

**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, October 1, 2013 at 7:00 P.M., pursuant to the adjournment of the September 17, 2013 meeting.

Very truly yours,

Laurence O. Toole  
Clerk to the Legislature

Dated at New City, New York  
This 26<sup>th</sup> day of September 2013

---

The Legislature of Rockland County convened in regular session pursuant to adjournment of the September 17, 2013 meeting.

A Roll Call being taken (7:02 p.m.), the following Legislators were present and answered to their names:

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

Late: Legislator Douglas J. Jobson (7:03 p.m.)

Absent: Harriet D. Cornell, Chairwoman

---

Honorable Jay Hood, Jr., Majority Leader led in the Salute to the Flag and delivered the invocation.

---

Legislator Douglas J. Jobson arrived at the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

---

**Comments from the Vice Chairman, Honorable Alden H. Wolfe**

Chairwoman Cornell could not be here tonight. I am going to read a brief statement that she asked me to read:

I rarely miss any meetings of the Legislature, but am absent this evening only because I felt it essential to attend and speak at the opening hearing being held by the New York Public Service Commission on the question of need for a new water supply source. This is a subject that has involved residents and elected officials of Rockland County for many years, and disputed issues have never been resolved by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. This has caused ongoing frustration by all interested parties.

At the end of August, when the Public Service Commission announced hearings, their chosen dates were early September, coinciding with the opening of school and religious holidays. I sent a letter requesting a later date so full public participation could occur. The PSC agreed and set October 1 and 2.

I am sure tonight's legislative meeting will run smoothly under the leadership of Vice-Chair Alden Wolfe.

Best regards to all.

Harriet

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 520 OF 2013  
ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF LEGISLATIVE MEETINGS  
SEPTEMBER 3, 2013 AND SEPTEMBER 17, 2013**

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

Resolved, that the transcribed minutes of the Legislative meetings of September 3, 2013 and September 17, 2013, 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 **1<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2013, at 7:05 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law creating the Rockland County public employment abuse prevention act.

Dated: New City, New York  
September 19, 2013

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

\_\_\_\_\_

The Vice Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m. 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. 521 OF 2013  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

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

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed (7:06 p.m.).

\_\_\_\_\_

Vice Chairman Wolfe deferred the vote to a future date.

\_\_\_\_\_

The Vice Chairman opened the public participation portion of the meeting at 7:07 p.m. and there were no speakers.

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9263

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 522 OF 2013  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$48,000 (NCTD)  
 CHILD CARE FRAUD PREVENTION AND DETECTION GRANT  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE  
 OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES  
 FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 2013 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2014  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE  
 ALL NECESSARY INSTRUMENTS AND DOCUMENTS  
 [DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES]  
 (\$48,000)**

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

WHEREAS, The Commissioner of Social Services has advised the County Executive and the Rockland County Legislature that the Department of Social Services has been awarded a Child Care Fraud Prevention and Detection Grant in the amount of \$48,000 from the New York State Office of Children and Family Services for the period April 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; and

WHEREAS, These funds shall be used for fraud deterrence and identifying and holding accountable anyone who defrauds the Child Care Subsidy Program; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Social Services, District Attorney's Office and Child Care Resources of Rockland will work together on this initiative to ensure that legally exempt child care providers are in compliance with New York State Office of Children and Family Services regulations; and

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate said funds to the proper account; 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 approves the acceptance of a Child Care Fraud and Detection Incentive Grant in the amount of \$48,000 from the New York State Office of Children and Family Services for the period April 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014, 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 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 - 2013

<u>Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):</u>		
A-DSS-6010-GD17-E5060	Program Costs	48,000
<u>Increase Est. Rev. Acct. (Debit):</u>		
A-DSS-6010-GD17-R3680	DSS Grant(s)	48,000

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9481

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 523 OF 2013  
 AMENDING THE 2013 BUDGET BY APPROVING THE ACCEPTANCE OF  
 ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM THE NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF MENTAL HEALTH  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$128,832 [NCTD] TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO  
 MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF ROCKLAND COUNTY,  
 LOEB HOUSE, ST. DOMINIC'S HOME AND ROCKLAND HOSPITAL GUILD  
 FOR TEN (10) NEW SUPPORTED HOUSING BEDS  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 TO EXECUTE ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS  
 INCLUDING THE APPLICABLE CONTRACT AMENDMENTS  
 [DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH]  
 (\$128,832)**

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

WHEREAS, The Commissioner of the Department of Mental Health (DMH) has advised the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that the New York State Office of Mental Health has awarded additional funding in the amount of \$128,832 to the following four (4) agencies for the calendar year 2013: (1) Mental Health Association of Rockland County (MHA) (\$25,767); (2) Loeb House (\$38,649); (3) St. Dominic's Home (\$38,649) and (4) Rockland Hospital Guild (\$25,767); and

WHEREAS, This allocation is designated for ten (10) new supported housing beds in Rockland County resulting from a recommendation from the NYS Medicaid Redesign Team initiative; and

WHEREAS, The acceptance of these funds will require amendments to the County's 2013 contracts with Loeb House, St. Dominic's Home and Rockland Hospital Guild; and

WHEREAS, The funding due to MHA was appropriated previously in the 2013 Adopted Budget, and therefore no additional allocation, budget amendment or contract amendment is required; and

WHEREAS, No County tax dollars (NCTD) are required to accept these additional funds; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appropriate these additional funds to the proper accounts; and

WHEREAS, Local Law No. 18 of 1996 provides for the Legislature to approve the "execution of all contracts in excess of \$100,000 entered into by the County"; and

WHEREAS, The Multi-Services and Budget and Finance Committees of 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 additional funding from the New York State Office of Mental Health in the amount of \$128,832 for the calendar year 2013, which will be distributed to Mental Health Association of Rockland County (MHA) (\$25,767), Loeb House (\$38,649), St. Dominic's Home (\$38,649) and Rockland Hospital Guild (\$25,767) and will be used for ten (10) new supported housing beds resulting from a recommendation from the NYS Medicaid Redesign Team initiative, and hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute all necessary documents related to the acceptance of these funds, including the applicable contract amendments, subject to the approval of the County Attorney; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no County tax dollars [NCTD] are required to accept these funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the funding due to MHA was appropriated previously in the 2013 Adopted Budget, and therefore no additional allocation, budget amendment or contract amendment is required; and be it further

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

General Fund - 2013

Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):

A-DMH-4342 E5010	Loeb House	38,649
A-DMH-4345 E5010	St. Dominic's Home	38,649
A-DMH-4347 E5010	Rockland Hospital Guild	25,767

Increase Est. Revenue Acct. (Debit):

A-DMH-4342 R3470	State Aid-OMH	38,649
A-DMH-4345 R3470	State Aid-OMH	38,649
A-DMH-4347 R3470	State Aid-OMH	25,767

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5327

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 524 OF 2013  
 AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF  
 AN INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF ROCKLAND  
 AND NYS OFFICE OF PARKS, RECREATION AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
 BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE FOR USE OF A  
 2013 BOSTON WHALER BOAT WITH TRAILER FOR MARINE LAW  
 ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES FOR THE PERIOD  
 SEPTEMBER 1, 2013 THROUGH THE CESSATION OF THE USE OF  
 THE BOAT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES AT NO COST TO THE COUNTY  
 [SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT]**

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

WHEREAS, Article 5-G of the General Municipal Law authorizes municipal governments to perform together that which each government is authorized to perform individually and requires that any intermunicipal cooperation agreement be approved by each participating municipal corporation by a majority vote of the voting strength of its governing body; and

WHEREAS, The County of Rockland through its Sheriff's Department and the, NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation desire to enter into an intermunicipal agreement for the use of a 2013 Boston Whaler Boat with Trailer for Marine Law Enforcement purposes for the period September 1, 2013 through the cessation of the use of the boat; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County funds; 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 the execution by the County Executive of an intermunicipal agreement between the County of Rockland through its Sheriff's Department and the, NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation for the use of a 2013 Boston Whaler Boat with Trailer for Marine Law Enforcement purposes for the period September 1, 2013 through the cessation of the use of the boat, subject to the approval of the County Attorney.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9495

