Open Work Session
FY19 Budget
May 15, 2018

Mrs. Hurley said this Work Session was added to the Agenda because there were some concerns that the revenue stated in the budget is over the revenue cap provided in the County's Charter. She said the Budget Summary Message indicates that the real property net assessable base increased 2.7 percent, so there were some concerns that perhaps the revenue cap was exceeded by 0.7 percent. She said they looked at the worksheet in the budget that does the calculation for the revenue cap, and that dollar amount is actually less than the dollar amount shown in the budget. She said they asked the Internal Auditors to take a look at it, and they have now put together their audit report.

Mr. Roser said he has a few things to go over. He then said the Auditors' main concerns were that the budget numbers should provide transparency, consistency, and accuracy. He said they reviewed the budgeted property tax base calculations from 2015 to 2019, and from 2015 to 2017, the numbers were fairly consistent. He said the County used a State certified number plus new construction to determine the property tax base. He said, in 2018, the County used a State certified number without adding new construction for the property tax base, and then in 2019 they used the number from a spreadsheet found on the SDAT website without an adjustment. He said, next, they looked at the revenue submissions for the current budget. He said on March 22nd, there was a public presentation that had the revenue number at $56,178,000. He said on April 17th the budget was submitted to the County Council at $56,914,00 for revenue, and on May 14th, yesterday, they understand the number presented was $56,503,000, and that was presented to the Council Administrator in a meeting yesterday that the Auditors did not attend. He said on Page 4 of their consult report dated May 10th, which they sent out to Council, recommends using the State certified documentation in a consistent manner in order to provide Council and the taxpayers the tools they need to evaluate the budget. He said, again, they recommend a calculation that provides transparency, consistency, and accuracy, and he thinks they can throw in simplicity if they simply use the State numbers. He said the complete report is available to Council, and is one of five documents they have issued to Council regarding the budget since the budget books came out. He said they would be happy to take any direction from Council as to where they would like them to go from here.

Mr. Dodd asked how they lost $4 million in a couple of weeks, to which Mr. Roser responded, he thinks they were basing the numbers on different criteria as far as the base, and wrestling with what base to use. Mr. Dodd asked if it is all an estimate, to which Mr. Roser responded, to be clear, it is all an estimate. Mr. Dodd said it changed three different times, to which Mr. Roser responded, they need to be able to pin it to something consistently in order to make their evaluations. He said it is a budget, and a budget, by definition, is an estimate. He said what they will get in revenue is going to be different than all three of these numbers, but they have to start somewhere.

Mr. Cannon said he, for one, agrees with Mr. Roser's recommendation that State certification is, without a doubt, the most consistent. He said he thinks if they decide to take the March number, they could get into some grey areas, and he thinks staying with a certified number from the State is probably the best way to maintain consistency throughout year after year. He then asked, if they were to do that or suggest that is what they would like to do, what would they have to do to put all of the pieces back together to get to that final calculation and make the necessary adjustments, and what dollar figures does he see they will have to work with, to which Mr. Roser responded, that is a matter for discussion.

He said they have a budget submitted with a certain number in it, they have a budget bill, and then they have a number they were presented with yesterday that is different from both of those, so he thinks they need to work with Finance to try to correct the situation. He said as far as the legality of what Council needs to do in order to get this done legally, they would defer to the lawyers on that.

