

Council Members Doesschate, Applrys, Conti, Fahey, Golby, Kimbrough, Kornegay and O'Brien introduced the following, which was approved:

Resolution Number 107.113.16R

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OUTLINING ITS ACTIONS AND EXPRESSING ITS FINDINGS AND INTENT WITH REGARD TO THE ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 CITY OF ALBANY BUDGET AS PROPOSED IN ORDINANCE 54.111.16 (AS AMENDED) ENTITLED: "AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE BUDGET AS PRESENTED BY THE MAYOR, WITH AMENDMENTS, ON OCTOBER 3, 2016 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017"

WHEREAS on October 3, 2016 the Common Council received the proposed budget for the City of Albany for fiscal year 2017; and

WHEREAS subsequent to receipt of such budget, the Common Council engaged in an extensive review of the proposal which included meeting with department heads, holding two public hearings, and discussing the city's financial status and Council budget priorities; and

WHEREAS as a result of this process the Council has adopted Ordinance Number 54.111.16 (as amended) which adopts the fiscal year 2017 City of Albany budget with revisions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Common Council does adopt the following statement outlining its actions and expressing its findings and intent with regard to adoption of the fiscal year 2017 City of Albany budget; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Mayor, Chief of Staff, Budget Director and all other department heads; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of the "Statement of Common Council Actions, Findings and Intent" as herein adopted be printed in the final bound document constituting the "City of Albany 2017 Budget" immediately following the Mayor's transmittal message.

**2017 City of Albany Budget
Statement of Common Council Actions, Findings, Intent and Recommendations**

The Common Council has completed its review of the proposed 2017 City of Albany budget. This statement summarizes the Council's actions, findings and intent with regard to adoption of Ordinance 54.111.16 (as amended).

Overview

For at least the past decade the Common Council has recognized that the significant fiscal challenges the City has been facing and has repeatedly noted that many of the prior budgets

relied on non-recurring funding mechanisms, unsustainable landfill revenues, unrealistic revenue projections and PILOT spin-ups that drain future resources. We strongly support the Mayor's efforts to obtain our fair share of funding from New York State to help address the fact that 63% of property in the city is tax exempt and that our city provides essential services to tens of thousands of state employees everyday who do not reside in the city. The Council is ready to assist in the effort to obtain sustainable funding from the state that is commensurate with the undue burdens our taxpayers shoulder throughout the year.

The 2017 proposed budget decreases expenditures by \$3.6 million or approximately 2% which is mostly realized through a \$2 million reduction for estimated retirement contributions and a similar, ambitious, reduction in workers' compensation expenditures. Most of the remaining savings is realized within the Department of General Services (DGS) through reductions in fuel expenses, overtime and contractual expenses. Notably, between 2014 and 2017, Commissioner Mirabile has been able to reduce the annual DGS budget by \$2.9 million (excluding energy savings) through aggressive management and implementation of cost-savings measures. The proposed 2017 budget also anticipates modest expenditure increases for benefits and almost a half million dollar increase in debt service payments.

Despite the estimated \$3.6 reduction in expenditures, the 2017 Proposed Budget increases the proposed tax levy by almost \$1.5 million as a result of significant reductions in other revenue. This increase in the tax levy is not expected to increase the real property tax rate since the total assessed property value in the city has increased in the latest city-wide reassessment proportionately to the proposed tax levy. However, the reassessment also highlights the increasing challenges the city faces in providing services to residents and visitors due to the large amount of tax exempt property which now stands at 63 percent of assessed value. The Council recognizes the efforts of the Mayor to secure additional state funding in recognition of the large amount of government exempt property within the city, as well as PILOTs from exempt not-for-profits. The Common Council is committed to working strategically with the Mayor and the residents of the city to urge these entities to make long-term, lasting commitments to supporting the city in the provision of needed services. We also note that despite these significant fiscal challenges, the Mayor's budgets have kept real property tax increases below the State-mandated 2% tax cap the past three years.

