

**BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**  
  
**MINUTES**

A meeting of the Budget & Finance Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday, March 5, 2009.

**Members Present:**

Legislator DuWayne Gregory - Chairman  
Legislator Lou D'Amaro - Vice-Chair  
Legislator John Kennedy  
Legislator Brian Beedenbender  
Legislator Daniel Losquadro

**Also In Attendance:**

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Maxvel Rose - Aide to Legislator Gregory  
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Gail Vizzini - Director/Budget Review Office  
Robert Lipp - Deputy Director/Budget Review Office  
Kara Hahn - Director of Communications/PO Lindsay's Office  
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Caucus  
Linda Bay - Aide to Minority Caucus  
Justin Littell - Aide to Legislator D'Amaro  
Ben Zwirn - Deputy County Executive  
Allen Kovesdy - Deputy Director/County Executive's Budget Office  
Debra Alloncius - Legislative Director/AME  
All Other Interested Parties

**Minutes Taken By:**

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

**Minutes Transcribed By:**

Donna Catalano & Alison Mahoney

*(\*The following was transcribed by  
Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer\*)*

(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 10:14 A.M.\*)

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Good morning, everybody. We're going to start the Budget & Finance Committee with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Beedenbender.

**SALUTATION**

We don't have any cards for the public portion, but is there anyone in the audience that would like to come up and make comments? Okay, seeing none, I'm going to ask the County Executive's Office, do you want to come up -- you have a few comments to make?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Mr. Chairman, when we go through the resolutions, we'll answer questions and make some comments then so you can get on with the agenda. Our comments will just be pretty much related to some of the bills that are on.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. Gail, do you have anything that you want to -- any input you want to make, maybe talk about sales tax?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Well, we continue to be very cautious about sales tax. Mr. Kovesdy and I were just talking before the meeting, the last check was down 10.3% which is consistent in terms of how the first quarter has been going. I'm not in a position to really make any changes to our projections. We're reviewing the economy for our capital review, but it continues to be a negative situation. Some of the literature indicates there may be some good news. I think Robert is putting together the good news and the not-so-good news and will continue to monitor the situation.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay, but it appears that maybe we're a little ahead of projection? We're, what, down about 38 million; we projected, what, 77 million?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Well, the General Fund was a negative 78 million. I think Allen has a comment on that as well.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Yeah. Good morning. Currently, against last year we're down \$32 million, compared to last year. As you know, last year was 1% under, so this year we had 1% plus, so you'd have to add to the \$32 million another \$22 million against the budget line. But right now we're 10.6% under last year.

The only good news is the first check, in this check the April numbers were only down 7.7%; while the total check was down over 10%, the April portion was only 7.7. I mean, it's still down, but it's down less than a ten. So you have the March numbers which were really draconian, but the April numbers picked up a little bit.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

So you see a slight uptick.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I could only say that only Allen Kovesdy could find that good news.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you. One thing I was trying to look at in this was is that a month that is traditionally not as heavy of a spending month, so is the impact lessened? Obviously, we wouldn't want to see that in, say, August where you have all the back to school shopping or December where you have all the Christmas shopping. Is that a month that traditionally has a lesser impact than other months throughout the year?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

This is a big check, this is a \$70 million check. We don't usually get too many checks over \$70 million range, so this is a big -- this is a big check. Just understand that this doesn't have any adjustments in it, this is raw numbers; we don't get the adjustments until the end of June.

But this check covers -- I'll give you the breakout; it's 100% of EFT; EFT is electronic filings. So it's all the electronic filings from April 1st through April 22nd, and it's 70% of the non-electronic filings from March. So you have a piece of the March number in here, but the April piece was only down 7.7%, the March piece was down considerably more.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

You are welcome.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

With that, we'll go into the agenda.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

***IR 1000-09 - Adopting Local Law No. -2009, A Charter Law to enhance budgeting flexibility and responsiveness (Schneiderman).*** I make a motion to table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1003-09 - Repealing home energy nuisance taxes on Suffolk County residents (Alden).***

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Beedenbender.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1004-09 - Establishing a program to reduce unfair home energy nuisance taxes on Suffolk County residents (Alden).***

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Beedenbender.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1024-09 - Adopting Local Law No. -2009, A Charter Law to impose further controls on County debt and debt service payments (Gregory).***

I make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator Beedenbender. All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Just a brief explanation, please.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

This law is to --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Or not brief if it's something more involved.