Mrs. Dawn Parks, Director of Finance, Mr. Paul Wilber, County Attorney, and Mr. Wayne Strausburg, Director of Administration, came before Council. Mrs. Parks said she is in total agreement that they need to come up with a policy that is consistent year-to-year. She said one of the issues they have had in the past ten years is they have had four different Directors of Finance, and four different ways this has been computed. She said one of the presentations went back to FY15, and last night she actually figured out how that was calculated. She said if they take the example that is in the budget presentation Council was given and minus out half a year of new construction, that is what was budgeted. She said they subtracted it out when they came up with the revenue cap, and they subtracted it out again when they booked the budget. She said that is how FY15 was done. She said it used the top portion of the Constant Yield because this is what is used on that page in the budget book. She clarified, she is not saying that is right or wrong, but she is just saying that it has been done differently by four different Directors. She said, when she was working on her budget for the real estate, she wanted to get the closest revenue they could get to utilize the revenue they have for this year. She said the closest and most accurate number is the March number. She said even the letter they get from SDAT states that more accurate numbers are available in March. She clarified, she is not saying that using the Constant Yield Notice is wrong, but she is just saying that when she was looking at her revenue projection, she wanted to use the closest number to what they are actually going to have in order to be able to utilize those funds for education, roads, and public safety instead of having a large variance. Mr. Cannon asked if the March number is certified, to which Mrs. Parks responded, it is a State report. Mr. Cannon asked if it has been certified yet, to which Mrs. Parks responded, she cannot say that it is certified or not as she would have to ask them if they consider it certified. She said it is a State report the County gets, but she does not know if it actually says on it that it is certified. She then asked Mr. Wilber if it states it has to be certified, to which Mr. Wilber responded, the Charter speaks in terms of revenues derived from taxes on property existing on real property tax rolls at the commencement of the County fiscal year. Mr. Cannon clarified, he is not worrying about the Charter. He said he is just trying to make sure the number they are using was bona fide, for lack of a better word, to which Mrs. Parks responded, it does come from the State, and that is where she started with her revenue projection. She said when they had their budget hearing in March, they did not have these projections yet as all they had was the February notice and not the March notice, and that is where the difference is. Mr. Cannon said one thing this shows is that, when they are looking at those types of numbers, they are reevaluating in March, to which Mrs. Parks responded, she should have put that in the report. She said, moving forward, if they decide they are going to use the report versus the Constant Yield Notice, she will put that in there, and she understands the confusion there. Mr. Cannon said whatever they are going to save, there is such flux, even with prior year carryforward, to which Mrs. Parks responded, this is a moving number. Mr. Cannon said he does not think they have to nail that exact number down on property assessable base to March as opposed to February, and he thinks they can be satisfied with what the State puts out in February and live with it no matter what. He said they have a huge variance in what is allowed as they move forward just with the carryforward. He said the terminology always throws him off, but he means whatever they might use from reserves.

Mr. Kilmer said he thinks the issue is, as they were saying before, that they need consistency, and he always thought there was just one number they used and he did not realize there were numbers they could pick from. He said he thinks most people, when thinking about this, think there is just a number used to base it on. He said he did not realize they had some discretion about what numbers could be used, and Mrs. Parks' preference is different than her predecessor's, and hers was different, so maybe they need to figure out what the right one would be, to which Mrs. Parks responded, her goal was to give a revenue projection that would allow them to utilize as much of what she anticipates their July 1 billing is going to be without a huge variance at the end of the year. Mr. Kilmer asked, looking retrospectively as to always getting the end of year reports for taxes and seeing they budgeted one number that actually came in different, can she look back and figure out what the most accurate number has been over the past four or five years, to which Mrs. Parks responded, she just looked at the last three years. She said, for FY18, right now they have a $694,00 variance. Mr. Kilmer asked if that is in the County's favor, to which Mrs. Parks responded, it is in their favor, but if it had been calculated based on how she did this year's, there would have been a $90,000 variance leaving $600,000 of revenue they could have utilized this year. Mr. Dodd asked Mrs. Parks what she missed, to which Mrs. Parks responded, she did not do that projection. Mr. Dodd asked what the difference was, to which Mrs. Parks responded, it was based on net. Mr. Dodd then said he is trying to figure out how she is coming up with her figures, to which Mrs. Parks responded, this was last year's, and it was based on the net assessable base on the Constant Yield. She said, when they do the billing on July 1st, the billing also includes half a year of new construction, and a full year of new construction in there. She said then during the year they have adjustments that come in and out of that number all year long, and when she does her budget assessment, she needs to be able to look at that and budget for it as well. She said she has to increase what would be the net assessment plus the actual revenue that would be generated for the half year and full year new construction, but she also has to take into account any adjustments that come along during the year because their system is set up to hit that main line, and they do not have it going to different revenue lines. She said they do have one half year, which is the January billing they do for new construction, and is on a different revenue line, but, other than that, any adjustments during the year hit that one revenue line, and if they do not budget for those, they end up with large variances.