The reductions in revenue include a necessary and proper correction of the previously budgeted \$1.9 million in revenue from red light cameras, a \$1.7 million reduction in PILOT payments, and a planned reduction of approximately \$2.4 million in landfill revenues. This reduction in landfill revenue (to \$7.4 million in 2017) is an extension of the Mayor's plan to keep the landfill open until 2023 by reducing the amount of garbage the city accepts from private haulers and other entities so that the closure of the landfill will coincide with the expiration of the city's bonds for the landfill. This prudent measure is a reminder of just one of the City's fiscal challenges and pending reality, i.e., it will no longer be able to rely on revenue from the landfill to help balance its budget.

Because of the continuing structural imbalance in the city's financial picture, the budget relies on another \$12.5 million in "Capital City Funding" from the State. The Council has been advised that the State has contracted for an audit to be performed to assess how the city might

make up the difference if the State were not to provide the \$12.5 million in funding. However, since the City has not been provided with a copy of that report, the Common Council has not had the benefit of any analysis and recommendations contained in that audit as it reviewed the 2017 Proposed Budget.

The Common Council has made two modest adjustments to the budget with respect to the funding activities of the Public, Education and Government Access Oversight Board (PEG Oversight Board) and a reduction in summer camp fees totaling \$39,000 that are funded out of a new revenue stream for utility pole registrations and savings from utilities in the Recreation Department. Consequently, these adjustments are budget-neutral. At the request of the administration, the Common Council has also moved \$439,540 from the Police Department to the Contingency Account to correct a clerical error in the number of funded positions. At the administration's request, the Council also transfers an additional \$169,255 out of the Contingency Account to cover expenses associated with the operation of the city's Records Unit that operates out of the Albany County Hall of Records. The Council also made three changes to move revenue accounts to their proper locations. The net impact of the changes made by the Council is a \$270,285 increase in the Contingency Account. The details of these changes and other items considered by the Council are set out below.

Council Revisions

Technical Corrections

The Common Council, with the agreement of the Mayor's Office, has made the following technical corrections that were identified during departmental presentations:

REVENUE TRANSFERS

The Council made three amendments to move revenue lines to appropriate departments and revenue subcategories. All of these amendments are budget neutral. Specifically:

1. Occupational Licensure Fee revenue of \$220,000 is moved from the City Clerk's revenue lines to the Department of Buildings and Regulatory Compliance;
2. Public Assembly Permit Fee revenue of \$25,000 is moved from the City Clerk's revenue lines to the Department of Fire and Emergency Services; and
3. The Interfund Transfer Account 5031.02 of \$1,000,000.00 is moved from "Federal Aid" on page 20 to "Interfund Revenue" on page 19 of the proposed budget.

REDUCTIONS TO EXPENDITURES

The Council corrected a clerical error in the Albany Police Department budget to reflect the Department's intent to keep staffing at 2016 levels. The proposed budget had erroneously increased staffing by six positions due to the Department's use of the Electronic Resource Planning system for the first time in the development of its budget. During his presentation, Chief Cox explained that the Department had not intended to increase the number of enlisted officers in his 2017 budget request and advised the Council that the 2017 Proposed Budget should be amended to reduce the number of Police Officer Recruits by five (from 21 to 16) and

the number of Police Officer IV's by one (from 201 to 200). The Council made those reductions and the associated FICA, health insurance and retirement costs totaling a reduction of \$439,540. At the request of the Director of the Budget, these funds were transferred to the Contingency Account (A 1900.7448) resulting in a zero net change in the budget.

During his budget presentation, Chief Cox asked the funds erroneously included in the Albany Police Department budget remain in the department to address the recent departure of the head of the department's Information Technology (IT) Unit and other issues, including additional technological support needs for full implementation of "body worn cameras." The Council supports the full implementation of the body worn camera initiative. However, the administration clarified that there was no specific request for inclusion of additional funding in the budget for implementation of the body worn cameras because the Albany Police Department is continuing to test different body worn camera systems and the selection of a vendor and other considerations may impact specific requests for personnel changes or other support. The Council was also advised that the administration may seek amendments related to these issues through a Board of Estimate and Apportionment transfer once the Albany Police Department is further along in the development of specific plans to address these changes in the department. As a result, the Council did not make budget amendments to address these issues.