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 525 OF 2013  
SETTING A DATE FOR PUBLIC HEARING  
2014 ROCKLAND COUNTY BUDGET**

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

WHEREAS, the proposed budget for the County of Rockland for the year 2014 will be filed in the Office of the Clerk to the Legislature of Rockland County on or about October 23, 2013; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing is required by the Charter of Rockland County and by New York State Law before said Budget may be adopted; and

WHEREAS, Article IV, Section 4.07 of the Charter requires said public hearing to be held no later than November 20, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Budget and Finance Committee has met, considered and by a unanimous vote approved this resolution; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that a public hearing on the proposed 2014 Rockland County Budget be held on the **19th day of November 2013 at 7:05 P.M.** in the Legislative Chambers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk to the Legislature of Rockland County be and hereby is directed to publish notices of such public hearing pursuant to the Rockland County Charter and the provisions of Section 359 of the County Law in a form approved by the County Attorney.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5050

Hon. Michael M. Grant, Sponsor  
Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Alden H. Wolfe, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Jay Hood, Jr., Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Philip Soskin, Co-Sponsor  
Hon. Douglas J. Jobson, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 526 OF 2013  
RECEIVE AND FILE REPORTS AND MANAGEMENT LETTER OF KPMG LLP –  
ROCKLAND COUNTY INFIRMARY/SUMMIT PARK HOSPITAL –  
FISCAL YEARS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND 2011**

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

WHEREAS, KPMG LLP has completed its audit and management letter for the Rockland County Infirmary/Summit Park Hospital for the years ending December 31, 2012 and 2011; and

WHEREAS, copies of the audit report and management letter have been filed with the Clerk to the Legislature of Rockland County and distributed to all members of the Legislature; 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 audit reports and management letter of KPMG LLP for the Rockland County Infirmary Summit Park Hospital, for the fiscal years ending December 31, 2012 and 2011, be and the same are hereby received and filed; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk of the Legislature be and is hereby directed to file a copy of the audits with the State Comptroller and with the County Clerk who shall publish the required legal notices in accordance with General Municipal Law of the State of New York, Section 35.

---

**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 **1<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2013, at 7:10 P.M.**, prevailing time, to consider adoption of a local law establishing and adopting a fund balance management policy within Rockland County government.

Dated: New City, New York  
September 19, 2013

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

\_\_\_\_\_

The Vice Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. 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. 527 OF 2013  
CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

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

RESOLVED, that the public hearing be and it is hereby closed (7:10 p.m.).

\_\_\_\_\_

Vice Chairman Wolfe deferred the vote to a future date.

\_\_\_\_\_

**Comments from the Chairman:**

Honorable Alden H. Wolfe

I encourage everyone to be heard on the PSC hearing. Chairwoman Cornell is there tonight and I will be there tomorrow night. I know that Legislator Low-Hogan will be there tomorrow night. It is in Haverstraw. It is very important that we are heard on the issue of need. This is not an up or down on the desal plant. I know that passions run very hotly. This is the PSC responding to this Legislature's frequent and urgent requests for a reconsideration of the underlying need for additional water supply in Rockland County. So I encourage everyone to go.

\_\_\_\_\_

Introduced by:

Referral No. 7493/6803

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 528 OF 2013  
 APPROVING ADDITIONAL PURCHASES IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
 FROM HIGHWAY REHABILITATION CORP.  
 FOR ASPHALT BITUMINOUS, HOT-IN-PLACE,  
 HEAT AND SCARIFYING MATERIAL  
 UNDER RFB-RC-2012-027  
 IN AN ADDITIONAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$100,000  
 FOR THE OPTION TERM FROM APRIL 18, 2013 THROUGH APRIL 17, 2014  
 AND FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,450,000  
 FOR THE FULL PERIOD FROM APRIL 18, 2012 THROUGH APRIL 17, 2014  
 WITH ALL PURCHASES TO BE MADE BY FORMAL PURCHASE ORDER  
 [DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES - DIVISION OF PURCHASING]  
 (\$1,450,000)**

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

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 338 of 2012, the Legislature of Rockland County approved the purchases in excess of \$100,000 from Highway Rehabilitation Corp., 2258 Route 22, Brewster, New York 10509, of asphalt bituminous, hot-in-place, heat and scarifying material under RFB-RC-2012-027 (the "RFB") in an amount not to exceed \$600,000 for the period from April 18, 2012 through April 17, 2013 with the option to renew for one (1) additional one (1) year option term; and

WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 202 of 2013, the Legislature approved the additional purchases in excess of \$100,000 from Highway Rehabilitation Corp. of asphalt bituminous, hot-in-place, heat and scarifying material under the RFB in an additional amount not to exceed \$750,000 for the period from April 18, 2013 through April 17, 2014 and in a total amount not to exceed \$1,350,000 for the full period from April 18, 2012 through April 17, 2014; and

WHEREAS, The Highway Department has requested authorization for an additional \$100,000 in materials during the remainder of the option term; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing therefore recommends to the County Executive and the Legislature that the County approve the additional purchase in excess of \$100,000 from Highway Rehabilitation Corp. of asphalt bituminous, hot-in-place, heat and scarifying material under the RFB in an additional amount not to exceed \$100,00 during the option term from April 18, 2013 through April 17, 2014 and in a total amount not to exceed \$1,450,000 for the full period from April 18, 2012 through April 17, 2014; and

WHEREAS, All purchases shall be made by formal purchase order; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for these purchases exists in the 2013 Budget of the Highway Department in Account No. 5110.4460 and is contingent upon 2014 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 Budget and Finance and Planning & Public Works 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 additional purchases in excess of \$100,000 from Highway Rehabilitation Corp., 2258 Route 22, Brewster, New York 10509, of asphalt bituminous, hot-in-place, heat and scarifying material under RFB-RC-2012-027 in an additional amount not to exceed \$100,00 during the option term from April 18, 2013 through April 17, 2014 and in a total amount not to exceed \$1,450,000 for the full period from April 18, 2012 through April 17, 2014, and authorizes 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 2013 Budget of the Highway Department in Account No. 5110.4460 and is contingent upon 2014 budget appropriations.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 9355

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 529 OF 2013  
 APPROVING PURCHASES IN EXCESS OF \$100,000  
 FROM GOOSETOWN ENTERPRISES, INC.  
 D/B/A GOOSETOWN COMMUNICATIONS  
 FOR RADIO EQUIPMENT/EMERGENCY VEHICLE  
 ACCESSORIES, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR AND INSTALLATION  
 FOR VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS  
 ON AN AS NEEDED BASIS UNDER RFB-RC-2013-042  
 IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$224,721.50  
 FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 15, 2013 THROUGH JULY 14, 2014  
 WITH FOUR (4) ADDITIONAL ONE (1) YEAR OPTION TERMS  
 WITH ALL PURCHASES TO BE MADE BY FORMAL PURCHASE ORDER  
 [DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES – DIVISION OF PURCHASING]  
 (\$224,721.50)**

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

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing requested bids for radio equipment/emergency vehicle accessories, maintenance, repair and installation under RFB-RC-2013-042 (the "RFB") for one year with four (4) additional one (1) year option terms; and

WHEREAS, One hundred twenty-six (126) firms were notified of the RFB through the County's electronic bid notification system, twenty (20) firms downloaded the specifications and the County received two (2) bid responses and one (1) no bid response; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing determined that Goosetown Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Goosetown Communications ("Goosetown"), 58 North Harrison Avenue, Congers, New York, 10920, was the lowest responsive, responsible bidder; and

WHEREAS, The Purchasing Department negotiated some of the individual line item pricing resulting in a savings to the County in the amount of \$5,400; and

WHEREAS, This contract is used by multiple County Departments; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Purchasing recommends to the County Executive and the Legislature of Rockland County that the County approve the purchases in excess of \$100,000 from Goosetown for radio equipment/emergency vehicle accessories, maintenance, repair and installation under the RFB for various County Departments on an as needed basis in an amount not to exceed \$224,721.50 for the period from July 15, 2013 through July 14, 2014, with four (4) additional one (1) year option terms; and

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

WHEREAS, Sufficient funding for these purchases is provided for in the 2013 Budgets of the Departments that use this contract and is contingent upon 2014 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 Budget and Finance and Planning & Public Works 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 purchases in excess of \$100,000 from Goosetown Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Goosetown Communications, 58 North Harrison Avenue, Congers, New York, 10920, for radio equipment/emergency vehicle accessories, maintenance, repair and installation under RFB-RC-2013-042 for various County Departments on an as needed basis in an amount not to exceed \$224,721.50 for the period from July 15, 2013 through July 14, 2014, with four (4) additional one (1) year option terms, 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 2013 Budgets of the Departments that use this contract and is contingent upon 2014 budget appropriations.

