

AUDIT & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE MEETING
Held In Room 318 of the
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512

Members: Chairwoman Conklin, Legislators Birmingham & LoBue

Monday **August 27, 2012**
(Immediately following Economic Dev. Mtg. starting @ 6:30 P.M.)

The meeting was called to order at 6:55 P.M. by Chairwoman Conklin who requested Legislator Birmingham lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call, Legislators Birmingham, LoBue, and Chairwoman Conklin were present.

3. Approval of Minutes – July 30, 2012

Minutes were approved as submitted.

4. 2011 Toski, Schaefer & Co., Audit Report/Joe Klimek

Chairwoman Conklin made a motion to accept the additional for this item, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

Mr. Klimek informed the Committee that his firm merged with another accounting firm as of January 1, 2012 and their new firm name is Toski & Co, P.C., a division of EFP Rotenberg, LLP.

Mr. Klimek stated that his firm is responsible to report to the Legislature. His firm audits management's financial statements. The County's comprehensive financial report is prepared by management and Toski & Co, P.C. formulates an audit opinion. They are representing independent auditors hired by the Legislature to audit management's financial statements. They are not part of the internal control structure of the County government, they are independent auditors. He stated that management follows the new GASB 54 fund types. Now the report will show different classifications than used in previous years. They used to be called undesignated or unreserved and now they use terms such as, unassigned, assigned, restricted, and non-spendable. Unassigned fund balance is very similar to the past unrestricted or undesignated, that is what is leftover in your fund balances where there is not restrictions or it has not been assigned. Restricted assets are net assets or fund balances that are required by General Municipal Law or Debt Agreements so that you have assets set aside to meet those requirements.

Legislator Dan Birmingham asked what some of our assigned and restricted, capital reserves or projects that are outstanding are.

Mr. Klimek stated that page 51 of the CAFR (Comprehensive Annual Financial Report) is the report that management has. Your non-spendable is typically your prepaid retirement, almost \$741,000. At the end of 2011, the County had \$4.5 million dollars appropriated for next year's budget, 2012. The other assigned fund balance represent your encumbrances. The un-appropriated is a reserve for possible Department of Social Services denial of claims and was assigned by management.

Legislator Birmingham asked when the \$2 million was assigned by management for this purpose. Did management take \$2 million out of the unassigned fund balance and put it into the general fund un-appropriated reserve?

Mr. Klimek stated it was put in un-appropriated assigned. It can be unassigned if it is not restricted.

Legislator Birmingham asked what statutory authority there is for the Administration to have assigned that \$2 million for this purpose without Legislative approval.

Commissioner of Finance Bill Carlin stated that GASB 54 is the statute and the Legislature passed a resolution accepting GASB 54 practices.

Legislator Birmingham asked if GASB 54 requires that the Legislature cede that assigning authority to the Administration.

Commissioner Carlin stated that it did not require that.

Legislator Birmingham asked if that assignment acts as a reserve unavailable for what we used to call fund balance.

Mr. Klimek stated it would be a management decision. If it was needed to use to balance the next year's budget because of 2% tax levy, etc. it is there but management could decide not to use it and leave it aside for these 4410 claims.

Legislator Birmingham asked if this category was new.

Commissioner Carlin stated it was not. It was previously called something different but it covers 4410 claims for a proper reserve.

Legislator Birmingham stated that GASB 54 just gave it a new name.

Commissioner Carlin agreed.

Mr. Klimek stated that at the end of the year the general fund has an unassigned fund balance. The fund balance was \$18,142,000 and the general fund balance was \$26,844,000. These are all the new categories required by GASB 54.

Legislator Birmingham asked if we compared these numbers with the last few years would the new GASB 54 reporting cause a spike in numbers.

Mr. Klimek stated that there was a schedule in the back that had statistical comparisons for the last two years.

Legislator Birmingham stated if we wanted an apples-to-apples view we should look at the total general fund bottom line.

Mr. Klimek stated that the County has accounting estimates in your financial statements and the estimates his firm looked at were Compensation Absence Liability, Use of Life of Capital Assets, and other Post-Employment Benefits. These items are all estimates prepared by management or an actuary and his firm determined the estimates are reasonable. The County had sensitive disclosure and long term liabilities that you should be aware of. All departments were cooperative. He stated there were no adjustments nor disagreements with management. The four reports that the County hired his firm to complete are Independent Auditor's Report on the Financial Statements, Opinion and Report on Compliance required for the County's Major Federal Programs, Report in Internal Control on Financial Reporting in accordance with Government Audit Standards, and Report of Compliance and Internal Controls on New York State Transportation Assistance. The results are very good.

