

**NOTICE OF MEETING**

Notice is hereby given that the Legislature of Rockland County will meet in its Chambers in the Allison-Parris Office Building, New City, New York on Thursday, December 3, 2015 at 7:00 P.M., pursuant to the adjournment of the November 17, 2015 meeting.

Very truly yours,

Laurence O. Toole  
Clerk to the Legislature

Dated at New City, New York  
This 30th day of November 2015

---

The Legislature of Rockland County convened in regular session pursuant to adjournment of the November 17, 2015 meeting.

A Roll Call being taken at 7:15 p.m., the following Legislators were present and answered to their names:

Christopher J. Carey  
Harriet D. Cornell  
Richard C. Diaz  
Toney L. Earl  
Michael M. Grant  
Lon M. Hofstein  
Nancy Low-Hogan  
Joseph L. Meyers  
Patrick J. Moroney  
John A. Murphy  
Aney Paul  
Ilan S. Schoenberger  
Philip Soskin  
Aron B. Wieder  
Alden H. Wolfe, Chairman

Late: Legislator Douglas J. Jobson (7:19 p.m.) and Jay Hood, Jr., Vice Chairman (7:16 p.m.)

---

Honorable Toney L. Earl, Deputy Majority Leader, led in the Salute to the Flag

Dr. Weldon McWilliams, Jr., Pastor, First Baptist Church, Spring Valley, New York delivered the invocation.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 545 OF 2015  
ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF LEGISLATIVE  
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Carey and unanimously adopted:

Resolved, that the transcribed minutes of the Legislative meeting September 16, 2015, as recorded by the Clerk and presented to the Legislature, be and they are hereby adopted.

---

**Comments from the Chairman**

Chairman Alden H. Wolfe

Tonight brings to a close something that is of critical importance in Rockland County government and that is the budget adoption process. I am glad to see so many people here in the audience today. We are not often blessed to have this many people here. I like to think that what we do here is important and has an impact on everyone in our community. Things of course get busy around here during the budget season and this year was unique, because it started a couple of weeks earlier and we have worked long and hard to try to grapple with these complicated issues.

I want to acknowledge the dedication of Michael Grant, Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, who has put in an incredible effort. He had about fifteen meetings, several caucuses and an extra Budget and Finance Committee meeting to talk about amendments this week. So, he really deserves a tremendous amount of credit for his hard work. Also, Nicole Doliner, our one and only Fiscal Analyst; we can't do what we do without her. Everyday we had budget review it was "bring it on" and she brought it. We really appreciate all of your hard work dealing with seventeen managers. Also, Susan Daly who is the Clerk to the Budget and Finance Committee, did an amazing job through all these budget review sessions.

---

**Special Order of the Day:**

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

NOTICE is hereby given that a public hearing will be held by the Legislature of Rockland County at its Legislative Chambers, 11 New Hempstead Road, New City, Rockland County, New York, on the **3rd day of December, 2015, at 7:10 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law overriding the tax levy limit for fiscal year 2016 in the county of Rockland.

Dated: New City, New York  
November 19, 2015

LAURENCE O. TOOLE  
Clerk to the Legislature  
Allison-Parris County Office Building  
11 New Hempstead Road  
New City, New York 10956

---

The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m. and the following person spoke:

- ❖ James Flynn, in favor
- ❖ Marge Hook, opposed
- ❖ Gail Moggio, opposed

---

Affidavits of publication and a complete transcript of the public hearing are on file in the Office of the Clerk to the Legislature.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 546 OF 2015  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Earl offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Murphy and unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed. (727 p.m.)

---

**LOCAL LAW NO. 6 OF 2015  
COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. Hood, Jr. offered the following Local Law, which was seconded by Mr. Carey and adopted  
A local law overriding the tax levy limit for fiscal year 2016 in the county of Rockland.

Be it enacted by the legislature of the county of Rockland as follows:

**Section 1. Overriding Tax Levy Limit for 2016.**

For fiscal year 2016, the county of Rockland overrides the real property tax levy limit established by Chapter 97 of the Laws of 2011 of the state of New York, and may adopt a budget for fiscal year 2016 that requires a tax levy that is greater than such tax levy limit.

**Section 2. Effective date.**

This local law shall take effect immediately upon filing in the office of the secretary of state pursuant to section 27 of the municipal home law rule.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	11	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, Hood, Jr.)
Nays:	06	(Legislators Earl, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Wolfe)

---

A stenographer was present for the following discussion in reference to Local Law No. 6 of 2015.

---

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: Thank you,

We were presented a budget by the County Executive Mr. Ed Day. A budget that is a complete failure and, quite frankly, an embarrassment for this good county. At the 11th hour, some of my colleagues feel they had reached a compromised budget with the County Executive.

Well, I have a bridge to sell. I don't trust the County Executive, plain and simple. Therefore, I will only refer my remarks to the County Executive's budget.

The County Executive's budget is laying off hundreds of hardworking employees whose services are vital for the County. Let me also note that many of our employees live in and pay taxes for this County.

The County Executive's budget is imposing an unfunded mandate to the five towns.

The County Executive's budget includes a retirement incentive program for employees that are not being laid off, yet it excludes those who are being laid off. And come January 1st, they will have to worry how to

pay their mortgage, or even how to put food on their table.

The County Executive's budget includes shutting the nursing home, a process that started in October, where the elderly residents have been transferred out of the nursing home, and unfortunately, a few have passed away after their transfer.

The County Executive's budget includes revenue from the sale of a building that has yet to be appraised, approved to sell, or even put on the market.

The County Executive's budget includes removing experienced and seasoned sheriff personnel from the street to sit at a desk and keeping track of a sign-in book, thereby compromising the safety of Rockland County.

The County Executive's budget does not include a single nickel for deficit reduction, as the County law requires.

The County Executive's budget has been severely criticized by the New York State Comptroller, raising concerns that his budget will increase the County's deficit.

And to top it all off, the County Executive's budget includes an increase for himself of \$15,509.

The County Executive's budget is plain wrong. It is wrong fiscally, it is wrong from a safety perspective, and it is wrong from a humane vantage point.

The options we have are very limited. Whatever we will attempt to do in order to fix this mess of a budget, it can only be done with a partnership of the County Executive, who has thus far not shown any willingness to do that. By the contrary, in the past, he has not kept his word. Period.

If a majority of this body agrees not to be culprits and partners with this shameful budget, and a majority ultimately vote not to approve his budget -- and that wasn't the budget that was moved out of the budget review meeting, the review committee -- then how are we lifting the tax cap?

It is for all the above reasons that I want to be on record not having any part with this County Executive's budget in any way,

shape, or form. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Meyers?

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: During the eight years that I've been here, I've always taken the position that we have to raise revenues moderately and cut money out of the budget. In fact, for a few years in a row, I think we needed to cut bone. We didn't during most of those years.

But one thing I'd noticed about this County Executive's budget -- actually, even the one last year -- this County Executive is willing to cut positions that need be, and to cut things out of the budget in order to try to balance the budget. And those things are not popular.

Last year, he sought to cut some sheriff's deputies out of the budget. This year, he's cutting security personnel and some other personnel, that the cost of which has been rightly or wrongly attributed to the hospital in years past, and had to get rid of some of those costs if we're going to get the benefit fiscally of the hospital going away.

One of the things that I and some others were very critical of during the years that County Executive Vanderhoef was here is that he overstated revenues in his budgets because he didn't want to make the hard choices to cut positions or do the difficult things that needed to be done. And that led to our fiscal calamity in this county.

But the other thing that led to our fiscal calamity was that this body allowed him to do it during all those years. And it was said many times by the leaders in the budget committee, et cetera, I believe that the budget committee, that if County Executive Vanderhoef was not going to be courageous, and was not going to do things in his budget that needed to be done, then we are going to let him have his budget, even though we know revenues are overstated. But we're not going to take the difficult positions that he, as the leader, has not been willing to take.

Okay, now fast forward. We have a County Executive willing to take the

difficult positions. We don't want to raise revenues, so people are not going to vote to bust the tax cap, and we don't want him to put savings in the budget by cutting positions.

What exactly is it that we do want him to do? He can't raise revenues and he can't cut expenses. I think what we're doing here, what it seems to me that we're leading to do here today, is to return ourselves to the same fiscal calamity that we did in the past, and to send signals to the rating agencies that we do not have our act together because of certain undetermined unwillingnesses to trust this County Executive down the hall.

We have to reach into the actual policies and deal with them. So if we do not pass the budget tonight, and then the County Executive's budget becomes the budget, yet he doesn't have the right to sell the building, and he doesn't have the right to raise the revenues because we didn't bust the tax cap, and he doesn't have the right to do the employment incentive, we're just going to

be -- we're all going to look like fools.

And the Comptroller's not going to like that, and the rating agencies are not going to like that, and the taxpayers are not going to like that.

The same revenue is going to be raised from the taxpayers as proposed in his budget if we don't pass an alternative budget tonight. It's just that the County won't get to use the money in 2016.

Isn't that ridiculous? That is ridiculous. Whether you trust Ed Day or don't trust Ed Day, who would want to leave here tonight having it be his budget, but with some of the things in his budget him not having the legal authority to do, and him not having the ability to actually get the revenue that his budget will collect from our taxpayers, because it will have to sit in a lockbox somewhere.

I don't believe it's ever happened in New York State that the tax cap has not been raised, but an alternative budget hasn't been passed, and the revenue has been, in a way,

put in a lockbox.

Do we really want to be in that position? I mean, I'm leaving this body. But you people, many of you people are going to be here. Do you want that to be the end result of the end of December?

And people make vague statements about how you can't trust the person down the hall, and he's raising taxes, and eliminating jobs, hardworking people, and no raising revenue and no loss of jobs.

What, then? Really, what, then?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Anyone else?

Mr. Schoenberger?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: I'm not going to repeat things that Legislator Wieder or Legislator Meyers said. I'm going to try to be focused.

This is probably one of the worst budgets I've seen in my 20 years here in Rockland County Legislature. It's a political budget. It's aimed at hurting his enemies and helping his friends.

One of his enemies is the County

Sheriff, who he tried to eliminate Sheriff's patrol last year. He wasn't successful, the County Executive wasn't successful.

This year, he's figured out another way to try and hurt the Sheriff, and thereby hurt public safety and hurt the people of Rockland County. That's just one example.

There's going to become an amendment tonight for the budget we're going to vote on, which passed the Budget and Finance Committee. And I voted no on it. And I think time will tell that I did the right thing.

And I'm going to discuss that in relation to lifting the tax cap. Because if you don't lift the tax cap, that amendment can't possibly go forward.

I start off with the County Executive's raise. The negotiators who met with the County Executive -- and I wasn't one of them -- essentially were blackmailed by the County Executive. They admitted in the Budget and Finance Committee they were told that if they took out the \$15,509 for his

raise, he wouldn't support anything, he'd veto everything.

So they came and gave him a raise. So for the 450 employees who are being terminated because not enough money, there's enough money for him, but there's not enough money for you.

The voluntary retirement incentive. Chairman Grant said in essence that the Budget and Finance Committee meeting just received this. It's never going to happen. So putting \$1,250,000 savings into the budget is simply false as reported upon the public.

The number that was just put in to keep the property tax down to just under ten percent, this budget proposed as amended by Budget and Finance, will increase the deficit.

The biggest fraud of all in this proposed budget and its amendments is the harm that is going to be done to the contract agencies. I have long supported the contract agencies and long fought for their continued funding. And I still feel that way today.

On what this proposed budget amendment does is it restores the contract agencies that were put into a lump sum in the budget, and then told you have to go out for RFPs. Now how that harms the contract agencies in the County Executive's budget is that these agencies don't know A, if they're getting any money ever, or he'll give it to somebody else; or B, if they get the money, how many months to take to get it if they ever get it.

They have to go through an RFP process. And the RFP process, because the proposal process is potentially loaded with landmines, where it can be given -- the money can be given not to the agencies who performed the services for all these years, but to someone that's the County Executive's friend, or someone the County Executive wants to get it.

We've seen that before with contracts by this County Executive. Check who our lobbyist is for Rockland County. Contracts that never came here that he gave out himself, and you'll see exactly what I mean.

So this amendment -- which I just didn't

have when we had -- the Budget and Finance Committee just handed it to me since then, because Nicole prepared it -- takes all the contract agencies, puts them on the line for a certain amount of money. For instance, Arts Council of Rockland, contract agency, 40,630. Association to Visually Impaired, contract agency, 154,117. Big Brothers Big Sisters, contract agency, 95,745.

It puts them back -- and it continues for a page and a half. I'm not going to read the whole page and a half. So it takes exactly what we had in 2014, 13, 12, 11, 10, decades, and puts it back to where it was.

Not like the County Executive has his budget. He takes all that money and then just puts it in as a lump sum to be divided later based on the RFPs.

Why is this so bad for contract agencies? They're being restored. They think they're getting something. They're not. You're being deceived. You're being misled. It's a fraud upon you.

Here's a letter from Tom Humbach dated

November 24, 2015, addressed to Michael Grant, Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, all legislators, and Edward J. Day. I'm going to read one paragraph from it.

It relates -- it says, "At the November 16, 2015, meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee, the following opinion was sought. County Attorney will provide an opinion in writing on whether a competitive bid is required, or if there are any impediments to putting a contract agency funding as line items in the budget."

This is what the County Attorney wrote. Quote, "In any event, specifically naming entities in the budget that are subject to competition or other vetting under the General Municipal Law or the County Procurement Policy is not advisable, since those entities may not be selected in the course of competition, creating the need for further legislation or budget transfers.

Also, designating funds to agencies subject to competition and actually entering

contracts based solely upon that budgeting constitutes the creation of illegal no-bid contracts."

So the County Attorney is saying that by doing what's proposed in the budget amendment, it's illegal.

And then the very next day, dated November 25, 2015, the County Executive issued this opinion. The question has been referred regarding the duty of the County Executive on laws adopted but of questionable validity, and what are the options of the Legislature to compel the County Executive to a higher law.

Here's what it says. "As per the ruling of the New York State Court of Appeals, the County Executive is duty bound to comport with all valid legislation. In the event that an executive, such as the County Executive, deems that certain legislation is invalid, the Executive has no obligation to comply."

Legal opinion says it's illegal. County Attorney says he has no duty to comply. When

these contract agencies are put back on line, you will not get the money. You won't.

The County Executive will say it's illegal. The County Attorney will say it's illegal. The County Executive says I won't obey an illegal act. We're all going out to bid just like it is now.

So for those people who think that by going through this process, they're helping you, they're not. Because even if we approve it, and even if he vetoes it and it's overridden, the County is going to sue because it's illegal and you won't get your money. Contract agencies are not being helped by these amendments. They're being misled.

Give me a second, I have some more notes.

The County Executive is a very sensitive man. If he doesn't like what you say, he doesn't like what you do, you automatically go on this special list he has. It starts with an S and it ends with a T, and there's two letters in between. And once you're on

that list, he uses his power to harm you if he can. And if not harming you, then harm anybody that stands in his way.

I don't know how many of you remember this, but last year, at the end of the year, around this time, the County Executive vetoed resolutions, his resolutions. He sent them over, we approved it, he vetoed it. Because he didn't like what legislators said at the meeting, precisely me.

It had to do with the funding of three villages for their fireworks displays. It wasn't even County funds. It went through some tourism funds.

He vetoed it because he didn't like that I questioned how he could be giving money to three villages for fireworks, while at the same time, be cutting out all the money for contract agencies. So he vetoed the resolution.

And then the County Executive made it very clear, he's going to resubmit the resolution and not veto it if we, mainly me, kept my mouth shut. If we just let it go,

didn't say anything.

And I let it go, because I thought it was more important for the three villages to get their reimbursements promised to them for the fireworks display than it was to play games with the County Executive.

He may not like what we say tonight. And therefore, if there's promises not to veto things, he may not keep his word. Because that's what he's done before, in the past. So for all of you who think you got a deal, don't count on it.

I will not vote to lift the tax cap. And the County Executive's budget, it was five percent, plus 11 percent increase for the sewer use tax. So that if you live in Ramapo, except for Suffern; and you live in the Town of Clarkstown, that's the entire town; or if you're one of the approximately 250 users of the Rockland County Sewer District, you're going to get a five percent property tax increase in the County Executive's budget. Plus, you're going to get an 11 percent increase on your sewer use

tax.

Now, I have a letter here from our County Auditor, where he said this was unacceptable, the Legislature shouldn't allow it, and that the budget submission had a property tax increase of 10.9 percent, which I say 11. And we had to do something about it.

The nerve. This was from the County Auditor, Bob Bergman. The nerve. He doesn't say in his letter the County Executive submitted that as the budget, that's part of his budget.

The other night, Mr. DeGroat admitted it was part of the County Executive's budget. We didn't put it in. But all of a sudden, it becomes our problem to clean it up. And then he doesn't tell the public about that 11 percent.

So if you live in Clarkstown, on his budget, it's five percent general tax, 11 percent sewer.

What happens if you go with these changes tonight that the Budget and Finance

Committee approved? It's just under ten percent property tax. Just under ten percent. Double the amount the County Executive put in.

I'm not going for it. First, I don't believe the County Executive. I believe that some of the things put in the budget, like the extra \$200,000 for the mortgage tax, his estimate that was raised to balance the Budget and Finance proposal, plus the extra \$600,000 in increased revenue from the sales tax to balance the committee's proposal -- and by the way, \$200,000 came to balance his technical changes. He could just as easily turn around and leave the technical changes in that he wanted, and veto the \$200,000 for the mortgage tax, and leave the \$600,000 for the sales tax increase. And thereby making fault property tax, and then blame the Legislature not for a ten percent, or for 12, or 13, or 14, 15 percent property tax increase, which is why we always try to do it when he submitted this budget.

He said over a budget that was so

deficient, that had so many gaps in it -- just give me a second, I'm sorry -- that was so deficient and had so many gaps in it, that he passed it to us and told us to fix it with the idea that we would raise property tax. And when we raised the property tax, he could then blame us, not him.

And then he would do what he did at the end of 2014 for 2015 when we fixed his budget. Come along and say, look what I did, look how much money I saved, I created a surplus.

We created a surplus, not him. We fixed his budget. Last year's budget exceeded the tax cap. We reduced it. And he takes credit this year as if we don't exist. That's what he's trying to do again this year for next year.

The State Comptroller's letter on the County Executive's budget said, "Based on the results of our review, except for the matters described in this letter, we found that significant revenue and expenditure projections in the proposed budget are

reasonable."

So what did the County Executive do? He forget about "except for the matters described in this letter". He went all over media, all over Facebook and said the State Comptroller finds that the significant revenue and expended projections in the budget are reasonable.

Now that's the most intellectually dishonest thing anyone can do. Yet he did it. He got away with it. It's all over social media, go look it up.

He says the State Comptroller says that he found that there was significant revenue, expended projection of the budget reasonable. It doesn't say except for the matters described in this letter, which there are about half a dozen of them.

One of which is the sale of real property. The State Comptroller said the 2016 budget includes estimated revenue of \$4 million for sale of real property, which is a non-recurring one-shot revenue. It is not a sound financial practice to fund recurring

expenditures with one-time revenue.

The State Comptroller also said that the sale of this property, which is the Sain Building, has not yet been appraised for market value or listed for sale.

Just the other day, we got an appraisal. We got an appraisal of the Sain Building. It came over, I think, December 1st with a cover letter. And the appraisal was done by an outside company.

And the appraisal says that as of November 12th, they value the Sain Building at \$4 million, fair market value. Not October 1st we submitted the budget. November 12th.

So you have to wonder, were they really paid to do a fair appraisal? Or were they really paid about the \$4 million value to justify and back what the County Executive said in his budget?

I know the answer. They were bought and paid for that opinion. It's not the first time the County Executive bought and paid for an opinion. Last year, he bought and paid

for the opinion for a loan for \$10,000.

And then he turned around and said, report by Anemone says the sheriff deputies should be eliminated. Of course there was no report, it didn't say that. We had Anemone here, and he said he never said that. But that's what the County Executive said all over media and Facebook.

So is he an honorable man or isn't? You can make your own conclusions.

The State Comptroller talked about the charge back, the charge backs for the RCC costs. And they say the legality of these revenue costs is in dispute.

There's \$1.8 million. On the proposed compromise by Budget and Finance, there's only \$900,000. \$900,000, almost one percent property tax increase. Almost one percent. If it doesn't come, it's a one percent property tax increase.

There are many other things in there about the retirement system, the hospital fund. It says the County hospital fund, the County's 2016 proposed budget for the

hospital is based upon the County's -- it means the County Executive's proposed budget, not ours -- for the hospital is based upon the anticipated closures of the hospital by September 21, 2015.

However, the possibility remains that the facility will not be fully closed by the end of 2015. Should this happen, the County will have to cover the associated operating costs, which are not in the covered budget.

And this proposal attempts to do that by putting in extra hundred thousand dollars in contingency. Now, I don't know how that's arrived at. I don't see how he could possibly calculate it. I remember the County Executive saying he couldn't do that. They had to close by the end of the year. You couldn't continue it or fund it. You've got to fund it for the whole year.

So they put in a contingency, we're not funding it. They're funding it. And how many people will still be there by the end of the year? How many employees will still be there by the end of the year when all their

positions are abolished?

What happens if you can't get the employees to come in? What happens if you can't provide adequate and safe care for the people that remain, whether it's 20 or 30 people, whatever the number may be? Because they can't be moved to other facilities, because they have illnesses and conditions that other facilities won't take. What's going to happen with those people?

Part of the County Executive's plan is that if he can get rid of all the employees by the end of the year, then the State will come in. And even if it's against these people's will, move them somewhere. Force them out. Because they can't be there if there's nobody there. It's unsafe.

So if it means this elderly, ill patient can no longer be in Rockland, and the only facility that will take him is in Massachusetts, the State will move him there. What happens to families? What happens to the person?

I guess putting a hundred thousand

dollars in contingency is going to solve that problem. I don't believe it.

We should not lift the tax cap. If we lift the tax cap, we are buying in to this lunacy.

His budget, it's wrong. It's wrong for the people. It's wrong for the contract agencies. It's wrong for the employees. It's wrong for everybody.

I see this lifting the tax cap and amending the budget as a tremendous misleading thing upon the people of Rockland County. You're being led to believe that something is going to be done. It's not.

The contract agencies are going to get the shaft either way you slice it. The patients are going to get the shaft either way you slice it. The security people, I supported your restoration of your positions going back to the former County Executive. I support them again.

But I don't support what I see as this fraud upon the public. And I will not vote

to lift the tax cap.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you.

Ms. Low-Hogan?

LEGISLATOR LOW-HOGAN: I just want to take the liberty of reading something that I'm going to give the credit to Michael Grant, the Chairman of our Budget and Finance Committee. He found this quote. It describes perfectly our circumstances.

"The test of a first rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time and still retain the ability to function. One should, for example, be able to see that things are hopeless, and yet be determined to make them otherwise." F. Scott Fitzgerald said that. It's a great quote. It really describes how many of us feel.

Many of us feel the frustration that Legislator Schoenberger was just describing, because we had so many issues with the County Executive's budget, his proposed budget. It was filled with gaps, and risks, and assumptions. More than we've seen in many

years.

So we were very challenged. And we had to do what this quote says. We felt hopeless, but many of us believe that we had to do whatever we could with this bad situation.

And so that is my way of saying that I am going to support breaking the tax cap. I support our amendment that was passed in the Budget and Finance Committee meeting shortly before this meeting, which makes changes to the County Executive's budget, and is guided by our priorities, and our values, and our sense of balance to the extent that anyone can possibly do that to that proposed budget. Which needs a lot of work.

So what you see reflected in that proposal that the Budget and Finance Committee just passed is a reflection of our hard work and our effort to balance our values and our priorities.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: So you guys are going to pay our real estate taxes --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Ma'am, please.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- your jobs, and don't have the money to pay.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Please, ma'am. Please.

Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak? Ms. Paul?

LEGISLATOR PAUL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 9.8 percent tax rate is high. That's a big increase for my constituents.

Last year, we passed the budget with under two percent cap with -- all the contract agencies were funded. The hospital was funded.

This year, I will not see any money set aside for the deficit for next year. And the 9.86 percent increase, I won't be able to stand with that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Hofstein?

LEGISLATOR HOFSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During Legislator Schoenberger's speech this evening, he spoke about the Sewer District, about a 10.9 increase.

First of all, it should be clarified the

letter states, "this increase, if adopted by the Legislature".

I think we also should go through Memory Lane hand in hand. Back in April, there was a two and a half million dollars bond proposal to put up a structure in Clarkstown. I brought up that a case was called to our attention of an \$8 million lawsuit the Sewer District lost involving eminent domain.

Not only did the Sewer District lose \$8 billion, the court decided when they were done with the interest and paying for the plaintiff's attorney, it cost the Sewer District, which meant it cost the residents of Rockland County, \$16 million.

When this proposal came before the Legislature, I made mention about my concern about this. I have mentioned that it was called to our attention there were people on the Commission being paid that the County Attorney said should not be paid.

I also made mention that the Town Supervisor that put that request in had come to this Legislature saying that he was going

to put the structure up for one purpose. And I asked him, at your Town Board meeting, you said you were putting it up for another purpose. Which was it? And if that wasn't enough, the Chairman of that Commission was retiring.

Well, I looked down history to find out a little bit more about the Sewer District, especially in light of the fact that the County Auditor was recommending a 10.9 increase. And in December of 2014, there was a problem with the Sewer District which cost the taxpayers \$950,000.

Now, who appoints the people on the Commission? The Legislature.

Then I look at the report from our outside auditors. Report dated September 25, 2015: It states that the auditors' opinion, the County should consider utilizing the fund balance in the Sewer District to offset future tax increases.

Why? Because the Sewer District is sitting with an excessive amount of money.

So before we consider this 10.9

proposal, back in April, on April 7th, I said that there should be a forensic audit of the Sewer District. And I'd like to be on record again this evening that there should be a forensic audit of the Sewer District before we consider any tax increases to be imposed on the residents of Rockland County, whether it's for a usage or it's for a tax.

Now, there are a lot of problems back and forth with the budget. And there's no perfect budget. But unfortunately, there are a lot of times that things are said and you have to question whether are you questioning the budget or are you questioning personalities?

And you people, all of you here in the audience, as well as all the other residents of Rockland County have elected us to find solutions. Not to point fingers as one another, not to put a show on for you here. Sometimes some people laugh, some of the comments are funny. But it's not funny when it's coming out of your pocket.

We've got to learn to put our

differences aside, find a compromise, and move forward. But before we do anything with this Sewer District, we should have a forensic audit done and get answers.

We have outside auditors that the County has paid for, and they said that we should be using those funds to subsidize any increases. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. Mr. Diaz?

LEGISLATOR DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to say a couple things. We've had lot of discussion so far about the budget, how bad the budget is as proposed. We have to talk about the budget when you're talking about the tax cap, unfortunately.

I just have to say this. Okay, a lot of angst here about the budget. What's in the budget, what needed to be fixed, what can't be fixed, what can be fixed, so on and so forth.

Here's the bottom line. If we vote against the budget tonight, okay, and the budget eventually becomes inactive because that's how it works. Even if we vote no, it

can still become enacted. The budget still needs, even with all the cuts, and all the holes, and everything else, the budgets, they still need to exceed the tax cap just to work that budget that doesn't work.

So let's say we don't. We don't exceed the tax cap. We don't vote on the budget. And it becomes the de facto budget of Rockland County. Where does the money come from to keep that budget, even in its sorry shape, whole? Where does that money come from?

It comes from -- and there's already a lot of cuts in here. There are people being laid off, in addition to all the people who are losing their jobs because of the failure to sell Summit Park facility.

So where do these cuts come from? My fear is that -- one of the things that I'm very concerned about -- is what happens to our not-for-profits here in Rockland County. My fear is that we've got to make up several million dollars.

Where do we start? Well, we can start

where we don't have to cut any jobs. We can just turn around and cut there. We've already had issues where they've cut monies from the Sheriff's Department, or attempted to. Where do you think it's going to go again?

So we have to look at that. We have to think about that tonight. As unpalatable as it is -- and I am a taxpayer just like everybody else in this room is, okay. And thinking about that increase in my taxes doesn't make me happy at all, and it doesn't make me happy voting to say yes to, you know, to say yes to increase those taxes. Because I have to think about, you know, how am I paying that bill, just like everybody else is.

But if we do not vote to exceed the tax cap, whether it's to approve the budget as is or approve an amended budget, bottom line is this. There are going to be more cuts coming. There's going to be more people hurt. We're trying to prevent that.

I, for one, am voting for Day to exceed

the tax cap. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Anyone else? Mr. Earl, then Mr. Soskin.

LEGISLATOR EARL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't know where to start. There were so many holes in the budget when we first got this budget. And I look at the job that Michael Grant attempted to do, and Nicole Doliner, trying to fill some of these holes.

