TUESDAY, MAY 26, 2026 **11:10 A.M.**

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The House will come to order.

Good morning, colleagues. Good morning.

In the absence of clergy, let us pause for a moment of silence.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

Visitors are invited to join the members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, Acting Speaker Hunter led visitors and members in the Pledge of Allegiance.)

A quorum being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of Monday, May 25th.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, I move to dispense with the further reading of the Journal of Monday, May 25th and that the same stand approved.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Without objection, so ordered.

MR. FALL: I have a quote this morning from Ziad Abdelnour, who is CEO and founder and president of Blackhawk Partners, Inc. And his words for us today are the following: *Life is like a camera. Just focus on what's important, and [sic] capture the good times, develop from the negatives, and if things don't work out just take another shot*. And these words are from Ziad Abdelnour.

Madam Speaker, members have on their desks a main Calendar. Before any housekeeping and/or introductions, we will be calling for the following Committees to meet off the floor: Ways and Means and Rules. These Committees will produce an A-Calendar which we will take up immediately. I will announce any further floor activities as we proceed. Majority members should be aware that there will be a need for a conference once we conclude our work on the floor today. As always, I will consult with the Minority Conference -- or the Minority Leader with their conference needs.

So with that as a general outline, Madam Speaker, let us begin by calling for the Ways and Means Committee to meet in the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ways and Means Committee members, please make

your way to the Speaker's Conference Room. Ways and Means Committee members, Speaker's Conference Room.

We have a piece of housekeeping this morning.

On a motion by Ms. Cruz, page 35, Calendar No. 262, Bill No. A00318, the amendments are received and adopted.

We have a few introductions as well.

Mr. Pirozzolo for the purpose of an introduction.

MR. PIROZZOLO: Good morning, Madam Speaker. How are you today?

So, it is a great privilege today that I introduce to you a gentleman from my district. His name is Ari Weiss. He's here with his daughter Gitty Weiss and -- I'm sorry, his wife Gitty and their daughter Esther. The reason I brought Mr. Weiss here today is because he's an outstanding volunteer within my community and actually the entire community of Staten Island. He does a lot of work with Hatzolah, which is an ambulance corps who serves everyone on Staten Island regardless of their background or their religion. And he also works with Shomrim, which is a safety patrol throughout the borough. And this dawned on me the other day when I was at a -- an event for one of my colleagues that I always see Ari there all the time. And we have ten elected colleagues -- I have ten electeds on Staten Island, my friends that we work with, and usually I always see him. So as busy as I think I am, he's as busy as I am at least ten times over.

So for that reason I'm gonna be presenting him with this awesome proclamation today, and I would like to ask if you

would please extend the courtesy of the floor to my constituents and my friends. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Yes. On behalf of Mr. Pirozzolo, the Speaker and all members, welcome, Mr. Weiss and your family to the Assembly Chamber, our People's House, extending to you the privileges of the floor. Hoping you get a chance to enjoy our proceedings today. And thank you so much for the contribution you make to the community. Being an EMS, a first responder, is not an easy job. When people run away, you're one of the people who run towards, so we appreciate that. Thank you so very much for your contribution to your community, and thank you all for joining us today.

(Applause)

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, can you please put the House at ease?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On Mr. Fall's motion, the House stands at ease.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m. the House stood at ease.)

**********.

(Whereupon, at 11:42 a.m. the House was called back to order.)

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The House will come to order.

Mr. Gallahan for the purpose of an introduction.

MR. GALLAHAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's certainly a special day for me here today in the -- in the Capitol. I have some very special guests here that came down from my district; actually from my home. I have my family here today. And my wife of 48 years, Lynn; our daughter Jackie; our son Corey; our son-in-law Jerry; and our three grandsons; Barrett, Cash and Tate. They're very excited to be here and very impressed with the -- with the Capitol building. And our grandson Barrett is currently in the middle of his -- his governmental instruction in his classroom, and they're talking about the New York State Capitol and our government here. So it's very fitting for him to be here today. He's learned a lot. They've all told me how excited they were. They've told me how impressed they were with the -- with the Capitol and the ornate carvings and etchings and the history. The so-called "almost finished" Capitol building that -- that wasn't finished, but anyway... I didn't get them in to see the -- the -- the unfinished part of the Senate, but I told them about it and they were thoroughly impressed. And probably the most impressing thing was -- was my office and -- and what we have up there to take care of the folks at the end of Session most days.

So please, Madam Speaker, would you please give all the cordialities to the floor and the People's House to my family?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Of course.

On behalf of Mr. Gallahan, the Speaker and all members, welcome to Lynn, Jackie, Corey, Jerry, Barrett, Cash and

Tate to our Assembly Chamber. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. Hoping you enjoy our proceedings today. I saw you get the personal tour from Mr. Gallahan this morning, and so it's always exciting to be able to have family members to be here and present. And congratulations on your longstanding nuptials. That's a long time, so congratulations to you for that. We will definitely miss Jeff here in the Assembly Chamber. He has been a wonderful member. So thank you so very much for joining us today, and we hope you have a wonderful time here. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, members have on their desk an A-Calendar. I now move to advance the A-Calendar.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On Mr. Fall's motion, the A-Calendar is advanced.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, can we now take up Rules Report No. 211 on page 8 by Mr. Pretlow?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Yes. Page 8, Rules Report No. 211, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A11480, Rules Report No. 211, Committee on Rules (Pretlow). An act making appropriations for the support of government; to amend Chapter 98 of the Laws of 2026 relating to making appropriations for the support of government, in relation thereto; to amend Chapter 100 of the Laws of

2026 relating to making appropriations for the support of government, in relation thereto; to amend Chapter 102 of the Laws of 2026 relating to making appropriations for the support of government, in relation thereto; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Mr. Pretlow, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced.

Governor's Message is at the desk. The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: I hereby certify to an immediate vote. Kathy Hochul, Governor.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: An explanation has been requested.

Mr. Pretlow.

MR. PRETLOW: So, Madam Speaker, this extender would ensure funding for State operations and other programs through May 28th. The bill includes additional funding for institutional payroll, Medicaid payments, unemployment insurance, OPWDD services, veterans' programs and general State charges.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Palmesano.

MR. PALMESANO: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Chairman yield for a few questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chair yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yeah, absolutely. I'll yield for three questions.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chairman yields.

MR. PALMESANO: Maybe one more than that. The first question, obviously -- I won't even ask it, I see it on the board. This goes to May 28th, correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Correct.

MR. PALMESANO: Now, this being our 15th extender, what is the total amount of all the appropriations of those 15 bills?

MR. PRETLOW: Through 15 extenders it's $36.2 billion.

MR. PALMESANO: And what is the increase of this extender beyond --

MR. PRETLOW: 2.5 billion.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. I did want to ask you now, I don't know, will this -- do you think this will be our last extender or will we have to take up another one on Thursday, do you think, just to get through?

