

**BUDGET COMMITTEE  
of the  
Suffolk County Legislature**

**Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Budget Committee was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium in the William Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, New York on **June 21**, 2002, at 11:30 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Chairman  
Legislator David Bishop, Vice Chair  
Legislator Andrew Crecca  
Legislator Jon Cooper

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Paul Sabatino, Legislative Counsel  
Fred Pollert, Director of Budget Review  
Ken Knappe, County Executive's Office  
Lance Reinheimer, Budget Review Office  
Kim Brandeau, Budget Review Office  
Audrey VanDeusen, Childcare Field  
Janet Walerstein, Childcare Council of Suffolk  
Lori Harrison, Scope  
Emerson Hasbrouck, Cornell Cooperative Extension  
Stuart Lowrie, The Nature Conservancy  
Jessica Ganz, The Balloon Council  
A. Cardamone, Community Programs Center  
Bill Faulk, County Executive's Office, I.R.  
All Interested Parties

Minutes taken and transcribed by Irene Kulesa, Legislative Secretary

*(The meeting came to order at 11:40 a.m.)*

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Cooper.

SALUTATION

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thank you. We have two, three speakers at three minutes each. Lori Harrison, would you come up please?

**MS. HARRISON:**

I'm here to speak on the Salary Enhancement Program and what a positive effect it had on my life. I was able to purchase a Health Insurance Plan through this program and if it's taken away, I will not have any health insurance, thus have to look for a job and leave my Childcare Program.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thanks. Audrey VanDeusen?

**MS. VANDEUSEN:**

Good morning, my name is Audrey VanDeusen and I'm currently serving as a member of the Board of the Childcare Council of Suffolk. And I'm here today to urge you to reinstate the salary enhancement or Earns Program, as we call it. Childcare is no small issue. There's hardly a family that has not had to deal with childcare issues at some point. Either a child or

grandchild in early years or after school care. It's not only an issue for single parent families, for it's a rare family that can live in Suffolk County and get along on one salary these days.

I speak from first hand experience when I say that we're facing a real crises in childcare. I spent twenty-five years as the Director of a Pre-School and Childcare Program right here in Suffolk County. Statistics have shown that childcare workers have the second to lowest paying job in the nation. It's a sorry statistic because I'm not sure what that says about the value we place on our children or those with whom they spend a good part of their time in their formative years.

Because pay is so poor and there are teachers with college degrees earning sixteen thousand dollars a year in childcare and the work challenging and demanding hiring and retaining qualified staff is challenging, to say the least. A few years ago, staff turnover was reported to be 40 percent. But I personally think it's higher than that. Staff who work with children in their formative years need to be not only nurturing but highly skilled and educated in child development. So that the time children spend in childcare, which for many is fifty hours a week is quality time, with age appropriate activities that stimulate their intellectual development during this critical period of brain development. Time which helps children become emotionally secure, which is a major issue when you have four or five teachers passing through during the year leaving for McDonalds or jobs that pay better or have benefits.

We were delighted when this Legislator addressed these critical issues and passed childcare legislation, which initiated the Salary Enhancement Program. It helped many and it helps to impact the quality issues, which are so now in jeopardy. It rewards those working in the field for completing educational milestones and offers incentives for our good people to stay in this most important field. Childcare is not a woman's issue or even just a family issue. It's an economic issue as well. A parent without needed childcare arrangements is a parent who cannot work.

I thank you for your past support of issues affecting children and families and I urge you to reinstate the Salary Enhancement Program. The families of Suffolk County need your support. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thank you. Janet Walerstein?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

Good morning. We're here again this morning to give you some more information, if you need, about the Salary Enhancement Resolution that Legislator Fisher has presented for review of the Budget Committee. And I'm here to say to you that this is a marvelous program that has handed out stipends to close to five hundred people, those of whom who have had 60 percent of these professionals have a BA or a BS degree or higher. Forty percent have accredited training in early childhood. Forty nine percent of the participants are making twelve dollars or less an hour and seventy-five making less than fifteen dollars an hour. And forty-four of the participants are in this field for five years or more. And there are stories that you heard before that somebody was able to buy health insurance with the stipend. And to stay in the field, we need skilled workers and this resolution would give two hundred thousand dollars more in this year's budget to be able to pay for another hundred and sixty providers, who will have not been paid out on their -- on the Earns Program. And this is called Earns Educational Advancement Rewards Now in Suffolk.

