The original documents are located in Box C21, folder "Presidential Handwriting, 5/13/1975 (2)" of the Presidential Handwriting File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

MEETING WITH
GOVERNOR CAREY & MAYOR BEAME

Tuesday, May 13, 1975

2:00 P.M.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN....

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN...

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEETING WITH GOVERNOR HUGH CAREY AND MAYOR ABE BEAME

Tuesday, May 13, 1975
2:00 p.m. (45 minutes)
The Oval Office

From: Jim Cannon Jim

I. PURPOSE

This meeting was requested by Governor Carey and Mayor Beame to apprise you of the fiscal crisis that New York City faces in the next two weeks and to appeal Secretary Simon's decision not to support legislation giving Treasury authority to loan New York City Federal funds.

This will provide you an opportunity to explain to them the problems the Federal government would have if it were to consider the fiscal crisis of one major municipality without at the same time considering the fiscal crisis of all other state and municipal governments who are experiencing similar financial difficulties. In addition, you may want to point out to the Mayor that you recognize that the current fiscal crisis has not developed overnight but rather results from a long series of decisions which has now precipitated this crisis.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS & PRESS PLAN

A. Background: Attached at Tab A is a brief memorandum Dick Dunham has put together covering the New York City problem. Also attached (Tab B) is a summary of Treasury's views on the impact of the problem.

This morning Jerry Jones passed on your request for additional budget information on New York City. We are in the process of pulling that together.

B. Participants: The Vice President, Governor Carey, Mayor Beame, Secretary Simon, Bill Seidman, Jim Lynn, Alan Greenspan, Jim Cannon, Dick Dunham, and Secretary Dunlop.

C. Press Plan: To be announced. Photo opportunity.

Options

1. Immediate announcement by statement through Ron Nessen. Draft statement being revised by Paul Theis, is at Tab C.

2. Ron Nessen and Jim Lynn to brief press on what happened at the meeting and to make clear the President's position.

3. President himself to go to briefing room and summarize statement for the cameras. Leave and have Ron Nessen or Jim Lynn brief on the meeting and take questions.

4. The President considers the request from Mayor Beame and Governor Carey for 24 hours, then announces his decision, or have Jim Lynn announce it.

Domestic Council staff recommends Option 3.

III. TALKING POINTS

1. I have followed the situation closely and I am fully aware of your fiscal problem.

2. I am very sympathetic with your plight and very sympathetic with the people of New York City. You are up against a hard problem.

3. Call on Governor Carey.

4. Call on Mayor Beame

A

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 12, 1975

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING NEW YORK CITY FINANCIAL CRISIS

The President will meet with Governor Carey and Mayor Beame on Tuesday, May 13, 1975, concerning the possible insolvency of New York City which could occur on or before May 23.

PROBLEM

The insolvency will occur unless the City can borrow on a short term basis by May 20 about $750 million to meet various payrolls, BAN*maturities and other expenses.

Three major N.Y.C. banks have notified Mayor Beame, Governor Carey and Secretary Simon that they cannot market New York City short or long term debts in the amounts required over the next 4 months.

BACKGROUND

There are three elements to the problem and the solution to the short term financing problem lies in a credible and realistic solution to the other two.

These are:

1. The City needs to borrow on a short term basis about $3.5 billion before the end of August. These tax anticipation notes would be used to finance the City's cash flow until property taxes or other payments are received in major amounts in the Fall.

2. The City must adopt by July 1, a 1975-76 Budget that is in balance. Mayor Beame states that there is a gap of $600-800 million between estimated expenditures and estimated income that must be covered by new taxes, increased State or Federal aid or city service cuts.

3. There is a long term imbalance between revenues and expenses which lie at the heart of the problem.

*Bond Anticipation Notes

Over the last five years, City revenues (excluding State and Federal aid) have grown at an average rate of about 8 percent. During the same period, however, expenditure growth has averaged 15 percent.

This differential between revenues and expenditures has been funded through the use of one time revenues, accounting changes such as capitalizing current expenses, and increased short term borrowing.

See Tab A for a description of the types of methods used over the last few years which have caused the current lack of confidence in City financial paper. Most of these methods are well documented and in the public domain.

SOLUTION

Long Term

The solution to the short term financing problem is to restore confidence in the integrity of and long term balance of City revenues and expenditures.