**MR. NOLAN:**

This law would amend our Capital Budget Offset Law. Basically, it's really a clarification more than anything to state that if you're increasing a project during the year in the Capital Budget & Program, you can't use Federal aid from another program as your offset.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion, we have a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1077-09 - Amending the 2009 Operating Budget and transferring funds to Literacy Suffolk, Inc. (Kennedy).*** The sponsor is not here, so I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator Beedenbender. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1099-09 - Amending the 2009 Operating Budget and transferring funds to BiasHELP, Inc. (Gregory).*** I make a motion to table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1105-09 - Amending the 2009 Operating Budget by transferring \$500,000 in excess energy appropriations to the Police Department's Patrol Special Operations Unit to fight violent street crime and gang activity (Cooper).***

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Losquadro, seconded by myself.  
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1106-09 - Amending the 2009 Operating Budget to strike \$500,000 in excess energy and parks appropriations (Cooper).***

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Same motion.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1182-09 - Amending the 2009 Operating Budget by eliminating partial funding for legislative newsletters (County Executive).*** Motion to table.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Second.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Second by Legislator Beedenbender. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy).***

***IR 1279-09 - Instituting a lag payroll in fiscal year 2009 for Bargaining Units 21, 30 and 24 (Management, Confidential, and Board of Elections Employees, respectively and exclusive of Suffolk County Community College Employees), to address revenue shortfalls and avoid a reduction in the workforce of County personnel (County Executive).***

I make a motion to table.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Just note my recusal on the record, please.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled***  
***(VOTE: 3-0-0-1-1 - Not present; Legis. Kennedy - Recusal: Legis. D'Amaro).***

***IR 1283-09 - Adopting Local Law No. -2009, A Charter Law to establish a fiscally sound, flexible policy for managing budget volatility. (County Executive).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**  
Motion to approve by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
***Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legis. Kennedy).***

### **INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS**

***IR 1296-09 - Enhancing Administrative Budget Deficit Control for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010 to proportionately include the Police District Fund 115 in the Budget Mitigation Plan (County Executive).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**  
Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**  
Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. Discussion?

**MR. KOVESDY:**  
Good morning, again. As you are aware, when the sales tax is set up in the beginning of the year, the General Fund and Fund 477 float, they're based on the receipts; whereas, the Police District is a set amount, in this case, in the \$69 million range. As sales tax has come in lower, the distribution does not get lower in the Police District unless the Legislature takes some kind of action and strikes the funds. This resolution strikes sales tax that will not be coming in or we don't project to come in in the Police District in 2009.

In addition, the Executive has put funds in the reserve, the Police reserve, as we've done in savings plan, over and above this matter.

We wanted to have the sales tax in the Police District reflect the sales tax receipts in the rest of the County, in the General Fund and 477; this is the mechanism that does it. Without this, the Police District will be getting their full share while the cuts will go to the General Fund and Fund 477. That's basically what it does, it keeps this in line with the reductions that are -- we have been getting in other areas.

**MR. ZWIRN:**  
If I might?

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**  
Now, is this done by a certain percentage, or how is it calculated?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

This is an area -- no, we've taken in reserve -- this is a little bit more than the 5% cut that we took, it's more in line with the money that we have in the reserve. It will all even out by the end of the year.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

The County Executive is in discussions with the Police Department, with the PBA and the SOA and the Detective Investigators -- you know, the Detective's Union. We're hopeful that there can be an agreement worked out with them with respect to the lag payroll that we had with AME and the other -- and some of the other unions, and we're also moving forward with the Probation Department. Everything seems to be moving along.

We would like to get this to the floor with a discharge and then let it sit there for a while while everything is else worked out. We don't -- we were hopeful that this particular bill would not have to be adopted. But we have to get savings in the Police Department, this is one way to do it and the County Executive is hopeful that we won't -- you know, that they'll be able to do it through negotiations. But there's nothing -- there's nothing imminent. I mean, it wouldn't have to be -- it's going to take some time to work out a resolution to that, so we wouldn't expect this to be -- we would ask this to be moved at the May 12th meeting.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator Beedenbender.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Thank you. Ben, I understand that this strikes the five and a half million dollars, but my question is not really, because if we need to spend on Police overtime we spend on Police overtime and we find it other places. There's not a point where somebody says there's no money in the budget and we stop putting Police out if we need them. So while it strikes them, if this is money we were going to spend anyway, then -- then we're going to spend it.

So I guess my question is, yes, we're striking it, but if we need it we spend it anyway; this is one of those things. I mean, I remember in past years, to transfer money in the budget, they took money from snow removal lines to move over to Police overtime. If we need it, we spend it and we worry about the budget after we put the officers out on the street.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

By law we have to pay any personnel costs that people are due. We do -- we have mechanisms; one is we transfer internally, at the end of the year you do a housekeeping resolution which moves the funds; otherwise, by law, if somebody works they have to get paid.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, I wasn't suggesting that we don't pay them. What I was suggesting is that if we need Police Officers, we put them on the street and we figure out the budget problem afterwards, and that's usually how we function. So while we may strike this and the actual number will be less, if the costs go up, we're going to spend it anyway.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's true of any issue with regard to public safety. I mean, if we blow through the DPW budget, you know, for clearing roads, we don't stop, you know, the minute we reach the budget line, we just go. And if worse came to worse, there was no other money to transfer, then we would probably do a budget note just to cover -- you know, for the short term.

But I think what we're trying to do is send a message that we need help from every avenue in the County workforce, and this would be freezing this money and putting it back to the General Fund where there's a real problem. I mean, we're down \$32 million in receipts, and that's, you know,

year-to-year and doesn't go year-to-budget. We're down considerably more, about 50 some odd million dollars, \$54 million?

So it's a real -- it's a real problem. It's not just a tactic to negotiate, we have a real problem of trying to balance the General Fund.

