

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 2011 BUDGET  
December 10, 2010**

The Public Hearing was called to order by Councilman-at-large Dolce at 3:33 PM followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: Councilmen Michalski, Muldowney, Councilwomen Floramo, Szukala, Councilman-at-large Dolce.

Also Present: Mayor Frey, City Attorney Cerrie, Fiscal Affairs Officer Curtin, Treasurer Woods, Clerk, Board of Assessors Mleczo, DPW Director Gugino, Department of Development Gornikiewicz, and Police Chief Ortolano.

City Clerk read Notice of Public Hearing.

The public hearing was held for the purpose of giving interested persons an opportunity to comment on the 2011 City Budget as follow:

	<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>
General	\$14,394,184	\$14,394,184
Water	2,450,600	2,450,600
Wastewater Fund	4,170,912	4,170,912
Capital Projects	-0-	-0-
<b>Totals</b>	\$21,015,696	\$21,015,696
Amount to be raised by taxes	\$4,665,567	
Total Anticipated Tax Rate	\$16.85	
Change from prior year	\$.50 increase	

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Rosemary Banach, 446 Lake Shore Drive West, addressed the Council and read the following:

I am here today to voice my concern, disappointment, and frustration with the proposed increase in taxes. With this budget we're no better than our county, or state. There is a

real disconnect between revenues and expenses, and I heard that same information at all the meetings I attended.

Now here we are at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, finding shortfalls, major shortfalls. This shouldn't be the time of discovery.

When in the course of the year has this been scrutinized? This didn't just happen last month. What was done earlier in the year to reduce expenses in each department when it was known that revenues were down as an ongoing practice?

Do you need closer scrutiny?

Right when these shortfalls are discovered, expenses need to be dialed down-not now at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour.

What processes are being put in place on a monthly or quarterly basis to address these issues earlier?

Every taxing authority is making cuts. We, Dunkirk, need to take a look at what we can/need to cut, or privatize. Every tax-paying household in Dunkirk has made cuts to their home budget and will now need to do so, more.

At the meetings I attended, I was concerned about the lack of dialogue on the hard, true long term cost savings. I heard the most dialogue from you about the cost of animal licenses. The hard issues often received tacit approval. I also didn't hear the hard cost cutting questions, though hard to ask-need to be asked and acted on! It was very troubling to hear your comments at the meetings like "wow the next line item is really short, but the next one is only \$100,000 short". Those go along with the comments written in the paper yesterday about "asking, the treasurer, *half jokingly* if we have the money to cover it.

It's hard to find humor in any of this. This is our money-your money.

I credit Mayor Frey and those of you that have been here over the past 8 years for no tax increase-but you need to ask the hard the real hard questions about cuts that will result in REAL cuts and real long term savings.

What has been done to realistically save? I think with much sharper pencil these tax increases could have been avoided. Corporate America is continuing to sharpen their pencils-Dunkirk needs to do better.

I'd like council to ask department heads to go back and cut 10% (more) and see what they come up with.

The citizens of Dunkirk do not want a tax increase.

**Public Hearing closed at 3:36 PM**

**William Tuggle, City Clerk**

\*\*\*\*\*