The confidence of the financial community can probably only be restored by extensive fiscal reform, a cut back in the current level of services and expenditures, and a long term demonstration of willingness on the part of the City administration to live within the available revenues.

See Tab B for an illustrative list of possible current reductions.

See Tab C for a possible program to accomplish the long term restoration of confidence, balance, and reform.

Short Term

A reduction in City expenses for the 1975-76 fiscal year and the adoption of a longer term solution cannot realistically be accomplished within the next two weeks.

It is unlikely that a program containing elements of the above and possibly some tax increases could be accomplished much before June 30.

This leaves a cash need of the City for:

By May 15	$650 - 750 Million
By June 11	$750 - 850 Million
Total through June 30	$1.5 Billion

These short term funds will probably have to be provided through:

A. Increased use of New York State credit.

B. Refinancing by the Banks of current notes - $234 Million BAN's*and $792 Million of TAN's.**

C. Or appeals to the Federal Reserve Board.

* Bond Anticipation Notes

** Tax Anticipation Notes

A

SOME COMMENTS ON THE CITY'S FISCAL SITUATION

The current fiscal imbalance situation has not developed overnight but rather results from a series of decisions made by both the Lindsay and Beame Administrations. The central theme of these decisions has been the provision of new and expanded services without regard to the present or future ability of the City to finance them. In addition, the ability of the City's powerful unions to extract exorbitant wage settlements, coupled with ineffective lower and middle management have contributed significantly to the situation in which the City finds itself.

Some of the more significant fiscal practices which have contributed to the City's predicament are outlined below.

1. Capitalization of operating expenses

An estimated $715 million of operating expenses are contained in the City's $1.7 billion capital budget for 1974-75. The City uses this device to reduce the need for tax levy monies in a given fiscal year. This practice, however, has grown to the point where it seriously erodes the City's ability to finance needed capital improvements to its aging and deteriorating physical plant (e.g. housing). Further, this practice, while legal, inevitably costs the taxpayer about 15 to 20 percent more over time because of the interest payments on the borrowed funds. Examples in 1973-74 budget, the entire cost of the vocational education program (estimated at $148 million) was transferred from the operating budget to the capital budget through a technical loophole in the law.

2. Rapid growth of debt service

Indicative of the City's growing reliance on both long and short term borrowings to achieve a "balanced" budget, the City's debt service payments will consume an estimated 16 percent or $1.8 billion of the expense budget for 1974-75 (up from 11.2 percent or $1.2 billion 1973-74). The magnitude of these payments impedes the City's ability to provide essential services and contribute to the use of fiscal gimmicks to balance the budget.

3. Underfunding pension cost

A series of articles in the New York Daily News last spring (3/25/74), indicated that the City may be seriously underfunding its entire pension program. The analysis noted that many of the actuarial assumptions have not been modified since they were made in 1917. This practice, coupled with the lucrative pension benefits agreed to by City officials and increases in the City's labor force have caused pension payments to jump from $465 million in 1972-73 to an estimated $1.1 billion in 1974-75

Dr. Bernard Jump of Syracuse University's Maxwell School indicated that retirement cost increases of $700 to $900 million per year (including social security) could reasonably be expected over the next seven years.

In addition, the Fire Department Pension fund is currently $200 million in arrears because of an impasse among members of the fund's Board of Trustees as to the respective responsibilities which the employees and the City should assume in making payments to liquidate the deficit.

Despite these factors, the City took advantage of some fiscal gimmickry to use $125 million of "excess" income in the Employees Retirement System to help "balance" the 1974-75 budget.

4. Underfunding collective bargaining settlements

In each of the last two fiscal years the City has underfunded the cost of its collective bargaining settlements by about $100 to $150 million annually. Essentially, the City assumes that contracts negotiated in one fiscal year, e.g., 1973-74, won't be settled until the following year, e.g., 1974-75. This allows the 1973-74 costs of such contracts to be paid retroactively through bonds issued under the "judgements and claims" provision of the City Charter and the State Finance Law. The effect on relative expenditure levels in the following year, e.g., 1974-75, is to double count the cost of the collective bargaining increase as the amount allocated doubles to meet the base year (1973-74) salaries plus the second year (1974-75) cost increases.