MR. PRETLOW: I'm hoping to complete the process of passing the budget by Thursday.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And just going back to some of our analogies in the past with the magnet and the metal. Has the -- has the metal dropped? Has it all come together or are we still

-- is there still some stragglers? Where are we at on the --

MR. PRETLOW: Well, we're using that same analogy. It turns out that the magnet is an electronic magnet. And as we increase the power, the magnet gets stronger so more shards are coming toward it. But we are -- we are getting there. And the other analogy, I think we're in the third inning.

MR. PALMESANO: Third inning?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: You took my next question. So do you have any - any idea -- I know we're gonna to do the TED bill next. Do you have any idea when the other bills will be introduced?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, like I said, I hope to have this budget process come to fruition by Thursday. So today's Tuesday; that gives us three days.

MR. PALMESANO: Gotcha. Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I look forward to talking to you in a few minutes.

Madam Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. PALMESANO: Madam Speaker, my colleagues, well, this is our 15th extender and hopefully our last one. It's really kind of hard to believe we've had to go this far past the deadline. But that being said, I'm certainly glad this process is starting to move. Budget bills are being printed, conversations are happening, votes are moving forward. That's a positive thing, and that's welcome news from where we were last week. But progress is not the same as

completion. And until that last budget bill is voted upon, the people we represent are still waiting. And they've waited long enough.

As we work through the remaining of the bills, I hope two things stay front and center: Number one, affordability. Because every New Yorker right now is feeling the squeeze, and this budget should be making their lives easier, and not harder. And second, safety. Because no matter -- no policy matters more than whether people feel safe in their neighborhoods and in their homes and in their communities. These are the priorities that should guide us that have been left out of the process.

I will once again obviously vote for this extender because we need to make sure our dedicated employees who do such a great job for us, providing critically important services to New Yorkers, get paid. And we will continue to push for a budget that delivers on what matters most to New Yorkers.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I vote yes.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Page 3, Rules Report No. 210, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A10008-C, Rules Report No. 210, Budget Bill. An act to amend Part U1 of Chapter 62 of the Laws of 2003, amending the Vehicle and Traffic Law and other laws relating to increasing certain motor vehicle transaction fees, in relation to the effectiveness thereof; and to amend Part B of Chapter 84 of the Laws of 2002, amending the State Finance Law relating to the costs of the Department of Motor Vehicles, in relation to the effectiveness thereof (Part A) to amend Chapter 751 of the Laws of 2005, amending the Insurance Law and the Vehicle and Traffic Law relating to establishing the Accident Prevention Course Internet Technology Pilot Program, in relation to the effectiveness thereof (Part B); intentionally omitted (Part C); to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, the General Business Law and the Public Officers Law, in relation to a demonstration program in the City of New York and the installation and operation of intelligent speed assistance devices; and providing for the repeal of certain provisions upon the expiration thereof (Part D); to amend Part FF of Chapter 55 of the Laws of 2017, relating to motor vehicles equipped with autonomous vehicle technology, in relation to the effectiveness thereof (Part E); intentionally omitted (Part F); to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, in relation to expanding the Automated Work Zone Speed Enforcement Program to include additional New York roadways (Part G); to amend Part PP of Chapter 54 of the Laws of 2016, amending the Public Authorities: Law and the General Municipal Law relating

to the New York Transit Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, in relation to extending provisions of law relating to certain tax increment financing provisions (Part H); authorizing the Metropolitan Transportation Authority to conduct environmental reviews under the State Environmental Quality Review Act for the Crosstown Extension of the Second Avenue Subway project in two stages (Part I); to amend the Agriculture and Markets Law, in relation to dairy promotion and marketing of agricultural products in New York State; and to repeal Sections 16-x, 16-y and 16-z of Section 1 of Chapter 174 of the Laws of 1968, constituting the New York State Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation thereto (Part J); to amend the Tax Law, in relation to extending the refundability of the investment tax credit for farmers (Part K); intentionally omitted (Part L); to authorize the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority to finance a portion of its research, development and demonstration, policy and planning, and Fuel NY program from an assessment on gas and electric corporations (Part M); to amend the Public Service Law, in relation to executive compensation disclosure by gas, electric, steam and waterworks corporations and costs not to be included in rates (Part N); to amend the Public Service Law, in relation to procedures for new rates or charges proposed by utilities (Part O); to amend the Public Service Law, in relation to establishing an energy affordability index (Part P); intentionally omitted (Part Q); to amend the Environmental Conservation Law, in relation to reforming the State Environmental

Quality Review Act (Part R); to amend the Environmental Conservation Law, in relation to increasing rebates for certain vehicle purchases by municipalities (Part S); to amend Chapter 584 of the Laws of 2011, amending the Public Authorities Law relating to the powers and duties of the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York relative to the establishment of subsidiaries for certain purposes, in relation to the effectiveness thereof (Part T); in relation to authorizing the trustees of the State University of New York to lease and contract to make available certain land on the State University of New York at Farmingdale's campus (Subpart A); in relation to authorizing the trustees of the State University of New York to lease and contract to make available certain land on the State University of New York at Stony Brook's campus (Subpart B); in relation to authorizing the Commissioner of Transportation to transfer and convey certain State-owned real property in the Town of Babylon, County of Suffolk (Subpart C); and in relation to authorizing the trustees of the State University of New York to lease and contract to make available grounds and facilities on the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry to the Abby Lane Housing Corporation (Subpart D) (Part U); to amend the New York State Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation to extending the authority of the New York State Urban Development Corporation to administer the Empire State Economic Development Fund (Part V); to amend Chapter 393 of the Laws of 1994, amending the New York State Urban Development Corporation Act, relating to

the powers of the New York State Urban Development Corporation to make loans, in relation to extending loan powers (Part W); intentionally omitted (Part X); to amend the General Business Law, in relation to establishing the "Safe by Design Act" (Part Y); intentionally omitted (Part Z); intentionally omitted (Part AA); to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to requiring insurers to provide explanations for certain premium changes (Part BB); intentionally omitted (Part CC); intentionally omitted (Part DD); to amend the Insurance Law and the Civil Practice Law and Rules, in relation to motor vehicle accident liability (Part EE); intentionally omitted (Part FF); to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to requiring annual reports on insurance for multi-family buildings (Part GG); to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to the annual Consumer Guide of Health Insurers (Subpart A); to amend the Insurance Law and the Public Health Law, in relation to ongoing treatment by an out-of-network provider during pregnancy (Subpart B); to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to accessible formulary drug lists (Subpart C); and to amend the Insurance Law and the Public Health Law, in relation to utilization reviews for treatment for a chronic health condition (Subpart D) (Part HH); intentionally omitted (Part II); intentionally omitted (Part JJ); to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to extending the policy period for excess profit refunds to motor vehicle policyholders (Part KK); to amend Chapter 495 of the Laws of 2004, amending the Insurance Law and the Public Health Law relating to the New York State Health Insurance Continuation