---

Introduced by:

Referral No. 5906

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 530 OF 2013  
 APPROVING ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT FUNDS  
 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,947 (NCTD)  
 FROM THE NEW YORK STATE OCCUPATIONAL  
 SAFETY AND HEALTH HAZARD ABATEMENT BOARD  
 FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
 FOR THE PERIOD AUGUST 1, 2013 THROUGH JULY 31, 2014  
 AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF ALL  
 NECESSARY DOCUMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
 [ROCKLAND COUNTY SEWER DISTRICT NO. 1]  
 (\$2,947)**

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

WHEREAS, The Executive Director of the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 has advised the County Executive and the Legislature that the Sewer District has been awarded a \$2,947 grant from the New York State Occupational Safety and Health Hazard Abatement Board for training and education, for the period August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014; and

WHEREAS, These grant funds will be used to train and educate eligible employees in lock-out/tag-out procedures, personal protective equipment, rigging and hoisting, hot works and welding, lifting and bending, and fall protection; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Sewer Commissioner's, by Sewer Resolution No. 30 of 2013 (dated June 27, 2013), has requested that the Legislature of Rockland County approve acceptance of these grant funds; and

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

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

WHEREAS, The adoption of this resolution does not involve the expenditure of any County funds; and

WHEREAS, The Budget and Finance and Planning & Public Works 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 grant for the Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 in the amount of \$2,947 from the New York State Occupational Safety and Health Hazard Abatement Board for training and education, for the period August 1, 2013 through July 31, 2014, and authorizes execution of all necessary 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:

SEWER FUND - 2013

<u>Increase Approp. Acct. (Credit):</u>		
G-SWR-8110-E5060	Program Costs	2,947
<u>Increase Est. Rev.Acct. (Debit):</u>		
G-SWR-8110-R3380	Public Safety Grant(s)	2,947



**RESOLUTION NO. 531 OF 2013  
WAIVE THE RULES OF THE LEGISLATURE  
TO CONSIDER PROPOSED RESOLUTION  
UNDER NEW BUSINESS**

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 Item 12 A, Resolution No. 532 of 2013 under New Business.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	13	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe)
Nays:	03	(Legislators Grant, Low-Hogan, Meyers)
Absent:	01	(Legislator Cornell)

**Debate:**

Point of Order – Mr. Grant

Section 149-24d of the Rockland County Charter Rules of the Legislature requires three days notice before an item can be introduced as new business or otherwise as an emergency. I would like to know what the emergency is.

Mr. Schoenberger

The County Executive is about to come out with the budget. I could come out any day now and it could even come out before our next meeting. First, a message should be sent to him, if this Legislature chooses to do so, which is not to include anticipated revenue in 2014 from the charge backs from Rockland Community College.

Secondly, I am glad you referred to the rules. Let me refer you to Chapter 149, Rules of the Legislature of Rockland County.

§ 149-24. Committee rules of operation:

C. Referrals.

- (1) Any and all referrals regarding a proposed resolution or local law filed by a County Legislator with the Clerk to the Legislature shall appear and be considered on the agenda of the appropriate committee no later than the third committee meeting after the referral is filed with the Clerk to the Legislature, or within 60 days after such filing, whichever occurs first.

I asked that this be put on the Budget and Finance agenda months and months ago. I received an email from you dated February 20<sup>th</sup>, which basically said to me that this referral will not appear on the agenda of the Budget and Finance Committee for the next regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, February 26<sup>th</sup> 2013. The reason for the rejection of the resolution is that it does not properly include mechanism for the funding of the \$1.8 million dollar cost of the charge backs.

You have no legal authorization to do that and you have left me no choice, but to go to the Full Legislature under New Business. You could have put it on the agenda within 60 days and followed the rules, but you chose not to. You introduced new rules to the Legislature, which says it has to have a funding clause to your approval. I have no choice, but therefore go directly to the floor and that is why it is under new business tonight.

Mr. Grant

There is a vetting sheet that goes with each and every resolution to determine the appropriateness and completeness of the resolution. I believe that you, Mr. Schoenberger, were the author of that item, which is to ensure that everything is ready for consideration by the Legislature. It is absolutely appropriate that when an item has been incorporated into the budget and a resolution has been introduced to rescind it that the appropriate funding mechanism be identified either the reduction in expenses or the increase in revenues of a line item or line items. That did not take place and I made you aware of it and you had the opportunity to resubmit and you chose not to. It remains defective even tonight as we speak.

Mr. Schoenberger

First, you are right, I was the author of that vetting sheet that was aimed specifically at the County Executive and his branch of government, because they would send resolutions to us, we would vote on them and then they would come back and say that the resolutions were not legal or we didn't consider the financial affects of it. So, we created a vetting sheet for that purpose. The vetting sheet is in my opinion aimed at the administration.

What I am most concerned about is you have used every opportunity, including your position as Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, to prevent an item from being discussed. Why won't you let it be discussed? Why can't we vote on it? Put it on the Budget and Finance Committee and if you wish to vote no or you had objections you could have done so. Instead you blocked it completely and now you are trying to do the same again tonight. This is not personal this is governmental. Let the Legislature vote. Let the County Executive consider it. If he wishes to veto it, it will come back to us and we will have an opportunity to override it or not if we choose to do so. Let's not do any more stalling tactics. Let's vote on the item, get it up there and do it one-way or the other.

Mr. Wolfe

With regard to the Point of Order, what I am going to do is determine as Chair that there is a motion that has been made in order to waive the rules and it is up to the individual members of this Legislature to make a determination as to themselves as to whether it is appropriate to waive the rules.

Point of Information – Mr. Grant

Certain members of this Legislature are employees of town governments. The towns Supervisors have very publicly and frequently stated their position on this particular issue. The Supervisors set the budgets for each and every department. They control the finances as much as the County Executive does here. I think some of our members might be conflicted. I think they should identify themselves and I think that they should abstain.

Mr. Wolfe

I don't believe that is a requirement. If any member of this Legislature happens to be an employee of the town and they feel that there is a need to identify themselves, and certainly such identification is healthy, but I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. Schoenberger

I want to refresh Legislator Grant's recollection and members of this Legislature, some of whom might not have been here when this happened, but several years ago I proposed an expansion of the two hats law. The law now says that anyone who is elected to a town or village office cannot serve on this Legislature and cannot wear two hats. I had proposed an expansion of that to say that anyone who was employed by a town or village could not serve on the Legislature. At that time I believe that Mr. Grant was adamantly opposed to it.

Mr. Wolfe

I think we are getting far off field here folks. With regard to the motion to suspend the rules it is not debatable.

Point of Order – Mr. Grant

§ 149-20. Suspension of rules. (effective January 1, 2000).

These rules may at any time during the session be suspended by a vote of at least 2/3 (12 votes). The member making application for such suspension must state the purpose for which the same is asked.