This practice also permits the City to grant salary increases in excess of what they might normally provide since there is little effect on the City tax levy funds in the base year.

5. Placing certain expenditures on a cash basis

Although the City normally operates on an accrual basis, they have been able to generate some one-time savings by placing certain expenditures on a cash basis. For example, if the last pay period of City FY 1973-74 actually includes 5 working days of the new fiscal year, an accrual system would require counting all the expenditures in 1973-74. By switching to a cash basis, however, the City charges only 5 days expense to the 1973-74 fiscal year with the remaining 5 days expense chargeable to the following fiscal year. While an ingenious strategy, it has one major drawback - viz. in 1977, according to City officials, the accrual pay period and the cash pay period will end on the last day of the City fiscal year (June 30). Thus, the City will, in effect, be faced with an extra or 27th pay period instead of the normal 26 periods.

6. Funding from one-time sources

The foregoing is but one example of the growing tendency of the City to resort to one-time sources to balance the budget. In CFY 1974-75 about $450 million in such sources were used. In addition to the use of pension fund interest ($125 million) and the accrual to cash accounting ($32 million) noted above, other devices totalled $297 million.

The use of these financing measures to support ongoing operating expenses means that a substantial portion of the programs in the 1974-75 budget had no dependable future support. Thus as the 1975-76 budget is drafted, the City will face the prospect of cutting the programs, finding some source of ongoing support, e.g., borrowing, increasing local taxes or getting additional State or Federal Aid and/or devising a new series of one-shot gimmicks.

B

Illustrative List of Possible Expenditure
Changes in 1975-76 Budget

1.	End free tuition at City University Establish State University tuition rate, for those who can afford it.	
		$million
	138,000 students	60+
2.	Reduce work force. Say 10,000 employees. average salary $11,000 fringe benefits 3,300 $14,300	
	10,000 x $14,300	143
3.	Raise subway fares $0.05 From .35 to .40	50
4.	Tolls on East River Bridges	50
5.	Charge Day Care according to Federal standards	15
6.	Reduce City University salaries to State University salary rates	10
7.	Renegotiate employee contracts to require partial -- 20% contribution of employees to the retirement	200
8.	Reduction in primary and secondary education costs	100
9.	State takeover of city court system	120
10.	State takeover of correction system (tax levy cost)	90
11.	Reduction in levels of free hospital services ($340 million tax levy)	100
12.	No increase in pay levels under pending negotiations	350-400

C

Elements of a Fiscal Improvement Program for New York City

1. Phase out the use of long-term borrowing to finance operating expenses over a 5 to 10 year period by amendments to the Local Finance Law. This should include requirements for disclosure of all such items now included in the capital budget or "outside the certificate."

2. Reduction of the City's short-term debt position in line with a plan for the next 12 to 18 months. This should include a program of improved advances/reimbursements of State and Federal aid.

3. Improvements in the City's financial accounting and reporting systems by means including:

    Work toward adoption of MFOA principles and standards

    Install improved accounting systems

4. Installation of a long-range fiscal planning process (3 to 5 years) for City expenditures and -- in so far as feasible -- revenues.

5. Establish a City-State fiscal commission to review aid programs, shared financing of operating programs, etc., along the lines of the Mayor's proposal.

B

Proposed Comments on the Consequences of a Default by New York

Robert A. Gerard, Director
Office of Capital Markets Policy - TREASURY

There is little doubt that a default by NYC would have a substantial psychological impact on the municipal market and the capital markets generally, NYC accounts for 25% of the short term tax-exempt market; its total outstanding debt is $12-13 billion. A default on even a single note issue would severely reduce the market values of all NYC securities, if it did not close the market entirely.

On the other hand, the cataclysm threatened by some City officials and some bankers is unlikely. NYC banks hold approximately $1.25 billion of NYC securities, slightly more than 1% of their total assets. To the extent a default created liquidity problems for one or more banks, the Fed would undoubtedly step in with loans. There could be serious hardship to individual investors who need to convert to cash, but, if the City took proper measures, it would be short lived.

A default could trigger the kind of radical fiscal action by the City which is required. Such action could induce the banking community -- probably with the blessing of the Fed -- to provide the City with the cash to cure the default and conduct its affairs until enough tangible evidence of progress exists to return to the public market.

