. I
do that in depositions.
MR. PERSICH: Understood. I'm
trying to wear my legal hat sometimes. But the problem is is that $I$ don't want to answer it like it's a direct result because we can't directly correlate the loss in a litigation. And my opinion on some of these fee cases, which is just mine, is like the tax map verification fee is worth something. Now, people will say it's only $\$ 50, \$ 20$. I quantify it this way. There's some filings that you make in supreme court that's $\$ 225$. That's the way I look it at. Some of these things are transactional in nature where somebody actually -- while you may see a button being pushed and a piece of paper being popped out for a tax map verification fee there's a whole bunch of stuff behind there. LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Well, Mr. Persich, you're talking to the wrong guy on this one. I don't want to get into it because $I$ know it's late in the day but $I$ disagree with that. I don't think it's worth 20 bucks. I don't think it's worth anything.

But I'll pass it off to Legislator Drucker. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I defer to my colleague first. She has seniority on me. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Andy, I know it sounds like a nuance but can you explain the difference when this ARPA money is going to come through between appropriation and spending? The legislature votes on appropriations, correct? MR. PERSICH: You vote on any dollar that $I$ want to spend. You have a vote on it. That's the way I view it. Because I pass a budget by control center, by object code and I have to do it that way. Any supplemental appropriations, any money coming in in order for me -- the comptroller will not let me spend the money unless I have an appropriation to charge against.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We have to vote on appropriations?

MR. PERSICH: You do. That is correct.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But it can be pretty broad, correct? Like it's
not as specific as like a spending item?
MR. PERSICH: No. I would say
yes and no and I'm mixing my answer here. If you give me a second here. If $I$ have an appropriation, $I$ have money or certain places where I can spend that money. Could be on salaries. It could be on equipment. It could be on contracts. It could be on widgets. I don't know. But $I$ have to give you the legislation that says I'm spending \$10 on salaries, $\$ 10$ on widgets, $\$ 20$ on equipment, $\$ 100$ on contracts. I have to itemize each one.

What I was saying before was, one of the things the previous comptroller made us do was put the obligations for these ARPA funds into specific programs that were CFDA. That's how they report on it. So I can't change that without doing it. You know what I mean? So I need to do that.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: SO, back when was it, '21, when we had the funds where did that go into? What line? MR. PERSICH: Right now any money

```
we've decided to programatically do anything
    with or spend we've come to the legislature
    and said this is the programs. The additional
    resources are sitting in a bank account
    somewhere in the treasurer's office. The cash
    is sitting somewhere.
    LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: What
    line is that?
    MR. PERSICH: It's not in a
    budget line.
    LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: We
    do know where that is?
    MR. PERSICH: We know where it
    is. It hasn't been appropriated into a line
    item. So that's where it is. We get money in
    all the time from the state and other agencies
    that sit in a bank. And then when we want to
    spend it we come to you and say we're going to
    take money out of the bank and put it in
    there.
    LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So,
    again, right now the legislature votes on any
    type of appropriation. I get that. There
    seems to be, and maybe I'm wrong, but there
```

seems to be seems to be a gray area as to whether or not the county has to come to the legislature for the spending of the funds after we voted to appropriate the funds; is that correct?

MR. PERSICH: We can only spend it within the guidelines that the feds have given us and that's what the programs we've appropriated follow.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But does the county legislature have to vote on what you spend the money that we already voted to appropriate?

MR. PERSICH: No.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
That's why we need this piece -- I'm using a Ferretti. That's all I needed to hear. MR. PERSICH: Let me circle back. I'll interpret it from my world which is not -- so, if you want me to spend -- if $I$ give you the general fund budget with salaries in it you don't say how $I$ can spend that money.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:

That's different. We're talking about -MR. PERSICH: No, no. But I'm just saying though but that's what you're saying to me is I have to come to you to spend it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: No. I'm talking about the ARPA money. That's why I'm submitting legislation today. That not only does it have to come to us for the appropriation but also for the spending.

Look, if it's already done, terrific. If it's not, maybe another future county executive or anyone else I think this will cover us with the complete peace of mind that it's going to be coming to us.

Again, it's checks and balances with a ton of money that just came in the door. And it's no offense to anybody. It's just that this is how $I$ feel it should be done.

I'm going to stop harping on that and I'm going to ask about HAP. So, this was decided back on May 15 th and there's over $\$ 70$ million left on that line. Where is that
money?
MR. PERSICH: We spent $26,27$.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
About $\$ 70$ million. We had $\$ 100$ million allocated, right? MR. PERSICH: $\$ 70$ million. 100. I'm sorry. I apologize.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: It's
a lot to think about. This is all I think about. Where is that money?

