

## Osborne, Ken (TREASURY)

---

**From:** Osborne, Ken (TREASURY)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 17, 2016 2:15 PM  
**To:** Durfee, Sally (TREASURY)  
**Subject:** Re: Flint Billing cycle date

They are going to add an amendment that would allow them to extend the timeframe via resolution. I talked with Nick, while not ideal his inclination was we could live with this. In a practical sense it sounds like we may have to revisit this at some point regardless.

They are not inclined to budge much more than that.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 17, 2016, at 2:01 PM, Durfee, Sally (TREASURY) <DurfeeS1@michigan.gov> wrote:

>

> Ken - is it time for Nick to give Rep. Poleski a call.....my sense is that the legislature will keep the pressure on state government if this amendment says April or May.

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Osborne, Ken (TREASURY)

> Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 10:05 AM

> To: Saxton, Thomas (Treasury)

> Cc: Durfee, Sally (TREASURY); Khouri, Nick (TREASURY)

> Subject: Re: Flint Billing cycle date

>

> I've expressed the potential scenario that we need to cover periods beyond April. Rep Poleski feels pretty strongly that he wants to force the administration to revisit the issue with the legislature at that time. His sense is they want the language to serve as pressure on state government to get this resolved.

>

> I am hanging out in committee to catch Chairman Pscholka after and see if he has the same view.

>

> Will update after I talk with him.

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Feb 17, 2016, at 9:55 AM, Saxton, Thomas (Treasury) <SaxtonT@michigan.gov> wrote:

>>

>> I would agree with Nick. Particularly given we don't have a firm schedule yet on the software changes, etc we need to make to the billing system.

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Khouri, Nick (TREASURY)

>> Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 9:40 AM

>> To: Osborne, Ken (TREASURY) <OsborneK1@michigan.gov>; Saxton, Thomas (Treasury) <SaxtonT@michigan.gov>

>> Cc: Durfee, Sally (TREASURY) <DurfeeS1@michigan.gov>

>> Subject: RE: Flint Billing cycle date

>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Either way, we are still left with a possible situation where we are through April, only spend \$25m, and the water still isn't safe  
>>  
>> Would we have to stop? Wouldn't we want to spend the last \$5m on May bills?  
>>  
>> How about saying something like "program continues until either the water is determined safe, or \$30m is spent, whichever is first"  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Osborne, Ken (TREASURY)  
>> Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 9:35 AM  
>> To: Khouri, Nick (TREASURY) <KhouriN@michigan.gov>; Saxton, Thomas (Treasury) <SaxtonT@michigan.gov>  
>> Cc: Durfee, Sally (TREASURY) <DurfeeS1@michigan.gov>  
>> Subject: Flint Billing cycle date  
>>  
>>  
>> Is there a way to find out what day of the month their billing cycles end on?  
>>  
>> Committee is still going, but I talked to Rep Poleski and feels pretty strongly about having an end date as his language contemplates.  
>>  
>> It would mean that bills containing April 14th would be the last bills covered.  
>>  
>> If the bill covers April 4- May 4 for example I think this would meet the April 2014 to April 2016 goal. If the last bill covered March 15- April 15th, there would be a two week portion of April not covered.  
>>  
>> Sent from my iPhone