

**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 Tuesday, December 4, 2012 at 6:00 P.M., pursuant to the adjournment of the November 20, 2012 meeting.

Very truly yours,

Laurence O. Toole  
Clerk to the Legislature

Dated at New City, New York  
This 29<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012

---

The Legislature of Rockland County convened in regular session pursuant to the adjournment of the November 20, 2012 meeting.

A Roll Call being taken at 6:08 p.m., the following Legislators were present and answered to their names:

Christopher J. Carey  
Edwin J. Day  
Toney L. Earl  
Michael M. Grant  
Douglas J. Jobson  
Nancy Low-Hogan  
Jay Hood, Jr.  
Joseph L. Meyers  
Patrick J. Moroney  
John A. Murphy  
Ilan S. Schoenberger  
Philip Soskin  
Frank P. Sparaco  
Aron B. Wieder  
Alden H. Wolfe, Vice Chairman  
Harriet D. Cornell, Chairwoman

Late: Legislator Aney Paul (6:29 p.m.)

---

Honorable Douglas J. Jobson, Legislator, District 1 led in the Salute to the Flag and delivered the invocation.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 534 OF 2012  
ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF LEGISLATIVE MEETINGS  
NOVEMBER 13, 2012 AND NOVEMBER 20, 2012**

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

Resolved, that the transcribed minutes of the Legislative meetings of November 13, 2012 and November 20, 2012, as recorded by the Clerk and presented to the Legislature, be and they are hereby adopted.

---

**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 **4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2012, at 6:05 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law creating a Rockland County Deficit Reduction Act (RCDRA).

Dated: New City, New York  
November 19, 2012

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

---

The Chairwoman opened the public hearing and the following person appeared and spoke:

- ❖ Frank Grandel, Expressed concerns

---

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. 535 OF 2012  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Jobson offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mrs. Low-Hogan and unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed. (6:15 p.m.)

---

**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 **4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2012, at 6:10 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law overriding the tax levy limit for fiscal year 2013 in the county of Rockland.

Dated: New City, New York  
November 19, 2012

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

---

The Chairwoman opened the public hearing and there were no speakers.

---

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. 536 OF 2012  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Wolfe offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Jobson and unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed. (6:16 p.m.)

---

**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 **4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2012, at 6:15 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law entitled "Rockland County Mandate and Taxation Information Act".

Dated: New City, New York  
November 19, 2012

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

---

The Chairwoman opened the public hearing and there were no speakers.

---

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. 537 OF 2012  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Jobson offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Soskin and unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed. (6:17 p.m.)

---

**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 **4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2012, at 6:20 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law entitled "Rockland County Taxation Transparency Act".

Dated: New City, New York  
November 19, 2012

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

---

The Chairwoman opened the public hearing and there were no speakers.

---

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. 538 OF 2012  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Mr. Sparaco offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Jobson and unanimously adopted:

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed. (6:20 p.m.)

---

Legislator Aney Paul arrived at meeting.

---

**LOCAL LAW NO. 10 OF 2012  
COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
STATE OF NEW YORK**

(Introduced by: Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger)  
(Co.-Sponsor: Hon. Alden H. Wolfe)

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following amended Local Law, which was seconded by Mr. Murphy and Mr. Wolfe and adopted:

A local law creating a Rockland County Deficit Reduction Act (RCDRA).

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

Section 1. Title.  
This local law shall be known as the Rockland County Deficit Reduction Act (RCDRA).

Section 2. Legislative Intent.  
It is the intention of the Legislature of Rockland County to develop a written plan to reduce the deficit in Rockland County over a series of years. In 2012 the Legislature of Rockland County had requested from the New York State legislature a deficit bond, which would have allowed the County of Rockland to bond the deficit of approximately 80 million dollars and pay the bond back over a period of ten years. The deficit reduction bond was approved by the New York State Assembly but not approved by the New York State Senate. As a result thereof, the County of Rockland must develop its own internal plan to reduce the deficit.

Section 3. Definitions.  
A. "Deficit" as used in this local law shall be defined as the unassigned fund balance of the general fund as certified by the county auditor as of the end of each fiscal year, to wit: December 31.  
B. "Deficit Reduction Fund" is defined as a fund created and appropriated in the annual budget and funded each year as provided in Section 4 of this law, entitled "for deficit reduction". This fund shall be "reserved" for reduction of the budget deficit and no monies, once deposited in the fund, can be removed or transferred without prior approval of the County Executive and the Legislature by legislative resolution duly adopted pursuant to the Rockland County Charter.

Section 4. Fund for Deficit Reduction.  
The County of Rockland, in adopting its annual budget, commencing with the budget for calendar year 2014, shall allocate a sum of no less than 10 million dollars on a reoccurring annual basis for the reduction of the deficit of Rockland County fund, which sum shall be held in the account designated "for deficit reduction", which account is a deficit reserve fund and cannot and will not be used for any purpose other than to eliminate the deficit in Rockland County. Any withdrawal of funds shall require a resolution which must be approved by two-thirds a majority of the Legislature.

Section 5. Deposit of Funds  
Such annual budgetary allocation of no less than 10 million dollars, in the fund "for deficit reduction" shall be cumulatively held and deposited in a depository approved by the Rockland County Investment Policy.

Section 6. Effective date.  
This local law shall become effective upon filing with the New York State secretary of state.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)  
Nay: 01 (Legislator Meyers)



**Debate:**

Mr. Schoenberger

Beginning calendar year 2014 the County shall allocate a sum of no less than \$10,000,000 on a reoccurring annual basis for the reduction of the deficit of Rockland County, which sum will be held in an account for deficit reduction. The account is a deficit reserve fund and cannot and will not be used for any other purpose. The concept behind this is that we asked for a deficit reduction bond from the State Legislature for \$80,000,000 for ten years without any sales tax increase. It was passed by the State Assembly, but not passed by the State Senate. Had that deficit reduction been approved by the State \$80,000,000 for ten years would have been \$8,000,000 plus interest, which would have made it \$10,000,000 per year, we would have had to appropriate that money to pay off that deficit bond. I felt that by creating a law, which would have required us to pay that money as if we had that deficit bond we would then be able to reduce the deficit by ourselves. It is less preferable to getting a deficit bond, because if you get the \$80,000,000 you have the money and it is earning interest in an account. If the State is not going to give it to us we have to do it ourselves. So that is the proposal behind this law. It does not mean we will not try to pursue a deficit bond, which I think we should in 2013. If we are successful then there will be no need for this law. Either we get a deficit bond and we have to pay it off the same way we pay off other bonded indebtedness or we do it ourselves by raising the money and pay off the deficit at a rate of at least \$10,000,000 per year. The deficit must be addressed and the way to make sure that this government, regardless of who sits in the County Executive's seat and regardless of who sits in this Legislative body, addresses it is to make it a binding Local Law commencing 2014.

I tried to make it commencing 2013 and to fund it for 2013 to use the money that would have been had from the LDC proposed by the County Executive, but our consultants, who are our auditors, told us that since that money could not be guaranteed to be received in 2013 if we did it that way that proposed revenue would not be booked as a revenue, but booked as a deficiency or debt. In fact what would happen is our deficit would increase by that amount of money. So that was the exact opposite of what I wanted to accomplish by this law. I want to reduce the deficit not increase it so that is why I proposed the law to be effective 2014 at which time we will be able to have a LDC, which will result in the sale of our nursing home. Thank you.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. Schoenberger

We have created a series of revenues this year, which for the first time is being applied to our budget this year. Much of the revenue we created for this year except for the property tax increase went into effect only partially for this year. In addition to that the sale of the nursing home, as I mentioned, would go into effect we believe in 2014 and the revenues received from the nursing home should be applied towards deficit reduction.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

The revenues you are talking about from this year is what?

Mr. Schoenberger

We increased property taxes; we did chargebacks to the towns for college costs and election costs, automobile tax, energy tax, cell phone tax and a hotel/motel tax. Most of those were only partially effective this year. Some like the energy tax only for the last two months of the year. We are going to be feeling the full impact and benefits of those taxes going forward and we are cutting more this year. 2014 we should have divested ourselves of the Mental Health Inpatient Unit. As I understand it as we sit here today the Rockland County Mental Health Inpatient Unit is being transferred to Nyack Hospital. Good Samaritan Hospital closed their inpatient unit, which was the Frawley Clinic. Nyack Hospital is opening one and they agreed to take our Mental Health Inpatient Unit and recreate it. All this has to go through the approval of the State process, which takes a long time. We have just received approval from the State to transfer our Mental Health Unit to Nyack Hospital. Nyack Hospital is expecting to have before the end of the year approval from the State to begin a mental health inpatient unit. When that is done they have a pending HEAL Grant for \$8,000,000 where they will renovate Nyack Hospital for mental health inpatient. We hope this transfer will take place at the beginning of 2014. As soon as they get the approval from the State, which we hope will be before the end of the year, they can then access the grant and do their construction. Hopefully by the beginning of 2014 they will be running the Mental Inpatient Unit instead of the County. That will be in excess of 350 employees, salaries, benefits and everything else that will be taken off the County payroll beginning 2014 and will become a Nyack Hospital charge.

There are a series of things like that which are going on. All of that will help cut County costs and help generate the revenue to deal with the deficit. But rather than take a chance on the money being spent somewhere else the Deficit Reduction Act should be created to lock up the money to reduce the County's deficit.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

The approval process that was referred to before, does it have to be approved by both the County Executive and the Legislature?

Mr. Schoenberger

Yes, the idea is that the money should be put into reserve account and it can only be used for the purpose specified. No money can be moved or taken out of the reserve account without both the Legislature's and the County Executive's approval. To reserve an account is to give it a level of protection where it cannot be used for a purpose other than for which it is designated. This will be an account designated for deficit reduction only.

Mr. Meyers

I support the spirit behind having a deficit reduction. I have tried over the years to help bring our budget into balance. We don't actually have any money now to put into this account. My concern is I don't like to create things that look like it could be perceived as a sham or look like we are doing something when we are actually doing nothing. So until we have the \$10,000,000 to put into the account I think we should defer passage of this law, because it is an empty law right now. I think it creates the impression that we actually have the money to put into this account. It is sort of like going to the bank to open up a bank account with no money to put into the account. I don't want to participate in passing something that looks like we are moving forward when we are just really standing still and running in place. I won't be able to support this tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Moroney

I disagree with my colleague Mr. Meyers. I think it is a good idea. I have some problems with it. In my twenty-three years here I have seen this happen before. No matter what lock box you put in it has a way of getting out, which makes me skeptical. I understand Mr. Schoenberger's endeavors to create this fund. I think it is a good idea moving forward. Maybe we should have done it a long time ago.

Every year we see the State of New York increase our mandates. This year it is \$25,000,000. Now we have to try to come up with another \$10,000,000 on top of that to put in that lock box. We are not doing anything bad here by creating this law and it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Schoenberger, I would like to make a motion to amend this by adding to the Local Law that any withdrawal of funds shall require a resolution which must be approved by two-thirds a majority of the Legislature. I think that enhances the fact that it will stay in the account for the purpose that it was put in there originally. I don't know who the County Executive is going to be. I think it would be better protection for the \$10,000,000 if must be approved by two-thirds a majority of the Legislature. I like the idea moving forward with a plan and something we should all consider very carefully, because we cannot keep going down this road or this fiscal cliff. We are getting to the edge every year and it is getting worse. I will support it with the amendment.

Mr. Schoenberger

This is not a sham. This is not an empty law. It should be done now rather than a year from now for 2014, because if we do it now we are putting both branches of government on notice, the public on notice, the rating agencies on notice and the world on notice that this is what we are going to do in 2014. This will make it happen for 2014 and if we wait too long the money that may have been allocated to this account may then be spent elsewhere. I believe that something must be done and that is why I proposed this law. If there is a better way to do this I am absolutely willing to listen.

Mr. Moroney, I respect your suggestion. I think it is a good suggestion. I am willing to listen to a better way. If the will of this body is that it is a two-thirds vote to take it out I am more than happy to agree to that. So if you are asking me if I will accept your amendment the answer is yes.

Mr. Day

I was actually going to bring up the same issue. My concern frankly was that we had two buildings for sale this year that we were told was going towards deficit reduction. When it all came to pass it was used for the current year, which is not deficit reduction it is dealing with operational issues during a current year. I think a two-thirds vote is necessary and desirable. Right now things look bleak for funding it and hopefully things will change as time progresses, but I think the two-thirds vote in this body is a critical piece to this. Thank you.

Mr. Jobson

I will support this tonight. I think it is a good idea. I still want to push forward in 2013 the bond. It is shameful that the County was left hanging as they have been by our so-called leadership in Albany. The Senate really deserves the heard of the blame, because our Senator couldn't get this taken care of up there and we deserve a partner to help us. The County should not be left hanging. The mandates that come down each and every year increase and this year is \$25,000,000. I know people get angry with government, but the towns push things up to the County and the State pushes things down to the County level and we play this hodgepodge of government of who is going to pay for it or how much and for how long. This is the nonsense that happens in government with programs that really do benefit people and communities. It is shameful that we play this hodgepodge with government, with programs and with peoples lives sometimes. I will support this tonight. I want to go back to Albany and put pressure on our so-called leaders, because we shouldn't have to take this route. The State should be helping us. We told them we would do all the heavy lifting, but at least they can give us an approval on our bond. If this is the route we have to take then we have to do it.

Chairwoman Cornell

I certainly did appreciate the bipartisan group that we took to Albany. You helped us, thank you.

Mr. Wolfe

I so support this legislation. I think it is important primarily because it takes an option away. One might look at boxing us into a corner as a bad thing, but I think in this instance it is a good thing, because it puts the County Executive's feet to the fire being the branch of government that actually operates the government on a day-to-day basis. The County Executive is in the best position to say, "I have a budget that I have to come up with at the end of this year and plan for the following year." He is in the best position to make decisions about what changes need to be made to accomplish that. I think this is a great idea.

I just want to clarify about deficit financing that should be mentioned at this point. There is a misconception about what deficit financing really is. Deficit financing is not taking on additional debt to pay for our operations. It is not additional debt at all. In fact it is no different than refinancing your house. The deficit is money we already owe so if we take out a bond all we are doing is refinancing our deficit and spreading out the payments over time. We asked New York simply for permission. We have not asked for a single handout. We just want permission to do what we think is right. I want to make sure that the people in the public understand deficit financing is not taking on additional debt. We are not taking on additional debt to pay our bills we are refinancing. Thank you.

Mr. Grant

I am supporting this. It imposes a significant amount of discipline upon both branches of government, Legislature and Executive, in terms of predetermining that there will be an allowance made for the deficit reduction and the money will not be available for general operations. I think it would not be necessary if the Senate would have gone along with the idea of a deficit bond to handle the problem, because that would have incurred an obligation on the part of the County and by law we would be required to satisfy that obligation. We can't rely on the Assembly and Senate to make that deficit financing available to us so this would impose another layer of discipline. It makes the very difficult choices we have to make tonight that much harder next year. This is a very difficult thing to do.

I am concerned about one unintended consequence and I apologize that I didn't raise this in committee. If we were to receive deficit financing from the State Legislature and we were to incur a bond payment and if it was \$80,000,000 that we asked for that would not satisfy the whole deficit. Would we be required to not only make that payment, but also set aside \$10,000,000 per year until the deficit was retired?

Mr. Schoenberger

We will be going to Albany to try and get a deficit bond, which will be in the amount that is certified by our auditors for the calendar year, which is the last certification that just ended in 2011. My recollection is that deficit was around \$96,000,000 in that audit. The audit however included the \$18,000,000 for the PBC, because it was still on the books on December 31, 2011. That \$18,000,000 was paid by the County in cash to eliminate the deficiency bond in June of this year. We are probably talking in about the same range. It could be \$80,000,000 or \$85,000,000. We will ask for a deficit bond. This Legislature will consult with the Commissioner of Finance and our auditors and we will ask for a number that is within the range of what we believe we need. If you remember the discussions before we asked for the \$80,000,000 over ten years, nobody exactly knew what the number was. We picked a number that we felt was safe enough and I imagine the same process will followed. If we go the deficit bond from the State of New York we would not need this law. This is a law as an alternate not providing with the deficit bond that we ask for.

Mr. Carey

I agree with Legislator Moroney's amendment. The sale of the properties this year was supposed to go toward the debt reduction, but it was put toward this year's deficit. I would want to make sure this money couldn't be used towards to operating budget. I support this tonight with the two-thirds.

Mr. Schoenberger

I just want to acknowledge legislator Jobson. He did go to Albany with us. A number of us went to meet with the Assembly Finance Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Then we went back a second time and met with the Assembly Finance Committee and the Senate Finance Committee and their staff. The first meeting we met with the Chair of the Assembly Finance Committee. I believe Doug Jobson joined us on the second trip. He was not the only person their in a bipartisan spirit. Sean Matthews, Deputy County Executive came with us. We also met with the Governor's staff. On the second trip the County Executive himself came along.

I don't have documentation of this and I am only going to share with you what I heard today. There was a Senate Democratic caucus and Republican caucus in this last two years and there were four people who call themselves the Independent caucus, which was led by Senator Jeff Klein. What I heard today is that the Independent caucus had grown to five and there was an agreement reached between the Senate Majority Leader Dean Skelos and the leader of the Independent caucus Jeff Klein that each one of them would be the Majority Leader two weeks at a time. In that Independent caucus there were four State Democratic Senators who broke with the Democratic Majority and went Independent and there is a fifth one who I believe is Republican who has joined them. Amongst those four was our own State Senator David Carlucci. If Jeff Klein is going to be a Majority Leader for two weeks and then Dean Skelos for two weeks and then Jeff Klein for two weeks and then Dean Skelos for two weeks I am hopeful that Senator Carlucci will use his considerable power and influence to help us obtain this deficit bond in the upcoming year. Thank you.

Mr. Jobson

I think the fifth person who joined to day was Malcolm Smith. It is even more shameful that these guys have to rotate, because they have to have a title for a couple of weeks at a time instead of worrying about taking care of the people. It is shameful. I hope you are right and I hope we make some headway.

---

**LOCAL LAW NO. 7 OF 2012****COUNTY OF ROCKLAND****STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following Local Law, which was seconded by Mr. Soskin and adopted:

A local law overriding tax levy limit for fiscal year 2013 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 2013.**

For fiscal year 2013, 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 2013 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:	14	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Low-Hogan, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
Nays:	03	(Legislators Jobson, Meyers, Sparaco)

**Debate:****Mr. Meyers**

The New York State Tax Cap Law, I did not support it at the time when the Tax Cap Law was first passed, because I thought it was one of those laws that they pass at a senior level of government where they don't give the local governments the tools to be able to live within the means of the law. So the Tax Cap Law was in some ways itself an unfunded mandate that municipalities and school districts had to live within a certain tax cap without giving those municipalities to tools to do it. The Tax Cap Law did not apply to New York State income taxes or any taxes imposed at the State level. It was simply the State government imposing tax caps at local levels. As the Tax Cap Law was passed I do notice that many municipalities have been able to live within the tax cap or have kept their taxes increases much lower so it did inspire local governments and school districts to be more cognizant to the amount of money they are raising from tax levy's. In that respect it focuses public attention and did do a good thing. The law itself was meaningless as a substantive matter, but as a public relations matter I think it did help local taxpayers.

Here in Rockland County we have a very bad fiscal situation. Clearly we have to raise more revenue through a property tax increase, because you can't meet all of our needs just by cutting expenses. When I watch CNN and see what is going on at the Federal level I see Republicans taking positions that they are not willing to raise much in the way of revenues in terms of tax rates and Democrats that don't want to do the cuts. I always firmly believed here in the Legislature that it was a package of revenue increases and significant cuts that would bring us to a healthier fiscal climate. I don't believe that we have achieved that. I think that we are very much relying on tax increases rather than cuts.

I am not going to vote to override the tax cap this evening not because I don't believe that we need to raise more revenue. The reason I am not voting for lifting the tax cap on this occasion is because it is a prelude to a vote for a budget that has an 18% tax increase and I don't want to have any votes from myself tonight that would send a mixed message to my constituents that I support an 18% tax increase, because I don't. Since this is a prelude to that I won't support this tonight.

Mr. Murphy

The 2% number is an oversimplification of Rockland County's problems. For more than half of the years that I have been here Rockland County government has held the property taxes for County government to be the lowest percentage in the State of New York. We have been running government for the past twenty years on the sales tax. Now that mandates force us to raise more money we can't raise the sales tax enough to pay for the increase in the mandates. So we have to look to raise the property taxes. 2%, when you have essentially a 2% tax rate, is not a lot of money. In those counties that have high County property taxes 2% brings in a great deal of revenue. The 2% cap is reasonable for counties that have an enormous property tax base. By us holding our property tax rate to second lowest in the State 2% of the second lowest doesn't generate enough revenue. For years I have argued that there is a lack of clear understanding of the property tax the average homeowners pays. During my tenure here property taxes for County government has constituted less than 6% of the total property tax bill. We are now being punished for that, because we need a lot of money. We can't get it from the sales tax so we have to revisit that low property tax base. No politician ever wants to raise property taxes in an area that is purported to be one of the ten highest taxes municipalities in the richest country in the world. That is why during my career here I have been loathed to raise the property tax and always opted to raise the sales tax, but now this strategy has come to be our worst nightmare. 2% is \$118.00 for this County on a home and I wish it wasn't a nickel, but the alternatives to that \$118.00 have a crushing affect not on the quality of life, but on programs that we actually can't do without. In a time of the threat of diseases generated by mosquitoes the concept of eliminating our mosquito control program is ludicrous. When you hear that we are circumventing the 2% understand where we were for the past twenty years – the lowest possible County property tax rate in the State of New York.

I am going to circumvent the 2% tax cap, because the alternatives are horrible and the average penalty to a homeowner is \$118.00. While it is more some can pay it is the cheapest out of our dilemma. Thank you.

Chairwoman Cornell

I have a memorandum prepared by Legislative Counsel where they incorporate information from the New York State Association of Counties. I think I will take this moment to read a little bit of it. We haven't gotten to the real discussion of the budget, but County Law Section 358 indicates that the amended budget must be balanced. Of course we have to adopt the budget this week no later than the 7<sup>th</sup>. If the Legislature takes no action then the budget submitted by the County Executive is deemed to be adopted. If the Legislature rejects the proposed budget or they fail to pass their own version the budget submitted by the County Executive is also deemed to be adopted. If the Legislature fails to pass the override of a 2% cap and a budget goes into effect with more than a 2% increase any levy money in excess of the 2% limit shall be placed in a reserve according to requirements of the Office of the New York State Comptroller paid for by the County and this money will only be allowed to be used to offset the property tax levy in the ensuing fiscal year. The New York State Association of Counties, which is an advocacy group for county governments indicates that in a scenario where a budget is proposed that is more than the allowable limit, and we have been given a budget that is more than the allowable limit, and the County Legislative body chooses not to vote on said proposal thereby allowing the tentative budget to be enacted without satisfying the override provision the State Comptroller has the power under the Tax Cap Law to step in and correct this inaction. The Comptroller's office has stated if the above happens they will consider the inaction of a vote to be a clerical error and shall place any levy money over the allowable levy limit into a reserve paid for by the County and the money will only be used to offset the property tax levy in the ensuing year.

I wanted to say this to my fellow Legislators, because we have both an opinion from our Legislative Counsel and an opinion from NYSAC based upon the State Comptroller.

Mr. Sparaco

I find it insulting in the first place to be presented with a budget from the County Executive's office that exceeded the 2% cap before even asking us whether or not we would exceed the cap and before even discussing it with any of us they just threw us their option, which was an 18% property tax hike. I thought they had to present their budget within the 2% and then we could override and change that budget. The whole concept of presenting a budget after the State government just passed a 2% property tax cap without even trying to live within the State law and just handing us the budget at 18% was insulting to me.

I would like to point out that property taxes have gone up around 85% in the last four years. If the 18% passes tonight you are looking at over 100% property tax increase over five years along with the energy tax, hotel tax, cell phone tax, and a few other taxes.

Legislator Meyers brought up Congress. If I felt that this was fair and somehow balanced with cuts and tax increases I would be willing to negotiate, but I don't see it that way. I would also like to point out that the highest-ranking Democrat in the State, Governor Cuomo, and a particular head of the Democratic Party in Rockland County, have both championed the tax cap. It has been part of their campaign platforms. Senator Carlucci has publicly chastised this body for breaking the tax cap. 85% of municipalities within the State are living within the tax cap and they seem to be extremely proud of that.

The truth of the matter is my colleagues and I differ on the role of County government. It is up to the voters to decide who is right. They speak during election time and you hear a lot of different things during campaign time. You heard me talk about how I wouldn't vote to break the property tax cap. You heard some of my colleagues say that they would and we all got elected. I did make a campaign promise. I did go to the Journal News Editorial debate and I did receive their endorsement after promising them and all my constituents and my supporters that I would not break the tax cap. My colleagues and I differ on our expectations of County government. My expectations of County government could live within the 2% property tax cap and to many of my colleagues that is blasphemy. I do believe in a smaller, thinner and less cumbersome County government. We can definitely live within the cap. Unfortunately for business owners, property owners and me my point of view is a minority amongst the minority. There are people out there that do not want this cap broken, don't want tax increases and they deserve a voice to. Government monies and taxpayer monies fund the contract agencies that get their money for dance clubs, I don't agree with that, but there are Legislators up here that do agree with that and think that is the role of government. I don't agree with that and the people that agree with me in the public, my constituents, have the right to have their voices heard on this body. Therefore, I will not be voting to break the cap this evening. Thank you.

Mr. Day

Last year, and for good and proper reason, I reluctantly did support lifting the cap. We were directly told by the NYS Comptroller that not to do so would have thrown our finances into a worse situation than they were already as the proposed "one time fee" was deemed not just improper but also illegal. In addition to all the other demands such as state mandates, we are facing about \$14 million shortfall from a gross overestimation by the administration of projected workforce concessions, even with a contract of three years of a 0% raise. It was also reported to me that co-pays for the pharmacy were offered by the union yet disregarded by the administration. In addition, over \$17 million that our Legislative leadership asserted would be so also never materialized. That is a hit of over \$30 million.

I certainly agree that state mandates are killing us, and have spoken in agreement to that reality many times. The nine mandates that make up 90% of the bill, commonly referred to as the "9 and 90" mandates, mathematically automatically deals the county a deficit of \$1.5 million dollars if we maintain the politically convenient 2% cap. I have said before that in my professional life, we strive to deliver product and service at a zero increase, but until the state stops driving up our costs and practices what it preaches and holds itself to a 2% cap, we will need to cut local services that we hold dear in Rockland to satisfy the beast in Albany. However, we also heard stories in the past about Summit Park making money and county receivables exceeding \$80 million, only to find that to be exaggerated or false. We are told by our own Sheriff that the hiring of fifteen officers for our jail is cost neutral, due to the elimination of overtime with that hiring. Later we're told by the administration that \$6 million of our 2013 state mandate cost is due to this hiring. I grow suspicious, given the fact that our own Finance Commissioner could not justify this claim, and that the math tells us that correction officers are not getting paid \$400,000 per year each!

This budget process, only about 4 weeks this year, should resemble our taking delivery of a car that needs an oil change and a tire check, maybe at worst a tune-up. What we get is a vehicle in need of an engine overhaul and rebuilt transmission. Then we are expected to fix it with a wrench and screwdriver, and along the way restoring what should be basic services at the expense of too many chiefs and patronage. As a practical not a political matter, and with all this, can this cap be maintained? Not this year. You cannot do that with the constraints placed on us including existing contracts, state mandates, etc. You certainly cannot do that when you are rolling in millions of 2012 missteps into this year's process and a factoring in a lot of doubt as to where the numbers truly lie. If I even remotely believed that we could, I would support the cap. While for this budget we must break it we absolutely must have a plan that will minimize the hit going forward, as many of the dollars approved today keep on affecting budgets for many tomorrows.

For the reasons detailed, I feel no ownership of this budget, and I could be politically expedient, and frankly irresponsible, and vote "no" to breaking the cap. But in order to make a difference and take a lead by proposing what I and others believe to be an enhancement of public safety with law enforcement and highway; public health with mosquito control; and some tax relief for our citizens from the proposed tax increases in front of us tonight, that is the only reason why I will vote to break the cap this year.

Amendments have been submitted for consideration by the full legislature that would amend the Budget and Finance Committee budget, and will actually reduce the tax increase in both the county executive's and the budget and finance proposed budgets by about one third, decreasing the impact to only about \$110 per year for an average home, and as a matter of comparison, about half of what the average Clarkstown property tax increase was this year. It seems to me that if we find additional monies as what we collectively identified and more that was reported in the budget & finance report, we should use those funds to provide property tax relief, especially after families absorbed a 30% property tax increase and energy tax last year.

Mr. Schoenberger

For those of you who have a budget book or for those of you who wish to go online to see the budget book I ask you when you get home to look at page C-22. That is the 2013 property tax levy and tax rate history. If you look at that you will see that in 1992 the County of Rockland's tax levy was about \$2.75 per \$1,000.00. It dropped to a low of \$1.10 in 2007 per \$1,000.00 of assessed value. In 2013 it is going up to \$2.50 per \$1,000.00 of assessed value, which is still .25 cents below the County tax rate of 1992. I say that in support of what Legislator Murphy said earlier. I have been here since 1996 and last year was the first year we had a really big property tax increase. For many of the years that I have been here the property tax rate has either stayed the same, gone up 2% or less and when I Chaired Budget and Finance Committee back in 1998-2000 one of those years we had a 17% property tax reduction. Like the proverbial Jacob, "seven years of plenty seven years of famine", we are into the seven years of famine. It is a very difficult time for everybody. \$2.75 per \$1,000.00 assessment in 1992 to \$2.50 per \$1,000.00 assessment in 2013, I quoted those numbers to you, but I don't want to be misleading – they also reflect the increased assessments over that period of time over that many years. The County has grown tremendously. Our assessment roles have grown tremendously. We are either the lowest property taxed County in New York State or the lowest. I think it is safe to say we are the second lowest.

Let's talk about lifting of the tax cap. Several towns did it this year, counties throughout the State have done it and are still doing it, and municipalities, cities and towns are doing it quite frequently. The real issue on the tax cap is about to come to fruition in the next couple of years is going to be the school districts. The school districts cannot do what we are doing tonight, which is hold a public hearing, pass a Local Law by 60% of our voters, and then lift the tax cap. The school districts need a public referendum. Many people feel they will not be getting a public referendum. If you were looking at an 18% property tax increase for school districts it would dwarf any property tax increase this County has ever done. It would make us small compared to them. They too have mandated costs. They too have had the pensions passed down to them. They too have State mandated programs and State mandated hiring levels. Right now those that have surpluses are using down their surpluses to not raise the tax cap. I am telling all of you that in a short period of time those surpluses will be done and then the school districts will have to go for a referendum to raise the tax cap. If they may it is not so easily passed as what we are doing tonight, which is by our body. If it doesn't pass and it doesn't happen or the school districts choose not to do it they will be cutting sports, after school activities, music and they will increase class size and cut special programs, because those are extra things that they do over and above the mandates. They will be like we are, reducing County government to where we are left with mandate activity and little else beyond that. The school districts are going to be in the same shape. If you are all concerned about the value of your homes, and what the future has to hold for this County you should be concerned about the tax cap and the affect it is going to have on school districts, because if they raise it your property taxes are going to skyrocket. We are just small piece. The school districts are about 80% of your property tax and we are about 6% to 7%. If the school districts raise the property tax all of us are going to have to dip into our pockets and pay a lot more. If they don't the quality of the school districts, what they provide and their educational services will decrease, which also affect your home values.

I say this to you, because we should all be aware of what the 2% tax cap really means and what it will mean in future years. The real issue on the tax cap is one to three years away with the school districts.

Mr. Carey

A year ago I was sitting out there newly elected with three others of my peers and outside looking in I thought that this was a broken process. Here I am a year later and the process hasn't changed. We really haven't changed or answered the hard questions. What is the role of County government? We grew over the last ten to twenty years and we had the sales revenues to support it. We all know how we got into this situation. I also said I was running on business principals and business experience. If I could sit here right now and tell you that I could get a budget within the 2% I would be voting to not break the cap. I know we can't do that, but I don't think we answered the strategic questions. Unfortunately 2014 is going to be big year with moving mental health to Nyack Hospital and potentially have a strategic decision to decide what we do with the rest of the hospital and do we go to an LDC. None of that is going to help us in 2013.

The Charter states that we have to get the budget by October 24<sup>th</sup> and we have to make our decision in December. All we were able to do last year was make incremental changes to the budget. The budget is set up for minor changes and tweaks. It is not set up for a County that is potentially \$114,000,000 in debt. I believe that we have to change how we do business or we will be having the same conversations that we are having right now year after year.

I can't sit here and tell you that I can get under the 2%. We haven't made decisions and we haven't enacted them that give us the latitude to get down to those levels. We can't have this same discussion next year. There are some things on the horizon that will potentially get us to that, but there has to be a willingness among my peers to make those hard decisions. Those decisions are coming up very soon. I think I will just be voting to score points to stay under the cap when in reality I couldn't look anybody in the eye and tell them that I know a way to get us there. Next year we shouldn't be having this same conversation. We can't add to this problem and I think currently we are. 18.4% is just too much to add to the 30% that we had last year.

I will ask the County Executive to give us a budget in the September timeframe or maybe earlier and multiyear projections that actually reflect some of the decisions that we make so we know when we are going to come out of this hole. We are kind of working blind and obviously I didn't sit here that we would miss four meetings, because of storms. I know that six week by itself is not enough time. I hope my fellow Legislators will support, as well as the County Executive and his team, to start looking at this January 1<sup>st</sup>. We do not need to start looking at this at the end of October. So reluctantly I will support this tonight to break the cap and I will do everything in power to not do that next year. Thank you.