MR. PERSICH: That money is
sitting in an appropriation right now that cannot be spent. The balance is sitting there in a program that is not spendable at this point. The HAP program has been discontinued because the guidance has come out and we decided to do that.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But \$70 million is sitting --

MR. PERSICH: -- somewhere.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Do you have any idea how long that's going to be sitting there for?

MR. PERSICH: We have to obligate
it by 2024.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Do you have any ideas for where --

MR. PERSICH: Well, I will say stay tuned because some of the new programs that we may do we will come to you and say of the $\$ 70$ million that we have out there in HAP maybe we want to give X number of dollars to a different program out there. That's the way I would view it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
hope that's the case because, again, that was already allocated. That was already appropriated. That was already everything. And now it's still sitting there. All right. Do you anticipate us being briefed on what --

MR. PERSICH: I would say within
the near future. I would say the September arena is probably when we will be coming with the new plan for some of the spending. We may not do it in big chunks. We may do it strategically. But $I$ think we will be coming to you with some additional things that we want to do in the future.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Again, $I$ know what you were saying about the opioid funding and you don't like to rush into spending it but, again, these are desperately needed programs I believe. Especially with the opioid crisis.

MR. PERSICH: I don't disagree.
I can tell you probably everybody in this room has been impacted.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
have one last subject $I$ want to hit real quick. Bonding. Have you gone out for bonds very often lately?

MR. PERSICH: We just did a deal in $I$ think it was June. Rates, they were all over the place. The history of it was we were going to do it on $X$ day but that was the day of a fed meeting. We ended up pulling the deal off the table. Saved probably a few million -- well, by pulling the deal we ended up saving. But the rates out there our coupon I think there was no premium on this deal which is -- I can't get into the complexity of this -- but the coupon is around five
percent. Wherein, in the old days it was probably around two, two and a half. So there is an uptick in rates.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I got a list from the treasurer's office as to various bond authorizations that just, again, are already done, sitting there. And like for public safety there's $\$ 174$ million bond authorization that's there. They want us to give them another $\$ 15$ million. Like, do you see them using the 174 that's there?

MR. PERSICH: One of the problems that we encounter when you do -- sometimes you don't spend the full appropriation. These outstanding appropriations do -- it's a lot but they're dedicated to specific resources. Which when you go to the market has different BPU lights. So, some of the things that we have out there.

I don't know the answer to the specific question about the 174. But we do have dedicated reasons as to why. Now, this 174 may be for I'm going to use to build the police academy or to build something else
that's outstanding. I don't know the answer. There are a lot of outstanding projects that are going on that $I$ will say we have the authorization. We just haven't spent it. It's part of the capital budget.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Can you look into this? Because I'm telling you, they're saying we need ambulances or the same that the correction officers need cars or whatever it is $\$ 174$ million is sitting there in authorization. This has not gone out to bond. So it's not for an ongoing project. We don't really start a project without having a bond a lot of times. Like you mentioned for the police academy and things like that. That's not going to happen. We have not gone out to bond for $\$ 174$ million just specifically for public safety. That's money that we authorized.

MR. PERSICH: I have to look into
that because I don't know that number.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
There's something called infrastructure and it's $\$ 479$ million. Is that DPW? Is there
already $\$ 479$ million that this body authorized?

MR. PERSICH: Let me go back and look at that. It might be environmental bond. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: The date of this is April 30, 2022. There's also a tax authorization, bond authorization and judgement settlement of $\$ 31$ million.

MR. PERSICH: Say that again.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
There's a line for property tax refund and judgement for 31 million, and again, that's bond authorization.

MR. PERSICH: That's certs.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
They're coming to us for more bonding. Like maybe Monday.

MR. PERSICH: Let me go back to the $\$ 479$ million which is where $I$ think one of the big things is part of that is the Bay Park conveyance that we to authorize. That's where a majority of that's from.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
would like you to look at these bond
authorizations already. Because I don't know how this affects our NIFA rating. I have no idea. But if we give you the okay to bond I can't imagine that helping.

MR. PERSICH: It helps in different ways because there's a process in place. We need the bond ordinance.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Our
debt could increase by this much money and not even have to come to us.

MR. PERSICH: No.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I
would like to just see what a summary is of all of these. And if you need a copy of this I can give it to you.

MR. PERSICH: I will contact
Michelle and get it. Let me just explain what we do with bond authorizations. We can advance money within the calendar year. That's why we need the appropriations because we're very project specific when we do our bond authorizations. Meaning that if we wanted to buy the computer we say that. So, that's why there's probably a lot of
outstanding unspent money out there that we've gotten too restrictive.

But one of the reasons that we advance money is, I have to be the one to tell what we can borrow because I have to pay the debt service out of the operating budget. If they obligate $\$ 500$ million $I$ can't afford that. And we can't go above -- look, one thing we're very sensitive of, especially my office and the debt managers, we make sure we have enough money in debt service no matter what we do because if we don't that will be a knock against us.