Assistance Demonstration Project, in relation to the effectiveness thereof (Part LL); intentionally omitted (Part MM); in relation to enacting the "Long Island MacArthur Airport Terminal and Rail Integration Project Act" (Part NN); to amend Part WW of Chapter 56 of the Laws of 2022 amending the Public Officers Law relating to permitting videoconferencing and remote participation in public meetings under certain circumstances, in relation to extending the provisions thereof (Part OO); exempting certain major electric generating facilities that provide emergency back-up generation for manufacturing facilities that produce semiconductors from certain siting requirements; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof (Part PP); to amend the Penal Law, in relation to criminal interference with access to a place of religious worship (Part QQ); to amend the Cleaner, Greener NY Act of 2013, in relation to the effectiveness of certain provisions thereof (Part RR); to amend the Public Service Law, in relation to enacting the Accelerate Solar for Affordable Power (ASAP) Act (Part SS); establishing the Blue Ribbon Commission on Residential Affordability through Energy Savings; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof (Part TT); to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, in relation to authorizing the creation of a Traffic Camera Violations Bureau to adjudicate owner liability for failure of operator to stop for a school bus displaying a red visual signal and stop-arm (Part UU); to amend the Environmental Conservation Law, in relation to climate change (Part VV); to amend Chapter 18 of the Laws of 2020

authorizing the Commissioner of Education to appoint a monitor to oversee the Wyandanch Union Free School District and establishing the powers and duties of such monitor, in relation to establishing a monitor team (Part WW); to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law and Education Law, in relation to certain retirement benefit enhancements (Part XX); to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to amortization and valuation methods used for contributions to the New York City Employees' Retirement System, the New York City Teachers' Retirement System, the Police Pension Fund, subchapter two, the Fire Department Pension Fund, subchapter two and the Board of Education Retirement System of such city (Part YY); to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law, in relation to service retirement of members of the New York City Fire Department Pension Fund (Part ZZ); to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to first grade firefighters and promotions from the firefighter rank (Part AAA); to require certain pension systems to submit a self-report on their financial health to the Superintendent of the Department of Financial Services; to require the Superintendent of the Department of Financial Services to submit a report on such reports; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration there of (Part BBB); to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law, in relation to allowing beneficiaries of certain deceased members to elect to receive death benefits in a lump sum (Part CCC); to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law, in relation to certain retirement benefit

enhancements (Part DDD); to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law, in relation to the treatment of prior service with certain agencies by the New York City Police Pension Fund (Part EEE); to amend the Retirement and Social Security Law, in relation to the restoration of 20-year service retirement for certain New York City corrections officers and sanitation workers (Part FFF); in relation to providing for the administration of certain funds and accounts related to the 2026-2027 budget, authorizing certain payments and transfers; to amend the State Finance Law, in relation to the School Tax Relief Fund; to amend the Private Housing Finance Law, in relation to housing program bonds and notes; to amend Part D of Chapter 389 of the Laws of 1997, relating to the financing of the Correctional Facilities Improvement Fund and the Youth Facility Improvement Fund, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for the Youth Facilities Improvement Fund; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for City University facilities; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds for library construction projects; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds for State University educational facilities; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for locally-sponsored community colleges; to amend Chapter 392 of the Laws of 1973 constituting the New York State Medical Care Facilities Finance Agency Act, in relation to the issuance of mental health services facilities improvement bonds and notes; to amend Part K of Chapter

81 of the Laws of 2002, relating to providing for the administration of certain funds and accounts related to the 2002-2003 Budget, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes to finance capital costs related to Homeland Security; to amend Chapter 174 of the Laws of 1968 constituting the Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation to financing project costs for the Office of Information Technology Services and Department of Law; to amend Chapter 329 of the Laws of 1991, amending the State Finance Law and other laws relating to the establishment of the Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund, in relation to the issuance of funds to the Thruway Authority; to amend Chapter 174 of the Laws of 1968 constituting the Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes to fund costs for Statewide equipment; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds for purposes of financing environmental infrastructure projects; to amend Part D of Chapter 389 of the Laws of 1997, relating to the financing of the Correctional Facilities Improvement Fund and the Youth Facility Improvement Fund, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for the Youth Facilities Improvement Fund; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for the purpose of financing Peace Bridge projects and capital costs of State and local highways; to amend Chapter 174 of the Laws of 1968 constituting the Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation to the issuance of bonds for economic development initiatives; to amend Part Y of Chapter 61 of the Laws of 2005, relating to providing for the

administration of certain funds and accounts related to the 2005-2006 budget, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for the purpose of financing capital projects for the Division of Military and Naval Affairs; to amend Chapter 174 of the Laws of 1968 constituting the Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation to issuance of bonds for project costs undertaken by or on behalf of the State Education Department, Special Act School Districts, State-supported Schools for the Blind and Deaf, approved private special education schools, non-public schools, community centers, day care facilities, residential camps, day camps, Native American Indian Nation schools; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for the purpose of financing the construction of the New York State Agriculture and Markets Food Laboratory; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to authorization for the issuance of bonds for the Capital Restructuring Financing Program, the Health Care Facility Transformation programs, and the Essential Health Care Provider Program; to amend Part Y of Chapter 61 of the Laws of 2005, relating to providing for the administration of certain funds and accounts related to the 2005-2006 budget, in relation to the issuance of bonds and notes for the purpose of financing capital projects for initiatives of the State Police; to amend Part D of Chapter 63 of the Laws of 2005, relating to the composition and responsibilities of the New York State Higher Education Capital Matching Grant Board, in relation to Higher Education Capital Matching Grants; to amend the State Finance Law, in relation to moneys in the Dedicated Highway

and Bridge Trust Fund; to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to increasing the cap on the amount of dormitory facility revenue bonds that can be issued; to amend Chapter 174 of the Laws of 1968 constituting the Urban Development Corporation Act, in relation to personal income tax revenue anticipation notes; to amend the State Finance Law, in relation to the calculation of total outstanding principal amount of debt; and providing for the repeal of certain provisions upon expiration thereof (Part GGG); to amend the New York City Civil Court Act, in relation to additional judges in the civil court of the City of New York (Part HHH); to amend the Public Service Law and the Public Authorities Law, in relation to establishing the Excelsior Power Program (Part III); and to authorize certain work in connection with the District Galleria project in the City of White Plains; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof (Part JJJ).

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Governor's Message is at the desk. The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: I hereby certify to an immediate vote. Kathy Hochul, Governor.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: An explanation has been requested.

Mr. Pretlow.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, Madam Speaker. Today as we continue the process of adopting the budget for State fiscal year '26-'27, the bill before us contains major components of legislation

that are necessary for the implementation of Transportation, Environment, Economic Development. This bill includes legislation to reduce utility costs for ratepayers, modify the timeline and implementation of the State's climate change goals, improve retirement benefits for members of Tier 6 and other members, and streamline the State's process for certain environmental reviews.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Palmesano.

MR. PALMESANO: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Chairman yield for some questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chair yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, I will.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. PALMESANO: Thank you, Mr. Pretlow. I'll ask -- I'll start out with what I asked in Committee. This is another budget bill. When can we expect to see the financial plan before we -- will we see the financial plan before we vote on any other bills?