Alan Holmes, Vice President
Federal Reserve Bank - New York City

The possible consequences of a default by New York City on its note or bond obligations are difficult to predict, but it seems reasonable to anticipate that general effects on the credit markets would be confined to NYC's own issues and to other issues regarded as having relatively weak credit standings. It is not anticipated that there would be a widespread collapse of the markets in State and local issues generally.

A major unknown in this analysis is the possible secondary effect that might stem from a significant weakening of confidence in the large New York City banks. The major banks hold sizable amounts of NYC obligations and depositors could be feared of the consequences of the City banks facing large losses or significant liquidity problems. While this result is a risk, it is by no means a foregone conclusion or even a likelihood. Available information on the exposure of large

New York City banks does not suggest that such exposure is a major proportion of capital. On the other hand, one cannot entirely dismiss the possibility of "irrational reactions" in the financial community.

J.C. Partee, Managing Director
for Research & Economic Policy - Federal Reserve Board

A default on its note issues by New York City probably would not have significantly adverse effects on the national economy, assuming that the City is permitted to continue to meet payrolls and other current expenses. An austerity program undoubtedly would be forced upon New York City, and the resultant cutbacks over time in current activities would tend to increase the already substantial unemployment problem in that area. Some other hard-pressed communities and governmental entities, adversely affected by increased investor sensitivity to the risk factor in tax exempt securities, might also be compelled to curtail some activities for lack of financing. But the scale of these direct impacts would be very small relative to the overall economy.

Potentially more damaging to the economy would be the possible psychological effects of a New York City default. Banks and other lenders might tighten up on their credit standards generally. Consumers, confronted with this new evidence of weakness in the financial structure of the country, could become even more cautious in their spending behavior. Markets for stocks and corporate bonds could suffer a reaction, with selective declines in those issues judged to be of doubtful or marginal quality. Such a reaction, if it developed, would obviously weaken the prospects for recovery in business capital spending, construction, and postponable consumer expenditures.

C

DRAFT STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT May 12, 1975

New York City faces a financial crisis, and I am sympathetic to Governor Carey and Mayor Beame and all of the residents of our largest city.

Although New York City's fiscal problems are enormous, they come down to this:

The city has been living beyond its means for many years. The cost of the services the City provides has been rising almost twice as fast as the City's capacity to pay for them. The difference between annual income and outgo has been made up in large part by borrowing -- and now the size of New York City's debts are so great that banks are finding it difficult to extend credit to New York City.

But the problem is not new. The New York City fiscal situation was analyzed by a non-partisan State Study Commission for New York City and also by the State Charter Revision Committee for New York City. Both concluded, in effect, that the City's revenue base, big as it is, is simply not large enough to finance all the services that New York City provides.

There is a way out of this dilemma, and I have been pointing to it: Fiscal responsibility, for cities, states, and the Federal government.

I know how hard it is to reduce or postpone worthy and desirable public programs. Every family who makes up a budget has to make painful choices. As we make these choices at home, so also must we make them in public office too. We must stop promising more and more services without knowing how we will cover their costs.

Above all, it seems to me, we must play fair with the public. The extent to which the Federal Government can or should redistribute revenues among the States and cities is limited by standards of equity. The extent to which States can or should subsidize cities is also limited. And the taxpayer, on whom the whole pyramid rests, can only carry so much and pay his own family bills. It is fruitless to promise him more than he is willing to pay for.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Look at —

24 hrs.

Must do what's right.
Bite bullet.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 13, 1975

MEMORANDUM TO: JERRY JONES

FROM: R. L. DUNHAM

SUBJECT: New York City Finances

I have attached for your use material that you requested of Jim Cannon by your note of May 12, 1975, concerning fiscal information relating to City of New York that the President requested.

The material was prepared by city officials and is incomplete, particularly in regard to projections of revenues and expenditures for the next five years.

Dick

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 13, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: DICK CHENEY

FROM: JERRY JONES

Attached is material concerning New York City's financial position which the President asked for. This information was provided by New York City and is not as extensive as we had requested. In most cases there are no forward projections and some key data is provided for five years rather than ten years as requested.

However, even with sketchy information, the picture is still bleak. The expense budget is up dramatically over the last five years. Wages have increased over a ten year period at an awesome rate and the cash flow requirements to service their debt is almost 10 percent of the operating budget. Since these are New York City numbers which have not been analyzed by the Domestic Council or OMB, the City's position may be put in a better light than it actually is.