And I don't know, I guess it's like trying to navigate your way through a minefield. And you have, like, a dictator down the hall there that's really not working with you.

And to have the -- and the reason I say a dictator, I was in a meeting yesterday with NAACP president, and he told me, he said Legislator Earl, you know I got a call from County Executive Ed Day today asking you -- asking me to use my influence to try and get you to vote, to pass this tonight, this budget. So I'm just letting you know that.

And I look around. I see one department head that has stood up to him each year that

he's been here, and that's Sheriff Falco. Sheriff Falco is the type of man that if you kick him, he going to kick back harder. If you bite him, he's going to bite back.

I wish I had more of my colleagues up here that had that same mentality, you understand? I sit up here and given factual information of what the County Executive had tried to do. And there's a difference in making hard cuts than trying to be a dictator, you understand?

I hear, I look at when he sat over here a couple seats down, every year he would take, as he looked at it, the high road. The high road by voting no on the budget, no matter what we restored and tried to make -- turn a bad budget into a good budget, you understand?

I look at the mess that he has created here. The hospital, look at the hospital. There are lawsuits. There are lawsuits against him now.

What's the last total, five, seven people we've lost since -- they never should

have let the cat out the bag. They're supposed to be quiet when you're closing a hospital. That's the state law. That's a mandate. You're not supposed to announce that.

It's all, you know, the County Executive had it all in the paper, on Facebook, wherever he could put it out. Oh, he's closing it, he's closing the hospital, he's closing that down. It's out there. These are facts. He never should have revealed that information. And it was a mass exodus.

Now, what we have, we've got lawsuits coming from all over. From the union. From other places. For what?

You know, and there's no communication line down there. There's no communication from here to there.

And for him to just feel that he can just pluck off colleagues up here, and department heads, and use them as a puppet, you understand?

I salute Sheriff Falco because he's got the same mentality that I have. You kick me,

I'm going to kick back harder. This, I will not be voting to lift this cap tonight. Sometimes you have to draw a line in the sand.

This restoration that revised, revisions that I got tonight just before I came in, most of them, we never would even gotten this far if we hadn't drawn the line in the sand.

My not-for-profits, I often tell this story, and he heard me tell this story, and I'm going to tell it again. We -- I went up to the Martin Luther King Center a couple of years ago, at a breakfast. Ed Day, County Executive Ed Day had told me that he was not going to cut the not-for-profits. Not only did he cut them, he defunded them all.

I was with him at West Street Daycare Center this year, down there handing out little certificates to the children as they graduated. He spoke there.

And then you come in here and you try and balance your budget on 37 -- we have a three quarter of a billion dollar budget. You going to balance that on those little

kids' back? \$37,000 when we got three quarters of a billion dollar budget. It's ludicrous. It's just -- it doesn't equate.

And not-for-profits, I look at them. What Legislator Schoenberger said is once they get into department heads, and once they get control of them, it's all over.

He can take, for instance, like I'll give you two of mine, the Martin Luther King Center and West Street. If he can get a meal for, say, maybe 20 cents less, a \$1.30, and bring it down to a \$1.20 or whatever, if he can bring that down then, he has the power to just say well, exclude one of them. You understand?

And that's not right. That's not right. It was not broken before. Why are you trying to dictate and control?

And like it's not -- he's not going to, how can I say, be fair with this. He's going to take and pluck off his favorites. If you don't play ball with him, then he's going to do what he wants to do.

And how can you give yourself -- I

wouldn't have the nerve to give myself \$15,000 raise, and all of these hundreds of people are laid off. Hundreds.

And Ed doesn't need that money. He doesn't need the \$15,000. I look at all my colleagues up here. We haven't got -- I've been here, I heard one say he's been here 13 years or something like that, he never got a raise. The job we do here is, it's like if you equate it out to the time spent, what do we get, \$33,000 a year, all right. If all the time that we put in, it figures out to below minimum wage, is what we put in up here.

And I often tell people, if you are running for this job, and you don't -- and you have other interests other than helping people and doing the right thing, you shouldn't run. You understand?

And most of the colleagues up here, most of my colleagues up here, they do have good interests. And we can't agree on everything, and I respect them for that.

But you know, like I said before, I

don't want to just belabor this, I will not be voting to raise the cap. I'm drawing the line in the sand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Soskin?

LEGISLATOR SOSKIN: I'm not going to deal with the personalities. All of my colleagues have done that already. And they're right.

The budget submitted to the Legislature showed a property tax of approximately five percent. By adding these amendments, it comes to a little under ten percent. I'm not going to look at the user fees. I don't know what all the other fees are. I guess when you get your tax bill, you'll go down the list and you'll see plenty of them.

We're in bad economic times right now, regardless of what the economic statistics tell us. The Federal Reserve agrees with us. They're not increasing interest rates. And all of you who have money invested are not getting very much as income.

If you have a pension plan, you're getting minimum amount. But if you have the

money in a savings bank, as most people do, you're lending the government money.

People cannot afford to have tax increases at this point. Especially before the holidays. When I lived in New York City many years ago, every year, the transportation department used to threaten to have a strike on the subway systems. I think it was Michael Quill, who was the head of the union, always managed to get his members a nice settlement at that time of the year. Some of you may remember that.

The union tries to work for its employees. Many of our employees will lose their jobs right at this time of the year. In fact, for the past -- with the closure of the hospital, for the past few months, we've had an expanded staff at the hospital. Because the orders came down from somebody, the hospital was closing, the nursing home is closing. And no new patients were being admitted.

I see problems with that. Employees are going to lose their jobs. The hospital is

closed, and we have people who are out of work.

There are many other items in here in this budget and on these amendments which are going to hurt people. There's an expression, NIMBY. Not in my backyard.

Nobody wants to lose money, as it would affect them. Taxes go up, everybody's going to be affected, and we have to think of the employees at this time of year to make sure that they're not going to be too affected, and many of them aren't.

Where is the money going to come from for many of these things? I guess I didn't realize when I spoke at the Budget and Finance Committee, because they gave a long dissertation all about the budget, and maybe I'll do that later on, but I don't want to do that right now.

We had professionals. Our Commissioner of Finance, all the department heads, not even our County Auditor, who is the former Director of Finance who knows the situation and who knows how to plug money from one

organization to another, he's well-versed in it. You heard the letter that was read by Legislator Schoenberger. He's known for that. I'll find money one way or another. Let me rely upon these professionals.

The budget itself does not lend itself to changes. It does not. There's no room to breathe. The budget is an estimate. It's a means to arrive at an increase or a decrease in taxes.

As much as I hate to say that, I'm going to rely upon the professionals hired by the County, and the department heads hired by the County, who have just altogether gotten a raise of almost a half a million dollars, if you look at the budget. I'm going to rely upon our professionals to handle everything.

And as much as I hate this budget, I'm going to go along with it as far as the tax cap is concerned. And I'm going to vote against increasing the tax cap. Not for myself, and not for necessarily the people in my district alone, but for all the people in Rockland County.

We got Spring Valley, you have Haverstraw, you have Orangetown, you have Monsey, you have Pearl River. It's a lot of problems around this county, and I think we should stick with what we've got and elect our financial professional people who are being paid I hope a decent salary, because that's confidential information, we really don't know that.

I'm going to rely upon them to keep the budget the way it is. And I will not vote for the tax cap. Okay.

And I want to again thank Michael Grant for all the work he's done; our financial analyst Nicole Doliner for all the work she's done; and I even want to thank the five democrats who drew up the amendments, because I know they worked very hard on it.

And although there are seven legislators up here, all of us do not necessarily have to agree. And in this particular subject, I disagree. Therefore, I'm going to vote against the increase on the tax cap.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Soskin.

Ms. Cornell?

LEGISLATOR CORNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to be very, very clear about this. The County Executive's budget that came to us before any amendments were suggested requires the lifting of the tax cap. Just be very, very clear, that everybody understands that.

I've been on the Legislature for quite a long time. I was actually on the Legislature before there was a County Executive, and I've served as a legislator during the reign of three County Executives. Some budgets were relatively calm, but budget time is almost always fraught with some kind of differences.

And conflict is fine, it's to be expected. People have different views. But it doesn't need to devolve into any kind of hostilities. There should be a recognition that finding common ground is what we have been elected to do.

And that was certainly the reason why a number of us sent in ideas for amendments to the County Executive's budget to try to make

it a better budget for the people of Rockland, for the people who work for the County of Rockland, and certainly for the people who were served by the County of Rockland.

I think there is a mistaken idea in the community that County government serves only the poor and the disadvantaged. So, you know, whoever is out there tonight, or ultimately watching this on television, your life and your family are protected daily by County government. And if the five town governments had to replicate the services to protect the health and safety of the people, the costs would be astronomical.

Government is a service industry. We don't work for a profit. We provide services to safeguard the public health against TB, against mosquito-borne diseases, against tobacco use and the diseases that come with that. Services to protect us from online predators, to bring evildoers to justice, to provide safe havens for abused and neglected children, services to inspect food

establishments, clean up oil spills, monitor water quality, maintain the parks, and provide emergency services. And those are only a very few of the services that County government does.

Government workers are your neighbors. They pay taxes, they attend your church or your temple, and they volunteer for local organizations. So there should really be no drum beat to eliminate public sector personnel while cheering growth in the private sector jobs.

The public sector is extremely important. The -- this doesn't mean that government shouldn't seek always to do things better and smarter, and over the years, we've really worked hard to diminish the numbers, to control costs through attrition and retirements, and at all costs we tried so hard to avoid layoffs. And that hasn't been possible.

But County workers are really dedicated to serving the public and they should be applauded. Instead, many of them have had a

sword hanging over their heads, which this year has dropped on hundreds, causing personal hardship and community loss as the services were either totally eliminated or diminished.

Some of these things I was going to say when we were talking about the budget, and I'm really sorry that we -- it was necessary to put the tax cap resolution up before the Chair of Budget and Finance, Michael Grant, had a chance to go through his report, because I think it shows you many of the things that were thought about, were talked about, were discussed during the many, many meetings and the many nights we have all spent here, or at least members of the Budget and Finance Committee have spent here going over these things.

But the County Executive under the charter is given the responsibility of running County government, the day to day operations of each and every department. He or she -- there hasn't been a she yet -- is the chief economic development officer, the

budget officer, and is required to create a budget. And the budget is a blueprint for the year ahead, which encompasses the needs and the values the administration seeks to fulfill.

That budget creation is not done in open public meetings. There's no requirement to do so, although County Executives often hold small meetings with members of the public to gain input and support. But the budget is created by the County Executive, then comes to the Legislature, the policy-making branch of government, to study, to discuss, to amend it or not, to return it in its original or its new form the Executive for signing, or for line item vetoes if changes from made.

It's really quite unlike Albany, where for decades, state budgets have been decided by three men in a room, the Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Majority Leader of the Senate.

In Rockland, budget discussions, arguments, questions, tearful speakers often -- which cause tears in the listeners

and the Legislators, at least in my eyes -- frayed tempers all play out in public meetings of the Legislature. Oh, yes, and angry taxpayers, don't let me forget that. But they all play out in very public meetings of the Legislature.

It's particularly painful when budget items are perceived to be unfair, inequitable, or demonstrate bias or favoritism. So needless to say, it is a very difficult time.

I'm not going to go into the all the years, the ups and downs of the Summit Park nursing home and hospital. You've heard some, you'll probably hear more during the next phase of tonight's meeting. But I just want to say that hardship is not the word to describe what closure means to patients, staff, and the Rockland community, which counted on the nursing home to be there for them when they needed it.

I also want to say, because many people have heard me talk many times about the importance of the mounted patrol, I believe

in that so very strongly, and that was one of the amendments I wanted to put forth. I did put it forth, and didn't feel that there was the strength within this Legislature to uphold that.

We were trying to put together something that would keep the tax as low as possible, but yet replace certain jobs and certain other things, such as the -- put money into the do what we said we would do years ago, which is to diminish and decrease the deficit.

And the other thing is the contract agencies. The contract agencies, I personally believe that if the tax cap is not lift, that the contract agencies are out of business, at least as far as County funding is concerned. And that is a great worry for me.

And I think that that minute part of the budget, contract agencies happen to be one of the least understood strengths of Rockland. These agencies -- I can't think of a one that didn't grow directly from community needs and

community activism because of things that were needed here in Rockland. You know, whether it was affordable quality child daycare so working families and single heads of households could go to work and hold down jobs, be productive community members. Whether it's delivering meals to seniors who are homebound, whether it's hospice care. Whether it's the arts that not only are important to our quality of life, but they're economic engines for the County.

Just looking into audience, the after-school and before-school care that's put up by Nyack Center. The environmental agencies like Cooperative Extension. And the adolescents and youth that are helped by agencies like CANDLE, and so many others. Just looking at the people I see right away in the audience.

But the -- yes, I agree that the budget that came to us was terribly difficult. Terribly. The worst -- there was no place to go. There was no place to bring back everything.

You know, that somehow -- I mean, I'm going to pledge to try to do what I can next year to see that the -- that we don't lose the mounted patrol, which is, you know, why is the City of New York putting more, creating a larger mounted patrol? It's because they are called -- they're equal to ten officers on foot. These are very important in crowd control.

So there are just so many things that I think -- you know, I didn't even talk about some of the major agencies that deal with developmentally or emotionally disabled children and adults.

So it's been a very stressful year for the contract agencies. The budget was passed in 2014, at the end of 2014 for 2015.

At the beginning of 2015, the agencies were all called to a big meeting at the Fire Training Center to say no, it was the County Executive's administration that called the meeting, the County Attorney. No, we're not going to really quite abide by the budget that was passed and signed for 2015. We're

going to do things a different way.

And so virtually all of the contract agencies had to spend this whole year trying to find out where they fit into the scheme of things as laid out by the County Attorney's office, using state laws that were so antiquated that you could fund -- it said the County could fund agencies that work to eliminate the golden nematode, but there was nothing there that really fit eliminating poverty or helping certain other kinds of services. So they have been living under stress the entire year, and that was very, very unfair.

So I just want to say that, you know, as an elected representative, I feel, I feel a legal and a moral responsibility to ensure to the best of my ability that we can provide services to all in Rockland County. And to do it at a cost that really doesn't overburden taxpayers.

It is a challenge, but it's not the challenges we encounter, but our joint commitment to respond to these challenges

that will determine how we move forward as a county. And if we can embrace the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, if we continue to look at each other as valued colleagues who may represent different points of view, but share a common desire to enhance the livelihoods of all who call Rockland home, we will have served the people of this county well.

And I urge my colleagues to join me in lifting the cap, which was requested in the County Executive's budget, and we can deal with the amendments when we then go on to talk about the budget. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Grant?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I want to thank the colleagues who offered complimentary or kind words. I really appreciate it.

My job here is -- I see my job first, as showing up; second, to listen and learn; third, to take action; and fourth, to be held accountable. And I expect to be held accountable for the decisions I make.

I think I've been accused of committing fraud, being a puppet, exposed as a whimsical philosopher, and the night's early yet. But let me try to limit my comments to the work that needs to be done right now.

Legislator Cornell mentioned about how the budget gets adopted. The budget gets adopted with a majority vote in this Legislature. It's nine votes.

The tax cap gets lifted by 60 percent of the members here, and that's 11 votes. And should there be a veto and it comes back to us, the veto is overridden with 12 votes. And we'll see where everybody stands when those individual votes are made.

It's been mentioned that the threshold vote issue here is to raise the -- or to take action to lift the cap. That's a first step. You're taking action that allows the cap to be lifted.

That would allow us to consider the County Executive's budget as it's been submitted, because his budget calls for a 4.95 percent increase in the tax levy. The

tax cap itself often referred to as the two percent tax cap this year only allows for about a .7 percent increase in the levy. It's about \$640,000. So that's the most money we can raise the levy by without taking any action.

But if you truly are concerned about the issues that are enumerated on the sheets that have been circulating, the summary sheet that most people have seen, then you want to know whether or not these eight positions that the County Executive left out of the budget through either errors, omissions, were reconsidered for other reasons, then those eight jobs are lost if this budget is not amended.

And if you're concerned about the 32 other people, who includes security, work in either building and finance, mental health or whatever, and you want to see them to retain the opportunity to continue service in Rockland County to Rockland County, then you need to amend the budget.

The sheriff -- Sheriff Falco, I don't

know if he's still here -- Sheriff Falco is a consummate professional. He runs one of the largest departments in County government.

Yes, there is money that's not included in these amendments. \$156,000 for the mounted patrol; \$239,000 for other issues that he felt were left out of the budget.

I believe that after January 1st we can find solutions to those problems. I don't think that not being included in these amendments is a factor at all.

Regarding the fraud. The County Attorney last year provided an opinion to the County Executive that he had to fund the budget to the tune of \$10 million, being in compliance with the Rockland County Deficit Reduction Act. That was used to dismantle the sheriff's patrol and unwind contract agency funding. That was the explanation that was given.

This year, the same County Attorney's office provided an opinion that he doesn't have to abide by that law, he doesn't have to abide by the amended law, and he's provided

the legal opinion that Mr. Schoenberger provided earlier. That's the next thing I'm going to be accused of, being a lawyer, because I'm here trying to make an argument and advocate for my clients.

So what do we do? We continue down the path here. The County Executive included \$1.8 million in charge backs, in revenue items in his budget. If we don't take action, that money stays in the budget, pushed down to the towns, and that's the end of it.

This amendment is a compromise, and it's certainly a compromise because people have different priorities. It splits the baby. \$900,000 will push down to the towns, and the County will continue to pay the other \$900,000.

What might that do? That might cause some action to be taken by the towns, go to litigation, and perhaps it's going to be settled in court once and for all, and we won't have to play this game again next fall.

As we continue down the -- but if we can

talk about the increases to the mortgage tax rate. You know, I had that conversation with the County Executive, the Commissioner of Finance as well. Certainly eight weeks into the process, we'd be fined \$200,000. It's something that the Legislature would like an opportunity to use to maybe fix this budget. And that it was somewhat disingenuous. But that's another story for another day.

And then the \$600,000 in sales tax. Yes, it may be just a little bit aggressive. I don't know that it's overly aggressive, because both O'Connor Davies and the Comptroller's office said that the County Executive's proposed budget was appropriately conservative in its estimate of sales tax. So I'll take the chance on that, and I'll take responsibility for it if it doesn't work out, because that would require me to do something different for next year.

Regarding the restoration and layoffs, if we can talk about that. It includes the security people that are here. It solves one of the disputes at least temporarily between

the County Executive and Sheriff Falco in terms of putting our well-trained and substantially higher paid deputies behind a desk in lobby, rather than out on the street, protecting County property and County residents.

Regarding the next couple of items. The adjustment of the voluntary separation incentive. It was identified very early in our process as bad public policy. It provided a very generous incentive to people to leave County service. And actually, some of those people would be leaving County service anyway because you got 35 years in, you're retiring, you're heading out the door. But I'll wait a week, or a month, or two months to see if I can leave with \$35,000 additional.

So what are you going to do about that? It's not good policy. I'm not voting for that policy that requires all of us to vote on that policy.

But if the County Executive thinks that the numbers can be maneuvered a little bit,

he's still got responsibility for \$1.25 million additional salary savings that he has to come up with. That means he has to manage the vacancies in the County to save that money. That's his obligation. And he said he was going to take it, and I'm willing to put it on his shoulders.

The designated fund balance. I'm a balance sheet guy. The most important thing to me the last couple of years is trying to get the County headed down a strong fiscal path where we can have confidence that the bottom line is balanced, that money will accumulate at some point in time so that we have a surplus. It allows us to handle some of our other cash flow needs.

And that fiscal stress indicator that you read so much about will continue to go down. And it's done so from 2013, 2014, mostly by the efforts in this Legislature, mostly by the work that's been done here to craft the plan and make a path to solvency and better decisions.

The Comptroller identified on his

report, which Mr. Schoenberger referenced earlier, that there is a need to find \$500,000 more to meet our pension obligation. That's a pension obligation calculated by them. That's the minimum amount. O'Connor Davies identified what they believed to be \$2 million that needed to be set aside in additional funds to handle the pension costs there.

So what's the choice here? Don't take action? I think not. I'll take action, I'll be held accountable. If I'm not meeting your needs, then I'm ready to be voted out.

The funding the nursing home for the first month. It is a disgrace that the nursing home was closed the way it was closed. That was never the plan here, and it was very much the intent of this Legislature -- I know at least myself and my colleagues in the majority for sure -- when the hospital was eventually closed, it would be closed by selling it to someone else.

Its highest, greatest value is an ongoing operation. A home to people; a bed

to somebody who needs care; jobs for people that want to work and take care of others; commerce in the community, because we buy food, and supplies, and laundry services, and all kinds of things, so that commerce is being conducted in the community.

Having it be an empty building is the worst possible thing that could happen to the County. It's the worst possible thing that could happen to our employees, because now there is no alternative employment for them. There are numerous financial consequences that are going come down on the County and be borne by the taxpayers. It is a horrible, horrible situation. It's a disgrace that it's come to this. It absolutely is.

Regarding -- what's the next thing on the list? I think we're pretty much there.

The nursing home, hundred thousand dollars. It was, I think, maybe appropriately criticized.

I don't know how to fix all of the problems. We each had different priorities here. Finding a common ground was a

difficult task. Certainly for me, because I certainly didn't get all that would I hope to get in this compromise here.

The County has a contingency provided in the County Executive's proposed budget of \$400,000. The additional hundred thousand dollars would make half a million.

We asked Dr. Fried, the Department of Hospitals, if you were to stay open -- we asked them for a month, three months, six months, a year -- what would it cost? Because we were concerned.

We were absolutely concerned that they wouldn't be able to find a nursing home for each one of our residents, and there were 31 residents that were considered potentially hard to place, because they had more than one barrier to placement. Whether it's Alzheimer's, mental retardation, physical disabilities; any one of those things that would have made a private nursing home choose not to choose them.

So what's the prudent thing to do? The County Executive's office has insisted that

the nursing home will be empty by December 31st. I'm a little skeptical, since this is down to 180 on October 1st. From 180 on October 1st, we're down to 24 today. Certainly there's evidence that they're moving towards that.

But we have to make some provision for it. The calculated number was about \$500,000 a month. Beyond that, it's the obligation of the County Executive to manage it.

I'm not so sure that the hospital and nursing home has been managed appropriately by this administration or prior administrations. That's a comment for another day, too.

Lifting the cap. We fix nothing, we fix nothing. None of these cuts get fixed if the cap isn't lifted. The cap, it has a \$4.7 million gap in what's allowed and what's been asked for by the County Executive.

What happens there? That money, when levied, is confiscated. It's put in an account where it earns interest. It is not available for use by the County, and the

budget is out of balance, and now you have to do something.

Who here in the room, raise your hand if you know, thinks that it won't affect the contract agencies? Who thinks that it won't affect the targeted security people again and again and again? Who here thinks that they won't push back on the town some other charges?

I don't. I think it would be a disaster. I think it would be an unmitigated disaster.

The budget proposal that my colleagues Mr. Diaz, Ms. Cornell, Ms. Low-Hogan, Mr. Hood -- this is a starting point. This isn't an end point. And for anyone here to say that they didn't have access, this exact same information that we had access to, they're lying. It's just that simple. They're lying.

If nothing else, I think I'll take credit for trying to make this the most transparent process that we have. And with the help of Nicole Doliner, everything was

available to everybody.

It was easy to figure out. And all you had to do was say, this is what I want taken out. This is what I want left in.

And Nicole will process the paperwork. She did this in about -- she did the detail sheets -- where did they go, Doug -- in about ten minutes. Ten minutes with the new changes in between meetings.

So it's rather disingenuous to say the information wasn't available, this is the first time I'm seeing it. Maybe this is the first time you're seeing this, these numbers arranged the way they're arranged. But it's disingenuous to say this is the first time I'm seeing it.

Job one, show up. Job two, pay attention and contribute. Job three, act. Job four, be accountable.

What I didn't want to leave after tonight was to say Michael, you failed to act. So I'm going to act. I'm going to vote for the cap.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Anyone else?

Mr. Schoenberger?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Thank you. I'm not going to rehash everything that's been said. My observation is that many of the speakers tonight agree that there are great deficiencies in the County Executive's proposed budget. How to deal with them is apparently where we differ.

I want to agree with Legislator Hofstein about a forensic audit. May I suggest to you, Legislator Hofstein, that perhaps you should speak to the new supervisor of the Town of Clarkstown, who is also by law, operation of law, a member of the Rockland County Sewer District. He can ask the Sewer District to reject the two and a half million dollar bill in Clarkstown. I am sure, because that's in his town, that if you request that, it might very well be honored.

As for the Sewer District, there are amounts that are allocated for the Sewer District for the operation of County government. There are amounts allocated to all of the departments. That's the central

service department allocations.

I'm going to talk about, for a moment, about the ones that are allocated directly to the -- from -- to the County part of budget by the Sewer District.

The County increased the allocated costs to the Rockland County Sewer Districts for 2015 very, very substantially. And they're being increased again this year in the budget.

It means the Town of Clarkstown, the Town of Ramapo residents except for Suffern, and about 250 users of the sewer districts in the county, Sewer District in Orangetown, are being taxed for paying to supplement the County's operating costs. And they're being increased the end of this year in 2016 from this year.

And let me give you an example. The sewer fund allocation attributable to the County for 2016, according to a letter I have here from Steven Grogan, dated November -- the Deputy Budget Director, the Deputy Commissioner of Finance, dated November 12,

2015, says the sewer fund is being allocated, the County expenses, \$1,375,300 for 2016.

Of that, \$543,805 is being allocated to the office of the County Executive. In other words, 39.54 percent.

And 401,570 is being allocated to the Finance Department, which is 29.2 percent. And Budget and Management -- it's in the same office -- is being allocated \$210,195, 15.20 percent.

Those are the really large ones. Now, if you look at the County Executive's allocated amount for the sewer fund -- this is the County Executive who says I have nothing to do with them, they're under the jurisdiction of Legislature, the Legislature is responsible for them. Guess how much of the County allocation the sewer fund is charged to the Rockland County Legislature. Anybody know? Zero.

So I welcome, Legislator Hofstein, a forensic audit. I want to know whether the audit will show that these allocations of Rockland County Sewer District funds are not

really actuals, but overestimates. So that the Rockland County Sewer District taxpayers are over-contributing to and supplementing the budget of the County. So that the County doesn't have to raise its taxes, or is supplementing those taxes, with the three towns that I told you, the residents of those three towns.

So on that note, I won't go into anything else I have already discussed. I won't rebut any of the legislators' statements. I think we should just get on with it. Everybody will vote in good conscience as they see fit. And the sun will rise tomorrow and life will go on. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. I have just a few things to say. I will limit my comments to what is in front of us right now, which is the tax cap. I will save my comments on the budget when we're voting on that.

One of the most troubling aspects of budget proposal as has been described is the

lack of any commitment for the deficit, for the funding of the deficit, for reducing our deficit, even though the law requires it. And, you know, we can go through the history. We know that the County Executive voted for the law in the first place, and then said that it was the \$10 million surprise of last year that caused all the havoc, and this year says he doesn't need to follow it because it's not a valid law.

But when we asked the administration to comment on the Comptroller's criticism of the budget, in particular the issue of what to do about the deficit and the fact that there was no commitment to reduce the deficit, the County Executive said that his plan was to operate the 2016 budget, to operate government in 2016 in such a way so as to generate a surplus.

And I thought that that was interesting. In my view, that's not a plan, that's a goal. But it made me think about the 2016 budget submission in the first place.

If the County Executive knows in October

of 2015 that he will be able to operate the budget for 2016 to a surplus, then what does that tell you? What it tells me is that the 2016 budget has a surplus that's already built into it, and that he plans on overtaxing Rockland County residents.

I think that's wrong. I think that's a tremendous problem. And much has been said, and much will be said about the fact that this budget is in many ways unfixable.

And I have a concern about lifting the cap. And even if this -- let's say this Legislature lifts the cap, and then the budget goes through even with the proposed tax increase, or even a reduction to the property tax increase that still exceeds the cap, we're still faced with the proposition that with selected vetoes and either success or failure on the override vote, that once the dust settles at the end of an override vote, we may end up with a property tax increase that is in excess of whatever this Legislature approves. And that's because property tax is the default.

So for example, if the amendments are passed where there's an inclusion of a \$200,000 increase in the mortgage tax, let's just use that -- let's say that's the only change on that side. The County Executive vetoes that; what's the impact?

It means that whatever the property tax levy was is now increased by \$200,000. And I'm not willing to give the County Executive what in my view would amount to a blank check. Because I don't trust him.

And a lot has been said about how trusting the County Executive isn't important, it doesn't matter, we all know he doesn't tell the truth all the time. But I think it has a real important meaning in this context. And again, my view is based on my actual experience in making deals with the County Executive, which have been broken.