MR. PRETLOW: Mr. Palmesano, the reason you haven't seen the financial plan in print now is because all the bills aren't in print. And in the off chance that one of the bills that we present, if the budget fails to pass it would make the financial plan incorrect. So after all the bills are printed we will have a financial plan for review.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And that financial plan will include all -- the All-Funds fund -- funding spending, the State

operating funds spending and the outyear budget gaps; is that correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, sir.

MR. PALMESANO: Regarding the sweeps and transfers, how much does this enacted budget increase bond gaps within the sweeps and transfers section, and how much is this over the Governor's proposal?

MR. PRETLOW: The increases are 3.5 billion.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And then the liquidity financing measure was put into law to address cash flow needs during COVID-19. Why do we continue to extend this authorization when the State's receipts are coming in higher than forecasted and we continue to see increased spending each year?

MR. PRETLOW: Repeat the question, please?

MR. PALMESANO: Sure. The liquidity financing measure that was put into law to address cash flow needs during COVID-19, why do we continue to extend this authorization when the State's receipts are coming in higher than forecasted and we continue to increase spending each year?

MR. PRETLOW: Because there's still outstanding contracts that haven't been paid and we're still catching up with them.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. I do have maybe one -- one or two brief questions on insurance reforms. The Governor has claimed that fraud and staged crashes inflate premiums by as much as $300 per year on average. Has the -- has the State Department of Financial Services provided any statistical specific act -- actuarial data

that confirms this 300 figure?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. PALMESANO: And is there anything in this budget bill that would ensure that there'll be savings for New Yorkers based on these provisions, and how that will be quantified to ensure that they will get actual reductions in premiums?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, we're -- we're judging our experiences with other states and how the moves that we're making in New York are being rep -- replicated in other states where they have decreased insurance costs.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And if there are -- well, are there gonna be any steps or mechanisms in place for the Department of Financial Services to address this if there are no savings?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, one of the -- one of the things that they're required to do is evaluate these reports, and we're gonna ensure that there are rate decreases.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: And if all else fails we're also issuing checks to all the ratepayers to help with that reduction.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: It's not in this bill.

MR. PALMESANO: All right. I have maybe one or two quick questions on the pension changes. The first question is, with these enhancements and changes that are being made, what is the

-- do we have what the overall cost to taxpayers for all pension enhancements included in this bill both for the State and for locals?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes. It's a total of -- it's 500 -- for -- just for the State it's $146.3 million.

MR. PALMESANO: And how about for locals? Do we know how much it's gonna cost them?

MR. PRETLOW: 289.9 million.

MR. PALMESANO: 389.9 million?

MR. PRETLOW: 289.9 million.

MR. PALMESANO: I'm sorry. And as you remember, and I know we brought this up when we passed Tier 6 back then we said any additional enhancements, that would be paid for by the State. Is the State gonna assume that cost or is that gonna be picked up by the local property taxpayers for these enhancements?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, I think the -- the section of law you're referring to was not withstood within -- with the legislation that we had --we had done.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Pretlow.

Now I'd like to talk about the CLCPA and some of those changes, if I may.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, you may.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick.

MR. PALMESANO: Sure. And I -- we can all agree

that I think that the utility rates are -- are sky high for New Yorkers. I know there's rebates of I think $200 per family, up to $200 per family. Is there anything -- and I know about the Rates Commission and the evaluation of the utilities. But is there anything actually in this budget bill that will actually reduce rates immediately for New York ratepayers?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, the implementation is gonna be done after an evaluation that we're doing over time.

MR. PALMESANO: All right. So the $2.4 billion that NYSERDA is sitting in in their surplus funds that was collected for the ratepayer, there's nothing in this budget bill that would (indiscernible) that and provide that relief directly back to New Yorkers, correct? Not in this bill?

MR. PRETLOW: No, that money's going towards energy efficiency programs.

MR. PALMESANO: All right. The taxes, fees, assessments and surcharges, they add up to about 20 -- sometimes in some cases 20 percent of a utility bill. Is there anything done in this budget bill to provide a suspension of those taxes and fees to provide that relief -- immediate relief to ratepayers right now?

MR. PRETLOW: We -- we don't have that number (indiscernible) the 20 percent you're referring to.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: But we are depending on with the Commission and the report that they do once they look at all -- the

entire situation.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. Anything in here that will increase or improve the supply of natural gas?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. PALMESANO: Anything in this bill that will help relieve the constraints on pipelines to relieve -- relieve natural gas to get into the system?

MR. PRETLOW: Not to my knowledge.

MR. PALMESANO: Now this bill also I know is gonna make some changes. But our current law says by 2040 we're supposed to be at net zero generation, meaning we can't use natural gas for power generation. Does this bill and the changes made to the CLCPA change that, or does that still stay in statute that by 2040 we're supposed to be at net zero generation and so you cannot use natural gas to generate energy?

MR. PRETLOW: Do you mind if I refer you to Ms. Glick for this answer?

MR. PALMESANO: Sure. That's fine. Thank you, Mr. Pretlow.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick.

MS. GLICK: Go Knicks.

MR. PALMESANO: Yes. Good to see you.

MS. GLICK: Could you repeat --

MR. PALMESANO: Sure.

MS. GLICK: -- because some of that touches on

energy.

MR. PALMESANO: Yes, absolutely, 100 percent.

I know -- I know there was [sic] changes made to the CLCPA in this -- in this budget bill. I -- I recognize that. I appreciate some of the changes that were made. But one of the ones that had stood out to me for a long time is by 2040 -- we're supposed be at net zero generation by 2040, meaning we won't be able to generate electricity with natural gas or fossil fuel. Does anything in this budget address that, or will that have -- will that still be on the books that we still have to meet that goal by 2040?

MS. GLICK: Well, I don't believe that there's any change regarding the generation.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. So we're gonna have to be at net zero generation by 2040.

In this budget bill I know there's some provisions for credits for -- tax -- for -- EV purchases for municipalities, right, and it's increasing it from 7,500 to $30,000. Is that right?

MS. GLICK: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: And why was that necessary that we do that in -- increase?

MS. GLICK: Well, I think in general we certainly understand that we want to incentivize, wherever possible, people moving away from fossil fuels.

MR. PALMESANO: Sure. And who's responsible for paying for that -- that credit? That goes that through NYSERDA,

right?

MS. GLICK: The EPF. That's within the Environmental Protection Fund.

MR. PALMESANO: So all these funds are gonna be paid with State dollars? There's no coming from -- it's not coming from NYSERDA through assessments on ratepayers' bills? You're saying this is all going through the EPF and not coming from ratepayers?

MS. GLICK: This would come through the EPF.

MR. PALMESANO: So it's all State taxpayer dollars. It's not going on increased rates like NYSERDA when they do their assessments; is that correct?

MS. GLICK: That's correct.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

These amendments I know adjust an accounting of -- of methane emissions from 20 years to 100 years; is that correct?

MS. GLICK: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: And we seem to be moving away from the original 70 by 30 target towards now a 60 by 40 target for greenhouse gas emissions; is that correct?

MS. GLICK: Correct.