Legislator Birmingham stated that it is important for them as Legislators to realize that even if this report states that the County is compliant and the reports are good that does not mean that the County is in good financial shape. He stated he is not saying that the County is not in good financial shape, he is merely pointing out that just because the audit says the County is in good shape does not mean the County is in good financial shape or blessing our financial position. This report blesses the reporting standards, not what is in the County funds.

Legislator Oliverio stated he agreed with Legislator Birmingham. He stated this is a very important point especially to the public because they may not be familiar with financial reporting standards and language within the report.

The Committee and attendees further discussed the CAFR.

Legislator Vincent Tamagna stated in reference to the reporting of retiree benefit plans that private business stopped defined benefit plans in the 1980s and 1990s. That our retiree benefit plans are essentially government defined benefit plans. The private sector could not afford these defined benefit plans so they did away with them. Our government keeps funding these types of plans, thinking that money will just keep coming in to fund them. Something has to be done.

Legislator Birmingham stated he agreed with Legislator Tamagna but stated that it is not all bad news. The County has put some modest steps in place to curb our post-employment retirement benefits. We have employees vesting later, management pays

for a portion of their benefits, etc. Quite frankly, that was only chipping away at the problem. There will be a day of reckoning but every other municipality in the nation is having this issue, as well.

The Committee and attendees further discussed the CAFR.

Legislator Birmingham asked Commissioner Carlin if the County has ever experienced a deficit between expenditures and revenues. For instance, the booklet says “total general fund expenditures exceeded general fund revenues by \$1.3 million.” He stated he was under the impression that the County typically had a spillover of money from every budget.

Commissioner Carlin stated that the County spent \$1.3 million dollars more but the budgeted plan was to spend \$4.5 million dollars more. So we actually did better than what was budgeted and that is what creates the spill off. The adopted budget stated that the County was going to spend \$4.5 million more than the County will take in, the difference would be funded through surplus from previous years.

Legislator Birmingham asked if the \$4.5 million more than the County will take in is then used from the fund balance.

Commissioner Carlin stated that that was correct. That the County budgeted to use \$4.5 million dollars of fund balance but only used \$1.3 million. Therefore, the County had a good year and the difference between the \$4.5 million budgeted use of fund balance and the \$1.3 million actual use of fund balance remains in the fund balance and that is what creates the spillover.

Legislator Birmingham stated that the difference between the \$4.6 million and \$1.3 million is the amount of fund balance the County did not need to invade.

Commissioner Carlin stated that that was correct. In the past ten years, the County has had approximately five years of fund balance invasion and five years where the County did not invade the fund balance. He also stated that the County has never had a budget where the County spent more than what was budgeted or planned to be used.

Legislator Birmingham asked if this was the way this difference was represented in last year’s CAFR.

Commissioner Carlin stated that it may look different because of GASB 54 but he could not remember what last year’s CAFR looked like.

Legislator Birmingham asked if the general fund revenues encompass the planned use of general fund balance.

Commissioner Carlin stated it never has.

Mr. Klimek stated that it was a good budget year for the County the difference between the budgeted use of fund balance and the actual use of fund balance was approximately \$3.2 million.

Legislator Anthony DiCarlo stated that earlier in this discussion we spoke about having a \$1.3 million deficit but that it was not truly a deficit because you netted that amount, you had already encompassed its use during the budget process.

Legislator Birmingham stated that that was his confusion with the reporting of that number in the CAFR. He asked where that \$1.3 million difference was reported in the CAFR.

Commissioner Carlin stated that that difference of budgeted fund balance use and actual fund balance use is not a discrete number. The amount rolls over and remains in the fund balance amount, there is not a separate classification.

Mr. Klimek stated that page 8 of the highlights booklet in the last paragraph states that when the 2011 budget was adopted an anticipated use of \$4.7 million of the general fund balance, the actual results are the use of \$1.5 million. Again, you have \$4.5 million in your fund balance at the end of 2011 that was designated for the 2012 budget that we are in right now, so we really had an unassigned general fund balance decrease from \$18.3 million in 2010 to \$18.1 million to 2011. So it's only about a \$ 0.2 million decrease in the unassigned fund balance. You still have a very healthy unassigned fund balance.