So the County Executive is doing everything he can, trying to work with the unions, work with the Legislature. And so far, even though it's been a little dramatic at times, everybody has -- you know, cooler heads have prevailed and there have not been any layoffs and we don't anticipate that there will be. But we're looking for an alternative from the Police Department as to where they can save some money and help the County out, you know, in the short term.

So in this bill, we're trying to move it forward, again, in the hopes that we do not have to, you know, use it. And the negotiations will go beyond -- we don't expect to have a resolution by Tuesday's General Meeting. So we would not move this bill and ask for an approval at the Tuesday meeting, but we would like to see it move forward just so that everybody knows that we're engaged and we're serious and that you have to come to the table and talk to us, and there have been discussions. I know that Jeff Frayler meet with the County Executive, I know -- I think it was on Friday, and Jeff Tempera is continuing to meet with them as well.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Ben, I agree that, you know, we stood pretty firm last Tuesday and said that all the bargaining units need to be included in this, and I believe that the Police Department and the PBA, the SOA and the Detectives all have to be included in that as well, and I understand this isn't a tactic. But what I'm saying is that, you know, I don't clearly see how this puts pressure on the Police union because in the end, if overtime is needed, it will be there and we will find something to pay for it and make sure we have Police Officers on the street. So it's not that I'm questioning that they should participate, it's that I don't understand this bill.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

There are very few ways that we can move forward, short of, you know, laying off Police Officers, which nobody wants to do under any circumstances. But as I say, we're trying to keep the ball moving forward, this is one way to do it. There are not a lot of other ways that we can. I mean, everybody knows that, you know, public safety is the primary job of government. And we don't want -- but we're also looking for help from every sector of public employees.

And again, there are discussions going on. This bill will not -- it's not going to come to a vote or to a head any time probably before the June meeting at the earliest, and by that time we hope that this would all be water under the bridge.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Losquadro?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you. And I think if there's one -- if there's one thing this body showed at the last meeting was we're serious about finding a solution to these problems.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

And I just thank you, and if I haven't mentioned it before, the County Executive is also thankful. I mean, it was -- you know, the Legislature stood together and took a tough vote, but it was necessary, we thought, to move the process forward and we're very appreciative of it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Well, irrespective of what the County Executive thought, this body felt that this was the right way to go and we had a serious problem that needed to be addressed.

I agree with Legislator Beedenbender and with the actual effectiveness of the this bill. But

moreover, the bill has been filed, we do not -- by your own words, there's no plan to move this forward at the next meeting. And as I said, this Legislature has shown that it's willing to take the steps necessary to effect the type of savings that we are going to be, because we cannot run with a structural deficit.

So this bill has been filed, it's here. I don't see what moving this forward on to the floor is going to gain in the negotiation process, because I agree with Legislator Beedenbender's interpretation of this bill; if push comes to shove, we'll find a way to save the money and we all know that. It's not going to be pretty. We've all spoken with the various unions and told them this is part of the problem that we need your help with and then we're going to address the rest, And I think the Police certainly know that as well as any of the other unions.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Thank you, Legislator. The only other point is at some point the General Fund is going to be short of cash.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

It's already short.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I'm just saying, and we have contract agencies that have -- are looking to get paid; I mean, there's a lot more difficult decisions yet to come. And again, we welcome any suggestions that any Legislator might have on -- with respect to the Police Department or any other of the shortfalls that we're looking for, looking for help. There's no pride of authorship necessary here. But we're going to be making some very tough decisions a little further down the road and, as I say, we just want to keep things moving forward. The Legislature has been responsive and been very helpful, but we're not done by a long shot.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

But just along the lines of Legislator Beedenbender and Losquadro, I would prefer to see you implement some type of plan where you're going to cut overtime as opposed to saying, "Well, we're just going to take \$5.5 million out of overtime." Because if you don't have a plan in place to reduce overtime, as Legislator Beedenbender mentioned, you know, you're just going to pay for those costs because they're going to come regardless and we have pay for it. So if you say, "Okay, this is how we're going to reduce overtime," therefore, at some later date we can't be expected to pay for something that we've already planned for, then that sounds like a reasonable plan. But if we don't have a plan in place, we're just going to take the monies from somewhere else.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

If I might. We've already put \$9.5 million of Police overtime in Fund 115 in reserve, so we've taken that out of the line and put it into a reserve.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay, but that's not answering the question I just stated. What's your plan to reduce overtime, as opposed to just taking money out of the overtime line?

*(\*The following was transcribed by.  
Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer\*)*

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, we can ask the Police Commissioner to come in, but he has -- he is doing everything he can to cut back on overtime now. I mean, there's no question about it. I mean, we're trying to save money everywhere we can. If there's an emergency situation, it's completely different. If somebody calls 911, somebody is going to show up, and fast. I mean, if we need more Police, they will pull Police. If they have to bring Police in on overtime for an emergency situation, they will do that; that's what everybody does. Nobody looks at the budget when there's an emergency situation. But on day-to-day stuff, they're doing everything they can to try to reduce the cost in every

department, including the Police, which makes sense.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

The other question, just one more question I have is in the first RESOLVED clause, it talks about enhancing other measures to reduce the Police District Fund; what is that in reference to?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

In the WHEREAS or RESOLVED?