When we talk about the County Executive's commitment to not veto certain things in the package of amendments that passed the Committee, we really have no assurance that it's going to happen the way

he says it's going to happen. And what that means is, as I've said, is that what we expect the property tax increase to be may end up being more. And that's not something that I'm willing to abide by.

The County Executive was supposed to build in \$4 million, at a minimum, of an allocation, a reserve for deficit reduction. He chose not to. That's his prerogative. I think it violates the law, but that's his prerogative. This is what we have to deal with.

By voting against the cap, what we're doing is we're essentially imposing a deficit reduction, because it forces the County Executive to do exactly what he said he was planning on doing in the first place. And that is operating the budget in 2016 to a surplus.

And if he claims -- if he claimed on October 1st, when he gave us the budget, that he was going to be able to do it, then he must know something more than we know about this budget. And if he has such confidence

in his abilities to operate County government in 2016 to such a surplus, then I'm willing to take him at his word. So for that reason, I will not be supporting the waiver of the tax cap.

And with that, I'm happy to call a vote. All those in favor of lifting the tax cap, please raise your hand?

And those opposed?

MR. TOOLE: Those voting in the affirmative are Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, and Hood. That totals eleven.

Those voting nay are Legislators Earl, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, and Wolfe. That totals six.

Motion passes, eleven ayes, six nays.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: The tax cap is lifted.

That brings us now -- actually, you know, right now I think what we should do is take a break. You want to take a break?

The public hearing has been closed.

**VETOED BY COUNTY EXECUTIVE/LEGISLATIVE OVERRIDE ON DECEMBER 15, 2015**

Introduced by:  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor

Referral No. 9505

**RESOLUTION NO. 547 OF 2015  
ACCEPTING REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE  
AFTER ITS REVIEW OF THE ROCKLAND COUNTY  
PROPOSED 2016 BUDGET**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Hood, Jr. and adopted

WHEREAS, the Budget and Finance Committee has reviewed the 2016 proposed budget, and recommends that said budget be amended in accordance with the enclosed schedules; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing has been held on the proposed budget; and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and approved this resolution, however, it was approved within 120 hours of the full legislative meeting and was deemed an immediate need by its Chair, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Budget and Finance Committee's Report on the 2016 Rockland County proposed Budget, consisting of the schedules attached hereto be and the same are hereby adopted.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes: 11 (Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, Hood, Jr.)

NAYS: 06 (Legislators Earl, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Wolfe)

---

A stenographer was present for the following discussion, which can be found after Res. No. 549 of 2015.

**REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE  
REGARDING THE  
ROCKLAND COUNTY EXECUTIVE'S PROPOSED 2016 BUDGET**

*"The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function. One should, for example, be able to see that things are hopeless and yet be determined to make them otherwise."*

— F. Scott Fitzgerald

**Preface**

The Rockland County Legislature closed out calendar year 2014 on a positive note with visible and vocal public support for our budget and policy initiatives. The 2015 County Budget, as amended by the legislature, was adopted by an overwhelming, bi-partisan vote of 15-2. The Legislature's budget restored cuts to Public Safety, reinstated funding for vital community-based not-for-profit organizations, defined and funded a plan to begin eliminating the outstanding deficit and kept the property tax levy under the cap. The Legislature's proposed revisions to the County Charter, approved by public referendum, established a new timeline for future budgets and made resolutions and local laws binding on all branches of County government. In addition, we were buoyed by the preliminary results of operations for Fiscal 2014 indicating improvements in both cash flow and fund balance for the year just ended.

As one cycle ended the next began.

A month later, in his state of the county address, County Executive Day said strong fiscal stewardship, efficient operations and collaborative leadership were the keys to Rockland's recovery. He went on to say, "Political posturing won't build a stronger Rockland County - consensus and collaboration between the Executive and Legislative branches will!" Chairman Alden Wolfe, said he thought the County Executive's agenda was packed with priorities that the Legislature shared, beginning with the call for collaboration. "I'm on the same page as the County Executive when it comes to attracting new businesses, closing on the Summit Park property by September, protecting Rockland commuters from toll increases on the Tappan Zee Bridge, encouraging a robust mass transit system and collaborating on a transparent budget."

When spring rolled around the stage was set for success in 2015.

In March, the federal government awarded a four-star quality rating to Summit Park Nursing Care Center (SPNCC). The award was a testament to the quality of care provided there and to our very dedicated staff at Summit Park as well. Moreover it underscored the value of Summit Park. The long anticipated sale of SPNCC was expected to play a key role in Rockland's continuing fiscal improvement.

March also marked the one-year anniversary of Rockland County's issuance of the \$96 million deficit financing bond. The bond dramatically changed the County's cash flow position and avoided millions of dollars in short-term borrowings. The first interest payments were covered by the premiums from the bond sale.

More good news followed in May from the credit rating agencies. Standard and Poor's (S&P) Rating Services upgraded its long-term and underlying rating to "BBB" with a Positive Outlook from "BBB-" with a stable outlook. Moody's Investor Services assigned Rockland a Baa2 with a

positive outlook. Moody's report said, "The Baa2 reflects significant improvement in the county's management and budgeting practices; strengthened liquidity following the issuance of deficit reduction bonds; strong oversight by the state; and a sizeable tax base with above average wealth."

Two local laws, championed by Chairman Wolfe, were passed in June to further strengthen transparency in the annual budget process. The first law required printed and electronic versions of the adopted budget include the report by the Legislature's Budget and Finance Committee that details the committee's budget recommendations and the veto message by the County Executive (if any) that details additions or deletions, unless overridden by the Legislature. The second law required Legislative approval to fill a vacant position during the budget process period between October 1st and December 20th of each year in an effort to add clarity to the process.

In July, Legislature approved the hiring of two Social Services Investigators to pursue all allegations of fraud related to Medicaid and other social service programs. Medicaid is a federal program that provides health services to eligible low-income adults, families, children, and people with disabilities. In New York State, counties are required to pay 50% of the state's share. For Rockland County, that amounts to \$73,600,000.

On August 7<sup>th</sup>, County Executive Day announced that SPNCC's purchaser Sympaticare, LLC's licenses were approved for both the hospital and the nursing care center. The Rockland County Health Facilities Corporation (the LDC) was free to move forward with the Purchase and Sale Agreement. County Executive Day set September 30, 2015 for closing the sale transaction.

Good news continued into September. After two years on the list of New York's most fiscally stressed municipalities, Rockland County saw an impressive 20-point improvement in its annual report card from the Office of the State Comptroller. Following a common theme, better budgeting and cash flow, as well as less short-term borrowing were cited for driving the fiscal stress score down. In 2014, Rockland County scored a 65.8% on the Comptroller's scale. The new score is a significant improvement from the 2012 and 2013 scores of 86.7%.

The Comptroller developed the monitoring system in 2013 to serve as an "early warning" of fiscal stress to local governments based on financial information and other aspects of the external environment. A score of 65% to 100% indicates a significant degree of fiscal stress. A score of less than 65% indicates only moderate fiscal stress.

The good news would soon come to a screeching halt.

On September 30th, Sympaticare LLC terminated the contract and the sale subsequently collapsed. County Executive Day set the wheels in motion for Summit Park to be shuttered by December 31, 2015. The next day, on October 1<sup>st</sup>, Day unveiled the County Executive's Proposed Budget for 2016 and the Budget and Finance Committee began its review.

The Report of the Budget & Finance Committee regarding the Rockland County Executive's Proposed Budget (CEPB) is structured to: (1) outline the review process and timeline; (2) provide a synopsis of key elements of the County Executive's proposal; (3) review the Comptroller's examination and recommendations; (4) explain the framework for our analysis; and (5) discuss the Committee's final recommendations.

### **Legislature's Process & Timeline**

In accordance with the provisions of Article IV of the Rockland County Charter, the Legislature's Budget and Finance Committee is tasked with reviewing the County Executive's Proposed Budget (CEPB). Under the new Charter revisions, the process requires the County Executive to submit a budget to the Legislature no later than October 1st of each year. The Legislature then has until December 7th to analyze it in its entirety, question department managers, hold public hearings, propose and debate changes and vote on a final plan.

It is important to note that if the Legislature cannot agree on revisions to the CEPB, or an amended budget is voted down by the members, then the CEPB is enacted by default. If the Legislature rejects the CEPB or takes no action, then the Executive's proposal is enacted as well.

To be clear, a "No" vote on a budget amended by this Legislature is the functional equivalent of a "Yes" vote for the budget proposed by the County Executive.

The review process began three weeks earlier year. The timeline included the following:

- County Executive Day unveiled the 2016 Proposed Budget of \$727,262,680 at a press conference on Thursday morning, October 1, 2015. The electronic version of the budget was available online Thursday evening. The printed budget documents for all legislators were delivered to the Legislature on Monday, October 5th.
- The Budget & Finance Committee received a presentation that same evening and commenced its review.
- The Office of the New York State Comptroller commenced their examination of the 2015 CEPB on Monday, October 5, 2015 and completed the field work on Friday, October 16th.
- The Comptroller's office subsequently delivered its Report of Examination to the County on Tuesday, November 10, 2015, only two days earlier than last year. The report contained six specific recommendations.
- Budget and Finance convened a series of 15 budget planning and review sessions with department heads, administration staff and outside financial consultants. Generally speaking, these budget review sessions were lightly attended by the public.
- Several other sessions were set aside to permit the Majority and Minority caucuses to deliberate.

- The County Legislature held a public hearing on County Executive Day's budget proposal on Tuesday, November 17, 2015 and scheduled a public hearing on amending lifting the tax cap for Thursday, December 3, 2015.
- The Budget and Finance Committee finalized its findings and recommendations on December 3, 2015. The report is summarized in the narrative below, memorialized in an accompanying resolutions and attached schedules.
- Adoption 2016 Budget is scheduled for consideration by full Legislature tonight, following this Report of the Budget & Finance Committee.

To assist in our review, the Legislature retained the services of O'Connor Davies, LLP to examine the County Executive's proposal for 2016. O'Connor Davies' certified public accountants have served as the County's independent auditors and the firm is very familiar with the County's operations and finances. The consultants presented a detailed analysis of the 2016 CEPB to the Committee on October 27, 2015. A copy of the eighty-four page report was distributed to all legislators, the media and the offices of the County Executive and the New York State Comptroller. An addendum was provided related to the CEPB Voluntary Separation Incentive proposal. O'Connor Davies' report is available upon request.

### **County Executive's Proposed Budget**

In his budget message on October 1, 2015, County Executive Day said his "proposed Budget for 2016 builds for the future by saving money, paying down debt and investing in our county's core needs."

The County Executive's 2016 Proposed Budget (CEPB) of \$727.2 million represents a decrease of \$42.6 million less than the Legislature's 2015 adopted budget of \$769.8 million.

Under the 2016 CEPB, the Property Tax Levy would increase by \$5.3 million, or 4.95 percent, for a total tax levy of \$113,320,000. In his message, the County Executive estimated that the property tax increase would cost the average Rockland homeowner an additional \$4.00 per month or \$48 in County property taxes next year. (County property taxes typically amount to less than 10% of the tax bill. The remainder goes to pay village, town, school and special district taxes.)

The County Executive cited the circumstances surrounding the canceled sale of Summit Park Hospital & Nursing Care Center for derailing his ability to deliver a property tax levy under New York State's tax cap. He further stated that "Sympaticare's decision to walk away from the transaction to sell the facility not only impacted the patients and staff, but the county taxpayers as well."

The CE budgeted \$188.0 million dollars in sales tax revenue for 2016, a significant increase of \$3.0 million more than was budgeted in 2015; a clear indicator of a steadily improving economy. Both the Comptroller and O'Connor Davies concurred this amount was conservative and reasonable. Additionally, the CE elected to use more conservative estimates of revenues from the so-called Residential Energy Sales Tax; reducing it from \$10 million to \$9.5 million next year.

The 2016 CEPB message included the following:

- Close Summit Park Hospital & Nursing Care Center - No expenses or revenues were budgeted in 2016 for the continued operation of the hospital or nursing home.
- Hospital - Eliminated all 288 filled, full-time positions from the County workforce, with the exception of a handful of positions.
- Security - Eliminated all 13 positions within the Department of General Services security division. In the future, this function will fall under the jurisdiction of the Sheriff, whose core mission is to patrol county buildings and county properties.
- Jail Medical - Transferred existing medical services and eight full-time positions from Summit Park Hospital to the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Office. Included are 13 new positions to meet the requirements of the New York State Department of Corrections. Full funding was provided for the medical services.
- Early Retirement Incentive – ERI (a.k.a. VSI) provided \$1000 for every year of service for all RAM, CSEA and nonunion workers who voluntarily leave county service. Incentive and other separation costs totaling \$1.9 million would be absorbed in 2015, effectively reducing the budget surplus. Savings were estimated to be \$2.5 million going forward. Hospital employees leaving county service were excluded from this plan.
- Sale of Property - As a result of the closure of Summit Park, the proposed budget calls for the sale of the Sain Building in New City to generate \$4 million.
- In contrast to the 2015 CEPB, which eliminated funding for all contract agencies the 2016 CEPB included 95% of the funding restored by the Legislature last year. However, it was lumped into two distinct pots of money with no line items indicating the agencies or amounts allotted.

Like last year, upon closer examination, contradictions in the budget "message" begin to come into focus.

In his budget message, the County Executive stated that "When we began the budget process, we were looking at a 20% property tax increase for 2016, based solely on the demands of the Deficit Financing Act, the ongoing repayment of the \$96 million deficit bonds and the heavy burden of unfunded mandates from the state. We also knew that a \$13.2 million payment toward the bonds was due early next year."

In fact:

- The 2015 budget provided \$5.0 million or 125% of the amount required by the Rockland County Deficit Reduction Act (the "Plan"). Applying the minimum amount allowed under the law (\$4.0 million) to deficit reduction, essentially freed up \$1.0 million dollars for other pressing needs.
- While it's true that a \$13.2 million payment toward the Deficit Bond is due in 2016, over \$4 million of the premium was already reserved for this purpose.
- The County Executive is correct in noting the heavy burden of unfunded state mandates. O'Connor Davies noted in their review that the county taxation necessary to pay for state mandates in Dept. of Social Services (including Medicaid) actually declined by \$7.9 million from \$94.5m in 2015 to \$86.6m in 2016.

Finally, on November 23, 2015, (seven weeks after the budget was submitted) the County Executive sent a memo requesting a number of so called technical changes involving eight positions in four different departments for a total of \$440,000. In reality, technical adjustments represent errors, omissions or after-the-fact considerations by the administration. They must be treated in the same fashion as any other amendment to the budget.

The Budget and Finance Committee was challenged to reconcile these disparate issues.

### **Comptroller's Review & Recommendations**

State legislation (Chapter 468 of the Law of 2013) authorized the County of Rockland to issue debt totaling \$96 million to liquidate the accumulated deficit of the County's general fund as of December 31, 2012. As a condition, the legislation requires the County Executive to annually submit his proposed budget to the Office of the NYS State Comptroller (OSC). The State Comptroller must examine the proposed budget and make recommendations for any changes needed to bring the proposed budget into balance. Such recommendations are made after the examination into the estimated of revenues and expenditures of the County. The County Legislature, must then review all recommendations made by the Comptroller and make adjustments to its proposed budget consistent with the recommendations contained in the report.

The Comptroller's Office completed an independent evaluation of the 2016 CEPB on November 10, 2015 and found the significant revenue and expenditure projections were reasonable. O'Connor Davies, the County's independent auditor and budget consultant had a similar finding.

In its report OSC had specific comments regarding seven different issues or concerns. These items included: Outstanding Deficit, Sale of Real Property, Chargebacks, Early Retirement Incentive, Pension Costs, Hospital Fund and Tax Cap Compliance.

The report makes six recommendations stating that the County Executive and the Legislature should:

1. Develop and implement a formal plan that will result in elimination of the counties accumulated deficit over a specified period of time.
2. Consistent with a plan to reduce the remaining deficit in the general fund, ensure that the 2016 adopted budget will result in a decrease of the deficit.
3. Assess the likelihood of the planned sale the property being completed by the end of the 2016 year. Consider replacing this revenue with other revenue or reducing appropriations if necessary.
4. Monitor the early retirement incentive closely and take necessary actions to reduce other appropriations if it does not achieve the projected \$2.5 million in savings.
5. Assess the sufficiency of the appropriation for employee pension costs and increase the appropriation as necessary.
6. Assess the hospital closure plans and considering putting an appropriation in the budget to cover potential course if it does not close as planned.

As noted previously, the legislature has the responsibility to initiate corrective action to address the recommendations in this report.

The Comptroller also noted that the county's proposed budget exceeds the tax levy limit. It includes a tax levy \$113.3 million which is 4.9% higher than the 2015 levy and exceeds the allowable tax levy limit increase of 0.73 percent. Therefore, the County Legislature must pass a local or overriding the tax levy limit before adopting the proposed budget or reduce the tax levy to comply with the law. The Legislature has scheduled the requisite Public Hearing and placed the local law on the agenda for December 3, 2015.

A complete copy of the Comptroller's Report is attached.

### **Framework for the Legislature's Budget Review**

The collapse of the hospital deal loomed large over the B&F proceedings. The sale of the hospital was long thought to be the cornerstone of the County's fiscal recovery. While the (eventual) sale was never viewed as a potential windfall it was expected to provide a means for retiring its outstanding capital debt, mitigating the cost of employee separation from service and other transition costs. The decision to close it completely and as soon as possible was short sighted to say the least. The hospital's greatest marketability, highest value and best use resided in being an ongoing operation, not an empty building. As an operating entity it cared for patients in need, was a home for seniors and provided jobs for hundreds of people involved in direct care and ancillary services. Empty it is an even greater financial burden to county government and is simply heartbreaking to watch. The 2015 County contribution to the EH Fund (the so called "loss") was approximately \$16 million while still providing care, shelter and employment. In the 2016 CEPB the cost is \$22 million and will offer none of these benefits - only holes in a structurally unsound budget.

At the outset, Budget and Finance laid out a framework for approaching the 2016 budget by setting goals, reconciling projections and creating a strong plan for continued fiscal improvement in 2016.

Following the presentation of the CEPB, the Legislature began a systematic review of the documents. Subsequent hearings were focused on Major Revenues, Summit Park, Deficit Reduction, State Mandates, Tax Cap Allowance, Non-Profit Contract Agencies, Fiscal Stress Indicators, Allocated Costs, Sheriff Dept Review, Personnel & Program Changes, NYS Comptroller's Report of Examination, O'Connor Davies Budget Analysis and Capital Projects.

At the outset, Legislator Wolfe, Legislator Schoenberger and I identified issues and communicated our concerns to OSC staff and asked that they focus their review on the following:

- The County Executive has not made any provision for a reserve fund for deficit reduction, which is required by Rockland County Local Law #6 of 2014, a copy of which is attached for your reference;
- The Proposed Budget includes a "one shot" sale of real property as a \$4,000,000.00 revenue item. It's our understanding that the property has not been formally appraised, and has yet to be marketed for sale.
- The Proposed Budget provides no funding for Summit Park Hospital and Nursing Care Center in 2016, relying on an optimistic three month time frame to close the facility in full compliance with NYS DOH regulations. Previous estimates for safe, legal closure of the

facility ranged from six to eighteen months. Further, closure of the facility may require Legislative approval.

- The Proposed Budget includes revenue from community college charge-backs in the sum of \$1.8 million. Charge-backs to Rockland's five towns was eliminated in 2013 by Resolution 532, a copy of which is attached for your reference. To this point, there has been little support in the Legislature for reinstating these charge-backs, and re-adoption is unlikely.
- The Proposed Budget includes \$2,500,000.00 in salary savings attributable to an Early Retirement Incentive that has not yet been approved by the County Legislature.
- The County Executive unilaterally ordered the closing of the County Nursing Home/Hospital and the transfer out of all remaining residents. At the time he issued the order there were approximately 180 residents in the Nursing Home and 60+ additional residents between the Hospital and adult home. In all of Rockland County there were approximately 80 available beds in other facilities for transfer. The County Executive has chosen to defund the Nursing Home/Hospital in calendar year 2016.
- The County Executive's proposed budget raises taxes above the amount allowed by the tax cap. When the County Executive submitted the budget it was the first time the Legislature learned of his intention to raise the tax cap. No prior discussion was had with the County Executive regarding lifting the tax cap.
- Were this budget to be enacted without the tax cap being lifted, the additional revenue over and above the tax cap would be segregated and not allowed to be used in 2016. Since the County Executive did not discuss this with the Legislature nor seek our approval prior to the proposal to exceed the tax cap, before submitting the budget to the Legislature, that revenue is also speculative.

Based on the information from these hearings, legislators worked, individually and in groups to develop ideas for improving the budget. Legislative Fiscal Analyst Nicole Doliner, Finance Dept. staff and the consultants from O'Connor Davies contributed immensely to the process. A master list of outstanding Action Items (requests for additional information) and potential amendments was maintained and shared.

One other observation - Public interest in the process was not as keen this year as it was last year. The meetings were generally lightly attended. Noticeably absent was any coverage of the proceedings by Rockland's only daily newspaper. The weekly newspapers were the only regular conduit of information to the general public.

### Budget and Finance Committee Recommendations

After careful analysis and consultation with department representatives, the public and the County's financial consultants, the Budget & Finance Committee identified the following items:

<b>AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET BY FUND</b>	
<b>Contract Agencies at 2016 Proposed level</b>	
<b>WITH TECH CHANGES</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<i>Social Services Tech changes</i>	(\$64,560)
<i>Health Tech changes</i>	\$85,000
<i>Finance Tech changes</i>	(\$15,000)
<i>Probation Tech changes</i>	\$86,700
<i>Personnel Tech changes</i>	\$51,640
<i>Hospital Tech changes</i>	(\$30,600)
<i>MIS Tech changes</i>	\$86,820
<i>Increase Mortgage Tax Revenue</i>	(\$200,000)
Reject Community College Chargebacks	\$1,800,000
Eliminate County Exec raise	(\$15,509)
Restore salaries in Law Department	\$97,779
Restore Mounted Patrol (non personnel)	\$156,600
Restore cuts to Sheriff	\$238,500
Restore 32 Proposed Layoffs	\$1,552,510
Human Right salary adjustment	\$0
Reject VSI	\$2,500,000
Designate fund balance Local Law	\$4,000,000
Reject sale of real property	\$4,000,000
Ajdust Pension cost as per OSC	\$500,000
Fund Nursing Home for 1 month	\$500,000
Restore Security - other costs	\$606,500
Increase Sales Tax revenue	(\$500,000)
Net Impact to County Taxation	\$15,436,380
<b>Real Property Taxes</b>	<b>\$113,320,000</b>
<b>Adjust Property Taxes</b>	<b><u>\$15,436,380</u></b>
	<b>\$128,756,380</b>
<b>2015 Real Property Tax</b>	<b>\$107,978,376</b>
<b>Increase</b>	<b>\$20,778,004</b>
	<b>19.24%</b>

While the Committee was able to identify specific areas of concern it was unable to find common ground on a package of amendments that would meet the needs of the majority of members. As of Tuesday, December 1, 2015 no package of amendments were offered for a vote. The Committee agreed to meet once more on Thursday, December 3, 2015 before the full legislature convenes. If any action is taken by the Committee this report will be amended to reflect those deliberations.

### **Rockland's Financial Outlook**

Caution is the watchword. In the May 2015 credit analysis S&P's positive outlook reflected their opinion that there is a greater than one-in-three chance that they will raise the rating on Rockland County within the next year due to continued improved budgetary performance and deficit mitigation. However, the rating is capped at the current level as long as the County's available reserves are less than negative 5% of general fund expenditures. Conversely, should the county reverse its current positive trend we could revise the outlook or lower the credit rating.

### **Acknowledgments**

The Committee wishes to thank our legislative staff and in particular Nicole Doliner, who as our Legislative Fiscal Analyst has been instrumental in working with the Legislature as well as with the Finance Dept. staff and our outside consultants, whose collective efforts have resulted in the Report of the Budget and Finance Committee tonight. While I am disappointed that consensus was not reached I wish to thank and acknowledge the members of the Budget and Finance Committee and all who attended our meetings, helped us discuss and debate these items.

I applaud the members of the County Legislature who have worked together in a non-partisan manner and showed their concern for the County as a whole and all its residents, not just individual districts. The Committee collaborated in a non-partisan manner so as to result in this Report of the Budget and Finance Committee tonight.

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

A	CA1002	Contract Agency - Public Benefit	5010			\$	1,484,810	\$		\$	(1,484,810)	\$	(1,484,810)
A	CA1000	Contract Agency - General Government	5010			\$	2,597,340	\$		\$	(2,597,340)	\$	(2,597,340)
A	CA7561	Arts Council of Rockland, Inc.	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	40,630	\$	40,630	\$	40,630
A	CA4083	Association for Visually Impaired	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	154,117	\$	154,117	\$	154,117
A	CA8821	Big Brothers Big Sisters	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	95,745	\$	95,745	\$	95,745
A	CA8822	CASA	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	11,300	\$	11,300	\$	11,300
A	CA8804	Child Care Resources of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	120,735	\$	120,735	\$	120,735
A	CA8804	Child Care Resources of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	57,285	\$	57,285	\$	57,285
A	CA7642	Chiklu Aweil African Dance	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,560	\$	1,560	\$	1,560
A	CA8750	Cornell Coop Extension of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	260,620	\$	260,620	\$	260,620
A	CA7535	Debra Weiss Dance Company	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,898	\$	1,898	\$	1,898
A	CA7655	Edward Hopper House	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	3,160	\$	3,160	\$	3,160
A	CA7541	Elmwood Community Playhouse	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,263	\$	8,263	\$	8,263
A	CA7518	Friends of the Nyorks	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	6,575	\$	6,575	\$	6,575
A	CA7684	Garnerville Arts	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	17,658	\$	17,658	\$	17,658
A	CA7515	Haverstraw Brick Museum	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,070	\$	13,070	\$	13,070
A	CA7520	Historical Society of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA3510	Hi-Tor Animal Care	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	44,825	\$	44,825	\$	44,825
A	CA7571	Hudson Vagabond Puppets	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,000	\$	4,000	\$	4,000
A	CA8941	Keep Rockland Beautiful	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	51,667	\$	51,667	\$	51,667
A	CA1171	Legal Aid Society	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	59,860	\$	59,860	\$	59,860
A	CA7410	Library Association of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	39,885	\$	39,885	\$	39,885
A	CA8806	MHA - Family Treatment Court	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	14,355	\$	14,355	\$	14,355
A	CA7555	Morning Music Club	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,085	\$	1,085	\$	1,085
A	CA6343	NAACP - Spring Valley Branch	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA6324	NAACP-Nyack Branch	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA7586	Penguin Rep	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,376	\$	2,376	\$	2,376
A	CA7545	Rivertown Films	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,355	\$	1,355	\$	1,355
A	CA7550	Rockland Camera	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,560	\$	1,560	\$	1,560
A	CA7521	Rockland Center for Holocaust	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	9,030	\$	9,030	\$	9,030
A	CA7552	Rockland Center for the Arts	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA7531	Rockland Conservatory to Music	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	18,057	\$	18,057	\$	18,057
A	CA7542	Rockland County Choral Society	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	3,184	\$	3,184	\$	3,184
A	CA8958	Rockland Schools 21st Century	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	199,621	\$	199,621	\$	199,621
A	EXE1233	EXE- Rockland Economic Develop	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	315,998	\$	315,998	\$	315,998
A	CA7536	Rockland Youth Dance Ensemble	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,810	\$	4,810	\$	4,810
A	CA4601	Bikur Cholim	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	81,257	\$	81,257	\$	81,257
A	CA4089	Brain Injury Association	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,492	\$	1,492	\$	1,492
A	CA8845	C.A.N.D.L.E.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	25,936	\$	25,936	\$	25,936
A	CA8819	Campus Fun & Learn Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA4091	Cardinal Cooke Residence	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,080	\$	5,080	\$	5,080
A	CA6330	Catholic Community Svc of RC	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	CA6960	CEJES Institute	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	6,296	\$	6,296	\$	6,296
A	CA4085	Center for Safety Change	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	63,200	\$	63,200	\$	63,200
A	CA8869	Christ Church of Suffern	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,901	\$	1,901	\$	1,901
A	CA6363	Clothes Work	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,221	\$	1,221	\$	1,221
A	CA6326	Community Improvement Council	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	CA6333	Community Outreach Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	90,195	\$	90,195	\$	90,195
A	CA8908	Community Outreach Center -Employ	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA8817	EPIC	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA8840	Friends Help Friends	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA3513	Friends of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,682	\$	1,682	\$	1,682
A	CA8316	Haitian American Cultural Org	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	21,873	\$	21,873	\$	21,873
A	CA3827	Hatzolah EMS	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA6317	Headstart of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	95,679	\$	95,679	\$	95,679
A	CA3626	HELP	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	32,503	\$	32,503	\$	32,503
A	CA6327	Help from People to People	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	22,571	\$	22,571	\$	22,571
A	CA8894	Helping Hands	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	21,873	\$	21,873	\$	21,873
A	CA4087	Home Aides of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	10,430	\$	10,430	\$	10,430
A	CA4093	Home Aides CHORE	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,275	\$	13,275	\$	13,275
A	CA7330	India Cultural Society of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,420	\$	5,420	\$	5,420