Legislator Birmingham stated that a take away from that spillover could be seen as the County over budgeted by \$3.2 million. Therefore, the Legislature should keep this in mind during the 2013 budget process because \$3.2 million of the 2011 budget did not need to be budgeted, or at least did not need to be used from property taxes.

Legislator Carl Albano stated that in his opinion the spillover is a good thing. He believes that the County cannot cut too tight. If we see this spillover pattern for several years then something is wrong but if it is seen for a year or two it should be seen as good planning.

Legislator Oliverio stated that he did not feel comfortable taking from the fund balance because he believes it will come back and haunt you and it has before.

Legislator DiCarlo stated that when reading this CAFR we need to remember last year was the 2% tax cap. We need to look at what happens after this year to see if that number really is any different.

Legislator Birmingham stated that the cap was not implemented for the 2011 budget process and we could have been below the 2.2 had it been there by not budgeting expenditures as much as we did.

Legislator Dini LoBue reminded everyone that many of the towns had to override the 2% tax cap. The County was ahead of its time in 2010, it was not even 3%, it was 2.74% tax increase. She also stated that when the economy began to falter the cost of energy rose. When the cost of energy rises our sales tax revenue increases. She believes it is a double-sided sword.

Legislator DiCarlo stated that the County has been having conversations for three to four months about capital projects and money. If the money is there then some of that funding should go towards those projects. We should not continue to borrow and borrow if the money is there. It is six, one, half dozen of another but that is something to think about during this budget season.

Legislator LoBue stated that we bonded this year in small increments and she spoke out against it. She did not feel comfortable doing that. She feels that when you have a project and bond for half of a million dollars, depending on the project, that bond is justifiable.

Legislator DiCarlo asked if the County can designate some of that unassigned money in the fund balance to capital projects.

Mr. Klimek stated that yes it can be designated for capital projects and would need a legislative resolution making the funds almost restricted. A commitment of fund balance can be done by the Legislature and removed by the Legislature. If a transfer is made from the fund balance to the capital projects fund and not all of the transferred funds are used the Legislature can move the difference back to the fund balance.

Mr. Klimek further stated that the County has four sources of revenues, charges for services that departments charge for services to the public, capital operating grants, property taxes, and sales use taxes.

The Committee and attendees further discussed the CAFR.

Mr. Klimek stated that his firm suggests that management implement a timely reconciliation of capital assets detail throughout the year with the Tyler-Munis system. Also, they suggest that management automate the financial statement preparation with the new Tyler-Munis system. There is a GASB 34 conversion that is required to be completed, taking all of your governmental funds and convert them to the full government wide financial statements. The County has that capability with the new Tyler-Munis system and his firm recommends the County utilize that feature to make that conversion.

Legislator Birmingham asked if the County was out of compliance with any of the GASB statements.

Mr. Klimek stated the County was not, that he was aware of.

Legislator Birmingham stated what the management representations were.

Mr. Klimek stated there are approximately six pages of representations and they were fairly standard.

Legislator DiCarlo asked Commissioner Carlin if there would be a fiscal impact to run these conversions with the new system.

Commissioner Carlin stated there would not be. The new system went live in November 1, 2011 and the conversions will begin this year, 2012. Once the baseline year is converted, it will be automatic every year after that.

The Committee and attendees further discussed this item.

Mr. Klimek stated that there were no material weaknesses in internal control. He also stated that the Putnam County management received a certificate of achievement in financial reporting. His firm only has two counties that receive that certificate.

The Committee and attendees further discussed this item.

5. Correspondence/County Auditor

- a) **Sales Tax Report** was duly noted.
- b) **Board In Revenue Report** was duly noted.
- c) **Transfer/Revenue Report** was duly noted.
- d) **Contingency/Sub-Contingency Report** was duly noted.
- e) **OTB Report** was duly noted.

6. Correspondence/Commissioner of Finance

- a) **Overtime/Temporary Report**

Legislator LoBue asked what the Sheriff-Security Services line is for on this report.

Commissioner Carlin stated he was not certain.

County Auditor Michele Alfano-Sharkey stated it is Board of Elections Security Services.

Commissioner Carlin stated they have three primaries this year that is likely what it is. He stated that they would call to find out what exactly it is.