Attached at Tab A is the original material supplied to the President by Dunham suggesting things that the City might do to improve their own financial position.

Attachment.

The City of New York
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
Bureau of the Budget
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10007

MELVIN N. LECHNER, Director of the Budget

May 12, 1975

Honorable Richard Dunham
Deputy Director
Domestic Council
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Dunham:

In accordance with your telephone request, please find the enclosed data which you requested.

EXPENSE BUDGET AS MODIFIED

	Total	Tax Levy	State	Federal	Capital & Special Budget	Other
70-71	8.2	4.6	1.7	1.3	0.5	0.1
71-72	9.1	5.0	1.8	1.6	0.4	0.3
72-73	10.1	5.5	1.9	2.0	0.5	0.2
73-74	11.1	6.1	2.1	1.8	0.8	0.3
74-75	13.1	7.0	2.4	2.3	1.2	0.2

NOTE: The operating budget for 1975-76 has not been finalized which makes it difficult to accurately project requirements for future years.

CAPITAL BUDGET FUNDING (in millions)

SCAL EAR	CITY FUNDS DEBT LIMIT	CITY FUNDS EXEMPT	STATE	FEDERAL	OTHER	TOTAL
65-66	500.5	89.6	71.5	1.2	1.5	664.3
66-67	437.0	101.5	123.6	13.7	1.6	677.4
67-68	560.6	112.3	220.7	59.4	82.5	1,035.5
68-69	503.3	115.3	245.7	60.0	3.7	928.0
69-70	728.6	71.4	194.7	132.6	2.9	1,130.2
70-71	801.4	202.4	348.4	74.8	0.9	1,427.9
71-72	827.3	334.6	349.9	106.2	4.1	1,622.1
72-73	1,015.2	326.6	285.5	226.6	3.6	1,857.5
73-74	1,141.4	217.5	123.6	783.4	1.1	2,267.0
74-75	*914.6	140.4	49.3	326.2	8.8	1,439.3*
75-76	**792.8	252.5	240.9	340.1	4.0	1,630.3**

* Does not include $320.4 millions Outside Certification

** Does not include $400.0 millions Outside Certification

RATIOS OF POSITIONS BUDGETED BY THE CITY OF NEW YORK TO TOTAL EMPLOYMENT IN THE CITY

	*Total Employment New York City	**Positions in New York City Budget	% of Total
1970-71	3,677,000	303,244	8.2%
1971-72	3,585,000	298,458	8.3
1972-73	3,554,000	296,415	8.3
1973-74	3,525,000	305,340	8.7
1974-75	3,459,000	308,441	8.9

NOTE: In projecting the tentative Executive Budget for 1975-76 it is estimated there will be a reduction of 35,082 positions from July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1976.

* Source: N.Y. State Department of Labor

** Source: Adopted Budget for the respective Fiscal Year

ACTUAL AND PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN WAGES AND PENSIONS

	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1974	CHANGE Absolute	%
Average wage of N.Y.C. Employees (members of 5 Ret. Systems)	$ 7,130	$13,147	$ 6,017	84%
Average Wage of N.Y.C. Employees excluding Policemen, Firemen and Teachers	$ 6,246	$11,281	$ 5,035	81%
Wage of Teacher (B.A. only: Max.)	$11,025	$16,650	$ 5,625	51%
Wage of Policeman and Fireman at maximum	$ 8,098	$15,250	$ 7,152	88%
Average Pension Contribution (average of 5 Ret. Systems)	$ 1,007	$ 1,995	$ 988	98%
Average Fringe Benefit Cost (all U.S.) per Employee per year*	$ 1,683	$ 3,802	$ 2,119	126%
Average Pension Cost (all U.S.) per Employee per year (included in Fringe Benefit Cost)*	$ 328	$ 922	$ 594	181%
Consumer Price Index (Bureau of Labor Statistics)	92.8	154.7	61.9	67%

* U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Data is for 1963-1973

Scheduled Maturities of Outstanding Short-Term Debt

(In Millions)