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

The first RESOLVED.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

It is a general flow for reducing expenses in the Police Department.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. So you don't have any other measures or you don't have --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, part of it is reducing overtime and expenses in general.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. And what's the other part?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That is -- that's --

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

You said part of it, so I'm assuming that --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, part of it is that the County Executive is trying to have the flexibility in the Police Department where he can move Police Officers between specialized bureaus. That's one of the problems, so he can have Marine Bureau, all the specialized bureaus that you have now, that he has the flexibility to move Police Officers out of those bureaus to do other work in the event that they need them somewhere else other than that bureau for that day. And that's one of the things that they're trying to do is trying to break down walls within the Police Department so that they have more flexibility.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay, and you feel that would help reduce overtime, because you have more flexibility between departments because you have more available officers.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yes, because right now some of them are assigned to certain duties and they stay there and if they need somewhere else they pull Police Officers from somewhere else.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes, thank you. I'm trying to understand the -- and maybe, Allen, you could answer this for me. This is from a separate line in our budget specifically for Police overtime, or is it all just part of the -- is it striking the sales tax portion from the General Fund to the Police District? What exactly are we targeting with this bill?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

You have to have a plus and a minus; The minus is the sales tax revenue. We took all the money from one place in the budget, rather than go through 50 different places in the police budget, we took it all out of the 110 line. That doesn't mean we don't adjust as it goes on, but from an administrative point it is easier for us to take from one particular point and then adjust as the year goes on

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right. So it's taking from the 110 line which is the overtime budget line --

**MR. KOVESDY:**

No, that's the permanent salary line. What -- there's two separate things, Mr. D'Amaro. One is we took it all from the 110 line just as an administrative way to reduce the budget so it's even, so the revenues match the expense.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, I understand that.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Okay. On the other side, when Connie was here she explained to you that we're trying to take closet o \$40 million in internal savings. Part of that \$40 million was moving \$9.5 million in overtime from the Police in through reserve, so they're two separate and distinct actions. As the year goes on we make adjustments as things happen, but in order to get to that \$40 million target, we had to make reductions in every single department, this was one of the reductions we made in the Police Department.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So we're reducing from the permanent salary line the five million that's in this bill.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Yes, sir

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And you -- I think you said in your comments that you anticipate not spending that five million?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

I don't want to speak for the Police Department. I just want to say that right now the sales tax is over \$50 million less than is in the budget. We feel that the Police Department's portion of the \$69 million should be reduced in proportion to how it's being reduced across the board.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, I understand that as well. The problem I have is, you know, then what's the message we're sending with this type of cut from Police permanent salaries?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Well, if there's less money in permanent salaries, there's less money for officers and there's less money across the board. When we look at it, the Police -- as you are familiar, the Police has holiday pay, it has overtime, it has a whole myriad of things. What we're hopeful is we will get some resolution, we'll straighten everything out and the budget will be correct. Right now you can't do that, in all honesty. The 115 budget is a gigantic budget, you can't take some money from supplies, equipment and things like that arbitrarily. It's much easier for us to take one in one particular area.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, you can't take it from the other areas without the concessions first, though; right?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, we -- I don't know.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I don't know either.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I haven't got the answer.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right. Well, I'm concerned about, you know, we passed the budget, we funded the Police partly through the Police property tax and then the payment from the budget itself, the sales tax portion that comes from the Operating Budget. Yeah, we're having a very difficult economic downturn right now, we've done some things already, we've done many things, whether it's asking the State to give us some relief, whether it was asking to work with our municipal unions. But it's more problematic for me when it comes to the Police District because as Mr. Zwirn says, when someone calls a cop we're not looking at a budget line, we're responding.

So what I'm leading to here is let's say you're successful in reducing the expenditures out of the Police District and you can cut overtime or whatever else you can do, putting aside whether or not you get actual concessions. Wouldn't any excess funding left be used to balance our budget anyway, or be turned over back to taxpayers for next year's budget anyway? Why do we need this bill?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

You're correct, any surplus --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I mean, let me just finish. I understand -- when we were talking about 1205, I understand that salaries are a large portion of our budget and one of the ways you can reduce your budget is through layoffs, which no one obviously wants to do. But this is not the same; this is just taking money out of a budget that you're anticipating will not be spent. And I'm questioning why do we need to do that by resolution? If you don't spend the money, my understanding is that it just remains in the budget and can be turned over.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Any fund balance obviously would be for the next year, you are correct in that statement. Again, I just want -- you know, the purpose from the Budget Office standpoint was that there is a reduction in the revenue, the revenue should be equalized across all lines in the County between all the funds. Otherwise, without this instruction, the Police will be getting their 69, \$67 million on a regular check basis whereas the shortfall will fall into the General Fund and a small proportion will be in to the Water Quality Fund

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. But the way you're proposing to spread it out and everyone take their allocate hit, so to speak, in the budget is different. One way was to ask unions to -- administrative unions to come to the table and work with us, which many of them have done, but this is not the same. This is just not -- you're not throwing out those options, you're just simply taking the money before the negotiation.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, that's why we weren't moving -- we weren't looking to move this until we had a really -- you know, a good opportunity to speak with the Police unions. As I said, we were just trying -- this was not going to a head. They're in discussions now and they're going to be complicated discussions because it's a little bit different than working with the other municipal unions, with the Police.