Mr. Wolfe

I understand that it requires twelve (12) votes. The question is whether a motion to waive the rules is debatable.

Mr. Schoenberger

It always has been.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

By debatable to we mean be able to speak to it.

Mr. Wolfe

Correct.

Mr. Meyers

I happened to have somewhat of a track record bringing things to the floor under new business. The concept that somebody was left no choice, but to bring it to the floor is not under a particular rule it is just a statement of motivation. Whatever actions were used to block a committee discussion on a topic does not give a right to bring something to the floor under new business, because "You left me know choice." It has to be an emergency.

On a few occasions I tried to put resolutions forward in committee and was not able to get them considered within the three meeting rule. I brought it up to Harriet and Ricardo McKay on several occasions. Harriet said that there was nothing she could do. Ricardo McKay made a ruling as our Legal Counsel that there was such a thing as "Committee Chairmanship Courtesy" where a Committee Chairperson can make the professional decision as Chair of the committee that he did not want to place something on their agenda and there was nothing that I could do to force a committee chair to put it on his agenda. Accordingly, both the Chair of this Legislature and our Legal Counsel on three separate pieces of Legislation refused to take any action whatsoever to place something on a committee roster with much less reason then Chair Grant has expressed for why he didn't place it on the agenda. There is no way that I will support waiving the rules for this. Thank you.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

If you asked me if I think that the vetting sheet applies only the County Executive I would have said "no." The vetting sheet has purpose, which is to tell us where the money is coming from and answer several other really important questions. I think that it applies to everybody. We were given this contingency information just a few minutes ago and it looks like that is the kind of information that would have been on such a vetting sheet. Why wasn't there a vetting sheet originally attached? Is there an answer to that question?

Mr. Schoenberger

I don't every recall a vetting sheet being presented on a resolution that was submitted by a Legislator. As a courtesy to all of you I have distributed a two-page summary outlining where the money will be coming from and how it is arrived at.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

I too do not see the reason for this being an emergency item.

Mr. Wolfe

I am going to call the vote on the issue of waiving the rules:

Ayes:	13	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder, Wolfe)
Nays:	03	(Legislators Grant, Low-Hogan, Meyers)
Absent:	01	(Legislator Cornell)

---

NEW BUSINESS  
Referral No. 4817

Introduced by:  
Hon. Ilan S. Schoenberger, Sponsor  
Hon. Frank Sparaco, Co-Sponsor

**RESOLUTION NO. 532 OF 2013  
AMENDING RESOLUTION 256 OF 2012 WHICH AUTHORIZED THE  
COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE TO CHARGE BACK TO TOWNS  
AMOUNTS PAID BY THE COUNTY FOR THE COST OF  
EDUCATING COUNTY RESIDENTS AT COMMUNITY  
COLLEGES OUTSIDE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY**

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

WHEREAS, Resolution 256 of 2012 which authorized the Commissioner of Finance to charge back to the towns amounts paid by the County for the cost of educating county residents at community colleges outside of Rockland County “beginning in the year 2012 and for each term thereafter” was approved by the Legislature on May 29, 2012 and signed by the County Executive on May 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Supervisors of the five towns have objected that this resolution was unfair and caused an undue financial burden upon their towns; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature of Rockland County wishes to amend Resolution 256 of 2012, so that the resolution only applies to the year 2012 and not thereafter; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, the Legislature of Rockland County hereby amends Resolution 256 of 2012, so that the final RESOLVED paragraph reads as follows:

RESOLVED, That the Commissioner of Finance be and he hereby is authorized to charge back accounts payable to out-of-county community colleges by Rockland County pursuant to Section 6305 of the New York state education law to the towns in Rockland County in proportion to the number of students who, on the basis of certificates of residence issued by Rockland County, were attending each such college as non-residents of the local sponsors thereof, for whose tuition Rockland County has been charged **for the year 2012 only and not thereafter**, and who were residents of each such town at the beginning of such terms.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	11	(Legislators Carey, Earl, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Moroney, Murphy, Paul, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wieder)
Nays:	05	(Legislators Day, Grant, Low-Hogan, Meyers, Wolfe)
Absent:	01	(Legislator Cornell)

---

**Roll Call:**

Legislator Grant – No.

Legislator Hood, Jr. – Yes.

Legislator Jobson – Yes.

Legislator Low-Hogan – No.

Legislator Meyers – No.

Legislator Moroney – Yes.

Legislator Murphy – Yes.

Legislator Paul – Yes.

Legislator Schoenberger – Yes.

Legislator Soskin – Yes.

Legislator Sparaco – Yes.

Legislator Wieder – Yes.

Legislator Carey – Yes.

Legislator Day – No.

Legislator Earl – Yes.

Vice Chairman Wolfe – No.

---

**Debate:**

Mr. Schoenberger

I gave out two-page sheets that were prepared by Nicole. One said contingency and the other one said possible funding sources. The amount in the 2013 budget for the community college charge backs is \$1,800,000. I asked Nicole what the actual was in 2012 and she said that is was \$1,600,000. The community college charge back revenues may have been inflated by \$200,000 in the budget by the administration. You get the charge back from the colleges and the town reimburses you so either way it is money in – money out. The actual number I am working on is \$1,600,000, because that was the actual number last year. I couldn't get an up to date number, because at this point there are no numbers, I believe, for the community college charge backs.

On the possible funding sources we have in our appropriation reserve now \$1,386,374. We have \$82,662 in contingency and Nicole found four other accounts where she believed there was excess money – the tax refund appropriation reserve, the jail appropriation reserve, Department of Social Services reserve, and the Office of the Aging appropriation reserve. Those altogether reached \$1,600,000, which is necessary to eliminate the charge back without having a negative affect on the County fiscal year 2013.

I believe that some of these reserve funds come from the administration sweeping accounts and placing those monies into reserve. In past years when the administration swept accounts and put money in reserve he came to us and we then passed a resolution, which took the money and put it somewhere that it couldn't be reached during the year and couldn't be used. This year the County Executive didn't, so when he takes the money from within a department reserve he moves it to another line within the department, which means that during the course of the year he could move it back if he chooses to do so. In past years he would send it to us and we would move it into a reserve account where it couldn't be touched. So that is where those appropriation reserves come from and as a result the actual number for \$1,600,000. This resolution does not seek to take back the money that the towns were charged or give back the money the towns were charged for 2012. It starts with 2013 and goes forward.

The Resolved states, "...Rockland County has been charged **for the year 2012 only and not thereafter...**" With that, I have moved it and I thank you for your consideration.

Point of Order – Mr. Grant

I would like a ruling from the Chair on the appropriateness of the resolution. It rescinds a prior act that included money in the current budget, 2013 budget, and it is unaccounted for in this resolution. Is this resolution in order or not?

Mrs. Yeger, Legal Counsel

There is nowhere in our rules anything that says that you have to have that clause in there. What we do, and we have ongoing discussions sometimes with Finance when we are looking at the vetting sheets and looking at County Attorney's resolutions to discuss the fact that the funding clause doesn't make sense or it doesn't add up or it doesn't match and we need to know where we are appropriating money. We need funding clauses when we are appropriating the money. At this point that is not what we are doing, but what we have is backup and you can amend to incorporate it into the resolution as the funding clause as to where the money is coming from and where it is going to.

Mr. Wolfe

It is your determination that the resolution is not out of order.

Mrs. Yeger, Legal Counsel

It is not out of order.

Mr. Schoenberger

The list that I have given you is just possible sources of funding. If you wish to incorporate it becomes the source of funding. The reason that I didn't put it in the resolution is I left it as an option.

Mr. Hood, Jr.