So I'm urging you to please pass this out of committee this morning, so that we can go forward and reward those who are in the field. It's not a salary, real salary piece. It is a reward for skill and professionalism. Our Day Care Centers are really in trouble getting qualified help and this is urgent for young children and their development. So I ask you again to please add this two hundred thousand dollars this morning or pass it out of committee, so that we can go forward with this program. We have lots of people who would like to be able to testify as to what this has done for them and enabled them to stay within the field. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred? With respect to the resolution that the previous speakers addressed, which is Legislator Fisher's 1593. Give us some historical perspective as to the County's role in this area?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Yes, there was a resolution that was adopted by the Legislature. The program was first funded in the 2001 Operating Budget, in the amount of approximately five hundred thousand dollars. There were significant delays in actually implementing the program. Only a portion of the funding, approximately two hundred thousand dollars was actually expended in 2001. The County Executive did not include it in the 2002 Operating Budget. It was a legislative part of the Omnibus Program to include three hundred thousand dollars in Fiscal Year 2002. The program has spent approximately two hundred and ninety four thousand dollars of it, as of this point in time. So the funds have been exhausted that had been provided in the 2002 Operating Budget.

The resolution, therefore, to provide additional funds needed to come up with an offset and the offset was the County's Benefit Fund. It is based upon the premise that the Early Retirement Incentive Program that was adopted by the Legislature will attract approximately five hundred employees that will be off the payroll by August 31st. And the two hundred thousand dollars reflects the savings in the Benefit Fund that the County doesn't have to make to the Employee Benefit Fund.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

The more important question becomes A, how did we wind up in a situation where we are subsidizing private care providers and the salaries they pay their employees? And is that a proper role for government and particularly County Government?

**MR. POLLERT:**

What the budget reflects is whatever the policy of the Legislature is. There was a resolution that authorized this Salary Enhancement Program. I would defer to Legislative Counsel. I believe it was vetoed by the County Executive and overridden by the Legislature.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

So there's a sense in County Government and I'm not aware of any other County Government's that provide these types of subsidies.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Nassau County does.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

In New York State or across the United States. There may be several but over three thousand Counties exist in this country. And one has to question whether or not it's the proper role of County Government and taxpayers to subsidize private childcare providers. I mean that's a philosophical view. Some may not share that and I respect the other side of the argument. I don't agree with it. You know you have a business, pay your employees the salaries that their credentials and their qualifications demand. And if you can't, then those employees have the option of seeking employment elsewhere. That's the way I see it. I'd be happy to entertain another viewpoint, if anyone on the committee, you know, has a different viewpoint.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

I have a question.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

For Budget Review. Is the total savings of the Early Retirement Program, the offset being used two hundred thousand? Or is that a portion of it or -- ?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That would be the entire savings with respect to the Benefit Fund. Part of what we had calculated when we did the Fiscal Impact Statement is that there would be some salary savings this year, as well as some indirect savings, such as transfers to the Benefit Fund. This is using up all the savings that we had anticipated in the employee -- the County's contribution to the Benefit Fund.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

Is there another offset or a more appropriate offset assuming {arguendo} that we wanted to move forward with this?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That was really the best --

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

We adopted the Early Retirement Incentive Program to save money. That was the whole idea behind it.

**MR. POLLERT:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

And now we're going to go after that same money that we just voted for to save? I mean that's what -- you know --

**MR. POLLERT:**

Well, the Budget Review Office came up with the offset. That was the best offset that we had at this point in time. One of the difficulties is that even if we identify an offset, it's subjected to, in large part, by the County Executive's Office that want to keep as much budget discretion as possible. So this is an area, which we could identify that, in fact, there was a surplus but you are correct, we hadn't counted on those savings as part of the Early Retirement Incentive Program. They would not have materialized if, not by virtue of the fact that the legislation was approved by the Legislature.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Legislator Bishop?

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

This program is currently operating?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Yes, it is.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

So if these funds are not included in the program, we will have the effect of stopping the program mid-year?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Yes, they have already expended, for all intensive purposes, all of the funds.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

The funds that were provided to them in the beginning of the year was the leftover money from 2001, correct?