So, the authorizations, even though
they seem high, when you do do a borrowing it's typically you do the borrowing for the entire project and you borrow in tranches. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I know that. I've been around a long time. But the thing is, look, do we really need more? Like, if we have this much outstanding bond authorization and we have ten years to spend it, I don't know how old some of this is, I mean we could use a lot of this old -- rather
than coming to us to bond again and again and again why don't we use some -- I mean, I would just like have an -- before $I$ would want -and obviously I do support a lot of these things -- but why do we have to authorize another 115 if there's $\$ 174$ million there?

If you could just let us know. And honestly I hate to do this but I think we're going to be asked to give the authorization to bond on Monday.

MR. PERSICH: It's a more complex
answer when it comes to debt and everything else.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: I get it. I know. MR. PERSICH: A number of 174 of what you're telling me may have a lot of strings attached to it.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: But that's what I'd like to know before we want to give another $\$ 15$ million.

MR. PERSICH: We'll get you the answer prior to Monday.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Or
another whatever the number. 160 million. MR. PERSICH: We'll give you an answer as to what is outstanding and the reason that it's outstanding.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Again, the only thing I'm going to leave with is I'd like to file that piece of legislation. If anyone wants to join I'd appreciate it. Because, Andy, you did a great job getting us through COVID. I remember you getting beaten up a few times. You were stellar in your responses and I feel like I want to be as careful as we can be right now. We're in a good position. This administration inherited a very sound, financially sound budget and you were a big part of it. I give Laura Curran a big kudo also and that was a major goal of that administration. I'm proud of the fact that we're in the position we're in now but $I$ want to keep it there. MR. PERSICH: Thank you for the kind words. And I will say from the top upstairs who $I$ work for the same edict is stay on the path of keeping this place fiscally
sound. That's my job and that's what I've been told to do.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: You have the goal but you also need the tools and I think that this piece of legislation would be a good tool and I think a lot of the things that we've done in the past, you know, you can wish it but we need to really do it the right way.

MR. PERSICH: As I was told once,
hope is not a strategy.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Mr.
Persich, do you recall the federal money that was used for the Restaurant Assistance Program?

MR. PERSICH: There was ARPA money and there was CDBG money that came out of that.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: You recall
that?
MR. PERSICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Did this
body approve the appropriation for that?
MR. PERSICH: Yes.
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 516-747-7353LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Did this body approve every time money was released to a specific restaurant?

MR. PERSICH: No.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So, when you said before that we, the legislature, does not approve the spending, was that a good example of us not approving the spending? The fact that every time you released money to a different restaurant, Applebee's, Fridays, you didn't come to us and say, legislature, can we release this money to Fridays?

MR. PERSICH: I would say yes.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So, really
what we're talking about is a request to micromanage after money is appropriated who the assistance goes to. Theoretically, if money was appropriated for assistance, for instance, the HAP program, and I haven't seen her legislation yet so $I$ won't comment on the legislation, but it sounds like we would have to approve every single $\$ 375$ check that was spent, right?

MR. PERSICH: I'll be honest with
you, I'd rather have the county attorney's office look at the legislation. But to your point, I would be a little bit more scared that I would have to come to you with what I would call -- you don't understand. There's a lot of operations here to get money out the door. There's a warrant of AP checks that go out. If I'm going to have to then get approval for that.

## LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I do

understand. I guess my point is, every dollar that's appropriated to a specific cause with this ARPA is signed off on by this body, correct?

MR. PERSICH: Yes.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
That's only because an advisory counsel was put into place by the Curran administration. There is no more advisory council.

Look, I totally agree with you. We did it right. I want to just keep doing it right. But there's nothing that says that that's the way it has to be done. Remember we had that whole discussion about how we're
going to vote on --
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Which we
have.
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON:
Right. And I really think it's worked well.
But there's nothing that says that it has to
continue that way. All right.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I
disagree. But let me get my points out. My
second point is, my question is with regard to
the bonding. Is bonding project specific?
MR. PERSICH: Not always but most
times here we do do some borrowing specific.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: How about
the money that we were just talking about?
MR. PERSICH: I don't have the
list in front of me but $I$ do know that when
you authorize a project for a bond ordinance
you usually do it in its totality. Just so
you know, local finance law kind of describes
how we have to do that. They say what the
total project cost is you have to authorize.
If it's going to cost you $\$ 100$ million to do a
project the borrower wants to know what
they're borrowing for.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Can we use the money, that 179 , for the money that may be requested to be borrowed for Monday, yes or no?