When this was initially proposed to be imposed on the towns I voted no, because I thought it was bad policy to have expenses roll down hill like the State does to us on many occasions. I don't like it when it is done to me. I wasn't willing to do it to the town. I am going to stay consistent tonight and support this to lift it from the towns and bring it back under the County's financial burden, which is obviously going to hurt the County and we are going to have to make up for this money. I am going to have to deal with that as one of seventeen. I am willing to do that in the next budget. I just wanted to go on record saying that is why I am doing this, because it is really the same taxpayers that we are talking about. The town taxpayers have to pay their town bill and then their County bill is going to go up a little bit, because of this, but their town bill will be reduced in some way and I can live with that.

It has been said that maybe the towns are in better shape than us, and that is probably true. The towns have certain obstacle in front of them with the request for lower assessments. I think if there is anything we can do on this level for my town I am willing to do that.

Mr. Grant

I would like to thank Mr. Schoenberger for giving me a heads-up this morning and sending me a copy of this resolution. I also appreciate that in late December early January he had a revelation that the decisions we have made previously were not the correct decisions and he had determined that we should reverse this action. He made a commitment to the town Supervisors and tonight he is keeping that commitment. I appreciate that.

Let's make no mistake about this. We took action in 2012 under very dramatic conditions to impose the charge back on the towns, because of the crisis in County government finance. That was recognized by the rating agencies as being a necessary drastic action. I think it is one of the things that have contributed to our rating change by S & P from a negative watch to stable watch.

We don't do this and enjoy it. We built it into the budget. It is \$1,800,000 in the budget and it is \$1,600,000 I think in real terms. It needs to have a corresponding action. The Governor still hasn't signed our Deficit Reduction Act. He signed 43 bills on Monday, one of those was the wine trail in Orange and Ulster County's have been expanded and you can buy wine on the side of the road, but Rockland County still doesn't have its Deficit Reduction Act or even just a yes or no decision yet. I think our chances are fading rapidly.

This is a rhetorical question, is there anyone in the room that thinks County government is going to finish in the black this year? That includes the Summit Park Nursing Home and Hospital and Mental Health. I don't think anybody in their heart thinks that is going to happen. This is not going to help the situation. This is going to make it worse. This is going to send a single to Albany that we are not serious about County government and that we are only serious about political considerations and our ties to the towns. That is the wrong message to send. I can't tell you how strongly I feel about this.

I know Legislator Schoenberger represented his recollection of how this was handled and he submitted the resolution and yes I did reject it. I said that it was defective; because it did say once we eliminate this requirement for the towns to pay this portion how we were going to fill that hole. I told him at the time that I was well aware of the Rules of the Legislature, that I had sixty (60) days and that I would use that full sixty (60) days. He submitted it a second time and I rejected for the same reasons. He chose not to make changes. He chose not to identify the items that are on these two sheets that we received tonight. Subsequently, he told me that he would not resubmit it again. Fine. Now it is being considered tonight, the same day as an emergency. He could have requested through the Chair that it be placed on new business providing all the appropriate notifications that are included in Roberts Rules and the Rules of the Legislature. You could have had this with the packet last week. You could have been prepared to submit amendments to it if you chose to.

I still believe in my heart that this is a defective resolution. Someone has to step-up and say where this money is going to come from and know that that money is not available for any other use and we will not finish in the black. This is a very serious matter. It is incredibly ill conceived. I understand the sentiment. I understand Legislator Hood's sentiment. This is the wrong decision to make. Political considerations are insufficient to make it better. For the people who chose to vote to consider it tonight I hope that is not an indication of how you are going to vote on it this evening. This is not worthy of our consideration tonight. If people want to send a message to the County Executive to please not incorporate it into the next budget, fine. If you want to send a memorizing resolution to the State Legislature, which already has Legislation, which will have FIT pick up their portion and the County's portion if they chose to fund it. There is no question in my mind that this is coming back to us next year. This year is the year we have to talk about. We passed a budget, included these numbers and this is not an appropriate thing to consider tonight. If you rescind it you must determine where the money is going to come from. We are not going to finish in the black. This is bad government, bad Legislation and bad "Legislating". Thank you.

Mr. Meyers

If the County Executive's office had sent us a resolution increasing a line item in the budget without having a corresponding decrease we would never consider that resolution. Of course this resolution is defective. It is spending more money, but doesn't say where the money is going to come from. I appreciate the list of things as to where it could come from, but this resolution is clearly and without a doubt defective.

To my good friend Legislator Hood, I am only mentioning this, because you like to tell people where is it at on the Legislature also. You did vote for a budget that included these charge back's so you haven't stayed totally consistent with passed positions. You can make a motion to take one line out.

I think that this Legislature has always been a town centric Legislature, which is why in my opinion, and please do not get offended, I view this Legislature "this body in general", not necessarily the people here, as somewhat of a failure during this six years that I have been here, because people vote based on their town loyalties rather than based on what is good for the County. When Legislator Grant suggested that people excuse themselves from voting if they work for a town it wasn't a mandate to do so it is just another symptom of a Legislature that really doesn't work, because traditionally this County was a town centric County. When they created this Legislature it was populated with people who were loyal to the Supervisors of the towns instead of running it directly themselves. So it is very difficult to get people to think for the County.

We know we are out of money. This Legislature is never really willing as an institution to every really get serious about these things. If we can save \$1,800,000 let's save it not spend it. The towns have known for a year now that they would have to pay for 2013. We need that money. Why are we giving it back? Because somebody running for office promised we would and has the power to deliver. Come on, wake up, use your heads and do something for the County instead of for the town or someone that you are loyal to, for a change. Let's really show the rating agencies and the Governor that this body is really willing to stand up for once and worry about the County government and what the County government needs. It was not pleasant to take the money from the towns. It was a difficult vote, but we made that vote. We need this money. Thank you.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

I agree with the comments made by Legislators Meyers and Grant. I really believe that this is the kind of decision-making that has contributed over the years to the fiscal mess that we are in. This is not an easy situation. I have received personal calls from my town Supervisor Andy Stewart who happens to be a very good friend and a person who I respect deeply and I think arguable the best town Supervisor in the County. He, along with other Supervisors, has tried to urge me to vote for this, but I can't do it. We still have a huge fiscal crisis. Most of the towns are in better fiscal shape than the County. Some are in extremely fiscal shape than the County. I agree we should take the \$1,600,000 and apply it to the \$128,000,000 deficit we have.

Because of the desire to be as balanced about this as we can be I would entertain the idea of doing a 50/50 split with the towns for 2013 with the understanding it will not be in the budget for 2014. When we have a new County Executive he will come up with other ways of addressing the deficit.

Mr. Grant

It doesn't solve the problem; 50/50 is still \$800,000 if you accept the \$1,600,000 or \$900,000 if you accept the \$1,800,000. We have the tax cap to deal with and assuming the entire levy was available to us for the application of the cap that would be \$1,593,000 that we would be able to increase our revenue next year without lifting the cap, which is not even enough to cover this let alone anything else that happens.

Essentially we are charging the taxpayers twice. I would like to remind my colleagues that in Fall of 2012 when the towns were adopting their budgets and we made known to them that this charge would be there they beat the living daylights out of this Legislature and the County of Rockland for causing their tax increases and they levied and collected those taxes. They have them in the bank and are available to pay for their obligations, which includes this that was identified in their budgets and somehow we think there is justice in taxing the towns people on the town budget and letting the town leaders keep half of it and then on your County budget we are going to tax them again. This makes absolutely no sense. Does this Legislation here contemplate the towns promising that money back to the taxpayers? It doesn't. We get used by the towns time and time again. They have their hands in everybody's pockets, but their own. This is just another example of them making a silk purse out of a souse ear for them and we look stupid. We look stupid when we vote for Legislation like this.

Mr. Schoenberger

My recollection is the Supervisors told us quite clearly that the charge backs for 2012 were not in their budget. They raised the money in tax in 2013 and they used that to pay the 2012. The 2013 money they raised in property went to pay us for 2012. The gap is 2013 and that is why I proposed this Legislation.

Mrs. Low-Hogan

I just want to say that this is not stupid. I think it is terrific, because it is a compromise. We have a really difficult situation here. It is a gesture of good will to the towns. Nobody up here wants to do either one, probably. I still stand by my amendment.