**MR. POLLERT:**

That's correct.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

So we have never appropriated the 2002, if you believe that there's a commitment. We never met the commitment for 2002. We simply rolled over what was not used in 2001. That might be too -- dragging you into a debate.

**MR. POLLERT:**

One of the difficulties is identifying what the total cost of the program will be. When the program was first adopted by the Legislature, we did a fiscal impact statement, which indicated that the total annual cost would be in the neighborhood of approximately two million dollars per year. The first year of funding of five hundred thousand dollars was seen as a portion of the funding because it would be normal types of delays in kicking the program off. This year the program has managed to spend more money because it was up and running and there were no delays in processing. I'm not sure what the costs are going to be next year.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

I think we'll get a good idea when we have one full year of the program with the possibility next year. Is this motion --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

No, no, we just had speakers, no.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Well, I shouldn't make a debate then.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I would like to hear from the Executive Budget Office as to their position on the resolution?

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Why don't we take it out of order?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That would be fine. Someone want to make a motion? Okay that's 1593.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Motion to take 1593 out of order.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Motion to take it out of order. It's now before us. Motion by Legislator Bishop, second by Legislator Crecca. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's now before us. Legislator Bishop? Okay.

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Good morning. Mr. Weiss has spoken quite often in front of this committee and the Finance Committee about the availability or the lack of availability of offsets in this 2002 Operating Budget that we're working under. There is an assumption, of course, with our cost savings in the early retirement incentive of the maximum benefit, you know, with the contribution to the Benefit Fund. The one thing that I would like to point out is with the employees, who do elect into the Incentive Program, there will be a considerable amount of payouts in 2002, for their vacation and sick accruals. A large majority of that will be recouped within the 110 savings of them not being on the payroll at that point. But there may be a time, later on this year that we're going to have to do a housekeeping resolution to transfer and cover those negative balances for those payouts. And this would certainly be one of the areas that we would be looking to use it as an offset, as well as some of the other benefit savings in social security and the others, if we recoup any of those savings. So at this time, with this offset, at this dollar amount, it's very difficult to assume that we're going to have that total flexibility of two hundred thousand to be used as an offset.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, now previously, as we heard from Budget Review, the Executive has not supported the funding of this program. Did not support it in 2002, vetoed it. Did not support it as part of his budget submission, I'm sorry, 2002 Operating Budget. And going forward, you're now in the preliminary stages of preparing the 2003 Budget.

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Would it be fair to say that they will not be included in the 2003 Budget?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

I cannot commit to that decision at this time.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

We'll know soon enough. We'll know in September and my guess is it probably will not be in there again.

**MR. KNAPPE:**

That could be. But like I said, I cannot speak specifically on that.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred, maybe you -- the view of the department's budget hearings where this issue came up already, I'm not aware of.

**MR. POLLERT:**

The Department of Social Services, which is responsible for preparing the budget request for this program, did not include or request funding in 2003.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Somehow I knew that would be the case. Okay. So I bring that up, so to put the issue in perspective for my colleagues because going forward, A, we don't have agreement on the offset. B, it's very unlikely it will be included in the proposed budget for next year. And other questions that come to my mind are how many employers Fred, involved in this childcare services and how many employees and to what extent are we subsidizing employee salaries? Is it really a worthwhile program? Fred, do you know?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Just with respect to the administrative costs of the Childcare Council, the costs are relatively small. The number of employees, I would really have to defer to the Childcare Council, the number of checks that they have actually issued. I really don't know because there's a sliding scale depending upon what the --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, Ms. Walerstein, would you mind joining us for that discussion?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

There were close to five hundred checks that went out to employees.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

How many employees?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

That's individual employees. And I have to take exception with it being called a salary piece because it really is a retention and a professional development reward. It is not about salaries or income. It is for the skill and the high quality of childcare. We cannot get people who are skilled to be able to work with children and keep them in the field, without giving them some reason to stay. And this has maintained, out of the five hundred that we have

given stipends to, there were five who did not stay over the six months. One is out on maternity leave. One is out on workers comp. One went to another center. Two moved out of State. So they were not -- the rest of them held because of that reward. That they saw themselves going into a career ladder that they could make a profession out of this.