- b) **Approval/Bond Resolution/Maybrook Bikeway Project/Town of Southeast (also reviewed by the Physical Services Committee)**

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

c) Approval/Budgetary Amendment (12A062)/Maybrook Bikeway Project (also reviewed by Physical Services Committee)

Chairwoman Conklin stated that the decrease was a change in the account number.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

d) Approval/Bond Resolution/Planning/New Freedom Grant/County's Share/Construction/Reconstruction of Sidewalks (also reviewed by Physical Services Committee)

e) Approval/Budgetary Amendment (12A063)/Planning/New Freedom Grant/Construction/Reconstruction of Sidewalks (also reviewed by Physical Services Committee)

Items 6d and 6e were voted on together.

Legislator LoBue stated she would be voting "no" for these items.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to move 6d and 6e together, pre-filing the necessary resolutions, seconded by Chairwoman Conklin.

By Roll Call Vote: Two Ayes. One Nay – Legislator LoBue. Motion Carries.

f) Approval/Budgetary Amendment (12A064)/Health/Preschool Program (also reviewed by the Health Committee)

Chairwoman Conklin stated there was a large increase in students which required this budgetary amendment.

Legislator Tamagna stated that school districts do not pay for this program, the County does. The Governor did mention this issue. The Governor stated that the schools should pay one third, the Counties one third, and the State should pay one third. The Governor believed that if that happened that the schools would have a vested interest and it would affect their budget. Legislator Tamagna stated that he believes that the County can brainstorm a much better, more efficient, and fiscally conservative program.

Chairwoman Conklin asked if there was a decision made when the Governor spoke about this issue.

Legislator Tamagna stated he spoke passionately about this subject but no decision was made.

Legislative Counsel Clement Van Ross stated this issue died in the Budgetary Conference.

Legislator DiCarlo stated that during this budget process, we will need to allow for the increase in the number of children to the Preschool Transportation Program. This is another unfunded mandate that is put on the County.

Legislator Tamagna stated he is not saying that we do not need to transport these children with needs because we do. If you look at what we are spending per child, it is alarming. He believes the math comes to approximately \$30,000 per child just for transportation.

Legislator DiCarlo asked if the County takes an active role in encouraging parents to transport their children.

Legislator Birmingham stated the County attempted that two years ago and the reimbursement rate to parents was the IRS rate and quite frankly some parents are not able to transport either because both parents work or what have you. He believes a two-pronged approach, the preschool transportation program and encouraging parents to transport their children, as Legislator DiCarlo has suggested, could possibly be the answer.

Legislator LoBue stated that the problem is that the previous Commissioner of Health looked at the program and was diligent in reducing costs where possible. The reimbursement might not be incentive enough to parents to drive their children. She agrees with Legislator Tamagna in that schools should pay a portion. School districts already have the infrastructure; it makes sense for districts to modify their transportation schedules to accommodate these children.

Legislator Tamagna stated the County needs to come up with a pilot transportation program to show the State how to carry this program out in the correct way.

Legislator Oliverio stated that the State and Federal Government require certain qualified individuals be with the children on these buses. The monitors are the big expense not so much the buses themselves.

Legislator Tamagna stated that if we gave each family \$10,000 and stated they are responsible for transporting your children, that the County would save a huge expense. Some families might jump at that chance.

Legislator Oliverio asked Chairwoman Conklin to direct Commissioner Beals, Commissioner of Health, to address what else can be done regarding this topic.

Legislator LoBue stated we also need a legal opinion from the Law Department for liability purposes.

Legislator LoBue made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator Birmingham. All in favor.

g) Approval/Budgetary Amendment (12A065)/District Attorney/Asset Forfeiture Program (also reviewed by Protective Services Committee)

Legislator LoBue made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator Birmingham. All in favor.

h) Approval/Budgetary Amendment (12A066)/Sheriff/Use of Inmate T-Commission Reserve Funds/Install Security Fence (also reviewed by Protective Services Committee)

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

i) Approval/Budgetary Amendment (12A067)/Coroners/Autopsies

Legislator LoBue made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator Birmingham. All in favor.

7. Approval/Fund Transfer (12T116)/Highway/Temporary/Provide for Additional Flaggers (also reviewed by Physical Services Committee)

Legislator LoBue stated she believes it is for four flaggers.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

8. Approval/Fund Transfer (12T164)/Board of Elections/Contracts/Furniture/ Meals/Miscellaneous

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

9. Approval/Fund Transfer (12T193)/Social Services/Overtime in Medicaid Unit

Legislator LoBue made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator Birmingham. All in favor.