But as I said, we're looking to try to share the pain across the board with all the public employees, some of the unions have already stepped forward. You know, the County Executive is trying to bring this to you so that you have, you know, a say in how -- you know, how it happens. What we're trying to do is -- the County Executive, he can manage the Police Department and he can just say, "I'm not going to pay the overtime," but will reduce overtime unilaterally and have the Police Commissioner do everything he can to try to do that. And that's what you're suggesting, that perhaps that's an easier --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. My understanding is that the County Executive, through the Police Commissioner, could set the policy to reduce expenditures. We're not talking about terminating employment here, we're just talking about not spending funds. And as Mr. Kovesy says, you can spread that out administratively on areas where you believe within the Police budget can take various hits to come up to that allocate share of pain that everyone needs to feel. So -- and if we do that and we do it successfully, if you do that successfully, the funds are there, the funds are there to balance the budget.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, the only difference I can see is that this would tell us now. If this was adopted say today and it was adopted, then that savings, you know, would go back to the General Fund. If you wait till the end of the year, it's -- we don't know where we'll be. One, we know upfront as much as we can, you know, barring an emergency situation where you have to call out the troops at any expense --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I understand that. I'm very hesitant to cut funding at this point for salaries for Police Officers, all right; and I guess I can't say it any more blunt than that. My own district, Huntington Station, is thankfully getting more Police protection these days, thanks in large part to the efforts of the County Executive and I appreciate that very, very much. But to come out the next week and announce to my constituents in Huntington Station that, "Oh, by the way, yeah, we brought in 12 more uniformed Police patrols, but I'm also cutting \$5 million out of their salary budget," is a bit inconsistent, for me to do any way. And as you said, Mr. Zwirn, this is a fundamental obligation of the County to provide this Police protection. And for me, in the face of knowing that there's an increase in the crime rate in some areas within my district, to then cut the funding for that Police protection I think would be unconscionable for me to do at this point. So I'm not prepared to support this bill at this time.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator Lindsay?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I think that we should move this bill to the full floor, if for no other reason to stress the trouble that we're in, the deficit that we're in. I think this is certainly much easier than the situation we faced last week with laying people off. I'm not saying that when push comes to shove we'll vote for this ultimately, but I think it should be on our calendar. Because what I see, I think I disagree with some of my colleagues, I think the money could be cut from overtime, but it will change the way we live. Every one of our districts has parades and street fairs and things that make us unique, every one of them require Police protection, most of that Police protection is on overtime. If we didn't have the money to pay the Police, we couldn't pay the street fairs and the parades and all the other things that we do that aren't absolutely necessary for us to live, it's part of our make-up, though, in every one of our communities, And I would certainly hate to see it come to that. But I just think that we've got to stay on course and move this bill to the floor and see if we can find out a different way of doing it than this, but I think unfortunately we still have to do it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I appreciate that, Mr. Presiding Officer, but, you know, I don't think that these communities would then not have their parades. And to say that --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

You can't close the streets without cops

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, you know, there are many fairs that don't take place in the streets. I know in Huntington there's a huge fair at the end of the summer that's in the Huntington Town Park where there's Police protection. And that's exactly my point, I want that revenue to be available, because I don't think that we can back off from providing Police protection in our neighborhoods. And this resolution, by cutting back -- if the overtime can be cut in a way that it's efficient to do so without putting anyone at risk if it can be done administratively, I'm all for saving the money. But to take the money first and then figure out how we're going to then provide the same level of protection or the protection that's necessary to protect people, I think is putting -- you know, it's doing it backwards.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you. I understand the Presiding Officer's comment perfectly, but we wouldn't be seeing any of these savings affected under the lag until the July paycheck. I don't think that -- for lack of a better term, I don't think this quite provides the hammer, so to speak, that people are looking for, or motivation in the negotiation process. I think that everyone involved -- again, I'll repeat it -- knows that this body is serious about effecting these savings; I don't think that this particular bill is going to accomplish that. I think we're going to continue to see the type of negotiations that we're having, and if at the end of the day they're not successful by the time we need to affect these savings, then yes, we're going to have to address something, and I think we all know that.

But if I could make a request through the Executive's Office that at Thursday's Public Safety meeting, if we can make sure the Commissioner, certainly Chief of Department are here. I know you're not running the Police Department, Mr. Zwirn, but some of the comments you just made about people coming from certain divisions, doing other work -- once again, I know I have concerns, other members of that committee and other members of this body have concerns as to what work is not going done. You only have a certain number of bodies, we all acknowledge that at this point. We all acknowledge that the prime focus obviously is emergencies, but we have many other divisions within the Police Department. There's an article in the paper today about the Mobile Crime Fighters And the -- you know, we need people to do that work and check up on all these tips that we're getting. We have a lot of work that needs to be done within the department and I'd like to speak to the department about their plans for addressing all of those needs in a time where we may have to do it with less, and what areas within the department we might say, "We're no longer going to provide those functions." I mean, we're quite willing to say that there are areas within our other municipal services that we're just not going to be able to provide service. And as we've acknowledged here, the Police Department is not different in the sense that we need the money to pay them.