Mr. Wolfe

I am going to compliment my colleagues Legislators Carey and Day, because you both really surprised me by your comments tonight. I want you to understand that it is not an insult it is a compliment, because to be honest I didn't expect you to vote to lift the cap, but through your comments, and I couldn't agree more, you recognize the fact that a County government is not a business and can't be run exactly like a business. There are certain realities and things that are entirely out of our control, like the lions share of our expenses. It is a very nice thing to say arbitrarily that 2% is a reasonable tax increase and if you go 2.1% suddenly that is an unreasonable tax increase and that is a decision that was not made by us it was a decision that was made in Albany and something that we had no involvement in. It was recently reported that this year 25% of municipalities are expected to seek to exceed the cap. It is up from 19% last year. I couldn't agree more with Legislator Schoenberger, there is a warning. Next year could be 30% if not more. The system is unsustainable. Counties are seemingly set up to fail through this burden of State mandates and really don't have a choice.

If you are voting against the lifting of the cap then you dam well better be prepared to offer \$13,000,000 in cuts to local share to this budget, because that is the difference. I am not talking about \$13,000,000 in expenses. I am talking \$13,000,000 in local share that is tax dollars. I will be supporting lifting the cap reluctantly. There is really no other choice it is simply the system that we have to deal with. I just want to respond to one point that Legislator Carey made about the budget process that is something that we talked about earlier this year at the Rules Committee jointly with Government Operations Committee. With consultation with myself, the Chairwoman Cornell and Counsel we have drafted a proposed Local Law for discussion that addresses possible changes to our Charter and the most important part of that is the budget process. I would have loved to have been actively working on that over the last few months, but it just was impossible to get scheduled. In 2013 we are going to take it up in earnest.

Mr. Grant

Last year I express my displeasure with the public policy provisions of the 2% tax cap. I thought it was bad public policy. I indicated at the time that the law was based on an expectation that was predicated on a fiction. The expectation that all municipalities will be able to adhere to the 2% cap I think the public bought that public relations campaign. It originated in Albany and trickled down to all of our communities. I have come to feel even more strongly that it is bad public policy for many of the reasons that Legislator Schoenberger mentioned. I think that we are on a verge of a crisis for towns, villages and school districts who in their efforts to adhere to this policy that the public came to expect have used up their surpluses and tried to diminish services and resources available to the public and won't be able to continue that practice much longer. There are real services that need to be delivered and they will reach a threshold where the services that have been taken away can't be taken away any longer and need to be replaced.

In the dictionary you will find "snake oil" is fraudulent or unproven medicine. I think the 2% tax cap is exactly that. Someone who sells snake oil is a snake oil salesman and I think some of the champions of this 2% tax cap are exactly that. We need to do something very drastic again this year. We look to Albany to help us and I haven't seen that help in a long time. You think the expectation that we should collaborate and consolidate is going to solve our problems. One of the shared services/collaborative programs that we participate in is the New York State Retirement System and we contribute to it. New York State Retirement System was created by the Legislature in Albany. The policies are determined by them and are administered by the Comptrollers Office and their performance has been dismal and because of that we have to contribute an additional \$15,000,000 to the retirement system this year. I don't see that could ever fit under the 2% Cap. The Grover Norquist's of the world who say, "I will never vote for a tax increase" and make promises to do that fail to make the other promise. The other promise is that they are going to deliver for you a balanced budget to go along with that no tax increase or adhering to a cap. As Legislator Wolfe mentioned, anyone who vote against this cap and doesn't provide you with \$13,400,000 in additional cuts or other new revenue they are just another snake oil salesman.

Ricardo McKay, Legal Counsel

Having heard some of the comments that have just been made I want to make sure that everybody is on the same legal page. There may be an assumption that by voting down the 2% cap the budget will go through with a lower tax, but that is not the fact. The law says that you must try to get under 2%. If you don't you have to ask for a waiver to go over it. If you go over it and your budget is balanced using that excess if you don't pass this resolution the taxpayers will still be taxed the 18% increase. The money will be collected and then put in the Comptrollers control and it will be held for 2014-tax reduction. So if you vote this down you are not reducing the real property tax in 2013. The real property tax will be 18% no matter how you vote. Why? The budget that we received from the County Executive had an 18% property tax built in therefore if his budget, under the process we are going through tonight, gets to be the one that is adopted it will have the 18% whether you override the 2% or not. If the budget we put in as a modified budget is adopted it has an 18% tax so the 18% has to go through no matter what you do on this vote. The situation comes out of the process and in the six weeks that the Legislature had it they couldn't find \$13,000,000 so they did other adjusts, but they can't offer a budget that is balanced so it is at 18% in both venues therefore 18% is what the real property tax will be no matter what the vote is.

Point of Order – Mr. Sparaco

I take exception to Counsel's explanation. He is implying that the Legislature's amendments or changes to the County Executive's budget have already been approved. They may have passed the Budget and Finance Committee, but voting against the 2% cap if the cap goes down now there could be other proposals from other Legislators presented tonight that we could live within the means. His explanation, as well appreciated by myself, has a certain spin to it as if breaking the cap is meaningless. The point of the matter is no budget has been accepted tonight, no amendments have been accepted tonight and they can be presented this evening that could theoretically live within the 2% cap.

Chairwoman Cornell

I think Counsel was indicating that whatever does happen we have to pass a balanced budget. As I said earlier, when we get to the budget we will take here all amendments that will be treated fairly and each amendment will have to carry with it an equivalent. If there is something coming out of the budget something else has to go in to balance it. If something is coming into the budget something else has to come out of it. It has to be a balanced budget. I think that is the point Counsel was making.

Point of Information – Mr. Grant

I thought there was one more piece to the explanation that Counsel was given and that is what happens to the money in excess to the 2%. My understanding is that if the County Executive's budget is adopted that budget includes an 18% tax increase that obviously exceeds the 2% limit. The tax bills will go out at that rate and the homeowners and businesses will be responsible for paying for it. The other piece is the Comptroller's office will then confiscate the difference between the 18% and 2%. It would take our budget completely out of balance and then there would be the expectation that somehow some way we would either find \$13,400,000 in additional cuts or run a deficit of \$13,400,000 for another year.

Chairwoman Cornell

It would be placed into a reserve account according to requirements set by the New York State Comptroller. It is paid for by the County. The money would only be allowed to be used to offset the property tax for the following year, which means that any intention to use it for current operations cannot be used.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

I do not have a problem breaking the 2% tax cap. I think it is unrealistic that we can do this with 2%. My researcher has indicated to me via text our County, town; school districts and special districts place us as the fifth highest taxes County in the United States. I think we have to keep all of that in prospective and that is why I will be voting against the proposed 18% property tax increase.

Chairwoman Cornell

That is not a very good statistic, however in terms of why we are fifth really has to do with the 70% of people's taxes going for schools, 20% for town governments and 7% to 8% is the County tax, which is first or second lowest rate in the State.

Mr. Soskin

85% of our budget is mandated. 15% is borne strictly by the County. I would like to go through a few things with you. It would be great if we could condense everything down and stay within the 2% increase. Between private industry and the government we just went through Storm Sandy, in the Rockaway's, New York City and even up here many communities were decimated. Trees fell, electricity was out and no heat. How would you like to do without that? Our Highway Department couldn't get trucks on the road. Private industry came in and checked for live wires. You have to get to work in the morning. Our Sheriff is dealing with public safety. Pensions, we all talk about pensions. We have very rich people here who belong to unions, let's restrict and cut back on their pensions. There is no one to guarantee pensions over here. In private industry there is an organization called The Pension and Guarantee Corporation. If an employer goes out of business the government will take care of the participants in that pension plan. We don't have that here. Taxes, we are the fifth highest taxing group in the Country, but you have to look at jurisdictions. Your State is one jurisdiction, locally you have towns, villages, County and then school districts, which are all separate taxing agencies. I know the Town of Ramapo just increased their taxes and I think many other towns in Rockland County did. The schools are going to if they haven't by now. There are reasons for all of these things.

When I become a Legislator I told my constituents that I would keep taxes down. I wanted to reduce them, but I owe the residents of Rockland County what I must provide for them. We have to make the hard decisions. It is not easy. You pay the taxes and we pay the taxes. We are no different than you. The union puts aside five days, we put aside five days to try and help the County. We need more time and unfortunately you are dealing with a clock and the clock doesn't give you enough time to go over a budget. We just got the results of the year 2011. We are comparing all of information to the year 2010 and there is a void there. A budget is just an estimate. We are putting a 2% cap on an estimate. You know the services that you would like. How can we live within a 2% cap? You have heard from everybody else here about the services.

A gentleman got up today and criticized our Chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee, "he is a no goodnik, he it taking money from our pockets that we need." That man has worked very hard over the past five years to keep taxes down and provide security for not only the employees of the County, but for all the citizens of the Rockland County and think about that when you talk in terms of 2%. It is very easy to criticize, but how would you like to do without all of these things. I am going to vote for the 2% and I am going to vote for the budget. The amount of County taxes paid is almost the smallest portion of your total tax picture.

Mrs. Paul

This is a very painful situation. Nobody wants to override the tax cap, I don't want to either. The State mandated programs are drowning us. I am not in favor of cutting programs or jobs, which will hurt all of our Rockland County residents especially in my district. We want to restore the jobs and also the basic programs. Reluctantly I have to vote yes to lifting the tax cap.

Mr. Moroney

If we don't address these problems that we have locally I may be voting before we leave here to have the Comptroller come down and take over. There is no question we have some serious problems ahead of us. We are all hoping we will get the deficit bond or something to remedy the deficit. We think that all of you know exactly what is going on, but I don't know exactly what is going on in County government, but do know that we make the towns and villages whole when residents do not pay their property taxes. Who pays that? We do in the amount of \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000. We don't have that money so we have to go out and borrow it to make sure that the County, towns and villages survive. I have a letter here from the five town Supervisors asking us to restore the money for the Narcotics Task Force. Do you think, we as a County government, wants to cut the Narcotics Task Force? We do not, nobody here does. All my colleagues have to vote their conscience and they shouldn't be criticized. These are some of the things that people don't know about. We have to face reality. We have a \$10,000,000 in one department that has been happening for years and we haven't done anything about it. In 2014 that is going to be eliminated and it is about time. We shouldn't be in that business. I am not here to criticize anybody on how they run their department. When you lose \$10,000,000 a year it should be addressed. It should have been addressed over the years. Now it has been addressed by the State.

What about the State mandates? What about the Sheriff's Patrol and Mounted Patrol? What about the Department of Health? The Department of Health in this County helps everybody. What about mosquito control? Nobody wants mosquitoes in their backyards and the towns and villages can't afford it. We have to do it as part of a County service to make sure everyone gets taken care of. Has anybody ever seen the wonderful care and help the residents receive at our Hospital and Nursing Home? They take care of everyone. These are some of the decisions that we as Legislators have to make. My constituents don't use half the services that the County provides, but what am I going to say to the people that need those services. I will not be selfish and not vote for it. I have a compassion for people. We have reduced County government employees by 500 in the last five years. We can't just keep balancing the books on the backs of the workforce.

We have a Comptroller that will put the money in a lockbox if we don't pass the budget. It is another hammer on our heads. I am not saying that we shouldn't be addressing the issues. This Legislature, and the leadership of this Legislature, has to start addressing it. As my friend and colleague Mr. Carey says we have to start January 1. We have to start this budget process from the beginning of the year, see where we can go, see what we can do and see what problems we can alleviate.

I may not vote for the budget, but I will vote to lift the 2% tax cap. It is just ludicrous that someone in their ivory tower in Albany that wants to be President can tell us 2%. On top of that they don't even pay us for the mandates. They owe us \$40,000,000 at a time. What do we do? The services that we provide to the residents of this County are second to none. I will continue to support the services even though most of my constituents do not use them. That is the way I feel in my heart and this is the way I will continue to feel until the day I retire from here, which won't be too long.

Mr. Wieder

Ladies and gentlemen, soon I will cast my vote. I will do my duty that I was elected to the best of my ability. It is my duty to vote reasonably and to give reason of my vote. I will vote yes to lift the tax cap and in all likelihood I will vote no to the proposed budget. Ladies and gentlemen, my vote against the 2013 budget is not a vote against my esteemed colleagues of the Budget and Finance Committee. They have done everything - and I have seen it throughout these couple of weeks - they could under difficult, difficult circumstances. However, my no vote is a vote against Albany. Local municipalities in New York State, counties, towns, villages and school districts are being crushed under the yoke of unfunded mandates from Albany. Make no mistake, mandates can be a very affective tool, but when these State mandates are not funded it becomes destructive. The tax cap enacted by Albany without mandate relief has been a sleight-of-hand kicking the bucket down the road literally towards local municipalities. I ask, how can you cap property taxes by 2% yet Albany has mailed us an invoice of over 10% of mandate increases that translate to higher property taxes above the cap? We have asked Albany to help us in the budget process.

We called for a law that would have required the County to submit the budget to the State Comptroller to certify that the budget is balanced. It passed in the Assembly, but sadly not in the Senate. Albany has failed local municipalities throughout the State. Albany has failed Rockland County.

While this budget might be the best possible budget under very bad circumstances there is nothing good with unfunded mandates, double digit tax increases and cutting of services therefore I have no choice and will be voting no. Thank you Madam Chair.

Mr. Jobson

I am going to take off from where my colleague Mr. Wieder just left off. This is one of the greatest shell games I have ever seen in my life. You heard Mr. Murphy, Mr. Schoenberger and a number of my colleagues articulate it very well. Whoever the Svengalis were who got in a room with our leaders in Albany and our Governor are the greatest snake oil salesmen we have had in a long time. In Albany they had to create an additional phantom Senate seat upstate somewhere in the middle of nowhere to create an additional seat to add to the bureaucracy so the lines that were cut and the secret deals that were made behind closed doors would all flush out and everybody would vote the way they were supposed to and everybody would keep the Majority. They passed the buck on us. I hear people say how great the representatives in Albany are, because of the tax cap. When will you people wake up. Wake up, think for yourselves for a change and don't listen to these Svengalis or what you hear on the news. This is about lives, families and jobs and municipalities.

This State increased and passed the buck to our Sheriff Department in the amount of \$3,000,000 for their retirement for this tiny County. We have to create \$27,000,000 for municipalities to pay for the property taxes that their residents have not paid for reasons unknown. Guess who has to make them whole? It is another State mandated law that is put on the counties and townships throughout the State. If somebody doesn't want to pay it the locals have to pick up the tab and make everybody whole. There were another \$25,000,000 additional unfunded mandates just this fiscal year alone. That all adds up to \$55,000,000. I wish more of my colleagues would have come to the Budget Review meetings and listened to what is going on here. Before we even sat down to even do a budget we had to collectively think about where we were going to pull \$55,000,000 extra that we didn't have last year.

I guess the easy thing to do is cut the workforce and do whatever makes us look good for whatever office we are running for. I don't think so. This 2% is such a fictitious number. There is no reality to it at all. Taxes end to eke upwards no matter what we try to do. I know it is a necessary evil. My school tax bill goes up quite a bit every year and I don't hear anybody complaining. County taxes have stayed relatively low for years. I respect everybody's opinion here and what they think, but be careful what you wish for. This is a two party system, but by in large the system pretty works well. My grandfather was one of the original five Supervisors many years ago who was on the original Board of Supervisors. The five Supervisors of this County sat down and did 95% of the County business.

Mr. Schoenberger

We owe your grandfather Rockland Community College.

Mr. Jobson

If people just decide to change the Charter and just get rid of the County Executive we could save a couple of million dollars right there. If certain people here want to give all the duties and all the responsibilities and heavy lifting to us be careful what you wish for, because you probably don't need him and the seventeen of us can hash it out if you really want to do that. He is the CEO and the every day supervisor of this County government. I have a job that I get up and go to everyday and I have another boss. I come here evenings. I have sat here through a month of budget reviews. This is a part-time job for me, my full-time part-time job as I say, because it takes more time than my real life.

Most people are trying to do the right thing by their people regardless of their political stripe. This whole thing with Albany is a sham and a shame. It is all left on the backs of the counties and towns of this State that have to carry everybody else's water and it is really a crime and shame.

Mr. Earl

I remember when we first got this budget, as we started to go over it, I was wondering how we were really going to plug these holes. What really troubled me the most was the fact that we had made commitments in this budget previously, such as no lay offs. Once we received the budget there were lay offs involved, which I thought was a no-no. We gave our word on that.

I know there is no magic solution for this tonight. There are no better alternatives, because if there were we would have come up with them. I see some of my colleagues that are voting to lift this cap, because they know there are no better alternatives here. I see where 1992 we were paying \$2.75 per thousand dollars. In 2013 that amount would be \$2.65. We are second in the State as far as that so I think we do a little bit of credit for that. The \$13,400,000 is a tough hole to try and plug and if anybody has a better solution I would love to hear them.

I am glad that we were able to counter the lay offs, put back vital services and also in general I am glad to see all the work that we put into this budget and where we are now. I see my colleague Mr. Sparaco, Republican Minority Leader, is going to vote tonight to lift the cap. We have a standing joke that when he won't vote for something I like I reach over and grab his hand and yank it up. I am glad to say that I won't have to do that tonight. There are no better alternatives and if there were I would like to hear them. I will be voting yes. Thank you.

Mr. Day

I just want to briefly express an appreciation for my colleague Alden Wolfe's comment. He is right, I did say that government should no be run like a business. As a matter of fact, I said it as part of my Minority Address in 2008 so he has a better memory than I do, because I had to think about it. I also added these couple of comments. What price do you put on a teacher? A teacher who has an impact on a child that directs that child to a great way in life, maybe it is your child. What price do you put on a police officer who happens to proved some sense of justice to your family at a very difficult time in your life? What price do you put on a direct care worker who takes care of your family members when they are sick? The bottom-line is your property values is driven by location, location, location, but truly they are driven by the fact that the streets are safe, the school are good and we have a good community.

I also said that we as elected officials must take the best precepts from business and apply them and be exacting and aggressive stewards of the money that we collect in taxes and that is a very important counterpoint to that. Listening to the comments of Legislator Moroney and Carey I think that comment fits with what they were saying very well. We need to aggressively move forward and fix what we can as soon as we can. Thank you.

---

**LOCAL LAW NO. 8 OF 2012****STATE OF NEW YORK****COUNTY OF ROCKLAND**

(Sponsors: Hon. John A. Murphy, Hon. Alden H. Wolfe)

Chairwoman Cornell offered the following Local Law, which was seconded by Mr. Wolfe and unanimously adopted:

A local law entitled "Rockland County Mandate and Taxation Information Act".

Be it enacted, by the Legislature of Rockland County, as follows:

**SECTION 1. TITLE.**

This local law shall be known and may be cited as the "Rockland County Mandate and Taxation Information Act."

**SECTION 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**

It is generally recognized that property taxpayers have a substantial interest in receiving complete tax bill information. Part of having complete information should include a description of major programs funded by the County as well as a summary of the impact that State mandates have on property taxes. It is the intent of this law to provide a tax bill insert to be included with the annual tax bill to ensure that the citizens of Rockland County receive such information in as clear and as complete a way as possible to assist their understanding as to what their real property taxes pay for.

**SECTION 3. COUNTY TAX BILL INFORMATION STATEMENT.**

The County Executive is hereby authorized to cause an information statement to be provided on the County tax bill in bold, capitalized font of at least 14-point type, reading as follows:

The State of New York requires local governments to perform many functions and provide services without financial support. These State requirements or "unfunded State mandates" have a direct impact on local spending and represent a significant portion of the County and Town real property taxes that are due. Please see the notice enclosed with this tax bill for a more detailed explanation of the spending required by the State of New York and the impact on local property tax rates or visit the following website: <http://co.rockland.ny.us> or <http://www.co.rockland.ny.us/Legislature>

This statement shall be prominently displayed on the tax bill as a separate section and not included with any other information provided on the County tax bill.

The County Executive is hereby authorized to case the County Tax Bill Insert required by Section 4 to be prominently posted on the County website.

In the event the websites of the County or the County Legislature are changed, the website(s) otherwise listed in this Section shall change to reflect the new website(s).

**SECTION 4. COUNTY TAX BILL INSERT.**

The County Executive is hereby authorized to take any and all action necessary to case a Tax Bill Insert summarizing County budget information and the impact that State mandates have on the County tax levy to be included as an enclosure with each annual property tax bill. The Tax bill Insert shall include the following sections:

- a. Summary of revenues and expenses included in the County budget, including a tabulation and/or graphical depiction of major cost centers and the respective percentage of total spending of each item.
- b. Standard statement defining State mandates which shall include an explanation that some mandated amounts are approximate or qualified and that all mandates are not identified, if such be the case.
- c. Narrative and/or graphical summary of financial impacts of identified State mandates and the percentage of total spending that these mandates represent.
- d. Other information deemed necessary by the County Executive to implement this local law.

**SECTION 5. OPTIONAL TOWN TAX BILL INSERT.**

A Town may, by local law, request that the County include a Town Tax Bill Insert summarizing Town budget information and the impact that State or county mandates have on the Town tax levy to be included as an enclosure with each annual property tax bill. The County Executive is authorized to develop a uniform Town Tax bill Insert template that shall include the following sections:

- a. Summary of revenues and expenses included in the Town's budget, including a tabulation and/or graphical depiction of major cost centers and the respective percentage of total spending of each item.
- b. Standard statement defining State or County mandates which shall include an explanation that some mandated amounts are approximate or qualified and that all mandates are not identified, if such be the case.
- c. Narrative and/or graphical summary of financial impacts of identified State or County mandates and the percentage of total spending that these mandates represent.
- d. Other information deemed necessary by the County Executive to implement this local law.

**SECTION 6. PROCEDURE.**

The County Executive shall submit proposed tax bill insert templates to the Budget and Finance Committee, which shall approve on an annual basis. Should the Budget and Finance Committee fail to take any action with 45 days of submission, the County Executive's templates shall be deemed approved. The procedures required by this local law shall be carried out in addition to, and in accordance with, other annual tax billing procedures existing with the County of Rockland. Nothing contained in this local law, or any amendments or regulations pertaining thereto, shall be construed to in any way affect, modify or alter in any manner whatsoever, the County tax levy, definition or description of the County tax levy, or calculation thereof.

**SECTION 7. 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.

---

**Debate:****Mr. Murphy**

This is one of my pets. I graduated grammar school and I know how to read, but when I get my tax bill I can never decode it. I think it is written by Town Tax Receivers to hide the reality of that tax bill. For years casually and formally I have suggested that the tax bill be illuminating to even the least academically inclined person. I am in office forty-one years and every time I go to the supermarket a neighbor asks me why their taxes are so high. So I can get out of the store I respond by saying, "Only 6% of your tax bill can you blame on me." They never believe that, because they don't know how much of their bill is for schools, towns, villages and County.

I saw a parade of Town Supervisors walk across the headlines of these newspapers in this County demonizing County Executive Vanderhoef and us, because we could no longer afford to pay for things that we had generously agreed to pay for, but they are legitimately town bills. The very idea that somebody in town doesn't pay their property tax and we pay it for them for the school and the towns is an unknown fact of life in this County. I don't care how big the bill is, but it should state on there what percentage of the total bill we pay for and how much is County, town and School. It should also state how much we are giving to the town that is optional and how much the State is charging us that we have to pay taxes on their house for.

When you have been around as long as I have and you have people who voted for me forty years ago who still don't know that I am the lowest item on their tax bill I say that it is time that we educated the public. I am very proud of the fact that in partnership with Mr. Schoenberger we have held the property tax on their home to the second in the State for over twenty years. That is an accomplishment that has been done collectively by both branches of government. Now in hard times Town Supervisors are complaining. One year we gave them money from revenue sharing and you know what they did with that money? They gave themselves raises. Does anybody remember that? I am very excited about the fact that we may send out a tax bill that explains to the public which branch of government has their hands in which pocket and why we are the lowest by revealing how much the mandates are costing us.

We have failed in educating the public as to what County government does. Most of you people circulate in political circles. I don't have any political circles I mix with ordinary citizens. None of them who buy tickets to my reelection have any idea what I do. They don't know about our 100-bed hospital. They don't know about all the services our Sheriff provides. They don't know all the services Mental Health provides. Mental Health, which gets a black eye every year at budget time is one of the organizations that treats human beings in pain or in danger of suicide even though they can't afford to pay. If you are mentally ill you are unlikely registered to get Medicare and Medicaid and you are unlikely to have a job. This County government has provided services without reimbursements, because we cannot get paid for every service we, as a humanitarian from of government, have to perform.

Let's all pass this and have a hand on what goes on that bill that is sent to very taxpaying home. Thank you.

Mr. Wolfe

I really wish that I could take credit for coming up with this idea, but unfortunately I can't. I will however take credit for voting for it. We essentially are waging somewhat of a public relations battle when we talk about these taxes. The point has been made tonight repeatedly that County taxes are really a very small tax of your overall property tax burden. We talk often about mandates and it has almost become such a buzz word that I fear that it will start to lose its meaning the more we talk about it, because people in the public are almost numb to it. The fact is unless we are able to communicate information in a way that is meaningful then I don't think the public will ever understand that we don't have control over the majority of our budget. The State mandates in 2012 alone are \$150,000,000 and that is the unfunded direct taxpayer funds. That is net out of the taxpayer's pocket and that is double of our entire property tax burden. I cannot push any harder this concept of mandate reform and how without it County governments and governments throughout the State are going to simply not going to service.

I support this. I think this and the next Local Law are a fantastic idea. Thank you.

---

**LOCAL LAW NO. 9 OF 2012**

**STATE OF NEW YORK**

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND**

(Sponsor: Hon. Alden H. Wolfe)

Chairwoman Cornell offered the following Local Law, which was seconded by Mr. Grant, Mr. Schoenberger and Mr. Wolfe and unanimously adopted:

A local law entitled "Rockland County Taxation Transparency Act".

Be it enacted, by the Legislature of Rockland County, as follows:

**SECTION 1. TITLE.**

This local law shall be known and may be cited as the "Rockland County Taxation Transparency Act".

**SECTION 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**

It is generally recognized that property taxpayers have a substantial interest in receiving complete tax bill information. Part of having complete information should include a description of major programs funded by the County as well as a summary of the impact that State mandates have on property taxes. It is the intent of this law to provide a tax bill flyer to be inserted with the annual tax bill to ensure that the citizens of Rockland County receive such information in as clear and as complete a way as possible to assist their understanding as to what their real property taxes pay for.

**SECTION 3. COUNTY TAX BILL FLYER.**

The County Executive is hereby authorized to take any and all action necessary to cause a Tax Bill Flyer summarizing County budget information and the impact that State mandates have on the County tax levy to be included as an enclosure with each annual property tax bill. The Tax Bill Flyer shall include the following sections:

e. Summary of revenues and expenses included in the County budget, including a tabulation and/or graphical depiction of major cost centers and the respective percentage of total spending of each item.

f. Standard statement defining State mandates which shall include an explanation that some mandated amounts are approximate or qualified and that all mandates are not identified, if such be the case.

g. Narrative and/or graphical summary of financial impacts of identified State mandates and the percentage of total spending that these mandates represent.

h. Other information deemed necessary by the County Executive to implement this local law.

**SECTION 4. OPTIONAL TOWN TAX BILL FLYER.**

A Town may, by local law, request that the County include a Town Tax Bill Flyer summarizing Town budget information and the impact that State mandates have on the Town tax levy to be included as an enclosure with each annual property tax bill. The County Executive is authorized to develop a uniform Town Tax Bill Flyer template that shall include the following sections:

e. Summary of revenues and expenses included in the Town's budget, including a tabulation and/or graphical depiction of major cost centers and the respective percentage of total spending of each item.

f. Standard statement defining State mandates which shall include an explanation that some mandated amounts are approximate or qualified and that all mandates are not identified, if such be the case.

g. Narrative and/or graphical summary of financial impacts of identified State mandates and the percentage of total spending that these mandates represent.

h. Other information deemed necessary by the County Executive to implement this local law.

The County Executive is authorized to develop, with the advice of the Rockland County Association of Town Supervisors, procedures necessary to implement this section.

**SECTION 5. PROCEDURE.**

The County Executive shall submit proposed tax bill insert templates to the Budget and Finance Committee, which shall approve on an annual basis. Should the Budget and Finance Committee fail to take any action with 45 days of submission, the County Executive's templates shall be deemed approved. The procedures required by this local law shall be carried out in addition to, and in accordance with, other annual tax billing procedures existing with the County of Rockland.

**SECTION 6. 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.

---

**Debate:**

Mr. Wolfe

This is a companion Law. The County Attorney's office made a determination that in order to fully implement the concept that is being pushed here we needed two Local Laws. This is the portion that not only allows us to include a flyer with the County bills and gives an option for a town to be allowed to put in a flyer as well.

---

The Chairwoman opened the public participation portion of the meeting at 8:19 p.m. and the following persons appeared and spoke:

- ❖ Jim Flynn, Thanks Legislators for no lay offs, concerned budget not balanced
- ❖ P.T. Thomas, CSEA RC President, Commended RC employees
- ❖ Ralph Sabatini, Opposed to tax increases
- ❖ Pat Godfrey, Opposed to tax increases
- ❖ Ed Graybow, Opposed to tax increases

Public Participation ended at 8:32 p.m.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 539 OF 2012  
WAIVE THE RULES OF THE LEGISLATURE  
TO CONSIDER PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS  
AS AN IMMEDIATE NEED**

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

RESOLVED, that the Rules of the Legislature be waived to consider Resolution No.'s 540, 541 and 542 of 2012, as an immediate need.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9481

Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 540 OF 2012  
ACCEPTING REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE  
AFTER ITS REVIEW OF THE ROCKLAND COUNTY  
PROPOSED 2013 BUDGET**

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

WHEREAS, the Budget and Finance Committee has reviewed the 2013 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 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 Chairman; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Budget and Finance Committee's Report on the 2013 Rockland County proposed Budget, consisting of the schedules attached hereto be and the same are hereby adopted.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
Nays:	02	(Legislators Low-Hogan, Meyers)

---

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	PA No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS		REVENUES	
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED
							INC. (DEC.)	INC. (DEC.)	INC. (DEC.)	
A	CA6816	Campus Fun and Learn	5010			Contract Agency	2,779 \$	2,779 \$	2,779	2,779
A	CA6360	CEILIES Institute	5010			Contract Agency	6,625 \$	6,625 \$	6,625	6,625
A	CY7642	Chiku Awa! African Dance	5010			Contract Agency	1,140 \$	1,140 \$	1,140	1,140
A	CA6363	Chimes Work	5010			Contract Agency	1,282 \$	1,282 \$	1,282	1,282
A	CY7542	Chorus Musical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	1,425 \$	1,425 \$	1,425	1,425
A	CY7542	Chorus Musical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	3,349 \$	3,349 \$	3,349	3,349
A	CY7535	Chorus Musical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	1,865 \$	1,865 \$	1,865	1,865
A	CY7541	Debra Weiss Dance	5010			Contract Agency	6,692 \$	6,692 \$	6,692	6,692
A	CA6817	EPIC	5010			Contract Agency	2,779 \$	2,779 \$	2,779	2,779
A	CA7518	Friends of Nyseks	5010			Contract Agency	9,911 \$	9,911 \$	9,911	9,911
A	CA7571	Hudson Vagabond Puppets	5010			Contract Agency	4,204 \$	4,204 \$	4,204	4,204
A	CY7570	Irish Cultural Society of Rockland	5010			Contract Agency	5,700 \$	5,700 \$	5,700	5,700
A	CY7559	Irish Cultural Society of Rockland	5010			Contract Agency	1,140 \$	1,140 \$	1,140	1,140
A	CA6308	RC Family Treatment Court	5010			Contract Agency	15,105 \$	15,105 \$	15,105	15,105
A	CY7545	Riverbowl Films	5010			Contract Agency	1,425 \$	1,425 \$	1,425	1,425
A	CY7550	Rockland Camera	5010			Contract Agency	1,539 \$	1,539 \$	1,539	1,539
A	CA6954	Rockland Interfaith Breakfast	5010			Contract Agency	5,771 \$	5,771 \$	5,771	5,771
A	CY7558	Rockland Irish American	5010			Contract Agency	14,464 \$	14,464 \$	14,464	14,464
A	CA7536	Rockland Youth Dance	5010			Contract Agency	5,059 \$	5,059 \$	5,059	5,059
A	CA8750	Cornell Cooperative Extension	5010			Contract Agency	274,231 \$	274,231 \$	74,231	74,231
A	4014A	Chronic Disease Prevention	4090			Fees for Services	22,800 \$	22,800 \$	22,800	22,800
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X1051	PH Tech I	Rescind Program Elimination	5,778 \$	5,778 \$	52,002	52,002
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8054	PH Tech I	Rescind Program Elimination	8,849 \$	8,849 \$	79,646	79,646
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8298A	PH Spec PH Ed LFT	Rescind Program Elimination	7,079 \$	7,079 \$	63,715	63,715
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8428	PH Assess Asst II	Rescind Program Elimination	6,061 \$	6,061 \$	54,549	54,549
A	4010	Department of Health	1800		Health Insurance	Rescind Program Elimination	3,938,650 \$	4,112,590 \$	176,000	176,000
A	4010	Department of Health	1811		Dental	Rescind Program Elimination	186,180 \$	177,570 \$	11,330	11,330
A	4010	Department of Health	1820		Vision	Rescind Program Elimination	37,355 \$	33,916 \$	2,289	2,289
A	4010	Department of Health	1820		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	2,652,000 \$	2,652,000 \$	184,650	184,650
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	748,110 \$	814,270 \$	66,160	66,160
A	4010	Department of Health	1850		Workers Comp	Rescind Program Elimination	287,000 \$	304,000 \$	17,000	17,000
A	4010	Department of Health	1860		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	35,159 \$	37,480 \$	2,330	2,330
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7784	Asst Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	6,651 \$	66,610 \$	59,949	59,949
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7666	Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	8,648 \$	86,482 \$	77,834	77,834
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7668	Clark Typist	Rescind Program Elimination	3,800 \$	38,000 \$	34,200	34,200
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X9008	Sr Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	11,225 \$	112,248 \$	101,023	101,023
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X8341	PH Tech II	Rescind Program Elimination	7,230 \$	72,398 \$	65,068	65,068
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1300		Temp positions	Rescind Program Elimination	- \$	75,000 \$	75,000	75,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1800		Health Insurance	Rescind Program Elimination	74,000 \$	84,000 \$	10,000	10,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Dental	Rescind Program Elimination	6,650 \$	7,430 \$	800	800
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Vision	Rescind Program Elimination	1,430 \$	1,430 \$	285	285
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1820		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	10,030 \$	92,426 \$	82,396	82,396
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1830		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	2,740 \$	40,135 \$	37,395	37,395
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1850		Workers Comp	Rescind Program Elimination	6,000 \$	6,000 \$	6,000	6,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1860		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	- \$	1,545 \$	1,545	1,545
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	3290		Operational Supplies	Rescind Program Elimination	- \$	95,000 \$	95,000	95,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	4090		Contractual	Rescind Program Elimination	1,700 \$	1,700 \$	1,700	1,700