Maturity	Principal	Interest	Type
May 30, 1975	$ 220.0	$ 14.2	BAN
June 11, 1975	200.0	9.6	TAN
June 11, 1975	187.0	12.8	TAN
June 11, 1975	115.0	5.5	TAN
June 11, 1975	250.0	12.1	RAN
June 25, 1975	249.0	5.3	BAN
June 30, 1975	375.0	8.4	RAN
August 22, 1975	141.0	10.7	BAN
August 22, 1975	600.0	40.0	RAN
September 11, 1975	46.0	1.8	BAN
September 15, 1975	400.0	33.6	RAN
October 17, 1975	420.4	32.7	BAN
November 10, 1975	250.0	20.7	RAN
December 11, 1975	400.0	37.8	RAN
December 17, 1975	30.0	1.8	URN
January 12, 1976	620.0	58.1	RAN
January 13, 1976	200.0	18.8	BAN
February 13, 1976	290.0	21.8	RAN
March 12, 1976	341.3	29.7	BAN
March 12, 1976	150.0	13.1	BAN
Total	$5,484.7	$388.5	

DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS 'F THE OUTSTANDING FUNDED DEBT OF T'E CITY

	PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS ON SERIAL BONDS	SINKING FUND INSTALLMENTS	INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT	TOTAL
74-1975	822.2	7.1	376.8	1206.1
75-1976	962.6	16.8	421.9	1401.3
76-1977	856.8	15.7	356.2	1228.7
77-1978	640.7	14.1	297.1	951.9
78-1979	499.0	13.1	255.3	767.4
79-1980	342.9	12.6	223.5	579.0
80-1981	303.4	7.8	191.4	502.6
81-1982	270.7	6.3	169.9	446.9
82-1983	251.4	5.9	154.2	411.5
83-1984	231.2	5.9	140.0	377.1
84-1985	210.3	5.9	126.9	343.1
85-1986	198.3	5.9	115.0	319.2

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 12, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: JIM CANNON

FROM: JERRY JONES

I understand that the President will be meeting with Governor Carey and Mayor Beame at 2:00 p.m. Tuesday. The President has asked for the following information for his use in this meeting:

1) New York City operating budget revenues and expenditures for the last ten years and projections for the next five years.

2) The same information as requested in #1 for the capital budget.

3) The ratio of persons employed by the City of New York to the total city population over the last ten years as well as a projection over the next five.

4) Actual and percentage increases in wages and pensions for City employees over the last ten years. Also, the relationship between increases in wages in pension benefits for City employees and the increase in the cost of living in New York City.

5) A status report of their short-term and long-term debt showing outstanding amounts, payment schedules, ~~projected short falls, etc.~~

Mayor Beame should know that the President has requested this information and that the President wants to discuss these matters with them during the meeting.

T
A
B

A

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 9, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: JIM CANNON

FROM: DICK DUNHAM RD

SUBJECT: New York City Financing

I have attached a list of proposed items.

I am stopping in the State capital in Albany to get additional information and more specific items from Dick Wiebe. These will include a memorandum from the Citizens Budget Expenditure Review and others.

I will be available at home in the middle of the afternoon. Art Quern is up to date on this effort.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 9, 1975

MEMORANDUM TO: JAMES CANNON

FROM: R. L. DUNHAM RD.

SUBJECT: NYC Financial Problem

As you requested, I have listed below some of the items that the City and/or the State can do to help resolve the City's fiscal problems.

The figures are only estimates based on my recollection, and they should not be used by anyone until I get more precise estimates.

This list is illustrative and not comprehensive.

1. End free tuition at City University.
   Establish State University tution rate, for those who can afford it. Average $500 (net of scholarship)

138,000 students	$million
	60+

2. Reduce work force. Say 10,000 employees.

average salary	$11,000
fringe benefits	3,300
	$14,300

10,000 x $14,300	143

3.	Raise subway fares $0.05 From .35 to .40	50
4.	Tolls on East River Bridges	50
5.	Charge Day Care according to Federal standards	15
6.	Reduce City University salaries to State University salary rates	10

		$ million
7.	Renegotiate employee contracts to require partial -- 20% contribution of employees to the retirement	200
8.	Reduction in primary and secondary education costs	100
9.	State takeover of city court system	120
10.	State takeover of correction system (tax levy cost)	90
11.	Reduction in levels of free hospital services ($340 million tax levy)	100
12.	No increase in pay levels under pending negotiations	350-400.