10. Approval/Authorization/Legislators to Attend September New York State Association of Counties Fall Seminar

Legislator LoBue stated that she understood there were two individuals attending and the cost for the hotel and seminar registration was approximately \$631 per person. She questioned if it would be more for travel costs.

Legislator Birmingham stated that it would be but that this was not a fiscal resolution. This \$631 per person is a good faith effort to state the cost for attendance and lodging. The office's education and training budget line has not been surpassed and therefore any costs over the good faith projection of \$631 per person was budgeted.

Legislator LoBue stated that stating that in the resolution would benefit the public so they would know the total cost for the seminar to the taxpayers.

Legislator Birmingham stated that he understood her point but the \$631 per person is approximate and made in good faith.

Chairwoman Conklin agreed with Legislator Birmingham.

Chairwoman Conklin made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator Birmingham. All in favor.

11. Approval/Local Law to Amend Chapter 5 of the Putnam County Code Entitled "Appropriations" (discussed in the Rules Committee)

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to accept the additional for this item, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

Legislator Birmingham stated that this item was passed out of the Audit Committee last month and forwarded to the Full meeting. At said Full meeting, Legislator Othmer requested this item be tabled back to the Audit Committee for further review. He stated that Legislator Othmer wanted to be present at this meeting but unfortunately Legislator Othmer could not be in attendance tonight due to another function.

Legislator Birmingham stated he is in favor of this revised proposed change. He pointed out that in the current law the Audit Committee has some form of involvement across the dollar amount levels. He believes the fact that the Audit Committee was left out of this threshold was simply an oversight. He does not believe in any way that the Audit Committee should have veto power over these transfers nor act in any way that supersedes the Full Legislature. He believes that the Audit Committee should simply review it and that is what the revised proposed change states. He would like to pass this revised proposed change to the September Audit Committee meeting. He believes that will avoid any hard feelings and give enough time to clear up any misunderstandings of intent and purpose regarding this revised proposed change.

Chairwoman Conklin stated she agreed with Legislator Birmingham to move this revised proposed change to the September Audit Committee meeting.

Legislator DiCarlo requested that Chairwoman Conklin send a memorandum requesting the presence of County Executive MaryEllen Odell and County Attorney Jennifer Bumgarner at the September Audit Committee meeting to discuss this item.

Chairwoman Conklin agreed.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to move the revised proposed change to the September Audit & Administration Committee meeting, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

12. Approval/Memorialization/Support of 2012 New York State Legislation S5054A/A7301B Adding the Counties of Kings, Queens, Bronx, Richmond and New York to the Thirteen Counties Already Designated for the Catskill Off-Track Betting Region of New York State

Legislator Tamagna, Legislative Representative to the OTB Board, stated that he met with OTB President Donald Groth after the Legislature had passed this original resolution. Our Legislature's concern last month when this was passed was that we did not want to get swallowed up in this action and have money funneled to New York City instead of our area. President Groth informed him that a State Senator from Orange County wanted the Catskill OTB to invest a large amount of money to build a Taj Mahal in a leased OTB facility in Orange County. President Groth and the OTB Board assessed the proposal and came to the conclusion that the Orange County OTB location does not warrant this expansion due to low level usage of the already in place OTB facility. The Board also believes Catskill OTB needs to grow, they want to re-open one OTB facility in each of New York City's boroughs. These facilities are already there and were just locked up by the City Council. President Groth stated that with \$50,000 in the Chinatown OTB that facility would bring in significant revenue stream. This new resolution does not change how the OTB Board spends money. They are extremely conservative in their spending. They are investing in the Brewster OTB facility right now because they own that facility and that facility creates a lot of revenue. Legislator Tamagna states that he hopes the Committee will agree to rescind the passed resolution and pass the new one.

Legislator Birmingham asked if the make-up of the Catskill OTB Board would be changed because we are adding five locations in the New York City metro area.

Legislator Tamagna stated though five locations would be added they would only have one representative in the Board from New York City, not five. The hold of the Board would still lie in our region. This new resolution tells the Governor that Putnam County is in favor of adding these five locations to the Catskill OTB Region.