---

Mrs. Low-Hogan made a motion to amend the resolution as a gesture of good will to the towns while at the same time maintaining our sensitivity to our extreme fiscal crisis in the County that we do a 50/50 split of the \$1,600,000 Community College charge back's between the County and the towns for 2013 with the understanding there will be no charge backs in the budget for 2014, which was not accepted by Mr. Schoenberger, but seconded by Mr. Meyers and failed.

The vote resulted as follows:

Ayes:	04	(Legislators Low-Hogan, Meyers, Paul, Wieder)
Nays:	12	(Legislators Carey, Day, Earl, Grant, Hood, Jr., Jobson, Moroney, Murphy, Schoenberger, Soskin, Sparaco, Wolfe)
Absent:	01	(Legislator Cornell)

---

Mr. Day

Just again for the record, as my colleague Legislator Hood said, I did not support these charge backs when they were first raised. I thought that is was inappropriate to level these charges to the towns for the same reasons he stated earlier. Back in November of last year myself, Legislator Carey, Assemblyman Zebrowski and a number of town Council people from both parties recommended a similar, but different approach; to eliminate the source of the tax.

I want to be clear about something for those who have been watching this unfold, this bill is being paid by every taxpayer in this County regardless. In January when you get your bill look at the bottom-line of the bill and part of that bill is your County and town tax levy. What we are speaking about here is not reducing the cost to the taxpayer we are speaking about what sub-line this tax will be on, and that is what this debate is about. The taxpayers are going to pay this regardless.

“WHEREAS, the Supervisors of the five towns have objected that this resolution was unfair and caused an undue financial burden upon their towns,” and it did. We put stress upon existing budgets and it was wrong. But this resolution also refunds 2013 charge backs; monies that were billed out on Town tax bills already. I did not hear that the Towns are refunding the charge backs to their taxpayers. So essentially, taxpayers will be paying for this chargeback twice. That makes no sense at all.

That said, I don't know if these are wishes or reality at this point, but I am going to presume for the moment as I look at possible funding sources that there will be the implementation of this \$1,600,000 if so approved. If this is going to happen tonight we should exactly provide 2013 amendments as part of the resolution so we know the \$1,600,000 is paid. But here is the issue I have, and I will direct this to Legislator Sparaco or Legislator Schoenberger, we apparently have \$1,600,000 of extra money. We are \$127,000,000 in the hole and he states very accurately that we are not going to be in the black next year. It would seem to me when this whole argument breaks down that with \$1,600,000 we may want to consider putting that money towards the 2014 budget or towards the existing deficit. I would like to hear the rationale from either of the sponsors as to why we are proceeding in this manner as opposed to doing something to make 2014 easier on our taxpayers or address the existing deficit.

Mr. Carey

When this came up before I voted no. I am going to support this tonight, because I felt that a lot of the problems were created by the County and pushing down to the towns doesn't change what the taxpayers are paying it is just who they write the check to. I think my feeling then as it is now is that this is a problem that has to be dealt with at the County level and that is why I am supporting this.

Mr. Wolfe

In early 2013 I joined with Legislators Sparaco and Schoenberger as a co-sponsor of this resolution. I am in a unique position tonight having removed myself as a sponsor and after giving it a lot of thought to deciding that I will not be supporting it tonight.

When I first started considering this is was early in 2013 and at that point we had the entire year ahead of us. As we sit here tonight in October we have the benefit of having insight into how we are doing for 2013. In particular if we were on target with salary savings, which we are not, because of a failure to execute the voluntary separation incentive in a proper way I would feel differently. I for one don't think that we are going to be in the black for 2013. I don't think that we are in the position to give anything away this year. I would rather any excess funds at the end of 2013 to whatever shortfall we have and if not it all ends up hitting our bottom-line in our accumulated deficit. If we end up in the black this year that is going to go to reduce our deficit, but if we don't it will end up increasing our deficit.

With the uncertainties of the 2013 budget year I can't support this tonight. I will however support any and all efforts to eliminate the charge back in 2014 and beyond. I think it is very important that the County Executive sends us a budget that is realistic. If I were a betting man I would bet that we are going to get something very interesting come the end of this month and I hope that it is something that is working. I will certainly fight and advocate for eliminating the charge back in 2014.

Mr. Wieder

First, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues on both sides of the argument; a very strong argument made by Legislator Grant and I appreciate the efforts by Legislator Schoenberger. That being said, tonight County government is doing their work and the County is up and running. I look further down to the south, Washington DC, and the Federal government has a partial shutdown and is closed for business. The reason for that is because politics as it stands these days is where dialog and conversation is not something that the politicians embrace and as a result the Federal government is closed for business.

I think that the conversation and debate that we had in reference to the charge back is a very healthy one. I voted for the charge backs back in May of 2012. Back then and ever since there were ongoing conversations and dialog about the charge backs. There are very good arguments on both sides of the issue and I respect all of the opinions, but the notion that County government is an island on its own is flawed and dangerous, and I can conceivably forecasting a government shutdown in Rockland County. If we are not going to continue constructive dialog between the villages, towns and the County our constituents are not going to actually benefit, as we see currently with the Federal government shutdown. So that is why I will support this resolution. I will vote to support the ongoing conversations and constructive dialog with or local towns and villages, because in the end the taxpayer is the one who is going to foot the bill. We need to support dialog and conversations among government entities and that is why I am supporting this bill. Thank you very much.

Mr. Moroney

I have a serious problem as to where the resolution originated. We all like to pride ourselves on being a mature body and a body that works for the betterment of the taxpayers and the people we represent. My recollection is we had other charge backs. One was the Board of Elections and I have not heard anything about that tonight. Do we have another one coming forward?

Mr. Grant is right, we are not in the black and we are not going to be in the black for many years to come. It looks like the people in Albany are not going to be on our side and they haven't been so far. There are a lot of rumors about why Governor Cuomo has not signed our bond resolution, but even if he did we will still be \$30,000,000 in the red.

Every year we get something from the Ethics Department saying that we had no participation in this that and the other thing. I was here when the Two Hat Rule was passed. I will be drafting a resolution that will exactly address the issue of extending the Two Hat Rule. We are talking about ethical standards in the Legislature, which we are all a part of and would like to think we are all above and beyond and abide by all the ethical rules we are presented with during the course of the year. I think we are in violation tonight; it is an ethical violation in my humble opinion. I don't agree with it and how it has come about. I understand where you are coming from with the towns and villages. Don't forget that we revenue share with the towns close to \$11,000,000 per year. Now four out of the five towns have a surplus. Here we are \$130,000,000 in the hole.

I forecast that we will not be in charge of County government in the next few years if we don't address these shortfalls in the next budget. I don't know if we have the courage to address the shortfalls that are facing us. If we don't have that political courage then we are not doing justice to the people we represent. I think the quicker somebody else comes in and takes over this government the better off we are. When I see what is happening this evening we don't have the will of the people in our hearts. I want to help the towns as much as possible, but for Gods sake we are not in a financial strong position so I don't even know why we are discussing this. Nobody addressed the fact that there are other charge backs.

Most of these town budgets are put together and have to be passed before this even sees the light of day. What are we doing? I like to be as fair as possible with the towns and villages, but I have serious problems with this. I will continue to listen to the discussion and then decide how I will vote. I am just very skeptical.

Mr. Grant

I can't be any clearer about it. I think this puts the County in a terrible position of defending why it is assuming a financial burden that it doesn't have the resources to manage. I think it is unconscionable that the towns continue to pressure members of this Legislature and administration that constantly give more to them. The County of Rockland has always provided for the towns when it could. We have not been in a position to provide increases to the towns for several years now, but they still demand more and more. It is not just this issue tonight. If you look at the Solid Waste Authority you will find that the towns extract more than a pound of flesh from the Solid Waste Authority. It seems that their vision is if it is not on our tax bill then it is good to go. It needs to stop on this issue tonight.