So I'd like to speak to the department about what areas they feel within the Police Department they could possibly remove or not provide services to the public with. Because if we're talking about a reduction, it just stands to reason, just as with every other department, there are services we're not going to be able to provide. So I'd like to have that discussion with them as to what the actual plans are for the department, and maybe that's something that will provide a real incentive to negotiate; if we say, "This is an area we are going to have to do without, we are no longer going to be able to provide." Just a throughout.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator Beedenbender.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a technical question, I guess, Allen. You said that as part of -- I guess earlier in the year when the County Executive established those reserve funds in all the different departments, they reserved nine and a half million dollars in the Police overtime or fund?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Overtime

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Now, the five and a half million dollars contemplated in this bill, is that in addition or included in that?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

It's included in

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. So we're not talking about \$15 million being cut.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

No

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. So if it's included in, then the County Executive has already reserved this in that number that -- you know, the third part of our plan to address this. So how does us striking it actually save any money? He's -- this has been accounted for already, so if we strike it, how do we save anything?

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Again, we're bringing the sales tax, which is a revenue, in line with the expenditures.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

I know, but if it's reserved, then at least in my -- maybe -- please correct me, because maybe I don't understand it. But if it has been reserved, we have said we are not going to spend this. So if that's -- if the chunk is locked away and we're not going to spend it, how does striking five and a half million of it save any money, one, and put pressure on anybody? If we send we're not going to spend it, then it's already locked away; I don't see how doing anything further to it exerts any pressure or has any further savings.

**MR. KOVESDY:**

Again, the easiest way to explain it is reserve funds can be moved back and forth at the discretion of the Executive and the Legislature, whereas once the money is stricken it's no longer there.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Right, but --

**MR. KOVESDY:**

So in other words, if the money was stricken from the 110 or the 111 or the holiday pay from wherever they do it, that money is no longer there to spend. If it's put in the reserve account, at some point it could be moved back to overtime, holiday or anything else later in the year. But once the money is gone, it's no longer part of the budget, it's like it was never there in the first place

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Gail, I saw you waving your hand, or Robert?

**MR. LIPP:**

Another issue is by striking the sales tax revenue, what it does is it's a benefit to the General Fund. Because the Police District gets a sum certain, so by striking it then -- by not striking it, it means that \$5 million is going to be lost to the General Fund, period, assuming that, as expected, the sales

tax projections are what they are. So if you do strike the sales tax revenue in the Police District, you're sharing the pain, you're reducing the General Fund and you're recognizing that the problem exists for both funds. And there is another way to finesse that hasn't been talked about.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, before you -- if I can interrupt, before you go there, Robert. I understand that, you know, the interplay between the General and the Police Fund. But there's -- there's nine and a half million dollars in reserve in the Police District, that nine and a half is reserved in the Police District. If it is not spent by the end of the year, it doesn't stay exclusively for the Police District, it goes back to the General Fund. So my question is --

**MR. LIPP:**

No.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Then correct me, please.

**MR. LIPP:**

What happens is it affects the fund balance in the Police District. So the end of the day, however money you get -- however much money gets spent or not will flow to fund balance, surplus or deficit in the Police District, period.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, okay. I'm trying not to get super technical here, but if -- all right. So we have a fund balance in the Police District, which means as we move forward into 2010 when we do our Operating Budget, that affects the tax rate that we'll have to put forward in the Police District to make it -- you know, so we can pay for it. And consequently, you know, when we did it this year, there are transfers back and forth. The higher the tax rate or the less money you need to pay for in the Police District, the less sales tax you have to transfer from the General Fund.

So I guess what I'm trying to get at is it seems like all these things are interrelated and cutting five and a half million that's already reserved doesn't seem like it's going -- it doesn't get you five and a half million dollars back. It seemed like there would be some sort of, you know, discount on that, given the interplays between the funds.

**MR. LIPP:**

I think what the intent here is, number one, like we said, it's where do you want the pain to be shown? You want it only in the General Fund, leave it the way it is? If you want it to be shared, do it. Now, your concern is, well, we're going to save the money anyhow. To the extent that that's true, you're not -- striking the appropriations isn't going to do anything because you're not spending the money -- if that's true, that remains to be seen -- and therefore, you are accomplishing sharing the pain between the two funds. If it's not true and you have to spend the money like some of the dialogue was perhaps overtime will skyrocket, who knows, the biggest risk you face is you might have insufficient appropriations at the end of the year in the fund; that's a real problem. So there's another way to finesse that which we haven't talked about.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Well -- I don't have any other questions. I was just trying to --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, I'm dying to know how we finesse that.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Yeah, it's a good question; how would we finesse that?