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015**

A	CA7522	JCC Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	15,990	\$	15,990	\$	15,990
A	CA8760	Jewish Family Services of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	20,585	\$	20,585	\$	20,585
A	CA8338	Jewish Federation of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,275	\$	13,275	\$	13,275
A	CA8339	Joseph's Home/ MIA Vet Shelter	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	12,730	\$	12,730	\$	12,730
A	CA8319	Korbit Nig Lakay, Inc.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	57,490	\$	57,490	\$	57,490
A	CA8790	Literacy Volunteers of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,170	\$	2,170	\$	2,170
A	CA8313	Marlin Luther King	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	74,550	\$	74,550	\$	74,550
A	CA8850	Mid-Hudson Community Council	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	28,545	\$	28,545	\$	28,545
A	CA8883	New Beginings Dignity	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,260	\$	8,260	\$	8,260
A	CA6314	Nyack Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	41,778	\$	41,778	\$	41,778
A	CA8818	RC Worksite Day Care Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	19,010	\$	19,010	\$	19,010
A	CA8803	RCC Senior Citizens Club	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,471	\$	4,471	\$	4,471
A	CA7562	Rockland Center for the Arts (AIPP)	6950		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	16,185	\$	16,185	\$	16,185
A	CA8030	Rockland Housing Action Coalition	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	47,520	\$	47,520	\$	47,520
A	CA8954	Rockland Interfaith Breakfast	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,298	\$	5,298	\$	5,298
A	CA7566	Rockland Irish American Culture	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,747	\$	13,747	\$	13,747
A	CA7577	Rockland YMCA - Nyack	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	23,970	\$	23,970	\$	23,970
A	CA6337	Stop FEAR Coalition	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA7573	Thorpe Senior Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,355	\$	5,355	\$	5,355
A	CA8931	Touch	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,060	\$	8,060	\$	8,060
A	CA4088	United Hospice of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	90,285	\$	90,285	\$	90,285
A	CA8031	Venture Foundation, Ltd.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	48,148	\$	48,148	\$	48,148
A	CA8620	Volunteer Counseling Service	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,515	\$	162,515	\$	162,515
A	CA8616	West Street Day Care Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	35,165	\$	35,165	\$	35,165
A	CA8958	Westcoast Comm Opportunity	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	166,315	\$	166,315	\$	166,315
A	6010	DSS - RODA Social Services	5350		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	45,300	\$	45,300	\$	45,300
A	6010	DSS - RCDC Humans Services	5550		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	98,321	\$	98,321	\$	98,321
A	6010	DSS - Bikur Cholim - Comm Action	5650		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	58,440	\$	58,440	\$	58,440
A	6010	DSS - Share	5840		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	6010	DSS - RODA Youth	5841		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	76,655	\$	76,655	\$	76,655
A	6010	DSS - Bikur Cholim Human Services	5940		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	58,440	\$	58,440	\$	58,440
A	6772	OFA - RCDC Senior Citizens	5490		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	30,135	\$	30,135	\$	30,135
A	6772	OFA - RODA Senior Citizens	5680		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	69,545	\$	69,545	\$	69,545
A	6772	OFA - Senior Citizen COC	5681		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	33,990	\$	33,990	\$	33,990
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X8888	Collections Asst	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	50,248	\$	50,248	\$	50,248
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X5785	Support Invest I	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	57,780	\$	57,780	\$	57,780
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X9214	Soc Svc Invest Fraud	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	45,650	\$	45,650	\$	45,650
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X9215	Soc Svc Invest Fraud	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	45,650	\$	45,650	\$	45,650
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	N006	Planning & Eval Asst	TECH CHANGE	\$	50,250	-	\$	(50,250)	\$	(50,250)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	T8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	66,610	\$	66,610	\$	66,610
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	2969		Salary Savings	TECH CHANGE	\$	(425,000)	(522,548)	\$	(97,548)	\$	(97,548)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1930		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	\$	1,892,585	1,609,885	\$	17,300	\$	17,300
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	R3810		Soc Svc Admin State	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	-	\$	14,600,000	\$	14,600,000
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	R4610		Soc Svc Admin Fed	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	-	\$	14,700,000	\$	14,700,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1100		Pharmacist	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	90,000	\$	90,000	\$	90,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1930		Pharmacist Relief	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	25,000	\$	25,000	\$	25,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1930		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	10,000	\$	10,000	\$	10,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	R3401		State Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	-	\$	40,000	\$	40,000
A	EXE1250	County Executive	1100	T3963	Municipal Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	38,000	-	\$	(38,000)	\$	(38,000)
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1100	T3963	Municipal Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	38,000	\$	38,000	\$	38,000
A	EXE1340	Budget & Mgt	1100	X8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	(66,610)	-	\$	66,610	\$	66,610
A	EXE1340	Budget & Mgt	1100	T8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	(66,610)	\$	(66,610)	\$	(66,610)
A	FIN1325	Department of Finance	1900	RX8680	Clerk - Rif	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	15,000	\$	15,000	\$	15,000
A	FIN1325	Department of Finance	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	TECH CHANGE	\$	(15,000)	(45,000)	\$	(30,000)	\$	(30,000)
A	PRO3140	Department of Probation	1100	N001	Super Probation Officer	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	80,300	\$	80,300	\$	80,300



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

D	5110	Highway - Main Roads	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	Increase Salary Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-		
D	CRF5010	Highway-Administration	7250		Allocation - Gen Svcs	Reduce allocation for Utilities Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-		
D		Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2810			Contribution - to balance fund								\$	-		
DM	RMF5120	Road Machinery	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	Increase Salary Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-		
DM	RMF5120	Road Machinery	7250		Allocation - Gen Svcs	Reduce allocation for Utilities Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-		
DM		Contribution from General (A) Fund				Contribution - to balance fund								\$	-		
EH	E922	Nursing SPH	1100	X9182		TECH CHANGE		-	31,610	\$	31,610			\$	31,610		
EH	E934	Laboratory	1100	X2857		TECH CHANGE	31,610	-	\$	(31,610)				\$	(31,610)		
EH	E501	Medical Admin	1100	X5432		TECH CHANGE	17,425	-	\$	(17,425)				\$	(17,425)		
EH	E504	Medical Records	1100	X5957		TECH CHANGE	13,175	-	\$	(13,175)				\$	(13,175)		
EH	E301	Administration	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 3,380	\$ 11,093	\$	7,713				\$	7,713		
EH	E304	Quality Assurance	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 5,053	\$	5,053				\$	5,053		
EH	E401	Personnel	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 8,280	\$ 13,954	\$	5,674				\$	5,674		
EH	E607	Transportation	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,812	\$	3,812				\$	3,812		
EH	E628	Housekeeping	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 23,050	\$	23,050				\$	23,050		
EH	E631	Materials Mgt	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,723	\$	3,723				\$	3,723		
EH	E659	Central Supply	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 887	\$	887				\$	887		
EH	E501	Medical Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 11,690	\$ 16,201	\$	4,521				\$	4,521		
EH	E504	Physicians Chronic	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,280	\$	3,280				\$	3,280		
EH	E510	Physicians SNF	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,511	\$	8,511				\$	8,511		
EH	E801	Food Services	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 47,429	\$	47,429				\$	47,429		
EH	E804	Cafeteria	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 2,660	\$	2,660				\$	2,660		
EH	E825	Laundry	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 10,638	\$	10,638				\$	10,638		
EH	E901	Patient Svc Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 7,660	\$ 12,111	\$	4,521				\$	4,521		
EH	E904	Medical Records	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 13,750	\$ 23,542	\$	9,792				\$	9,792		
EH	E905	Admissions	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 4,787	\$	4,787				\$	4,787		
EH	E907	Social Worker	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,777	\$	8,777				\$	8,777		
EH	E908	Adult Day Care	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 9,131	\$	9,131				\$	9,131		
EH	E910	Pharmacy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 13,918	\$	13,918				\$	13,918		
EH	E913	Nursing Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 22,872	\$	22,872				\$	22,872		
EH	E922	Nursing SPH	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 81,790	\$	81,790				\$	81,790		
EH	E928	Nursing Home	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 189,806	\$	189,806				\$	189,806		
EH	E931	Radiology	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 798	\$	798				\$	798		
EH	E934	Laboratory	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 6,720	\$ 18,668	\$	11,968				\$	11,968		
EH	E937	Rehab Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 4,433	\$	4,433				\$	4,433		
EH	E940	Physical Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,383	\$	6,383				\$	6,383		
EH	E947	Occupational Ther	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,028	\$	6,028				\$	6,028		
EH	E950	Rec Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,915	\$	8,915				\$	8,915		
EH	E956	Personal Care	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 5,053	\$	5,053				\$	5,053		
EH	E962	Outpatient	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,280	\$	3,280				\$	3,280		
EH	E965	Volunteers	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 2,837	\$	2,837				\$	2,837		
EH	E928	Nursing Home	8600		Appropriation Reserve	Operating Expenses for 1 month at NH	\$	-	\$	150,000	\$	150,000		\$	150,000		
EH	E928	Nursing Home	R1601		Patient Svc Fees	Operating Revenue for 1 month at NH				50,000	\$	50,000		\$	(50,000)		
EH	4982	Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2810			Contribution - to balance fund							22,558,180	23,137,560	568,400	\$	(568,400)

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

M	DGS2300	MIS	1100	X3358	Mgmt Analyst Program	TECH CHANGE		80,388	\$	80,388				\$	80,388
M	DGS2300		1100	Z996	Standby Time	TECH CHANGE	2	4	\$	2				\$	2
M	DGS2300		1530		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	152,235	158,665	\$	6,430				\$	6,430
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2289	Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	16,740	\$	16,740		\$	16,740
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2290	Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	16,740	\$	16,740		\$	16,740
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2320	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	60,688	\$	60,688		\$	60,688
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2624b	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	33,130	\$	33,130		\$	33,130
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3022	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	55,612	\$	55,612		\$	55,612
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3300	Sr Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	69,636	\$	69,636		\$	69,636
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3301	Sr Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	76,846	\$	76,846		\$	76,846
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X6048	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$	57,766		\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$	57,766		\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X9228	Sr Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	25,416	\$	25,416		\$	25,416
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X7757	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	55,220	\$	55,220		\$	55,220
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X7758	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$	57,766		\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X8076a	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	33,130	\$	33,130		\$	33,130
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X8076b	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	22,080	\$	22,080		\$	22,080
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1110		Overtime	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	100,000		\$	100,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1800		Watchman RLF	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	30,000	\$	30,000		\$	30,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1800	X8293Z	Security Aide RLF	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	369,000	\$	369,000		\$	369,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1910		Insurance	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	220,000	\$	220,000		\$	220,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1911		Dental	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	21,000	\$	21,000		\$	21,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1912		Vision	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	4,100	\$	4,100		\$	4,100
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1930		Social Security	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	90,000	\$	90,000		\$	90,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1940		Unemployment	Restore Security	\$	154,000	\$	-	\$	(154,000)		\$	(154,000)
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1970		Compensated Absence	Restore Security	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	(200,000)		\$	(200,000)
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1980		Mobility Tax	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	4,500	\$	4,500		\$	4,500
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	3070		Uniforms	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	5,000	\$	5,000		\$	5,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	3280		Operational Supplies	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	1,000	\$	1,000		\$	1,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	R1210		COBRA	Restore Security						116,900		(116,900)	116,900
M	DGS2600	DGS-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R2803			Contribution - to balance fund						1,562,740	2,694,606	1,331,866	(1,331,866)
Q	PER9050	Unemployment Insurance	8010			Employee Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$			\$	-
Q	PER9050	Unemployment Insurance	R2809			Interfund Revenues								\$	-
A	UNC9990	Real Property Taxes	R1001			To balance above						113,320,000	118,629,010	5,309,010	5,309,010
												Balanced			

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND**  
**REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE AND PLANNING & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES**  
**AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET**  
**RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES**  
**as Adopted by Legislature 12/3//2015**

SCHEDULE E

PROJECT	2016 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET	RECOMM.	APPROP. INC. (DEC.)	GENERAL FUND CONTRIBUTION	RECOMMENDED CHANGES 2016 CAPITAL BUDGET FEDERAL/ STATE AID	CAPITAL FUNDS
<b>Schedule III</b>						
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Drainage</b>						
Project 7001 - Pascack Brook Improvement	Close Project \$1,315 to Debt Service;	In Process	10,437,000			10,437,000
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES</b>			<b>10,437,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,437,000</b>

**VETOED BY COUNTY EXECUTIVE/LEGISLATIVE OVERRIDE ON DECEMBER 15, 2015**

Introduced by:  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor

Referral No. 9505

**RESOLUTION NO. 548 OF 2015  
ADOPTION OF THE 2016 COUNTY BUDGET**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Jobson and adopted

WHEREAS, a public hearing has been held on the 2016 proposed County Budget; and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and approved this resolution, however, it was approved within 120 hours of the full legislative meeting and was deemed an immediate need by its Chair, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the proposed Rockland County Budget for the year 2016, as has been filed by the County Executive with such changes, alterations and revisions as may have been made by the Budget and Finance Committee with the approval of the Legislature of Rockland County, and any other changes, alterations and revisions as may have been made by the Legislature of Rockland County, be and it is hereby adopted.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes: 09 (Legislators Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, Hood, Jr.)

Nays: 08 (Legislators Carey, Earl, Hofstein, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Wolfe)

---

A stenographer was present for the following discussion, which can be found after Res. No. 549 of 2015.

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

A	CA1002	Contract Agency - Public Benefit	5010			\$	1,484,810	\$		\$	(1,484,810)	\$	(1,484,810)
A	CA1000	Contract Agency - General Government	5010			\$	2,597,340	\$		\$	(2,597,340)	\$	(2,597,340)
A	CA7561	Arts Council of Rockland, Inc.	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	40,630	\$	40,630	\$	40,630
A	CA4083	Association for Visually Impaired	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	154,117	\$	154,117	\$	154,117
A	CA8821	Big Brothers Big Sisters	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	95,745	\$	95,745	\$	95,745
A	CA8822	CASA	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	11,300	\$	11,300	\$	11,300
A	CA8804	Child Care Resources of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	120,735	\$	120,735	\$	120,735
A	CA8804	Child Care Resources of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	57,285	\$	57,285	\$	57,285
A	CA7642	Chiklu Aweil African Dance	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,560	\$	1,560	\$	1,560
A	CA8750	Cornell Coop Extension of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	260,620	\$	260,620	\$	260,620
A	CA7535	Debra Weiss Dance Company	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,898	\$	1,898	\$	1,898
A	CA7655	Edward Hopper House	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	3,160	\$	3,160	\$	3,160
A	CA7541	Elmwood Community Playhouse	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,263	\$	8,263	\$	8,263
A	CA7518	Friends of the Nyorks	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	6,575	\$	6,575	\$	6,575
A	CA7684	Garnerville Arts	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	17,658	\$	17,658	\$	17,658
A	CA7515	Haverstraw Brick Museum	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,070	\$	13,070	\$	13,070
A	CA7520	Historical Society of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA3510	Hi-Tor Animal Care	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	44,825	\$	44,825	\$	44,825
A	CA7571	Hudson Vagabond Puppets	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,000	\$	4,000	\$	4,000
A	CA8941	Keep Rockland Beautiful	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	51,667	\$	51,667	\$	51,667
A	CA1171	Legal Aid Society	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	59,860	\$	59,860	\$	59,860
A	CA7410	Library Association of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	39,885	\$	39,885	\$	39,885
A	CA8806	MHA - Family Treatment Court	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	14,355	\$	14,355	\$	14,355
A	CA7555	Morning Music Club	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,085	\$	1,085	\$	1,085
A	CA6343	NAACP - Spring Valley Branch	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA6324	NAACP-Nyack Branch	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA7586	Penguin Rep	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,376	\$	2,376	\$	2,376
A	CA7545	Rivertown Films	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,355	\$	1,355	\$	1,355
A	CA7550	Rockland Camera	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,560	\$	1,560	\$	1,560
A	CA7521	Rockland Center for Holocaust	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	9,030	\$	9,030	\$	9,030
A	CA7552	Rockland Center for the Arts	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA7531	Rockland Conservatory to Music	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	18,057	\$	18,057	\$	18,057
A	CA7542	Rockland County Choral Society	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	3,184	\$	3,184	\$	3,184
A	CA8958	Rockland Schools 21st Century	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	199,621	\$	199,621	\$	199,621
A	EXE1233	EXE- Rockland Economic Develop	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	315,998	\$	315,998	\$	315,998
A	CA7536	Rockland Youth Dance Ensemble	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,810	\$	4,810	\$	4,810
A	CA4601	Bikur Cholim	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	81,257	\$	81,257	\$	81,257
A	CA4089	Brain Injury Association	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,492	\$	1,492	\$	1,492
A	CA8845	C.A.N.D.L.E.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	25,936	\$	25,936	\$	25,936
A	CA8819	Campus Fun & Learn Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA4091	Cardinal Cooke Residence	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,080	\$	5,080	\$	5,080
A	CA6330	Catholic Community Svc of RC	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	CA6960	CEJES Institute	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	6,296	\$	6,296	\$	6,296
A	CA4085	Center for Safety Change	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	63,200	\$	63,200	\$	63,200
A	CA8869	Christ Church of Suffern	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,901	\$	1,901	\$	1,901
A	CA6363	Clothes Work	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,221	\$	1,221	\$	1,221
A	CA6326	Community Improvement Council	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	CA6333	Community Outreach Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	90,195	\$	90,195	\$	90,195
A	CA8908	Community Outreach Center -Employ	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA8817	EPIC	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA8940	Friends Help Friends	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA3513	Friends of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,682	\$	1,682	\$	1,682
A	CA8316	Haitian American Cultural Org	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	21,873	\$	21,873	\$	21,873
A	CA3827	Hatzolah EMS	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA6317	Headstart of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	95,679	\$	95,679	\$	95,679
A	CA3626	HELP	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	32,503	\$	32,503	\$	32,503
A	CA6327	Help from People to People	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	22,571	\$	22,571	\$	22,571
A	CA8894	Helping Hands	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	21,873	\$	21,873	\$	21,873
A	CA4087	Home Aides of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	10,430	\$	10,430	\$	10,430
A	CA4093	Home Aides CHORE	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,275	\$	13,275	\$	13,275
A	CA7330	India Cultural Society of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,420	\$	5,420	\$	5,420

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015**

A	CA7522	JCC Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	15,990	\$	15,990				\$	15,990
A	CA8760	Jewish Family Services of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	20,585	\$	20,585				\$	20,585
A	CA8338	Jewish Federation of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,275	\$	13,275				\$	13,275
A	CA8339	Joseph's Home/ MIA Vet Shelter	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	12,730	\$	12,730				\$	12,730
A	CA8319	Korbit Nig Lakay, Inc.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	57,490	\$	57,490				\$	57,490
A	CA8790	Literacy Volunteers of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,170	\$	2,170				\$	2,170
A	CA8313	Marlin Luther King	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	74,550	\$	74,550				\$	74,550
A	CA8850	Mid-Hudson Community Council	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	28,545	\$	28,545				\$	28,545
A	CA8883	New Beginings Dignity	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,260	\$	8,260				\$	8,260
A	CA6314	Nyack Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	41,778	\$	41,778				\$	41,778
A	CA8818	RC Worksite Day Care Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	19,010	\$	19,010				\$	19,010
A	CA8803	RCC Senior Citizens Club	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,471	\$	4,471				\$	4,471
A	CA7562	Rockland Center for the Arts (AIPP)	6950		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	16,185	\$	16,185				\$	16,185
A	CA8030	Rockland Housing Action Coalition	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	47,520	\$	47,520				\$	47,520
A	CA8954	Rockland Interfaith Breakfast	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,298	\$	5,298				\$	5,298
A	CA7568	Rockland Irish American Culture	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,747	\$	13,747				\$	13,747
A	CA7577	Rockland YMCA - Nyack	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	23,970	\$	23,970				\$	23,970
A	CA6337	Stop FEAR Coalition	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642				\$	2,642
A	CA7573	Thorpe Senior Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,355	\$	5,355				\$	5,355
A	CA8931	Touch	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,060	\$	8,060				\$	8,060
A	CA4088	United Hospice of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	90,285	\$	90,285				\$	90,285
A	CA8031	Venture Foundation, Ltd.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	48,148	\$	48,148				\$	48,148
A	CA8620	Volunteer Counseling Service	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,515	\$	162,515				\$	162,515
A	CA8816	West Street Day Care Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	35,165	\$	35,165				\$	35,165
A	CA8958	Westcoast Comm Opportunity	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	166,315	\$	166,315				\$	166,315
A	6010	DSS - RODA Social Services	5350		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	45,300	\$	45,300				\$	45,300
A	6010	DSS - RCDC Humans Services	5550		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	98,321	\$	98,321				\$	98,321
A	6010	DSS - Bikur Cholim - Comm Action	5650		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	58,440	\$	58,440				\$	58,440
A	6010	DSS - Share	5840		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513				\$	162,513
A	6010	DSS - RODA Youth	5841		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	76,655	\$	76,655				\$	76,655
A	6010	DSS - Bikur Cholim Human Services	5940		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	58,440	\$	58,440				\$	58,440
A	6772	OFA - RCDC Senior Citizens	5480		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	30,135	\$	30,135				\$	30,135
A	6772	OFA - RODA Senior Citizens	5680		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	69,545	\$	69,545				\$	69,545
A	6772	OFA - Senior Citizen COC	5681		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	33,990	\$	33,990				\$	33,990
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X8888	Collections Asst	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	50,248	\$	50,248				\$	50,248
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X5785	Support Invest I	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	57,780	\$	57,780				\$	57,780
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X9214	Soc Svc Invest Fraud	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	45,650	\$	45,650				\$	45,650
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X9215	Soc Svc Invest Fraud	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	45,650	\$	45,650				\$	45,650
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	N006	Planning & Eval Asst	TECH CHANGE	\$	50,250	-	\$	(50,250)				\$	(50,250)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	T8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	66,610	\$	66,610				\$	66,610
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	2969		Salary Savings	TECH CHANGE	\$	(425,000)	(522,548)	\$	(97,548)				\$	(97,548)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1930		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	\$	1,892,585	1,609,885	\$	17,300				\$	17,300
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	R3810		Soc Svc Admin State	TECH CHANGE					14,600,000	14,700,000	100,000		\$	(100,000)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	R4610		Soc Svc Admin Fed	TECH CHANGE					14,600,000	14,700,000	100,000		\$	(100,000)
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1100		Pharmacist	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	90,000	\$	90,000				\$	90,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1930		Pharmacist Relief	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	25,000	\$	25,000				\$	25,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1930		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	10,000	\$	10,000				\$	10,000
			R3401		State Aid	TECH CHANGE						40,000		40,000	\$	(40,000)
A	EXE1250	County Executive	1100	T3963	Municipal Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	38,000	-	\$	(38,000)				\$	(38,000)
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1100	T3963	Municipal Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	38,000	\$	38,000				\$	38,000
A	EXE1340	Budget & Mgt	1100	X8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	(66,610)	-	\$	66,610				\$	66,610
A	EXE1340	Budget & Mgt	1100	T8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	(66,610)	\$	(66,610)				\$	(66,610)
A	FIN1325	Department of Finance	1900	RX8680	Clerk - Rf	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	15,000	\$	15,000				\$	15,000
A	FIN1325	Department of Finance	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	TECH CHANGE	\$	(15,000)	(45,000)	\$	(30,000)				\$	(30,000)
A	PRO3140	Department of Probation	1100	N001	Super Probation Officer	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	80,300	\$	80,300				\$	80,300



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

D	5110	Highway - Main Roads	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	Increase Salary Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
D	CRF5010	Highway-Administration	7250		Allocation - Gen Svcs	Reduce allocation for Utilities Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
D		Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2810			Contribution - to balance fund								\$	-
DM	RMF5130	Road Machinery	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	Increase Salary Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
DM	RMF5130	Road Machinery	7250		Allocation - Gen Svcs	Reduce allocation for Utilities Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
DM		Contribution from General (A) Fund				Contribution - to balance fund								\$	-
EH	E922	Nursing SPH	1100	X9182		TECH CHANGE		-	31,610	\$	31,610			\$	31,610
EH	E934	Laboratory	1100	X2857		TECH CHANGE	31,610	-	\$	(31,610)				\$	(31,610)
EH	E501	Medical Admin	1100	X5432		TECH CHANGE	17,425	-	\$	(17,425)				\$	(17,425)
EH	E504	Medical Records	1100	X5957		TECH CHANGE	13,175	-	\$	(13,175)				\$	(13,175)
EH	E301	Administration	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 3,380	\$ 11,093	\$	7,713				\$	7,713
EH	E304	Quality Assurance	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 5,053	\$	5,053				\$	5,053
EH	E401	Personnel	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 8,280	\$ 13,954	\$	5,674				\$	5,674
EH	E607	Transportation	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,812	\$	3,812				\$	3,812
EH	E628	Housekeeping	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 23,050	\$	23,050				\$	23,050
EH	E631	Materials Mgt	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,723	\$	3,723				\$	3,723
EH	E659	Central Supply	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 887	\$	887				\$	887
EH	E501	Medical Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 11,690	\$ 16,201	\$	4,521				\$	4,521
EH	E504	Physicians Chronic	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,280	\$	3,280				\$	3,280
EH	E510	Physicians SNF	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,511	\$	8,511				\$	8,511
EH	E901	Food Services	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 47,429	\$	47,429				\$	47,429
EH	E804	Cafeteria	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 2,660	\$	2,660				\$	2,660
EH	E825	Laundry	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 10,638	\$	10,638				\$	10,638
EH	E901	Patient Svc Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 7,660	\$ 12,111	\$	4,521				\$	4,521
EH	E904	Medical Records	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 13,750	\$ 23,542	\$	9,792				\$	9,792
EH	E905	Admissions	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 4,787	\$	4,787				\$	4,787
EH	E907	Social Worker	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,777	\$	8,777				\$	8,777
EH	E908	Adult Day Care	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 9,131	\$	9,131				\$	9,131
EH	E910	Pharmacy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 13,918	\$	13,918				\$	13,918
EH	E913	Nursing Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 22,872	\$	22,872				\$	22,872
EH	E922	Nursing SPH	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 81,790	\$	81,790				\$	81,790
EH	E928	Nursing Home	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 189,806	\$	189,806				\$	189,806
EH	E931	Radiology	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 798	\$	798				\$	798
EH	E934	Laboratory	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 6,720	\$ 18,668	\$	11,968				\$	11,968
EH	E937	Rehab Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 4,433	\$	4,433				\$	4,433
EH	E940	Physical Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,383	\$	6,383				\$	6,383
EH	E947	Occupational Ther	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,028	\$	6,028				\$	6,028
EH	E950	Rec Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,915	\$	8,915				\$	8,915
EH	E956	Personal Care	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 5,053	\$	5,053				\$	5,053
EH	E962	Outpatient	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,280	\$	3,280				\$	3,280
EH	E965	Volunteers	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 2,637	\$	2,637				\$	2,637
EH	E928	Nursing Home	6600		Appropriation Reserve	Operating Expenses for 1 month at NH	\$	-	\$	150,000	\$	150,000		\$	150,000
EH	E928	Nursing Home	R1601		Patient Svc Fees	Operating Revenue for 1 month at NH						50,000		\$	(50,000)
EH	4982	Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2810			Contribution - to balance fund						22,558,180	23,137,560	\$	(568,400)

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

M	DGS2300	MIS	1100	X3358	Mgmt Analyst Program	TECH CHANGE	-	80,388	\$	80,388				\$	80,388
M	DGS2300		1100	Z996	Standby Time	TECH CHANGE	2	4	\$	2				\$	2
M	DGS2300		1530		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	152,235	158,665	\$	6,430				\$	6,430
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2289	Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	16,740	\$	16,740		\$	16,740
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2290	Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	16,740	\$	16,740		\$	16,740
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2320	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	60,688	\$	60,688		\$	60,688
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2624b	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	33,130	\$	33,130		\$	33,130
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3022	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	55,612	\$	55,612		\$	55,612
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3300	Sr Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	69,636	\$	69,636		\$	69,636
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3301	Sr Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	76,846	\$	76,846		\$	76,846
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X6048	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$	57,766		\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$	57,766		\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X9228	Sr Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	25,416	\$	25,416		\$	25,416
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X7757	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	55,220	\$	55,220		\$	55,220
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X7758	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$	57,766		\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X8076a	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	33,130	\$	33,130		\$	33,130
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X8076b	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	22,080	\$	22,080		\$	22,080
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1110		Overtime	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	100,000		\$	100,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1800		Watchman RLF	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	30,000	\$	30,000		\$	30,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1800	X8293Z	Security Aide RLF	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	369,000	\$	369,000		\$	369,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1910		Insurance	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	220,000	\$	220,000		\$	220,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1911		Dental	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	21,000	\$	21,000		\$	21,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1912		Vision	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	4,100	\$	4,100		\$	4,100
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1930		Social Security	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	90,000	\$	90,000		\$	90,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1940		Unemployment	Restore Security	\$	154,000	\$	-	\$	(154,000)		\$	(154,000)
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1970		Compensated Absence	Restore Security	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	(200,000)		\$	(200,000)
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1980		Mobility Tax	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	4,500	\$	4,500		\$	4,500
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	3070		Uniforms	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	5,000	\$	5,000		\$	5,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	3280		Operational Supplies	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	1,000	\$	1,000		\$	1,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	R1210		COBRA	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	1,000	\$	1,000		\$	1,000
M	DGS2600	DGS-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R2803			Contribution - to balance fund						1,562,740	2,694,606	1,331,866	(1,331,866)
Q	PER9050	Unemployment Insurance	8010			Employee Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$			\$	-
Q	PER9050	Unemployment Insurance	R2809			Interfund Revenues								\$	-
A	UNC9990	Real Property Taxes	R1001			To balance above						113,320,000	118,629,010	5,309,010	5,309,010
											Balanced				

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND**  
**REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE AND PLANNING & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES**  
**AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET**  
**RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES**  
 as Adopted by Legislature 12/3//2015

SCHEDULE E

PROJECT	2016 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET	RECOMM.	APPROP. INC. (DEC.)	GENERAL FUND CONTRIBUTION	FEDERAL/ STATE AID	RECOMMENDED CHANGES 2016 CAPITAL BUDGET CAPITAL FUNDS
<b>Schedule III</b>						
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Drainage</b>						
Project 7001 - Pascack Brook Improvement	Close Project \$1,315 to Debt Service;	In Process	10,437,000			10,437,000
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES</b>			<b>10,437,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,437,000</b>

**VETOED BY COUNTY EXECUTIVE/LEGISLATIVE OVERRIDE ON DECEMBER 15, 2015**

Introduced by:  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor

Referral No. 9505

**RESOLUTION NO. 549 OF 2015  
APPROPRIATION OF BUDGET ITEMS FOR 2016**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Hood, Jr. and adopted

WHEREAS, the 2016 County Budget has been duly adopted; and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and approved this resolution, however, it was approved within 120 hours of the full legislative meeting and was deemed an immediate need by its Chair, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the several amounts specified in said Budget, be and they are hereby appropriated for the conduct of the County Government for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 2016.