The issue remains defective. There is not funding clause. No one is compensated for the money that is coming out of the budget. It may be \$1,600,000, but you still have to make \$1,800,000 in adjustments the budget. No one wants to go back and answer to their town Supervisors or Council people or even residents who were led to believe that somehow we have done them a disservice. This money has been levied on their town tax bill. This money exists in the towns' bank account to pay this bill. We don't have money to assume this bill. It is insane. It is perpetuating the insanity that has got us in some of the trouble we are in. There is just no other way to describe it.

I am so frustrated tonight I am making up words, "Legislating". I beg you and implore all the members up here that tonight is not the night to make your Supervisor or town Council to feel good about this. The money has been taken from the taxpayers by the towns to pay the bill. The town wants to take it back from the County to put in their pocket and then they are going to increase our deficit or have us levy taxes to cover this cost going forward. It should be perfectly understood that towns have not paid their 2012 bill yet. So they have the money they collected in 2013 to pay the 2012 bill. They told the public the money is for this purpose. We can't help them. Do what needs to be done and do the right thing today. For the people who consistently voted against the budget, because the budget wasn't balanced – well this budget won't be balanced, because there is \$1,600,000 mission from it, because they chose to serve their town Supervisor instead of serving the taxpayers of Rockland County.

Mr. Schoenberger

There was a comment about this being done for political reasons and that is just not true. I voted for tax increases and cuts in County government many times on things that I would have preferred not to vote for, because I believe the County needed it. I voted to increase County property tax. I voted to lift the sales tax exemption on utility bills. I voted for a motor vehicle tax, increase the mortgage tax and sales tax. I voted for lay offs. I voted not only for lay offs, but to transfer the nursing home to a LDC so it could be sold even though it really broke my heart to do it I stepped up to the plate and did the tough things that had to be done. Many others did not. Others sat here and voted no and they did so for political reasons. I want all the Legislators here to know, including my friend Legislator Grant, that I appreciate their comments and their sharing their wisdom and experience with us. I don't take any comments that were made personally towards me by anyone.

Legislator Moroney talked about the Board of Election resolution to do the charge backs. The charge backs for 2012 for the Board of Elections by this County to the towns were not made, because the administration never sent over the necessary resolution to us, which was to set the charge backs. They had to do so between October 1<sup>st</sup> and December 15<sup>th</sup> of 2012 and for calendar year 2012 they didn't even do it. So the County Attorney opined that in 2013 we could charge back 2012 and 2013. I don't necessarily agree with him, but what makes it even more interesting is that in order for the charge backs for the election costs to become effective every single year this body, whether it is budgeted or not, will have to vote to approve that particular authorization to allow it to be charged back. We are going to sit here when the administration finally give us the bill and look at and we are going to have to vote yes we do or no we don't. If we vote no we don't it will be money in the budget, but not charged back. We will be required to allow this every single year and that will be a tough vote every single year.

I want to acknowledge Legislator Day, because his analysis is absolutely on point and correct. The same taxpayer pays for this whether it is on the County bill or on the town bill. It is the same amount of money it is just who gets to put it on their bill and who gets to pick up the costs for it. It is the exact same amount of money and the same people. Legislator Day asked a good question. On the chart that I gave you on possible funding sources there is a tax refund appropriation reserve, I am not sure, but I think that is about 30% or 35% of that amount, the Sheriff-Jail appropriation reserve, the Social Services appropriation reserve and the Office of the Aging appropriation reserve I believe is roughly 35%. In each of those 35% is \$35,000, because there is about \$100,000 in each of those accounts. I am not sure about the Tax Refund appropriation reserve, because I did not discuss that with Nicole today, but the other three I did and she told me there was about \$100,000 in each. That money still exists to be applied towards the budget.

Part of this could go towards this issue if we choose to do so. Our sales tax exceeds our estimate, I am told, this year so some of that money could be used for this. I did not put that down as a source of revenue, but our sales tax I am told exceeds the budgeted amount. The chart is possible funding choices. At the end of the year when the books get balanced and then it comes to us on March 31<sup>st</sup> this amount of money will have to be reconciled. We have done that every year. Millions of dollars are moved back and forth from accounts.

Mr. Soskin

We passed a resolution passing the charge back of the elections to the towns after they completed their budget season and after their tax bills went out. The taxpayers of the towns have not borne the cost of this yet. At this point, what we are doing now in 2013 will cover those 2012 costs. We are enabling the towns to pay the money to us or just wash it out and that affect to us should be zero. They didn't pay it to us and we are telling them that they don't have to pay it to us. So 2012 the County will be bearing the cost of those elections. As Legislator Schoenberger said, if we don't allocate the funds amongst the various budget lines the County Executive will.

Giving the towns 50% of the amounts that they will be spending for the charge backs we defeated that. We decided not to go along with that therefore we are sending a message to the towns that we realize that maybe we had no choice we had to bill them for the charges in 2012 even though many of us didn't want to do it, but we felt we had to. Now as we approach the end of the year, as these monies seem to be there we are not going to charge them for these costs. For 2013 we are sending them a message. Now they are making up their budgets they have time to include these charges in their budgets. The taxpayer will not be hit for an additional cost on their bill. We are offsetting this against last years bill. The taxpayer may not be affected at all. I hope you all understand that.

When it comes to the election costs we are putting the towns on notice that we are not going to bend on that and we are not going to defer our billing for the election costs. We expect to receive the funds for them. We are giving them a partial allowance, because of our financial condition we can give them no more for the past and it is impossible for us to do this in the future.

Politically correct? Maybe yes maybe no. I think this goes along with what Mr. Moroney was talking about. That is the way I see it and that is why I voted the way I voted.

Mr. Grant

What is going on here is a rationalization of any excuse or any explanation that seems plausible to vote yes on this and I implore my colleagues not to do this. There are a couple of sheets that seem to identified balances in accounts that might be used to cover the cost of rescinding the college charge backs. I would remind all of you that the best information that is available that has been shared with us by our Fiscal Analyst is that the voluntary separation incentive is going to be almost \$3,000,000 short. This \$1,600,000 on these sheets may exist in those accounts, but it does not identify where there are shortfall in the current budget. I implore you not to use that for the basis of your decision tonight. We cannot afford to rescind the charge backs for 2013 for the towns just because it is going to make them all feel better and us feel better. The fact of the matter is, yes we will charge taxpayers twice for this because they were charged on the town bill, we are going to allow the towns to keep that money and we are going to charge them on their County bill a second time, because the money has to come from somewhere. Please do not vote yes on this. Let Legislator Schoenberger keep his commitment to the Supervisors and don't plunge the County deeper into debt.

Mr. Day

Again, to redirect back to the question I originally asked. There were a number of funding sources identified. Are we ready tonight to devote this funding as part of this resolution to pay for this? I would like to hear from the sponsors when we look at \$1,600,000 of what appears to be found money. What is the rationale for devoting it to this particular item as opposed to either deficit reduction or dealing with the 2014 budget?

Let me be very clear, in spirit I agree with this. We should never have done this to the towns. This is a County responsibility and I want to support this. It is as simple as that, but I think it is reasonable to expect that if it is going to be done the questions being raised are answered. I would like to know the rationale and if in fact we will fund this resolution this evening? I will ask to add a resolve clause to this later one.

Mr. Schoenberger

Ed, you and I know there is no such thing as found money. That is the best answer that I can give you. You have money that is in the budget that gets allocated. It is being allocated, because the Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee requested it and it is being proposed as a possible allocation towards this resolution. It is not being amended. It is being proposed as one of the possible allocations. At the end of the year there are always pluses and minuses and those pluses go towards the minuses. These are just some of the pluses that we will have hopefully by the end of the year. If we take money out of contingency in the next three months or reduce the Legislative appropriation reserve in the next three months then that money won't be there. There is no such thing as found money.