**MR. LIPP:**

Dying is a little extreme, don't you think?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's the easy way out.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes. Well, we've spoken in-house about this, and perhaps instead of taking the approach of, as is being done in the County Executive's bill, you strike the revenue you need to have the offset, as Allen clearly explained. We think as an alternative -- which we haven't unveiled, I guess, yet -- is you could change, instead of striking appropriations, you could change the allocation from a fixed dollar amount, which is what the Police District gets to a percentage. It doesn't have to be an eighth, quarter, three-eighths; it could be a percentage that could be calculated by the Budget Office, by us based upon the expected lower dollar amount and they would get a lesser dollar amount going forward. And implicitly, it would sort of do the same thing, that is it would -- other things be equal, they would have a negative fund balance or a less positive fund balance and you wouldn't have to actually strike the appropriations.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So you're really -- you're adjusting the revenue coming in as opposed to the appropriation line where it would be spent.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yeah. Right now, the way the Treasurer does stuff is they have a dollar amount which was adopted at 69 million and change, that was reduced in the General Meeting by three point something million dollars already; the Treasurer is aware of it, we've had conversations with them. If, for instance, by the end of the month they needed the full 69 million minus the three and change, they -- the next sales tax checks would go, all of that amount, to the Police District. Now what we would be directing them, if this type of resolution was passed, is they would have to just take one nth, if you will, of the sales tax revenue to the Police District. They wouldn't be able to give them the full amount if they needed it right upfront.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So we're changing the sales tax allocation from the General Fund but it would be based on a percentage as opposed to a fixed amount. We're changing the allocation from the General Fund to the Police District with respect to sales tax

**MR. LIPP:**

Effectively, I guess, you could look at it that way

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And that, you feel, could be a more viable alternative because, in effect, the funding, instead of striking the appropriation or the expenditure, the funding is still available within the General Fund if it's, in fact, needed, which is the unknown right now.

**MR. LIPP:**

Right. I think at the end of the day what we're talking about here is, you know, this is -- we haven't spoken about this before. Let's vet it out as, you know, as an option C, if it meets everybody's asset test. It's a little more complicated than just striking a fixed dollar amount. The only -- the obvious, only clear benefit is you don't lose the appropriations that you may risk having to pay because maybe overtime escalates or depending upon perhaps, as Legislator Losquadro said, he's concerned that they're going to -- and Legislator Beedenbender, that they're going to spend the money anyhow. If you don't have the appropriations, that's a problem.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It may just be putting off the inevitable anyway. I don't know, I'd have to think that one through, but thank you.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion to table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Seconded. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

***Tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***IR 1302-09 - To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and charge-backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature (Control No. 808-2009) (County Executive).***

I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Put that on the Consent Calendar.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

And to put it on -- and to place on the Consent Calendar. Seconded by Legislator Beedenbender. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***IR 1305-09 - To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature No. 318-2009 (County Executive).***

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***1308-09 - To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature No. 319-2009 (County Executive).*** Same motion, same second, same vote. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

***1320-09 - To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and charge-backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature (Control No. 809-2009) (County Executive).***

Same mote -- same mote; oh my gosh. Same vote -- same motion, same vote, same second. All right, you do it, Mr. D'Amaro.

***(\*Laughter From Panel\*)***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

***1344-09 - To amend Resolution No. 905-2008 "To enhance consumer responsibility and ensure depositories informed transactions (credit) in Suffolk County" (Horsley & Browning).*** I make a motion to approve.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Beedenbender. Legislator Losquadro?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Just a brief explanation, please.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I believe you'll recall that last year we passed a resolution that imposed new requirements on potential depositories in terms of credit counseling for their customers. After a lot of discussion with the depositories and the Treasurer, the requirement has been amended slightly so that now that -- and incidentally, this will go into effect now in 2010, okay? So that commencing in 2010, lending institutions who want to be named as a depository must give the Treasurer a letter attesting or certifying that the lending institution makes available to the Suffolk County branch account holders -- it's branch holders, not account holders -- to apply for consumer credit at such branches contact information from the New York State Banking Department or the National Foundation for Credit Counseling Service websites. And that's going to be the requirement that they'll have to give us a letter to that effect beginning in 2010 in order to be named a depository by the County.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I know BRO, in their report, had said that this requires a little bit of additional work on the part of the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer -- BRO, have you spoken to the Treasurer on this? Or Counsel, do you know, has the Treasurer made any indication that this is problematic for them in any way, or is this just administrative?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I believe the Treasurer is -- I think the Treasurer had a concern about the original bill because depositories, potential depositories were expressing a concern. I think this amendment addresses those concerns, the banking association is okay with this resolution. So I think this is the necessary corrective going forward.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. George, all of the preemption issues or any of the other regulatory issues associated with State or Federal banking regulations and oversight, we have no conflict here? We're adding above and beyond what may be already required out there by State and Federal lending institutions?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Correct. This is just additional information that we're asking the depositories to give people who come to them for credit. So -- and as I said, I spoke to the attorney for the banking group, their lobbying group about this, they've reviewed it, they're fine with it. And I don't think there's any preemption issues, you know, Federal or State, not that I'm aware of.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The credit counseling is something that would be in the nature of counseling associated with finances across the board or towards mortgages or towards banked-owned credit cards, or do we know?