MR. PALMESANO: Do you think this change really is kind of an admission that the original methodology overstated our emission impacts and created unnecessary pressure --

MS. GLICK: No, I wouldn't --

MR. PALMESANO: -- pressure on energy costs and reliability for New Yorkers?

MS. GLICK: No, I wouldn't say that at all.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. So we're loosening reporting requirements in some cases and pushing back regulation development, too, correct?

MS. GLICK: We are making some changes in this bill.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And this kind of goes along with what the changes we need to make to the electrification mandates, the All-Electric Buildings Act, correct?

(Conferencing)

MS. GLICK: I think it primarily reflects a change in the State energy plan, and that's why the reporting requirement.

MR. PALMESANO: All right. And I saw in this language of the bill that the DEC has the ability to do some analysis and see -- look at the feasibility of the Cap and Invest Program. So there will be an analy -- it's up to the DEC to analyze this and see if it's feasible to implement; is that correct?

MS. GLICK: It's one way in which we can move the State forward, but it is not in this bill required.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And then also I see that there's language requiring the DEC to assess the affordability, feasibility and economic growth in the context of the CLCPA mandates; is that correct?

MS. GLICK: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: And does the DEC have to report back any of these findings? How does that work? They do these studies and then they have to share it with us, or they just do it on their own, or how is that gonna work exactly?

MS. GLICK: Well, they will be putting forth regulations by the end of 2028, and presumably much of this discussion will be part of the regulatory process.

MR. PALMESANO: So we should have that information if there's affordability problems, feasibility problems, reliability problems. Before we put those regulations in place we should have a full vetting of this, right?

MS. GLICK: Well, I -- I think that in the incoming couple of years we will see a great many innovations because that's what business does. So I think that what we envision today may be very different in a year or two.

MR. PALMESANO: Wouldn't it be wise -- and I mentioned this with the electric school bus mandate. Now that we're trying to push back some of the timelines a little bit, make some modifications, which I appreciate, wouldn't now be the right time to do a thorough full cost-benefit analysis to measure what the cost -- the true costs are gonna be to ratepayers, for families? And also to do a true feasibility study working with the NYISO, working with utilities, work with the Public Service Commission, the Department of Public -- to see if this can be done? Shouldn't we do these things first before

we go out and fully implement the provisions of the CLCPA? Wouldn't now be the time to do that to show the ratepayers of the State how much it's gonna truly cost them, how feasible this is from a reliability perspective and from a practical perspective? Wouldn't that be the right thing to do with this process?

MS. GLICK: I'm sorry, every time you take a breath I thought it's the end of the question. But I --

MR. PALMESANO: How about this? Shouldn't we do a feas -- a cost-benefit --

MS. GLICK: I got the question. I get it.

MR. PALMESANO: -- a feasibility study before we implement the CLCP [sic] requirements that are necessary to show the ratepayers?

MS. GLICK: Well, in my -- in my humble opinion, when we look at all of the costs that are facing New Yorkers, we should also include the cost to the State for dealing with extreme weather events that we've seen increasing over the last several years and which will no doubt continue to increase. And I think that we also need to look at what the issue is regarding insurance costs to individuals and taxpayers, both as those who are paying to recover from storms and those who may or may not be able to get insurance based on extreme weather that we are seeing. So I -- I believe that we should always look at both sides of the ledger when we're discussing what the costs are and the impact for State residents.

MR. PALMESANO: Sure. Sure. And I have no

problem with that, but as long as we're telling them what the true dollar cost is.

I'd like to pivot to the -- the Blue Ribbon Commission on Residential -- the Rates Commission.

MS. GLICK: That would be somebody else.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. So I might be bouncing back and forth depending on some of this. But anyway, on that provision, in the one-House budget there was Minority appointments. I don't see any Minority appointments in this. Is there -- is there any reason why there are no Minority appointments like this? Because this seems like a significant issue. Even with the CLCPA we had Minority appointments.

MR. PRETLOW: Mr. Palmesano, I know you're aware in our Assembly one-House budget we did --

MR. PALMESANO: Yes.

MR. PRETLOW: -- include Minority representation, but in the negotiating process that -- that part was eliminated. Not that we wanted to eliminate it, but it was eliminated.

MR. PALMESANO: I -- I -- I certainly believe you on that point, Mr. Pretlow.

One part in this Commission thing kind of stood out to me. It says any person employed by a utility corporation or employed by a corporation that owns or operates an electric plant or any current consultant, advisor, board member or any other person similarly affiliated with such corporation shall not be eligible to be

appointed to this Blue Ribbon Commission. Why are we not allowing people who own power plants? People who understand transmission? People who understand generation? People who understand utilities and pipelines and wires and poles and substations? Why are they not allowed to be part of this Commission? Wouldn't it make more sense --

MR. PRETLOW: As I know you're aware, one of the longstanding crit -- criticisms of the -- of most of these boards is that they're stocked with insiders; utility company insiders that know the players and are usually more -- treat the industry more favorably than they treat the individuals, the ratepayers. This is an attempt to ensure that regular people who are not -- or people that are not connected with the industry in their past to be in charge of setting rates for individuals.

MR. PALMESANO: I -- Mr. Pretlow, I can appreciate your attempt to answer that question from that perspective. But, you know, the CLCPA was loaded with State agency heads who really who didn't understand energy generation, how the utility system works. We had advocates who were pushing for these green mandates. Why wouldn't we want expertise? If we're gonna put this -- if we wanna reduce rates for New Yorkers, why would we not include expertise from the industry? And they would just be one voice. They wouldn't control it, because obviously (indiscernible) from the appointments, they'd be overwhelmed just like they were on the CLCPA. And my argument is, thank God we had those Minority

appointments and we had people with energy industry expertise on that panel. Otherwise, the CLCPA would have been much more of a disaster than it already is. Shouldn't we have energy expertise? Why did the -- the Majorities and the Governor say they don't want -- it almost seems like they want to rubber stamp whatever you want to do.

MR. PRETLOW: Well, there is a requirement for them to have expertise for their membership on -- on this Commission. It's just that we're saying it cannot be former employees -- I'm sorry, current employees.

MR. PALMESANO: Right. But you can't have power plant owners. So where are you gonna get the expertise? I mean -- so -- and when I read a little further, there is issues with utilities but they don't -- you can't work for them to understand how the system works.

MR. PRETLOW: I -- I don't know how former power plant owners are eliminated from that. I know we're -- the requirements for eligibility are an academic expertise or a professional expertise in utility regulations and oversight; utility management; administration and compliance; energy or public utility law; commodity market and energy market regulations; reliability and adequacy of bulk power transmission systems; Federally-designated bulk -- bulk transmission operators; and macroeconomics.

MR. PALMESANO: What about the NYISO? Shouldn't the NYISO be on this Commission? Obviously they're the ones that deal with making sure the lights stay on, the power stays on.

Wouldn't the NYISO be a part of this Commission?

MR. PRETLOW: As far as I know, yes, they're not precluded.