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept. Div.	Department Name	Object	Pop. No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS		REVENUES		2013 (INC./DEC.)
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	
A	4035	DOH - Mosquito Control	R1210		CODRA	Rescind Program Elimination					
A	7510	EXE - County Historian	X0492		County Historian	Rescind Program Elimination	7,739	7,739			61,000
A	7510	EXE - County Historian	1820		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	1,680	1,680			1,680
A	7510	EXE - County Historian	1880		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	590	590			590
A	7510	EXE - County Historian			MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	30	30			30
A	1420	Department of Law	4080		Fees for Services		125,000	76,000			(50,000)
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1100	X0816	Patrol Officer	Rescind Layoff	8,679	86,792			78,913
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1100	X0831	Patrol Officer	Rescind Layoff	9,688	86,670			76,008
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1100	X0833	Patrol Officer	Rescind Layoff	8,679	86,792			78,913
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1100	X5101	Patrol Officer	Rescind Layoff	8,679	86,792			78,913
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1820	X7681	Patrol Officer	Rescind Layoff	8,679	86,792			78,913
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1830		Retirement	Rescind Layoff	1,081,540	1,146,820			65,980
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1830		Social Security	Rescind Layoff	285,888	316,065			30,420
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	1100	X0850	Patrol Sergeant	Rescind Program Elimination	11,747	117,648			105,901
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	1100	X7660	Patrol Officer	Rescind Program Elimination	9,485	84,846			75,361
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	1100	X8301	Patrol Officer	Rescind Program Elimination	8,679	86,792			78,913
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	1100	X8322	Patrol Officer	Rescind Program Elimination	8,679	86,792			78,913
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	1820		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	10,405	109,605			99,200
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	1830		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	2,520	32,095			29,575
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	3990		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	-	1,375			1,375
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	4080		Operational Supplies	Rescind Program Elimination	-	10,500			10,500
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol			Fees for Services	Rescind Program Elimination	-	120,000			120,000
A	3116	SHF - Mounted Patrol	R1210		CODRA	Rescind Program Elimination					
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X8095	Cook I	Rescind Outourcing	9,777	37,766			33,689
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X0098	Cook II	Rescind Outourcing	5,028	50,796			45,768
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X7690	Cook I	Rescind Outourcing	3,777	37,766			33,689
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X7691	Food Svc Helper	Rescind Outourcing	3,023	30,234			27,211
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X7692	Cook II	Rescind Outourcing	4,028	50,260			46,234
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X7693	Cook III	Rescind Outourcing	4,777	47,766			42,989
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X7695	Cook II	Rescind Outourcing	5,552	55,250			49,698
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X7777	Cook I	Rescind Outourcing	5,591	55,905			50,314
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1100	X8679	Cook IV	Rescind Outourcing	3,777	37,766			33,689
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1820		Retirement	Rescind Outourcing	6,212	62,119			55,904
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1830		Social Security	Rescind Outourcing	4,781,005	4,947,800			166,795
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1830		MTA Tax	Rescind Outourcing	1,313,910	1,395,785			81,875
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	3010		Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	58,315	1,395,785			1,337,470
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	5060		CODRA	Rescind Outourcing	400,000	400,000			0
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	R1210		CODRA	Rescind Outourcing					
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1110		Overtime	Rescind Outourcing	3,200,000	3,000,000			(200,000)
A	3150	SHF - Correctional Facility	1800		Relief	Rescind Outourcing	400,000	300,000			(100,000)
A	3112	SHF - Patrol	1110		Overtime	Rescind Program Elimination	380,000	390,000			(50,000)
A	8050	Commissioner of Labor	1100	X4029	Comm. Labor Relations	Rescind Program Elimination	-	6,500			6,500
A	8050	Commissioner of Labor	1820		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	-	1,680			1,680





COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dist. No.	Department Name	Object	Pos. No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES		
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2014 (INC./DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2014 (INC./DEC.)
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1271	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	9,571	98,714	34,843		34,843	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1272	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,500	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1273	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,532	35,320	31,788		31,788	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1277	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1278	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	5,273	52,728	47,453		47,453	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1523	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	4,551	45,510	41,049		41,049	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X2997	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,618	36,184	32,566		32,566	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X3945	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,632	36,324	32,692		32,692	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1760	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	4,921	49,205	44,284		44,284	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1795	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1795	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X3818	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	3,968	39,680	35,696		35,696	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1820	X3818	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	1,770	17,700	16,335		16,335	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1830	X3818	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	1,770	17,700	16,335		16,335	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1880	X3818	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	1,770	17,700	16,335		16,335	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	5080	X3818	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	1,770	17,700	16,335		16,335	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	R1210	X3818	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	400,000	400,000	(400,000)		(400,000)	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X2620	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	6,942	66,415	59,774		59,774	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X3430	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	8,422	84,222	84,800		84,800	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X7272	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	3,034	30,340	27,306		27,306	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1820	X7272	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	5,100	49,890	44,690		44,690	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1830	X7272	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	1,468	14,685	13,369		13,369	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	R1210	X7272	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	650	670	20		20	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	5060	X7272	Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	200,000	200,000	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	DMHW680	DWH Local Government Unit	1101		Salary Savings		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)		(150,000)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP Hospital Administration	1101		Salary Savings		(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		(10,000)	
EH	HSPE807	HSP Transportation	1101		Salary Savings		(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)		(20,000)	
EH	HSPE831	HSP Materials Management	1101		Salary Savings		(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		(10,000)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP Nursing SPH	1101		Salary Savings		(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	HSPE828	HSP Nursing Home	1101		Salary Savings		(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)		(400,000)	
EH	DMHM020	DHHS - Hospital	1100	7768	Psych Soc Worker II	Abolish Vacant Position	84,260	-	(84,260)		(84,260)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	St Account Clerk Typist	Abolish Vacant Position	46,650	-	(46,650)		(46,650)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	28,981	-	(28,981)		(28,981)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	28,981	-	(28,981)		(28,981)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	Director Med Svcs	Reduce Salary	22,891	-	(22,891)		(22,891)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	Director Med Svcs	Reduce Salary	22,891	-	(22,891)		(22,891)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	Director Med Svcs	Reduce Salary	80,922	-	(80,922)		(80,922)	
EH	HSPE830	HSP Hospital Administration	1100	2973	Director Med Svcs	Reduce Salary	150,000	-	(150,000)		(150,000)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP-Medical Administration	1100	5889	Internist 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	14,051	-	(14,051)		(14,051)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP-Medical Administration	1100	5894	Food Svc Helper 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	38,380	-	(38,380)		(38,380)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Food Services	1100	7073	Records Clerk Typist	Abolish Vacant Position	22,170	-	(22,170)		(22,170)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	8416	St Typist PT	Abolish Vacant Position	21,428	-	(21,428)		(21,428)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	8128	Medical Clerk LFT	Abolish Vacant Position	46,610	-	(46,610)		(46,610)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	3563	Nurses Aide Inst	Abolish Vacant Position	22,894	-	(22,894)		(22,894)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	1465A	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	6,598	-	(6,598)		(6,598)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	2579C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	9,982	-	(9,982)		(9,982)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	2581C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	9,982	-	(9,982)		(9,982)	

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Pay No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES			
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	
EH	HSP5022	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	281D	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(2,888)
EH	HSP5022	HSP - Nursing SPH	1100	1284A	Nurses Aide Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(12,888)
EH	HSP5022	HSP - Nursing SPH	1100	1284B	Nurses Aide Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(15,888)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1328	Nurses Aide Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(43,658)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1331A	Nurses Aide Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(18,658)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1712C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(13,288)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1731	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(13,288)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	2830C	Nurses Aide Inst	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(38,692)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	2830C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	(8,384)
EH	DMHM110	DMH - Ponona Clinic	1130		Temporary		\$	150,000	\$	75,000	\$	\$	(75,000)
EH	DMHM651	DMH - Personnel Office	1130		Temporary		\$	50,000	\$	25,000	\$	\$	(25,000)
EH	DMHM620	DMH - Inpatient	1800		Relief		\$	1,223,000	\$	577,000	\$	\$	(646,000)
EH	DMHM620	DMH - Inpatient	1110		Overtime		\$	500,000	\$	250,000	\$	\$	(250,000)
EH	HSP5001	HSP - Food Services	1130		Temporary		\$	270,000	\$	170,000	\$	\$	(100,000)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1130		Temporary		\$	50,000	\$	20,000	\$	\$	(30,000)
EH	4881	Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2310		Contribution - to balance fund		\$	18,745,320	\$	14,717,030	\$	\$	(2,028,290)
EH							\$	19,745,320	\$	14,717,030	\$	\$	(2,028,290)
EH							\$	1,171,852	\$	1,044,442	\$	\$	(127,410)
EH							\$	16,944,720	\$	14,717,030	\$	\$	(2,227,690)
<b>FUND TOTAL</b>													

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Fall Legislature 12/04/2012

Fund	Dept. No.	Department Name	Object	Pay No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 INC. (DEC.)	
							Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change		
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X1674	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,777	57,765	5,777	57,765						51,989
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2289	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	1,886	15,858	1,886	15,858						14,272
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2300	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	5,777	57,765	5,777	57,765						51,989
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2349	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,164	31,636	3,164	31,636						28,472
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2350	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,312	33,100	3,312	33,100						29,788
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3025A	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,312	33,100	3,312	33,100						29,788
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3025B	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,310	23,104	2,310	23,104						20,794
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3301	St-Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	6,842	69,416	6,842	69,416						62,574
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3001	St-Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	7,685	76,846	7,685	76,846						69,161
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2649	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,342	23,416	2,342	23,416						21,074
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2649	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X7757	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X7758	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	3,279	32,785	3,279	32,785						29,506
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8078A	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,185	21,859	2,185	21,859						19,673
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8078B	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8422	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	232,000	2,310	232,000	2,310						27,000
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1810	1810	Insurance	Rescind Outsourcing	1,450	14,500	1,450	14,500						1,450
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1812	1812	Veteran	Rescind Outsourcing	3,705	37,050	3,705	37,050						33,345
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1920	1920	Retirement	Rescind Outsourcing	27,290	272,900	27,290	272,900						245,610
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1920	1920	Social Security	Rescind Outsourcing	344,945	3,449,450	344,945	3,449,450						3,104,505
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1950	1950	Workers Comp	Rescind Outsourcing	6,500	65,000	6,500	65,000						58,500
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1990	1990	MTA Tax	Rescind Outsourcing	-	45,770	-	45,770						45,770
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	2070	2070	Uniforms	Rescind Outsourcing	-	3,685	-	3,685						3,685
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	R210	R210	CPBRA	Rescind Outsourcing	-	7,000	-	7,000						7,000
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	5360	5360	Program Cost	Rescind Outsourcing	-	1,000,000	-	1,000,000						1,000,000
M	D6S2300	DSS-MIS	1101	1101	Salary Savings	Contribution - to balance fund	(50,000)	(10,000)	(50,000)	(10,000)						(60,000)
M	D6S1245	DSS-Maintenance	1101	1101	Salary Savings	Contribution - to balance fund	(194,750)	(400,000)	(194,750)	(400,000)						(594,750)
M	D6S2600	DSS-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R2003	R2003		Contribution - to balance fund					1,857,488	1,857,488				(184,178)
M						<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>1,127,618</b>	<b>1,442,891</b>	<b>1,127,618</b>	<b>1,442,891</b>	<b>1,842,310</b>	<b>1,842,488</b>	<b>16,178</b>			
Q	PER050	Unemployment Insurance	8010	R2009	Employee Benefit		750,000	50,000	750,000	50,000	750,000	60,000				(700,000)
Q						<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>(700,000)</b>			
						<b>Total</b>	<b>89,686,360</b>	<b>84,791,378</b>	<b>89,686,360</b>	<b>84,791,378</b>	<b>91,644,888</b>	<b>85,768,603</b>	<b>(14,774,982)</b>			

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
 AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
 2013 BUDGET  
 As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Obj	Account	Of This	Object Name & Description	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	
								INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.	INC.	DEC.		
								<b>REVENUES</b>											
								<b>APPROPRIATIONS</b>											
								Property Tax											
								Sales Tax											
								Balance											
								\$ 99,000,000 \$ 99,000,000 \$											
								\$ 175,000,000 \$ 175,000,000 \$											

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012  
TECHNICAL CHANGES TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Account or Title	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES				
					2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 LOCAL SHARE INC. (DEC.)	
A	DMH4305	Camp Venture	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	78,750	78,750	-	-	-	78,750	
A	DMH4306	Mental Health Assoc	5970	Direct Service Enhancement - Success Team Pg	-	12,000	12,000	-	-	-	12,000	
A	DMH4306	Mental Health Assoc	5970	Direct Service Enhancement - Transportation Pg	-	69,830	69,830	-	-	-	69,830	
A	DMH4332	NY Assoc for Learning Disabled	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	11,205	11,205	-	-	-	11,205	
A	DMH4342	Loeb House	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	9,140	9,140	-	-	-	9,140	
A	DMH4354	Bikur Cholim Partners in Health	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	16,030	16,030	-	-	-	16,030	
A	DMH4355	Jewish Family Svcs - Autism Pg	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	42,750	42,750	-	-	-	42,750	
A	SHF3113	Sheriff - River Patrol	R3389	State Aid - Public Safety	-	29,620	29,620	-	29,620	29,620	(29,620)	
A	SHF3113	Sheriff - River Patrol	R5060	Program Costs	-	37,000	37,000	-	-	-	37,000	
A	CA8816	West St. Day Care Center	5010	Contract Agency	-	17,323,285	(276,705)	-	-	-	(276,705)	
A	DOH2961	DOH-Education, Children EIP (0-2)	5520	Tuition (To balance above)	17,600,000	17,629,620	29,620	-	-	29,620	-	
<b>GENERAL(A) FUND</b>					\$ 17,600,000	\$ 17,629,620	\$ 29,620	\$ -	\$ 29,620	\$ 29,620	\$ -	
G	SWR8110	Sewer-Administration	1100	Salaries - N001 Sewer Use Compl Insp (Hebrew Spkg) (to correct salary)	39,780	47,820	8,040	-	-	-	8,040	
G	SWR9952	Sewer-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R5990	Appropriated Fund Balance (To balance above)	-	2,222,340	2,230,380	8,040	2,222,340	2,230,380	8,040	
<b>SEWER (G) FUND</b>					\$ 39,780	\$ 47,820	\$ 8,040	\$ -	\$ 2,222,340	\$ 2,230,380	\$ 8,040	

REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE AND PLANNING & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES  
 AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET  
 RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES  
 As Adopted by the Full Legislative Assembly

PROJECT	2013 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET	RECOMM.	APPROP. INC. (DEC.)	RECOMMENDED CHANGES			CAPITAL FUNDS
				GENERAL FUND CONTRIBUTION	FEDERAL	STATE AND	
<b>Schedule III</b>							
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Public Transportation</b>							
1894 - Bus Stop Improvements - 2008 Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	500,000			500,000	
1895 - Purchase One (1) Hybrid Electric Commuter Coach Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	1,014,562			1,014,562	
1891 - Install Vehicle Locator Systems (TRIP/TOR Bus) Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	1,500,000			1,500,000	
1896 - County Transit Centers Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	1,250,000			1,250,000	
1801 - Purchase of Two (2) 26' Buses - TRPS Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	400,000			400,000	
1817 - Purchase of Four (4) Transit Buses for TOS Replacement Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	2,345,500			2,345,500	
1822 - Purchase of Five (5) 28' Cutaway Buses for TRPS Replacement Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	400,000			400,000	
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Drainage</b>							
7055 - Peasack Brook - Lake Susannahs Terrace Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	3,000,000			3,000,000	
7054 - Damcrest Kill (or Related Streams) in the Vicinity of Lake Lucia - 2007 Road Work Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F		Pending	5,000,000			5,000,000	
7105 - Lake Susannah - Bridge, Clear, Design, Upstream and/or Downstream of Dam - Joint Project with Town of Ramapo Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F		Pending	5,000,000			5,000,000	
7106 - Drainage Improvements - Memorial Pond Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F		Pending	3,000,000			3,000,000	
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES</b>			<b>25,447,032</b>			<b>25,447,032</b>	<b>16,000,000</b>

Debate:Mr. Schoenberger

Usually I prepare a written statement, but I wasn't able to for tonight, because this was not really decided by the committee until late last night. I just want to say something that I said earlier in reference to Legislator Jobson. I don't know if I was clear. Without the yes vote of Doug Jobson's grandfather on the then Board of Supervisors Rockland Community College would never have been built. Almost every family in Rockland County has been benefited either directly or indirectly by RCC. RCC is not a State mandated program, but an optional one created by our forefathers in County government.

I would like to thank you, our Chair Harriet Cornell, Nicole Doliner, our Fiscal Analyst, Chris Seidel your eminently qualified Confidential Secretary, the Budget and Finance Committee, the Finance Department, the Legislators who attended our meetings, the department heads who helped us participate in arriving at this Report of the Budget and Finance Committee and the public.

The Budget and Finance Committee Report, which is on your desk, makes several changes to the County Executive's proposed budget. The first of those is it restores the Mosquito Control Program and the funding for the chemicals used to combat mosquitoes. That entire program was wiped out in the proposed budget submitted by the County Executive. The Budget and Finance Committee believes that this is a very important program for the health and safety of Rockland County residents. I have said it before and I will say it again, mosquitoes do not know where the County or town line starts. It is not something that if we give up that the towns could do or could do as well.

There are three areas that I look at as County government keeping its word. The Security people in the Department of General Services, which is 16.5 positions, which is 19 people. The food service for the jail is 10 positions. The laundry at the health complex is 13 positions. They are all CSEA. In September of this year this Legislature, by an overwhelming vote, approved the contract with CSEA and RAM and both those contracts contained a clause that said that there would be no lay offs or terminations for budgetary reasons. On all three of these, we had the department heads in and asked them for an explanation of these proposed lay offs. I am not going to tell you what they all said, but I am going to use Security at the Department of General Services as an example. I asked the Commissioner of the department: What are these lay offs? What do they mean? How are they coming about? The department head, Mr. Walsh, said that there were 16.5 positions with 19 people filling those positions and the County Executive proposed going out and hiring an outside company to provide this service. He said that they went to the New York State bid and were going to hire the number one provider on that bid. They were going to hire that company to do the security for the County buildings and property. He projected there would be savings to the County in the amount of \$1,000,000 a year for elimination of those positions. He said that they were going to save the money by hiring people at a cheaper rate, by taking away their benefits, pension, their medical and their vacation and therefore they will save \$1,000,000 for those 19 positions. Our Legislative Analyst Nicole Doliner, who is sitting there, calculated the savings and the savings came to something like \$439,000. It was clear and it was admitted by the department head that it was purely a budgetary consideration and purely money driven. To me that was clearly in violation of the contract that the majority of us voted on for the CSEA, that ends in 2013. And that contract due to the givebacks and concessions that CSEA made they were promised no lay offs or terminations for budgetary reasons.

I don't speak for anyone else, but I certainly speak for myself and now I am speaking as the Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, because this is the report of the Budget and Finance Committee. The feeling of the committee is that we must keep our word. We are government. When we give our word we must keep it. When we signed a contract with our employees and it is negotiated, not by us, but by the administration then our employees expect us to live up to the contract and we expect them to live up to the contract. The employees are living up to the contract. They are taking five unfunded workdays this year. They will work five days this year and won't be paid for their work and they will work five days next year and won't be paid for their work. They will have to wait until 2014 to be paid for those days. They have also given up longevity, made contributions to their health care and they have done a lot and in exchange for that they were guaranteed no lay offs or terminations for budgetary reasons.

The Report of the Budget and Finance Committee feels a moral, legal and ethical obligation to keep our word to our employees and therefore these positions have been restored in the proposed budget.

The Mounted Patrol was proposed by the County Executive to be eliminated. There were 5 positions in the Sheriff Patrol and four positions in the Mounted Patrol proposed to be eliminated by the County Executive. Those employees do not have the same contractual protection that CSEA and RAM have, however the Mounted Patrol is a unique service to Rockland County residents. It is not duplicative of any town or police department or police services. The Mounted Patrol is instrumental in crowd control and instrumental in making sure that peace is restored in the event there is any kind of conflict. Why, because officers on horses dominate crowds. I don't know what the respective ratio is. Some people told me that one mounted patrol officer equals six people on the ground. Someone else told me eight people on the ground. You would have to deploy six or eight officers to make up for one officer on a horse. Mounted Patrols are used throughout the country. If anyone has ever seen the movies, photographs or videos of Mardi Gras, there are the mounted patrols. They are instrumental in crowd control, keeping the peace and instrumental in preventing riots and instrumental in protecting the public safety. It is for that reason that the Budget and Finance Committee recommends the restoration of the Mounted Patrol and also the five positions in the Sheriff Patrol, because the last thing we want to see happen is the reduction in public safety.

There are other restorations, and I don't want to spend all night going through them. The questions are: How do we pay for the restoration of the five bodies in the Mosquito Control Program and its necessary chemical elements? How do we pay for any of this? The answer is what the Budget and Finance Committee did was make corresponding cuts elsewhere in the budget so we do not increase the property tax further. We must have realistic revenue enhancements and expenditure reductions to balance the budget. How do we pay for it? First, we are abolishing 22 other positions in County government that are vacant, but fully funded for 2013. We made other cuts as well. Through the cooperation of our County Sheriff, who is a great leader, Lou Falco, we are reducing, with his consent, jail overtime by some \$200,000, reducing Sheriff's Patrol overtime by \$50,000 and jail relief by \$100,000. When we keep these positions going in security, food service and laundry we then take back the money that would have been spent for an outside source, which the County Executive put in the budget. For the laundry contract the County Executive put \$400,000 in the budget so if we keep the employees we take that \$400,000 back. The radiology contract for the hospital is \$200,000. The security contract is \$1,000,000. We did additional salary savings of \$1,480,000. The unemployment that would have been paid out need not be paid out for these people is \$700,000. We have reduced the sales tax reserve by \$1,000,000 and our County contingency budget by \$500,000. We reduced 409-contracts (fees for service) in the Department of Law, which had \$125,000 to \$75,000, which means they will have to hire less outside counsel and do more work themselves. We have abolished in the Department of Mental Health vacant positions, which has a net County taxpayer reduction of \$662,000. We reduced the temporary line in the Department of Mental Health by \$100,000 and the relief line by \$646,000. That still leaves \$1,000,000 in the relief line in the Department of Mental Health. We reduced the overtime in the Department of Mental Health by \$250,000. We reduced a temporary line in the Hospital by \$130,000, which still leaves them \$200,000. There was a contract through the Department of Health relating to bus transportation that we reduced that was \$180,000 of which 36% is State funded so the net reduction in County taxpayer savings is \$117,140.

The total cuts from the list I have given you are \$7,585,838. To restore the positions and the benefits that I outlined to you was \$5,360,000. To restore the operational supplies is \$134,000 and \$95,000 is only for the Mosquito Control Program. Then we made an adjustment in the amount of \$486,180 for something that the committee is being very conservative with, because it is called a "Cobra Adjustment." What the administration did was to project that with all the lay offs and terminations a number of the employees would then go out and purchase Cobra to keep their medical benefits. They put \$486,180 in our 2013 budget as revenue for that Cobra. We don't really believe it is revenue, because if you take it in from the employees we then have to pay it to Empire. So it goes in one hand and out the other hand. It really isn't revenue that stays in the budget. We took the \$486,180 out, because we wanted to balance the budget and wanted to be honest in our budget.

I am going to tell you something, with all that we have done in this budget; we are taking the favorable variances in the report of our outside consultant on the County Executive's 2013 budget and balancing them against the unfavorable variances. We probably have one of the closest budgets that we have had in Rockland County to being balanced in many, many years.

We then restored certain contract agencies. Our total restorations come to \$6,169,173. It leaves a balance of \$1,416,665, which could be used for property tax reduction, but in the interest of being cautious, safe and to protect County residents for the upcoming year we are putting it into an account where it will be held and not touched unless it is absolutely needed. We have \$500,000 in our contingency and another \$1,416,665. Why? Say the relief in the Department of Mental Health was cut no one sitting here can be absolutely sure that the \$1,000,000 is enough. No one can be sure that the overtime in Mental Health or the temporary line in the Department of Mental Health is sufficient in the budget. We need to have these reserves in case something goes wrong otherwise it will increase the deficit.

There is another reason we did not take that money as a cut in the budget to the property tax and that is a letter from Moody's Investor Service dated September 26, 2012 where they reissued our rating. It is a seven-page letter that I will read portions of to you.

Under the title *DETAILED CREDIT DISCUSSION* they say, "The County has announced significant employee reductions, which together with revenue enhancements on the deficit reduction bonds, which were denied. County Management Notes that were an attempt to slowly chip away at the deficit through expenditure decreases revenue enhancement."

On their *OUTLOOK* for our County. "What could make the rating go up (removal of negative outlook)?" Implementation of realistic revenue enhancements and expenditure reductions to close the significant gap. What could make the ratings go down? Failure to implement realistic revenue enhancements and expenditure reductions to offset growing budget gap."

Therefore, to reduce the property tax, as much as I would like to, we have to show the rating agencies of our willingness to increase revenue enhancements in a place where it is absolutely reliable and absolutely certain that the money will come in. The most certain form of revenue for the County unfortunately is property tax.

Something else in the Moody's letter, which I thought was very interesting is that they say our direct debt burden is 1.1% and our overall debt burden is 3.5% and our payout of principal is 74.6% in ten years. So our debt situation is good, but our cash flow is a problem. Rather than take a chance of jeopardizing our Moody's ratings and rather than taking a chance on hurting our County government we chose in the Budget and Finance Committee not to take that \$1,416,665 and apply it to property tax reduction. I am sure there are Legislators, just like I, who would like to have done that, but the committee feels the more responsible way of doing it is not to do it. Every \$810,000 is 1% so \$1,416,665 is 1.5%. If 18% raises \$157.00 per household in tax what is the reduction of 1.5%? \$8.00 to \$10.00 per household. It is better to create that reserve so we don't create future deficits. People can disagree with me I am a big boy and I understand that and I don't fault anyone for having a different point of view and I don't criticize them.

Earlier a speaker spoke of the \$12,000,000 in a revenue item that was from the LDC, which was taken off the line, because if we left that item in it would increase our deficit by \$12,000,000. There is a difference between our outside consultants and our Commissioner of Finance over some \$4,000,000 in bond money - money that was bonded to be used for certioraris. I have reviewed that and discussed in depth with our outside consultants regarding the budget. I discussed in depth with our Commissioner of Finance and Deputy Budget Director and I believe the issue really boils down to a question of how it is posted in the 2013 budget. I received assurance from our Commissioner of Finance that the money will be spent and used properly and I know legally it must. You can't use bonded money to pay operational expenses. He will come back to us, once the budget is adopted, in 2013 with the appropriate budget adjustment if it is needed.

We did not restore the positions in the Pre-Natal Clinic. The County's Pre-Natal Clinic will be taken over by Nyack Hospital. We will be fully divested of the Pre-Natal Clinic. It is going to save us an excess of \$2,000,000 per year.

I spoke earlier about the Mental Health Inpatient Unit to Nyack Hospital, which I hope could be done in 2013, but realistically could be done in 2014. It will save the County 50 to 80 salaried employees, plus everything else related to it. There will be a tremendous savings. We made extensive cuts in County departments, including Hospitals and Mental Health and the Law Department. We did not restore funding to the County Pharmacy.

The County Executive sent over a budget that eliminated the funding for the County Pharmacy for 2013, which is about \$2,000,000. We did not restore that funding. We leave it in the hands of the County Executive to fulfill that commitment and end the no co-pays. We know, we believe and we accept that the public is upset that back in 1985 the then Legislature created a pharmacy that allowed employees to get their prescription drugs for no co-pay. In those days the co-pay was \$1.00. In 1989 the Legislature at that time again reissued it. In those days the co-pay was \$4.00 with \$1.00 for generic drugs. We know the world has changed. I personally believe this had to be negotiated at the bargaining table and I still believe that, because it is what you call a "past practice". I know the administration negotiated for the last three contracts, but for one reason or another, I am not going to cast blame, it was not successful. They have proposed no funding for 2012 and we have not restored funding. We support the County Executive's efforts to make the County Pharmacy fair and equitable to the employees and to the taxpayers and that is under his leadership and direction.

I think I have completed most of the highlights that I wanted to say. Chair Cornell said to me, "don't talk too long - don't talk too long." I hope I haven't talked too long Chairwoman Cornell. At this point I will entertain any questions anyone has.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

It is upsetting to hear that, according to some Legislators, we don't really have a problem here or that it is not our fault it is the State Senate's fault, the Governor's fault and it is the Mandates fault. As far as I know we still have the lowest bond rating in New York State so I think a question that we have to ask ourselves is, what is it that other counties are doing that we are not doing or visa-versa.

We currently have a \$96,000,000 deficit in our County. According to our auditors we have a projected additional deficit of \$15,000,000 for the current budget year 2012. The proposed County Executive's budget requires \$15,000,000 to "balance the budget", which equates to an approximately 18% tax increase. It also assumes the lay offs and the cuts that have been discussed. The auditors say that the County Executive's budget has holes in it, that it is not right and to truly balance it an additional \$6,700,000 is required. Therefore, according to the auditors, the total deficit as reflected in the County Executive's budget for 2013 that has to be made up somehow is \$22,000,000.

Here are the reasons why I cannot support the budget that is being proposed with the changes that were just outlined by Chair Schoenberger of the Budget and Finance Committee. These things are just things that I observed and many of the Legislators that I have spoken to observe some of the same things so we are trying to figure out how to fix them. The budget process itself is broken. The receive schedules, lists of all the cuts and additions to the budget with final numbers, plus technical changes, on the same night we were expected to vote on them, which was last night at the Budget and Finance Committee meeting, is unfair and probably unprofessional. In addition to that to have a system, and someone said this last night, where only agencies who "speak up" and get the ear of the County Executive can manage to get a last minute technical change is also unfair and unprofessional.

One recommendation might be for the future is to only allow technical changes that are really errors or mistakes like typos and that might make it a more fair process. We were told if an agency didn't "speak up" they were not included in the technical changes.

These are not credible budgets, either one of them, in my mind. How does an auditor find \$6,700,000 still missing and not accounted for in the County Executive's budget? How does the Legislative Financial Analyst, who did a fantastic job, Nicole Doliner, find an additional \$6,700,000 in savings that the County Executive never found? How does the Director of Finance suddenly pull out of his hat last night \$300,000 to pay for last minute technical changes made to the budget? I really don't know the answers. Either people don't understand the budgets or maybe some of those people were originally not looking for real savings. I am not sure.

We always talk about how we get the budget too late in October. What if the Fiscal Task Force and the Government Operations Committee work together in the year to deconstruct the current budget and be ready with specific recommendations to the Legislature well before the County Executive's proposed budget is handed to them? In other words, we take the budget that we have been studying and we work on that from January, because we are going to find more mysteries and more holes and more recommendations as a result of that.

We have done nothing to address the underlying deficit problem and we have no viable financial plan for the future. The proposed changes that Chairman Schoenberger outlined do nothing to address the outstanding \$114,000,000 deficit. I voted against the CSEA agreement several months ago, because I thought that it did very little to help us address our dire financial situation. I was against the deferred payment plan, because in 2014 we have to pay it back. I was also against the no lay offs for budgetary reasons for the very same reason. In 2014 we will have to pay back all the deferred pay plus automatic health care and pension increases.

Now I think we need to have some systemic changes that are going to tackle this huge deficit. For example, we need to negotiate union contracts that require additional health care and pension contributions from employees, as is the standard that we are seeing across our communities and in our school districts. I know this isn't popular, but we should eliminate the no co-pay at the pharmacy for employees. We can't just take the attitude that it is not funded, because it wasn't funded last year, but they took the money in the budget and paid for it. Instead of deferring we should have had or need to have salary cuts perhaps across the board among hire compensated employees. Consider 5% to 10% across the board cuts in the departments. Again, consider independent operational audits of departments to make sure that we have operating efficiencies and staff efficiencies.

For all of the reasons I have outlined I think both of the budgets are bad for Rockland County and its citizens. For all of these reasons I think the tax increase is too high to justify. What we have actually here in Rockland County a continued step increase for taxes with no real effort, in my opinion, to reduce the tax burden, no effort on the part of the County Executive or even sometimes this Legislature. Now I understand what Legislator Schoenberger just said that we are not applying the \$1,700,000 that is left over to reduce the tax burden, but I disagree with putting it aside for "anything that is unforeseen"

My gateway into public service was through the doors of a non-profit agency called The Association of the Visually Impaired. I began there as a volunteer and I eventually served as Chairman of the Board of Directors. I met Harriet Cornell, John Murphy, Cathy Lukens and many others through the non-profit world. I am deeply touched by the stories of how Rockland County came to be a respected center of the non-profit world. In fact as I recall it was Dominican Nuns who first came here in the late 1800's from New York City and opened the first orphanage right where Camp Venture is now in Orangetown. The programs, services and employees that were originally cut are critical to our County, especially to our most vulnerable citizens. We do them no favor when we ignore much needed systemic change in our budget process year after year. Thank you.