Mr. Roser said he thinks what they really should be looking at here is consistency. He said, if they are going by a number that is certified by the State every 12 months, by definition that is self-correcting as whatever happens in the next 12-month period will be corrected for in the next assessable budget, and it can go up or down. He then asked, if they pull a figure off of this spreadsheet that is lower than the certified base, do they go back to that as a stopgap measure in order to get a better number? He said they need consistency, and in order to do that, they need to tie their boat to a dock that is steady, and that is the same thing every year, and not trying to chase a number that is going up or down by definition, but let it correct itself in that 12-month period. Mrs. Parks said even if they use the constant yield number, they would still need to account for the new construction and put that back in there because new construction is revenue by Charter, to which Mr. Roser responded, the new construction is allowed for in this certified document, and the Auditors completely agree that it needs to be added back in because, by definition, new construction is not included because it has never been taxed. He said, if they had to apply the tax cap to new construction, the perpetual tax on it would be zero because 1.02 times zero is zero, so they agree with adding the new construction back in. He said they can get as far in the weeds as they want on this issue, but they need to sit down and decide what they are going to use year after year, and let it rebalance itself at the end of that 12-month period so they have something going forward and are not chasing these 14-month numbers back and forth.

Mr. Cannon asked Mrs. Parks what her preference is, to which Mrs. Parks responded, as the one who does the budget, she likes to get as close to what is accurate as possible. She said she understands consistency though, and she wants not only herself, the Executive, and the County Administrator, but Council to be comfortable with the policy she is following. She said she is very willing to work with Mr.

Hitchens and Mr. Roser on coming up with a policy they follow from year to year. Mr. Hitchens said one issue he has with the March number is that the spreadsheet does not seem to take into consideration abatements and deletions, whereas the certification does, so he is not sure how she accounts for that, to which Mrs. Parks responded, the third number is not a budget number. She said that number came from when she was looking to see if it busted the revenue cap because, if it had, she would have come back and said they need to go to constant yield, or find out what rate they needed to go to in order not to. She said that is the number they get when they remove out the adjustments that were estimated, and the constant yield notice is the only place she can grab that number from. She said the estimated adjustments she gave them yesterday on a piece of paper where she reduced the number by $411,000 because that would not be considered revenue, and that is under the constant yield allowable amount. She said, once they remove the adjustments, it is below the allowable amount on that page, and the allowable amount is the $56,670. She said the way their system works, if she did not adjust for that, they would end up with a big variance at the end of the year, and her objective was not to have a huge variance at the end of the year. Mr. Hitchens asked how the $411,000 is accounted for in the actual budget itself in Munis. Mr. Cannon then asked where they are getting the $411,000 number from, to which Mrs. Parks responded, on the Constant Yield Notice, they can see that on line 9, estimated abatements and deletions, she calculated out what that number is, which is the $411,000. Mr. Hitchens referred to his slide and said, on line number 9, estimated abatements and deletions, Mrs. Parks took that $43 million and multiplied it against the approved tax rate of $0.9398, and that gets the $411,000. Mrs. Parks said, in Munis, the highlighted number is what they billed July 1st of last year, and that is one number that included new construction, and a half year of new construction. She said all of the other transactions are what is happening during the year. She said they hit that account number all year long, and that is where she based her revenue estimate on accommodating for that. She said she is not against using the Constant Yield Certification to be the base number they go from, but she used the closest number she had to get a more realistic number without the variance.

Mr. Joe Holloway said Mrs. Parks has stated she does not like a variance at the end of the year, to which Mrs. Parks responded, not a large variance. Mr. Joe Holloway said he knows what she is trying to do is guess work, and he understands that, to which Mrs. Parks responded, it is an estimate. Mr. Joe Holloway then asked if having that variance at the end of the year is really that much of an issue, to which Mrs. Parks responded, if they have large variances at the end of the year, that is revenue they did not use. Mr. Joe Holloway said that is revenue they could always use later, to which Mrs. Parks responded, they can use it later, but income tax is like throwing a dart. She clarified, with income tax there is no number available to them to base it off of, and a lot of things they have to estimate, so they have to go through historically and look at how much it has been increasing over the last few years and whether they think it is going to continue to increase. She said, with real estate, they have more accurate numbers. She said they not only have the February number, but they also have the March number, so to better utilize the revenue they could possibly have for the year in this year's budget, she used the March number. She said, again, if they would like to set a policy, they can do so moving forward, and they can work on that. She said, if they are not comfortable with the way she did her estimate, they could amend it. She said she is comfortable with her number and she feels she did not breach the revenue limitation with that number, but Council has to be comfortable with her comfort level as well.