The Vote resulted as follows:

Ayes: 10	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, Hood, Jr.)
Nays: 07	(Earl, Hofstein, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Wolfe)

---

A stenographer was present for the following discussion, which can be found after Res. No. 549 of 2015.

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

A	CA1002	Contract Agency - Public Benefit	5010			\$	1,484,810	\$		\$	(1,484,810)	\$	(1,484,810)
A	CA1000	Contract Agency - General Government	5010			\$	2,597,340	\$		\$	(2,597,340)	\$	(2,597,340)
A	CA7561	Arts Council of Rockland, Inc.	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	40,630	\$	40,630	\$	40,630
A	CA4083	Association for Visually Impaired	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	154,117	\$	154,117	\$	154,117
A	CA8821	Big Brothers Big Sisters	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	95,745	\$	95,745	\$	95,745
A	CA8822	CASA	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	11,300	\$	11,300	\$	11,300
A	CA8804	Child Care Resources of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	120,735	\$	120,735	\$	120,735
A	CA8804	Child Care Resources of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	57,285	\$	57,285	\$	57,285
A	CA7642	Chiklu Aweil African Dance	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,560	\$	1,560	\$	1,560
A	CA8750	Cornell Coop Extension of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	260,620	\$	260,620	\$	260,620
A	CA7535	Debra Weiss Dance Company	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,898	\$	1,898	\$	1,898
A	CA7655	Edward Hopper House	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	3,160	\$	3,160	\$	3,160
A	CA7541	Elmwood Community Playhouse	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,263	\$	8,263	\$	8,263
A	CA7518	Friends of the Nyorks	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	6,575	\$	6,575	\$	6,575
A	CA7684	Garnerville Arts	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	17,658	\$	17,658	\$	17,658
A	CA7515	Haverstraw Brick Museum	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,070	\$	13,070	\$	13,070
A	CA7520	Historical Society of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA3510	Hi-Tor Animal Care	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	44,825	\$	44,825	\$	44,825
A	CA7571	Hudson Vagabond Puppets	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,000	\$	4,000	\$	4,000
A	CA8941	Keep Rockland Beautiful	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	51,667	\$	51,667	\$	51,667
A	CA1171	Legal Aid Society	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	59,860	\$	59,860	\$	59,860
A	CA7410	Library Association of Rockland	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	39,885	\$	39,885	\$	39,885
A	CA8806	MHA - Family Treatment Court	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	14,355	\$	14,355	\$	14,355
A	CA7555	Morning Music Club	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,085	\$	1,085	\$	1,085
A	CA6343	NAACP - Spring Valley Branch	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA6324	NAACP-Nyack Branch	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA7586	Penguin Rep	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,376	\$	2,376	\$	2,376
A	CA7545	Rivertown Films	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,355	\$	1,355	\$	1,355
A	CA7550	Rockland Camera	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,560	\$	1,560	\$	1,560
A	CA7521	Rockland Center for Holocaust	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	9,030	\$	9,030	\$	9,030
A	CA7552	Rockland Center for the Arts	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA7531	Rockland Conservatory to Music	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	18,057	\$	18,057	\$	18,057
A	CA7542	Rockland County Choral Society	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	3,184	\$	3,184	\$	3,184
A	CA8958	Rockland Schools 21st Century	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	199,621	\$	199,621	\$	199,621
A	EXE1233	EXE- Rockland Economic Develop	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	315,998	\$	315,998	\$	315,998
A	CA7536	Rockland Youth Dance Ensemble	5010	224	Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,810	\$	4,810	\$	4,810
A	CA4601	Bikur Cholim	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	81,257	\$	81,257	\$	81,257
A	CA4089	Brain Injury Association	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,492	\$	1,492	\$	1,492
A	CA8845	C.A.N.D.L.E.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	25,936	\$	25,936	\$	25,936
A	CA8819	Campus Fun & Learn Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA4091	Cardinal Cooke Residence	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,080	\$	5,080	\$	5,080
A	CA6330	Catholic Community Svc of RC	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	CA6960	CEJES Institute	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	6,296	\$	6,296	\$	6,296
A	CA4085	Center for Safety Change	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	63,200	\$	63,200	\$	63,200
A	CA8869	Christ Church of Suffern	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,901	\$	1,901	\$	1,901
A	CA6363	Clothes Work	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,221	\$	1,221	\$	1,221
A	CA6326	Community Improvement Council	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513	\$	162,513
A	CA6333	Community Outreach Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	90,195	\$	90,195	\$	90,195
A	CA8808	Community Outreach Center -Employ	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	36,114	\$	36,114	\$	36,114
A	CA8817	EPIC	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642	\$	2,642
A	CA8840	Friends Help Friends	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA3513	Friends of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	1,682	\$	1,682	\$	1,682
A	CA8316	Haitian American Cultural Org	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	21,873	\$	21,873	\$	21,873
A	CA3827	Hatzolah EMS	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,484	\$	5,484	\$	5,484
A	CA6317	Headstart of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	95,679	\$	95,679	\$	95,679
A	CA3626	HELP	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	32,503	\$	32,503	\$	32,503
A	CA6327	Help from People to People	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	22,571	\$	22,571	\$	22,571
A	CA8894	Helping Hands	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	21,873	\$	21,873	\$	21,873
A	CA4087	Home Aides of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	10,430	\$	10,430	\$	10,430
A	CA4093	Home Aides CHORE	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,275	\$	13,275	\$	13,275
A	CA7330	India Cultural Society of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,420	\$	5,420	\$	5,420

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015**

A	CA7522	JCC Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	15,990	\$	15,990				\$	15,990
A	CA8760	Jewish Family Services of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	20,585	\$	20,585				\$	20,585
A	CA8338	Jewish Federation of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,275	\$	13,275				\$	13,275
A	CA8339	Joseph's Home/ MIA Vet Shelter	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	12,730	\$	12,730				\$	12,730
A	CA8319	Korbit Nig Lakay, Inc.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	57,490	\$	57,490				\$	57,490
A	CA8790	Literacy Volunteers of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,170	\$	2,170				\$	2,170
A	CA8313	Marlin Luther King	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	74,550	\$	74,550				\$	74,550
A	CA8850	Mid-Hudson Community Council	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	28,545	\$	28,545				\$	28,545
A	CA8883	New Beginings Dignity	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,260	\$	8,260				\$	8,260
A	CA6314	Nyack Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	41,778	\$	41,778				\$	41,778
A	CA8818	RC Worksite Day Care Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	19,010	\$	19,010				\$	19,010
A	CA8803	RCC Senior Citizens Club	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	4,471	\$	4,471				\$	4,471
A	CA7562	Rockland Center for the Arts (AIPP)	6950		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	16,185	\$	16,185				\$	16,185
A	CA8030	Rockland Housing Action Coalition	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	47,520	\$	47,520				\$	47,520
A	CA8954	Rockland Interfaith Breakfast	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,298	\$	5,298				\$	5,298
A	CA7568	Rockland Irish American Culture	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	13,747	\$	13,747				\$	13,747
A	CA7577	Rockland YMCA - Nyack	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	23,970	\$	23,970				\$	23,970
A	CA6337	Stop FEAR Coalition	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	2,642	\$	2,642				\$	2,642
A	CA7573	Thorpe Senior Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	5,355	\$	5,355				\$	5,355
A	CA8931	Touch	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	8,060	\$	8,060				\$	8,060
A	CA4088	United Hospice of Rockland	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	90,285	\$	90,285				\$	90,285
A	CA8031	Venture Foundation, Ltd.	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	48,148	\$	48,148				\$	48,148
A	CA8620	Volunteer Counseling Service	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,515	\$	162,515				\$	162,515
A	CA8816	West Street Day Care Center	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	35,165	\$	35,165				\$	35,165
A	CA8958	Westcoast Comm Opportunity	5010		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	166,315	\$	166,315				\$	166,315
A	6010	DSS - RODA Social Services	5350		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	45,300	\$	45,300				\$	45,300
A	6010	DSS - RCDC Humans Services	5550		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	98,321	\$	98,321				\$	98,321
A	6010	DSS - Bikur Cholim - Comm Action	5650		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	58,440	\$	58,440				\$	58,440
A	6010	DSS - Share	5840		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	162,513	\$	162,513				\$	162,513
A	6010	DSS - RODA Youth	5841		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	76,655	\$	76,655				\$	76,655
A	6010	DSS - Bikur Cholim Human Services	5940		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	58,440	\$	58,440				\$	58,440
A	6772	OFA - RCDC Senior Citizens	5490		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	30,135	\$	30,135				\$	30,135
A	6772	OFA - RODA Senior Citizens	5680		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	69,545	\$	69,545				\$	69,545
A	6772	OFA - Senior Citizen COC	5681		Contract Agency	\$	-	\$	33,990	\$	33,990				\$	33,990
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X8888	Collections Asst	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	50,248	\$	50,248				\$	50,248
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X5785	Support Invest I	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	57,780	\$	57,780				\$	57,780
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X9214	Soc Svc Invest Fraud	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	45,650	\$	45,650				\$	45,650
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	X9215	Soc Svc Invest Fraud	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	45,650	\$	45,650				\$	45,650
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	N006	Planning & Eval Asst	TECH CHANGE	\$	50,250	-	\$	(50,250)				\$	(50,250)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1100	T8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	66,610	\$	66,610				\$	66,610
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	2969		Salary Savings	TECH CHANGE	\$	(425,000)	(522,548)	\$	(97,548)				\$	(97,548)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	1930		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	\$	1,892,585	1,609,885	\$	17,300				\$	17,300
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	R3810		Soc Svc Admin State	TECH CHANGE					14,600,000	14,700,000	100,000		\$	(100,000)
A	DSS9010	Department of Social Services	R4610		Soc Svc Admin Fed	TECH CHANGE					14,600,000	14,700,000	100,000		\$	(100,000)
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1100		Pharmacist	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	90,000	\$	90,000				\$	90,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1930		Pharmacist Relief	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	25,000	\$	25,000				\$	25,000
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1930		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	10,000	\$	10,000				\$	10,000
			R3401		State Aid	TECH CHANGE						40,000		40,000	\$	(40,000)
A	EXE1250	County Executive	1100	T3963	Municipal Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	38,000	-	\$	(38,000)				\$	(38,000)
A	DOH4010	Department of Health	1100	T3963	Municipal Aid	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	38,000	\$	38,000				\$	38,000
A	EXE1340	Budget & Mgt	1100	X8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	(66,610)	-	\$	66,610				\$	66,610
A	EXE1340	Budget & Mgt	1100	T8566	Admin Secretary	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	(66,610)	\$	(66,610)				\$	(66,610)
A	FIN1325	Department of Finance	1900	RX8680	Clerk - Rf	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	15,000	\$	15,000				\$	15,000
A	FIN1325	Department of Finance	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	TECH CHANGE	\$	(15,000)	(45,000)	\$	(30,000)				\$	(30,000)
A	PRO3140	Department of Probation	1100	N001	Super Probation Officer	TECH CHANGE	\$	-	80,300	\$	80,300				\$	80,300



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

D	5110	Highway - Main Roads	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	Increase Salary Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
D	CRF5010	Highway-Administration	7250		Allocation - Gen Svcs	Reduce allocation for Utilities Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
D		Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2810			Contribution - to balance fund								\$	-
DM	RMF5120	Road Machinery	1100	Z999	Salary Savings	Increase Salary Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
DM	RMF5120	Road Machinery	7250		Allocation - Gen Svcs	Reduce allocation for Utilities Savings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		\$	-
DM		Contribution from General (A) Fund				Contribution - to balance fund								\$	-
EH	E922	Nursing SPH	1100	X9182		TECH CHANGE		-	31,610	\$	31,610			\$	31,610
EH	E934	Laboratory	1100	X2857		TECH CHANGE	31,610	-	\$	(31,610)				\$	(31,610)
EH	E501	Medical Admin	1100	X5432		TECH CHANGE	17,425	-	\$	(17,425)				\$	(17,425)
EH	E504	Medical Records	1100	X5957		TECH CHANGE	13,175	-	\$	(13,175)				\$	(13,175)
EH	E301	Administration	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 3,380	\$ 11,093	\$	7,713				\$	7,713
EH	E304	Quality Assurance	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 5,053	\$	5,053				\$	5,053
EH	E401	Personnel	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 8,280	\$ 13,954	\$	5,674				\$	5,674
EH	E607	Transportation	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,812	\$	3,812				\$	3,812
EH	E628	Housekeeping	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 23,050	\$	23,050				\$	23,050
EH	E631	Materials Mgt	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,723	\$	3,723				\$	3,723
EH	E659	Central Supply	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 887	\$	887				\$	887
EH	E501	Medical Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 11,690	\$ 16,201	\$	4,521				\$	4,521
EH	E504	Physicians Chronic	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,280	\$	3,280				\$	3,280
EH	E510	Physicians SNF	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,511	\$	8,511				\$	8,511
EH	E901	Food Services	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 47,429	\$	47,429				\$	47,429
EH	E804	Cafeteria	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 2,660	\$	2,660				\$	2,660
EH	E825	Laundry	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 10,638	\$	10,638				\$	10,638
EH	E901	Patient Svc Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 7,660	\$ 12,111	\$	4,521				\$	4,521
EH	E904	Medical Records	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 13,750	\$ 23,542	\$	9,792				\$	9,792
EH	E905	Admissions	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 4,787	\$	4,787				\$	4,787
EH	E907	Social Worker	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 8,777	\$	8,777				\$	8,777
EH	E908	Adult Day Care	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 9,131	\$	9,131				\$	9,131
EH	E910	Pharmacy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 13,918	\$	13,918				\$	13,918
EH	E913	Nursing Admin	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 22,872	\$	22,872				\$	22,872
EH	E922	Nursing SPH	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 61,790	\$	61,790				\$	61,790
EH	E928	Nursing Home	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 189,806	\$	189,806				\$	189,806
EH	E931	Radiology	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 798	\$	798				\$	798
EH	E934	Laboratory	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ 6,720	\$ 18,668	\$	11,968				\$	11,968
EH	E937	Rehab Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 4,433	\$	4,433				\$	4,433
EH	E940	Physical Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,383	\$	6,383				\$	6,383
EH	E947	Occupational Ther	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,028	\$	6,028				\$	6,028
EH	E950	Rec Therapy	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 6,915	\$	6,915				\$	6,915
EH	E956	Personal Care	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 5,053	\$	5,053				\$	5,053
EH	E962	Outpatient	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 3,280	\$	3,280				\$	3,280
EH	E965	Volunteers	1920		Retirement	Adjust pension costs as per OSC	\$ -	\$ 2,637	\$	2,637				\$	2,637
EH	E928	Nursing Home	6600		Appropriation Reserve	Operating Expenses for 1 month at NH	\$	-	\$ 150,000	\$	150,000			\$	150,000
EH	E928	Nursing Home	R1601		Patient Svc Fees	Operating Revenue for 1 month at NH				50,000		50,000		\$	(50,000)
EH	4982	Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2810			Contribution - to balance fund					22,558,180	23,137,560	568,400	\$	(568,400)

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2016 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET  
as Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/3/2015

M	DGS2300	MIS	1100	X3358	Mgmt Analyst Program	TECH CHANGE	-	80,388	\$	80,388			\$	80,388	
M	DGS2300		1100	Z996	Standby Time	TECH CHANGE	2	4	\$	2			\$	2	
M	DGS2300		1530		Social Security	TECH CHANGE	152,235	158,665	\$	6,430			\$	6,430	
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2289	Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	16,740	\$			\$	16,740
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2290	Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	16,740	\$			\$	16,740
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2320	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	60,688	\$			\$	60,688
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X2624b	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	33,130	\$			\$	33,130
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3022	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	55,612	\$			\$	55,612
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3300	Sr Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	69,636	\$			\$	69,636
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X3301	Sr Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	76,846	\$			\$	76,846
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X6048	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$			\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$			\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X9228	Sr Watchman PT	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	25,416	\$			\$	25,416
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X7757	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	55,220	\$			\$	55,220
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X7758	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	57,766	\$			\$	57,766
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X8076a	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	33,130	\$			\$	33,130
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1100	X8076b	Security Aide	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	22,080	\$			\$	22,080
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1110		Overtime	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$			\$	100,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1800		Watchman RLF	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	30,000	\$			\$	30,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1800	X8293Z	Security Aide RLF	Restore proposed layoff position	\$	-	\$	369,000	\$			\$	369,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1910		Insurance	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	220,000	\$			\$	220,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1911		Dental	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	21,000	\$			\$	21,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1912		Vision	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	4,100	\$			\$	4,100
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1930		Social Security	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	90,000	\$			\$	90,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1940		Unemployment	Restore Security	\$	154,000	\$	-	\$			\$	(154,000)
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1970		Compensated Absence	Restore Security	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$			\$	(200,000)
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	1980		Mobility Tax	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	4,500	\$			\$	4,500
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	3070		Uniforms	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	5,000	\$			\$	5,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	3280		Operational Supplies	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	1,000	\$			\$	1,000
M	DGS1247	DGS Security	R1210		COBRA	Restore Security	\$	-	\$	1,000	\$			\$	1,000
M	DGS2600	DGS-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R2803			Contribution - to balance fund						1,562,740	2,694,606	1,331,866	(1,331,866)
Q	PER9050	Unemployment Insurance	8010			Employee Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$			\$	-
Q	PER9050	Unemployment Insurance	R2809			Interfund Revenues								\$	-
A	UNC9990	Real Property Taxes	R1001			To balance above						113,320,000	118,629,010	5,309,010	5,309,010
											Balanced				

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND**  
**REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE AND PLANNING & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES**  
**AMENDMENTS TO THE 2016 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET**  
**RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES**  
 as Adopted by Legislature 12/3//2015

SCHEDULE E

PROJECT	2016 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET	RECOMM.	APPROP. INC. (DEC.)	GENERAL FUND CONTRIBUTION	FEDERAL/ STATE AID	CAPITAL FUNDS
RECOMMENDED CHANGES 2016 CAPITAL BUDGET						
<b>Schedule III</b>						
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Drainage</b>						
Project 7001 - Pascack Brook Improvement	Close Project \$1,315 to Debt Service;	In Process	10,437,000			10,437,000
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES</b>			<b>10,437,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,437,000</b>

STATE OF NEW YORK : BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE.

LEGISLATURE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY

----- X  
 BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE - 9:20 p.m.  
 Referral No. 9505 - Accepting Report Of Budget &  
 Finance Committee After Its Review Of The  
 Rockland County Proposed 2016 Budget, Adoption  
 Of the 2016 County Budget, Appropriation Of Budget  
 Items For 2016.

----- X  
 Legislative Chambers  
 11 New Hempstead Road  
 New City, New York  
 December 3, 2015  
 9:20 p.m.

B E F O R E:

ALDEN H. WOLFE, CHAIRMAN

JAY HOOD, JR., VICE CHAIRMAN

CHRISTOPHER J. CAREY	NANCY LOW-HOGAN
HARRIET D. CORNELL	JOSEPH L. MEYERS
RICHARD C. DIAZ	PATRICK J. MORONEY
TONEY L. EARL	JOHN A. MURPHY
MICHAEL M. GRANT	ANEY PAUL
LON M. HOFSTEIN	ILAN S. SCHOENBERGER
DOUGLAS J. JOBSON	PHILIP SOSKIN
ARON B. WIEDER	

Rockland & Orange Reporting  
 2 Congers Road  
 New City, New York 10956  
 (845) 634-4200

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Grant, I just want to make a housekeeping note before consideration of Referral 9505. We need the Legislature to vote for immediate need.

So I'll make that motion. Seconded by Mr. Grant. All in favor, please say aye? It's the immediate need. All in favor, please say aye?

(Response of aye was given.)

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Opposed? Okay, that's granted. Mr. Grant?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Mr. Chairman, we spoke earlier, and I have the report of Budget and Finance Committee.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Yes, I know you have the report.

LEGISLATOR GRANT: It is a lengthy report. And if you would like, I can certainly file this as submitted it. Or I can, if you prefer, I can read it now.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Whatever your pleasure is. We can file it.

What we can do is, the report exists.

It passed the committee. What we can do is make sure it's posted on the website if anyone wishes to view it in detail.

Regardless of what the outcome is tonight, we'll make sure that we post it so that it's publicly available. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Grant's talking about more housekeeping than anything. It still needs to be moved and seconded. The question is will he read it or not?

I think you've spoken, we've spoken in some depth, but it's up to you.

LEGISLATOR GRANT: I'm willing to forgo for our sake here tonight. I will go over 1A, Referral 9505 A, Accepting the Report of the Budget and Finance Committee After Its Review of the Rockland County Proposal 2016 budget, and that includes the amendments as submitted earlier.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Moved by Mr. Grant, that's seconded by Mr. Hood. Again, on the question --

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: On the

question?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: On the question,  
Mr. Schoenberger?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Yes. I move  
to amend the report to eliminate the salary  
increase for the County Executive in the  
amount of \$15,509, and that the reduction of  
that money should be used to reduce the tax  
increase. That's my motion.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I will second that  
motion. There's a motion to amend. On the  
question of the motion, I'd like to speak on  
that.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Mr. Chairman,  
when the vote is called, I'd like a roll call  
on that, please.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Very well. There's a  
motion on the floor to amend the report of  
the Budget and Finance Committee to eliminate  
the salary increase proposed by the County  
Executive in the amount of \$15,509, and would  
be offset by the reduction of the property  
tax.

For our own housekeeping, we always say

that every amendment needs to be balanced.  
So for the record, I want to note the line,  
the position numbers.

In the Executive's Department, 1230A,  
Position 56910000, that's the position of the  
Rockland County Executive. And the  
offsetting entry will be on the line for the  
property tax. Nicole, that's noted? Okay.

So this is the amendment. On the  
amendment, I'm basically going to say what I  
said in the Committee because we're on the  
record now. It's funny, I've been so busy  
this week with everything that's going on  
here, and in my private life where I actually  
pay my bills, and normally I come here and I  
have nice, well thought out remarks.  
Tonight, I have bits of paper, and notes, and  
things like that, so I apologize if I'm a  
little bit on the confused side.

But when I do want to say is that I  
think we should all be just unbelievably  
offended by a proposal to increase the salary  
of an elected official who, at the same time,  
is proposing to lay off hundreds and hundreds

of County employees.

I think that it shows tremendous hubris. It shows a complete disconnect from reality. And to make it such a point that it becomes a nonnegotiable point in discussions with the Legislature, to me it just is wrong.

And I want to make sure that it's clear. It's been posed as a restoration of a salary cut.

Ed Day never took a salary cut. When Ed Day took office on January 1, 2014, his salary was exactly what it is now. The only salary he had before that was his salary as a legislator. He was earning roughly \$32,000 a year. So if anything, he got a pay increase when he became the County Executive.

And you know what? He should. He has a job as the County Executive, and a position. The position paid what it paid.

And it pays no different today than it did the very day that he started working. To suggest that he took a pay cut is absolutely not true.

And again, I want to make it clear, the

only way that you can increase an elected official's salary within his or her term is by a local law. If the County Executive insists on taking a pay increase, and in fact, does accept checks, County taxpayer funded salary checks, in 2016 without the passage of a local law, then he is doing something that he should not do. And I think we all need to keep an eye on what he does on January 1st in that respect.

So I am proud to second the motion. Anyone else on the question? On the amendment?

Okay. On the amendment?

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: On the amendment.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Wieder?

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: I'm going to vote yes on this amendment. But when the final vote will come for the accepting of the budget, I will be voting no.

And my vote to accept this amendment is to simply say one thing. It's a disgrace. We got a budget, and I was going through item by item. I've asked Nicole to do a

comparison to last year.

The County Executive wanted to slip this by the County Legislature. We have staff here, and they were able to find this. It's a disgrace for a County Executive to fire hundreds of employees, dismiss them out of hand, not go through on a deal with the nursing home and the hospital.

This -- Legislator Meyers talked before about what we were supposed to do. We could have had 32 and a half million dollars, and to fix this mess of a budget. County Executive wanted to close the hospital and not sell it, so we shouldn't be able to fix his budget. That's my opinion.

My vote to amend this, but ultimately vote no, is to clearly distance myself from this disgraceful line item. One of my colleagues who was part of the negotiation deal with the County Executive told me look, Aron, I had no choice.

I said to him, how can you do that? How can you fire all these employees? How can you just in good conscience accept this, this

increase of salary?

His response was Aron, I had no choice. I walked into his room, and he told me this is the first thing that we're going to negotiate. If I don't get my salary increase, nothing else will go.

So I want the record to reflect that I will not be part of this, of this disgraceful act. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Hood?

VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Chairman. I'll take this opportunity to talk about the budget. Can I do that, or just on the question?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: It's what -- I mean, I prefer we stay on the question, but it's --

VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, I mean, it all goes together because, you know, I think a lot has been said about these amendments that have been negotiated. And, you know, part -- in any negotiation, it's give and take.

And I felt that when I was talking to the County Executive and his staff that when

I'm attempting to save 32 jobs, I'm attempting to save our taxpayers of the towns \$900,000, I had to give and take some. You know, and part of it's something he wanted in the budget, which he put in the budget, it's not -- he hasn't been hiding it, is that he wanted to have his salary be put back to his previous amount.

And I decided that is not worth arguing about for me. It's just not. There's too many other good things here that are being amended, and I hope that the people that are for these amendments understand that that was really part of the package.

And I don't like it. Like I said, I don't like that he, you know, did the fanfare, he reduced his salary, now he's going to put it back up. It's just, it's not -- like I said before, it's not something I would do.

So that's how it happened. And I hope that I'm going to vote no on this amendment. And I hope that the people that are for the amendments later on will join me, and also

join me on the amendments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Meyers?

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Thank you. The timing of the salary increase is certainly not ideal. Of course it's not really an increase, it's just to bring his salary back to where it was originally.

But mind you, some amendments are being proposed shortly that would restore some jobs, okay. No matter how people might try to spin it that somehow the County Executive is responsible for the loss of the Summit Park jobs, I think we all know at this point that the deal fell apart because of a disingenuous proposal.