Mr. Schoenberger

I am compelled to respond to this, because I think, even though I know Legislator Low-Hogan means well, it is a reflection of her lack of understanding or misunderstanding of how County government operates and the laws that govern County government. She asked what are other counties doing. They are going bankrupt. You only have to look at Westchester County, Nassau County, Suffolk County, Erie County and New York City to see counties that have gone bankrupt where we haven't. We are fighting not to go bankrupt. You talked about the \$96,000,000 deficit at the end of 2011. As I said earlier, the \$96,000,000 deficit included an \$18,000,000 deficiency bond, which this County paid off in June of this year. The snapshot of the deficit was on December 31, 2011. If the snapshot were made June 30, 2012 it would be \$96,000,000 less \$18,000,000, because the \$18,000,000 has been paid off. The number you gave for the deficit or potential deficit as shown in the report by O'Connor-Davies included the \$12,000,000 that was put on the books for the LDC, which this Budget and Finance Committee has reversed. It is not being put on the books. The number you gave doesn't reflect that \$12,000,000 reduction.

You talked about the budget process being broken. I would readily agree with you and would Legislator Carey, but those dates are set by New York State law and by the County Charter. The County Charter mirrors New York State Law in terms of the dates. The difference between the County Charter and New York State law is New York State law has a Treasurer or Commissioner of Finance for every County who then submits the budget to the Legislature. When we went to a Charter form of government that was erased and replaced by the County Executive who is the Budget Officer of Rockland County who submits on that date. The dates are consistent with New York State law. If you want to fix the budget process you have to go to Albany and you have to have Albany change those dates. Legislator Carey asked me last year why can't the County Executive submit them earlier so that we would have more time to review it. I told him that is beyond our control. He can submit it to us September 1<sup>st</sup> and give us more time to review it if he chooses to. He can submit it on October 15<sup>th</sup> instead of on October 23<sup>rd</sup>. He could submit to us January 1<sup>st</sup> if he chooses to do so, but he chooses not to do so. The County Executive submits the budget to us a 4:55 p.m. on the last day allowed by law. Most of us don't even see until we come in the next day. That is his right whether you like it or not. So if you want to change those dates change the law.

To say that this County has done nothing to address the deficit is a tremendous disservice. A disservice to the Legislature, to the Executive and to the employees who have sacrificed so much and to the residents of this County. I will tell you why I say that. When I look in our County book and I compare our County employees who are in the proposed 2013 budget to what they were thirty years ago we are 575 less employees and the Budget and Finance Committee are eliminating 22 more. The workload has not reduced in thirty years, and that is a major significant cut. I don't know of any other County, City, town or village that has made that kind of a cut ever.

We have contracted out our Alcohol and Drug Treatment Program that we used to provide. We are divesting ourselves of the Mental Health Inpatient Unit to Nyack Hospital as I described earlier. Hundreds of County employees will be affected. The County payroll will drop significantly from that. We also abolished our Outpatient Drug Counseling. We no longer do that.

The budget proposes an LDC. We reversed the \$1,000,000 so there is no dollar impact on the 2013 budget. The LDC is a Local Development Corporation. We went to the State Legislature two years in a row and asked them to authorize us to form a Public Benefit Corporation. They did it for Westchester, Suffolk, Nassau and many other counties that would allow their nursing home and hospital to go to a Public Benefit Corporation, which would then run it. The State Legislature refused to grant it to us. The only alternative we have now is either to close the nursing home, sell the nursing home or we can create what our outside consultant/attorneys from Harris Beach recommended, which is to create a Local Development Corporation and transfer the nursing home to Local Development Corporation. For what purposes? To divest it and to sell it, because it is not a mandated program.

You heard earlier that we went to Albany, Chair Cornell, Sean Mathews, Doug Jobson, Aron Wider, Alden Wolfe, and we went through all the cuts we made and all the revenue enhancements, which includes increasing taxes, created charge backs, made cuts in County government. Why did we do all these things? To deal with the deficit and to say that we have done anything to address the underlying deficit is absolutely false. Look at all the things we have done to stabilize this County. We went to Albany and met with the Assembly Finance Committee and we met with the Senate Finance Committee two different times. We also met with the Governor's office. After we sat down with all of us the first question everybody asked of us was, "What are you doing with your nursing home." They want us to divest from our nursing home. The pressure comes down from Albany. The message is not only to us, but also to every other County in this State. If you don't believe me ask the CSEA who deals on a State level. It is happening in every County. We are moving in that direction, not because we want to, but because we have to. The LDC that is proposed that will be formed in 2014 will have a target date by mid to the third-quarter of 2014 to divest the nursing home. The LDC will take control then look to market and sell it and they will come back to us with a proposal to buy it. When someone does we will no longer have a nursing home, employees for it and no longer have a place for those people in Rockland County who have nowhere else to go. It will be gone. This was always the place that took them in and it is not a State mandated service and it is going to have to go, unfortunately. We fought hard and as long as we could, but I am going to tell you something – the State will never recognize our situation until we divest the nursing home. It is coming straight down from Albany and make no mistake about that.

To say we have done nothing to address the underlying budget couldn't be further from the truth. With all due respect to you Legislator Low-Hogan a person I respect very much, if you have better ideas I want to hear them. If you have better solutions we all want to hear them. I have said that repeatedly. I have no pride of authorship. Things don't have to be my way or no way, I don't believe in that. Earlier this evening we had a Deficit Reduction Law and Legislator Moroney asked to make the vote two-thirds, I didn't say no, it is a good idea and I accepted his idea immediately. I don't have any pride of authorship for what is happening here. I wish we didn't have to do the things that we are doing. I wish that we didn't have to make the cuts and raise the taxes, but we have to prevent this County from going bankrupt. We have to prevent this County from suffering the harm imposed on us by State mandates.

Mr. Flynn spoke earlier about keeping our words to these employees about no lay offs. He said to us, and rightfully so, that if we don't keep our word to those employees the unions are going to sue us. When you have a clear contractual provision that says there will be no lay offs for budgetary reasons and all the records of all the meetings show that these are budgetary lay offs we are going to lose. These employees will not be allowed to come to work, they will sue us and when they are successful we will wind up paying their back salary, back pension benefits and the COBRA benefits, plus their possible legal fees. Guess what? We will pay all of those and we would have gotten zero services, because we would have had to pay outside consultants to do the work that they would have done and whined up paying for it twice. Now for those of you who don't believe that is the more prudent and beneficial way to run this County then vote no.

If you vote no on our budget the County Executive's budget becomes the budget. If you think that is a better budget then vote for the County Executive's budget. I am not going to do it. It takes nine Legislators to vote for anything. Vote for the County Executive's budget if you think that is better. Watch the litigation that ensues, watch the harm that comes to this County, watch the rating agencies as they treat this County and put us into bankruptcy and then watch how much you have to pay just to run this County on a day-to-day basis, not by a Legislative body and not by the County Executive, but by a Control Board who will come done whose members will be paid millions of dollars from County funds. So if you think these are easy solutions and easy choices, let me tell you, they are not, but to say that nothing has been done to address the underlying deficit is just not acceptable, not accurate, not true and I felt so compelled that I had to respond.

Thank you Chair Cornell.

Mr. Hood, Jr.

I have been pretty quiet up until now and just soaking it in. When I pulled up to the building tonight I really didn't know how I was going to vote. It has been one of the most difficult processes I have been through and it seems to get tougher every year. Last year I thought it was really tough, but this year was even worse.

I feel compelled to answer Legislator Low-Hogan also. Those things are so much easier said than done. I have wanted the County Executive to work with us in a timelier fashion for years. I wanted information, but I don't get it. So to say that we should change the date or ask for it earlier is just not going to happen with this County Executive. Hopefully next year we will have a new County Executive and there will be more negotiation. It is a little bit of a fantasy world on some of the things that you said. To say that we shouldn't blame the mandates; I don't really want to call it "blame", but I will call it reality, because that is where our money is going. It has nothing to do with blame. We are just telling you how it is working. To have a Governor give us no help means we can't expect anything from him. This is a very complex problem so to have such a strident speech that you have the answers or this is what we should do I think is very strident for your first go-around of a budgetary process. You can have your opinion, but I certainly disagree.

We can all agree that the system is broken from the budgetary process, to the mandate system and so many other things that need to be fixed. We lost a lot of time this year trying to work on this budget due to the storm. I hope Legislator Carey can push his ideas through and I will help him with that next year. We raised taxes last year 30% and I thought it would get us back on track and be able to have somewhat of a balanced budget. This year we got new bills in the amount of \$30,000,000 plus so that 30% did us no good and we are back to where we started or maybe even worse off. To say the mandates is not a problem is just not getting it.

It has been talked about the different tax bills, school, town, village and County. I look at my own personal bill, which did meet the averages that were in the newspaper. I started at \$660.00 per year a couple of years ago and it went up to \$770.00 this year for all that the County provides and with the 18% increase my bill will be \$900.00. \$900.00 for everything we do, which includes all the mandates that we have to pay for and all the non-mandated programs that we/I believe are necessary for our residents. \$900.00 is what I am talking about in my life. To have someone come here and say that I should be ashamed of myself, I just laugh at that, I am not ashamed of myself. I am not ashamed of the job I have done. Could things be better? Sure. I will admit that we could have done better, but we are trying to right the ship under the circumstances that we are in and the broken system that we are in. I would never say that I was ashamed of myself. I am proud of the job that we all do up here. I am proud of this County and everything that we do.

Between mandates and non-mandates. People want us to cut and cut until we don't have to cut taxes. Well, I refuse to become a government of only mandates. I am not going to have the State tell me where to spend every nickel and there is nothing left to do the other programs that we want for public safety, mosquito program and public health education programs. I have lower income district and a lot of my constituents need these services. I have empathy for that. I am not going to become just a State mandated County.

I refuse to pass costs along to the towns and villages. I voted no on passing the election costs and other things down to the towns and villages and I hope that we can take over those costs again. We don't like it when the State does it to us and we shouldn't do it to the towns and villages. If I have to raise taxes to do that then so be it.

For all that we do \$900.00 is not a lot of money, which is that way I feel. Now I have to look at the reality of what we have in front of us tonight. The reality is the yes vote for our amendments is an 18% tax increase. The reality is a no vote is an 18% tax increase with the County Executive's budget. You get the raise in taxes either way. I am waiting to hear other suggestions, which I think may be coming. The same people that have done other suggestions other years simply didn't work and the numbers didn't match up so I don't have too much faith in those either. A yes vote for the amendments tonight that the Budget and Finance Committee has worked so hard on is a better plan. It does not lay off workers that are protected by the contract that they signed. I can just imagine as a lawyer the lawsuits immediately upon voting no tonight. You are going to have an Order to Show Cause on the Judges desk 9:00 am tomorrow morning. I am saying whether I agree with it or not, but it is a reality and a cost. It can cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars to fight that and to me it is not worth it. A better plan is to be a body of your word and vote yes tonight on the amendments.

I also have to say a word for Sheriff Lou Falco. He has done yeoman's work to try to find cuts in his budget to allow us to balance our budget better. I appreciate that, Sheriff Falco. This yes vote tonight for the amendments replenishes the Sheriff's Department in a way that will benefit public safety. There are certain areas like Haverstraw that could use more police officer. If you take one Sheriff off the road that is one less car on the road in every town that could go all over the County giving our tickets, catch DWI and whatever they can do. To say that it will not affect public safety is just missing the point. It is not duplication it is extra and I am willing to pay for that.

I have to say through all the meetings we had that went to midnight many nights we did a lot of work on this, we had caucuses with the Democrats and they know that I wanted more cuts. I could not get anybody to really agree with me and that is maybe my fault, because I just didn't have the right ideas. I don't know. I just can't just vote no and be stuck with a worse budget from the County Executive. I fought for what I wanted, I didn't get it, but this is a better plan and I am going to go with it and take the best alternative in front of me and that is the amended budget tonight. The next few years I don't think it will be any easier. We are going to have to look possible at some of the cuts that I recommended in caucus. I think we have to take a serious hard look at things that are going to come down. I have always hoped over the years that the sales tax would rebound, but it just hasn't come back. I am hoping in the next few years the economy will rebound and we will have enough money to pay for everything we want to do. With that I am going to support the amendments tonight as proposed and I hope that you all join me.

#### Chairwoman Cornell

I have a couple of letters that I am not going to read in their entirety, but I think they are important in line with the public safety issue that Legislator Hood was just talking about. The first is from the Mayor of the Village of Nyack, Jennifer Laird-White.

She says, "Nyack wants to formally let you know how valuable the Sheriff's Department horses are to our policing." She talks about the events that go on in Nyack and she said, "We also have our late night businesses that cause no small amount of headaches and requirements for policing well beyond what the town and even our neighbors police forces can sometimes provide. The key to calm in Nyack on many, many occasions has been the arrival of the horses, impressive in their size and precision, capable of drawing gasps of delight from kids but, most importantly, calming the most difficult drunk or criminal. No one wants to tangle with the horses and many potentially dangerous events have been eliminated with the arrival of these sweet and mighty beasts."

I also have a letter that came to me Chief of Police from the Town of Haverstraw, Charles B. Miller. He made some very important points about how important the Sheriff's Department has been to the Town of Haverstraw.

"This year alone the Sheriff's Department has assisted the Town of Haverstraw Police Department well over eight hundred and fifty (850) times as of this date. The Sheriff's Road Patrol alone has assisted my department well over one hundred (100) times this year. They have assisted my officers and my department in several circumstances including but not limited to bar fights, stabbings, shootings, major crimes scenes, fire scenes and at serious accident scenes. The Sheriff's Patrol is in town on a daily basis to assist and back up my road patrol officers when needed. The Sheriff's Mounted Unit helps my department during the summer months by providing us with mount patrols in the downtown area. These patrols are highly visible and helps make the visitors to our local restaurants and stores throughout the village feel safer and are a big deterrent for some of the local drug dealers and thugs. If any positions are eliminated at the Sheriff's Department it will have an adverse affect on my department. We all know the New York State Civil Service rules on layoffs, the last hired is usually the first to go. By eliminating positions it will have an undesirable affect on the Rockland County Sheriff's Bureau of Criminal Identification Unit (BCI). They are responsible for processing any and all crime scenes within the jurisdiction of the Town of Haverstraw Police Department. The BCI Unit is able to provide my department with highly trained and professional Crime Scene Technicians, Fingerprint, Experts, Arson Investigators, Bomb Technicians, and Sketch artist. They also assist my detectives by processing all evidence we are able to obtain at a crime scene along with any stolen vehicle we recover. The cost that not only the Town of Haverstraw Police Department, but every other police department in this County would incur to become experts in processing and collecting evidence at crime scenes and to become Fingerprint Experts, just to name a couple, would be astronomical."

He ends by asking us to reevaluate the current circumstances to keep Rockland County safer by maintaining the Sheriff's Department as we have put into our report.

I also want to make a couple of points about mandates. You probably don't know that New York State is one of only two States in the entire nation that requires counties to pay half the cost of Medicaid. It is a little known fact for a very large expense. In 1997 Rockland County's local share of Medicaid was \$25,700,000. This year it is \$73,350,000 and next year it will be \$76,000,000 in 2013. Being a partner with the State, as Rockland County is as an agent of the State for many of these mandated and social programs, I am proud of that role. I am happy as a County to play that role, but not happy when we are not fully reimbursed or when the reimbursements come so late that it really becomes a huge expense and burden for us.

I am a longtime advocate for children so I strongly believe in the Early Intervention and Pre-School Special Education, but the reimbursement rate for the Early Intervention is really horrible. We have to pay 100% upfront in the first instance and by State statute these costs cannot be claimed until nine months into the school year. As a result counties often wait for more than a year for 49% reimbursement. This creates enormous cash flow problems and consequently checks do not go out timely to those agencies that are providing these services. This gives you a little bit of an idea about the mandates.

I would like to talk a little bit about what our County government does with your tax dollars and some of my colleagues have talked about some so I am going to try not to necessarily touch on the same things. Since the economic recession started in 2007 there are many, many more people needing government assistance and many of these are newly poor. Newly poor, out of work for the first time in their lives and they are forced to visit food pantries and soup kitchens to feed their families and to go to our Department of Social Services. Government agencies and not-for profit organizations provide food, shelter and assistance. I also do a lot of work with school personnel. I meet with principals and teachers on a regular basis. The schools have seen students who have been formerly very fine students just having their academic standing just decline, because they are under so much stress since they feel the stress that their families have. Their world has changed and in many cases they may have had to move in with grandparents or relatives.

From my earliest years in the Legislature I held a lot of hearings on women and family issues, and this goes back into the 1980's. There were many women who would say that they were divorcees or widowed and still living in their homes in middle class neighborhood, but they are ashamed, because they didn't have the money to buy gifts so their children could go to birthday parties.

I tell you all this, because social services are not just for "others". They are there for you or for your neighbor when they are needed. That goes for the services to protect children or adults from abuse. We have Child and Protective Services. It is hard to imagine that abuse goes on in your neighborhood, but believe me it does. I know it does.

Over the years County government has recognized the importance of utilizing the private sector agencies known as "contract agencies." They are not-for-profit businesses that offer specialized services, which contribute to the health, safety and well being of County residents. They are not under the same restrictions as government and they are able to utilize volunteers. This County has historically contracted with them to deliver very specialized services, which would be too costly for government to provide, such as services for the developmentally disabled, the mentally ill, and people with alcohol and other drug dependencies. This becomes even more crucial when you remember that town governments closed their counseling centers years ago, which had been dealing with many of these issues.

A survey taken about five years ago revealed that the economic impact of 208 Rockland not-for-profit agencies that deliver social services enrich the cultural landscape and protect the environment was more than \$1 billion dollars. They employed 11,000 people, brought in hundreds of millions of dollars through grants and contracts, with almost \$20,000,000 added value from volunteer hours.

And there are the dedicated public servants who work for County government performing all kinds of services to safeguard your families. I've heard people say, "I don't use government services." Wrong! You may not know that government workers are protecting your children from online predators, bringing evildoers to justice and inspecting food establishment so you don't get food-borne illnesses. They work with older people to teach ways to avoid falls, which can lead older people to an earlier death or a helpless life, at great cost, rather than an active, independent life. They work with veterans to ensure that these heroes get the help they need and the benefits to which they are entitled.

I don't know anyone, including myself, who thinks the County should cut the Mosquito Control Program to avoid West Nile Disease. We have specialists who have the know-how and experience. Why would five towns want to start their own programs? However, there are equally serious health issues to tackle. What about the epidemic of childhood obesity leading to diabetes? Diabetes is the seventh leading cause of death in the United States. The mission of the Rockland County Department of Health is to prevent disease, to send public health workers into homes, schools and senior centers to educate and prevent all manner of ills and accidents from sexually transmitted diseases to the many deadly consequences of tobacco. The nutrition programs that are held, such as Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies, have saved the County thousand of dollars in the cost of care for babies who might otherwise have been born with significant medical issues. Each of these efforts, plus many others, has the potential to save the County significant funds in the treatment of illnesses that could be prevented or diminished.

County government does many things. Many government workers have jobs that put them in harm's way every day. Those who work without sleep mobilizing services during the super-storm or the floods of Irene. These workers are your neighbors who pay taxes, attend your church or temple and volunteer for local organizations.

It is ironic that Rockland County has the sad distinction of having the fourth or fifth highest property taxes in the nation when such a minute proportion of your tax bill is actually for County government services. As I said before, only 7% to 8% of a homeowner's total annual property taxes are for County government taxes. The school taxes are 65%, 20% for town and villages and 8% for the other taxes, such as sewer and solid waster.

It is public health, it is public safety, it is crime prevention, it is fair elections, it is consumer protection, it is clean air and water, it is safe roads and bridges and it is Rockland Community College that are the things that County government does. I am so proud to be a County Legislator and to support those kinds of supports. So you may not know that you are receiving those benefits, but you are receiving them. These functions are the very definition of County government. They all represent cost avoidance, the much greater cost to taxpayers and society in dollars and human capital when these obligations are not fulfilled. I am certainly supporting this much better budget that has been described to us by Legislator Schoenberger. I thank you for listening.

Mr. Meyers

First of all, Chair Cornell, in most Legislative bodies in the country the Chair has the privilege of speaking first. I don't know how it has been in this body before Chair Cornell, but she always waits patiently and speaks last. I think that is a credit to her. I certainly have no objection to you speaking a little bit earlier than last before everybody in the audience has long since left or fallen asleep. It is probably a good idea.

I do disagree with some of the things that have been said. I think that the budget process, since I have been in the Legislature, has been very disheartening. I think Legislator Low-Hogan dipped her finger on it and it is undeniably true. I have been in this Legislature only since the beginning of 2008 and I was very alarmed when O'Connor Davies came in, in 2007 right before I was elected and then in 2008, and talked about how revenues were being overstated and how the deficit were growing. Nobody seemed too alarmed. In fact, the overstated revenues were accepted notwithstanding our consultants, the tax increases were nil or 1.3% and a couple of years they even reduced the tax increase that was recommended from down the hall. The whole thing made no sense at all. The consultant is telling you that budgets are not working and we are tens of millions of dollars in the hole and everybody was fine with it and the budgets were accepted. We were very slow to adjust to the crisis as it developed. We did a crappy job the last five years in terms of budgeting. Now we are really in the hole.

The whole point of budgeting, especially in a government process like this, and Chair Cornell put her finger on it, so many of the programs do something good for people and every program have supporters. So you will get a letter from Nyack, Haverstraw and Mayor of Spring Valley saying how important the Mounted Patrol is, or you are thinking about eliminating certain programs and then the supporters of those programs come forward. How do you choose? Every program conceivably does something good for people. Every County employee has a job to do. So, what do you do? Well for a couple of years we accepted overstated revenues that we knew were false. Were we serving the public? Were we serving our public employees? No, we weren't.

In 2008, some others and I said that even if you have some light lay offs that year and eliminate some programs earlier on in the process you would have saved dozens and dozens of jobs in the CSEA. So we did not do you good service by waiting until the crisis grew to the point where there had to be very serious lay offs. I know this isn't popular for the CSEA employees left in the room, but approving a contract that has a no lay off pledge tying both arms behind your back at a time when you know you are in a fiscal crisis – we did that just a few months ago and only two people on this board (Legislator Low-Hogan and myself) out of seventeen thought that was a bad idea – to tie both arms behind our backs. I don't understand how fifteen out of seventeen thought that was a good idea.

It is important to me to try to understand how this works, because in the last five years in has never computed in my head at all how the people here and the gentleman down the hall think about budgeting. I guess it was just political expedience, I don't really know. Hard decision have to be made.

I used to think when I was younger that if you were a public employee and a member of the union you had some really serious employment protections, but the people who have the best employment protections in Rockland County government are our patronage employees. They have not suffered the kind of lay offs that the CSEA has suffered. They are more protected than you are and they don't even have to pay union dues. I suggested cuts in our own Legislative staff, the County Clerk's office, District Attorney's office and the Sheriff Department and it was absolute heresy. These are the kind of difficult decisions that do have to be made.

Programs do have to go by the wayside, perhaps temporally until the County is flush again, that do good things for people. I don't really think that this body is prepared to make those difficult decisions. Legislator Bierker, a Conservative, made a statement that I thought was very liberal that if you want to live here you should live in Rockland County, because we take care of our people and if you don't like it you should go move to Omaha or someplace where they don't take care of their people. I think there is a happy medium. Three or four years ago this body was very upset, because Legislators Sparaco, Michel and myself suggesting cutting General Services hierarchy, cutting the Pre-Natal Program, cutting the Tourism Department and two out of those three things occurred last year, but it occurred three years too late. You would have saved so much money if you had done it three years earlier. It was absolute heresy. We were unbelievable idiots to even suggest such a thing and people thought we were insane.

So cuts have to be made and that is the thing that politicians at every level of government don't ever seem to want to do. They don't want to cut anything that does something nice for somebody and yet cut you must.

I will be voting against the budget tonight. Why do I vote the budget? If you had nine people voting against the budget you would have nine people to do something different than both of these budgets. That is a point I always make, which nobody ever contradicts. If you had nine serious people that wanted to go a different route you would go a different route. Since I don't have nine people I am voting against the budget to express my distaste for the process and for the fact that we don't really take seriously the things that we need to do to get our budget in balance going forward. There will come a day when Rockland County's finances will be healthy again. We will be able to restore many of the things that we had to cut, but we are not healthy now and we can't do all of the things that we used to do and that would hurt some people. That is just a fact of life that we have to accept and we have to make those difficult choices as to who is going to be hurt, because we don't have the money to pay for everything, but nobody ever wants to make those difficult choices. Thank you.

#### Mr. Carey

Ilan, I did hear you that the State has the ultimate say in changing the budget date, but hopefully it didn't come off that the only thing that we were talking about for budgeting was to move the date up when we get the budget. I really think we have in place what is needed. We had some very good sessions. I know Legislator Wolfe is the Chair of the Joint Task Force, which I think is the vehicle that we all talked about as getting underneath the covers to get into these details. We get one bite of the apple during the budget process to change this. I was under the assumption that the Task Force was going to be our eyes and ears during the year, because it would create that sense of urgency since we are in a crisis and I think that is the forum we should be using. 2014 is a watershed year. We have major decisions to make this year in order to see some of the benefits to the bottom-line in 2014. I believe that the Joint Task Force is a way to keep those decisions on track. We need quarterly updates so that we have informed decision on the budget process when it finally does catch up to us at the end of the year. I have looked at the long-term plan that provides a nice trend analysis on certain things, but those should be the vehicles that we look at: What does the LDC decision really mean? What does it mean when inpatients go out? So when we make a decision this time of year we are looking out two or three years to see what the impacts of our decisions are today. I hear Legislator Hood loud and clear. I just don't think that we can let the County Executive walk away from the process without feeling that we have done everything in our power to get them at the table and do the business of that Joint Task Force. I really feel strongly that was pulled together for exactly that purpose and it is just a question of a sense of urgency. Thank you.

#### Mr. Wolfe

Legislator Carey, you are absolutely right, that is the reason why the Joint Task Force was created and conceived. I always felt that the task force would have a lot more value during February through June when we will be able to get into our targets for the budget for that year. I appreciate your support on that and I am glad that you agree.

I want to acknowledge the hard work of Ilan Schoenberger, who has been guiding the Budget and Finance Committee through some very difficult decision-making. The true award of excellence and elevation to sainthood goes to Nicole Doliner, who is our only Fiscal Analyst. You have all seen the stack of papers that we have to go through, but it is just not that, it is the analysis that she does that is so intuitive and really outside the box. She really understands the budget and I cannot compliment her enough. We really could not have done anything without her so thank you very much.

We are a consensus body. We operate by consensus. A majority vote is how we accomplish things and it is also sometimes how we don't accomplish things. Last night at the Budget and Finance Committee meeting there was a proposal of amendments and I voted against them last night. I have attended all of the sessions, except for one at the expense of my day job and my personal life as all of us have, but that is where the work gets done. The work gets done at the Budget and Finance Committee and that is the place where we essentially craft our improvements to the County Executive's budget. Last night I didn't get what I wanted. I wanted to take something out of the budget that others felt was important to restore. I wasn't alone, but the majority vote of the committee was to include it. I have to give credit to Legislator Hood who really hit the nail on the head. What are my choices? Do I pick up my toys and go home? The answer to that is a resounding no, because the overall impact of these amendments to the County Executive's budget is really profound. It adopts the recommendations of our independent auditor, which is something we have been criticized for in the past and were criticized for it tonight. I think it was very important that we resolve the favorable and unfavorable variances as best as we could keeping in mind that no one has a crystal ball. Who is to say that one person knows better than the other.

There are no salary increases in the budget. The budget cuts spending and it reduces the size of government again. I took a look at the budget book and we are a third smaller, over 1000 positions smaller, than 1990. A speaker said something tonight about adding to the size of government and nothing could be further from the truth. More than 1000 positions lower now than it was in 1990. In fact, 25% lower than it was when I took office in 2007, 727 positions, and that doesn't include the positions we are cutting tonight.

One of my big concerns was some of the revenue lines that were included that were speculative and that has been a continual problem for us moving forward. It is not like we have been exceeding expenditure over all these years. In fact, we have been coming under budget on our expenditures or the most part on our operating budget. The problem has been in predicting revenues. The revenues for the money that we spend on one side haven't been coming in. I thought that it was important that these amendments add a hedge against potential revenue shortfall and I think that is absolutely critical.

It maintains important services, like law enforcement, health education, and mosquito control and road maintenance. Very importantly it honors our contracts with County employees. All of this, without adding to the County Executive's proposed tax increase of 18.4%, which folks is \$12.00 per month. We are well past the point of making meaningful cuts without impacting services. I talked earlier tonight about local share. It is not enough to cut an expense when there is revenue associated with it. We could cut our entire Department of Public Transportation and we will not save one single dollar of taxpayer money, because it is entirely funded from sources other than County taxpayers. It is not enough to say, "Just let's cut," because you are never going to get the impact of that cut on the other side. An example of that tonight, the contract that we are cutting from the Department of Health, we have a savings of \$117,000 and the actual value of the contract is more than that, because there is some funding that comes from the State on that. I think that is an important distinction to make.

There have been tremendous cuts in the Highway Department in the last couple of years, including this year. We would be left with not enough drivers to drive the snowplows. Not enough drivers to even cover the County in the event of a snowstorm. So when we talk about cutting to the bone that is really what we are talking about. Which County road would you like not to be plowed this storm?

Everything that we have done this year, all of the unpleasant things that we talk about quite often, including the lay off of over 100 County employees, has essentially been undone with the snap of a finger by the 2013 State mandates to the tune of \$25,000,000 plus. I remember sitting here last year and saying that the 2012 budget was a launching point a step in the right direction. I knew that 2013 was not going to be any easier. The reality is nobody likes raising taxes. Do you think we like raising taxes? Do we derive a personal benefit and emotional pleasure or financial benefit from raising taxes? Of course we don't. Nobody likes to be in the position that we are in right now, but we are obligated to pass a budget that is as balanced as can be. I can say with a straight face that I believe that the budget that is proposed tonight with these changes is the most balanced budget that I have ever been asked to vote on. I think that is a credit to this body for spending the time and effort in making the County Executive's budget more real and by factoring in all of these variances.

Again, as far as the tax increase is concerned, a percentage of a small number is a small number. The total property tax burden per property owner, not per person, is \$65.00 per month right now. With the increase it will be about \$77.00 per month. I asked Nicole to do some research for me. I wanted to get a sense of what the per capita tax burden is relative to other counties in the Hudson Valley. After we have factored in property taxes, the sales tax and other taxes as it turned out Rockland County per capita is among the lowest tax burden per capital in the Hudson Valley and I bet you are surprised to hear that, but it is the truth.

I guess I will just wrap up by saying that it is never perfect. Budgeting is an inexact science. All I can say is that we always try to get it right and we do the best that we can, because that is really all that we can do. While this amendment did not include all of the things that I would have liked to see, I am 100% confident that it makes for a better budget than that which was presented to us in October. I will be voting for these amendments and will be supporting the budget tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Wieder

I would like to thank the Budget and Finance Committee and Legislator Schoenberger for doing all the heavy lifting. You should all be very proud of this proposed budget. I participated in all of the committee meetings and caucuses and it has just been amazing to see the kind of work that was done with regards to this budget.

However, this budget is a direct result of harsh realities created by Albany. If we, the County, had the liberty to set forth a budget and had total control of 100% of the budget, revenues and expenditure, I can assure you that this would have been a far different budget, a far better budget. Therefore, this budget is a product made in Albany and Albany, I vote no. I vote against your unfunded mandates. I voted against the unfunded mandates of hire knew personnel for the County prison and I will be voting no for the proposed budget. Thank you.