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's -- the resolution talks about anybody who is applying for consumer credit in any form, that they would have to give them contact information to get information about the proper use of credit.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Just a clarification, also to Mr. Nolan. The original bill provided that the counseling services will be directly made available by any lending institution doing business with the County. Now we're backing off of that and saying, "If you want to do business with Suffolk County, you just have to hand a consumer a letter saying you can go visit this website if you choose to get the counseling." So it's two very different bills.

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's not that different. It's both -- it only applies to banks that are looking to be a depository. The earlier bill also was basically they could provide the credit counseling directly or give contact information, where they could get the information. But the site that they're going to be directed to by the prior resolution was not the best, and that's really the major changes, directing them somewhere else.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So under the prior bill, you also -- the bank had the option of not providing the counseling direct but to direct to a certain website or agency and this bill is changing that, and also deleting the option of providing the direct counseling.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right. And now it is really where the banks would be required to give them contact information.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

What was the issue, if you know, with implementing the direct counseling by the banks?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I didn't have those conversations with the banks, but I think perhaps Legislator Horsley did. I just don't -- I get the sense that is something they don't normally provide to customers and they didn't want to and didn't feel they had the resources to do it

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But at least under this bill now, they'll still be getting -- consumers will be getting contact information to a credible agency.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Excuse me, for counseling services.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Exactly.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion, we have a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

***IR 1351-09 - Utilizing County assets to address budgetary shortfalls (Viloria-Fisher).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Beedenbender. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

***IR 1373-09 - To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature No. 320-2009 (County Executive).*** I make a motion --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

***1414-09 - Instituting a lag payroll in Fiscal Year 2009 for Bargaining unit 21 and 30 (Management and confidential employees, respectively and exclusive of Suffolk County Community College and employees of the Board of Elections) to address revenue shortfalls and avoid a reduction in the workforce of County personnel (County Executive).*** Motion to table by Legislator Beedenbender, second by Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Also, please note my recusal on the record as per my disclosure statement filed with the Presiding Officer.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, I also recuse on this under the similar circumstances as Legislator D'Amaro.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Now, has this bill been amended at all, or it still stays in the same form, Ben?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

No, it's the same bill that you had before you on -- at the last General Meeting.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Are you looking to change it at all, amend it?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't believe the County Executive is of the mind to change the bill.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Just -- thank you, through the chair. I don't think anyone here wants to see any one group excluded, we just want to make sure that there's a parity, that no group is impacted to a greater or lesser degree than another. And when we have a group that has already had steps taken away from them, we want to make sure that that's factored in to the equation to make sure that individuals,

simply by virtue of working in an appointed position, aren't treated more harshly.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I understand. And that has been conveyed to me by Legislator Losquadro and others, that you would prefer to have the exempts get the step and then -- that they had given up, get the step back and then take a two week lag payroll. I have brought that forward to the County Executive and he believes that they should continue to give up the step and then have a reduced lag payroll. That's his -- it's not --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

If the step was credited back into the lag. I mean, does -- again, further discussions on this are needed.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Through the Chair, I would just suggest that I agree with Legislator Losquadro's comments. The system that's set up in this bill, while I explained it the other day, it's incredibly complicated and convoluted. And there are situations wherein depending on salaries, there are people -- if you have -- there's a lot of concerns I have with that, because if you look at it, even if you're crediting somebody, in the end you know they're going to lose one week's paycheck; so we'll just use one week to make it simple. There are people that have automatic payroll deductions, so I wonder what the Comptroller would do with people who could possibly go negative. I mean, you could be deducting lots of money out of your paycheck and depending on the numbers, you could end up going negative.

So I just -- I think the simpler way is what Legislator Losquadro suggested, that we reinstitute the step and institute the full two-week lag payroll, like all the AME employees and Corrections -- well, the AME employees have done, and that will at least institute some parity in the situation. And I guess my proposal would be if the County Executive is not of the mind to introduce something like that, I would welcome, my colleagues, we'll do it ourselves. Because our employees need to take the same pain --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I hear cosponsor somewhere.

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Yeah. No, but, Ben, what I'm saying is my employees and everybody else's employees need to take the same pain that the AME employees have, but they don't need to take more. Because we just have to remember, and I'll repeat it again, that no employees got cost of living this year because there is no contract. The exempt employees got no step because we eliminated that, and now we're going to lag them; that's three out of three, that's crushing. The AME employees, because their union stepped forward, they'll get -- they didn't get the 3%, they'll get the step and they'll get a lag payroll; so that's two out of three, so I think our employees should get the same thing. I guess, Counsel, I would ask -- I don't know what the heck that resolution has to look like, but --

**MR. NOLAN:**

I look forward to working with you on it.

*(\*Laughter From Panel\*)*

**LEG. BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, yes, there are exempt employees in Counsel's office as well. Can you put your name on that one, George. All right.

**CHAIRMAN GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion, we have a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 3-0-0-0-2 Recused: Legislators D'Amato & Kennedy).***

Having no more business, we are adjourned. Thank you.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:16 AM\*)***