MR. PALMESANO: They have to be appointed by one of those designees to be on the board [sic], right?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: So if they're not then their voice would be quiet, right?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, they have to be appointed, yes.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

Relative to -- I got one question I wanna ask you about, nuclear, if I may. You know, the Governor has expressed support for expanding nuclear power generation in -- in the State by 5 gigawatts of capacity. If we're really serious about meeting our CLCPA goals, it seems -- why does this budget seem to ignore any development of nuclear and zero-emission nuclear power sources, a reliable base load generation. Wouldn't it be better -- shouldn't there be some focus on that, or do you think that's not part of this?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, that is really in the -- in the future. The costs involved with nuclear generation are enormous. Every project, I believe, in this country has always come in over budget by -- by not millions, but billions of dollars. And it's something that -- it's on the back burner. Yes, the Governor is saying that we should do this within the ten-year period. But as it is right

now we're looking at more conventional methods of power generation.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. I wanna ask you a question, if I may, too -- I'm sure there's some other questions on the nuclear side, maybe, possibly. On the -- the semiconductor backup power, it seems like the budget provides an exemption from the State's power plant siting review process for major electric generating facilities that provide backup power to manufacturing facilities that produce semiconductor chips. Currently, what review must take place for these electric generating facilities under Article 10 of the Public Service Law?

MR. PRETLOW: I think they've already gotten approval.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. How -- do we know how many manufacturing facilities produce semiconductor chips in New York State?

MR. PRETLOW: I do not.

MR. PALMESANO: Is this provision specifically designed to assess -- assist the Micron project in Central New York? Will they benefit from this project?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: They will. Okay.

When you talk about -- I know one part of the provision deals with utility profits and return on equity. How do you expect -- isn't a lot of that already governed -- governed by law already?

MR. PRETLOW: No. I don't believe so. I'm not a lawyer.

MR. PALMESANO: I know. Because you talk about creating an affordability index, which -- how are they gonna decide how these utilities make a process -- profit? And the federal government decided long ago to allow utilities to be profitable. If not profitable, why would they be in business, then?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: As far as I know we're not interfering with that.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. And is it your contention that this rates commission, although not having expertise across the board, is gonna deliver real ratepayer relief to citizens?

MR. PRETLOW: No, they will have expertise across the board.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay. But just not -- (indiscernible) generation or that work for utility company.

MR. PRETLOW: It's people that are currently employed in the industry.

MR. PALMESANO: Will this Commission be able to evaluate the taxes, fees, assessments and surcharges that are on our bills?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. PALMESANO: Okay.

Mr. Pretlow, thanks for your time.

I'm gonna use the remainder of my time to go on the bill, if I may.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. PALMESANO: Yes, Madam Speaker. A few quick things in the provisions I didn't talk about that I like. I like the fact that we put the Death Gamble in this legislation to protect our corrections officers. We've been advocating for that. I like the fact that we did the 20-year reinstatement for our New York City -- retirement reinstatement for New York City corrections officers to match the police department -- New York City Police Department and the New York Fire -- City Fire Department. That will certainly help with recruitment and retention. I like that we are making some changes to the CLCPA. It's something we've been talking about, something we've been telling you that needed to be made. The auto insurance thing I'd just like to talk on real quick is that these liability -- the changes to liability issues and fraud. We need to make sure -- and I haven't seen any quantification on how this will result in actual savings for New Yorkers. We need to make sure that it does happen. On the pension system, I understand we're lowering the age group -- the retirement age for one group but not everyone else. Not -- not the janitor, not the maintenance worker, not the laborer. And the other thing is, we -- we made a promise back in 2011 that the State would pick up any enhancement costs for our localities. We made some improvements earlier in 2021 and 2022. Those bills weren't picked up. (Indiscernible) those utilities -- those ratepayers and those local

municipalities have already seen that happen. I like the fact that we are changing to a 100-year methodology, which makes sense. I like the fact that we can deal with the Cap and Invest delays and delaying the CLCPA. And I like the fact that DEC can consider affordability, reliability and feasibility moving forward. I think these are some of the things that we'll see liked. But the fact of the matter is there's still no financial plan. We need a fiscal plan. And I think there are still some things missing. There's no direct ratepayer relief in this budget bill. Yes, there's a $200 rebate, but in and of itself it's not enough. No refund of the $2.4 billion that the ratepayers have already paid for this. Give them some direct relief. Suspend some of these taxes, fees and surcharges that accompany about 20 percent of the bill. People want direct ratepayer relief now. They don't want to subsidize someone's EV purchase, someone's electric heat pump or electric lawn mower. And this budget bill kind of expands upon that from 7,500 to 33,000. Really? Are we listening? There's nothing in this bill that expands natural gas or encourages the supply of natural gas. Nothing to deal with the pipeline constraints for natural gas. Nothing to increase air permits to build new natural gas. Nothing to slow down the electrification mandates. And in fact in 2021 we've had two denials for permits for new natural gas power plants. It's these green -- I know the natural gas power (indiscernible) are going up and you cite that, but it's because of the green mandates that are making it more difficult. The NYISO who's charged with taking the -- turning the lights on and making sure the lights stay on and the power stays on

have said this. We've said this. Despite the fact that we've been telling you this. By 2040 we still now, based on this law, have to have no generation come from natural gas, despite the fact that 60 percent of New Yorkers heat their homes with natural gas; 40 percent of our generation comes from natural gas. And natural gas has always been referred to as a bridge fuel, and the technology doesn't exist yet to get to where -- we talk about advanced nuclear, carbon capture, sequestration and renewable and natural gas. Those types of things. The technology is not there yet. So why are we just looking to dismantle natural gas? We don't tear build -- tear down a bridge before you build a new one. And I see constantly the blaming of the utilities' failure to take responsibility for the policies -- these green policy mandates that you keep implementing. Like I said, these delays are good. But remember, just recently there was a report coming out saying if we don't make more significant changes, utility prices will go up to over $4,000 for New Yorkers. Price of a pump of gas -- a gallon of gas at the pump is gonna be $2.23 a gallon more than what it is. Diesel, $2.41 more than what it is. Small- and medium-size commercial businesses, 46 percent higher and a 60 percent increase in delivery truck operations. This is not sustainable. This is not affordable. And the total cost of this whole program is more than a quarter-of-a-trillion dollars. Some say as much as a half-a-trillion dollars. That's more than our total State budget. And the -- the fact that we don't have appointments on this committee [sic] is mind-blowing to me. The fact that we're gonna take out people who have

expertise in the industry, from power generation, from transmission, to understanding how the utilities work. Someone who understands. I don't understand where we're going for that. These -- we want reliable base load generation. We need to make sure there's people on this Commission that really has that. We had that on the CLCPA, but we don't seem to have it now. And we doubled down on that language not to allow those people with that expertise. It's almost like you just want a rubber stamp for your failed policies. You don't want someone to come out and voice opposition or an honest discussion of how bad these policies are for affordability. How bad these policies are for reliability. We need to do better. We need to be smarter. And having a broad diverse of opinion would help us make this policy more effective and make sure it's an affordable, reliable, feasible energy plan. So again, just passing that on. We need to look at the feasibility studies, the cost-benefit analysis. And I'm glad the DEC can look at this, but we should be doing an independent agency outside to do a true cost analysis. If this is such a good thing, let's say how much it's gonna cost New York's seniors, veterans, disabled in true dollars and cents for our business. Let's do a feasibility study, true feasibility and show the grid can handle it. Show -- work with the utilities. Work with the NYISO. Work with the -- the power -- the Public Service Commission to show that it can work. Because it's not working. The NYISO has already sent the red flag, and we're looking at that more and more problematic because the work is not being done. It's not being thorough enough. I'm just afraid we don't have the expertise on