City Records Unit – Shared Services Agreement

Consistent with the purpose of the Contingency Account (A 1900.7448), the Common Council has transferred \$169,255 from that account to various accounts (A1660.7110 et seq.) to provide ongoing funding for the City's Record Unit that operates out of the Albany County Hall of Records.

Since 1982, the city and county have had a shared services agreement for the storage and management of city records at the Albany County Hall of Records. Under the agreement, the city has paid the salaries of two city employees working at the Hall of Records and related costs, including a pre-set contractual amount to offset the County's costs for storing the records. This unit performs vital functions for the city of Albany. Pursuant to the Local Government Records Law (Arts and Cultural Affairs Law Article 57-A) the city is required to store, retain and make available public records for specified periods of time. Additionally, through this arrangement, the city maintains a wide variety of records that are of interest to historians, genealogists, archaeologists, teachers, authors, lawyers and residents, including marriage licenses, city directories, census records, police blotters, civil war records, immigration records, slave records, maps, photos and land records.

The expenses associated with this unit were omitted from the 2017 Proposed Budget due to the administration's belief that the costs associated with the operation of this unit were being picked up by Albany County. After issuance of the proposed budget, the Mayor learned this would not be the case. As a result, the Council has amended the 2017 Proposed Budget to include all costs associated with this unit totaling to \$169,255. The amounts included in the amendment are identical to those included in the 2016 city budget except for a modest adjustment in health insurance and FICA.

Since unit serves a vital city function, there is no question that the city must provide funding for this purpose in the absence of funding from another source. Additionally, since the County-City cooperative agreement for record retention and retrieval is considered the gold standard for municipal shared services arrangement, the Council had no reason to consider another arrangement for the maintenance of its records at this time.

Public, Education and Government (PEG) Cable Access Support

The Common Council recognizes that the PEG Oversight Board has made significant progress and improvements in PEG operations. Some of these improvements include program scheduling and video on demand availability. In order for the Board to continue with this momentum, additional funding is critical. Insufficient funding and staffing hinders the Board from acting in the public's interest and carrying out its mission to oversee implementation of PEG Access, the cable television public access facility/studio and promoting public awareness of public access in the City of Albany.

The PEG Oversight Board has requested the Common Council add \$20,000 to the 2017 budget to enable it to hire personnel or contract for services to help it achieve its mission. The Board will hire a PEG Technical Assistance Specialists/Community Liaison and part-time help to assist with recording government and community meetings; providing technical support to the Public Access Studio Coordinator; and conducting community outreach to engage and increase Channel Albany viewership. We understand the PEG Oversight Board is considering other options for expanding its services and may use this money to contract with outside vendors and purchase miscellaneous supplies.

The Council is appreciative of the time and energy the PEG Oversight Board has put into considering all options to make an assessment of how the city and the public will be best served in using these funds.

Department of Recreation

The Common Council amends the budget to reduce both the Recreation Department's revenue line for summer camps (A0000.2089) and the Recreation Department's utilities expense line (A7140.7420) by \$19,000 to eliminate the need for the Recreation Department to charge a \$25-\$85 weekly fee to camp participants who are city residents.

The 2016 budget expected that residents would be charged \$85 per week for summer camp, unless they were eligible for the free and reduced lunch program, in which case the charge would be \$25 per child per week. The implementation of the fee caused concern in the community that children who could not afford the camp fees would be turned away from these city services although our children are also most likely to be greatest need of activity and supervision during the summer. The Recreation Department attempted to address these concerns by creating a sliding scale for camp fees and allowing for caregiver involvement in order to eliminate barriers to these services. As a result, although the 2016 budget anticipated the city's summer camp program would generate \$29,600 in revenue, the program only generated \$16,267 in revenues in 2016. That amount included a \$10,000 sponsorship. Consequently, less than

\$7,000 was generated in actual camp fees in 2016. The proposed budget projected the same \$29,600 in revenue from camp fees for 2017.