And somebody told me this, and I don't know if this is true or not, that the case came before Rabbinical Court in Brooklyn or something very recently, and it was determined that this buyer never had any intention of buying Summit Park for the price that he bid on, that he bid to buy. That it was always a bait and switch sort of thing.

The other thing I just want to point out

is that, you know, not that long ago, we passed a bill in this Legislature, knowing what kind of fiscal situation we're in, to raise a bunch of salaries. Some that were requested by Ed Day, and was expanded to be some jobs that were requested by the members of this body. And in an arrangement that was agreed to, and a compromise that was agreed to between the County Executive and this Legislature.

And Mr. Schoenberger mentioned before that he was asked not say anything on a vote about the fireworks. I was asked not say anything about the vote on raising those salaries, as that would be something that I would normally comment on. And I kept my mouth shut because the arrangement had been worked out between the two bodies.

So it's not as if raising salaries in 2015 was something that we haven't already done. And this salary increase is really just to bring him back.

Oh, and by the way, I think that legislators also voluntarily decided to

reduce their salaries. I didn't. Because I thought the whole thing was ridiculous.

But I'm wondering how many of my colleagues' salaries, when you voluntarily agreed to reduce it, how many of those are still in effect in 2015? Are you still taking a lower salary like you offered a few years ago? Or are you all back to your regular old salary quietly?

I'd like to know that if we're going to cast aspersions on the man across the hall on that issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay, anyone else on the question?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Soskin first, then Mr. Schoenberger.

LEGISLATOR SOSKIN: I would love to give you an answer, Legislator Meyers. We did not take a cut in our salary. It was a deferral of several weeks' worth of pay to give the County Finance Commissioner enough funds for -- to pay out expenditures because there was a shortage of cash at that point. It was

a matter of cash flow.

We just took a deferral and we waited, like, two or three years before we were repaid the amount. We never lost that amount. And that's just for your information. And I'm sure the Commissioner of Finance who's sitting here would agree with that.

It's not a matter of the salary so much. It's the idea of doing it at this time. We're laying off people. How can you take a salary increase?

My opinion, my opinion? I don't know how many people from the union are here, but do you think it's right? They're fighting for their employees.

How would you like to come upon a period just before the holidays, when everybody has a holiday period, come home and not be able to give your kids gifts? And how many people today, how many children today -- and I hear this on the radio all the time -- hand in a letter to Santa Claus? What do you want for Christmas? They want clothing. They want

food. They don't want to go to bed hungry.  
That's what this is all about.

We're talking about the sheriff's staff.  
We're talking about all the other employees,  
the security people, the hospital people.

And also to clarify one thing as far as  
the hospital is concerned. The buyer entered  
into a deal, and the deal had a certain  
number of residents in the nursing home.

And for whatever the reasons were, it  
took almost a year and a half to get his  
license. And as part of his license  
agreement, he had to pledge to repair the  
building and put in another \$32 million to  
repair the building.

And he didn't get his license until  
early August 2015. And there were lawsuits  
pending. And if he had problems getting  
money, it was because of the pending  
lawsuits. What bank would lend a group money  
when there are lawsuits outstanding?

And he said he needed a few more weeks,  
or a month, or maybe to the end of the year  
to consummate the deal. He wasn't given a

choice. It had to be done September 30th.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Folks, can I just ask that we stay on the question?

LEGISLATOR SOSKIN: That's just an answer to Legislator Meyers, why I disagree with his comments.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you.  
Mr. Schoenberger, then Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Legislator Hood said it's give and take. But to me, I have a feeling that we give and the County Executive takes. Let's see what it looks like after the budget goes to him and comes back with vetoes.

County Executive says, and Legislator Meyers said they're going to bring the salary back to what it originally was. That's not true.

When Ed Day took office, when he was elected, he told everybody in Rockland County as a show of his leadership, he's cutting his salary by ten percent. And the Legislature took that ten percent, and when we adopted the 2014 budget, his salary was reduced by

that ten percent.

The day he took office, that new salary was the salary. We set the salary in accordance with his agreement at that number. And I think it was 134,139.

Now he publicly tells the people that everybody knew that was temporary, and everybody knew he was going to get more. But that's not true, and we all know it. He never said that until just now when he wanted more money.

What I think Legislator Meyers is referring to is what the salary was when the former County Executive left office, which was after 20 years of service. 20 years. That's the salary that he's saying was originally.

Well, we can go back to when the first County Executive took office. We can go back to when Scott Vanderhoef took office 20 years ago, and see what that salary was. And I'll tell you, it's substantially below what Ed Day is earning now. So originally is a choice of words they want to use.

Now I'm going to talk about something here that honestly and truly I was not even going to mention. Not even going to mention. But after Legislator Meyers said what he said, I think you all have a right to know.

This Legislature and the former County Executive, Scott Vanderhoef, entered into a agreement with the unions whereby they forgoed salary increases. And they agreed to have a lagged payroll. They agreed that they would work ten working days per year in 2012 and not get paid for those days. I'm sorry, five working days in 2012 and not get paid for those days. And five more working days in 2013, and then get paid for those days.

And we as the Legislature -- there were three unions who agreed to that, CSA, RAM, and Doctors Council. We the Legislature weren't bound by that and didn't have to be bound by that, agreed to do it as well. Most of us did, if not all of us.

And then ten days, which is basically one paycheck, two weeks, was paid to us at the end of 2014. I lagged my salary, at the

salary as a County Legislator, for 2012 and 2013, and then I got paid my salary at the end of 2014, those two weeks that I had missed. And so did all of you and everybody else in this county.

Alden Wolfe lagged his salary as a County Legislator in 2012 and 2013. And when he became Chair of the Legislature in 2014, his salary was higher. Chair makes 40,000, legislators make 32.5. He got paid his last salary at the exact same amount that was lagged, 32.5. So you got the two weeks of pay based on the salary that was lagged.

When the County Executive Scott Vanderhoef left at the end 2013, he got paid the lagged salary, exactly, based upon when it was lagged. But when Ed Day got paid his lagged salary at the end of 2014, the two weeks he got paid, he got paid the salary based upon his salary as County Executive, not based upon the salary he lagged. It's true.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Well, wait. Why did the treasurer sign the checks? Why did --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Ma'am, please. Please, ma'am.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Because the treasurer --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Please don't put us in the position of asking you to leave. Please.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: You want to know the truth? He works for pleasure of the County Executive. He'd be fired.

So Ed Day -- never mind the lagged salary of the County Executive was already paid to a former County Executive. He got paid a second time as the County Executive. Even though he was paid once.

So you want to talk about salaries that were forgiven, or people that gave up? This is a man who gave up nothing. He got three and a half times the salary that he lagged when he was paid as County Executive. It was paid on the salary of 134,139 when he lagged it at 32.5. Now he wants another \$15,509.

And you know what? I learned about this not too long ago. And I was deciding what to do with it, do anything at all, make an

issue, not make an issue. And honest, I was not going to raise it tonight. It was not relevant to the budget because it was paid already.

But because of what was said, I think it has to be brought out and told. This is not an honorable man. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Meyers?

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: I think that the County Executive has made an offer to this body that he would maintain the salary at the 2010 level, at the 2013 level of ten percent less if this body also took a ten percent pay cut. So maybe that's an amendment that we should entertain, and I don't think it's gotten any traction in this body.

As Legislator Soskin rightly pointed out, my recollection was faulty. This body never agreed to take a ten percent discount as Ed Day did, or a ten percent reduction. We just -- this body just agreed to let their salary lay for a couple of years. So that offer was never made and adopted by this body, as that offer was made by the County

Executive.

So I think what the County Executive is willing to do is to make that deal right now. He'll maintain his salary at the ten percent reduced level if the Legislature steps up and takes a ten percent salary cut as he did a couple years ago.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay, I'm going to speak now, then I'm going to call the question. I just want to correct a couple of statements that Mr. Meyers made that weren't exactly true.

First off, there were several legislators that did take a voluntary pay cut. I think one of them was Mr. Jobson. I don't recall who else. But there was someone else who took a ten percent pay put. I also want to -- Aney Paul did as well, okay.

And I also want to say that again, just you know, I'm not arguing for a pay increase. But the reality is that the Legislature hasn't received a pay increase in more than a decade. 2003, so 12 years there's been no increase in legislative pay, while the pay of

every single other employee in the County of Rockland, including the County Executive, received pay increases over that time.

And I actually did the calculation once, that if we had mirrored all of the other increases that have been through the union contracts and the County Executive, which has essentially mirrored all of these pay increases, that the Legislature's current salary would actually represent more than a ten percent pay cut from where our salary would have been.

Again, interest of clarity. I'm not arguing for a pay increase.

I think what Legislator Meyers was referring to with regard to the deferral, the deferral of pay, again, was a voluntarily effort, a voluntary agreement between the unions and the County in order to help our cash flow. It didn't have an impact on the budget, but it affected cash flow.

And it was something that we, as legislators, were asked to participate in because it was designed to help the County

weather cash flow troubles. My understanding is there was only one legislator who refused to do that, and that was Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: So clearly, he proudly did that. I just want to make sure that --

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: I said that.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you, I have the floor now, Mr. Meyers. Yes, thank you.

So, you know, in this issue that Mr. Schoenberger raised, I think is very valid. I, too, was aware of it, and I really wasn't quite sure how to handle it.

Because one might argue -- first of all, it shocks the conscience. That's beside the point. The fact that an elected official should earn essentially a 400 percent return on an investment on the backs of the County taxpayers is unconscionable.

And, you know, it seems that when we are talking about the compensation for Mr. Day, that's a word that seems to come to mind. It certainly came to my lips fairly often this evening.

And I'm not just going to beat up on him. He feels that it's something that he deserves. That's his prerogative. He can say, I deserve that. And I can say I don't think he does. And that's really what we are talking about now.

I'm not going to take the step of saying that any of his actions are contrary to the law. I don't know if he would give me the same courtesy. But I certainly will not draw that conclusion.

However, I do think that we do have a County Auditor, and the County Auditor I think has some time on his hands these days. So what I'm suggesting that we do, and perhaps we can put it down as an action item to refer to the Committee a resolution asking -- not asking, directing the County Auditor to perform an audit of the salary deferral program.

Because once it came to my attention that there were salary, there were payments being made that exceeded the deferral, and certainly in the County Executive's case,

it's several thousand dollars. If you think about what he earns, it's one paycheck. And that was deferred at 32,000, it was paid back at 139,000 or so.

Since it was budget neutral, meaning the salaries were budgeted, it was just cash flow that this helped out, then if there's a difference between the amount that was deferred and the amount that was paid out, then that difference is unbudgeted. And I'm curious where the heck that was paid from. I would imagine that it had an increase, or resulted in an increase in salaries paid out in the year of the payment, which I believe was last year.

So I'd like to introduce a resolution to that effect. I think it's important that we get a clear understanding. And with that, I'm going to call the question.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Excuse me, may I say something?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: No, I'm calling the question now, Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: I mentioned --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: You've had two opportunities to speak.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Then I ask for a point of personal privilege, which is --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: State the reason for the point of personal privilege. Not the point of personal privilege, the reason.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: You said certain things that I didn't say.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay, point taken. Thank you. I'm going to call the question.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: So you don't follow --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: All in favor of the amendment, which is to remove the County Executive's --

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Roll call.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: -- salary increase.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: I ask for a roll call.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Yes, from the --

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: You know what? I'll withdraw that.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: No, I'd like a roll

call. Those that are voting in favor of the amendment are voting to eliminate the County Executive's proposed salary increase. Roll call.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Grant?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: I go first? I'm going to, how should I say, hold my nose and vote no. I accept responsibility for decisions I made in negotiations related to the budget amendments that have been prepared.

I placed a higher value on the restoration of certain positions, the inclusion of certain, what I thought to be financial necessities. And in fact, lifting the cap in and of itself, which keeps us from going off the fiscal cliff again. So I vote no.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Legislator Hofstein?

LEGISLATOR HOFSTEIN: I vote no.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Jobson?

LEGISLATOR JOBSON: I vote no.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Low-Hogan?

LEGISLATOR LOW-HOGAN: No, for the same reasons Michael Grant just stated.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Meyers?

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: No.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Moroney?

LEGISLATOR MORONEY: I'm going to vote no, but you know, I've been here, I think Harriet has been here a little longer than I am. And tonight I think is probably the worst performance I've seen this Legislature make. For all the budgets that we've been through in 25 years, I've never heard so much personal attacks and vendettas, or whatever you want to call it.

You know, we're talking here, our next vote up will be a budget for \$750 million, close to it. And we're here arguing and discussing about \$15,000.

Well, I may not like it. But it's a part of the amended budget that we're going to vote on later on.

If the people that negotiated these amendments and are now -- we start taking them one by one, these amendments, and taking

them apart and not voting for them. Well, you know, maybe you don't trust him over there on the other side of the aisle. Maybe that's okay. Maybe you have reasons for that. Maybe I have reasons for that.

But how are you, in good faith, to negotiate something, how do you go back on it now? Every Legislator -- and I'm not denying anybody to raise the issue. You should raise all the issues you want.

But we have to vote as a block if we're going to pass this budget tonight. And I can't understand for the life of me, as Mr. Grant says, I'm holding my nose also.

But it's part of the process, it's part of the negotiations. \$15,000, we're arguing about \$15,000 when we have a \$750 million budget coming up in front of us.

So I think we should move on. Move on to bigger and better things. And let's try to be peaceful and negotiate this budget in the right way.

If you have a problem with that, that's fine. There's no problem with that. We're

all here, we're all 17 individuals.

But if you go down this road and nitpicking about this and that and the other thing, you know, you can bring any resolution you want. Any Legislator can at another time.

But we have a lot of stuff in front of us here with this budget. And I'm very interested in how it's going to turn out.

If we vote for the budget with the amendments, we're going to increase the taxes another five percent. That's more important than 15,000 that we're talking about here.

It is bad timing, I admit it is bad timing. But it's done, it's part of the negotiations. Let's get over it, move on. I vote no.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Legislator Murphy?

LEGISLATOR MURPHY: No.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Paul?

LEGISLATOR PAUL: No.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Schoenberger?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: First off, I

was not part of the negotiations, I was never consulted in the negotiations, I was never asked for my input in the negotiations. The first thing I learned about the negotiations was when I was walking in here for the meeting.

So I'm not bound to anybody else's negotiations. I wasn't part of it. If I had given my word and I was part of it, that would be something else. But I wasn't involved. Therefore, I'm not bound.

I'm not bound to commitments other people made, or promises they made. I'm bound to myself and my conscience.

Secondly, I made this motion for a reason. I think that this is probably the most egregious and selfish part of the County Executive's budget. Everybody says the timing is not good. That's an understatement if I ever heard it.

Take \$15,500 for yourself when you're trying to put people that have worked for this County for years out on the street. You're trying to endanger public safety.

You're trying to take away the money from the contract agencies that feed the hungry, and do everything for the poor and the disabled in this County, and putting it in your own pocket is egregious.

Now, the County Executive's got the back of this, because his salary is 139,000, he wants a \$15,500 increase, and it occurred during his term of office.

And I'll wait for Legislator Meyers to be done griping and carping, and being discourteous.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Is that what roll call is?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Exactly.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Making a statement?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Exactly.

You've been here for eight years, and you don't even know what roll call is?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Roll call is not another statement.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: You are so

wrong.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Schoenberger has the floor.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: I had the floor on the point of personal privilege. You didn't give it to me.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Meyers, I recognized you on your point of personal privilege. I'm going to ask you to stop it, please.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: For the record --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: When you're called -- Mr. Schoenberger -- you had an opportunity to speak when you were called, and you chose not to. You simply cast your vote. Your opportunity has ended.

Mr. Schoenberger?

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Make it short.

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Maybe I'll speak longer now because you asked me to make it short. In any event --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Do you want to participate or not? Because if you're going to sit there --

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: I'm trying to participate and follow --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: You're out of order. Your snarky comments are not welcome. Please. And it's not helping anything. Please give others courtesy, the same courtesy that is always extended to you, sir.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: You didn't give me --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Please. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: You didn't give me --

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: So it's not over. The County Executive has to come back to us. Let me tell you why, because on January 1, 2014, his salary was set at 139,000. He is now during his term of office.

What local laws may have been passed years ago by another County Executive are not applicable to him. The law clearly states

that you cannot raise the salary of an elected official during his term of office -- his, personally, his -- without a local law. That means he's got to come back to us for a local law.

Now this budget passed, or the tax cap lifted, and then whatever passed by eleven-six. In order to pass a local law, you need 12 votes. So after this process goes through everything, it goes through and it comes to a local law, if they don't get -- they, meaning the County Executive -- doesn't get 12 votes to approve his local law, he doesn't get the raise.

Now I'm just going to sit back and wait for that day. And I'm going to lobby as many people as I can to make sure it doesn't get passed. And I want him to know it. He thinks he made a deal.

He didn't make a deal. He made a deal with some, but not with others. And others are not obligated to him and his view. And I'm one of them.

So I hope that when the local law comes

in to give him this raise that we can put together six votes that say no. By then, the budget will be adopted, the vetoes will be over.

Now having said that, do I think that he may take retribution out on the other legislators, and on the public, and start vetoing more than he promised? After the pattern in the past, I assume it would be a pattern again.

I'm going to vote no on this amendment, and I will stand with that no vote through the local law and through whatever process it takes.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I believe your position --

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: I'm sorry, I vote yes. Thank you. I vote no on the raise but yes on the amendment.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Legislator Soskin?

LEGISLATOR SOSKIN: I'm not going to make a speech. Enough has been said. I vote yes to the amendment.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Legislator  
Wieder?

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: I vote yes on this  
amendment. I don't want to have anything to  
do with this disgraceful act. After I found  
out that the \$15,509 wasn't enough, he had to  
take more money from the taxpayers with the  
lack of agreement.

That is outrageous. I don't have  
nothing to do with this. I vote yes on this  
amendment.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Legislator  
Carey?

LEGISLATOR CAREY: No.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Cornell?

LEGISLATOR CORNELL: No.

MR. TOOLE: Legislator Diaz?

LEGISLATOR DIAZ: If I have a moment. I  
just want to say something again that  
Legislator Grant said earlier. When you make  
a decision, you stand by the decision. We  
sat there and we made a decision. We had a  
discussion.

And if it means that we saved some jobs

by doing this, then that's -- I can work with that, okay. Holding my nose, but we came to that decision. I made my decision, I'm standing up for my decision. I'm voting no.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Legislator Earl?

LEGISLATOR EARL: I vote yes on this. Any way you spin this is just morally wrong. It's just not the right thing to do. Thank you.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Vice Chairman Hood?

VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: A lot's been made about keeping your word, and some people haven't in the past. I am going to keep my word. I'm going to keep my word through the local law that comes up. I'm going to keep my word on the budget.

As far as, you know, the sale of the Sain Building, if he needs that to, you know, execute his budget, the budget that's going to pass, I'm going to continue to keep my word and give what tools are necessary to execute the budget in the following year. So I'm going to vote no on that tonight.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. Chairman Wolfe?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I think it's a disgrace to use the, I guess your own self-enrichment as a tool when you're playing with the lives and the livelihood of hundreds of people in this county. And I think it's very -- it's just distasteful to me that he would even use that as a nonnegotiable item, and not even entertain restoring positions and making these changes without him lining his pocket.

So with that, I vote yes.

MR. TOOLE: Thank you. I have five members voting in the affirmative, voting aye: Legislators Earl, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder and Wolfe. That's five.

Those voting nay are Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, and Hood.

The motion fails.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. Continuing on the question with the main motion, which is accepting the report of the Budget and Finance Committee.

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: On the question?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: On the question.

Mr. Wieder?

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: Legislator Grant, Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, on November 10, the County Executive and members of the Rockland County Legislature received a letter from the Office of the State Comptroller, New York State Comptroller.

LEGISLATOR GRANT: That is correct.

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: He wrote in that letter there were six recommendations. And this letter of recommendation came about that the local law that we have adopted. And I think, Legislator Grant, you've voted on that local law. So I won't ask you.

The first recommendation that the Comptroller made was develop and implement a formal plan that will result in the elimination of the County's accumulated deficit over a specific period of time. Have you satisfied that recommendation in your proposed amendment?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Grant?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Am I being  
interrogated?

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: You know, it's a  
simple yes or no.

LEGISLATOR GRANT: We had that --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I understand. I think  
what I'd like to do is, Mr. Grant, if you  
would like to at this time address the  
deficit financing issue. But I agree, this  
is not, you know, a deposition here.

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: Well, no, it's --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: The question clearly  
was loaded, Mr. Wieder. So Mr. Grant?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Thank you,  
Mr. Chairman. I'll try to answer as  
straightforward as possible.

Does it meet the plan established by  
this Legislature for the deficit reduction  
over a period of some ten years? No, it does  
not. No, it does not.

But the clear intent of a number of my  
colleagues on this Legislature to vote no on  
the tax cap, and no on the proposed budget or  
the amended budget, the intent there is not

to satisfy it in any way. The opportunity here was to satisfy it in some way.

Am I happy about it? No, I'm not. Do I think it's better for Rockland County? Yes, I do. Does Mr. Day have access to this money to spend? No, he does not.

And that is our intent. Our intent is to reduce the outstanding accumulated deficit over time. This small measure here does a better job than anything you've offered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. Mr. Wieder?

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: I was going to continue to ask some additional questions from the Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I think questions have been answered. In all seriousness, I believe questions have been answered.

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Mr. Chairman, if it helps you in any way, shape, or form, I will answer any and all questions that Mr. Wieder poses.

LEGISLATOR WIEDER: I was about to say

that I was going to ask some additional questions, but after listening to Legislator Grant's response, and after being here at some of the Budget and Finance review meetings, which I'm not a member of, I will forgo any additional questions.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. All right, anything else on the question on the amendment? Okay, then it's been moved and seconded.

This is to accept the report of the Budget and Finance Committee. I'll say a few words now, I might as well. From the beginning of this process, once we realized the enormity of the issues with this budget, it took us a while to kind of wrap our head around it.

I know that Legislator Grant and myself wrote a letter to the Comptroller's Office expressing our concerns about some of the holes in the budget. Mr. Schoenberger also wrote a letter to the Comptroller's Office. And our concerns were supported and acknowledged by the Comptroller in his review

of the budget.

I don't want to rehash what was said before, but the Comptroller's report was certainly not an endorsement of the budget. It identified some very serious policy issues that were built into the budget.

Some of those policy issues include the closure of Summit Park. It included the imposition of charge backs to the towns. Charge backs were eliminated by the Legislature a number of years ago, and threatened to be unilaterally imposed by the executive earlier this year.

Again, despite a resolution of the Legislature eliminating them, this has been a continuing bone of contention. Many of us believe that the County Executive does not have the authority to unilaterally impose them, especially when we ended them, so the inclusion of charge backs, \$1.8 million in this budget, is a problem from a policy perspective.

The budget also contains as a matter of policy this new scheme for funding

not-for-profits. It seems to change every time we talk to someone in the administration about it. We get wildly contradictory responses about the process.

We're told there's an RFP for next year. Then we're told that certain agencies have already been committed funding. And then we're told that we're going to be part of the process of making decisions. And then we're told that the application that the not-for-profits filled out in October isn't really an application, it's just a fact finding mission.

Then we find out that, well, the funding's in there. Then we find out that there's no guarantee that anyone is getting funded. It is completely confusing and poorly handled, but it's built into the budget.

The transfer of the security function to the Sheriff's Department. There's a question as to legality of the direction to the Sheriff, and there's also a serious concern that the direction is being made without any

funding associated with it at all.

But of most concern to me are the one shot revenues. You know, the Executive, I was there when he proposed the budget. And he said, this is a budget that avoids the sins of the past. There are no one shot revenues.

The Comptroller acknowledged that there are one shot revenues. There's \$4 million for the sale of the Sain Building, which may or may not happen in 2016, who knows. May or may not be approved, may or may not be necessary. There's two and a half million dollars for the VSI which hasn't been approved, and is unlikely to be approved in its current form.

And in order to fix this budget, I've come to realize that it's impossible to fix it a little bit. Because if you fix it a little bit, and you can't fix the big things, or you can't completely fix the items that affect these very serious policy issues, well, if that happens and I vote yes on that budget, then what am I doing? Yeah, I'm

doing some of the things that I want to do. But I'm also endorsing the things that I can't abide.

And I understand the consequences of not adopting a budget. I don't know if that's going to happen tonight; we're going to find out. But I understand the practical impact. There's a default provision in our charter that says that if the Legislature does not adopt a budget by December 7th, then the proposed budget becomes the default budget. And I recognize that.

However, I can't endorse the policy decisions that are incorporated into this budget. In 2016, I'll certainly work to address any issue that comes up, whether this budget is adopted or not.

I know that there are serious problems and serious issues with the funding for the contract agencies. We need to address the Sain Building, the use of space. If there are functions that are going to transfer to Building A, that's not going to come for free, because the whole place needs to be

renovated. That's going to cost millions and millions of dollars. Probably would exceed the proceeds from the sale of the Sain Building in the first place.

And if the Sain Building is going to be closed, what are we going to do about all that parking that's back there? I'm an attorney. Thank God I have a reserved parking spot, because when I go to court here, it's an absolute mess. And anyone that's ever been called for jury service will understand how awful the parking situation is for this courthouse.

How are we going to replace that parking? Are we going to have to build a garage? Are we going to have to find other places for people to park? These are things that haven't been thought out yet.

So in finding that the budget is unworkable -- my view, it's unworkable -- I can't in good faith support amendments to it that go so far, that go to a certain point but not, in my view, far enough. And I also will acknowledge the fact that to fix

everything would have resulted in a property tax increase that I think is, you know, it's way excessive. And I don't think anyone on this body would be comfortable voting for a 20 percent property tax increase after what we've done through the years.

So with that, I cannot support the amendment. I'm very concerned about my actions being construed as an endorsement. We're involved with litigation right now with the CSEA. I actually support the CSEA's position. The CSEA is saying that the County Executive did not have the authority under the charter to close Summit Park.

I agree with that. Why do I agree with that? Because that's what the charter says. And if I endorse the layoffs, and endorse the entire package, the things that we couldn't fix, then I think that it's going to undermine our legal position, and I think ultimately we're going to end up with a result that's not good. So for those reasons, I'm not supporting this amendment.

All right, so we're going to call the

questions. Mr. Carey?

LEGISLATOR CAREY: Could you just walk through what A, B, and C mean so we understand what we're voting on?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Right now, we're voting on accepting the report of Budget and Finance Committee. And essentially this is the --

LEGISLATOR CAREY: Just accepting it into -- correct?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: -- the amendments to the budget. If this resolution passes, then the budget that is being considered for adoption will be the budget as amended.

LEGISLATOR CAREY: And B?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: It's basically the same schedules.

LEGISLATOR CAREY: No, no, but B is the act of voting the budget?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Correct. B is adoption of the budget.

LEGISLATOR CAREY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: As may or may not be amended. So again, this, what we're voting on now, is amending the budget per the

recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee. All those in favor, please raise your hand?

Looks like it's the same. It's Meyers, Carey, Grant, go down the line.

Those opposed, please raise your hand?

MR. TOOLE: In recapping the vote, those voting in the affirmative, voting aye are Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, and Hood. I believe that totals eleven. Yes, eleven.

Those voting nay are Legislators Earl, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, and Wolfe. That totals six.

The motion passes eleven ayes, six nays.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. Mr. Grant?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
Item 11 A 1 B, adoption of the 2016 budget.  
And I so move.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: It's moved by  
Mr. Grant, seconded by Mr. Jobson.

On the question. Mr. Hood?

VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you,

Chairman. I was one of the ones, you know, intimately involved with coming up with this proposal. And I have to tell you, it really was the most difficult budget that I've seen.

I mean, there's so many lines that people wanted different things on. You know, you're for charge backs, you're against charge backs. You want more deficit reduction, you can do with less deficit reduction. There are just so many examples.

It's amazing that we actually came up with this. We sat for hours, the five of us. And you know, it's not perfect. It certainly isn't.

I mean, like I said, before I'm staunch, staunchly against charging the towns the charge backs. But I agreed to half and half, because something just had to be done to get the tax increase to a more reasonable number.

So going down the line, there's things that you need to know, like the technical changes that had to be made, which I think are personally what I would call mistakes on the budget that came over needed to be fixed,

like the Medicaid inspectors or fraud investigators that we all were really for weren't in the budget. So we corrected that with this amendment, which is important.

Unfortunately, something that wasn't put back in, we just couldn't all agree on it, was the sheriff's cuts this year, which include some to the mounted and some other equipment-based things. I am hopeful, and I will certainly do all I can to find other moneys, whether it's grants or forfeiture funds.