Mr. Cannon said he thinks the first issue is they should probably take into consideration what the Auditors have suggested, and that is to go with the State certified Constant Yield Certification number as he really feels that is something that is always going to be consistent. He said where they are now is that they need to ask what they have to do to get out of where they are as far as the numbers that have been presented this year. He then asked if any of these numbers now are over the revenue cap, to which Mr. Roser responded, yes, some are. He said, with the last number they landed on yesterday, his understanding is that they are not, but the previous numbers that were given may be. He said, if they use the constant yield number and back out the new construction like they have done in the past, he is not sure as they would have to run the numbers on that. Mr. Hitchens said he believes if they take the certified net assessable rate, which is $5.97 billion, and multiply it versus their approved tax rate, which is $0.9398, and then add in the full year construction, they would still be under the cap. Mr. Cannon asked if that is what is reflected in this budget, to which Mr. Hitchens responded, what is reflected, and Mrs. Parks can feel free to correct him if he is wrong, is they took the $6.05 billion number from the March 31st estimate and multiplied against the proposed rate of $0.9398. He said that does not subtract abatements and deletions, and he believes that is what the $411,000 number is, to which Mrs. Parks responded, yes, that is the $411,000. She said, when she did the budget, she budgeted for what happens during the year to reduce the variance they would have at the end of the year. Mr. Hitchens asked if the $411,000 they are expecting a reduction in is reflected in the budget itself, to which Mrs. Parks responded, it is not a separate line item. She said it is reflected in the amount she budgeted, and her calculation includes the $411,000. She said that is why when she was looking at whether she hit the revenue cap or not, she took that number, reduced it by the estimated adjustments for the year, and it is below. Mr. Hitchens said, however, the budget that is up on the screen is the budget that is presented in Munis, and $56.9 million is the line for property tax, which is above the revenue cap, to which Mrs. Parks responded, that is because that includes the $411,000. Mr. Hitchens clarified, they are not expecting to collect that, to which Mrs. Parks responded, that is going to be reduced during the year with the transactions that happen during the year. She said that number will be reduced, just as it has been reduced if they look at what they actually billed. Mr. Roser said, if they use the numbers Mrs. Parks has suggested, and not the numbers the Auditors have suggested, they are over the revenue cap. He said he thinks they need to decide what they need to do to make that happen as part of this budget, and that is a legal matter, and he is not sure where they go to make that happen because that is not what this says. He then asked how they would make that say what they want it to say, and what they have agreed on. Mr. Hitchens said he has only been with the County for six months, so he is humble and open to being corrected, but he would expect that first line on the screen to be below the cap, even if they have to subtract the deletions and abatements on there, to which Mrs. Parks responded, in order to subtract it on there, she would have to budget it. She said, if they look at discounts, that reduced the amount. She said she feels she would need to budget it as a separate line item for these, and she would have to change their financial system to do that. She said she does not have a problem if they want to look at using the constant yield and relooking at the numbers. Mr. Roser said, the three things they need, again, are consistency, transparency, and accuracy, and that is the way they are going to get it. He asked Mr. Wilber what they need to do to this budget in order to change these numbers to what they have agreed on, to which Mr. Wilber responded, what he is looking at looks like a schedule on the budget. Mrs. Parks clarified, that is the Munis printout.

Mr. Dodd said they are bouncing around a lot, and Mr. Roser alluded to a legal concern. He then asked what they need to do legally to make this happen, to which Mr. Wilber responded, they need an amended schedule. Mr. Dodd asked if it is just amending the schedule, to which Mrs. Parks responded, Council has the right to make changes to the budget, so she is not sure what the legal issue is. Mr. Strausburg then asked why everybody thinks they need to change the revenue figure as it is below the revenue cap, and does not need to be changed. He clarified, what is in the budget is below the revenue cap, and it is 1.7 percent. Mr. Cannon clarified, if the formulation was correct, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, the formulation is correct. He said it may be different than what has been done in the past, but it is correct. He said all the Charter refers to is revenue, and does not stipulate a formula, does not say gross revenue, and does not say net revenue, to which Mr. Cannon responded, he knows, but he is wondering how they got off on all of these other things, such as abatements, etc. Mr. Strausburg said he agrees with Mr. Roser that, going forward, they should have a formatted policy of the way on an annual basis they are going to calculate their projected real estate property taxes, and calculate whether they are above or below the revenue cap so that it is done the same way as they go through different Administrations. He said that is one point, and he agrees with that totally. He said, on the other hand, he does not see there is any need to change this budget at all because the real property revenue Mrs. Parks has projected is below the revenue cap, to which Mr. Cannon responded, as long as the elements included in her formula are legitimate and acceptable. Mr. Roser said the answer to the question then is they do not need to do anything but codify their formula going forward, and accept their losses. Mr. Strausburg said he is comfortable they have not busted the revenue cap, but he agrees with Mr. Roser that he thinks they ought to have a codified policy saying this is how they will do the calculation each year so they are consistent. He said Mrs. Parks was trying to get to the most accurate figure she could get to, and that is what accountants and Finance Directors do. Mrs. Parks said she can go back and calculate out what it would be if they did use the constant yield to see what that difference would be. She said she is sure Council has not had time to go through the full expense budget, but, if there are items they cut, they would be reducing a revenue on the other side as well. She said they could take that into consideration. Mr. Cannon said they want to try to work with what they have.