Mr. Day

I am not going to quarrel with you. If we are saying that these are the possible finding sources for a new business item being brought up tonight it is found money in one way shape or form. There is an assertion being made that there is funding available for this particular resolution. It is as simple as that. Whether it is found or not it would seem to me it would be incumbent upon this body to fund this resolutions. I am just trying to find out the rationale for it. The sponsors are ready to spend \$1,600,000 to do this and that is fine. Again, in spirit I agree with it.

Will we move the money tonight so we can do it? Why are we doing this as opposed to dealing with the 2014 budget or taking \$1,600,000 off our deficit?

Mrs. Low-Hogan

Everybody knows there is no found money and that this money should be applied to the deficit. I think this is a really big mistake for us. The patient is already dead who cares if we put another bullet in it. Well, the Comptroller's Oversight Board cares.

Mr. Meyers

I think what I am hearing between the lines with respect to these possible sources of funding that Legislator Day is mentioning is that we don't actually know if these amounts are actually left over for the year 2013. They could still be allocated and therefore these are possibilities if the money is still in these places, but nobody can assure tonight that these monies won't be used for their intended year 2013. I would like to phrase that as a question.

Mr. Schoenberger

Two of the funding sources are clearly under our control directly, Legislative Appropriation reserve and the contingency. No money can be spent from those without a Legislative resolution. The others were appropriation reserves placed in the various departments when the County Executive swept those accounts. In past years when he swept accounts and came to us with a resolution we moved the money into reserve so it couldn't be touched during the course of the year. This year he chose to keep control of the money. He has the right to move the money in the Sheriff-Jail reserve during the course of the year from one line to another line. That is different from what he did in past years. I can tell you that I do not know how much the Tax Refund Appropriation reserve is, but I think it far exceeds \$26,000. The \$35,000 that I am proposing is possible funding sources from the Office of the Aging, Social Services and the Sheriff-Jail. I believe all three of them exceed \$100,000 at the present time. So I haven't taken away or recommended that we take it away or that we actually move, but there is \$100,000 there. I believe \$35,000 should not be affected/one-third of it should not be affected by the administration. Once we pass this resolution and he knows that is what we are considering he is on notice.

Mr. Meyers

So the answer is that we don't actually know that the administration doesn't need that money.

Mr. Schoenberger

The answer is the administration has taken that money, reserved it presumably to be used for the end of the year, but the administration has the right to transfer money. They have the right to do a lot of things. They could create a job tomorrow in the jail as a temporary and then use that money to pay for it. Legislator Murphy brought to our attention when we were doing lay offs we laid off an employee at the Sheriffs Department and one of them miraculously appeared in the Office of General Services at the same salary they were making a few days later. The administration did that, because there was extra money in General Services and created a temporary.

Mr. Meyers

We don't know for sure that he won't need this money. Is this all that is left in the contingency account?

Mr. Schoenberger

Yes. As a matter of fact if you look at the other chart that I gave it shows how much we started with and how much was spent. The contingency started with \$500,000 and there is \$82,662 left. We took \$357,000 due to Hurricane Sandy. We took \$53,000 for emergency repairs to Haverstraw Bay Park and \$7,300 for matching grant funds for Tourism.

Mr. Meyers

The \$82,662 left in contingency, if we were to use this as a possible funding source that would leave the County with no contingency for the remaining three months of the year.

Mr. Wolfe

I believe that is correct.

Mr. Meyers

Does that sound like a good idea? No contingency for the County of Rockland if we use this money. I have no idea what Legislative Appropriation reserve is. I don't understand why the Legislative reserve has \$1,418,000 in it and we only spent \$31,000 of it for an entire year when we are supposed to be budgeting thin. We have 90% of it left. What is the Legislative Appropriation reserve for? Why did we appropriate \$1,418,000 to such a line item when we obviously need so little of it?

Mr. Wolfe

I will draw this to a conclusion now. The Legislative Appropriation reserve was an additional fund that was created when we adopted our amendments to the 2013 budget to take some of the money that we had found in the budget and retain it under Legislative control. So it is essentially an additional contingency account.

My first year on the Legislature in 2006 I looked into the propriety of a waiver of sales tax on clothing over a certain amount, and there was a State law that allowed us the opportunity to opt into it. It was in mid budget year 2006, we would have given up millions of dollars in sales tax. So I asked myself, here we are mid-year where are we going to get the money from? If we can find the money should we give it away? I came to the conclusion then that we shouldn't and I didn't proceed with that.

We have been speaking for over an hour. I appreciate everyone's passion on this issue. I think it has been well discussed. I am going to call for the vote.

---

**Roll Call:**

Legislator Grant – No.

Clearly the discussion has gone on for more than an hour. Clearly we have not moved to approve this resolution one iota, because there is still no funding for it. This again, will just plunge us deeper into the hole. It will send the wrong signal to Albany in terms of our willingness to deal with our own problems in the face of political pressure. And make no mistake about it there was political pressure being applied here tonight. It flies in the face of all of the no votes cast on every budget that has been passed before, because the claim was that those budgets weren't balanced. This does not balance our budget. It takes it out of any possible realm of being balanced. To the best of our knowledge, the data provided to us by the Fiscal Analyst, the voluntary incentive program is \$3,000,000 short of its target. That is a \$3,000,000 hole in the budget and you add \$1,600,000 to that it equals \$4,600,000. Where is the coming from? I implore you not to rationalize this and not to justify it by some political consideration or allegiance to a town and vote no. I vote no.

Legislator Hood, Jr. – Yes.

Legislator Jobson – Yes.

Legislator Low-Hogan – No.

Legislator Meyers – No.

Legislator Moroney – Yes.

Legislator Murphy – Yes.

Legislator Paul – Yes.

Legislator Schoenberger – Yes.

While we were discussing this I asked our staff, and we have a very good staff, to see if they could find the Disclosure Law that is required to be with the resolutions. I was a sponsor of it. My recollection was correct and I have it in front of me. Part C of that Law says, “Mandatory Referral Backup And Documentation – All referrals submitted to the Legislature by the County Executive or Department Head shall have a complete Disclosure Statement submitted with the resolution when the resolution is presented to the Clerk to the Legislature.”

Legislator Soskin – Yes.

Legislator Sparaco – Yes.

Legislator Wieder – Yes.

Legislator Carey – Yes.

Legislator Day – No.

In light of the comments I made earlier, I came into this meeting looking to support this. The reality is this bill has been paid already. There will be no taxpayer relief by this resolution, in fact quite the opposite will happen, it will be a bill paid twice. The funding is not secured to do it. If you are going to state the funding is there I expect it to be done. I have not gotten an answer yet as to why we are not taking this money and putting it toward the deficit that we have or a budget that we know is stressed that is coming. I did not support charge backs when it came up last year and I will not support charge backs going forward to the towns, it is wrong, but I cannot support this. It is absolutely a flawed resolution. Thank you.

Legislator Earl – Yes.

Vice Chairman Wolfe – No.

---

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
HAROLD JEFFREY KEAHON**

Chairwoman Cornell 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 Harold Jeffrey Keahon.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
LUCY F. BABCOCK**

Mr. Grant offered the following memorial, which was seconded by Mr. Hood, Jr. and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Lucy F. Babcock.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
KATHERINE "KAY" SECOR**

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

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Katherine "Kay" Secor.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
ARLENE NUGENT**

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

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Arlene Nugent.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
JOHN BAADE**

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 John Baade.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
ANITA WEINSTEIN**

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

RESOLVED, that the Legislature of Rockland County adjourn this meeting in memory of Anita Weinstein.

**ADJOURNMENT IN MEMORY OF  
LUCINDA WATSON**

Mr. Schoenberger 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 Lucinda Watson.

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 533 OF 2013  
ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Murphy offered the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Wieder and unanimously adopted (8:42 p.m.)

RESOLVED, that the meeting of the Legislature is hereby adjourned to Tuesday, October 15, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

---

Respectfully Submitted,

DARCY SHAPIN - GREENBERG  
Proceedings Clerk