Mrs. Paul

As many of the Legislators mentioned we need a system change in this budgetary process. We need to start planning early, just like Legislator Carey mentioned, from January onwards we have to start planning. I am a nurse at Nyack Hospital and when a patient comes admission time is when we plan for the discharge planning. When we finish this budget we have to start planning for next years budget then we will have enough time to discuss and find solutions. This amended budget restored jobs and contract agency funding. These jobs are very vital to our community. These jobs help to prevent diseases and promote health. We will be able to save millions of dollars by preventing diseases and promoting healthy lifestyles. We need a safe and healthy place to live, to work and raise a family. I will vote for this amended budget.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9481

Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 541 OF 2012  
ADOPTION OF THE 2013 COUNTY BUDGET**

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing has been held on the 2013 proposed County Budget; and

WHEREAS, the Budget and Finance Committee 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 Chairman; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the proposed Rockland County Budget for the year 2013, as has been filed by the County Executive with such changes, alterations and revisions as 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:	10	(Legislators Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Wolfe, Cornell)
Nays:	07	(Legislators Carey, Day, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Sparaco, Wieder)

---

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	PA No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS		REVENUES	
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED
							INC. (DEC.)	INC. (DEC.)	INC. (DEC.)	
A	CA6816	Campus Fun and Learn	5010			Contract Agency	2,779 \$	2,779 \$	2,779	2,779
A	CA6360	CEILIES Institute	5010			Contract Agency	6,625 \$	6,625 \$	6,625	6,625
A	CY7642	Chiku Awa! African Dance	5010			Contract Agency	1,140 \$	1,140 \$	1,140	1,140
A	CA6363	Chimes Work	5010			Contract Agency	1,282 \$	1,282 \$	1,282	1,282
A	CY7542	Chimera Medical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	1,425 \$	1,425 \$	1,425	1,425
A	CY7542	Chimera Medical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	3,349 \$	3,349 \$	3,349	3,349
A	CY7535	Chimera Medical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	1,865 \$	1,865 \$	1,865	1,865
A	CY7541	Debra Weiss Dance	5010			Contract Agency	6,692 \$	6,692 \$	6,692	6,692
A	CA6817	EPIC	5010			Contract Agency	2,779 \$	2,779 \$	2,779	2,779
A	CA7518	Friends of Nyseeks	5010			Contract Agency	9,911 \$	9,911 \$	9,911	9,911
A	CA7571	Hudson Vagabond Puppets	5010			Contract Agency	4,204 \$	4,204 \$	4,204	4,204
A	CY7570	Irish Cultural Society of Rockland	5010			Contract Agency	5,700 \$	5,700 \$	5,700	5,700
A	CY7550	Irish Cultural Society of Rockland	5010			Contract Agency	1,140 \$	1,140 \$	1,140	1,140
A	CA6308	RC Family Treatment Court	5010			Contract Agency	15,105 \$	15,105 \$	15,105	15,105
A	CY7545	Riverbowl Films	5010			Contract Agency	1,425 \$	1,425 \$	1,425	1,425
A	CY7545	Riverbowl Films	5010			Contract Agency	1,539 \$	1,539 \$	1,539	1,539
A	CY7550	Rockland Camera	5010			Contract Agency	1,539 \$	1,539 \$	1,539	1,539
A	CA6854	Rockland Interfaith Breakfast	5010			Contract Agency	5,771 \$	5,771 \$	5,771	5,771
A	CY7558	Rockland Irish American	5010			Contract Agency	14,464 \$	14,464 \$	14,464	14,464
A	CA7536	Rockland Youth Dance	5010			Contract Agency	5,059 \$	5,059 \$	5,059	5,059
A	CA8750	Cornell Cooperative Extension	5010			Contract Agency	274,231 \$	274,231 \$	74,231	74,231
A	4014A	Chronic Disease Prevention	4090			Fees for Services	22,800 \$	22,800 \$	22,800	22,800
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X1051	PH Tech I	Rescind Program Elimination	5,778 \$	5,778 \$	52,002	52,002
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8054	PH Tech I	Rescind Program Elimination	8,849 \$	8,849 \$	68,494	68,494
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8298A	PH Spec PH Ed LFT	Rescind Program Elimination	7,079 \$	7,079 \$	79,646	79,646
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8428	PH Assess Asst II	Rescind Program Elimination	6,061 \$	6,061 \$	63,716	63,716
A	4010	Department of Health	1800		Health Insurance	Rescind Program Elimination	3,938,650 \$	4,112,590 \$	54,549	54,549
A	4010	Department of Health	1811		Dental	Rescind Program Elimination	186,180 \$	177,570 \$	176,000	176,000
A	4010	Department of Health	1820		Vision	Rescind Program Elimination	37,355 \$	33,916 \$	11,330	11,330
A	4010	Department of Health	1820		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	2,625 \$	2,625 \$	2,280	2,280
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	748,110 \$	814,270 \$	184,650	184,650
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		Workers Comp	Rescind Program Elimination	287,000 \$	304,000 \$	85,682	85,682
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	35,159 \$	37,480 \$	7,000	7,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7784	Asst Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	6,651 \$	6,651 \$	59,949	59,949
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7666	Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	8,648 \$	8,648 \$	77,834	77,834
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7668	Clark Typist	Rescind Program Elimination	3,800 \$	3,800 \$	34,200	34,200
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X9008	Sr Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	11,225 \$	11,225 \$	101,023	101,023
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X8341	PH Tech II	Rescind Program Elimination	7,230 \$	7,230 \$	65,068	65,068
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1300		Temp positions	Rescind Program Elimination	74,000 \$	75,000 \$	75,000	75,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1800		Health Insurance	Rescind Program Elimination	6,630 \$	6,630 \$	10,000	10,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Verbal	Rescind Program Elimination	7,430 \$	7,430 \$	600	600
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	11,265 \$	11,265 \$	288	288
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	10,030 \$	10,030 \$	114,280	114,280
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Workers Comp	Rescind Program Elimination	2,740 \$	2,740 \$	37,395	37,395
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	6,000 \$	6,000 \$	37,395	37,395
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Operational Supplies	Rescind Program Elimination	1,545 \$	1,545 \$	1,545	1,545
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	3290		Contractual	Rescind Program Elimination	95,000 \$	95,000 \$	95,000	95,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	4090			Rescind Program Elimination	1,700 \$	1,700 \$	1,700	1,700



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES		
						2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 (INC./DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 (INC./DEC.)
A	600	Commissioner of Labor	1800	Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
A	600	Commissioner of Labor	1800	MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25
A	2900	DCH Education Pre-K	4000	Fees for Services	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ 187,000	\$ 20,700	\$ (166,300)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (187,300)
A	2901	DCH Education Pre-K	4000	Medicaid Reimburse	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,572	\$ (49,572)
A	2901	DCH Education EIP	4000	Medicaid Reimburse	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ 84,000	\$ (8,270)	\$ (92,270)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (92,270)
A	2901	DCH Education EIP	4000	Medicaid Reimburse	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,250,000	\$ 9,233,538	\$ (16,462)
A	CLK4410	County Clerk	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (30,000)	\$ (60,000)	\$ (30,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (30,000)
A	DOH185	Medical Examiner	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (100,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (100,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (100,000)
A	DOH4010	Health Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (150,000)	\$ (300,000)	\$ (150,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (150,000)
A	EMR5210	Social Services	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (150,000)	\$ (300,000)	\$ (150,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (150,000)
A	EMR5210	Fire & Emergency Services	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (10,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (10,000)
A	EMR5210	Emergency Services	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (10,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (10,000)
A	EMR5210	Finance Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (45,413)	\$ (90,826)	\$ (45,413)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (45,413)
A	LAW1430	Law Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (20,000)	\$ (40,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (20,000)
A	PER1430	Personnel Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (20,000)	\$ (40,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (20,000)
A	PLN8020	Planning Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (10,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (10,000)
a	LEG1010	Legislative Board	6600	Appropriation Reserve	Appropriation Reserve	\$ -	\$ 1,416,685	\$ 1,416,685	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,416,685
A	UNC1900	Contingency	1940	Unemployment Insurance	Unemployment Insurance	\$ 750,000	\$ 50,000	\$ (700,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (700,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6035	Sales Tax Reserve	Sales Tax Reserve	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ (1,000,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,000,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6050	Contingency	Contingency	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ (500,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (500,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6053	Designated for Fund Balance	Designated for Fund Balance	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ (12,000,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (12,000,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6260	State of Real Property	State of Real Property	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ (12,000,000)
A	UNC1910	Unallocable General Services	4240	Unallocable General Services - to balance	Unallocable General Services - to balance	\$ 1,875,910	\$ 1,957,408	\$ 81,498	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 81,498
A	TRF5225	Contributions to County Road (D) Fund	9010	Contribution - to balance fund	Contribution - to balance fund	\$ 10,095,375	\$ 9,471,713	\$ (623,662)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (623,662)
A	TRF5225	Contributions to Hospital (EH) Fund	9010	Contribution - to balance fund	Contribution - to balance fund	\$ 16,746,320	\$ 14,717,000	\$ (2,029,320)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (2,029,320)
A	TRF5225	Contribution to Hospital (EH) Fund	9031	Interfund Transfer DMH Jail	Interfund Transfer DMH Jail	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FUND TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 61,338,343</b>	<b>\$ 61,286,071</b>	<b>\$ (52,272)</b>	<b>\$ 27,553,880</b>	<b>\$ 27,541,110</b>	<b>\$ (12,242,770)</b>
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	HW Main Mech	Rescind Layoff	\$ 6,540	\$ 65,404	\$ 58,864	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58,864
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	Laborer II	Rescind Layoff	\$ 5,925	\$ 58,040	\$ 52,115	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,115
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	Laborer II	Rescind Layoff	\$ 6,942	\$ 55,223	\$ 48,281	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48,281
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	Silled Laborer	Rescind Layoff	\$ 7,377	\$ 73,794	\$ 66,417	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,417
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1101	Retirement	Rescind Layoff	\$ (100,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (100,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (100,000)
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1920	Social Security	Rescind Layoff	\$ 810,025	\$ 878,110	\$ 68,085	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,085
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1930	MTA Tax	Rescind Layoff	\$ 239,635	\$ 259,475	\$ 19,840	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,840
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1980	COBRA	Rescind Layoff	\$ 12,925	\$ 13,160	\$ 235	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 235
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	RT210	COBRA	Rescind Layoff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ (50,000)

**COUNTY OF ROCKLAND**  
**2013 BUDGET**  
**AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET**  
 As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept/Div	Department Name	Object	Pay	The	Account of This	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS		REVENUES		2013 INS (DEC)
								2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	
D		Contribution from General (A) Fund	12810				Contribution - to balance fund					
								984,822	1,285,172	271,200	271,200	
D							<b>FUND TOTAL</b>					
								\$ 10,080,775	\$ 10,410,975	\$ 321,200	\$ 321,200	
								\$ 10,132,775	\$ 10,410,975	\$ 277,200	\$ 277,200	

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dist. No.	Department Name	Object	Pos. No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES		
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2014 (INC./DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2014 (INC./DEC.)
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1271	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	9,571	98,714	34,643		34,643	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1272	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,500	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1273	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,632	36,320	32,688		32,688	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1277	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1278	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	5,273	52,728	47,453		47,453	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1523	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	4,551	45,510	41,049		41,049	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X2997	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,618	36,184	32,566		32,566	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X3946	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	3,632	36,324	32,692		32,692	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1760	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	4,921	49,205	44,284		44,284	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1795	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1796	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X2877	Laundry Worker II	Rescind Outourcing	3,968	39,680	35,696		35,696	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1820	X3818	Relief Cook	Rescind Outourcing	12,020	120,200	118,835		118,835	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1830		Social Security	Rescind Outourcing	1,710	17,100	16,400		16,400	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1880		MTA Tax	Rescind Outourcing	1,710	17,100	16,400		16,400	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	5080		Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	400,000	4,000,000	(400,000)		(400,000)	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	R1210		COBRA	Rescind Outourcing				71,800	71,800	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X2620	Radiologic Tech - A	Rescind Outourcing	6,942	66,415	59,774		59,774	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X3430	Srvg Radiologic Tech	Rescind Outourcing	8,422	84,222	84,800		84,800	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X1272	Radiologic Tech 1/2	Rescind Outourcing	3,034	30,340	27,306		27,306	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1820		Retirement	Rescind Outourcing	5,100	49,890	44,690		44,690	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1830		Social Security	Rescind Outourcing	1,468	14,685	13,969		13,969	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1880		MTA Tax	Rescind Outourcing	650	670	20		20	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	R1210		COBRA	Rescind Outourcing						
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	5080		Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	200,000	2,000,000	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	DMHW680	DWH Local Government Unit	1101		Salary Savings		(150,000)	(300,000)	(150,000)		(150,000)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP Hospital Administration	1101		Salary Savings		(10,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)		(10,000)	
EH	HSPE807	HSP Transportation	1101		Salary Savings		(20,000)	(40,000)	(20,000)		(20,000)	
EH	HSPE831	HSP Materials Management	1101		Salary Savings		(10,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)		(10,000)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP Nursing SPH	1101		Salary Savings		(200,000)	(400,000)	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	HSPE828	HSP Nursing Home	1101		Salary Savings		(200,000)	(400,000)	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	DMHM020	DH&H Hospital	1100	7768	Psych Soc Worker II	Abolish Vacant Position	84,260		(84,260)		(84,260)	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	2973	Sr Account Clerk Typist	Abolish Vacant Position	46,650		(46,650)		(46,650)	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	2974	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	28,981		(28,981)		(28,981)	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	7255B	Director Mail Sorts	Reduce Salary	25,951		(25,951)		(25,951)	
EH	HSPE501	HSP-Medical Administration	1100	2073	Director Mail Sorts	Reduce Salary	80,922	150,000	(69,078)		(69,078)	
EH	HSPE510	HSP-Physicians SNF	1100	5889	Internist 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position						
EH	HSPE801	HSP - Food Services	1100	8594A	Food Svc Helper 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	14,051		(14,051)		(14,051)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	7073	Records Clerk Typist	Abolish Vacant Position	36,380		(36,380)		(36,380)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	8416	Sr Typist PT	Abolish Vacant Position	22,170		(22,170)		(22,170)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	8122B	Medical Clerk LFT	Abolish Vacant Position	21,428		(21,428)		(21,428)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	3569	Nurses Aide Inst	Abolish Vacant Position	46,610		(46,610)		(46,610)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	1465A	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	22,804		(22,804)		(22,804)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	2579C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	6,598		(6,598)		(6,598)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	2591C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	9,982		(9,982)		(9,982)	



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Fall Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept. No.	Department Name	Object	Pay No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 INC. (DEC.)	
							Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X1674	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,777	5,766	5,766	51,989						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X2289	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	1,886	15,858	14,272	14,272						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X2300	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	5,777	15,858	14,272	14,272						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X2349	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,164	31,636	28,472	28,472						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X2350	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,312	33,720	30,408	30,408						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X3025A	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,312	33,720	30,408	30,408						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X3025B	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,310	23,104	20,794	20,794						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X3301	Sr Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	6,842	69,416	62,574	62,574						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X3001	Sr Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	7,685	76,846	69,161	69,161						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	49,698	49,698						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	49,698	49,698						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X2649	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,342	23,418	21,076	21,076						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X2649	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	49,698	49,698						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X7757	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	49,698	49,698						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X7758	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	3,279	32,785	29,506	29,506						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X8078A	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,185	21,859	19,673	19,673						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X8078B	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,185	21,859	19,673	19,673						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X8422	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	49,698	49,698						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1100	X8422	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	232,000	235,100	211,000	211,000						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1812	1812	Insurance	Rescind Outsourcing	1,450	14,500	13,050	13,050						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1812	1812	Retirement	Rescind Outsourcing	3,705	37,050	33,345	33,345						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1920	1920	Social Security	Rescind Outsourcing	27,290	272,900	245,610	245,610						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1920	1920	Workers Comp	Rescind Outsourcing	344,945	3,449,450	3,104,505	3,104,505						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1950	1950	MTA Tax	Rescind Outsourcing	6,500	65,000	58,500	58,500						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	1990	1990	Uniforms	Rescind Outsourcing	-	45,770	41,700	41,700						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	2070	2070	CPBRA	Rescind Outsourcing	-	3,685	3,335	3,335						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	R210	R210	Program Cost	Rescind Outsourcing	-	7,000	6,300	6,300						
M	D6S1247	D6S-Security	5360	5360	Salary Savings	Rescind Outsourcing	-	7,000	6,300	6,300						
M	D6S2300	D6S-MIS	1101	1101	Salary Savings	Contribution - to balance fund	1,000,000	-	-	(1,000,000)						
M	D6S1245	D6S-Maintenance	1101	1101	Salary Savings	Contribution - to balance fund	(50,000)	(10,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)						
M	D6S2600	D6S-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R2003	R2003		Contribution - to balance fund	(194,765)	(400,000)	(594,765)	(594,765)						
M						<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>1,127,618</b>	<b>1,442,891</b>	<b>1,315,843</b>	<b>1,315,843</b>						
Q	PER050	Unemployment Insurance	8010	R2009	Employee Benefit		750,000	50,000	(700,000)							
Q						<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>(700,000)</b>	<b>(700,000)</b>						
						<b>Total</b>	<b>69,686,360</b>	<b>64,791,378</b>	<b>(14,774,982)</b>	<b>(14,774,982)</b>						



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012  
TECHNICAL CHANGES TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Account or Title	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES				
					2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 LOCAL SHARE INC. (DEC.)	
A	DMH4305	Camp Venture	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	78,750	78,750	-	-	-	78,750	
A	DMH4306	Mental Health Assoc	5970	Direct Service Enhancement - Success Team Pg	-	12,000	12,000	-	-	-	12,000	
A	DMH4306	Mental Health Assoc	5970	Direct Service Enhancement - Transportation Pg	-	69,830	69,830	-	-	-	69,830	
A	DMH4332	NY Assoc for Learning Disabled	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	11,205	11,205	-	-	-	11,205	
A	DMH4342	Loeb House	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	9,140	9,140	-	-	-	9,140	
A	DMH4354	Bikur Cholim Partners in Health	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	16,030	16,030	-	-	-	16,030	
A	DMH4355	Jewish Family Svcs - Autism Pg	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	42,750	42,750	-	-	-	42,750	
A	SHF3113	Sheriff - River Patrol	R3389	State Aid - Public Safety	-	29,620	29,620	-	29,620	29,620	(29,620)	
A	SHF3113	Sheriff - River Patrol	R5060	Program Costs	-	37,000	37,000	-	-	-	37,000	
A	CA8816	West St. Day Care Center	5010	Contract Agency	-	17,323,285	(276,705)	-	-	-	(276,705)	
A	DOH2961	DOH-Education, Children EIP (0-2)	5520	Tuition (To balance above)	17,600,000	17,629,620	29,620	17,600,000	29,620	29,620	29,620	
<b>GENERAL(A) FUND</b>					\$ 17,600,000	\$ 17,629,620	\$ 29,620	\$ 17,600,000	\$ 29,620	\$ 29,620	\$ 29,620	\$
G	SWR8110	Sewer-Administration	1100	Salaries - N001 Sewer Use Compl Insp (Hebrew Spkg) (to correct salary)	39,780	47,820	8,040	39,780	47,820	8,040	8,040	
G	SWR9952	Sewer-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R5990	Appropriated Fund Balance (To balance above)	-	-	-	2,222,340	2,230,380	8,040	(8,040)	
<b>SEWER (G) FUND</b>					\$ 39,780	\$ 47,820	\$ 8,040	\$ 2,222,340	\$ 2,230,380	\$ 8,040	\$	\$

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
 REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE AND PLANNING & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES  
 AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET  
 RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES  
 As Adopted by the Full Legislative Assembly

PROJECT	2013 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET	RECOMM.	APPROP. INC. (DEC.)	RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO CAPITAL BUDGET			CAPITAL FUNDS
				GENERAL FUND CONTRIBUTION	FEDERAL	STATE AND	
<b>Schedule III</b>							
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Public Transportation</b>							
1894 - Bus Stop Improvements - 2008 Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	500,000			500,000	
1895 - Purchase One (1) Hybrid Electric Commuter Coach Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	1,014,562			1,014,562	
1891 - Install Vehicle Locator Systems (TRIP/TOR Bus) Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	1,500,000			1,500,000	
1896 - County Transit Centers Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	1,250,000			1,250,000	
1801 - Purchase of Two (2) 26' Buses - TRPS Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	400,000			400,000	
1817 - Purchase of Four (4) Transit Buses for TRPS Replacement Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	2,345,500			2,345,500	
1822 - Purchase of Five (5) 28' Cutaway Buses for TRPS Replacement Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	400,000			400,000	
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Drainage</b>							
7055 - Pasack Brook - Lake Sunnyside/Terrace Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F		In Process	3,000,000			3,000,000	
7054 - Damcrest Kill (or Related Streams) in the Vicinity of Lake Lucia - 2007 Road Work Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F		Pending	5,000,000			5,000,000	
7105 - Lake Suzanne - Bridge, Clear, Design, Upstream and/or Downstream of Dam - Joint Project with Town of Ramapo Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F		Pending	5,000,000			5,000,000	
7106 - Drainage Improvements - Memorial Pond Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F		Pending	3,000,000			3,000,000	
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES</b>			<b>25,447,032</b>			<b>25,447,032</b>	<b>16,000,000</b>

**Debate:**Mr. Schoenberger

We discussed the Report of the Budget and Finance Committee at great length over a great period of time. This is the motion, in essence, to adopt that report. I expect there will be amendments. What I am going to ask my colleagues who wish to make amendments is to please make your amendment, have someone else second it and let's debate it rather than to leave up to me to just accept it or not accept it. I would prefer that we do it that way so it is fully done in a transparent fashion for everybody here. Thank you.

Chairwoman Cornell

With any motion for an amendment that it comes fully designed with something coming out something else has to go in.

Mr. Day

I would like to make a motion for any amendment to the budget and ask for it to be seconded.

First off, I want to offer my apologies to my colleagues for having these amendments handed to you only now. I did submit them at the outset of the meeting, but there was a miscommunication as to my request to have these handed out immediately. I would ask that you review them. I did have extensive conversations with our Fiscal Analyst. Hopefully, you will find that they are sound, but also aggressive.

I want to acknowledge Ilan Schoenberger, our Budget and Finance Chair again this year.

When I look at the County Executive's proposed budget and the budget proposed by our Budget and Finance Committee, I simply see a defined difference of approach, not a right or wrong to it. That aside for a moment, that does not detract from the hard work done by the committee and the Chair Ilan Schoenberger.

While myself, and Legislators Carey and Moroney who collaborated on these amendments not being on the budget and finance committee, and not seeing any sense of what that report would look like until last night, we are relegated to proposing amendments on the floor this evening. And I will acknowledge the efforts of the budget and finance committee in finding additional cuts, many of which we were concurrently discussing and weighing ourselves over the past few weeks.

Many of my colleagues have varying degrees of anger and frustration that has been increasing over the past few years. We deal with, as Legislator Soskin put it last year, to quote "we all know the numbers are make believe" ... and he is a public accountant!

Other than social services, we have an organization, our County government, that does not even have an across the board, mandated monthly review and update of conditions within many departments. That is something that is surprising in any organization and it makes it very difficult at budget time.

I will not contemplate that. I also will not contemplate cuts in the basic services each and every resident deserves – public safety, public health, and our roads. But I will not slam our citizens who are reeling already from tax and fee levies from last year. I and others are ready to offer what we believe to be an appropriate counter proposal that will, as I mentioned earlier, reduce the tax increase in both the County Executive's and the Budget and Finance proposed budgets by applying the savings that are both part of the Budget and Finance Report and with added amendments we have proposed. By adopting this version of the budget for 2013, we have an opportunity to decrease the proposed tax increase by about a third, decreasing the impact to only about \$110 per year for an average home, and as a matter of comparison, about half of what the average Clarkstown property tax increase was this year. Additionally, we will fully restore those basic services of law enforcement, mosquito control, and highway.

And I do wish to make a statement to my fellow union members. I listened to all the conversation regarding whether the proposed outsourcing was budgetary, thus in violation of the just signed agreement or programmatic in nature, rendering it proper within the collective bargaining agreement. We have the administration telling us it was programmatic and our unions saying it is not. I have my own personal, and somewhat strong opinion based on all that I heard and decorum will prevent me from offering that opinion publicly to the administration tonight. All that said, it should not be a matter of whether I or any other legislator believes what happened is legitimate or not, simply because none of us had a hand in the discussions or input in to the basis, nuances, or specifics of the agreements.

While I certainly understand their coming to the appropriating body to have the outsourcing stopped, this is not the proper forum in my view. Twenty plus years in the NYPD and I saw my share of contractual disagreements, and we pursued grievance, arbitration, and legal avenues. We never went to the city council for funding of the amount in question. While an understandable and desirable shortcut to take in the eyes of my friends in the C.S.E.A., it is not appropriate in this case. As much as my heart is with you on this one, to govern by expediency or convenience is inherently dangerous. It is a distinction but in my opinion an important one. As far as the comments about legal action, if your position on this is as strong as many of us suspect, a show cause order stopping the outsourcing should be requested and likely be immediately granted.

You have in front of you a sheet that provides an overview of the proposed amendment to the budget as offered by Legislator's Carey, Moroney, and myself. The chart is rudimentary without schedules given the time constraints, but should be fairly accurate as it works off the same sheet we received from the committee as prepared by our Legislative Fiscal Analyst.

To clarify that information further, the restorations and additional cuts are detailed as follows:

2013 AMENDMENTS:

CUT LAUNDRY CONTRACT – \$400,000 SAVINGS  
 CUT RADIOLOGY CONTRACT – \$200,000 SAVINGS  
 CUT SECURITY CONTRACT – \$1,000,000 SAVINGS  
 REMOVE UNEMPLOYMENT - \$700,000 SAVINGS

HIGHWAY – RESTORE POSITIONS ONLY -	\$421,200
SHERIFF - RESTORE POSITIONS ONLY -	\$492,060
SHERIFF – RESTORE MOUNTED & POSITIONS-	\$551,618
MOSQUITO CONTROL – RESTORE POSITIONS/SUPPLIES-	\$740,859
<b><u>TOTAL -</u></b>	<b><u>\$2,205,737</u></b>

I want to acknowledge the work that was done by the Budget and Finance Committee in dealing with a lot of this, because a number of the issues that a few of us have been speaking about we found that some of it was addressed already by the committee. So I want to make it clear that in a way it was a collective approach to some degree as far as the amendments that were made to get us to where whichever budget is proposed. Either way this work was done properly.

AMENDMENTS TO B&F REPORT PLAN "B":

MENTAL HEALTH – (P.247) Line #1130 - Temporary	\$200,000 (1)
HOSPITAL – (P.255) Line #1130 – Temporary	\$330,000 (2)
HOSPITAL – (P.255) Line #1800) - Relief	\$1,000,000 (3)
YOUTH BUREAU – (P. 227) YB1250A/Line #5830	\$60,000 (4)
DEPUTY MEDICAL EXAMINER LFT (Position Only) (Book #2 P.16) # Line M1668 (plus 40K benefits)	\$162,300 (5)**

The prorated salary savings for 2013 pending appointment of Medical Examiner at listed salary of \$ 162,679 is \$40,379; apply to contingency pending the hire

Even when there are not proposed layoffs for full time employees, temporary employees, duplicative positions, and excessive overtime is a luxury, particularly within Departments that are being downsized and/or eliminated.

- (1) A Department being eliminated – Temporary Worker request is 26 times the 2012 budget line. Relief positions budget line more than doubled 2012 -2013 (\$733,500 to \$1,648,000) and Overtime budget line increased 35% (\$425,075 to \$570,000). In short, utilize relief better and do more with less.
- (2) A Department formally criticized for inefficiencies by both KPMG and Toski. Temporary Worker request is 24 times the 2012 budget line. Relief positions budget line more than doubled 2012 -2013 (\$1,418,270 to 2,903,000) and Overtime budget line increased slightly. In short, utilize relief better and do more with less.
- (3) Further to (2) above – propose reducing Relief positions from \$2,903,000 to \$1, 903,000, which is still about a \$500,000 increase over the 2012 Relief budget line of \$1,418,270.

- (4) While it is laudable for government to provide employment opportunities for our young people as part of an admittedly wonderful program, we must temper that with the reality that full time employees, many with families, are being terminated. While some may say that we should eliminate the expenditure completely, reducing this budget line by 30% is both moderate and appropriate under these critical circumstances.
- (5) This matter was discussed at length during last year's budget process. Questioned was the need, in addition to a full time Medical Examiner, for medical support that included a LFT Deputy; two (2) assistant P/T M.E.'s; and two (2) pathologists along with investigative support of three (3) investigators. The entirety of the response from the DOH Commissioner was regarding the Deputy M.E.'s high competency. I concur, but that is not the issue; it is about the need for this position. With the end of the Medical Examiner's term and an experienced and highly qualified Deputy again serving as M.E., it is an ideal time, much like we did on my recommendation with Probation a couple of years back, to eliminate the Deputy M.E. position. If the Deputy at some point continues to decline the M.E. position as in the past, that would be her choice. Pending that permanent hire, savings of approximately \$3365 per month (starting January 1<sup>st</sup>) would be realized and should be applied to contingency.

I would like to reference Legislator Meyers. He talked about decisions not made and the affect years down the road on our workers. Our workers have been doing yeoman's work, and a lot more work with a lot less people over the last few years. Legislator Jackson said it a couple of years ago at budget time, "deal with it now." We were threatened back in 2010 with the PBC. If we did not borrow that money then there would have to be lay offs. Could you imagine if we had dealt with that in March 2011? We really wouldn't have had the mess that we are in.

This is a matter of where we believe our priorities, as a government should be. We should not compromise public safety and basics such as our roads because of a failure to prioritize for the vast majority of those who expect services for their tax dollars or a resistance to grappling with inefficiencies or patronage.

I hear that "many of our departments and many of our services have already been cut to the bone." As was spoken to by Legislator Murphy numerous times, patronage jobs continue to be largely untouched. In addition, smaller departments that could be consolidated with the larger ones, along with higher paid department heads/commissioners/RAM members, are not.

He made specific references to departments and offered that the head of one makes as much as our County Executive. Over \$150,000 not including benefits, and references the Commissioner of General Services who could pick up the slack from accessing an \$85,000 deputy who would collect three pensions upon retirement.

We have two and a half people performing media related functions in the county executive's office, one of whom was hired within a month of when he proffered over 500 C.S.E.A. layoffs two years ago. We still are paying out over \$150,000 in salary and benefits for a "Tourism Coordinator" for what should be a clerical job overseeing a website at one quarter that amount.

Year and year, these efforts go nowhere, whether it be by the Executive or Legislative branch. If time has not run out by now, it will very soon. Think of what other basic services and lesser-paid workers can be restored if that was done. We certainly would welcome our colleague's input to add any patronage or other unnecessary positions for elimination to our proposal tonight.

I will certainly welcome any of my colleagues input to add any patronage or any of the necessary position elimination to our proposal this evening. We are open to that. These are just some thoughts offered. Again, my apologies to the Chair of Budget and Finance Committee for bringing this so late in the evening. Thank you.

Mr. Carey

I second.

Mr. Schoenberger

I want to begin the discussion by saying to you that I want to discuss this on a professional basis. There is no personality issue here. One of the things that has been said earlier by a couple of Legislators, I believe Legislator Day and Legislator Low-Hogan, was about the process and how we get things at the last minute and how we have to change the process, not get things at the last minute. With all due respect to you, this just got handed to us at the last minute. I am not blaming you, I am just saying that I wish we had the opportunity, you and other members of the Budget and Finance Committee and leadership members who are not members of the Budget and Finance Committee, to sit down and discuss these things and work through them as you and I have done on previous years before we got here tonight so that questions could be asked and things could be addressed.

Let me go down the list and see if I can understand this.

Laundry contract – you took out the \$400,000 savings  
Radiology contract – you took out the \$200,000 savings  
Security contract – you took out \$1,000,000 savings

That I assume is because that money will be used to be paid out to someone to provide the security contract instead of the current employees, someone to provide the radiology service rather than the current employees and someone to provide the laundry contract rather than the current employees. Am I correct?

Mr. Day

Yes.

Mr. Schoenberger

So you are putting the money back in for the outside consultants. It disturbs me in a sense that I feel very strongly about honoring our contractual obligation. It would seem to me by doing that it now means we face the aspect of litigation and that puts the County at risk. We all discussed that earlier.

You took out the unemployment for \$700,000 yet if you put these people out of a job we are going to need that \$700,000 for unemployment. The relief from Hospitals has a cut of \$100,000 and hospitals temporary, which we had cut out of \$330,000 to \$130,000; you are cutting the entire amount. So Hospitals is going to have \$1,330,000 cut from their budget. Has anyone done an examination as to how hospital is going to operate with as much as \$1,330,000 short for next year?

Mr. Day

Again, I do offer my apologies. As it relates to this, the temporary worker request is 24 times the 2012 budget line. To be very honest with you, there is not going to be an agreement here and if doesn't fly tonight I understand from a time perspective. I spoke at length about the issue my approach and my belief. It is a very tough decision for me. I know how I feel about the C.S.E.A. contract. I don't think that decision belongs with this body. I think there is a process that should be followed and I think they will be successful, but that is neither here nor there.

As far as it relates to this, we have listened over the years to story after story about Summit Park and monies. Our position was to take a very aggressive approach, look at last year's budget line, have an expectation that you meet those numbers last year you can meet the numbers this year. It is aggressive; I said that from the outset. Again, it hasn't been vetted and I understand that. The entire Legislative body may not accept it and I accept that, but something has to happen here. The reason why we took this approach is that the bottom-line number returns a substantial amount of money back.

Mr. Schoenberger

I am sorry for interrupting you, but my simple question was, how could we be sure that when you take \$1,000,000 from relief from the hospital and the entire temporary line of the hospital of \$330,000 that the hospital, which has patients and staff, are going to be adequately served and be able to do that within the budgetary allocation and that we are not just chopping money that is going to be made up later one by overtime or additional staff, because there are mandates to meet and therefore creating a deficit on the other end.

Mr. Day

My direct answer is that I am looking at the money in hospital relief, temporary and overtime in last years budget and saying, "make it work." None of us have the knowledge to have that kind of detailed conversation.

Mr. Schoenberger

That is why we go through a Budget and Finance Committee, bring in the department heads and Commissioners and an outside consultant. If I am not mistaken, and I could be, the outside consultant did not contest the relief hospital amount. Nicole am I correct in that?

Nicole Doliner, Fiscal Analyst

Correct.

Mr. Schoenberger

Nick DeSantis, when he reviewed it, didn't say that we had \$1,000,000 too much in hospital relief.

Mr. Day

He is an auditor, I wouldn't expect him to.

Mr. Schoenberger

He said we had \$1,700,000 too little and you are approving another cut of another \$1,000,000 will leave \$2,700,000 too little.

Mr. Day

This is an operation decision. This has nothing to do with the balance of the books.

Chairwoman Cornell

It does.

Mr. Schoenberger

There is a mathematical computation here that I don't understand. When you get to the restoration of position and benefits you have \$1,927,657, which points with an arrow:

Highway –	Restore Positions Only -	\$421,200
Sheriff -	Restore Positions Only -	\$492,060
Sheriff –	Restore Mounted & Positions-	\$551,618
Mosquito Control –	Restore Positions/Supplies-	\$740,859

I add up those up to \$2,205,737.

One more thing you did was you reduced the COBRA adjustment to \$181,380. We were very conservative. We felt that \$486,000 was too high, but we didn't reduce it, because it is shown as revenue it has an outside expenditure. We thought it was a balance line and we were being extremely cautious not to cut that as revenue. You reduced it, you put everybody back in, which means everybody that the administration calculated as COBRA you put in \$181,380 and chopped of \$300,000 from the COBRA.

Mr. Day

I would just say that the number was vetted. I didn't make it up.

Mr. Schoenberger

I am not saying you made up anything. I just don't understand the balance between it and I am uncomfortable with it. I don't know if the Deputy Medical Examiner, which you are proposing to eliminate, is covered by the Doctors Council contract, because it is a doctor. The Doctors Council, RAM and C.S.E.A. are the same ones that approved the contract with terminations or lay offs.

Mr. Day

There is no lay off, it is a position.

Mr. Schoenberger

It is an abolishment.

Mr. Day

An abolishment of a position.

Mr. Schoenberger

It is a termination. There is no termination or lay off for budgetary reasons. I hear what you are saying. I do not want to interrupt you during your presentation. I have to say to you that I wish we had the opportunity before it being handed to us at 10:30 p.m. on the night of the adoption of the budget to vet this. I would have very much like to have loved to vetted it. I would very much have wanted the input of the committee and our staff and our expertise. I believe in your heart you mean well. I believe you are trying to do something that you believe will reduce the County expenses and what you believe is good for the County. I don't doubt for one minute the sincerity of your intentions, but the numbers don't add up to me.