MR. PERSICH: I can't reallocate it. I have to look at it. But before I see the information $I$ can't reappropriate authorized bond. I have to do additional ordinances. I have to rescind -traditionally what happens is when you have left over bond ordinances when your project is completed you rescind any outstanding authorizations because it kind of goes against -- the markets look at what your outstanding borrowing ordinances are.

The short answer is I don't think you can reallocate it. I have to look at the list. I don't know off the top of my head.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: You don't think so?

MR. PERSICH: No.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Legislator
Drucker.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I thought you forgot about me. I'm kind of worn down here. I don't have a lot. With regard to what my colleague Legislator DeRiggi-Whitton, I think, John, some of her concern, $I$ remember reading a couple of months ago in the papers that the county executive when he was asked about the surplus money from HAP said that the administration wasn't going to fund that program anymore for whatever reason. Not enough participation or whatever the reasons were. And that the administration was looking into other appropriate areas to direct the money to.

I think maybe the concern was he's going to take it on himself or the administration is going to take in on themselves to use that money for what they think is fit without coming to us. But maybe that's what the concern was. I remember reading that the administration was considering various other ways to spend the money. Anyway, that's not my question Andy.

Thank you though.
I need a little quick education.
Hopefully you won't take long. My eyes glaze over as I said with some of this stuff. With regard to the gap and fund balances, I need to know what the differences is or there's nonspendable and there's spendable, right? What is in the spendable is restricted versus committed versus assigned? Can you tell me about that?

MR. PERSICH: I would prefer if
the comptroller could.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I probably
should have asked her but $I$ forgot.
MR. PERSICH: So, all those
categories, $I$ will do it, if $I$ may use the term I'm going to dumb it down for you. Restricted, spendable, this the other. They're all restricted for purposes that are already defined. Meaning that we've said we're going to restrict spending for this. We have restricted money, restricted fund balances. If you look in the police district fund it's restricted fund balance because it
can only be used in that thing.
The only thing that has discretionary portion of it is what we call unassigned fund balances of the four categories. Because it's spendable, unspendable, restricted and unassigned. The way I remember it when I wore my comptroller's hat in Huntington.

All the other three categories -and I would defer to the comptroller on this one -- is I can't really spend them unless they're dedicated for a specific resource. The unassigned it sits in a bank. If I wanted to spend it for this body $I$ would have to come to you and say please appropriate $X$ number of dollars out of unassigned fund balance to pay for $X$. I hope that helped.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: A little bit. It's enough for me. With regard to talking about the HAP program and the money that's left over in that. According to what you said earlier that $\$ 70$ million, whatever it is, it's sitting in the comptroller's office right now?

MR. PERSICH: The $\$ 70$ million, the cash itself is sitting in the treasurer's office. Remember, $I$ guess maybe I didn't convey this. How this place works, the county works, is we do a budget which gives you the appropriation to spend it. Then it has to go through the comptroller's office for approval back to the treasurer's office to release the check. The comptroller theoretically is the oversight of the money. I don't know if that was conveyed or not but that's one of the processes. The treasurer has to wait for the comptroller to approve the payment and then he issues the payment.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: But I guess my question then is, the $\$ 70$ million is not in any particular fund right now?

MR. PERSICH: No. It's sitting in a cash account. It's dedicated to the ARPA fund. At the end of the year we have to do a lot of cleanups and everything else. There's a lot of accounting stuff that we have to do. But we have to replace the funds at the end of the year.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I just have one more question. The tax cert liabilities, the litigation fund, how much do you know, if you know, how much has been spent from the litigation fund to pay for tax cert refunds of the $\$ 208$ million that was set aside for this purpose, do you know?

MR. PERSICH: There's a little disconnect here because $I$ will say there's some budgeting things. But we anticipate approximately $\$ 75$ million as of the end of this month will be paid. And we're hoping to get out the door by the end of the year approximately 125 to 175 million.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: On top of the 75?

MR. PERSICH: No. Inclusive of the 75. So, we're going to get out in total this year max approximately 175. It's a processing issue too. You know what I mean? We had money to roll forward in future years to pay down the additional debt.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: By the end of '22 that will be rolled out?

MR. PERSICH: We'll have rolled over carry forward money from the residual money left in the special revenue fund for certs that we will use for next year. Along with DAFT and the operating funds. But we're going to try and get as much out the door that's accruing interest so that the liability is lowered.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I'm done
with this witness.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you. Does any other legislator have any questions? I'm going to open it up to any public comment if there's any at this time just to wrap up. It doesn't appear to be any. So, we're going to close it out. I want to thank Mr. Persich.

I think just in closing this hearing, I think we can all agree on, I think what budget agrees on, the comptroller agrees on, even NIFA based on their report agrees on is that we certainly should not be under a control period any longer. I think we're unanimous in that $I$ hope. So hopefully something comes of that very soon.

Again, thank you all and God bless. (Committee adjourned at 5:08 p.m.)
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