Mr. Taylor said he thinks both he and Mr. Roser are concerned that if that top line is left the way it is, that is actually over the revenue amount under Mrs. Parks' methodology, so, essentially, it includes fictitious income, and he thinks it should be reduced to what Mrs. Parks derived with the $411,000 deduction. Mr. Strausburg said it is adjusted by other lines, to which Mr. Taylor responded, he does not think it is. He said the problem is, if somebody challenges it, they could be over, and he thinks the budget amount might have to be reduced somewhat because of that, and he thinks they better think about that. Mr. Roser said this is a Munis printout, and for their purposes it does not mean a whole lot. He then asked what it says in the actual budget bill, and if their revenue number is proper with what was just said? He said, if they want to use that third number of the three numbers they were given, is that the number that is actually in the budget bill that Council is being asked to pass? He asked, if it is not, what do they need to do to get it in there, to which Mrs. Parks responded, technically, the budget bill would not need to be put in until June. Mr. Kilmer said, under the Charter, it says they can correct revenue estimates and mathematical errors, so he guesses the point is, to his understanding, Council may think the revenue estimate is a little high, and it may need to be adjusted down, and, therefore, the expenditures would also need to be adjusted down. He said he thinks what they are talking about is that Council thinks there is a dispute about the revenue estimate, and that it may be too high. He then asked, if that is the case, how does that affect the budget Council was given, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, he is happy to go get an Attorney General opinion because he does not think they are busting the revenue cap. Mr. Cannon said they would not get that opinion back until August or September, to which Mr. Strausburg responded, then reduce the mill rate if Council wants to. He said he is confident they are not busting the revenue cap, there is no one here who has convinced him they are, and if Council would like him to get an Attorney General opinion, he is happy to get one. Mr. Cannon asked if they have already requested that, to which Mrs. Hurley responded, no. She said she spoke about it to Mr. Wilber briefly yesterday that this would be a possibility. Mr. Wilber said they can talk to the Attorney General and the Comptroller's Office to see if they have any input.

Mr. Taylor said, just to clarify, he does not think the concern he and Mr. Roser have is so much about the tax cap, but is about the budget being truly balanced. Mr. Cannon said he thinks, as it is right now, everybody at the table is totally confused as to the numbers they are working with. He said the numbers on the screen are not even the same numbers in the budget book, and none of these numbers match up, to which Mrs. Parks responded, those are the numbers in the budget book. Mr. Cannon said, unless he is reading it wrong, they are not the same ones in the Budget Message. Mrs. Parks said the Budget Message has a net assessment, not a dollar amount. Mrs. Hurley said it has a net assessment, and that net assessment came from the constant yield certification rather than the report that Mrs. Parks had used. Mr. Cannon said that is what they are trying to say, that the numbers do not match, and he thinks that is what Mr. Roser's and Mr. Taylor's concerns are because nothing matches. He said, when they say it is not balanced, they are asking where these figures were taken from to say it is balanced. Mr. Strausburg said the budget being balanced means whether the revenue shown is matching up with the expenditures being shown, and they do, and there is absolutely no question of that. He said balancing a budget does not mean that their actuals in the coming fiscal year are going to entirely match up with what they are showing in their budget, and they never do, and that is the reason why they typically run surpluses from year to year to year. He said there is absolutely no question that this budget is balanced as submitted, to which Mr. Cannon responded, there is no question that the revenues equal the expenditures, but the question is if those revenues are accurate. Mr. Strausburg said they never know whether they will be accurate, to which Mr. Cannon responded, as everyone here has said, it is an estimation. Mr. Strausburg said they never know because they are projecting, to which Mr. Cannon responded, at the starting gate, he would expect the numbers in the budget book to be somewhat consistent to the numbers on the screen, and he thinks that is what the concern is. He said those numbers do not match. He said he does not care about the fact that the revenues and expenditures are equal in one place and they want to call that balanced when the number they are showing for revenue is not the same number showing on the screen. He said, granted, he can be easily confused by all of this, but he does not know how they are getting the difference, and whether one number is right or the other number is right. He said, if the first number is right, they have an unbalanced budget. Mrs. Hurley said the worksheet in the budget book is what was really confusing for her because when they look at that worksheet it says what the FY19's allowable revenue is, but when they go to the actual budget bill, that amount is higher than what is allowed, and that is where the confusion came in. She said she spoke to Mrs. Parks about that, and she said perhaps they may need to amend that worksheet. Mrs. Parks said, looking at the worksheet, that is a worksheet that has been used for many, many years, and they may need to look at that as well when putting a policy together to look at how they are determining what their revenue cap is, and to be sure that it is correct. Mrs. Hurley said they have this worksheet telling them what the numbers are, but then when they get into the details of the budget, those numbers are different, and she thinks that is creating a lot of confusion, to which Mrs. Parks responded, that is where the confusion is.