there. And I know this is all being done in the name of climate change and global emissions. But may I remind my colleagues, New York only contributes .4 percent of global emissions. .4 percent. China is 30 percent and has 1,000 coal plants and building more every day. And I remind you, this is not so much green policy. The only thing green about it is what it's gonna cost in increased ratepayer dollars and increased taxes. And it's not so clean. And I've talked about it in the past regarding the EV batteries. The cobalt and the lithium using child labor in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, mining for the cobalt to power the electric vehicles. Poisoning water, rivers and streams in the -- the Lithium Triangle of Argentina. It's almost like it's okay if it's not happening here. For these disadvantaged communities, they're the ones that are gonna pay the brunt of it. We need to move forward because I think the policies in this House continue to look to -- to dismantle the affordable, reliable natural gas infrastructure supply and delivery system. It's designed to take away consumer choice on how you heat your home, cook your food, power your building. It will jeopardize the reliability of the grid, leading to dangerous and deadly blackouts. And it will continue our nation-leading outmigration of more families, farmers, small businesses and manufacturers leaving the State. I assure you, myself, our Conference and more smart New Yorkers will continue to push for a commonsense energy policy that prioritizes energy affordability, reliability, feasibility, safety, fuel diversity and energy choice. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, New Yorkers deserve nothing less.

I will be voting in the negative on this. I know some of my colleagues may vote yes because of --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Palmesano.

MR. PALMESANO: -- (indiscernible). But I vote no and urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Smullen.

MR. SMULLEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question. Is this a -- is this bill on a Message of Necessity?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Yes.

MR. SMULLEN: Great. Thank you so much.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: A Governor's Message, yes.

MR. SMULLEN: Would the Chair yield for some questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chairman yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, thank you very much, Chair. Since we're here on a Message of Necessity, what is the urgency for the policy of the CLCPA provisions that's in the budget?

MR. PRETLOW: We're trying to get a budget passed by May 29th, so we have a Message of Necessity to ensure that these

bills go through this Body in a expedited manner.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, certainly an expedited manner, but in the absence of -- of hearings. Our hearings for this were actually earlier in the year, and the changes that we're actually put forth in this Body today are actually policy provisions, not budget provisions. They don't have much to do with the budget other than people's family budgets around the State who are -- who can't afford to live in New York State.

So let's talk a little bit about some of the policy things. Is one of the drivers of the CLCPA changes the fact that New York's electricity prices are some of the highest in the nation?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, one of the drivers of this C -- CP -- CLCPA is environment and clean air.

MR. SMULLEN: So it's clean air. It's not actually the fact that people are having to pay for unaffordable electricity rates. Did you know that New York has the fifth-highest rates in the nation, 29 cents per kilowatt hour as of today?

MR. PRETLOW: Repeat that, please. I couldn't hear you. Sorry. Could you repeat the question, please? I did not hear you.

MR. SMULLEN: Yes. Did -- did you know that New York has the fifth-highest electricity cost in the nation at 29 cents per kilowatt hour?

MR. PRETLOW: It wouldn't surprise me.

MR. SMULLEN: And is -- are those costs, are they

worth the carbon savings that have been done by the CLCPA?

MR. PRETLOW: What we're trying to do with this bill is energy affordability and make changes in the process in which utilities raise rates and make sure that the rates are not exorbitant.

MR. SMULLEN: So the utilities raise the rates?

MR. PRETLOW: Pardon?

MR. SMULLEN: So the utilities raise the rates?

MR. PRETLOW: They've always raised their rates.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, don't they do that at the -- under the direction of the Public Service Commission?

MR. PRETLOW: And -- and what we're doing is giving the Public Service Commission more authority to look into what's behind those rate increases. How much --

MR. SMULLEN: So how can we bring those rates down?

MR. PRETLOW: Can I answer the question, please, sir? You know, how much they're charging the customer for their advertising, which we're now eliminating. How much they're charging for them and hiring lobbyists, which we're eliminating. Things like that that have normally gone into their -- their ratemaking process we're taking away, which gives them less of an ability to raise rates.

MR. SMULLEN: So let's go back to the rules and regulations about the percentages for carbon emissions by 2040 versus 2030. I see that it's been reduced from 70 to 60. Is that gonna help

bring down electricity rates?

MR. PRETLOW: I believe so.

MR. SMULLEN: And why is that?

MR. PRETLOW: Because less -- less emissions brings down less pollution. Less pollution gives us cleaner air. Cleaner air gives us longer lives.

MR. SMULLEN: Wow. Are those -- are these new goals, are they achievable?

MR. PRETLOW: We do believe so, yes.

MR. SMULLEN: Okay. And what is the cost-benefit analysis that was done --

MR. PRETLOW: I do not have -- I do not have --

MR. SMULLEN: -- that led to this policy change?

MR. PRETLOW: Smarter people than me came up with a lot of these things. I don't have that.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, thank you for -- for that admission. Because I don't know what the -- what the possibilities are because it's never been a transparent process. And this bill today, this policy in the budget, any changes to the membership of the Climate Action Council?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. SMULLEN: No. So the Chairs are who?

MR. PRETLOW: The -- the Chairs that are -- they're the same Chairs as they -- they were then.

MR. SMULLEN: And that would be the --

MR. PRETLOW: I don't know them personally and I do not know their names.

MR. SMULLEN: The -- the Commissioner DEC and the head of NYSERDA?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SMULLEN: So in this bill, actually, though, and just reading through it, you know, it says here that it's directing the DEC to consider the feasibility of a market-based Cap and Invest Program; is that true?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SMULLEN: So they're going to review the feasibility of a program, the head of a -- of a State agency that's -- that's appointed by the Governor, and then they're gonna be the ones to oversee the implementation of it. Isn't that a conflict of interest?

MR. PRETLOW: We don't believe so.

MR. SMULLEN: No? How not -- how so not if someone who is making up the rules then has to implement the rules?

MR. PRETLOW: This isn't a nuance. We've -- we've often had agencies look at other agencies.

MR. SMULLEN: Okay. So, you know, DEC is being given this -- this responsibility. Shouldn't DEC have had this responsibility all along? It's been since 2019. I was here on the floor when the CLCPA passed.

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. We're not giving -- we're

telling them they have to do it, they just have to consider it.

MR. SMULLEN: Okay. Well, we'll take that suggestion to the State agency to be something that would be directed, I would -- I would assume.