Legislator Birmingham stated his concern that the Catskill OTB Board would have to accept the previously agreed upon union contracts that were in place before the NYC OTB closed. He is not sure if that is good or bad or how it compares to the current Catskill OTB union contracts stand. He is worried at the end of the day New York City will swallow us up if we agree to open these five locations under the Catskill OTB Region's wing. Legislator Birmingham stated he is not questioning anyone's ability to run OTB. The previously stated issues are just his concerns.

Legislator Tamagna stated that President Groth stated these new locations will be run the way the rest of the region is already run. At the same time these discussions are taking place, New Jersey is expanding their OTB and opening locations on the New Jersey-New York border, including Upstate borders. Legislator Tamagna stated that former Legislator and current Town of Southeast Supervisor Tony Hay has spoken with President Groth as well and Supervisor Hay is in support of this new resolution.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to accept the additional for this item, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

Legislator LoBue made a motion to repeal Resolution #184 of 2012 and to pre-file the new memorialization, seconded by Legislator Birmingham. All in favor.

13. Discussion/Surcharge on Tax Bills when making Partial Payment

Legislator Oliverio stated he requested this item be discussed. He received calls from constituents that live in Putnam County but whose children attend another County's school district based on district boundaries. Putnam County charges a surcharge when school tax bills are paid in partial payments. Westchester County does not. He would like to know why Putnam County does that. These residents are paying the tax, but just need a few extra months during the year to pay in full.

Legislator Birmingham stated that the County guarantees the school taxes, as well as in Dutchess County. In Westchester County, the towns guarantee the school taxes and he believes that those towns would have the option to charge the partial payment surcharge because they are guaranteeing the school taxes. Putnam County residents pay Putnam County their Westchester County School District school taxes. Putnam County guarantees these Westchester County School Districts taxes because Putnam County residents go to school there. Putnam County then pays the Westchester School Districts their school taxes for those that reside in Putnam County but are required to attend Westchester County Schools. Putnam County is required to pay these Westchester districts their school taxes on time and we borrow to do so. In doing so, Putnam County taxpayers taxes help to cover the interest of that borrowing.

Commissioner Carlin stated that it requires manpower to process these payment plans. If Putnam County did not have a partial payment option the Finance Department would have a lot less staff and a lot less cost. Not to mention, a number of unhappy taxpayers.

Legislator Oliverio stated that he understood the thinking but these constituents call their Westchester School Districts and their superintendents tell them that they have no idea why Putnam County charges a surcharge because Westchester does not. These types of answers are extremely frustrating to constituents.

Commissioner Carlin stated that the difference between Westchester and Putnam is that in Westchester the towns collect the taxes.

Legislator Oliverio asked if we could call those business managers at the Westchester School Districts and request that they not address these questions but give those that call and ask the contact information for the Putnam County Finance Department. These constituents are feeling ripped off because it is not being explained to them properly.

Commissioner Carlin stated the surcharge helps to offset the cost of processing partial payments. He would be happy to explain all of this to the Westchester County School Districts.

The Committee further discussed this item.

14. Schedule of Revenues/Fines Levied by Boards/FYI was duly noted.

15. Other Business

Chairwoman Conklin made a motion to accept both Other Business items, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

a) Approval/Fund Transfer (12T192)/Finance/GPS System & Support

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

b) Approval/Fund Transfer (12T196)/Office for Aging/Computer Equipment

Commissioner Carlin stated that the Office for Aging has a State reporting requirement and when they go to see their clients they have to complete a very thick booklet for facts and figures to be reported to the State to see if these clients are eligible for reimbursement. They complete this assessment form by hand and then bring it back to the office and type it into the computer. What they were hoping is if they could get laptops and only have to do it once. They have money in their budget to pay for it this year.

Legislator LoBue stated she is concerned that they are going to run out of money from the lines they are taking the money from.

Commissioner Carlin stated that they would not run out of money in these lines in the rest of 2012 because they have done route work and figured out ways to save the fuel for their vehicles. Such as, parking in Putnam Valley and that is saving them a tremendous amount of fuel. Not to mention that the laptops will be a huge productivity savings.

Chairwoman Conklin stated this would be thirteen laptops.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, seconded by Chairwoman Conklin. All in favor.

There being no further business, at 8:32 P.M., Legislator Birmingham made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Legislator LoBue. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Krista M. Butler, Administrative Assistant.