So it's not salary. It's not going to a center. It's not going to individual workers. It is for a specific piece that we are very bereft in education. And it's early care and education in keeping people who are skilled in the field. It is essential. It is critical what we know now about brain development. What we know about how children learn to have them in situations that are inappropriate. And there are working parents all through Suffolk County that are keeping their young children with providers, who really may not have the skill to be able to handle them in an appropriate manner. And somewhere down the line, that is going to affect the education and the performance.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

By what stage does the educational system in this State have a responsibility to meet the needs you're describing?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

Well, certainly the Governor has seen fit to do a Retention Program, seeing this and the Quality and Protection Act in seeing this zero to age 12, in terms of --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

There are State Funds to carry out the program?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

There are State Funds that we deduct from the Earns Program here that we give out, yes.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

And what's a typical employee salary?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

A typical employee salary --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

For how many hours a week?

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

Well, they work about forty hours a week or more. Some of them do more. And some of them have second jobs. The -- what we -- the last survey we did, was about seven dollars and fifty cents an hour and you know living on Long Island this is not doable. So that either they have second jobs --

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I have to tell you, I don't take issue with your premise about your employees not receiving an adequate wage.

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

I know you don't.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

The question for me becomes; they don't work for government. They work for private employers. It's the private employers and the parents who have their children in those programs, responsibility to pay for adequate salaries. Not government.

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

This is -- you know, the parents can't afford to pay anymore. Parents shouldn't really have to pay more than ten percent of their salary. The low-income parents are paying maybe twenty-five, twenty six percent and some thirty and thirty five percent of their salaries for childcare. And it is not enough to keep the system. But we're talking about skill here.

We're talking about people, who will go out of the field because they can't afford to stay. And it's the skilled workers that we're talking about. We're talking about people who have, you know, I have a degree in early childhood.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

So does my wife.

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

Good, so so -- that alone, is she working? We need her. If she's retired, we need her to come back.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

I appreciate your responding to the questions. We do want to move along, however. Okay I did receive one other card.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

It's before us, on this issue.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Yes, on this issue. Is it Carmichael? I can't make this out. I'm sorry, Cardanelle?

**MS. CARDAMONE:**

Cardamone.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Oh yes, you can come on up.

**MS. CARDAMONE:**

I have to first apologize for being a little late today.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

That's quite all right.

**MS. CARDAMONE:**

I am a childcare worker at Community Program Center of Long Island.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Where are they located?

**MS. CARDAMONE:**

They are located in Edgewood, New York, in the heartland district. They have three sites. You asked about the importance of this program in keeping workers. I am a worker. I've worked in the center before. I left the center to work a job in the public schools. I do have a master's degree. I came back to the center because it is a homey atmosphere. It is -- I feel I'm doing a job there.

I worked in a public school where I was servicing a hundred children a week, in half-hour sessions and doing what I felt was no good. I was working futilely. Here I work with twelve children. I work with children with disabilities. I provide a service; however, I'm not given a third of the salary I was making in the public schools. I understand that I have the ability and the capability to go to other places for employment that my colleagues do not. And I make a choice, as you said, I make a choice to work in that center. However, I don't -- maybe I don't understand the complete workings here. But I was told this money was approved through June.

My question is, it hasn't gone through the full year. In planning and approving these programs, aren't there preliminary -- isn't there preliminary research done to know? I mean for myself it was a hardship to fill out the application, get my materials together. You're talking of people that are working at seven dollars an hour to pay fifty dollars in transcript

fees, to apply for this, to get their transcripts sent and the money is pulled and the program has not even gone full cycle.

I understand if it is not approved for 2003. And then myself and my co-workers, as a choice, are choosing to work in the field knowing the wage. However, we were under the impression it was approved throughout this year and we would be receiving checks in June. And that's my question. I understand if it's not approved again. I don't understand it not completing its full cycle.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay. Mr. Pollert, could you just reiterate how the funding was provided and for what period this year?