The Council finds that small amount of revenue generated by charging fees for city residents to attend summer camps has not been worth the administrative burden, the potential deterrent effect on attendance and the negative impact on department-community relations. The Council prefers the Department of Recreation staff time and resources to be used and focused on increasing the programming for the summer camp program as well as other recreational activities in our most economically challenged neighborhoods. \$10,600 has been left in the summer camp fee revenue line with the expectation that the Department may generate income via non-resident camp fees and request modest registration fees to encourage families to make a commitment to camp attendance so that the Department may plan appropriately for staff and programming. The Department is also encouraged to continue to seek sponsorships, grants and other funding mechanisms that are compatible with the development of a robust summer camp program in the city.

Salary Adjustments and Promotions

During its deliberations the Common Council heard from many individuals and groups advocating for city employees who have not received salary adjustments in recent years while expressing opposition to, and dismay at, the proposed salary adjustments and promotions of some employees, many of whom are scheduled to receive salary increases of 10% or more.

The Common Council has struggled with this dichotomy and its lack of authority to effectuate changes with regard to either of these issues. Section 604 of the City Charter and legal precedent prevents the Council from either increasing or decreasing salaries or abolishing lines that it did not create. Consequently, despite our unanimous sentiment that our rank and file employees should receive salary adjustments and our desire to see collective bargaining negotiations settled with amicable and equitable agreements, we lack the authority to amend the budget to adjust salaries.

As the Common Council has examined the budget and listened to requests from the public for additional funding for various initiatives, we have been mindful that the expenditure of additional funds can hamper the ability of the city to provide city employees with salary adjustments and contract settlements. Consequently, wherever the Council has initiated amendments to the budget, it has found revenue or savings elsewhere, or kept within amounts previously not anticipated to be available by the administration.

Although there is not universal support amongst Council members for all or most of the raises contained in the 2017 Proposed Budget, most Council members recognize the need for the city to provide increases throughout the city to attract and retain qualified staff to perform vital city functions. Where department heads, such as in the Departments of Law, Planning and General Services, have managed to provide salary increases and promotions through a thoughtful reconfiguration and reallocation of positions and resources within their existing personnel budget, the majority of the Council supports and applauds such efforts.

Office of Audit and Control Salary Adjustment Request

During his presentation, the City Auditor noted that although he had requested both analyst positions in his office be increased to \$47,500 in the 2017 budget, only one analyst position had been increased to that level from \$47,337 to make that individual ineligible for overtime. The other position was increased in the 2017 budget from \$41,063 to \$42,500. Mr. Engstrom noted that both individuals perform the same types of services, and consequently, should earn the same salary and noted that the increase could be accommodated through the \$16,000 savings in health insurance in his office's budget. Since the City Charter does not appear to give the Council authority to effectuate such a change in salary, we believe the most appropriate mechanism for securing such an increase would be through the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

Office of the Treasurer Salary Adjustment Requests

During his presentation to the Finance Committee, the Treasurer proposed reducing his salary from \$98,483 to \$60,000 and applying the \$38,483 savings, along with \$3,662 from the postage line, to increase the salaries of thirteen employees within the Office of the Treasurer. In addition to the questions raised regarding the ability of the Council to make these salary adjustments under the City's Charter, Council Members expressed concern that such a modification would lock the city administration and the Council into higher salaries for those employees in future years without any assurance the city would be able to support those raises in the future. Additionally, it was noted that the Council does not have the legal authority to reduce the salary of an elected official while in office. While the Treasurer indicated a willingness to sign a legally binding agreement to reduce his salary, it was noted that since his position will be on the ballot in 2017, there is no guarantee that any future Treasurers will agree to a similar reduction in salary to keep the proposed salary modifications budget-neutral. As a result, there was no support for the proposal in the Finance Committee, and only limited tentative support amongst other Council members. Consequently, this proposal is not part of the budget amendments proposed or adopted by the Council.

Other Salary and Title Adjustments

We note that the administration made some additional salary adjustment and title change requests that were the result of clerical errors in inputting information into the ERP system. Because these affect the titles and salaries of individuals who are actually currently employed by the city and our authority to make such changes through the budget process is debatable, we felt these changes should be handled through the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.