Mr. Day

Generally speaking, the numbers have some substance to them, and I agree with you, but let's also go back to my colleague Mrs. Low-Hogan regarding the fact that just last night we got a sense of direction as to where we are going. This is a very compressed situation. It didn't work out that way with the storms and everything else, but I agree 100% with you.

Chairwoman Cornell

I am having difficulty just figuring this out and I think my counsel has also. I am going to ask you one question, because you have something here – Youth Bureau Temp. Was that a personnel temporary line?

Mr. Day

Student workers, Rockland County Youth Employment Program.

Chairwoman Cornell

But that is not temporary workers. The County's Youth Employment Program is a training program for young people. We have a year-round program and a summer program, which is basically training people and helping them get jobs in the community. We didn't have a discussion about this program here. I know the program, because years ago it was sponsored by Tom Morahan, myself and two other Legislators. What I have here doesn't have anything to do with personnel as far as the Youth Bureau.

Mr. Day

Part of this Madam Chair was a time crunch. The reality here is even if we take some of the numbers out of here, a \$4,200,000 issue there certainly, I believe, some substantial amounts of money if we so desire to go that way. I am not going to belabor it. I think it may, if nothing else, point out that we can collectively do a little bit more. That is just my thought.

Chairwoman Cornell

In just talking with counsel he can't really just write this up, because it is not completed.

Mr. Hood, Jr.

I just had a comment on this. Legislator Day, we have gotten along really well and so many things we have agreed on. I don't even disagree with some of these things. I don't see how we can make such a large cut to the hospital. To hand this to us today, which is not in correct form, to make amendments to the budget and then have the numbers not ad up – you are always very prepared – and I expect a little more and earlier so we could have gone over this. We have always worked well together. I think we could have worked on some of these things together. It doesn't look very professional to me. Let counsel say what should have been done here .

Mr. McKay, Legal Counsel

The requirement at this stage is that any amendment proposed has to be in a normal form of a resolution. It doesn't have to be a resolution document per se, but it has to be at least convertible and understandable. Everybody sitting here needs to know what your request is and that would require the showing of what is being deleted and what is being added. If this was passed we would have great difficulty figuring out where you want it and where you are saying it is going. There are other issues concerning whether or not any of these things have ripple effects in a sense of whether there is some other form of revenue that may be lost, because some function is being eliminated.

Mr. Schoenberger

The Deputy Medical Examiner has a 36% State aid component to it and it is not reflected here.

Mr. McKay, Legal Counsel

If you change the Deputy Medical Examiner rate of pay that would have a ripple effect concerning the contribution we would get. It would also affect other lines of anticipated revenues. Resolutions reflect an increase and decrease in lines and then we can identify where it is going and see if it is proper form. The person who would get it the next morning would not have to guess where it is supposed to go and what line it is supposed to be applied to. As I look at it here I can't follow this. I would have to turn to the Finance people and ask them if this is something that could be done. I believe this is not in proper form.

Mr. Day

If it is not going to be accepted as proper form then I am not going to belabor this. I am going to withdraw this.

Mr. Hood, Jr.

I just have two other comments before I end.

Chairwoman Cornell

It has been withdrawn. Thank you.

Mr. Day

We see these changes that came out very late in the reports from the committee, the adjustments that were made. It is difficult from our prospective as Legislators at times, because the bottom line is we are trying to make this work. We have seventeen people with good intentions here; there is no question about that. The process, as compressed as it is, just contributes to making it very difficult. Jay made a comment that I don't make mistakes like this. You are right, I don't. This is something we are doing at the last minutes trying to get something in a format digestible for the body.

Mr. Schoenberger

I want to respond not argumentatively and not fighting with you. Nicole Doliner was here on Sunday all day. The charts that you are referring to she was working on Sunday all day. I came in Monday morning and she was still working on the charts. She was working on the charts with the Commissioner of Finance. She spent I can't tell you how many hours back and forth. The amount of time that is put in doing something like this and getting it together for Monday nights meeting I was worried Monday afternoon if she would have it done for Monday night and she worked all day Sunday and all day Monday.

Mr. Day

I don't doubt it.

Mr. Schoenberger

I just asked the Deputy Budget Director Mr. Grogan and the Commissioner of Finance Mr. DeGroat, "Do you understand this?" Mr. Grogan said to me, "It would take me hours to take what you have given and translate it into the proper form so that they could analyze it." I don't doubt your sincerity. I don't doubt that you mean well. I don't doubt that you have the best interest of the County at heart, not for one minute. We have to pass something tonight and it has to be certified on his desk tomorrow in final form. It is unfortunate for all of us, because some of us could have very easily have perhaps lived with these if we understand them. I asked, in fairness to you, the Commissioner of Finance if the Deputy Medical Examiner is funded 36% and he said you were right that it wasn't and I was wrong. He said that they cut that funding out last year and that it used to be.

There are a lot of things that could generate a lot of misunderstandings. If something like \$1,000,000 in relief, which is going to put the County in a situation where we will have to make it up during the course of the year, is going to affect the deficit. If it gets done improperly then we can wind up raising the property tax even though you mean to cut it.

I thank you for withdrawing as I understand you did, because I think the confusion over it would have been most unfortunate, because it probably would have undermined what you are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Day

I appreciate your observations, your counseling and your commentary. We will format it better next time, but I think if nothing else what we took away from this that maybe there are things that we can do to maybe set the bar even higher.

Mr. Schoenberger

There are always choices.

Mr. Day

Exactly. The attempt here was very simple, we tried to moderate the impact upon taxpayers and maintain levels of service. It is a collective effort. I appreciate the commentary. Next time we won't have two storms to deal with.

Chairwoman Cornell

I just want to thank Nicole again, because not only did she work Sunday, Monday and today, but all the days before that and she was ill last week as well. You do deserve sainthood. Thank you very much.

Commissioner DeGroat and the department, I just want to thank you all for your help through this whole process.

Mr. Hood, Jr.

First, if you are going to reduce the property tax levy \$4,283,386 I think it would be more prudent to reduce the deficit by that amount and have the revenue that we need. That is what the rating agencies have said so to reduce that revenue by that much and not take that much of a stab at our deficit I think would be imprudent.

Secondly, what I don't like about this is now we are going to have this in front of us last minute, didn't really get to vet it at all, and it is going to come out that Legislator Day had a plan that reduced taxes by 8% and the others didn't go for it, and that is what it looks like now. I really didn't have a chance to look at this or even have a chance to vote on this. 5%, I know he with drew it, but it is still going to come out, "I put forward a plan and nobody went for it." That is just unfair to us.

Point of Personal Privilege – Mr. Day

Jay, I don't really want to get into it with you, but at least Legislator Schoenberger was able to see where I was coming from. If you want to put this back on the table and put \$3,800,000 into the deficit let's go for it. As far as questioning where I am coming from let's not go there. I am trying to do something good and proper here with the best of intentions. I did vet this stuff. I did speak with our Fiscal Analyst this morning. We had a number of conversations about it. So the form is not proper – don't question my intention.

Mr. Schoenberger

Let's all remember we are Legislators that are trying to serve our constituents and trying to serve the whole County. Let's not try to have anything become personal. Let's respect each other's right to our own opinions and let's go forward.

Chairwoman Cornell

Thank you Mr. Schoenberger.

Mr. Meyers

My microphone often didn't work. I think there was a certain employee at that time in the Legislature that would pull my plug out of my microphone and fortunately he is no longer with us.

One of the things that I said last year was that we had meetings, many of which I didn't attend this year, where different department heads come in. The Democrats and Republicans each have caucuses where we discuss mainly the general directions in which we are going, but not necessarily specific line items of the detail you get at the Budget and Finance Committee meeting the night before the final vote. I don't think that there is enough time to vet different ideas. I had suggested in years past that we schedule a few Committee of the Whole meetings where people can suggest ideas that could be vetted then Nicole could work them up. We don't have enough give and take after talking to the department heads to come up with ideas like this. So Legislators Day, Moroney and Carey are left bringing it to us here, because there is no other forum to bring it to us except meetings where department heads are coming in, which are not the proper forum.

I had some questions back to the original list that we had. It seems that a lot of the cuts that are being made, aside from the cuts that are being made to take out the contracts that were put in instead of the employees, are things like the sales tax reserve, which is \$1,000,000. I know that our consultants were satisfied with the sales tax number, but that \$1,000,000 is really like an extra contingency and then \$500,000 is coming out of the contingency. Then you have all of these overtime and relief budgets that are being cut, which is not really like cutting a position. It is just sort of hoping that we won't need those numbers. The jail is going to use whatever the jail is going to use to support their needs, comply with New York State Law and to maintain the requirements of the jail and they can't change that. I remember meeting with the former Sheriff who explained the State mandated requirements for training in the Sheriff's Department. When they are out of training others have to do overtime or relief has to be done. I see a lot of these things as things that will contribute to the busting of the budget and contribute to our deficit growing. I am very unhappy with where these different items were cut from. They were cut from amorphous line items where nobody can really guarantee us that these numbers won't be needed. Thank you.

Chairwoman Cornell

At the many meetings that we did have of Budget and Finance a lot of these things were discussed with department heads. When their questions came up as well there were calls to department heads to find out about these things.

Mr. Schoenberger

Legislator Meyers is correct, this is not exactly cost accounting. This is not where you have a set of books and you can look at how much money came in and how much money went out, make subtractions and see what the net is. This is a projection for the year to come. Within that there are variables. The sales tax reserve was cut by \$1,000,000 and the contingency was cut by \$500,000. If you look at it carefully that is picked up at the bottom with the Legislative Appropriation Reserve \$1,416,665. They sort of net each other out. It is the same money so it is not really a harm done.

The Sheriff was asked by the County Executive to cut millions of dollars from his budget. We worked very closely with the Sheriff and he was extremely cooperative. He came in and said, on the Jail Relief - \$100,000 cut and the Jail Overtime -\$200,000 cut, "I can do those. I am hiring new people, I am bringing new people in under the mandate." He had twelve of the fourteen positions already filled. He said that going forward knowing that he had twelve of the fourteen he can afford to make these cuts and he was willing to surrender that money to the County and run his budget within those amounts. And he said it would be the same thing for the Patrol overtime-\$50,000 cut. He said, "I am willing to run my department to not go over those amounts and I want to contribute that \$350,000 towards the expenditure of my Mounted Patrol and my five patrol deputies." I think that was a greater concession from him than we get from most department heads. Most department heads, we have to take it away from them. He came in and volunteered them, because he wanted to preserve the things that I talked about. So we accepted those numbers. We had them vetted through Nicole and we vetted then with the Commissioner of Finance and Nick DeSantis. Everybody came back and said that they were reasonable and attainable.

I understand where you are coming from Joe, but this is not cost accounting it is budgetary accounting. When you are dealing in County government and you have a \$736,000,000 budget and the only revenue that you know you are going to get later on in the year through tax collections is the real property tax our consultant said that the County Executive overestimated sales tax revenue, which was \$175,000,000 (includes \$11,000,000 for towns and villages) and it should be \$174,000,000. That is six tenth of one percent differential based upon a projection. I can't fault our outside consultant for trying to be more conservative. I can't say to the Commissioner of Finance that your \$175,000,000 so off based it has to be \$174,000,000, but we could create a reserve and that is what we did.

Mr. Meyers

I understand what you are saying. Of course, I would have been more comfortable if you would have eliminated a program, a position, but everything that was selected here were amorphous line item.

Mr. Schoenberger

No, that is not true.

Mr. Meyers

It is. I am talking about the ones that are here.

Mr. Schoenberger

The ones that are here are covered by contracts and contractual obligations. We are trying to prevent the County from being exposed to damages. The 22 we eliminated are 22 fully funded positions in the 2013 budget that are vacant.

Mr. Meyers

The Abolished HSP and DMH Vacant, what the County Executive has been doing over the last number of years is technically those positions are funded, but he keeps them vacant throughout the years. I see that as another sort of contingency. Even though it is funded he really doesn't hire anyone for those positions so that when we cut those out we cut out his ability to have those positions in the budget here in this case it is \$662,000, but are we really saving \$662,000? He was going to try to save the \$662,000 by not hiring anyone so it cuts out another flexibility that was probably in the budget anyway.

Mr. Schoenberger

Last year he had about 40 to 50 positions that were funded for one dollar a year. We wiped them all out, because we didn't want a position on a budget line. If he could find money he could transfer it over and fill the position and we didn't want that. We wanted to make sure the positions were never filled during the year and money wasn't hidden somewhere, moved over and the next thing you know we have 40 to 50 more employees. This year he funded 22 positions fully, full salary, full benefits, full pension and full medical. The \$662,040 from the abolishment of positions is net County tax dollars, 100% net. Take out the State aid, take out the Federal aid, it is net – net. We took out 22 fully funded positions.

We are trying to make the County Executive tow the line. We are trying to take away from him the latitude to fill positions and to incur expenditures beyond what we appropriate.

We had a problem with the Department of General Services. We had someone that was terminated in the layoffs that went into effect July 27<sup>th</sup> and the next day he went into a temporary position in General Services at a salary of \$65,000 a year for the remainder of the year. All of us felt that was inappropriate. We didn't create the position he just did it as a temporary. We are trying to restrict the funding in the departments so those kind of things can't happen and that is why we are taking the \$662,040 out of their department.

The Commissioner of Hospitals was very upset, because most of those 22 positions are his. He came before our committee and after lengthy discussions he had three positions – two by law had to be there. He had one in the budget for \$195,000. We cut it down to \$150,000. He had another position that also was required by law and the third was a head nurse that he said he needed and we relented and gave him the position and wiped out about 18 positions. We were very tough and we have cut.

We have cut a lot of these lines. Law Department, which is the subject of a great deal of discussion in the Budget and Finance Committee and the Legislature over this last year, had \$125,000 for fees for 409, which is outside counsel. We took away \$50,000 of that. We are trying to put restraints in. You have been here; you know what I am talking about. They hire people for \$95,000 and then come to us for another \$50,000.

We are trying to make government more accountable and it is not easy. It is like a huge ocean liner that we just can't turn it. We just can't close the hospital tomorrow, because the State won't allow us. We can't close the nursing home tomorrow, because the State won't allow us. We can't outsource the mental health facilities tomorrow, because the State won't allow us. We need to present this in a way that the State will approve them and we need to have alternatives. We have been pending for more than a year to get approval for the Mental Health Inpatient Unit at Nyack Hospital.

Mr. Wolfe

I have always viewed this job as not just a responsibility, but also an opportunity. In order to fully take advantage of the opportunity we all have to put the time in that the job deserves. I have to say that it is a continuing source of frustration for me. If you don't attend the meetings and you don't put the time in to educate yourself about all of the issues then you are not fully part of this process. There is no time of year more important than the budget process. If you want to effect change and have an impact on this County then you need to be part of the process. I have to say these last minute amendments and the type of things happening tonight happen periodically year to year and typically it is concepts and ideas that were never mentioned at a committee meeting. They rarely, if ever, go anywhere and there is a reason for that. A lot of the issues that we are discussing right now were explored at the committee meetings. This whole concept of budgetary versus programmatic layoffs, we talked about it. The issue about the Deputy Medical Examiner, I brought it up at the meeting and it was explained to me why it couldn't be cut. It had to do with the fact that the incumbent was acting and her schedule and it is less than fulltime. We talked about it and explored it.

What is most critical here to me is this whole concept where we talk about the hospital relief and temporary – it was just last Wednesday when we talked about mental health and the Commissioner of Hospitals was there and he told us the only way he is able to have a 24/7 operation is that he surviving on his relief and temporary lines, because of all the cuts we have made through the years.

The committee vetted the proposals. The place to have an impact on anything that happens in this Legislature is always in the committee. The whole concept that there was never a sense of direction and we got the information yesterday late in the day – we have been talking about this for weeks. There has always been an open line of communication. There was less input this year than in years past. We had three caucuses and two Sunday's. It is very easy to come into the process late in the game, but you are never going to accomplish anything. It just doesn't work like that. If we are going to be a collaborative body where we are going to build a consensus the place to do that is in the committee. I do not buy the argument that it is not set up for input. How many nights did we have a full night of meetings and at the end we would discuss. This is how decisions are made. This is how ideas are floated. No one is ever shutout of the process. So I really take exception to any assertion that the process is not set up for people to make a meaningful impact. You have to take advantage of the opportunity.

Chairwoman Cornell

It is important in really listening to what we ask of the department heads, because there are some things we thought we could cut and then we really hear what it is, what they do and why it is needed. We have made changes as we went along. There is a motion on the floor.

Mr. Moroney

I guess most of us here forget Mr. Bruce Levine, no, absolutely not. I remember him very well, because he would come in here with the exact same thing. I thought the concept was getting a combined effort in this Legislature to come up with the best budget we can. Now if Mr. Day didn't do his diligent homework that might not be his fault, because it is not easy to keep up with all these committees. Also, I wasn't invited to any caucus. Don't tell me this is the first time this ever happened. This has been going on for years.

Chairwoman Cornell

Thank you, I am very disappointed that I wasn't invited to your caucus.

Mr. Grant

As this process wind's down and called for a vote, I am anticipating that there are no other further amendments to the amended budget as proposed by the Report of the Budget and Finance Committee, the vote we are about to take is a choice between the budget as we have amended it here or the County Executive's budget. Based on the way our Charter is constructed if we do not adopt his budget proposal becomes the budget for 2013. So make no mistake about it, you are either voting for the budget as we have amended it here, because you think it is a better budget or you are voting no to implement the County Executive's budget, because you think that one is a better budget. Thank you.

Mr. Schoenberger

First, In response to my friend Legislator Moroney, I think that if anyone views the tape and listens to what was said, I have tried to be nothing, but respectful and courteous to my colleague Legislator Day. Secondly, many of us in the Democratic caucus have been hoping for a number of years you would come and join us, Pat.

Mr. Jobson

I want to thank everybody who has been involved in this process. It has been a tough arduous month and the storms did not help. Ian, I want to thank you, because you are always on top of things and you did a yeoman's job this year. You really vetted everything and this is the best budget I felt good about in a while, because all the revenue sources are legitimate. There are no phony doctored up straw dogs in this and all the numbers work out. It is always going to be an issue in a County like ours when sales tax revenue is the big number that you hang on each and every year. I don't know what we are going to do overnight to change that. I want to thank the Budget and Finance Committee and everybody that has been involved with the process. Like Michael said, you have some choices and you want to do the right thing by the people. I can't see myself in this tough budgetary time, with people having trouble making mortgage payments and keeping their families a float, you do have a choice to send seventy plus people packing or keep them on the payroll. I made a promise to the CSEA people that I wouldn't send anyone packing that I don't have to and there is no legitimate reason we have to.

This doorstep has got over hundred jobs that could disappear tomorrow and nobody would ever miss them. The golden goose never gets touched regardless who they are a friend of, who their party affiliation is and certain people/sacred cows that never ever see the light of day come and go and they have a better ticket to ride than anybody else in County government. It has to come to a stop one of these days, because it is nonsense and all the people in this County are paying for it.

I will vote yes on this budget. Thank you.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9481

Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 542 OF 2012  
APPROPRIATION OF BUDGET ITEMS FOR 2013**

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

WHEREAS, the 2013 County Budget has been duly adopted; and

WHEREAS, the Budget and Finance Committee 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 Chairman; now, 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, 2013.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Meyers, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wolfe, Cornell)
Nays:	02	(Legislators Low-Hogan, Wieder)

---

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	PA No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS		REVENUES	
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED
							INC. (DEC.)	INC. (DEC.)	INC. (DEC.)	
A	CA6816	Campus Fun and Learn	5010			Contract Agency	2,779 \$	2,779 \$	2,779	2,779
A	CA6360	CEILIES Institute	5010			Contract Agency	6,625 \$	6,625 \$	6,625	6,625
A	CY7642	Chiku Awa! African Dance	5010			Contract Agency	1,140 \$	1,140 \$	1,140	1,140
A	CA6363	Chimes Work	5010			Contract Agency	1,282 \$	1,282 \$	1,282	1,282
A	CY7542	Chorus Musical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	1,425 \$	1,425 \$	1,425	1,425
A	CY7542	Chorus Musical & Dental	5010			Contract Agency	3,349 \$	3,349 \$	3,349	3,349
A	CY7535	Debra Weiss Dance	5010			Contract Agency	1,865 \$	1,865 \$	1,865	1,865
A	CY7541	Elmwood Playhouse	5010			Contract Agency	6,882 \$	6,882 \$	6,882	6,882
A	CA6817	EPIC	5010			Contract Agency	2,779 \$	2,779 \$	2,779	2,779
A	CA7518	Friends of Nyseks	5010			Contract Agency	9,911 \$	9,911 \$	9,911	9,911
A	CA7571	Hudson Vagabond Puppets	5010			Contract Agency	4,204 \$	4,204 \$	4,204	4,204
A	CY7570	Irish Cultural Society of Rockland	5010			Contract Agency	5,700 \$	5,700 \$	5,700	5,700
A	CY7555	Irish Cultural Society of Rockland	5010			Contract Agency	1,140 \$	1,140 \$	1,140	1,140
A	CA6308	RC Family Treatment Court	5010			Contract Agency	15,105 \$	15,105 \$	15,105	15,105
A	CY7545	Riverbowl Films	5010			Contract Agency	1,425 \$	1,425 \$	1,425	1,425
A	CY7545	Riverbowl Films	5010			Contract Agency	1,539 \$	1,539 \$	1,539	1,539
A	CY7550	Rockland Camera	5010			Contract Agency	1,539 \$	1,539 \$	1,539	1,539
A	CA6954	Rockland Interfaith Breakfast	5010			Contract Agency	5,771 \$	5,771 \$	5,771	5,771
A	CY7558	Rockland Irish American	5010			Contract Agency	14,464 \$	14,464 \$	14,464	14,464
A	CA7536	Rockland Youth Dance	5010			Contract Agency	5,059 \$	5,059 \$	5,059	5,059
A	CA8750	Cornell Cooperative Extension	5010			Contract Agency	274,231 \$	274,231 \$	74,231	74,231
A	4014A	Chronic Disease Prevention	4090			Fees for Services	22,800 \$	22,800 \$	22,800	22,800
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X1051	PH Tech I	Rescind Program Elimination	5,778 \$	5,778 \$	52,002	52,002
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8054	Pg Spec PH Ed	Rescind Program Elimination	8,848 \$	8,848 \$	68,494	79,646
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8298A	PH Assess PH ED LFT	Rescind Program Elimination	7,079 \$	7,079 \$	70,794	63,715
A	4010	Department of Health	1100	X8428	PH Assess Asst II	Rescind Program Elimination	6,081 \$	6,081 \$	60,910	54,549
A	4010	Department of Health	1800		Health Insurance	Rescind Program Elimination	3,938,650 \$	4,112,590 \$	176,000	176,000
A	4010	Department of Health	1811		Dental	Rescind Program Elimination	186,180 \$	177,570 \$	11,330	11,330
A	4010	Department of Health	1825		Vision	Rescind Program Elimination	37,355 \$	33,916 \$	2,289	2,289
A	4010	Department of Health	1825		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	2,652,100 \$	2,612,270 \$	184,650	184,650
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	748,110 \$	814,270 \$	84,680	84,680
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		Workers Comp	Rescind Program Elimination	287,000 \$	304,000 \$	17,000	17,000
A	4010	Department of Health	1830		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	35,159 \$	37,480 \$	2,330	2,330
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7784	Asst Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	6,651 \$	66,610 \$	59,949	59,949
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7666	Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	8,648 \$	86,482 \$	77,834	77,834
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X7668	Clark Typist	Rescind Program Elimination	3,800 \$	38,000 \$	34,200	34,200
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X9008	Sr Env Health Spec	Rescind Program Elimination	11,225 \$	112,248 \$	101,023	101,023
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100	X8341	PH Tech II	Rescind Program Elimination	7,230 \$	72,398 \$	65,068	65,068
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1100		Temp positions	Rescind Program Elimination	74,000 \$	75,000 \$	75,000	75,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1800		Health Insurance	Rescind Program Elimination	6,630 \$	84,000 \$	10,000	10,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Vision	Rescind Program Elimination	7,430 \$	800	600	600
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Retirement	Rescind Program Elimination	1,430 \$	285	285	285
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	10,030 \$	114,265 \$	114,265	114,265
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Workers Comp	Rescind Program Elimination	2,740 \$	40,135 \$	37,395	37,395
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	6,000 \$	6,000 \$	6,000	6,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	1812		Operational Supplies	Rescind Program Elimination	1,545 \$	1,545 \$	1,545	1,545
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	3290		Contractual	Rescind Program Elimination	95,000 \$	95,000 \$	95,000	95,000
A	4053	DOH- Mosquito Control	4090			Rescind Program Elimination	1,700 \$	1,700 \$	1,700	1,700



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES		
						2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 (INC./DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 (INC./DEC.)
A	600	Commissioner of Labor	1800	Social Security	Rescind Program Elimination	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
A	600	Commissioner of Labor	1800	MTA Tax	Rescind Program Elimination	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25
A	2900	DCH Education Pre-K	4000	Fees for Services	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ 187,000	\$ 20,700	\$ (166,300)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (187,300)
A	2900	DCH Education Pre-K	4000	Medicaid Reimburse	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,572	\$ (49,572)
A	2901	DCH Education EIP	4000	Medicaid Reimburse	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ 84,000	\$ (8,270)	\$ (92,270)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (92,270)
A	2901	DCH Education EIP	4000	Medicaid Reimburse	Eliminate Bus Consultant Contract	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,250,000	\$ 9,233,538	\$ (16,462)
A	CLK4410	County Clerk	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (30,000)	\$ (60,000)	\$ (30,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (30,000)
A	DOH185	Medical Examiner	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (100,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (100,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (100,000)
A	DOH4010	Health Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (150,000)	\$ (300,000)	\$ (150,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (150,000)
A	EMR5210	Social Services	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (150,000)	\$ (300,000)	\$ (150,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (150,000)
A	EMR5210	Fire & Emergency Services	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (10,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (10,000)
A	EMR5210	Emergency Services	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (10,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (10,000)
A	EMR5210	Finance Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (45,413)	\$ (90,826)	\$ (45,413)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (45,413)
A	LAW1420	Law Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (20,000)	\$ (40,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (20,000)
A	PER1430	Personnel Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (20,000)	\$ (40,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (20,000)
A	PLN8020	Planning Department	1101	Salary Savings	Salary Savings	\$ (10,000)	\$ (20,000)	\$ (10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (10,000)
a	LEG1010	Legislative Board	6600	Appropriation Reserve	Appropriation Reserve	\$ -	\$ 1,416,685	\$ 1,416,685	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,416,685
A	UNC1900	Contingency	1940	Unemployment Insurance	Unemployment Insurance	\$ 750,000	\$ 50,000	\$ (700,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (700,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6035	Sales Tax Reserve	Sales Tax Reserve	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ (1,000,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,000,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6050	Contingency	Contingency	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ (500,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (500,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6053	Designated for Fund Balance	Designated for Fund Balance	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ (12,000,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (12,000,000)
A	UNC1900	Contingency	6260	State of Real Property	State of Real Property	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ (12,000,000)
A	UNC1910	Unallocable General Services	4240	Unallocable General Services - to balance	Unallocable General Services - to balance	\$ 1,875,910	\$ 1,957,408	\$ 181,498	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,498
A	TRF5225	Contributions to County Road (D) Fund	9010	Contribution - to balance fund	Contribution - to balance fund	\$ 10,095,715	\$ 4,471,713	\$ (5,624,002)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (5,624,002)
A	TRF5225	Contributions to Hospital (EH) Fund	9010	Contribution - to balance fund	Contribution - to balance fund	\$ 16,746,320	\$ 4,717,200	\$ (12,029,120)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (12,029,120)
A	TRF5225	Contributions to Hospital (EH) Fund	9031	Interfund Transfer DMH Jail	Interfund Transfer DMH Jail	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>FUND TOTAL</b>						<b>\$ 61,338,343</b>	<b>\$ 61,286,071</b>	<b>\$ (52,272)</b>	<b>\$ 27,553,880</b>	<b>\$ 27,541,110</b>	<b>\$ (12,242,770)</b>
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	HW Main Mech	Rescind Layoff	\$ 6,540	\$ 65,404	\$ 58,864	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58,864
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	Laborer II	Rescind Layoff	\$ 5,925	\$ 58,040	\$ 52,115	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,115
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	Laborer II	Rescind Layoff	\$ 6,942	\$ 55,223	\$ 48,281	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48,281
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1100	Silled Laborer	Rescind Layoff	\$ 7,377	\$ 73,794	\$ 66,417	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,417
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1101	Salary Savings	Rescind Layoff	\$ (100,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ (100,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (100,000)
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1920	Retirement	Rescind Layoff	\$ 810,025	\$ 878,110	\$ 68,085	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,085
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1930	Social Security	Rescind Layoff	\$ 239,635	\$ 259,475	\$ 19,840	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,840
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	1980	MTA Tax	Rescind Layoff	\$ -	\$ 13,160	\$ 13,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,160
D	5110	Highways-Main, of Roads and Bridges	RT210	COBRA	Rescind Layoff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ (50,000)



COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dist. No.	Department Name	Object	Pos. No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES		
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2014 (INC./DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2014 (INC./DEC.)
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1271	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	9,571	98,714	34,843		34,843	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1272	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,500	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1273	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,532	35,320	31,788		31,788	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1277	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1278	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	5,273	52,728	47,453		47,453	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1523	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	4,551	45,510	41,049		41,049	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X2997	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,618	36,184	32,566		32,566	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X3946	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,632	36,324	32,692		32,692	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1760	Laundry Worker III	Rescind Outourcing	4,921	49,205	44,284		44,284	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1795	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X1797	Laundry Worker I	Rescind Outourcing	3,451	34,508	31,055		31,055	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1100	X3818	Relief Cook	Rescind Outourcing	3,968	39,680	35,696		35,696	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1820	X3818	Relief Cook	Rescind Outourcing	1,004	10,040	9,186		9,186	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	1839		MIA, Tax	Rescind Outourcing	1,710	17,100	15,390		15,390	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	5060		Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	400,000	-	(400,000)		(400,000)	
EH	HSPE825	Hospital/Laundry	R1210		COBRA	Rescind Outourcing	-	-	(71,800)		(71,800)	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X2620	Radiologic Tech - A	Rescind Outourcing	6,942	66,415	59,774		59,774	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X3430	Srvg Radiologic Tech	Rescind Outourcing	8,422	84,222	84,800		84,800	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1100	X1272	Radiologic Tech 1/2	Rescind Outourcing	3,034	30,340	27,306		27,306	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1820		Retirement	Rescind Outourcing	5,100	49,890	44,690		44,690	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	1839		Social Security	Rescind Outourcing	1,468	14,695	13,369		13,369	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	R1210		MIA, Tax	Rescind Outourcing	650	670	20		20	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	5060		COBRA	Rescind Outourcing	-	-	20		20	
EH	HSPE831	Hospital/Radiology	5060		Program Cost	Rescind Outourcing	200,000	-	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	DMHW680	DWH Local Government Unit	1101		Salary Savings		(150,000)	(300,000)	(150,000)		(150,000)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP Hospital Administration	1101		Salary Savings		(10,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)		(10,000)	
EH	HSPE807	HSP Transportation	1101		Salary Savings		(20,000)	(40,000)	(20,000)		(20,000)	
EH	HSPE831	HSP Materials Management	1101		Salary Savings		(20,000)	(40,000)	(20,000)		(20,000)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP Nursing SPH	1101		Salary Savings		(200,000)	(400,000)	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	HSPE828	HSP Nursing Home	1101		Salary Savings		(200,000)	(400,000)	(200,000)		(200,000)	
EH	DMHM020	DH&H Hospital	1100	7768	Psych Soc Worker II	Abolish Vacant Position	84,260	-	(84,260)		(84,260)	
EH	HSPE800	HSP Hospital Health Svcs	1100	2673	Sr Account Clerk Typist	Abolish Vacant Position	46,650	-	(46,650)		(46,650)	
EH	HSPE800	HSP Hospital Health Svcs	1100	2673	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	28,981	-	(28,981)		(28,981)	
EH	HSPE800	HSP Hospital Health Svcs	1100	2673	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	28,981	-	(28,981)		(28,981)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP-Medical Administration	1100	7255B	Director Med Svcs	Reduce Salary	150,000	-	(150,000)		(150,000)	
EH	HSPE810	HSP-Physicians SNF	1100	5889	Internist 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	80,922	-	(80,922)		(80,922)	
EH	HSPE801	HSP - Food Services	1100	8594A	Food Svc Helper 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	14,051	-	(14,051)		(14,051)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	7073	Records Clerk Typist	Abolish Vacant Position	36,380	-	(36,380)		(36,380)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	8416	Sr Typist PT	Abolish Vacant Position	22,170	-	(22,170)		(22,170)	
EH	HSPE804	HSP - Medical Records	1100	8122B	Medical Clerk LFT	Abolish Vacant Position	21,428	-	(21,428)		(21,428)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	3563	Nurses Aide Inst	Abolish Vacant Position	46,610	-	(46,610)		(46,610)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	1465A	Reg Nurse Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	22,804	-	(22,804)		(22,804)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	2579C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	6,598	-	(6,598)		(6,598)	
EH	HSPE822	HSP-Nursing SPH	1100	2591C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	9,982	-	(9,982)		(9,982)	

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Pos No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES		
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)
EH	HSP5022	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	281D	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
EH	HSP5022	HSP - Nursing SPH	1100	1284A	Nurses Aide Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	2,888	-	(2,888)			(2,888)
EH	HSP5022	HSP - Nursing SPH	1100	1284B	Nurses Aide Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	12,953	-	(12,953)			(12,953)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1328	Nurses Aide Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	15,658	-	(15,658)			(15,658)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1331A	Nurses Aide Inst 1/2	Abolish Vacant Position	43,655	-	(43,655)			(43,655)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1712C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	13,298	-	(13,298)			(13,298)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1712E	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	13,298	-	(13,298)			(13,298)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	1731	Nurses Aide Inst	Abolish Vacant Position	39,662	-	(39,662)			(39,662)
EH	HSP5028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1100	2830C	Reg Nurse Inst PT	Abolish Vacant Position	8,364	-	(8,364)			(8,364)
EH	DMHM110	DMH - Ponona Clinic	1130		Temporary		150,000	79,000	(71,000)			(71,000)
EH	DMHM051	DMH - Personnel Office	1130		Temporary		50,000	25,000	(25,000)			(25,000)
EH	DMHM020	DMH - Inpatient	1800		Relief		1,223,000	577,000	(646,000)			(646,000)
EH	DMHM200	DMH - Inpatient	1110		Overtime		500,000	260,000	(240,000)			(240,000)
EH	HSPF001	HSP - Food Services	1130		Temporary		270,000	170,000	(100,000)			(100,000)
EH	HSPF028	HSP - Nursing SNF	1130		Temporary		50,000	20,000	(30,000)			(30,000)
EH	4881	Contribution from General (A) Fund	R2310		Contribution - to balance fund					14,717,030		14,717,030
<b>FUND TOTAL</b>							\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
							18,745,320	14,717,030	(2,028,290)	16,944,230	14,717,030	(2,127,198)