**MR. POLLERT:**

The funding was provided by the Legislature in the amount of three hundred thousand dollars. Part of that was through the budget negotiation process, because nothing had been included by the County Executive's Office. We only had a partial year's worth of experience last year. So there was really no good forecast with respect to how much money would be required this year. In addition to that, on January 11th, I believe we had a meeting with the Childcare Council and with the sponsor of the legislation that had indicated that private funding was also going to be requested to maintain this program. That apparently has not been successful. So in part, because outside funding didn't come in, the program has expended all the money that was allocated this year.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

And see that's where I have a problem. We have representations time and time again in the Legislature that this that and the other thing is going to happen. And then when it doesn't happen, you know, we come back to the Legislature as the last resort. I appreciate your question, because I think it helps you and everyone else present understand how this evolved and that this is not a permanent program. From my recollection it was a Pilot Program and at the time it was proposed, I argued that like all Pilot Programs, they have a way of creeping to becoming permanent programs and we don't have any business doing it in the first place. So I'm very steadfast in my position, as I think the Executive is.

Now, if there are enough Legislators here, as we get to the agenda and we vote on this to vote it out, so be it. But I'd just like you to know that as we go forward in two months, three months, September, October, this issue will come to the floor again. And as we heard already, most likely will not be included. And next year, the number will probably not be three hundred, five hundred thousand; it probably will be something more than that. And given all of the other priorities the County has in its budget, I would be somewhat less than optimistic that it would be funded next year. So I think, let's see what happens today. But Counsel did you want to add anything to Mr. Pollert's comment?

**MR. SABATINO:**

Just to be fair, I think, there's a little longer history to it. What happened was in May of 2000, the original proposal that came before the Legislature was, at this committee for, I think, it was like two point two million, the committee said no. Work it through the Operating Budget. So later that year in 2000, for Fiscal Year 2001, the Legislature provided five hundred and fifty five thousand dollars to start the program.

The resolution, which was the Omnibus, also included the standard clause, which directed all departments to carry out all the programs were funded in that budget. What happened in February of that year, was that Legislator Fisher was contacted by the entity that was looking for the money and ascertained that the Department of Social Services was not implementing the five hundred and fifty thousand dollars despite the directive.

We then had to draft another resolution, ask for a certificate of necessity, which was never provided. Then we finally adopted another resolution directing Social Services to do what the original resolution said to do, which was to implement it. Then that took another month or two. Then the contract itself wasn't completed until, I think, like September. So that, I

think, Legislator Fisher had to walk the contract through the system. So they had three months to try to draw down the five hundred and fifty five thousand dollars, which was virtually impossible.

That's why there was then carry over funding for the next year to try to make up for the two hundred and fifty or two hundred thousand dollars that was lost. So the program was basically, it went to a series of interruptions that were bureaucratic in nature, as opposed to the Legislature not providing the funding.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Ken there's no position on the offset, however, right? Before we vote on the resolution?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

To just reiterate what I said before, in regard to the offset. It's assuming Budget Review's analysis that we do agree that after everything is said and done with the Early Retirement Incentive, we will recoup about two hundred thousand in the contribution to the Benefit Fund. However, that two hundred thousand dollars, after the full analysis of the Early Retirement Incentive, may have to be used to offset other, for lack of better terms, the scat pay. You know the terminal vacation and sick payout for these employees, who are opting into the Incentive Program.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

So would it be fair to say that the -- really the issue before this committee is how you want to allocate that two hundred thousand dollars? Do you want to allocate it for County purposes or for the purposes of the resolution?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Or even if we do not need the two hundred thousand to pay off the Incentive Program, the third option will be to have the money roll into the fund balance, which is similar to what Legislator Crecca said and recoup the full savings, as anticipated with the Early Retirement Incentive.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

It was the Executive and Legislators intent to recoup about fifteen million dollars in savings on the early retirement.

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Over a couple of years. That's correct. And even though two hundred thousand in that fifteen million is a small piece but it is a key to it.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Okay, because I think it's important to put this entire issue in perspective and it's not premature, as you prepare next year's budget. Look into your crystal ball and not really a crystal ball, at this point, you have some pretty good idea now that the State Budget has been adopted, how we're going to receive State aid. If there will be increases, decreases. We know that there's been increases in DSS expenses. We know there will be increases in the Police Department and all these other areas. So at this point in juncture, what are we looking at, in terms of the effects on property taxes next year?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

In very general terms and Fred Pollert could probably expand a little bit on this because he and Weiss had in depth conversations about this. In their models and their projections, I believe that they were counting on the early retirement bill to bridge a large deficit gap that we were projecting. I do know that Mr. Weiss and the Deputy Budget Director, Mr. Bortzfield mentioned in front of the full Legislature and the committee that this fifteen million is needed to bridge that gap.