Curbside Waste Collection Fee (WCF)

The curbside WCF has been one of the most difficult issues for the Common Council to deal with over the past year. We recognize that the city's difficult fiscal situation -- exacerbated by the number of tax-exempt properties in the city and the significantly lower per capita state aid funding the city receives as compared to other major upstate cities -- requires the city to generate more revenues while finding savings in the operating budget. Additionally, the landfill will be

closed in a matter of years, requiring the city to make up the lost revenue from the closure while also figuring out how to pay for disposal costs that we now take for granted as being “free.” As the city prepares to transition to the closure of the landfill, the landfill is taking in less garbage to ensure the landfill is operational until the bonds are paid off. As a result, the 2017 budget anticipates a \$2.4 million reduction in the amount of revenue generated by the landfill. Recognizing these challenges, the Council is making it clear that the city needs to move expeditiously towards a system that incentivizes reducing the amount of garbage that is generated to reduce the overall city costs associated with waste collection and disposal. This requires not only the adoption of a waste fee schedule that is based upon the volume of garbage that is left curbside, but also an increase in reuse, composting and recycling education efforts.

The Council seriously considered a number of mechanisms for adjusting the current fee schedule in recognition of the ingrained inequities of the current curbside WCF system, including eliminating the fee, adjusting the fee, and spreading the fee out amongst all properties that receive City of Albany curbside waste collection services. These options were considered along with the option of keeping the WCF for 2017 at the current rate of \$180 per unit for the 2nd, 3rd and 4th units in residences receiving such services in light of the challenges posed by the other options and the existing tightness of the budget without this reduction in revenue.

The elimination of the fee entirely is not feasible as evidenced by the inability of any Council member to develop and introduce a budget amendment or other proposal that identifies specific cuts to achieve the needed savings to balance the budget without revenue from a curbside WCF. The administration has made it clear that it is not prepared to undertake spreading the fee out to all property owners provided with curbside waste collection services and that the Department of Buildings and Regulatory compliance was inundated with calls and complaints in 2016 that diverted staff from its mission – and consequently, is not ready to expand on the number of people who may be contacting that office with questions and concerns about the WCF. The administration also made it clear that it considered the continuation of the existing trash fee and the increase in the Contingency Account from the Police Department clerical error essential for the City to implement an already tight budget.

While a number of Council members supported an amendment to reduce the revenue line for the WCF so that the fee schedule for 2017 would be reduced to \$135 per unit for the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th units in residences receiving such services, a majority of members did not support this reduction due to concerns over the impact of the reduced revenues on the City’s ability to implement the proposed budget or because of their opposition to the continued implementation of any WCF. As a result, the trash fee revenue line remains unchanged in the budget at 1.5 million dollars. Some members also made it clear that their support for the budget should not be construed as support for the continuation of the existing WCF.

The Council also agreed to move up the sunset date for the current trash fee arrangement by two years, to December 31, 2017, and require the city to implement a volume based fee in 2018 if one is to exist at all. This expedited transition to a volume based fee, along with a requirement for improved reuse, composting and recycling education, will have the added benefit of reducing the flow of trash to our landfill, and therefore, assist in the extension of the life of the landfill to 2023.

Proposed Consolidations of Various Departments and Units

We note that the 2017 Proposed Budget indicated that certain offices or units are expected to be consolidated in the Department of Administrative Services. We advised the administration that these changes cannot be effectuated through the budget document, but must be addressed through amendments to the City Code. Currently, only the Purchasing and Human Resources units are included within the Department of Administrative Services. The City Code does not include the Information Technology Unit, the Department of Cultural Affairs, and Assessor's Office in the Department of Administrative Services, although they were included in the proposed consolidation in the budget. The Council has been provided with draft legislation to partially effectuate these changes that the Finance Committee will take up shortly. However, we need to clarify here that the Council and the administration are in agreement that the proposed legislation will not transfer the Assessor's Office to the Department of Administrative Services and that the Assessor's Office will remain a separate office reporting directly to the Mayor.