Whatever, you know, the sheriff needs us to do to stop those cuts some other way in 2016, I will certainly help. Because no one's been more supportive to the Sheriff's Office than the ones that are on this amendment in the past.

We did restore some positions. Some of them might be vetoed, we understand that. We're going to have to deal with that when it comes. Deficit reduction, we did put some in. It's better than none. We have a million dollars in there.

And the budget deficit has come down in the past year to, you know, our budget was part of the reason that good budgeting and also the County Executive's execution of the budget has led to a surplus. So hopefully, that can happen again this year. That will be even more than a million dollars at the end of the year for a deficit reduction.

So those are the major components. You know, I'm not as proud of this as I was probably last year when we, some of us led the charge to save the severe cuts to the Sheriff's Department and things of that nature. I think we made a budget that really worked.

And this year, you know, it was just too big. It was just too big a job. We couldn't make it as good as last years, I don't think. But I believe that it's better than what was handed to us. I wish we could have done some things a little better, but this is the best we could do under the circumstances.

And I want to thank my colleagues that worked together with me on this. I'm hearing

a lot about, you know, I wasn't included; I wasn't, you know, I wasn't part of it. But you know, you basically have to jump in.

You know, I saw about a week or two, maybe a week ago, not even that long ago, I just felt like it really wasn't going anywhere. We were getting nowhere, pretty much. And I said, I got to grab these people together.

And that's what we did. We came together and we came up with this. You have to take the bull by the horns.

What I was hearing, and I'll admit it right now, I'll tell you in public, what I was hearing is we're not busting the cap. That's it. That's what I heard.

Maybe you said something different. But I heard that certain legislators didn't want to bust the cap. And I did not see that as an option. Because even if we voted no on Ed's budget, passed the budget, we would have gotten -- and we would have had to bust the cap. Or there's an automatic \$5 million fall for next year. Automatic. And all that does

is lead to more cuts, more pain. And I just wasn't going to let that happen.

So I'm glad that the cap was, you know, was lifted this year. Even though it was painful, we don't want to do it, it's something that had to be done with the numbers that were in front of us.

Hopefully you can be with me. We need nine votes to pass this tonight. I hope that we have at least that.

And I also want to thank Mike Grant for all the work he did. I mean, he put in immense amount of hours, really. I mean, I put in my time, but you put in ten times the amount. So that does have to be acknowledged again.

And of course Nicole, for all the work you do. You know, I email you I need a schedule right now, like, in five minutes. No, I usually don't say it like that.

MS. DOLINER: That's what I'm here for.

VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: But seriously, thank you. You do a great job, and you got us through it, really.

So with that, I guess I'll just say I hope this amendment passes, and I hope 2016 ends as it did this year, with a surplus. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Schoenberger?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: Yeah. Once again, I'm going to vote no on this. I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote no, even though I know that the majority of them won't.

We lifted the tax cap, we raised taxes above the amount authorized by the tax cap. I was under the impression that if you don't lift the tax cap, there's some sort of rebate that goes back to the homeowners. If that's the case, we obviously will not be getting it.

And the second thing is that we are actually undermining, I believe, litigation brought by CSEA against the County Executive for exceeding his authority, and closing the hospital and nursing home, and applying the name of the County of Rockland, the Department of Health Commissioner closed.

You do all that without legislative approval, because I think the sum and substance and basis of the CSEA litigation, and I think you may face an argument in court that by passing this budget tonight and approving what we were approving, that in essence, we are ratifying the County Executive's actions, and will undermine that lawsuit.

And I think that's a very, very poor act of judgment on our part to do that. Because I believe the CSEA's lawsuit had merit, and now we may be undermining that merit. So I'm going to vote no.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. It has been moved and seconded. All in favor, please -- all right, Mr. Soskin?

LEGISLATOR SOSKIN: I'm going to vote no on this budget. And my reason is that -- and I know it's going to pass, because I'm -- my initial is S. I'm right at the end of the alphabet.

The reason I'm doing it is because I think it is a terrible budget. And it's the first time in 13 years that I'm voting

against a budget.

I am under the impression that because we amended the budget, the County Executive can veto any portion of it that he wants. And if it comes back to us, I don't know if we can override it or not. And therefore, he can do anything he wants.

Because I feel this is a bad budget, I cannot vote for it. Okay. But this is a test to him. And his professional people. They came up with an amendment together with my colleagues, who gathered together and negotiated with him and his staff to certain things.

Let's see if he sticks by his agreement. It's a test. Again, this is just my opinion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you.

Mr. Moroney, then Mr. Meyers.

LEGISLATOR MORONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to vote for this amendment, and I'll tell you why. Briefly, I sat here in this Legislature when we raised taxes, property taxes in this county by

30 percent. Next year, we raised them by 18 percent. The year after that, we raised them by 10 percent. That was 58 percent in three years.

Guess what that got us? That got us \$140 million deficit. That's what happened.

Now we're talking about, it's not a great budget, but we're talking about our negotiated amendments here where people in good faith reached out to the County Exec and worked something out. I remember there was things about these amendments I don't like. I don't like the \$600,000 sales tax increase.

But you know what? I remember when this Legislature put on \$5 million in tax increase, sales tax. It was a wish list.

This is a wish list also. I'm hoping that it will be more than 600,000, the economy picks up or something like that. But on my colleague Ms. Cornell very capably mentioned all the services that we provide for the County of Rockland, but she forgot one thing. And I'm sure she didn't forget it, but she just didn't want to talk about

it.

This Legislature, we, this County government, we give the towns and villages every year \$11 million in sales tax.

11 million. Now I could make a motion here tonight and say let's suspend that for five years until we get back in good shape. You know what? I probably would get a second. And that's okay. I could live with that.

But don't forget these things, that we -- we had 11 -- we had over \$11 million we gave to the towns and villages just to survive that police departments down in the towns. And we have some people that received that that are here this evening.

So you're not going to like everything that's about this budget. But when you're here as long as I have and as long as some other people are, you have good things and bad things. This is a bad budget? Maybe it is.

But ultimately, the budget responsibility, we are there allocating -- we're the allocating body over here in the

Legislature. But the guy across the hall is the guy that has to, every day to day, runs County government.

You may disagree with him. You may not like him. You may not trust him. But that's his job. That's what the people of Rockland County elected him to do.

And in two years, if this budget hasn't worked out, they'll probably vote him out of office. I don't know if that's going to happen. Who knows how elections go.

But I'm here to reminisce about some of the things that we have done in the past. 58 percent in three years, that didn't get us out of the hole that we were in. As a matter of fact, it sunk us deeper in the hole.

Every year I say this, and you know, I see the people that are sitting out there in the seats, their jobs are in jeopardy. You think I like that? No, I don't. You think I like closing of the hospital? No, I don't. All the people, the layoffs, the 32 people? No.

But they're being restored. That's part

of this amendment. And I appreciate the fact that these legislators that went before the County Executive negotiators, I appreciate that.

I don't like it. I don't like all the things that are in this budget. But I'm going to vote for it because I think it's the best thing we've got.

Now, we can do better a lot of stuff going on the first of the year, and then bring any resolution we want here. But tonight is the business of the taxpayers of Rockland County, and I think this Legislature is doing the best they can.

I have no problem with my colleagues pointing out the deficits and the shortcomings of this budget. That's no problem, I have no problem with that.

But we should stay on course, try to be nice, try to do the right thing for the people of Rockland County. Thank you. I vote yes.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Meyers?

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: I think my position

on budgets have been pretty consistent over the last eight years. And that is that I was always willing to support tax increases if they were combined with cuts in the budget so that we weren't balancing the budget on the backs of taxpayers.

My vote tonight is sort of inconsistent with that, because we're restoring funding in certain areas, including areas that restore jobs, job that are worthwhile, jobs that we probably can't afford. And we're raising the taxes almost ten percent.

But since the alternative is to not have a budget approved tonight, and possibly have a budget that defaults to the County Executive's budget, yet without getting -- without the tax cap having been busted, you know, because the coalition that was put together tonight, those two went part and parcel together. It would just be even more unacceptable.

And that's why I'm doing this tonight. Because really, politics is like soup. Everybody has to put a little bit in, and

some people don't understand that, to get enough out.

The other point I would like to make is that earlier, I said in my statement about the salary deferral that I didn't support the salary deferral because it was window dressing. I wanted deep cuts that year. I didn't want to offer up window dressing with some of a few thousand dollars from Legislators with salary deferral. I wanted actual cuts.

After I said that, Legislature Chair Wolfe revealed that I didn't support the deferral as if it was new information. I just said that three minutes before. And you know, some people in the audience said ah-ha. I just said -- if you had listened to me, I just said five minutes before that I didn't support the deferral. That's what I was trying to say in the point of personal privilege that was inexplicably refused. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Diaz?

LEGISLATOR DIAZ: Just one more word on

this. I haven't been here for other budgets. Obviously, I'm the shortest term person here. But I saw a lot of effort that was put into this, a lot of work put into this.

Starting with the Chair, Michael Grant, did an incredible job. And Nicole, of course, for all the work she put in, making sure we've got everything, all the information we needed so that we could sit here tonight and go over -- especially over the last few days -- work out a better budget than what we had.

And does it answer all the questions that we needed to answer? No, it doesn't. But it does a better job of answering some questions that needed to be addressed, things that needed to be addressed. It does a better job of that.

It doesn't give us everything we want. You know, one of the things that I've learned from my years with state government before coming to this body is that there are times you need to hold your nose a little bit and go forward. It may not be the best thing you

want to do, it might not be -- it may not answer every issue, address every problem. But it does the best it can.

Had we left things the way they were, that would not have been what we would have done. We would not be doing the best we can if we leave things the way they were. We had to make the changes.

Because we've been able to make those changes, because we've been able to get some agreement that these changes can, you know, that we can work on them, I'm voting yes on this budget, on the amended budget. I want to see us go forward.

And I have to tell you, this was probably the hardest decisions I've had to ever make in my working life leading up to this, leading up to tonight. But I'll say it again. I've made those decisions, I will stand by those decisions. And I'm voting yes tonight on this amended budget.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. All in favor, please say aye?

Was it the same count as it was before?

MR. TOOLE: No.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Raise your hand.

Mr. Moroney, Mr. Hofstein, are you for?

Okay. Let's count, then.

The nays?

LEGISLATOR SCHOENBERGER: I'm glad you guys finally saw the light.

MR. TOOLE: Recapping the tally of voting in the affirmative, voting aye are Legislators Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, and Hood. That totals nine.

Those voting nay, Legislators Carey, Earl, Hofstein, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, and Wolfe. That totals eight, so that puts the tally up.

Motion passes nine ayes and eight nays.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Okay. Next is the -- Mr. Grant, we're going to be moving --

LEGISLATOR GRANT: I think I packed up, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: -- to the appropriation. We'll certainly be able to recycle a lot of paper after this process.

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Item 2, Referral  
Number 7577, Rescinding Resolution of the  
Number --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I'm sorry, this is the  
appropriation resolution, 11A --

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Okay. 11 A 1 C,  
Appropriation of Budget Items For 2016. I  
move it.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Moved by Mr. Grant,  
seconded by Mr. Hood. On the question? And  
this is an appropriation of the budget items  
of 2016 as contained in the budget that just  
passed. All in favor, please raise your  
hand.

Why don't we get the nays?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: These are the yeas.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: All those opposed?  
Mr. Hofstein, are you an aye or a nay on the  
appropriation?

LEGISLATOR HOFSTEIN: Nay, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Carey, is he away?

MR. TOOLE: Very good. Let me recap.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Murphy is also a  
nay?

LEGISLATOR MURPHY: You got my vote, right?

MR. TOOLE: Very good. Recapping the vote, those voting in the affirmative, voting aye are Legislators --

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: I'm sorry. This is for the appropriation. Are you voting aye or nay?

LEGISLATOR GRANT: Mr. Chairman, could you please remind my colleagues that there's a vote being taken and they should be in their seats?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Thank you.

LEGISLATOR MURPHY: Do I have to sit down to vote?

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Mr. Murphy, are you an aye or a nay on the appropriation?

MR. TOOLE: To recap the vote, those voting in the affirmative, voting aye are Legislators Cornell, Diaz, Grant, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, and Hood. That totals nine.

Those voting nay are --

LEGISLATOR MEYERS: Carey's back.

LEGISLATOR CAREY: I'm an aye.

MR. TOOLE: Very good. I will just add one to the affirmative tally. That now tallies ten with Mr. Carey.

Those voting nay are Legislators Earl, Hofstein, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, and Wolfe. That totals seven. So that tallies.

The motion passes ten ayes, seven nays.

CHAIRMAN WOLFE: Before I move with the agenda, I just want to congratulate everyone on their hard work. We very often have a difference of opinion, different views.

I like to think that we conduct what we do here, which is the people's work, in a way that's respectful, mostly respectful, and really in the public interest. So I'd like to thank all of my colleagues for their participation in this process.

Mr. Schoenberger, I'd like to move on with the agenda. At the end, perhaps.

Proceedings

THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be a true  
and correct transcription of the original  
stenographic minutes to the best of my ability.



---

Jennifer L. Johnson

Introduced by:

Referral No. 7577

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
 Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
 Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 550 OF 2015  
 RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 470 OF 2015 AND  
 RATIFYING MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
 THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND AND THE  
 ROCKLAND ASSOCIATION OF MANAGEMENT (R.A.M.)  
 PROVIDING ADDITIONAL TERMINAL LEAVE BENEFITS FOR  
 EMPLOYEES SEPARATING FROM COUNTY EMPLOYMENT  
 IN CONNECTION WITH THE DOWNSIZING OF  
 THE SUMMIT PARK NURSING CARE CENTER AND  
 THE SUMMIT PARK HOSPITAL**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Diaz and adopted

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 470 of 2015, the Legislature of Rockland County ratified a Memorandum of Agreement between the County of Rockland and the Rockland Association of Management (R.A.M.) which provided additional terminal leave benefits for employees terminating from County employment as a result of the abolishment of position in connection with the sale of Summit Park Nursing Care Center and the Summit Park Hospital; and

WHEREAS, Due to the change in circumstances and underlying conditions, the sale of Summit Park Nursing Care Center and the Summit Park Hospital did not come to fruition because the purchasers delivered a notice of termination; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature of Rockland County hereby rescinds Resolution No. 470 of 2015; and

WHEREAS, The County of Rockland and the Rockland Association of Management (R.A.M.) have negotiated the impact of the downsizing of the Summit Park Nursing Care Center and the Summit Park Hospital, and

WHEREAS, Such impact negotiations have resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement, attached hereto and subject to ratification by the Rockland County Legislature, providing additional terminal leave benefits for employees who separate from County employment in connection with such downsizing; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding is available in the Hospital Fund's liability reserve for accrued vacation, sick and holiday time; and

WHEREAS, The Budget & Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby rescinds Resolution No. 470 of 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That said Memorandum of Agreement is hereby ratified by the Legislature of Rockland County; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding is available in the Hospital Fund's liability reserve for accrued vacation, sick and holiday time; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Rockland County Department of Personnel shall carry out all such administrative tasks as are required to effectuate and put into operation the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance of Rockland County be and he is hereby authorized to effectuate the payments resulting therefrom, if required, as provided for by the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Meyers, Murphy)

Introduced by:

Referral No. 7435

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 551 OF 2015  
RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 471 OF 2015 AND  
RATIFYING MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND AND THE  
CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION, INC., (C.S.E.A.) LOCAL 1000  
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND  
MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES UNION, AFL-CIO  
ROCKLAND COUNTY UNIT, ROCKLAND COUNTY LOCAL 844  
PROVIDING ADDITIONAL TERMINAL LEAVE BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES  
SEPARATING FROM COUNTY EMPLOYMENT  
IN CONNECTION WITH THE DOWNSIZING OF  
THE SUMMIT PARK NURSING CARE CENTER  
AND THE SUMMIT PARK HOSPITAL**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mrs. Cornell and adopted

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 471 of 2015 the Legislature of Rockland County ratified a Memorandum of Agreement between the County of Rockland and the Civil Service Employees Association, Inc. (C.S.E.A.), Local 1000 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Union, AFL-CIO, Rockland County Unit, Rockland County Local 844 which provided additional terminal leave benefits for employees terminating from County employment as a result of the abolishment of position in connection with the sale of Summit Park Nursing Care Center and the Summit Park Hospital; and

WHEREAS, Due to the change in circumstances and underlying conditions, the sale of Summit Park Nursing Care Center and the Summit Park Hospital did not come to fruition because the purchasers delivered a notice of termination; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature of Rockland County hereby rescinds Resolution No. 471 of 2015; and

WHEREAS, The County of Rockland and the Civil Service Employees Association, Inc. (C.S.E.A.), Local 1000 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Union, AFL-CIO, Rockland County Unit, Rockland County Local 844 have negotiated the impact of the downsizing of the Summit Park Nursing Care Center and the Summit Park Hospital, and

WHEREAS, Such impact negotiations have resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement, attached hereto and subject to ratification by the Rockland County Legislature, providing additional terminal leave benefits for employees who separate from County employment in connection with such downsizing; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding is available in the Hospital Fund's liability reserve for accrued vacation, sick and holiday time; and

WHEREAS, The Budget & Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby rescinds Resolution 471 of 2015; and be it further

RESOLVED, That said Memorandum of Agreement is hereby ratified by the Legislature of Rockland County; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding is available in the Hospital Fund's liability reserve for accrued vacation, sick and holiday time; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Rockland County Department of Personnel shall carry out all such administrative tasks as are required to effectuate and put into operation the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance of Rockland County be and he is hereby authorized to effectuate the payments resulting therefrom, if required, as provided for by the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Meyers, Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5906

- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 552 OF 2015  
 APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000 TO  
 HAUSER BROS. INC. IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$489,000  
 FOR CONTRACT 2015-04, MT. IVY AND  
 WILDER PUMP STATION IMPROVEMENTS  
 FOR THE ROCKLAND COUNTY SEWER DISTRICT NO. 1  
 AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [ROCKLAND COUNTY SEWER DISTRICT NO. 1]  
 (\$489,000)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mrs. Low-Hogan and adopted

WHEREAS, Bids were advertised by the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 for Contract 2015-04, Mt. Ivy and Wilder Pump Station Improvements; and

WHEREAS, This work is needed to replace worn pump base elbows, discharge piping, check valves and flow meters at the Mt. Ivy and Wilder Pump Stations and includes concrete work, bypass pumping and removal and reinstallation of existing pumps; and

WHEREAS, The Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 received bids for the project on October 14, 2015; and

WHEREAS, In a memo dated October 22, 2015, Staff of the Sewer District indicated that a total of one (1) bid was received as follows:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
Hauser Bros., Inc.	\$489,000

and

WHEREAS, The bids were checked and tabulated by staff of the Sewer District; and

WHEREAS, The Sewer District requested and received a detailed cost breakdown of Hauser's bid which was reviewed by District staff and Gannett Fleming who is the design engineer on the project, and the pricing was found to be reasonable; and

WHEREAS, Hauser Bros., Inc.'s bid was originally \$513,000 but after negotiations with staff from the District, they reduced the price of the bid to \$489,000; and

WHEREAS, Hauser Bros., Inc. has completed similar projects at the facility to the District's satisfaction; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 59 of 2015, the Board of Sewer Commissioner's of the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1, approved the award of Contract 2015-04 to Hauser Bros. Inc., 17 Old Schoolhouse Lane, Orangeburg, NY 10962, in an amount not to exceed \$489,000; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Sewer Commissioners upon the recommendation of the Executive Director is now requesting that the Legislature of Rockland County accept the bid of and approve the contract with Hauser Bros., Inc. 17 Old Schoolhouse Lane, Orangeburg, NY 10962; and

WHEREAS, Local Law No. 18 of 1996 provides for the Legislature to approve "execution of all contracts in excess of \$100,000 entered into by the County"; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for this agreement is available in the 2015 adopted operating budget of Rockland County Sewer District No. 1; SWR-8120-E4580; and

WHEREAS, The Planning & Public Works and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the award of the contract in excess of \$100,000 to Hauser Bros. Inc. 17 Old Schoolhouse Lane, Orangeburg, NY 10962, in an amount not to exceed \$489,000 for Contract RFB-RC-2015-04 Mt. Ivy and Wilder Pump Station Improvements for the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1, and authorizes the County Executive to execute the contract and such other documents as may be necessary to carry out the intent of this resolution, subject to the review of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this agreement is available in the 2015 adopted operating budget of Rockland County Sewer District No. 1; SWR-8120-E4580.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislator Meyers, Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 4124

- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 553 OF 2015**  
**ACCEPTANCE OF A DONATION FROM THE ROCKLAND COUNTY SOIL & WATER**  
**CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR USE BY THE ROCKLAND COUNTY TASK FORCE**  
**ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT TO PAY FOR THE COSTS OF SPONSORSHIP**  
**FOR THE STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**  
**GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SENIOR STUDENT PROJECT**  
**[DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING]**  
**(\$4,000)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mrs. Cornell and Mr. Diaz and adopted

WHEREAS, Legislator Harriet Cornell, Chairwoman of the Rockland County Task Force on Water Resources Management ("Water Task Force"), has advised the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that the Water Task Force has been offered a donation from the Rockland County Soil & Water Conservation District in the total amount of \$4,000 for use by the Water Task Force to pay for the costs of sponsorship for the Stevens Institute of Technology Green Infrastructure Senior Student Project; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to have the Legislature formally accept said donation; and

WHEREAS, Said donation is to be appropriated to the Department of Planning; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County funds; and

WHEREAS, The Budget & Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby accepts the donation from the Rockland County Soil & Water Conservation District in the total amount of \$4,000 for use by the Rockland County Task Force on Water Management Resources to pay for the costs of sponsorship for the Stevens Institute of Technology Green Infrastructure Senior Student Project; and be it further

RESOLVED, That said donation is to be appropriated to the Department of Planning; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-PLN-8020-E5060	Program Costs	\$4,000
------------------	---------------	---------

Increase Est Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A-PLN-8020-R2705	Gifts & Donations	\$4,000
------------------	-------------------	---------

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Legislature hereby directs the Clerk to the Legislature to express the appreciation of the Legislature of Rockland County and the County Executive to the Rockland County Soil & Water Conservation District for its donation to the Rockland County Task Force on Water Management Resources.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 4249

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 554 OF 2015  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF CONTINUATION GRANT  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,310 (NCTD)  
 FROM THE NYS GOVERNOR’S TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE  
 FOR THE POLICE TRAFFIC SAFETY (PTS) PROGRAM  
 FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2015 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2016  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT]  
 (\$9,310)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Diaz and adopted

WHEREAS, The Office of the Sheriff has advised the County Executive and the County Legislature that they have been awarded an \$9,310 Police Traffic Safety (PTS) Program continuation grant from the New York State Governor’s Traffic Safety Committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

WHEREAS, Said grant funds will be used to help cover overtime costs related to enforcing traffic laws in an effort to reduce serious injury or death from traffic violations; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate these funds to the proper account; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of the County of Rockland hereby approves the acceptance of an \$9,310 Police Traffic Safety (PTS) Program continuation grant from the New York State Governor’s Traffic Safety Committee for the Sheriff’s Department to help cover overtime costs related to enforcing traffic laws in an effort to reduce serious injury or death from traffic violations for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016, and authorizes execution by the County Executive of all necessary grant documents, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A -SHF -3112	-E1110	Overtime	8,621
	-E1930	Social Security	660
	-E1980	MTA Mobility Tax	29

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A -SHF -3112	-R3380	Public Safety Grant(s)	9,310
--------------	--------	------------------------	-------

The vote resulted as follows:

- Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
- U.A. Nay: 01 (Legislator Murphy)

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9361

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 555 OF 2015  
 ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$558,750 (NCTD)  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND  
 EMERGENCY SERVICES STATE HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM  
 (SHSP) GRANT (NO. WM15972950)  
 FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2018  
 AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]  
 (\$558,750)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mrs. Paul and Mr. Hood, Jr. and adopted

WHEREAS, The Office of the Sheriff has informed the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that his department has been awarded a State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) grant (No. WM15972950) in the amount of \$558,750 from the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, This grant will be used to help fund the County's counter-terrorism teams so that they can be better prepared in the event of a terrorist attack or mass casualty incident; and

WHEREAS, This grant is federally funded but administered by New York State; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate these funds to the proper accounts; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the acceptance of a State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) grant (No. WM15972950) in the amount of \$558,750 from the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 and authorizes execution of all necessary grant documents by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this grant will be used to help fund the County's counter-terrorism teams so that they can be better prepared in the event of a terrorist attack or mass casualty incident; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this grant is federally funded but administered by New York State; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A -SHF -3108 -GS53	-E2050	Equipment	219,125
	-E4090	Fees for Services, Non-Employee	209,375
	-E5060	Program Costs	130,250

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A -SHF -3108 -GS53 -R4380	Public Safety Grant(s)	558,750
---------------------------	------------------------	---------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9361

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 556 OF 2015  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$186,250 (NCTD) FROM  
 THE NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND  
 EMERGENCY SERVICES LAW ENFORCEMENT TERRORISM PREVENTION  
 PROGRAM (LETPP) GRANT (NO. WM15972952)  
 FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2018  
 AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF]  
 (\$186,250)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Diaz, Mr. Earl, Mrs. Paul and Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, The County Executive has been advised by the Office of the Sheriff that the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services has awarded Rockland County a \$186,250 Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) grant (No. WM15972952) for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Said grant will be used to reimburse law enforcement in Rockland County for various counter-terrorism personnel and training expenses and to reimburse for cost related to various equipment needed by the Rockland County Police Information Network (RCPIN); and

WHEREAS, Said grant is federally funded but administered by New York State; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate these funds to the proper accounts; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of the County of Rockland hereby approves the acceptance of a \$186,250 Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) grant (No. WM15972952) from the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018, and authorizes execution of all necessary grant documents by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That said grant will be used to reimburse law enforcement in Rockland County for various counter-terrorism personnel and training expenses and to reimburse for cost related to various equipment needed by the Rockland County Police Information Network (RCPIN); and be it further

RESOLVED, That said grant is federally funded but administered by New York State; and be it further

RESOLVED, That No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A -SHF -3118 -GS54	-E1130	Temporary	23,150
	-E1930	Social Security	1,771
	-E1980	MTA Mobility Tax	79
	-E2050	Equipment	68,125
	-E4090	Fees for Services, Non-Employee	93,125

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A -SHF -3118 -GS54	-R4380	Public Safety Grant(s)	186,250
--------------------	--------	------------------------	---------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9361

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 557 OF 2015  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS  
 FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$246,317  
 FISCAL YEAR 2015 PORT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM  
 (AGREEMENT #EMW-2015-PU-00059-S01)  
 FOR THE ROCKLAND COUNTY SHERIFF MARITIME SECURITY PROJECT  
 AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF]  
 (\$246,317)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Earl and adopted

WHEREAS, The Office of the Sheriff has informed the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that they have been awarded a Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Port Security Grant in the amount of \$246,317 (Agreement #EMW-2015-PU-00059-S01) from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and

WHEREAS, This funding will be utilized from Capital Project No. 1475 - Sheriff Department Vehicles and Equipment Three (3) Year Replacement Program; and

WHEREAS, The \$246,317 grant covers 75% of the estimated total cost (\$328,422) of the purchase of a new Marine Unit boat for which the grant was awarded and, of the remaining 25% local share (\$82,105) has been approved by Resolution No. 432 of 2015 and in the 2015 Amended Capital Budget; Capital Project No. 1475 - Sheriff Department Vehicles and Equipment Three (3) Year Replacement Program; and

WHEREAS, Local Law No. 18 of 1996 provides for the Legislature to approve "execution of all contracts in excess of \$100,000 entered into by the County;" and

WHEREAS, Funding related to this grant item has already been appropriated in the 2015 Amended Capital Budget; Capital Project No. 1475 - Sheriff Department Vehicles and Equipment Three (3) Year Replacement Program; and by Resolution No. 432 of 2015; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the acceptance of Fiscal Year 2015 Port Security Grant Program in the amount of \$246,317 (Agreement #EMW-2015-PU-00059-S01) from the U.S. Department Of Homeland Security, and authorizes execution of all necessary grant documents by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this funding will be utilized from Capital Project No. 1475 - Sheriff Department Vehicles and Equipment Three (3) Year Replacement Program; and

RESOLVED, That, pursuant to Local Law No. 18 of 1996, the County Executive or his designee is hereby authorized to execute all instruments and documents necessary to the acceptance of this grant, and to do so electronically, or in whatever other manner is required by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and be it further

RESOLVED, That funding related to this grant item has already been appropriated in the 2015 Amended Capital Budget; Capital Project No. 1475 - Sheriff Department Vehicles and Equipment Three (3) Year Replacement Program; and by Resolution No. 432 of 2015.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 5886

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 558 OF 2015  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF CONTINUATION GRANT  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,000 (NCTD)  
 FOR THE SHERIFF'S CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY PROGRAM  
 FROM THE NYS GOVERNOR'S TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE  
 TO PURCHASE CHILD SAFETY SEATS AND RELATED SUPPLIES  
 FOR THE SHERIFF'S FITTING STATION/SPECIAL CHILD SAFETY EVENTS  
 AS WELL AS TO PURCHASE VARIOUS SUPPLIES FOR THE INSTALLATION OF  
 THESE SEATS AND TO PURCHASE PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL  
 FOR CHILD SAFETY SEAT AWARENESS FOR THE PERIOD  
 OCTOBER 1, 2015 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2016  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]  
 (\$5,000)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Diaz, Mr. Earl, Mrs. Paul and Mr. Soskin and unanimously adopted

WHEREAS, The Rockland County Sheriff has advised the County Executive and the County Legislature that his department has been awarded a \$5,000 Child Passenger Safety Program continuation grant from the New York State Governor's Traffic Safety Committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

WHEREAS, Said grant funds will be used to purchase child safety seats and related supplies for the Sheriff's fitting station/special child safety events as well as to purchase various supplies for the installation of these seats and to purchase promotional material for child safety seat awareness; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate these funds to the proper account; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of the County of Rockland hereby approves the acceptance of a \$5,000 Child Passenger Safety Program continuation grant from the New York State Governor's Traffic Safety Committee for the Sheriff's Department to purchase child safety seats and related supplies for the Sheriff's fitting station/special child safety events as well as to purchase various supplies for the installation of these seats and to purchase promotional material for child safety seat awareness for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016, and authorizes execution by the County Executive of all necessary grant documents, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept said grant; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

<u>GENERAL FUND - 2015</u>		
<u>Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):</u>		
A-SHF-3108-GS55-E5060	Program Costs	5,000
<u>Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):</u>		
A-SHF-3108-GS55-R3380	Public Safety Grant(s)	5,000

The vote resulted as follows:

- Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
- U.A. Nay: 01 (Legislator Murphy)

Introduced by:

Referral No. 8894

- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Aron B. Wieder, Sponsor
- Hon. Lon M. Hofstein, Sponsor
- Hon. Richard C. Diaz, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 559 OF 2015  
 APPROVING THE ACCEPTANCE OF A CONTINUATION GRANT  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
 FOR THE EARLY INTERVENTION (EI) ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$131,433 [NCTD]  
 FOR THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 1, 2015 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2016  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE  
 ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE AGREEMENT  
 WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
 (DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH)  
 (\$131,433)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Earl, Mr. Jobson, Mrs. Paul and Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, The Commissioner of Health has advised the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that the New York State Department of Health has awarded the Rockland County Department of Health a continuation grant in the amount of \$131,433 to continue the Early Intervention (EI) Administration Program for the period from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

WHEREAS, The grant covers salaries and fringe benefits for employees who will administer the mandated EI Administration Program, which were already appropriated in the 2015 Adopted Budget and are already budgeted in the 2016 Proposed Budget, and therefore no funding clause is required; and

WHEREAS, The grant is federally funded but administered by New York State; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars [NCTD] are required to accept the grant funds; and

WHEREAS, Local Law No. 18 of 1996 provides for the Legislature to approve the "execution of all contracts in excess of \$100,000 entered into by the County"; and

WHEREAS, The Multi-Services and Budget and Finance Committees of this Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the acceptance of the continuation grant from the New York State Department of Health for the Early Intervention (EI) Administration Program in the amount of \$131,433 for the period from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016, and hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute all necessary documents including the agreement with the New York State Department of Health, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars [NCTD] are required to accept the grant funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That should outside funding be reduced and/or eliminated, any position(s) previously created under this grant shall automatically terminate without further action of the Legislature.