Mr. Cannon asked if there are any recommendations on where they need to go, to which Mr. Wilber responded, it sounds like there just needs to be a reconciling of this worksheet. Mr. Joe Holloway said they could cut the budget by $411,000 if that is what the difference is, to which Mrs. Parks responded, she would like to see what it would be if she had used the constant yield instead of trying to get the closest revenue projection by using the March number, and go from there after seeing what that is instead of cutting $411,000. She said she does not feel that it needs to be cut because she feels like she is within the revenue limitation. She said, due to the estimate, she takes into account what is going to happen during the year. She said she thinks the question is using the March report versus the constant yield report, and determining it from there. She said, even if they go there, it does not take into account their homestead tax credits, where the top portion on which they use to determine their revenue cap does take that into account. She said trying to find something that is apples to apples is not the easiest, to which Mr. Roser responded, he thinks if they do the same thing year after year they would have apples to apples. He said they are doing all of these machinations, and throwing all of these numbers together trying to account for this and that, and they are getting totally in the weeds when it is a very simple matter and not rocket science. He said they should take the certified number, apply what they need to it, such as new construction, which is what they do every year and it balances and accounts for itself year in and year out. He said he thinks going forward they can do that, and then the question is what they need to do, if anything, to make this budget correct. He said maybe they should work on that, to which Mrs. Parks responded, absolutely. She then asked if that would need to be in a Work Session, or if that is something she can work with Mr. Hitchens and Mr. Roser on, to which Mr. Cannon responded, he would love to see them work it out before it comes before Council again. He said, when looking in different places, such as the budget message, the certification charts, and Munis, they have $56,196,850, they have $63,563,026, and they have $56,667,994, and the numbers are just all over the board. Mr. Roser referred to the slide on the screen and showed where it says it takes the homestead tax credit into account as pointed out by Councilman Joe Holloway, to which Mr. Joe Holloway responded, it reads "Estimated to July 1st including homestead tax credit." Mr. Roser said that is why he is saying they need to get something that is consistent because this report is the same every year. Mr. Joe Holloway said it also says it includes one quarter of a year of new construction.

Mr. Roser said he would suggest the Auditors and accountants sit down and hash this out and bring Council something they all can agree on. Mr. Kilmer said they will be having budget work sessions throughout the month. Mr. Joe Holloway said the only good thing about this is they are not in a deep recession, and they are not pushed up against the wall, so, if there are some differences, they are okay, to which Mrs. Parks responded, the goal is to go back and make sure the policy they put in place would reflect the same every year historically. She said, unfortunately, they can only go back ten years to FY2009 because that is when they were in Munis, rather than to pull the information out of the prior system, to which Mr. Roser responded, he does not think they are going backwards but need to be going forward. He said they need to decide on what they are going to do, and that is totally open right now as this proves with all of these numbers and machinations. He said they should settle on something they think is consistent and accurate year after year that they can pin their wagon to, and then they can go forward and he does not think they need to worry about the past. There was no further discussion.

Signatures on next page

Open Work Session
FY19 Budget
May 15, 2018

John T. Cannon, President

Larry W. Dodd, Vice President, District 3

Ernest F. Davis, District 1

Marc Kilmer, District 2

John B. Hall, District 4

Joe Holloway, District 5

Matt Holloway, At-Large

Laura Hurley

Laura Hurley, Council Administrator