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Fall Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept. No.	Department Name	Object	Pay No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 PROPOSED BUDGET		2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED		2013 INC. (DEC.)	
							Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change	Budget	Change
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X1674	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,777	57,765	5,777	57,765						51,989
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2289	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	1,896	15,958	1,896	15,958						14,272
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2300	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	5,777	57,765	5,777	57,765						51,989
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2349	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,164	31,636	3,164	31,636						28,472
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2350	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,312	33,120	3,312	33,120						29,808
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3025A	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,312	33,120	3,312	33,120						29,808
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3025B	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,310	23,104	2,310	23,104						20,794
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3301	Sr Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	6,842	69,416	6,842	69,416						62,574
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X3001	Sr Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	7,685	76,846	7,685	76,846						69,161
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X5049	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2649	Watchman PT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,342	23,416	2,342	23,416						21,074
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X2649	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	1,450	14,500	1,450	14,500						13,050
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X7587	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X7758	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8078A	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	3,279	32,785	3,279	32,785						29,506
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8078B	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	2,185	21,859	2,185	21,859						19,673
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8078C	Security Aide LFT	Rescind Outsourcing	5,522	55,220	5,522	55,220						49,698
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1100	X8422	Security Aide	Rescind Outsourcing	232,000	2,320,000	232,000	2,320,000						2,088,000
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1810	1810	Insurance	Rescind Outsourcing	1,450	14,500	1,450	14,500						13,050
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1812	1812	Veteran	Rescind Outsourcing	3,700	37,000	3,700	37,000						33,300
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1920	1920	Retirement	Rescind Outsourcing	27,290	272,900	27,290	272,900						245,610
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1930	1930	Social Security	Rescind Outsourcing	344,945	3,449,450	344,945	3,449,450						3,104,505
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1950	1950	Workers Comp	Rescind Outsourcing	6,500	65,000	6,500	65,000						58,500
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	1990	1990	MTA Tax	Rescind Outsourcing	-	-	-	-						-
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	2070	2070	Uniforms	Rescind Outsourcing	-	-	-	-						-
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	R210	R210	CPBRA	Rescind Outsourcing	-	-	-	-						-
M	D6S1247	DSS-Security	5360	5360	Program Cost	Rescind Outsourcing	-	-	-	-						-
M	D6S2300	DSS-MIS	1101	1101	Salary Savings	Contribution - to balance fund	1,000,000	-	1,000,000	-						(1,000,000)
M	D6S1245	DSS-Maintenance	1101	1101	Salary Savings	Contribution - to balance fund	(50,000)	(100,000)	(50,000)	(100,000)						(50,000)
M	D6S2600	DSS-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R2003	R2003		Contribution - to balance fund	(194,750)	(400,000)	(194,750)	(400,000)						(205,250)
M						<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>1,127,618</b>	<b>1,442,891</b>	<b>1,127,618</b>	<b>1,442,891</b>						<b>315,273</b>
Q	PER050	Unemployment Insurance	8010	R2009	Employee Benefit		750,000	50,000	750,000	50,000						(700,000)
Q						<b>FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>						<b>(700,000)</b>
						<b>Total</b>	<b>89,666,360</b>	<b>54,791,378</b>	<b>89,666,360</b>	<b>54,791,378</b>						<b>(34,874,982)</b>

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
 AMENDMENTS TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET  
 2013 BUDGET  
 As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Obj No.	Account or Title	Object Name & Description	APPROPRIATIONS		REVENUES		2013 INC. (DEC.)
							2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	
						Property Tax		\$ 99,000,000	\$ 99,000,000	\$ -	
						Sales Tax		\$ 175,000,000	\$ 175,000,000	\$ -	
						Balance				\$ -	

COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
2013 BUDGET  
As Adopted by the Full Legislature 12/4/2012  
TECHNICAL CHANGES TO 2013 PROPOSED BUDGET

Fund	Dept No.	Department Name	Object	Account or Title	APPROPRIATIONS			REVENUES					
					2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 PROPOSED BUDGET	2013 LEGISLATIVE APPROVED	2013 INC. (DEC.)	2013 LOCAL SHARE INC. (DEC.)		
A	DMH4305	Camp Venture	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	78,750	78,750	-	-	-	78,750		
A	DMH4306	Mental Health Assoc	5970	Direct Service Enhancement - Success Team Pg	-	12,000	12,000	-	-	-	12,000		
A	DMH4306	Mental Health Assoc	5970	Direct Service Enhancement - Transportation Pg	-	69,830	69,830	-	-	-	69,830		
A	DMH4332	NY Assoc for Learning Disabled	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	11,205	11,205	-	-	-	11,205		
A	DMH4342	Loeb House	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	9,140	9,140	-	-	-	9,140		
A	DMH4354	Bikur Cholim Partners in Health	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	16,030	16,030	-	-	-	16,030		
A	DMH4355	Jewish Family Svcs - Autism Pg	5970	Direct Service Enhancement	-	42,750	42,750	-	-	-	42,750		
A	SHF3113	Sheriff - River Patrol	R3389	State Aid - Public Safety	-	29,620	29,620	-	29,620	29,620	(29,620)		
A	SHF3113	Sheriff - River Patrol	R5060	Program Costs	-	37,000	37,000	-	-	-	37,000		
A	CA8816	West St. Day Care Center	5010	Contract Agency	-	17,323,285	(276,705)	-	-	-	(276,705)		
A	DOH2961	DOH-Education, Children EIP (0-2)	5520	Tuition (To balance above)	17,600,000	17,629,620	29,620	-	-	-	29,620		
<b>GENERAL(A) FUND</b>					\$	17,600,000	\$	17,629,620	\$	29,620	\$	29,620	\$
G	SWR8110	Sewer-Administration	1100	Salaries - N001 Sewer Use Compl Insp (Hebrew Spkg) (to correct salary)	39,780	47,820	8,040	-	-	-	8,040		
G	SWR9952	Sewer-Unallocable Revenue Dept	R5990	Appropriated Fund Balance (To balance above)	-	2,222,340	2,230,380	8,040	2,222,340	2,230,380	8,040		
<b>SEWER (G) FUND</b>					\$	39,780	\$	47,820	\$	8,040	\$	8,040	\$

REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE AND PLANNING & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES  
 AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET  
 RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES  
 As Adopted by the Full Legislative Assembly

PROJECT	2013 PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET	RECOMM.	APPROP. INC. (DEC.)	RECOMMENDED CHANGES			CAPITAL FUNDS
				GENERAL FUND CONTRIBUTION	FEDERAL	STATE AND	
<b>Schedule III</b>							
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Public Transportation</b>							
1894 - Bus Stop Improvements - 2008 Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project: No Plans for CDPT to Move Forward with Project	In Process	500,000			500,000	
1895 - Purchase One (1) Hybrid Electric Commuter Coach Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project	In Process	1,014,562			1,014,562	
1891 - Install Vehicle Locator Systems (TRIPS/TOR Bus) Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project	In Process	1,500,000			1,500,000	
1896 - County Transit Centers Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project	In Process	1,250,000			1,250,000	
1801 - Purchase of Two (2) 26' Buses - TRIPS Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project	In Process	400,000			400,000	
1817 - Purchase of Four (4) Transit Buses for TOR Replacement Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project: No Plans for CDPT to Move Forward with Project	In Process	2,345,500			2,345,500	
1822 - Purchase of Five (5) 28' Cutaway Buses for TRIPS Replacement Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project	In Process	400,000			400,000	
<b>Current Projects - Funded &amp; Unfunded - Drainage</b>							
7055 - Peasack Brook - Lake Susannahs Terrace Restore Project Proposed to be Closed as per PPW / B&F	Close Project: Scope of Project Covered Under CP #713 - Peasack Brook/Urban Road Debt Stock \$2,500 Retained for Arts in Public Places	In Process	3,000,000			3,000,000	5,000,000
7054 - Damnest Kill (or Related Streams) in the Vicinity of Lake Lucia - 2007 Road - New York State Thruway Road Work Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F	Cancel Project: Private Property & No County Easement Exists	Pending	5,000,000				5,000,000
7105 - Lake Susannah - Bridge, Clear, Design, Upstream and/or Downstream of Dam - Joint Project with Town of Ramapo Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F	Cancel Project: Not County Regulated Stream/Channel PCDA Jurisdiction	Pending	5,000,000				5,000,000
7106 - Drainage Improvements - Memorial Pond Restore Project Proposed to be Cancelled as per PPW / B&F	Cancel Project: RODA No Plans to Move Forward with Project	Pending	3,000,000				3,000,000
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE CHANGES</b>			<b>25,447,032</b>			<b>7,411,042</b>	<b>16,000,000</b>

**Debate:**

Mr. Meyers

Some mention has been made over the last few months that if you vote against the budget then you should be voting against the appropriation. I am not sure that is true. The budget is passed and now it is a procedural matter of appropriating the money that is required in the budget that has been legally passed. I am going to vote to appropriate and it doesn't take away one wisp from the fact that I was opposed to the budget. Thank you.

Mr. Carey

I just want to reiterate that the budget has been passed and is behind us now. This is a matter of doing business for the going. In respect to the wishes of my peers I will be voting for this.

---

Chairwoman Cornell called for a recess at 11:24 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 11:35 p.m. Legislator Murphy did to return to the meeting and is an unauthorized absent for the remainder of the items to be voted on.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 7300

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor  
Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 543 OF 2012  
ACCEPTING THE BID OF THE LOWEST RESPONSIBLE BIDDER  
AND APPROVING A CONTRACT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
WITH HELMER CRONIN CONSTRUCTION INC.  
IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$104,820  
FOR CONSTRUCTION SERVICES FOR THE  
EUGENE J. GROGAN CORRECTIONAL  
CENTER STORAGE GARAGE AND AUTHORIZING ITS  
EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES-FACILITIES MANAGEMENT]  
(\$104,820)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Moroney and adopted:

WHEREAS, The Division of Purchasing advertised a public bid for construction services for the Eugene J. Grogan Correctional Center's Storage Garage to replace the roof and outside block wall covering and received nine (9) bids; and

WHEREAS, Academy Construction who submitted the lowest bid in the amount of \$78,000 did not include its subcontractor information in a sealed envelope as required by General Municipal Law §101(5) and failed to submit certain material information as required by the bid specification; and

WHEREAS, Based upon these material variances, it was determined that the bid of Academy Construction was deemed non-responsive; and

WHEREAS, Helmer Cronin Construction Inc., 27 Route 210, Stony Point, New York 10980, who submitted the second lowest bid in the amount of \$104,820, was determined to meet all of the bid specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Commissioner of General Services and the Director of Facilities Management recommend that the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County reject the bid of Academy Construction and accept the bid and award a contract with Helmer Cronin Construction Inc., Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$104,820; 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 project exists in Sheriff's Department Forfeiture Funds FS02-E4500; 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 accepts the bid in the amount of \$104,820 and awards the contract for construction services for the Eugene J. Grogan Correctional Center's Storage Garage to replace the roof and outside block wall covering from Helmer Cronin Construction Inc., 27 Route 210, Stony Point, New York 10980; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County approves the contract in excess of \$100,000 with Helmer Cronin Construction Inc., 27 Route 210, Stony Point, New York 10980 for construction services for the Eugene J. Grogan Correctional Center's Storage Garage to replace the roof and outside block wall covering in an amount not to exceed \$104,820 pursuant to plans and specifications prepared by the Department of General Services-Facilities Management, and authorizes its execution by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this project exists in the Sheriff's Department Forfeiture Funds FS02-E4500.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5906/7621

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor  
Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 544 OF 2012  
RATIFYING AN AGREEMENT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
WITH PLYMOUTH ROCK ENERGY  
FOR THE SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS (FIRM ACCOUNTS)  
FOR THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND AND  
THE ROCKLAND COUNTY SEWER DISTRICT NO. 1  
IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$200,000  
FOR THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2012 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2013  
WITH ALL PURCHASES TO BE MADE BY FORMAL PURCHASE ORDER  
[DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES – DIVISION OF PURCHASING]  
(\$200,000)**

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

WHEREAS, By Resolution 579 of 2009, the Legislature of Rockland County amended the County's Procurement Policy and added § 140-15 entitled Energy Advisory Group to the Laws of Rockland County, creating the Energy Advisory Group, which consists of the Commissioner of Finance, the Director of Purchasing and the Executive Director of the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 (the "Sewer District"), and permitting the Energy Advisory Group to, among other things, develop and review energy related bids, act as the County's agent in awarding said bids and forward information regarding such awards to the Legislature of Rockland County for ratification; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing requested bids for the supply of natural gas (Firm Accounts) under RFB-RC-2012-071 (the "RFB") for the County of Rockland and the Sewer District; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing also solicited a proposal from the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA), a cooperative of local governments; and

WHEREAS, Over forty (40) natural gas marketers plus MEGA were notified of the RFB, three (3) of the marketers submitted bids (i.e., Plymouth Rock Energy, LLC ("Plymouth"), Hess and Marathon Power) and one (1) of them (i.e., Hess) also responded to the RFB with pricing based on the MEGA cooperative; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing and the County's energy consultant Energy Enterprises, Inc. analyzed the four (4) proposals and determined that it would be in the best interests of the County to award the contract to Plymouth for a period of six (6) months (The one (1) year pricing option was considerably higher in price.); and

WHEREAS, Plymouth, 1074 Broadway, Woodmere, NY 11598, submitted the lowest price for Pricing Method #1 (i.e., indexed based pricing with trigger option) which requires the marketer to deliver natural gas on a firm full plant requirement but allows the County to lock in pricing at any time, meaning the marketer must supply the County's usage needs at the bid price; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with § 140-15, the Director of Purchasing submitted the energy consultant's analysis to the members of the Energy Advisory Group for review and approval; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Energy Advisory Group agreed with the energy consultant's analysis and recommendation, and they awarded the bid to Plymouth for Pricing Method #1; and

WHEREAS, The pricing offered by Plymouth is lower than the County's previous bid (i.e., \$1.0790 vs. \$1.4150); and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing has issued a blanket purchase order to Plymouth; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing recommends to the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that they ratify the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Plymouth for the supply of natural gas (Firm Accounts) for the County and the Sewer District under the RFB in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the period November 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013; and

WHEREAS, All purchases will be initiated by formal purchase order; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for these purchases is provided for in the 2012 Budget of the Department of General Services and is contingent upon 2013 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 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 ratifies the County's agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Plymouth Rock Energy, LLC, 1074 Broadway, Woodmere, NY 11598, for the supply of natural gas (Firm Accounts) under RFB-RC-2012-071 for the County of Rockland and the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the period from November 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013, with all purchases to be made by formal purchase order, subject to the approval of the Director of Purchasing; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for these purchases is provided for in the 2012 Budget of the Department of General Services and is contingent upon 2013 budget appropriations.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 8593

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor  
Hon. Frank Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 545 OF 2012  
RATIFYING AN AGREEMENT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
WITH COLONIAL ENERGY INC.  
FOR THE SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS (INTERRUPTIBLE ACCOUNTS)  
FOR THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$307,052  
AND ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$180,546  
AND FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$487,598  
FOR THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2012 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2013  
WITH ALL PURCHASES TO BE MADE BY FORMAL PURCHASE ORDER  
[DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES – DIVISION OF PURCHASING]  
(\$487,598)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by and adopted:

WHEREAS, By Resolution 579 of 2009, the Legislature of Rockland County amended the County's Procurement Policy and added § 140-15 entitled Energy Advisory Group to the Laws of Rockland County, creating the Energy Advisory Group, which consists of the Commissioner of Finance, the Director of Purchasing and the Executive Director of the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1, and permitting the Energy Advisory Group to, among other things, develop and review energy related bids, act as the County's agent in awarding said bids and forward information regarding such awards to the Legislature of Rockland County for ratification; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing requested bids for the supply of natural gas (Interruptible Accounts) under RFB-RC-2012-089 (the "RFB") for the County of Rockland and Rockland Community College (RCC); and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing also solicited a proposal from the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA), a cooperative of local governments; and

WHEREAS, Over forty (40) natural gas marketers plus MEGA were notified of the RFB, one (1) marketer submitted a bid (i.e., Colonial Energy, Inc. ("Colonial")) and one (1) marketer (i.e., Hess) responded to the RFB with pricing based on the MEGA cooperative; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing and the County's energy consultant Energy Enterprises, Inc. analyzed the two (2) proposals and determined that it would be in the best interests of the County to award the contract to Colonial for a period of one (1) year (The two (2) year pricing was slightly lower in price, but it was not recommended by the energy consultant based upon the current stable market and recent declining prices.); and

WHEREAS, Colonial, 3975 Fair Ridge Drive, Fairfax, VA 22033, submitted the lowest price for Pricing Method #1 (i.e., indexed based pricing with trigger option and 100% swing) which requires the marketer to deliver natural gas on a firm full plant requirement but allows the County to lock in pricing at any time, meaning the marketer must supply the County's usage needs at the bid price; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with § 140-15, the Director of Purchasing submitted the energy consultant's analysis to the members of the Energy Advisory Group for review and approval; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Energy Advisory Group agreed with the energy consultant's analysis and recommendation, and they awarded the bid to Colonial for Pricing Method #1; and

WHEREAS, The pricing offered by Colonial is lower than the County's previous bid (i.e., \$0.743 vs. \$1.0220), which will result in an estimated savings of \$73,562 or 23.96% if usage remains the same; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing has issued a blanket purchase order to Colonial; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing recommends to the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that they ratify the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Colonial for the supply of natural gas (Interruptible Accounts) for the County and RCC under the RFB in an amount not to exceed \$487,598 for the period from November 1, 2012 through October 31, 2013; and

WHEREAS, All purchases will be initiated by formal purchase order; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for these purchases is provided for in the 2012 Budget of the Department of General Services and is contingent upon 2013 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 Planning and 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 ratifies the County's agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Colonial Energy, Inc., 3975 Fair Ridge Drive, Fairfax, VA 22033, for the supply of natural gas (Interruptible Accounts) under RFB-RC-2012-089 for the County of Rockland in the amount not to exceed \$307,052 and Rockland Community College in the amount not to exceed \$180,546 and in a total amount not to exceed \$487,598 for the period from November 1, 2012 through October 31, 2013, with all purchases to be made by formal purchase order, subject to the approval of the Director of Purchasing; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for these purchases is provided for in the 2012 Budget of the Department of General Services and is contingent upon 2013 budget appropriations.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 5519

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 546 OF 2012  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS  
 TOTALING \$243,638 (NCTD)  
 DISASTER NATIONAL EMERGENCY GRANTS  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR  
 FOR THE PERIOD MAY 1, 2012 THROUGH NOVEMBER 9, 2012  
 TO COVER VARIOUS MUNICIPALITY CLEAN UP EXPENSES  
 RELATED TO HURRICANE IRENE AND TROPICAL STORM LEE  
 AND TO COVER VARIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES  
 RELATED TO SAID HURRICANE AND STORM  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE  
 ALL NECESSARY INSTRUMENTS AND DOCUMENTS  
 [COUNTY EXECUTIVE]  
 (\$243,638)**

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

WHEREAS, The Executive Director of the Rockland Workforce Investment Board has advised the County Executive and the Rockland County Legislature that the Rockland Workforce Investment Board has been awarded a Disaster National Emergency Grants totaling \$243,638 from the New York State Department of Labor for the period May 1, 2012 through November 9, 2012; and

WHEREAS, These grants are federally funded but administered by New York State; and

WHEREAS, These grants will be used to pay the Town of Clarkstown, Town of Orangetown, Town of Ramapo, and the Village of Spring Valley for various clean up expenses related to Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee and to pay for various administrative expenses related to said hurricane and storm; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept these grants; 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 Rockland County hereby approves the acceptance of Disaster National Emergency Grants totaling \$243,638 from the New York State Department of Labor for the period May 1, 2012 through November 9, 2012, and authorizes the County Executive to execute all necessary instruments and documents, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That these grants are federally funded but administered by New York State; and be it further

RESOLVED, That these grants will be used to pay the Town of Clarkstown, Town of Orangetown, Town of Ramapo, and the Village of Spring Valley for various clean up expenses related to Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee and to pay for various administrative expenses related to said hurricane and storm; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept these grants; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2012

<u>Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):</u>		
A-EXE-1237-E5060	Program Costs	243,638
<u>Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):</u>		
A-EXE-1237-R4089	Federal Aid - General Gov't	243,638

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9263

- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Patrick J. Moroney, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 547 OF 2012**  
**APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS**  
**IN THE AMOUNT OF \$45,326 (NCTD)**  
**SAFETY NET ASSISTANCE PROJECT (SNAP)**  
**PROCESS AND TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT GRANT**  
**FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (USDA)**  
**FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE AGENCY**  
**TO PURCHASE SCANNING EQUIPMENT AND ACCESSORIES IN ORDER**  
**TO HELP INCREASE ACCESS BY ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS TO SNAP BENEFITS**  
**FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 30, 2012 THROUGH AUGUST 30, 2015**  
**AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF ALL GRANT**  
**DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE**  
**[DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES]**  
**(\$45,326)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mrs. Paul and adopted:

WHEREAS, The County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County have been advised by the Rockland County Department of Social Services that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) - Food and Nutrition Service agency has awarded Rockland County a \$45,326 Safety Net Assistance Project (SNAP) Process and Technology Improvement Grant for the period September 30, 2012 through August 30, 2015; and

WHEREAS, This grant will be used to purchase scanning equipment and accessories in order to help increase access by eligible households to SNAP benefits; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept this grant; and

WHEREAS, The Multi Services and Budget and Finance Committees of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the acceptance of a \$45,326 Safety Net Assistance Project (SNAP) Process and Technology Improvement Grant from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) - Food and Nutrition Service agency to purchase scanning equipment and accessories in order to help increase access by eligible households to SNAP benefits for the period September 30, 2012 through August 30, 2015, and authorizes execution of all grant documents by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept this 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 - 2012

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DSS-6010-GD16-E3290	Operational Supplies	42,108
-E4380	Maintenance Agreements	3,218

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A-DSS-6010-GD16-R4680	DSS Grant(s)	45,326
-----------------------	--------------	--------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 9361

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 548 OF 2012  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$149,500 (NCTD) FROM THE NEW YORK STATE  
 OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY SERVICES -  
 LAW ENFORCEMENT TERRORISM PREVENTION PROGRAM (LETPP) GRANT  
 (NO. WM12972922)  
 FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2012 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2014  
 AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]  
 (\$149,500)**

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

WHEREAS, The County Executive has been advised by the Sheriff that the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services has awarded his department a \$149,500 Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) grant (No. WM12972922) for the period September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2014; and

WHEREAS, This grant will be used to help cover overtime costs incurred by law enforcement in Rockland County that are related to terrorism prevention and preparedness training; 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 \$149,500 Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) grant (No. WM12972922) from the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2014, 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 cover overtime costs incurred by law enforcement in Rockland County that are related to terrorism prevention and preparedness training; 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 - 2012

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A -SHF -3118 -GS31	-E1110	Overtime	20,000
	-E4920	Reimburse Municipalities	129,500

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A -SHF -3118 -GS31	-R4380	Public Safety Grant(s)	149,500
--------------------	--------	------------------------	---------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9361

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 549 OF 2012  
 ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$448,500 (NCTD)  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY  
 AND EMERGENCY SERVICES - STATE HOMELAND  
 SECURITY PROGRAM (SHSP) GRANT (#WM12972920)  
 FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 2012 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2014  
 AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF ALL NECESSARY  
 GRANT DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]  
 (\$448,500)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Earl and Mr. Sparaco and unanimously 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 (#WM12972920) in the amount of \$448,500 from the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2014; 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 (#WM12972920) in the amount of \$448,500 from the New York State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Services for the period September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2014, 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 - 2012

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A -SHF -3118 -GS32	-E1130	Temporary	30,000
	-E2050	Equipment	280,000
	-E3030	Medical Supplies	39,800
	-E4090	Fees for Services, Non-Employee	47,000
	-E4380	Maintenance Agreements	51,700

Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):

A -SHF -3118 -GS32	-R4380	Public Safety Grant(s)	448,500
--------------------	--------	------------------------	---------

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nays:	02	(Legislators Murphy, Soskin)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6704

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 550 OF 2012  
 APPROPRIATION OF FEDERAL FORFEITURE FUNDS  
 REQUESTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
 TO BE USED FOR POLICE EQUIPMENT FOR THE  
 CLARKSTOWN POLICE DEPARTMENT PER THE AUTHORIZATION  
 OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
 [OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY]  
 (NO COUNTY TAX DOLLARS)  
 (\$21,840)**

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

WHEREAS, The Office of the District Attorney has requested that \$21,840 of forfeiture funds in balance sheet account A-8880 (Designated for Law Enforcement - Federal Proceeds) be appropriated to the District Attorney's 2012 Budget to be used for police equipment for the Clarkstown Police Department per the authorization of the Law Enforcement Oversight Committee; 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 total \$21,840 appropriation exists within said balance sheet account; and

WHEREAS, The use of these funds for said purposes are 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 - 2012

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DA-1165-FA01-E4500	Forfeiture Funds - Services	21,840
----------------------	-----------------------------	--------

Increase Approp. Fund Bal. (Debit):

A-UNC-9990-R5990	(Designated for Law Enforcement - Federal Proceeds)	21,840
------------------	---	--------

The vote resulted as follows:

- |            |    |   |
|------------|----|---|
| Ayes:      | 15 | (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell) |
| U.A. Nays: | 02 | (Legislators Murphy, Soskin)  |



**RESOLUTION NO. 551 OF 2012  
WAIVE THE RULES OF THE LEGISLATURE  
TO CONSIDER PROPOSED RESOLUTION  
AS AN IMMEDIATE NEED**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Sparaco and adopted:

RESOLVED, that the Rules of the Legislature be waived to consider the next proposed Resolution No. 552 of 2012, as an immediate need.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6704

Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
 Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
 Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 552 OF 2012  
 APPROVING THE SOLE SOURCE PURCHASE  
 IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
 FROM SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY CORP. D/B/A/ SYTECH  
 OF AN UPGRADE TO THE ROCKLAND COUNTY  
 DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE'S  
 ADVANCED DIGITAL AUDIO COLLECTION SYSTEM (ADACS)  
 IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$144,750 [NCTD]  
 TO BE MADE BY FORMAL PURCHASE ORDER  
 [DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES – DIVISION OF PURCHASING]  
 (\$144,750)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Carey and Mr. Earl and adopted:

WHEREAS, The Rockland County District Attorney and the Director of Purchasing request that the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County approve the sole source purchase in excess of \$100,000 from System Engineering Technologies Corporation d/b/a Sytech ("Sytech"), 6121 Lincolnia Road, Alexandria, VA 22312, of an upgrade to the Rockland County District Attorney's (DA's) Office's Advanced Digital Audio Collection Systems (ADACS) in an amount not to exceed \$144,750; and

WHEREAS, The upgrade involves an integration and expansion of the ADACS equipment, which is composed of two (2) existing digital electronic surveillance systems manufactured by Sytech; and

WHEREAS, The DA's Task Force uses the ADACS equipment to conduct criminal investigations, which it must conduct using court authorized electronic surveillance equipment that is compliant with the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) of 1994 and which include the interception, collection and preservation of spoken and written communications including landline and cellular telecommunications, facsimile exchange and packet data communications; and

WHEREAS, The ADACS equipment is used by other law enforcement agencies that the County works with jointly on investigations, and a portion of the County's original ACDACS was supplied to it by the FBI in 2003; and

WHEREAS, All equipment, system implementation and conversions, maintenance and support are provided by Sytech's facility in VA, and Sytech does not sell its products through distributors; and

WHEREAS, The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) has an IT Schedule 70 contract directly with Sytech but only for the purchase of new equipment, and not for the upgrade sought here; therefore, this request is being submitted as a sole source purchase request; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to section 140-3.8 of the County's Procurement Policy, a contract may be awarded without competition when the Director of Purchasing determines in writing, after conducting a good faith review of available resources, that there is only one source for the required commodity, supply, service or construction item; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with section 140-3.8, the Director of Purchasing has conducted a good faith review and determined that a sole source procurement is appropriate and justified because, among other things, Sytech manufactured the ACDACS equipment that the DA's Office currently owns, the equipment is proprietary and the integrity of the data that previously has been collected and stored on the equipment would be at risk if a manufacturer other than Sytech provided the upgrade; and

WHEREAS, The purchase will be initiated by formal purchase order; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County tax dollars [NCTD] as forfeiture funding previously approved by Resolution No. 354 of 2012 is available; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for this purchase is provided for in the 2012 Budget of the District Attorney in Fund A, Agency – DA, Dept. FA01, Account E2500; 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 Budget and Finance 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 Chairman; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves the sole source purchase in excess of \$100,000 from System Engineering Technologies Corporation d/b/a Sytech ("Sytech"), 6121 Lincolnia Road, Alexandria, VA 22312, of an upgrade to the Rockland County District Attorney's (DA) Office's Advanced Digital Audio Collection Systems (ADACS) in an amount not to exceed \$144,750, and authorizes the purchase to be made by formal purchase order, subject to the approval of the Director of Purchasing; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County tax dollars [NCTD] as forfeiture funding previously approved by Resolution No. 354 of 2012 is available; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this purchase is provided for in the 2012 Budget of the District Attorney in Fund A, Agency – DA, Dept. FA01, Account E2500.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 1519

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor  
Hon. Frank Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 553 OF 2012  
APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO AND EXTENSION OF  
AN AGREEMENT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
WITH HARRIS BEACH, PLLC  
FOR LEGAL SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE MATTER OF  
WEST GATE LANDSCAPING, INC. V. COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
IN THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF \$60,000 FOR A TOTAL SUM  
NOT TO EXCEED \$159,000 AND EXTENDING  
THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 31, 2012 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2013  
AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS]  
(\$159,000)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Soskin and adopted:

WHEREAS, Harris Beach LLC was retained in connection with the defense of the County in the matter of West Gate Landscaping, Inc. v. County of Rockland under Index No. 8310/07; and

WHEREAS, By that action, West Gate Landscaping Inc. ("West Gate") alleges the wrongful termination of a contract with the County dated December 4, 2001 in the amount of \$908,000, and is seeking millions of dollars for wrongful termination and delay damages; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the contract, West Gate was required to stabilize the embankment of the Nauraushaun Brook where it enters Lake Tappan pursuant to certain plans and specifications; and

WHEREAS, Harris Beach's current contract with the County, as amended and extended, is in the amount of \$99,000; and

WHEREAS, To date, Harris Beach has conducted approximately twelve (12) depositions, several of which have lasted multiple days, and it also has engaged in extensive motion practice in connection with those depositions; and

WHEREAS, Harris Beach also has engaged in multiple, failed negotiations to settle this action, but Plaintiff has not sought to engage in reasonable settlement negotiations; and

WHEREAS, Harris Beach also has prepared and filed a voluminous motion for summary judgment, seeking the dismissal of this action; and

WHEREAS, Plaintiff's counsel has filed opposition to that motion and our reply is due to be filed on or before January 11, 2013; and

WHEREAS, The Superintendent of Highways recommends to the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County to approve an amendment and extension of the agreement with Harris Beach, PLLC, 445 Hamilton Avenue, Suite 1206, White Plains New York 10601, for legal services in connection with the matter of West Gate Landscaping, Inc. v. County of Rockland in the additional amount of \$60,000 for a total sum not to exceed \$159,000 and an extension for the period from December 31 2012 through December 31, 2013; 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, Sufficient funding for this agreement exists in the Rockland County Drainage Agency Capital Project No. 7049; and

WHEREAS, The Planning and Public Works Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and by a vote of 4 ayes, 1 nay, 1 u. a. nay and 1 absent approved this resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and by a vote of 9 ayes and 1 nay, approved this resolution now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby approves an amendment and extension of the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Harris Beach, PLLC, 445 Hamilton Avenue, Suite 1206, White Plains New York 10601, for legal services in connection with the matter of West Gate Landscaping, Inc. v. County of Rockland under Index No. 8310/07 in the additional amount of \$60,000 for a total sum not to exceed \$159,000 and an extension for the period from December 31, 2012 through December 31, 2013, and authorizes its execution by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this to the agreement exists in the Rockland County Drainage Agency Capital Project No. 7049.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Cornell)
Nay:	01	(Legislator Wolfe)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

**Debate:**

**Mr. Meyers**

This is the time that we talked about in committee in terms of whether the County Attorney's office should be doing this in-house. I think that there are other serious questions regarding this item. The plaintiff's in this action are constituents in my district. I think that we should have an Executive session on this, because there are things that a lot of the people on this body do not know about that are going on in the litigation that they might be shocked about. I think that we should discuss it so I am going to make a referral. Maybe you would like to co-sponsor it with me.

**Mr. Schoenberger**

I have to tell you that I am a little bit concerned about the parties to a litigation meeting with us outside of our counsel.

**Mr. Meyers**

They wouldn't meet with us. We would discuss it with the County Attorney's office. If you have a constituent that is a plaintiff in an action and they tell you hair-raising things I don't know what to do with that information. I am going to put in a referral.

**Mr. Schoenberger**

That is fine.