The 2003 Budget, looking forward is still going to be a tight budget, even though we've seen,

you know, very few positives but positives nonetheless, in sales tax revenues and the like. We're just not out of the woods at this time and this fifteen million needs to be fully optimized for the 2003 and future budgets.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Well, we anticipate, how do we stand in terms of the collective bargaining agreements with the bargaining units? Where are we there?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

That I'm going to have to defer to Mr. Pollert.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Bargaining Units and contracts?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

This is the Budget Committee.

**MR. POLLERT:**

Frankly, I don't know exactly where we are with the negotiations. That's up to the Division of Labor Relations. I've had a few discussions with Mr. Tempera that indicated that they are moving to arbitration with respect to, I believe the superior officers. With respect to our budget forecast, I don't know how to put it delicately but we were going through the budget requests that departments have turned in. And I have a tremendous amount of concern with respect to the budget request of the Department of Social Services. Both my budget model, as well as Ken's budget model and what we had represented to the rating agencies showed a projected savings in Medicaid. The latest budget forecast prepared by the Department of Social Services is now indicating that they're going to exceed their budget. In addition to that, the budget forecasts or requests that they had made for 2003, is totally out of line with anything that I have included in my budget model. They are requesting more than a thirty-percent increase in its institutional care.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

What does that equate from dollars?

**MR. POLLERT:**

Thirty eight million dollars net.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

You answered my question.

**MR. POLLERT:**

It's on a net basis.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

You answered my question. Other people left the room. They don't want to hear the answer. They'll deal with it in November, okay! We'll now go to the agenda. We have before us tabled resolution -- we'll take a five minute recess.

Five Minute Recess

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Fred, comment? Well, members were out of the room, so I wanted them to hear the number. Did you hear the Budget Director's comment about DSS? Thirty eight million dollars? Okay. Just tell me what your position is in the Budget Office?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Without going into the specifics, in extreme, since I'm not a hundred percent familiar with

DSS is budget request. I do know from their budget hearing that they were requesting a large net increase compared to the 2002 Adopted Budget. And along with what, Fred Pollert mentioned with his model, I'm pretty sure that that is in the same format, as Mr. Weiss had in his model. It was quite shocking to him of the DSS's request, with what he was projecting, when they went in front of the credit agencies. I'm sorry?

**MR. POLLERT:**

They had requested overall a 16 percent increase in expenditures. There's about a large portion of it is due, as Legislative Counsel said to the institutional care. That's up by about 30 percent. But there are also increases in Medicaid and in the PA caseload. We come up with a briefing sheet, which we will be happy to print out and give to the members of the committee.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay, very good. Okay.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

At last.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Okay, we have --

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

On this motion? I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**LEGISLATOR COOPER:**

Second the motion.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

This is on resolution 1593. Motion to approve and second by Legislator Cooper. All in favor? Opposed?

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

On the motion?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

Yes, on the motion, go ahead.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Just a couple of quick points. As was mentioned, this is a Pilot Program. And it appears that if you want to doom a Pilot Program to failure, then you make it sporadic, untrustworthy and pull the plug on it, without even giving it a chance to record the data that you're looking for to judge whether it works or not. So I think it would be foolish not to provide one year of this, at the very least.

Then Mr. Chairman, you mentioned that you're opposed to the overall concept of the program, which I appreciate. And I think we should have that debate at a later point. And I think there are some points that even here need to be brought out that childcare is actually an engine in our local economy. It allows people to work. It serves our most important resource, our children. And if we don't have an adequate childcare system, we're sentencing those children to an unregulated underground system that surely will have greater expense and problems in the years ahead. And so, I think that when you look at this overall problem of the salaries in the childcare area and the problems that it leads to and the disruption it has on individuals, families in our society as a whole, this is an expense well taken. And then certainly, an experiment worth pursuing to its completion. Let's give this program one full year of a true honest effort and that's what this resolution is about.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:**

And let's do that in an honest way and not by leading the employees that work for childcare providers along into thinking this a permanent program. It was not envisioned as a

permanent program. It is not a permanent program. It is not supported by the Executive. And if it's going to become a permanent program, then it should be included in the permanent County Budget. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Legislator Crecca and the Chair is opposed. The resolution is defeated.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Motion to discharge without recommendation.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

On the motion?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

On the motion.