Capital Budget

The Council has conducted a preliminary review the proposed 2017 Capital Budget during its discussions with Department heads and will review it, and compliance with the adopted debt policy, more closely when presented with the separate bonding ordinances in early 2017. We note that although the 2017 budget includes \$3.8 million more in capital spending than was projected in the 2016 five year Capital Plan, \$3 million of this increase is attributable to potential TIP Pavement Preservation projects that are expected to be 80% reimbursable. It is understandable that the administration would want to take full advantage of such funding when it is available. However, the Council continues to be concerned about the level of borrowing, the accumulation of debt, and the impact on the city's fiscal health and bond ratings.

Recommendations for the Future

During its deliberations, the Council identified several additional areas of concern that cannot be immediately addressed in this budget. Some of those areas of concern relate to the budget process and the Council's limited role. Others relate to concerns and recommendations that the Council hopes the Mayor and her administration will consider and work with the Council to implement, where appropriate.

- Future proposed budgets should contain clear and transparent year to year budget information, including current and proposed individual staffing and salary lines, year-to-date expenditures for all entries, and clear explanations of the budgetary assumptions supporting revenue and expenditure projections.

The format for the 2017 proposed budget was modified from past practices to eliminate individual salary and position information for the current fiscal year, preventing Council members and the public from easily identifying staffing reconfigurations or salary adjustments imbedded in the budget. This required individuals to attempt to decipher the information by

referring to both the 2016 and 2017 budgets – a cumbersome process. Although the administration was asked to provide information regarding staffing reconfigurations and salary adjustments in a uniform document the Council was left to obtaining this information from Department heads during their presentations to the Finance Committee. Other requests were made of the Budget Office for explanations of various projections, including projected decreases in retirement contributions and workers’ compensation expenses that should have been part of the budget narrative. Although the Council was provided with print-outs of prior years’ expenditures, it was never provided with a written explanation as requested. The provision of clear and transparent information and explanations in support of proposed budgets is a necessary component of good government and the ability of the Common Council to perform its obligations under the City Charter. As a result, the Council respectfully requests that all future budgets include clear and transparent year to year budget information, including current and proposed individual salary lines, year-to-date expenditures for all entries, and clear explanations of the budgetary assumptions supporting individual revenue and expenditure projections.

- Eliminate “ERP Savings” entries in future budgets, and instead, use the Electronic Resource Planning (ERP) system to identify concrete, achievable reductions in expenses beginning immediately.

The 2017 proposed budget includes an “ERP Savings” line for most, but not all, of the departments and units funded through the city budget. The amounts included in the 2017 “ERP Savings” lines for each unit or department are identical to those included directly or implicitly in the 2016 budget. The savings projections hover around 2%, but fall within a range of 0% to about 8.5% of each department’s personnel costs. Though the Council asked for information regarding the rationale for the varying percentages and questioned how the administration might realize additional savings in 2017 from the implementation of the Kronos time-record keeping system this year, the responses provided left the Council struggling to understand these “ERP Savings.” The Finance Committee considered consolidating these lines in recognition of the fact the administration is in the best position to ensure savings and individual Department targets may be difficult to achieve if there are no vacancies. However, the Budget Office indicated creating a new line to accomplish this and the appropriate allocation of the line would be challenging – and acknowledged that it would most likely eliminate these “ERP Savings” lines from the 2018 budget.

The Council endorses the elimination of these poorly understood savings lines, and encourages the administration to begin using the ERP system immediately to identify additional savings in 2017 and beyond. The city has invested over \$1 million dollars in the development and implementation of an ERP system over the past two years using a grant from the state’s Financial Restructuring Board (FRB) specifically earmarked for this purpose. Amongst the goals of the new system was to ensure the various departments and elected officials have up-to-date information on the city’s accounts and resources so individual departments and the administration as a whole could effectively and efficiently monitor transactions, reduce errors, and identify potential efficiencies from the analysis of available data. In her presentation, the Budget Director also indicated that there were staff in many of the city’s departments, in “silos” that were performing functions that were duplicative of those intended to be performed by the Department of Administrative Services, and that with full implementation of the ERP system, some positions would become obsolete. In light of the city’s difficult fiscal situation, the

Council urges the administration to maximize the benefits from this ERP system by identifying and implementing opportunities for additional savings as soon as possible.