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9019

- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 554 OF 2012  
 APPROVING TRANSFER OF FUNDS  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$40,000  
 FROM THE COUNTY'S CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT TO  
 SUPPORT THE CONTINUED OPERATION OF  
 THE CHILDREN'S VILLAGE - PROJECT TURNING POINT  
 DECEMBER 1, 2012 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2013  
 [YOUTH BUREAU]  
 (\$40,000)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Moroney and adopted:

WHEREAS, The Children's Village operates the county's runaway and homeless youth program ("project turning point"); and

WHEREAS, The Executive Director of the Rockland County Youth Bureau has advised the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County it requires a transfer of funds in the amount of \$40,000 from the County's contingency account to support the continued operation of the Children's Village - Project Turning Point for the period December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to transfer these funds to the proper account; and

WHEREAS, The Budget and 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 approves a transfer of funds in the amount of \$40,000 from the County's contingency account to support the continued operation of the Children's Village - Project Turning Point for the period December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance is hereby authorized to increase the following accounts in the amounts indicated:

GENERAL FUND - 2012

<u>Decrease Approp. Acct. (Debit):</u>		
A-UNC-1990-E5050	Contingency	40,000
<u>Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):</u>		
A-YB-1250-E4090	Fees for Services, Non-Employee	40,000

The vote resulted as follows:

- Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
- U.A. Nay: 01 (Legislator Murphy)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 7498

Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
 Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
 Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor  
 Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
 Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor  
 Hon. Patrick J. Moroney, Sponsor  
 Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
 Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
 Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
 Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
 Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 555 OF 2012  
 APPROVING A SECOND OPTION TO RENEW FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR TERM  
 AND AMENDING AN AGREEMENT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000 WITH  
 ADVANCED ANALYTICAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC. FOR LABORATORY ANALYTICAL  
 SERVICES IN THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF \$170,000 FOR A TOTAL CONTRACT SUM  
 NOT TO EXCEED \$470,000 FOR THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 2013 THROUGH  
 DECEMBER 31, 2013 UNDER RFP-RC-2010-027 AND AUTHORIZING ITS  
 EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH]  
 (\$470,000)**

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

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 99 of 2011, the Legislature of the County of Rockland approved an agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Advanced Analytical Technologies, Inc., 100 Red Schoolhouse Road, Building C, Unit 13, Chestnut Ridge, New York 10977, for laboratory analytical services under RFP-RC-2010-027, in an amount of \$150,000, for the period from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 with four one year options to renew; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 587 of 2011, the Legislature of the County of Rockland approved a first option to renew and an amendment to an agreement in excess of \$100,000 with Advanced Analytical Technologies, Inc., 100 Red Schoolhouse Road, Building C, Unit 13, Chestnut Ridge, New York 10977, for laboratory analytical services under RFP-RC-2010-027, in additional amount of \$150,000, for a total sum not to exceed \$300,000 for the period from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012, with three one year options to renew; and

WHEREAS, The Commissioner of Health recommends to the County Executive and Rockland County Legislature that the County of Rockland exercise the second option to renew for an additional one year term and enter into an amendment of an agreement with Advanced Analytical Technologies, Inc., 37 Ramland Road, Orangeburg, New York 10962, for laboratory analytical services under RFP-RC-2010-027, in an additional amount of \$170,000, for a total contract sum not to exceed \$470,000 for the period from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013; and

WHEREAS, That sufficient funding for this service is contingent upon 2013 budget appropriations in the Department of Health; 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, The Multi-Services 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 a second option to renew for an additional one year term and an amendment to the agreement with Advanced Analytical Technologies, Inc., 37 Ramland Road, Orangeburg, New York 10962, for laboratory analytical services under RFP-RC-2010-027, in the additional amount of \$170,000, for a total contract sum not to exceed \$470,000 for the period from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013, and authorizes its execution by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this service is contingent upon 2013 budget appropriations in the Department of Health.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6698

- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 556 OF 2012  
ACCEPTING AND APPROVING THE REPORT OF  
THE BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE WITH  
REFERENCE TO MORTGAGE TAXES  
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 2012 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2012  
[DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET & FINANCE]**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Wolfe and adopted:

WHEREAS, The Budget & Finance Department has rendered its report distributing mortgage taxes among the various municipalities in the County of Rockland, and establishing the rate of distribution of such taxes, which has been submitted to the Legislature, and

WHEREAS, A true copy of such report is hereto annexed, and

WHEREAS, The mortgage taxes are distributed to the various municipalities on the basis of the amount of mortgage taxes collected from the properties in the various townships by a formula which utilizes the assessed valuation of the towns and villages, after deducting the amounts which go to the State of New York, the County of Rockland, and the amounts that are kept by the County Clerk as his processing fees, and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the attached report, with reference to the mortgage taxes, be and is hereby accepted and approved, and the Clerk is directed to spread the same upon the minutes of this meeting.

The vote resulted as follows:

- |           |    |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| Ayes:     | 16 | (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell) |
| U.A. Nay: | 01 | (Legislator Murphy)   |



REPORT OF COMMITTEE  
MORTGAGE TAX

TO THE HONORABLE LEGISLATURE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY

The Budget and Finance Committee has reviewed the apportionment arising from tax on mortgages  
Collected from April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012 among the several towns and villages of this  
County as follows:

STATEMENT OF MORTGAGE TAX  
FOR PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS  
ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

One Quarter of the Tax collected by recording officer pursuant to report to the Legislature of Rockland County	\$3,760,864.39
Total disbursement of Recording Officer	108,838.60
Interest Earned for Period (County Clerk)	16.96
Amount Paid to Commissioner of Finance	3,652,042.75
Interest Earned for Period (Commissioner of Finance)	2,011.62
Net Amount for Distribution to Tax Districts	3,654,054.37

AMOUNT ALLOCATED TO EACH TOWN

CLARKSTOWN	1,254,753.70
HAVERSTRAW	260,531.34
ORANGETOWN	942,788.72
RAMAPO	1,055,289.04
STONY POINT	140,691.57

ASSESED VALUATION OF TOWNS

CLARKSTOWN	4,698,635,540
HAVERSTRAW	3,846,798,279
ORANGETOWN	4,836,790,069
RAMAPO	2,046,047,151
STONY POINT	296,657,129

We have also prepared a warrant which we submit herewith directing the Commissioner of Finance to pay to the Supervisors of the several towns and to village Treasurers, the sums apportioned pursuant to Section 261 of the Tax Law, as amended.

## DISTRIBUTION OF TAX TO TOWNS AND VILLAGES

TOWN OF CLARKSTOWN	\$1,223,724.53
Village of Upper Nyack	20,912.48
Village of Spring Valley	8,074.89
Village of Nyack	2,041.80
TOWN OF HAVERSTRAW	193,937.78
Village of Haverstraw	26,709.59
Village of West Haverstraw	27,682.62
Village of Pomona	12,201.35
TOWN OF ORANGETOWN	846,679.79
Village of Grandview	5,016.69
Village of Nyack	47,233.35
Village of Piermont	24,836.62
Village of South Nyack	19,022.27
TOWN OF RAMAPO	700,951.40
Village of Hillburn	6,343.67
Village of New Hempstead	26,787.69
Village of New Square	13,740.06
Village of Pomona	7,617.76
Village of Sloatsburg	14,052.14
Village of Spring Valley	50,307.54
Village of Suffern	54,698.07
Village of Wesley Hills	33,128.32
Village of Chestnut Ridge	48,239.55
Village of Montebello	42,231.12
Village of Kaser	7,684.77
Village of Airmont	49,506.95
TOWN OF STONY POINT	140,691.57

## RATE OF DISTRIBUTION OF TAX TO INCORPORATED VILLAGES

Upper Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	0.01666660
Spring Valley in the Town of Clarkstown	0.00643544
Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	0.00162725
Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	0.10251968
West Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	0.10625447
Pomona in the Town of Haverstraw	0.04683257
Grandview in the Town of Orangetown	0.00532112
Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	0.05009961
Piermont in the Town of Orangetown	0.02634378
South Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	0.02017660
Hillburn in the Town of Ramapo	0.00601131
New Hempstead in the Town of Ramapo	0.02538422
New Square in the Town of Ramapo	0.01302019
Pomona in the Town of Ramapo	0.00721865
Sloatsburg in the Town of Ramapo	0.01331592
Spring Valley in the Town of Ramapo	0.04767181
Suffern in the Town of Ramapo	0.05183231
Wesley Hills in the Town of Ramapo	0.03139265
Chestnut Ridge in the Town of Ramapo	0.04571217
Montebello in the Town of Ramapo	0.04001853
Kaser in the Town of Ramapo	0.00728215
Airmont in the Town of Ramapo	0.04691317

## ASSESSED VALUATIONS OF VILLAGES

Upper Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	156,620,566
Spring Valley in the Town of Clarkstown	60,475,585
Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	15,291,671
Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	788,745,073
West Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	817,478,999
Pomona in the Town of Haverstraw	360,310,891
Grandview in the Town of Orangetown	51,474,299
Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	484,642,609
Piermont in the Town of Orangetown	254,838,697
South Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	195,179,935
Hillburn in the Town of Ramapo	24,598,858
New Hempstead in the Town of Ramapo	103,874,626
New Square in the Town of Ramapo	53,279,841
Pomona in the Town of Ramapo	29,539,377
Sloatsburg in the Town of Ramapo	54,489,981
Spring Valley in the Town of Ramapo	195,077,526
Suffern in the Town of Ramapo	212,102,698
Wesley Hills in the Town of Ramapo	128,461,680
Chestnut Ridge in the Town of Ramapo	187,058,528
Montebello in the Town of Ramapo	163,759,599
Kaser in the Town of Ramapo	29,799,247
Airmont in the Town of Ramapo	191,973,124

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 6698

- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 557 OF 2012  
 AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO THE LEGISLATURE TO  
 EXECUTE A WARRANT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE  
 DIRECTING THE PAYMENT OF MORTGAGE TAX MONIES  
 FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 2012 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2012  
 [DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET & FINANCE]**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Earl, Mr. Jobson and Mr. Soskin and adopted:

WHEREAS, The Budget & Finance Committee of the Rockland County Legislature has rendered a report to the County Legislature setting forth the distribution and allocation of mortgage taxes to the various municipalities, and

WHEREAS, Said report has been adopted by the Rockland County Legislature and spread upon its minutes, and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Clerk to the Legislature be and he is hereby authorized and directed to execute a warrant to the Commissioner of Finance directing the payment of mortgage tax money, as apportioned by the Budget & Finance Committee of this Legislature, and approved by Resolution No. 556 of 2012, pursuant to the provisions of the Tax Law.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)



STATE OF NEW YORK >  
COUNTY OF ROCKLAND >

WARRANT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY

TO: STEPHEN F. DEGROAT  
COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE  
BUDGET DIRECTOR  
NEW CITY, N.Y. 10956

You are hereby notified by the Legislature of Rockland County, State of New York, that the sum of Three Million, Seven Hundred Sixty Thousand, Eight Hundred Sixty-Four and 39/100 (\$3,760,864.39) Dollars arising from tax on Mortgages and interest earned in the amount of Two Thousand, Twenty-Eight and 58/100 (\$2,028.58) Dollars for the period between April 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012 inclusive, as reported by the recording officer to the Rockland County Legislature, has this day been apportioned to the several towns and incorporated villages, pursuant to Section 261 of the Tax Law, as amended, having deducted One Hundred Eight Thousand, Eight Hundred Thirty-Eight and 60/100 (\$108,838.60) Dollars expenses of the County Clerk, as allowed by the State Board of Tax Commissioners, which leaves a net balance of Three Million, Six Hundred Fifty-Four Thousand, Fifty-Four and 37/100 (\$3,654,054.37)

Dollars, which has been apportioned as follows:

To the Supervisor of the Town of Clarkstown for Town purposes	\$ 1,223,724.53
To the Treasurer of Upper Nyack for Village purposes	20,912.48
To the Treasurer of Spring Valley for Village purposes	8,074.89
To the Treasurer of Nyack for Village purposes	2,041.80
To the Supervisor of the Town of Haverstraw for Town purposes	193,937.78
To the Treasurer of Haverstraw for Village purposes	26,709.59
To the Treasurer of West Haverstraw for Village purposes	27,682.62
To the Treasurer of Pomona for Village purposes	12,201.35
To the Supervisor of the Town of Orangetown for Town purposes	846,679.79
To the Treasurer of Grand View for Village purposes	5,016.69
To the Treasurer of Nyack for Village purposes	47,233.35
To the Treasurer of Piermont for Village purposes	24,836.62

To the Treasurer of South Nyack for Village purposes	19,022.27
To the Supervisor of Ramapo for Town purposes	700,951.40
To the Treasurer of Hillburn for Village purposes	6,343.67
To the Treasurer of New Hempstead for Village purposes	26,787.69
To the Treasurer of New Square for Village purposes	13,740.06
To the Treasurer of Pomona for Village purposes	7,617.76
To the Treasurer of Sloatsburg for Village purposes	14,052.14
To the Treasurer of Spring Valley for Village purposes	50,307.54
To the Treasurer of Suffern for Village purposes	54,698.07
To the Treasurer of Wesley Hills for Village purposes	33,128.32
To the Treasurer of Chestnut Ridge for Village purposes	48,239.55
To the Treasurer of Montebello for Village purposes	42,231.12
To the Treasurer of Kaser for Village purposes	7,684.77
To the Treasurer of Airmont for Village purposes	49,506.95
To the Supervisor of Stony Point for Town purposes	140,691.57

You are hereby directed to pay to the respective qualified officers of the several towns and incorporated villages, the sum apportioned to them as appears in the foregoing schedule and for the purposes specified.

Given under our hands and the seal of the Legislature of Rockland County, State of New York,  
this day of \_\_\_\_\_ New City, New York.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lawrence O. Toole, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

REPORT OF COMMITTEE  
MORTGAGE TAX

TO THE HONORABLE LEGISLATURE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY

The Budget and Finance Committee has reviewed the apportionment arising from tax on mortgages  
Collected from April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012 among the several towns and villages of this  
County as follows:

STATEMENT OF MORTGAGE TAX  
FOR PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS  
ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

One Quarter of the Tax collected by recording officer pursuant to report to the Legislature of Rockland County	\$3,760,864.39
Total disbursement of Recording Officer	108,838.60
Interest Earned for Period (County Clerk)	16.96
Amount Paid to Commissioner of Finance	3,652,042.75
Interest Earned for Period (Commissioner of Finance)	2,011.62
Net Amount for Distribution to Tax Districts	3,654,054.37

AMOUNT ALLOCATED TO EACH TOWN

CLARKSTOWN	1,254,753.70
HAVERSTRAW	260,531.34
ORANGETOWN	942,788.72
RAMAPO	1,055,289.04
STONY POINT	140,691.57

ASSESED VALUATION OF TOWNS

CLARKSTOWN	4,698,635,540
HAVERSTRAW	3,846,798,279
ORANGETOWN	4,836,790,069
RAMAPO	2,046,047,151
STONY POINT	296,657,129

We have also prepared a warrant which we submit herewith directing the Commissioner of Finance to pay to the Supervisors of the several towns and to village Treasurers, the sums apportioned pursuant to Section 261 of the Tax Law, as amended.

## DISTRIBUTION OF TAX TO TOWNS AND VILLAGES

TOWN OF CLARKSTOWN	\$1,223,724.53
Village of Upper Nyack	20,912.48
Village of Spring Valley	8,074.89
Village of Nyack	2,041.80
TOWN OF HAVERSTRAW	193,937.78
Village of Haverstraw	26,709.59
Village of West Haverstraw	27,682.62
Village of Pomona	12,201.35
TOWN OF ORANGETOWN	846,879.79
Village of Grandview	5,016.69
Village of Nyack	47,233.35
Village of Piermont	24,836.62
Village of South Nyack	19,022.27
TOWN OF RAMAPO	700,951.40
Village of Hillburn	6,343.67
Village of New Hempstead	26,787.69
Village of New Square	13,740.06
Village of Pomona	7,617.76
Village of Sloatsburg	14,052.14
Village of Spring Valley	50,307.54
Village of Suffern	54,698.07
Village of Wesley Hills	33,128.32
Village of Chestnut Ridge	48,239.55
Village of Montabello	42,231.12
Village of Kaser	7,684.77
Village of Airmont	49,506.95
TOWN OF STONY POINT	140,691.57

## RATE OF DISTRIBUTION OF TAX TO INCORPORATED VILLAGES

Upper Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	0.01666660
Spring Valley in the Town of Clarkstown	0.00643544
Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	0.00162725
Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	0.10251968
West Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	0.10625447
Pomona in the Town of Haverstraw	0.04683257
Grandview in the Town of Orangetown	0.00532112
Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	0.05009961
Piermont in the Town of Orangetown	0.02634378
South Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	0.02017660
Hillburn in the Town of Ramapo	0.00801131
New Hempstead in the Town of Ramapo	0.02538422
New Square in the Town of Ramapo	0.01302019
Pomona in the Town of Ramapo	0.00721865
Sloatsburg in the Town of Ramapo	0.01331592
Spring Valley in the Town of Ramapo	0.04767181
Suffern in the Town of Ramapo	0.05183231
Wesley Hills in the Town of Ramapo	0.03139265
Chestnut Ridge in the Town of Ramapo	0.04571217
Montebello in the Town of Ramapo	0.04001853
Kaser in the Town of Ramapo	0.00728215
Airmont in the Town of Ramapo	0.04691317

## ASSESSED VALUATIONS OF VILLAGES

Upper Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	156,620,566
Spring Valley in the Town of Clarkstown	60,475,585
Nyack in the Town of Clarkstown	15,291,671
Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	788,745,073
West Haverstraw in the Town of Haverstraw	817,478,999
Pomona in the Town of Haverstraw	360,310,891
Grandview in the Town of Orangetown	51,474,299
Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	484,642,609
Piermont in the Town of Orangetown	254,838,697
South Nyack in the Town of Orangetown	195,179,935
Hillburn in the Town of Ramapo	24,598,858
New Hempstead in the Town of Ramapo	103,874,626
New Square in the Town of Ramapo	53,279,841
Pomona in the Town of Ramapo	29,539,377
Sloatsburg in the Town of Ramapo	54,489,981
Spring Valley in the Town of Ramapo	195,077,526
Suffern in the Town of Ramapo	212,102,698
Wesley Hills in the Town of Ramapo	128,461,680
Chestnut Ridge in the Town of Ramapo	187,058,528
Montebello in the Town of Ramapo	163,759,599
Kaser in the Town of Ramapo	29,799,247
Airmont in the Town of Ramapo	191,973,124

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5327

Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor  
Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor  
Hon. Frank Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 558 OF 2012  
APPROVING AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION TO AGREEMENT IN EXCESS  
OF \$100,000 WITH PTD SYSTEMS, INC.  
IN THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF \$8,852, FOR  
A TOTAL CONTRACT SUM NOT TO EXCEED \$153,436  
FOR USE OF FORCE COORDINATOR SERVICES AT  
THE ROCKLAND COUNTY POLICE & PUBLIC SAFETY ACADEMY  
UNDER RFP-RC-2010-23  
FOR THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 16, 2012 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2012  
AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
[SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]  
(\$153,436)**

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

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing let bids for services at the Rockland County Police and Public Safety Academy under RFP-RC-2012-23 for management, training and consultant services; and

WHEREAS, The award for Use of Force Coordinator was made to PTD Systems, Inc., 2 Edgebrook Lane, Monsey, New York 10952; and

WHEREAS, The County entered into an agreement with PTD Systems, Inc., 2 Edgebrook Lane, Monsey, New York 10952, for said services, on February 14, 2011 in an amount not to exceed \$76,718, for the period from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 166 of 2012 the Legislature of Rockland County approved the extension of and amendment to the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with PTD Systems, Inc. 2 Edgebrook Lane, Monsey, New York 10952 for Use of Force Coordinator Services at the Rockland County Police Academy under RFP-2010-23 in the additional amount of \$35,408, for the term period from January 1, 2012 through June 15, 2012, and for a total contract not to exceed \$112,126; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 361 of 2012 the Legislature of Rockland County approved the extension of and amendment to the agreement in excess of \$100,000 with PTD Systems, Inc. 2 Edgebrook Lane, Monsey, New York 10952 for Use of Force Coordinator Services at the Rockland County Police Academy under RFP-2010-23 in the additional amount of \$32,458, for the term period from June 16, 2012 through November 16, 2012, and for a total contract not to exceed \$144,584; and

WHEREAS, The Sheriff recommends that the County enter into an amendment and extension to the agreement with PTD Systems, Inc., 2 Edgebrook Lane, Monsey, New York 10952, for the period from November 16, 2012 through December 31, 2012, in an additional amount of \$8,852, for a total contract sum not to exceed \$153,436, for Use of Force Coordinator services at the Rockland County Police and Public Safety Academy, and authorizes its execution by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for this agreement exists within the 2012 budget of the Sheriff's Department 3120-E4090; 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, 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 amendment and extension to the agreement, in excess of \$100,000 with PTD Systems, Inc., 2 Edgebrook Lane, Monsey, New York 10952, for the period from November 16, 2012 through December 31, 2012, in an additional amount of \$8,852, for a total contract sum not to exceed \$153,436, for Use of Force Coordinator services at the Rockland County Police and Public Safety Academy, and authorizes its execution by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney, and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this agreement exists in the 2012 Budget of the Sheriff's Department 3120-E4090.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5327

- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Frank A. Sparaco, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 559 OF 2012  
 APPROVING AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION  
 TO AGREEMENT IN EXCESS OF \$100,000 WITH  
 EAGLE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CORP.  
 IN THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF \$10,583 FOR  
 A TOTAL CONTRACT SUM NOT TO EXCEED \$183,436  
 FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES AS DIRECTOR OF THE POLICE ACADEMY AT  
 THE ROCKLAND COUNTY POLICE & PUBLIC SAFETY ACADEMY  
 UNDER RFP-RC-2010-23 FOR THE PERIOD  
 FROM NOVEMBER 16, 2012 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2012  
 AND AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]  
 (\$183,436)**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Day and Mr. Sparaco and adopted:

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing let bids for services at the Rockland County Police and Public Safety Academy under RFP-RC-2010-23 for management, training and consultant services; and

WHEREAS, The award for Director of the Police Academy was made to Eagle Professional Services Corp., 805 Sherman Avenue, Thornwood, New York, 10594; and

WHEREAS, The Sheriff recommends that the County enter into an amendment and extension to the agreement with Eagle Professional Services Corp., 805 Sherman Avenue, Thornwood, New York, 10594, for the extended period from November 16, 2012 through December 31, 2012, in an additional amount of \$10,583, for a total contract sum not to exceed \$183,436, for Director of Police Academy services at the Rockland County Police and Public Safety Academy; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for this agreement exists within the 2012 budget of the Sheriff's Department 3120-E4090; 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, 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 amendment and extension, in excess of \$100,000 with Eagle Professional Services Corp., 805 Sherman Avenue, Thornwood, New York, 10594, for the period from November 16, 2012 through December 31, 2012 in an additional amount of \$10,583, for a total contract sum not to exceed \$183,436 for Director of Police Academy services at the Rockland County Police and Public Safety, and authorizes its execution by the County Executive, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That sufficient funding for this agreement exists in the 2012 Budget of the Sheriff's Department 3120-E4090.

The vote resulted as follows:

- Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
- U.A. Nay: 01 (Legislator Murphy)



Introduced by:

Referral No. 9193

- Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor
- Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Sponsor
- Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor
- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 560 OF 2012  
RECLASSIFYING FOURTEEN POSITIONS  
AT ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

Mr. Schoenberger offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Earl and Mr. Wolfe and adopted:

WHEREAS, The President of Rockland Community College (RCC) has requested the reclassification of fourteen positions in order to ensure an effective campus public safety and security program, and

WHEREAS, The Department of Personnel has conducted such classification reviews and has made appropriate civil service classifications, and

WHEREAS, Rockland Community College is requesting no additional funds to implement these reclassifications, and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the following positions be established at Rockland Community College:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Position #s</u>
Campus Security Aide (RCC) (9 positions)	SG 52 - \$43,639 - \$52,726	9026, 9027, 9028 9029, 9030, 9031 9032, 9033, 9034
Campus Security Aide (RCC) (PT) (5 positions)	SG 52 - \$43,639 - \$52,726	9035, 9036, 9037 9038, 9039

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the title of Campus Security Aide (RCC) and Campus Security Aide (RCC) (PT) be allocated to salary grade 52 (\$43,639 - \$52,726) as provided in the contract between the County of Rockland and the Civil Service Employees' Association, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following positions be hereby concurrently abolished

<u>Title</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Position #s</u>
Security Aide (9 positions)	SG 52 - \$43,639 - \$52,726	7196, 1826, 1820, 1819, 1818 1817, 1816, 7195, 5658
Security Aide (PT) (5 positions)	SG 52 - \$43,639 - \$52,726	8543, 8542, 8540, 8541, 8539

The vote resulted as follows:

- Ayes: 16 (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
- U.A. Nay: 01 (Legislator Murphy)



AMENDED

Referral No. 8825

Introduced by:

Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Toney L. Earl, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Aney Paul, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Joseph Meyers, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Patrick J. Moroney, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 561 OF 2012**  
**REAFFIRMING ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO EXIST AND TAKE SUCH ACTIONS AS MAY BE**  
**NECESSARY TO DEFEND ITSELF AGAINST OUTSIDE ATTACKS**

Mr. Soskin offered the following amended resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Carey, Mr. Day, Mr. Earl, Mr. Grant, Mr. Hood, Jr., Mr. Jobson, Mr. Meyers, Mr. Moroney, Mrs. Paul, Mr. Schoenberger, Mr. Sparaco, Mr. Wieder, Mr. Wolfe and Chairwoman Cornell and adopted:

WHEREAS, Hamas was founded with the stated goal of destroying the State of Israel, and Hamas has been designated by the United States as a Foreign Terrorist Organization; and

WHEREAS, Hamas has refused to comply with the Quartet's (the United States, the European Union, Russia, and the United Nations) requirements that Hamas recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce violence, and agree to accept previous agreements between Israel and the Palestinians; and

WHEREAS, in June 2006, Hamas illegally crossed into Israel, attacked Israeli forces, and kidnapped Corporal Gilad Shalit, whom they held for five years before exchanging him for 1,027 mainly Arab and Palestinian prisoners, 280 of whom were convicted and serving life sentences for planning and perpetrating terror attacks on the Israeli people that resulted in the murder of 569 Israeli citizens; and

WHEREAS, Hamas has launched more than 12,000 rockets and mortars against Israeli population centers since 2001, and has launched more than 6,000 such rockets and mortars since Israel withdrew its civilian population and its military from Gaza in 2005. In its most recent series of rocket attacks on November 14-21, 2012, Hamas launched over 1,400 rockets aimed at Israeli towns and cities, killing four civilians and two soldiers, wounding scores, and causing significant damage to buildings and property; and

WHEREAS, Hamas has increased the range and payload of its rockets, reportedly with support from Iran and others, which put hundreds of thousands of Israelis in major population centers in central Israel such as Jerusalem and Tel Aviv in danger of rocket attacks from Gaza; indeed, sirens went off in those cities warning of in-coming rockets; and

WHEREAS, Hamas locates elements of its terrorist infrastructure in civilian population centers, thus using innocent civilians as human shields, while as Israeli MK Meir Sheerit stated, "There is no other nation in the world that operates as the IDF [Israel Defense Forces] does. Before bombing a building, the IDF phones all the residents to warn them to get out;" and

WHEREAS, despite living under the threat of constant missile attack from Gaza, the IDF permitted the opening of crossings into Gaza to allow deliveries of food, medicine, gas and other humanitarian supplies to the people of Gaza; and;

WHEREAS, as President Barack Obama stated on November 18, 2012, Israel has "every right" to defend itself against missile attacks by militants inside Gaza. "Let's understand what the precipitating event here that's causing the current crisis and that was an ever-escalating number of missiles that were landing not just in Israeli territory but in areas that are populated, and there's no country on Earth that would tolerate missiles raining down on its citizens from outside its borders," and

WHEREAS, as Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu stated, "We are unwilling to accept the current situation, in which residents of Israel live with constant rocket attacks." Israel justly responded to "an ever escalating number of missiles that were landing not just in Israeli territory, but in areas that are populated. And there's no country on earth that would tolerate missiles raining down on its citizens from outside its borders," and

WHEREAS, on November 21, 2012, Israel and Hamas signed a ceasefire agreement mediated by Egypt wherein, among other things, they agreed that both Israel and all Palestinian factions would cease hostilities into and out of Gaza; and

WHEREAS, the Multi Services Committee has met, considered and by a vote approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Rockland County Legislature hereby:

- (1) reaffirms Israel's right to exist and to take such actions as may be necessary to defend itself against outside attacks;
- (2) reiterates that Hamas must recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce violence, agree to accept previous agreements between Israel and the Palestinians, and verifiably dismantle its terrorist infrastructure;
- (3) calls on our State and Federal officials to:
  - (A) condemn Hamas for deliberately embedding its fighters, leaders, and weapons in private homes, schools, mosques, hospitals, and otherwise using Palestinian civilians as human shields, while simultaneously targeting Israeli civilians; and
  - (B) lay blame both for the breaking of the 'calm' and for subsequent civilian casualties in Gaza precisely where blame belongs, that is, on Hamas;
  - (C) eliminate the annual foreign aid appropriation to the Palestinian Authority, as they have agreed to form a unity government with Hamas, despite there being a restriction on foreign aid to a power-sharing Palestinian government that includes Hamas as a member, or that results from an agreement with Hamas and over which Hamas exercises "undue influence," unless the President certifies that the PA government, including all ministers, has accepted the following two principles embodied in Section 620K of the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 (1) recognition of "the Jewish state of Israel's right to exist" and (2) acceptance of previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements

RESOLVED, that the Clerk to the Legislature be and is hereby authorized and directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to Barack Obama, President of the United States; Hillary Rodham Clinton, United States Secretary of State; Ambassador Susan Rice, United States Ambassador to the United Nations; Ron Prozor, Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations; Michael Oren, Israeli Ambassador to the United States; Consul General Ido Aharoni of the Office of the Consul General of Israel in New York; Hon. Charles Schumer and Hon. Kirsten E. Gillibrand, United States Senator; Hon. Eliot L. Engel, Hon. Nita M. Lowey and Hon. Nan Hayworth, Members of the United States Congress, New York State Governor Andrew M. Cuomo; Hon. David S. Carlucci, New York State Senator, Hon. Kenneth P. Zebrowski, Jr., Hon. Ellen C. Jaffee, Hon. Nancy Calhoun, and Ann G. Rabbitt, Members of the New York State Assembly; the President Pro Tem of the New York State Senate; the Speaker of the New York State Assembly; the Majority and Minority Leaders of the New York State Senate and Assembly; and to such other persons as the Clerk, in his discretion, may deem proper in order to effectuate the purpose of this resolution

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	15	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
Nay:	01	(Legislator Low-Hogan)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

**Debate:**

Mr. Day

I make a motion to amend the resolution to include a clause the removed funding to Hamas. The amendment reads as follows:

Eliminate the annual foreign aid appropriation to the Palestinian Authority, as they have agreed to form a unity government with Hamas, despite there being a restriction on foreign aid to a power-sharing Palestinian government that includes Hamas as a member, or that results from an agreement with Hamas and over which Hamas exercises "undue influence," unless the President certifies that the PA government, including all ministers, has accepted the following two principles embodied in Section 620K of the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 (1) recognition of "the Jewish state of Israel's right to exist" and (2) acceptance of previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements

Mr. Soskin

I accept the amendment.

Mr. Schoenberger

I was born in Jerusalem more than 66 years ago. When I was 13 months old my parents came to this Country by boat, which took them thirty days to get here. After they came here they had a friend of theirs that came to visit who told my parents that the apartment building across the street from where we lived had been blown up by the Arabs. The front wall of the apartment building that we lived in came down. My crib was against that wall so you almost didn't have me.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5726

- Hon. Philip Soskin, Sponsor
- Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Sponsor
- Hon. Toney L. Earl, Sponsor
- Hon. Aney Paul, Sponsor
- Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Sponsor
- Hon. Patrick J. Moroney, Sponsor
- Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 562 OF 2012  
 REDESIGNATING THE ROCKLAND COUNTY  
 EXECUTIVE’S OFFICE AS THE TOURISM  
 PROMOTION AGENCY FOR THE  
 COUNTY OF ROCKLAND – FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013**

Mr. Soskin offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Jobson 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. 280 of 2011, the Legislature of Rockland County redesignated the Rockland County Executive’s Office as the Tourism Promotion Agency for fiscal year 2011-2012; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to redesignate the County Executive’s Office for fiscal year 2012-2013 in order to apply for State matching funds; and

WHEREAS, The Multi-Services Committee of the Legislature has met, considered and unanimously approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Legislature of Rockland County hereby redesignates the Rockland County Executive’s Office as the Tourism Promotion Agency for the County of Rockland for fiscal year 2012-2013 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, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell) |
| U.A. Nay: | 01 | (Legislator Murphy)   |

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 563 OF 2012  
 RECEIVE AND FILE COUNTY FLOW CONTROL –  
 FILING OF UPDATED IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.**

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

RESOLVED, that the County Flow Control – Filing Of Updated Implementation Schedule. be and it is hereby received and filed.

The vote resulted as follows:

- |           |    |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| Ayes:     | 16 | (Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell) |
| U.A. Nay: | 01 | (Legislator Murphy)   |
-

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
KEITH VASSILATOS**

Mr. Day offered the following memorial, which was seconded by Mr. Carey and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Keith Vassilatos.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
ELSIE WADE**

Mr. Hood, Jr. 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 Elsie Wade.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
VINCENT D. TYER, JR.**

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 Vincent D. Tyer, Jr..

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
JOSEPH McKIERNAN**

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 Joseph McKiernan.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
SAMUEL A. JACOB**

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 Samuel A. Jacob.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
VICKI McPHAIL**

Mr. Moroney 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 Vicki McPhail.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 564 OF 2012  
ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Jobson offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Sparaco and adopted (11:45 p.m.)

RESOLVED, that the meeting of the Legislature is hereby adjourned to Tuesday, December 18, 2012 at seven o'clock in the evening.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	16	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Moroney, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe, Cornell)
U.A. Nay:	01	(Legislator Murphy)

---

Respectfully Submitted,

DARCY M. GREENBERG  
Proceedings Clerk