**LEGISLATOR CRECCA:**

I just want to state that I believe that this resolution should go to the full floor of the Legislature. I'm not going to reiterate all the arguments that were made. From a budgetary point of view, I agree with the arguments that have been made here and that's why I did not support a motion to approve. The problem is is that we, as Legislature, did approve this program. It is a program, like it or not, that was a policy initiative of ours and we did not provide proper funding for it. And while I disagree with the offset and while I question whether or not we will be able to afford to move forward with this program in 2003, I think as Legislator Bishop said, there is a certain obligation on our part to fund programs that we set forth. So just with that, that's why I'm making a motion to discharge without recommendation. I believe this deserves the full debate of the Legislature and I think that's the appropriate place for it to be. And I'll make that motion to discharge without recommendation.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

With respect to the motion, I would add that in terms of responsibility, then the responsibility to vote for tax increases to pay for programs and new programs should be consistent with that position. We argue all the time about State and Federal unfunded mandates. And now we're imposing a mandate on ourselves and not the request of government but outside agencies and that's a very slippery slope. So we have a motion to discharge without recommendation. All in favor? List me as opposed.

**I.R. NO. 1593-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Operating Budget transferring funds for the Child Care Council of Suffolk. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES (Legislator Vivian Fisher)**

**VOTE: 3-1-0-0 DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

One thing you have to be, I believe, as an elected official is consistent. Okay, we now have before us tabled resolution 1196. Is there a motion on 1196? Hearing none?

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Motion to table by Legislator Bishop, second by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed?

Abstentions? Tabled.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS - PRIME:**

**I.R. NO. 1196-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for the Vocational Education and Extension Board. (VEEB) ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION (Legislator Martin Haley)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**

Same motion.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Same motion and same second on 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1568, 1587. Okay, so up to 1201, we have a motion to table and second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled

**I.R. NO. 1197-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for the Police Athletic League. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION (Legislator Martin Haley)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**I.R. NO. 1198-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for the North Shore Youth Council. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND EDUCATION & YOUTH (Legislator Martin Haley)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**I.R. NO. 1199-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for the Nature conservancy. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Legislator Martin Haley)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**I.R. NO. 1200-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for Mather Hospital Fortunato Breast Health Center. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HEALTH (Legislator Martin Haley)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**I.R. NO. 1201-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for Lifeline Mediation Center. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES (Legislator Martin Haley)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

1568, we have a motion to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Legislator Crecca is opposed.

**I.R. NO. 1568-2002 Requiring child product recall notification at childcare facilities. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES (Legislator Andrew Crecca)**

**VOTE: 3-1-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**  
1587.

**LEGISLATOR BISHOP:**  
Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**  
Motion to table by Legislator Bishop, second by Legislator Cooper. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled.

**I.R. NO. 1587-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Operating Budget transferring funds for the New York State Fishing and Tackle Trade Association. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PARKS, SPRTS & CULTURAL AFFAIRS (Legislator Fred Towle)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**  
1590 same motion, same second, same vote.

**I.R. NO. 1590-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Operating Budget and transferring positions from the Department of Public Works to the Police Department. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION (Legislator Maxine Postal)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 TABLED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**  
1591.

**MR. KNAPPE:**  
Legislator Caracciolo, can I talk on 1591 please?

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**  
Yes. Motion to approve by Legislator Bishop, second by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

**I.R. NO. 1591-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Operating Budget and transferring funds for the ARC Adult Community Alternative Sentencing Program. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION (Legislator Angie Carpenter)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**MR. KNAPPE:**  
Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**  
It's a bonafide offset. And finally, I would like to say the same for 1594. I made inquiry during the last several days with Budget Review Office, Jim Spero and he's informed me that too, is a bonafide offset. Motion and a second. Motion by Legislator Bishop, second by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

**I.R. NO. 1594-2002 (P) Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for various contracted agencies. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET (Legislator George Guldi)**

**VOTE: 4-0-0-0 APPROVED**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:**

Is there any business before the committee? A motion to adjourn by Legislator Cooper, second by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed? Approved.

***(The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 P.M.)***

{ } Denotes spelled phonetically