The vote resulted as follows:

- Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
- U.A. Nay: 01 (Legislator Murphy)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 6704

Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
 Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor  
 Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
 Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
 Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 560 OF 2015  
 APPROPRIATION OF FEDERAL FORFEITURE FUNDS  
 REQUESTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
 TO COVER REGIONAL INVESTIGATIVE RESOURCE CENTER (RIRC)  
 SERVICE COSTS RELATED TO OVERTIME, TRAINING  
 AND A WEB-BASED ACCUSATORY INSTRUMENT  
 [OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY]  
 (\$50,000)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, The Office of the District Attorney has requested that \$50,000 of federal forfeiture funds in balance sheet account 8890 (Reserved for the DA - Federal Proceeds) be appropriated to the District Attorney's Budget to cover Regional Investigative Resource Center (RIRC) service costs related to overtime, training and a web-based accusatory instrument; and

WHEREAS, There is no expiration date required for use of these funds; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County funds since sufficient funds to cover said \$50,000 appropriation exists within said balance sheet account; and

WHEREAS, The County Attorney advises that the use of these funds for said purposes is permitted under federal guidelines; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DA-1165-FA02-E4500	Forfeiture Funds - Services	50,000
----------------------	-----------------------------	--------

Increase Approp. Fund Bal. (Debit):

A-UNC-9990-R5990	(Designated for the DA - Federal Proceeds)	50,000
------------------	--	--------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6704

Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
 Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor  
 Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
 Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
 Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 561 OF 2015  
 APPROPRIATION OF FEDERAL FORFEITURE FUNDS  
 REQUESTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
 TO COVER INVESTIGATIVE AND TECHNOLOGY COSTS  
 ASSOCIATED WITH CONFIDENTIAL INVESTIGATIONS THROUGH THE  
 REGIONAL INVESTIGATIVE RESOURCE CENTER (RIRC)  
 [OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY]  
 (\$50,000)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Moroney and adopted

WHEREAS, The Office of the District Attorney has requested that \$50,000 of federal forfeiture funds in balance sheet account A-8904 (Designated for the DTF/RIRC - Federal Proceeds) be appropriated to the District Attorney's Budget to cover investigative and technology costs associated with confidential investigations through the Regional Investigative Resource Center (RIRC); and

WHEREAS, There is no expiration date required for use of these funds; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County funds since sufficient funds to cover the total \$50,000 appropriation exists within said balance sheet account; and

WHEREAS, The County Attorney advises that the use of these funds for said purposes is permitted under federal guidelines; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DA-3190-FA04-E4500	Forfeiture Funds - Services	50,000
----------------------	-----------------------------	--------

Increase Approp. Fund Bal. (Debit):

A-UNC-9990-R5990	(Designated for the DTF/RIRC - Federal Proceeds)	50,000
------------------	--	--------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6704

Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
 Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor  
 Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
 Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
 Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 562 OF 2015  
 APPROPRIATION OF FEDERAL FORFEITURE FUNDS  
 REQUESTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
 TO COVER THE COST OF CELL PHONES AND LEGAL RESEARCH (WESTLAW)  
 [OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY]  
 (\$50,000)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Soskin and Chairman Wolfe and adopted

WHEREAS, The Office of the District Attorney has requested that \$50,000 of federal forfeiture funds in balance sheet account A-8890 (Designated for the DA - Federal Proceeds) be appropriated to the District Attorney's Budget to cover the cost of cell phones and legal research (WestLaw); and

WHEREAS, There is no expiration date required for use of these funds; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County funds since sufficient funds to cover the total \$50,000 appropriation exists within said balance sheet account; and

WHEREAS, The County Attorney advises that the use of these funds for said purposes is permitted under federal guidelines; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DA-1165-FA02-E4500	Forfeiture Funds - Services	50,000
----------------------	-----------------------------	--------

Increase Approp. Fund Bal. (Debit):

A-UNC-9990-R5990	(Designated for the DA - Federal Proceeds)	50,000
------------------	--	--------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 2973/9500

Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
 Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
 Hon. Aron B. Wieder, Sponsor  
 Hon. Lon M. Hofstein, Sponsor  
 Hon. Richard C. Diaz, Sponsor  
 Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
 Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 563 OF 2015  
 AMENDING THE 2015 BUDGET BY APPROVING THE ACCEPTANCE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$84,906 [NCTD] TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO  
 OPEN ARMS, INC. FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM  
 (SNAP) REVENUE AND A 2% COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT (COLA)  
 AND TO MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF ROCKLAND COUNTY, INC., DAYTOP VILLAGE, INC.,  
 ROCKLAND COUNCIL ON ALCOHOLISM AND OTHER DRUG DEPENDENCE, INC., LEXINGTON  
 CENTER FOR RECOVERY, INC., VILLAGE OF HAVERSTRAW (OUTREACH), COMMUNITY  
 AWARENESS NETWORK FOR A DRUGFREE LIFE AND ENVIRONMENT, INC. (C.A.N.D.L.E., INC.)  
 AND THE CLARKSTOWN CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR A 2% COLA  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 TO EXECUTE ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS  
 INCLUDING THE APPLICABLE CONTRACT AMENDMENTS  
 [DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH]  
 (\$84,906)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Diaz, Mr. Earl, Mrs. Paul and Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, The Commissioner of the Department of Mental Health (DMH) has advised the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that the New York State Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS) has awarded the Rockland County Department of Mental Health (RC DMH) additional funding in the amount of \$84,906 to be distributed to the following eight (8) mental health providers for the calendar year 2015: (1) Mental Health Association of Rockland County, Inc. (\$2,964); (2) Daytop Village, Inc. (\$5,330); (3) Rockland Council on Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependence, Inc. (\$2,868); (4) Open Arms, Inc. (\$44,291); (5) Lexington Center for Recovery, Inc. (\$14,709); (6) Village of Haverstraw (Outreach) (\$3,876); (7) Community Awareness Network for a Drugfree Life and Environment, Inc. (C.A.N.D.L.E., INC.) (\$1,757); and (8) the Clarkstown Central School District (\$9,111); and

WHEREAS, The award to Open Arms, Inc. is the result of additional Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) revenue in the amount of \$34,491 along with a two percent (2%) Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) in the amount of \$9,800; and

WHEREAS, The award to the remaining mental health providers is the result of a two percent (2%) COLA; and

WHEREAS, The acceptance of these funds will require amendments to the County's 2015 contracts with these contract agencies; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars [NCTD] are required to accept these additional funds; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate these additional funds to the proper accounts; and

WHEREAS, Local Law No. 18 of 1996 provides for the Legislature to approve the "execution of all contracts in excess of \$100,000 entered into by the County"; and

WHEREAS, The Multi-Services and Budget and Finance Committees of this Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the acceptance of additional funding from the New York State Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS) in the amount of \$84,906, to be distributed to the following eight (8) mental health providers for the calendar year 2015: (1) Mental Health Association of Rockland County, Inc. (\$2,964); (2) Daytop Village, Inc. (\$5,330); (3) Rockland Council on Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependence, Inc. (\$2,868); (4) Open Arms, Inc. (\$44,291); (5) Lexington Center for Recovery, Inc. (\$14,709); (6) Village of Haverstraw (Outreach) (\$3,876); (7) Community Awareness Network for a Drugfree Life and Environment, Inc. (C.A.N.D.L.E., INC.) (\$1,757); and (8) the Clarkstown Central School District (\$9,111), as the result of additional Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) revenue (for Open Arms, Inc. only) and a two percent (2%) Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) (for all agencies including Open Arms), and hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute all necessary documents related to the acceptance of these funds, including the applicable contract amendments, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars [NCTD] are required to accept these funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance hereby is authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2015

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DMH-4306-E5010	Mental Health Association	2,964
A-DMH-4308-E5010	Daytop Village, Inc.	5,330
A-DMH-4330-E5010	Rockland Council on Alcoholism	2,868
A-DMH-4334-E5010	Open Arms (\$34,491 SNAP + \$9,800 COLA)	44,291
A-DMH-4356-E5010	Lexington Center for Recovery	14,709
A-DMH-4220-E5060	Narcotics Addiction Control	<u>14,744</u>
		84,906

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A-DMH-4306-R3476	State Aid - OASAS	2,964
A-DMH-4308-R3476	State Aid - OASAS	5,330
A-DMH-4330-R3476	State Aid - OASAS	2,868
A-DMH-4334-R3476	State Aid - OASAS	44,291
A-DMH-4356-R3476	State Aid - OASAS	14,709
A-DMH-4220-R3476	State Aid - OASAS	<u>14,744</u>
		84,906

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

Referral No. 6924

**RESOLUTION NO. 564 OF 2015  
APPROVING AN INTERMUNICIPAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND AND THE COUNTY OF ULSTER FOR \$35,500  
(NCTD) IN HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EQUIPMENT  
FOR ITS USE AS PART OF THE REGIONAL HAZMAT TEAM  
FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2018  
AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES]  
(\$35,500)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Carey and Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, Section 119-o of Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York authorizes municipal governments to perform together that which each government is authorized to perform individually and requires that any intermunicipal cooperation agreement be approved by each participating municipal corporation by a majority vote of the voting strength of its governing body; and

WHEREAS, The County of Rockland ("County") and the County of Ulster are municipal corporations as defined by Section 119-n of Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution 463 of 2015, the Rockland County Legislature approved acceptance of a Hazardous Materials Grant in the amount of \$142,000 from the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 in order to enhance the capabilities of the Regional HazMat Team; and

WHEREAS, As grantee of the Hazardous Materials Grant, the County of Rockland is responsible for the purchasing and distribution of the hazardous materials equipment to the Regional HazMat Team, which includes the Counties of Rockland, Orange, Ulster and Sullivan; and

WHEREAS, The County of Ulster will receive \$35,500 in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for the purchase of the hazardous materials equipment for the this agreement is available in Dept. GE05, line E5060; and

WHEREAS, Neither this resolution nor the intermunicipal cooperation agreement hereby approved will require the expenditure of any County funds; and

WHEREAS, The Office of Fire and Emergency Services is recommending that the County enter into an intermunicipal cooperation agreement with the County of Ulster for the receipt of \$35,500 (NCTD) in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team for the period from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the intermunicipal cooperation agreement between the County of Rockland and the County of Ulster to receive \$35,500 (NCTD) in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team for the period from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 and authorizes execution of the intermunicipal cooperation agreement by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for the purchase of the hazardous materials equipment for this agreement is available in Dept. GE05, line E5060; and be it further

RESOLVED, That neither this resolution nor the intermunicipal cooperation agreement hereby approved will require the expenditure of any County funds.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6924

Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 565 OF 2015  
APPROVING AN INTERMUNICIPAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND AND THE COUNTY OF ORANGE FOR \$35,500  
(NCTD) IN HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EQUIPMENT  
FOR ITS USE AS PART OF THE REGIONAL HAZMAT TEAM  
FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2018  
AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES]  
(\$35,500)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Hofstein and Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, Section 119-o of Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York authorizes municipal governments to perform together that which each government is authorized to perform individually and requires that any intermunicipal cooperation agreement be approved by each participating municipal corporation by a majority vote of the voting strength of its governing body; and

WHEREAS, The County of Rockland ("County") and the County of Orange are municipal corporations as defined by Section 119-n of Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution 463 of 2015, the Rockland County Legislature approved acceptance of a Hazardous Materials Grant in the amount of \$142,000 from the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 in order to enhance the capabilities of the Regional HazMat Team; and

WHEREAS, As grantee of the Hazardous Materials Grant, the County of Rockland is responsible for the purchasing and distribution of the hazardous materials equipment to the Regional HazMat Team, which includes the Counties of Rockland, Orange, Ulster and Sullivan; and

WHEREAS, The County of Orange will receive \$35,500 in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for the purchase of the hazardous materials equipment for the this agreement is available in Dept. GE05, line E5060; and

WHEREAS, Neither this resolution nor the intermunicipal cooperation agreement hereby approved will require the expenditure of any County funds; and

WHEREAS, The Office of Fire and Emergency Services is recommending that the County enter into an intermunicipal cooperation agreement with the County of Orange for the receipt of \$35,500 (NCTD) in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team for the period from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the intermunicipal cooperation agreement between the County of Rockland and the County of Orange to receive \$35,500 (NCTD) in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team for the period from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 and authorizes execution of the intermunicipal cooperation agreement by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for the purchase of the hazardous materials equipment for this agreement is available in Dept. GE05, line E5060; and be it further

RESOLVED, That neither this resolution nor the intermunicipal cooperation agreement hereby approved will require the expenditure of any County funds.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6924

Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon Nancy Low-Hogan, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 566 OF 2015  
APPROVING AN INTERMUNICIPAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND AND THE COUNTY OF SULLIVAN FOR  
\$35,500 (NCTD) IN HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EQUIPMENT  
FOR ITS USE AS PART OF THE REGIONAL HAZMAT TEAM  
FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2018  
AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES]  
(\$35,500)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, Section 119-o of Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York authorizes municipal governments to perform together that which each government is authorized to perform individually and requires that any intermunicipal cooperation agreement be approved by each participating municipal corporation by a majority vote of the voting strength of its governing body; and

WHEREAS, The County of Rockland ("County") and the County of Sullivan are municipal corporations as defined by Section 119-n of Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution 463 of 2015, the Rockland County Legislature approved acceptance of a Hazardous Materials Grant in the amount of \$142,000 from the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 in order to enhance the capabilities of the Regional HazMat Team; and

WHEREAS, As grantee of the Hazardous Materials Grant, the County of Rockland is responsible for the purchasing and distribution of the hazardous materials equipment to the Regional HazMat Team, which includes the Counties of Rockland, Orange, Ulster and Sullivan; and

WHEREAS, The County of Sullivan will receive \$35,500 in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for the purchase of the hazardous materials equipment for the this agreement is available in Dept. GE05, line E5060; and

WHEREAS, Neither this resolution nor the intermunicipal cooperation agreement hereby approved will require the expenditure of any County funds; and

WHEREAS, The Office of Fire and Emergency Services is recommending that the County enter into an intermunicipal cooperation agreement with the County of Sullivan for the receipt of \$35,500 (NCTD) in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team for the period from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, The Public Safety and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the intermunicipal cooperation agreement between the County of Rockland and the County of Sullivan to receive \$35,500 (NCTD) in hazardous materials equipment for its use as part of the Regional HazMat Team for the period from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2018 and authorizes execution of the intermunicipal cooperation agreement by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for the purchase of the hazardous materials equipment for this agreement is available in Dept. GE05, line E5060; and be it further

RESOLVED, That neither this resolution nor the intermunicipal cooperation agreement hereby approved will require the expenditure of any County funds.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 7780

Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Aron B. Wieder, Sponsor  
Hon. Lon M. Hofstein, Sponsor  
Hon. Richard C. Diaz, Sponsor  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 567 OF 2015  
APPROVING THE EXTENSION OF AND AMENDMENT TO  
THE AGREEMENT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
WITH BERKSHIRE FARM CENTER AND SERVICES FOR YOUTH  
TO PROVIDE NON-SECURE DETENTION PROGRAMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT  
OF SOCIAL SERVICES UNDER RFB-RC-2011-019  
EXERCISING THE THIRD YEAR OPTION TERM OF THE AGREEMENT FROM  
DECEMBER 1, 2015 THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 2016 AND INCREASING THE  
AMOUNT OF THE AGREEMENT BY \$159,030.00 FOR THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 1, 2015  
THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 2016 FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$652,288.05  
FOR THE FULL PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 1, 2011 THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 2016  
WITH NO REMAINING OPTION TERMS AVAILABLE  
AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES]  
(\$652,288.05)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Diaz, Mrs. Low-Hogan, Mrs. Paul and Mr. Soskin and adopted

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 19 of 2012, the Legislature of Rockland County approved the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Berkshire Farm Center and Services for Youth ("Berkshire"), 13640 Route 22, Canaan, New York 12029, to provide Non-Secure Detention Programs for the Department of Social Services under RFP-RC-2011-019 (the "RFP") in an amount not to exceed \$193,486.50 for the two (2) year period from December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2013, with three (3) remaining one (1) year option terms; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 656 of 2013, the Legislature approved the extension of and amendment to the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Berkshire to provide Non-Secure Detention Programs for the Department of Social Services under the RFP, exercising the first year option term of the agreement from December 1, 2013 through November 30, 2014, and increasing the amount of the agreement by \$163,270.80 for the period from December 1, 2013 through November 30, 2014, for a total amount not to exceed \$356,757.30 for the full period from December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2014, with two (2) remaining one (1) year option terms; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 495 of 2014, the Legislature approved the extension of and amendment to the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Berkshire to provide Non-Secure Detention Programs for the Department of Social Services under the RFP, exercising the second year option term of the agreement from December 1, 2014 through November 30, 2015, and increasing the amount of the agreement by \$136,500.75 for the period from December 1, 2013 through November 30, 2015, for a total amount not to exceed \$493,258.05 for the full period from December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2015, with one (1) remaining one (1) year option term; and

WHEREAS, By this resolution, the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services and the Director of Purchasing recommend to the County Executive and the Legislature that the County further extend and amend the agreement with Berkshire, exercising the third year option term of the agreement from December 1, 2015 through November 30, 2016, and increasing the amount of the agreement by \$159,030.00 for the period from December 1, 2015 through November 30, 2016, for a total amount not to exceed \$652,288.05 for the full period from December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2016, with no remaining option terms available; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for this extension/amendment to the agreement exists in the 2015 Budget of the Department of Social Services and is contingent upon 2016 budget appropriations; and

WHEREAS, Local Law No. 18 of 1996 provides for the Legislature to approve the “execution of all contracts in excess of \$100,000 entered into by the County”; and

WHEREAS, The Multi-Services and Budget and Finance Committees of this Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the extension of and amendment to the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Berkshire Farm Center and Services for Youth, 13640 Route 22, Canaan, New York 12029, to provide Non-Secure Detention Programs for the Department of Social Services under RFP-RC-2011-019, exercising the third year option term of the agreement from December 1, 2015 through November 30, 2016, and increasing the amount of the agreement by \$159,030.00 for the period from December 1, 2015 through November 30, 2016, for a total amount not to exceed \$652,288.05 for the full period from December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2016, with no remaining option terms available, and hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute the extension/amendment to the agreement, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this extension/amendment to the agreement exists in the 2015 Budget of the Department of Social Services and is contingent upon 2016 budget appropriations.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 7171

- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 568 OF 2015  
 APPROVING REPLACEMENT OF  
 AIR CONDITIONING COILS IN  
 ACADEMIC II BUILDING AND THE  
 NORTH TOWER OF THE CULTURAL ARTS CENTER  
 ON THE MAIN CAMPUS  
 (ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE)  
 (\$27,124)**

Mr. Grant offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Earl and adopted

WHEREAS, Rockland Community College had to undertake replacement of air conditioning coils of Air Handler 2 located in the Academic II building, and the North Tower located in the Cultural Arts Center; and

WHEREAS, The replacement of the air conditioning coils was completed by Hauser Bros., Inc., 17 Old Schoolhouse Road, Orangeburg, New York 10962 on May 29, 2015 (Academic II) and June 12, 2015 ( Cultural Arts Center); and

WHEREAS, Hauser Bros., Inc. is an approved County Contractor; and

WHEREAS, The total cost of repairs was \$27,124; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 42 of 2015, the Rockland Community College Board of Trustees unanimously approved the repair, half of the total cost of replacement to be reimbursed by the SUNY Office for Capital Facilities; and

WHEREAS, In order to receive reimbursement from SUNY Capital Facilities a resolution is needed from the Rockland County Legislature approving this request; and

WHEREAS, The Planning & Public Works and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County approve Rockland Community College's replacement of air conditioning coils of Air Handler 2 located in the Academic II building, and the North Tower of the Cultural Arts Center in the amount of \$27,124.

The vote resulted as follows:

- |           |    |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| Ayes:     | 16 | (Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe) |
| U.A. Nay: | 01 | (Legislator Murphy)   |

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5726

- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon Aron B. Wieder, Sponsor
- Hon. Lon M. Hofstein, Sponsor
- Hon. Richard C. Diaz, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 569 OF 2015  
 RE-DESIGNATING THE ROCKLAND COUNTY  
 EXECUTIVE’S OFFICE AS THE TOURISM  
 PROMOTION AGENCY FOR THE  
 COUNTY OF ROCKLAND – FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016  
 [OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE]**

Mr. Soskin offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Hofstein and Chairman Wolfe and adopted

WHEREAS, The State of New York makes tourism funds available to counties on a matching basis for local and regional tourism promotion; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 541 of 2014, the Legislature of Rockland County re-designated the Rockland County Executive’s Office as the Tourism Promotion Agency for fiscal year 2014-2015; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to re-designate the County Executive’s Office for fiscal year 2015-2016 in order to apply for State matching funds; and

WHEREAS, The Multi-Services Committee of this Legislature have met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby re-designates the Rockland County Executive’s Office as the Tourism Promotion Agency for the County of Rockland for fiscal year 2015-2016 in order to make application for the maximum amount of matching funds to promote tourism in Rockland County.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 2870

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Aron B. Wieder, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Lon M. Hofstein, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Richard C. Diaz, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Christopher J. Carey, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Nancy Low-Hogan, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Joseph L. Meyers, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Patrick J. Moroney, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. John A. Murphy, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 570 OF 2015  
APPOINTMENT OF ILEANA ECKERT, OF GARNERVILLE, NEW YORK  
TO THE ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Mr. Soskin offered the following resolution, which was seconded by the entire Legislature and unanimously adopted

WHEREAS, by Resolution 403 of 2013, Dorothy "Penny" Jennings was reappointed to the Rockland Community College Board of Trustees for a term of office that expires on June 30, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Dorothy "Penny" Jennings submitted her resignation in February of 2015; and

WHEREAS, it has been recommended that Ileana Eckert of Garnerville, New York, be appointed to the Rockland Community College Board of Trustees to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Dorothy "Penny" Jennings for the remainder of the term, which term would expire on June 30, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Multi Services Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and by a unanimous vote approved this resolution; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County hereby appoints Ileana Eckert to fill the unexpired term of Dorothy "Penny" Jennings as member of the Rockland Community College Board of Trustees, which term expires on June 30, 2018; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County expresses its appreciation and thanks to Dorothy "Penny" Jennings for her years of dedicated service to the Board of Trustees of Rockland Community College and to the County of Rockland as a whole; and authorizes the Clerk to the Legislature to send a copy of this resolution to Dorothy "Penny" Jennings with our thanks; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk to the Legislature shall notify the Rockland Community College Board of Trustees and the appointee of this resolution.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 4065

Hon: Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor

Hon. Aron B. Wieder, Co-Sponsor

Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 571 OF 2015  
AMENDING RULE 149-11(D) OF THE RULES OF THE LEGISLATURE TO CLARIFY  
THAT A MOTION TO WAIVE THE RULES TO CONSIDER NEW BUSINESS IS  
DEBATABLE**

Mr. Hood, Jr. offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Carey, Mr. Meyers and Mr. Schoenberger and adopted

WHEREAS, §149-11(D) of the Rules of the Legislature currently reads as follows:

§ 149-11. Time requirements.

D. Any new business matter, in order to be considered at a regular or adjourned meeting of the Legislature, must be an emergency, and prior to a request for a waiver of the rules the mover must explain why the proposed new business item is an emergency and shall require a vote of at least 2/3 (12 votes) to waive the rules of the Legislature.

; and

WHEREAS; while it has been the historical practice that a motion to waive the rules to consider new business is debatable, it does not specifically state so in the section; and

WHEREAS, the Rules Committee has met, considered and by a unanimous vote, approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that Section 149-11(D) of the Rules of the Legislature shall read as follows:

§ 149-11. Time requirements.

D. Any new business matter, in order to be considered at a regular or adjourned meeting of the Legislature, must be an emergency, and prior to a request for a waiver of the rules the mover must explain why the proposed new business item is an emergency and shall require a vote of at least 2/3 (12 votes) to waive the rules of the Legislature. **A motion to waive the rules of the Legislature to consider new business is debatable.**

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

;

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
HON. GEORGE PARNES**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following memorial, which was seconded by Chairman Wolfe and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Hon. George Parnes.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
CATHRYN LIGGIO**

Mr. Murphy offered the following memorial, which was seconded by Mr. Moroney and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Cathryn Liggio.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
LEONARD SULLIVAN**

Mr. Moroney offered the following memorial, which was seconded by Mr. Murphy and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Leonard Sullivan.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
DOROTHY DANZIG MASCH**

Mrs. Cornell offered the following memorial, which was seconded by Mrs. Low-Hogan and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Dorothy Danzig Masch.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
SAEED JAFFREY**

Mrs. Cornell offered the following memorial, which was seconded by the entire Legislature and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Saeed Jaffrey.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
MICHAEL GALVIN**

Chairman Wolfe offered the following memorial, which was seconded by entire Legislature and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Michael Galvin.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 572 OF 2015  
ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Jobson offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Wieder and adopted:  
(11:00 p.m.)

RESOLVED, that the meeting of the Legislature is hereby adjourned to Tuesday, December 15, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Cornell, Diaz, Earl, Grant, Hofstein, Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Meyers, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Hood, Jr., Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Respectfully Submitted,

DARCY SHAPIN-GREENBERG  
Proceedings Clerk