- Obtain and distribute a copy of the PFM audit of the city performed at the request of the State Financial Restructuring Board

Given the city's difficult fiscal situation, the administration, the Common Council and the public should have access to the thorough audit and analysis recently performed on behalf of the State so that it can benefit from the analysis and perspective of outside experts and potentially implement recommendations. It is unclear why the State would have expended the time and money involved in this exhaustive review of the city's finances and then not share the results with the stakeholders who are most affected by the city's current fiscal situation and in the best position to implement any appropriate recommendations and changes.

- Identify opportunities to partner with the school system, including potential opportunities for additional income for crossing guards.

During its deliberations, Council members expressed concern about the problems the city has with filling crossing guard positions and ensuring reliable attendance. It was noted that the two short shifts available to crossing guards and the limited amount of pay generated from such shifts contribute significantly to the problems with filling these positions and ensuring reliable attendance. Council members felt our children would benefit from the city and the school district collaborating to provide crossing guards with expanded income opportunities by serving within our schools for jobs such as lunch aide, hall or playground monitor, or other potential part-time positions. Since many of our children already know the crossing guards well, and vice versa, employing crossing guards in these kinds of positions would be a logical and mutually beneficial choice. We believe additional opportunities for collaboration and coordination exist with regard to offering recreational opportunities to our community, and especially to our youth.

Possible Charter Amendments

In addition to the foregoing, we note that the Council struggled with understanding the City Charter provisions with regard to its authority to make technical corrections to the budget, including especially the addition and deletion of specific positions and undisputed adjustments to salary lines that unintentionally veered from existing 2016 salaries. It makes no sense that the Council has the authority to approve or deny salary adjustments proposed throughout the year through the Board of Estimate and Apportionment process and Charter provisions, but that it lacks the authority to impact salaries, including raises and promotions, when it is asked to approve the budget. As the city continues to struggle financially, and is looking at precipitously declining landfill revenues and has had to use "spin-ups" from future 19-A PILOT payments that are now due to expire in just 15 years, it is likely that the Council will be presented with budgets that require it to exceed the real property tax cap or cut city services drastically. Given the level of responsibility that comes with the approval or rejection of such budgets, it is clear the Council should have the ability to make significant adjustments in budgets, including eliminating or adding positions and adjusting salaries. As a result, the Council is committed to further

examining its authority under the City Charter and potentially placing amendments to the Charter before the voters in November.

Conclusion

With adoption of Ordinance 54.111.16 as amended and this resolution, we complete action on the fiscal year 2017 City of Albany budget.

Passed by the following voice vote of all the Council Members elected voting in favor thereof:

Affirmative – Applys, Conti, Doesschate, Fahey, Flynn, Golby, Igoe, Herring, Kimbrough, Kornegay and O’Brien

Negative – Bailey, Commisso, Krasher and Robinson

Affirmative 11 Negative 4 Abstain 0

Clerk of the Common Council

President of the Common Council

Mayor

Date

I, Gerald Campbell, Acting City Clerk and Clerk of the Common Council, do hereby certify that Resolution Number 107.113.16R was passed at a meeting of the Albany Common Council on November 30th, 2016.

In Affirmation thereof, I hereto set my hand and affix The Seal of the City of Albany this _____ day of December 2016.

Acting Clerk of the Common Council

TO: Gerald Campbell, Acting City Clerk

FROM:

**RE: Request for Common Council Legislation
Supporting Memorandum**

DATE: December 12, 2016

RESOLUTION NUMBER 107.113.16 (MC)

TITLE: RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OUTLINING ITS ACTIONS AND EXPRESSING ITS FINDINGS AND INTENT WITH REGARD TO THE ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 CITY OF ALBANY BUDGET AS PROPOSED IN ORDINANCE 54.111.16 (AS AMENDED) ENTITLED: “AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE BUDGET AS PRESENTED BY THE MAYOR, WITH AMENDMENTS, ON OCTOBER 3, 2016 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017”

GENERAL PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION: To adopt an explanatory resolution to be read in conjunction with the budget adopted with amendments by the Common Council.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.