So let's talk a little bit about some more of the provisions that aren't in here in the CLCPA. Was there any -- any consideration in the policy in the budget to actually repeal something like the Climate Superfund Act that we passed last year, the $500 million green slush fund?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. SMULLEN: No. So we're not gonna -- we're not gonna give them -- what about the Environmental Bond Act? $5 billion that we're borrowing on behalf of New York State's taxpayers to put towards green initiatives. Was that considered to be repealed in this -- in this effort?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, the Bond Act raised money for us to implement a lot of the changes that we're looking at.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, certainly raising money is one thing, but paying it back is certainly another. It -- it does have to be paid back with interest the last time I checked.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, but this was voter approved. It's a voter-approved expenditure.

MR. SMULLEN: Okay. Well, thank you so much, Chair. I appreciate the -- the questions.

Madam Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. SMULLEN: So here we are in 2026 tapping the brakes on a bad bill that was passed in 2019 because reality has caught up with this State and its green mandates. The green new scam that's been promulgated on New York State's taxpayers, on its businesses is coming to an end because it's unsustainable.

Electricity rates are through the roof. Rates for things like gasoline, for propane, for natural gas, for diesel fuel are driving small businesses right out of the State. They're driving large businesses out of the State because it's unsustainable. And it's a real shame that this Body is now trying to cover its tracks with some revisions eight years later when in reality this was a bad deal to start with. And it doesn't go far enough. We ought to repeal the CLCPA. We ought to give back to the citizens not through gimmicks like this, but give them the real chance to run businesses, to raise their families in the State.

Since this bill has been passed, over a million people have left Upstate New York. The rural communities that I represent have been decimated by higher costs and they're gonna continue to do so. New York has some of the highest electricity costs in the nation when, in fact, we're closing down nuclear plants. We're having to string an electric line from Hydro-Québec to New York City to replace shuttered nuclear plants. And we're making it more expensive because we're not allowing the natural gas to be fracked. We're not allowing pipelines to cross New York State to bring energy to market

at reasonable costs.

So we wonder why this is happening. Well, there is a reason: It's bad policy. And bad policy has always been in the budget in this State. Here we are on a Message of Necessity saying we need to change bad policy that we have put forth, but we're gonna try to do it under the cover of a rushed process where there's no public hearings. Where there's no opportunity for the public to be heard. Where there's no opportunity for State commissioners to be questioned by the representatives of the people. That is wrong, it's bad policy, and for that reason I will be voting no on this bad bill.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the sponsor yield for some questions, please?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MR. PRETLOW: For Mr. Slater, absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MR. SLATER: Thank you very much, Chairman. I appreciate the time. Just some clarifying questions on a couple of aspects of the bill before us today. I just want to confirm, I heard a couple of things about nuclear; nuclear power generation. So the Governor has signaled support for expansion of nuclear power. Is there anything in this particular budget bill that speaks to that

expansion of nuclear power generation?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. SLATER: Is there anything in this bill that speaks to supporting communities that are going through the decommissioning of nuclear power plants in their community?

MR. PRETLOW: Nothing.

MR. SLATER: Nothing. Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. And I apologize, I am gonna bounce around a little bit on different topics.

If we can, I'd like to go over to the SEQR amendments that are being proposed in regards to housing.

MR. PRETLOW: Yup.

MR. SLATER: This budget loosens the requirements and exempts certain housing constructions from these regulations. Can you define for me what housing constructions?

MR. PRETLOW: Housing on previously disturbed land with water and sewer connections are exempt from SEQR. Everything else remains the same.

MR. SLATER: And is there a new --

MR. PRETLOW: In New York City, 200 -- it's 250 units or 500 dwelling units in a densely-zoned area. And for the rest of the State it's 20 dwelling units in municipalities with no zoning, 100 dwelling units in municipalities with zoning, and 300 dwelling units in Census-defined urban areas.

MR. SLATER: And so when you say "zoning", can

you maybe be a little more specific? So if --

MR. PRETLOW: Zoning. You know, some communities like where I live there are commercial zones, three-family zones, and some communities don't have those zoning.

MR. SLATER: Right. So any type of zoning that a municipality has established, whether it's residential, commercial, then it would apply to the specifications of the number of units. Is that what you're saying?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SLATER: Understood. And we have a new definition on previously-disturbed site; is that correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SLATER: Can you explain to us what that definition entails?

MR. PRETLOW: I thought I just did. It's a -- a site that's -- has water and sewer hookups or it's determined by a municipality or lead agency. Has building or improvements two years prior to application. Is next to another previously-disturbed parcel if not in a Census urban area. It's not in a 100-year flood plan, flood hazard area or a coastal erosion hazard area, and is not used for agricultural purposes in three of the previous five years.

MR. SLATER: Thank you very much. And you also have a new definition for small community water system; is that accurate?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SLATER: Can you explain to us what that definition is? And mostly curious on how we were able to identify the small community water system as a part of these reforms.

MR. PRETLOW: Well, it's a standard definition. I don't have it at the tip of my tongue. Maybe Ms. Glick could answer that? Or maybe not.

MR. SLATER: I'm happy to repeat the question.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick.

MS. GLICK: Yes, repeat the question.

MR. SLATER: Thank you very much. The -- the question goes to the definition of a small community water system. I'm just curious if you can explain to us what that entails, and I'm also curious how we identified this specific issue as part of the reforms.

MS. GLICK: Are you seeking to determine if there is a population level?

MR. SLATER: I'm just seeking to understand what qualifies as a small community water system and why it was inserted into these reforms.

MS. GLICK: Well, I think just to make it consistent. It is an existing DOH -- DOH oversees drinking water. So I presume that this is about making it consistent with their regulations.

MR. SLATER: Understood. And similarly for public school facilities. That's a new definition, my understanding, as part of these reforms. But it -- is it --

MS. GLICK: It's New York City only.

MR. SLATER: I wanted to understand why New York City only.

MS. GLICK: I would imagine that it's about being able to find locations for school sites where you would have a large number of children coming in on a daily basis.

MR. SLATER: Understood. But child care facilities have been removed as a construction project which can be exempt from these new requirements; is that accurate?

MS. GLICK: Yes.

MR. SLATER: Do we know whys we removed child care facilities?

MS. GLICK: Well, they're generally significantly smaller than schools.

MR. SLATER: I appreciate the answer.

The amendments require the lead agency to make a determination regarding an initial SEQR determination within one year and an EIS statement within two years. But it also speaks to some limited extensions. Can you help us define what those limited extensions are? Is that a number? You only get three extensions, or how does something like that work?

MS. GLICK: I don't think that there is -- the whole interplay of why you would want to have some timeline would be to move a --a project forward. But sometimes, and this has been the case in many instances, where there's insufficient details from the developer. And so this is to balance those two things that, yes, we

wanna make sure that we have an expeditious review, but by the same token, we want to be certain that there is, in fact, full information available. And so there might need to be an extension in order to ensure that that gaming of the -- the system --

MR. SLATER: And I -- and I appreciate that. Having been a town supervisor and dealt with the process, running into similar situations, I do appreciate the effort there. So is the applicant the one who is going to be applying for the extension, or is it the municipality or the lead agency that applies for the extension?

MS. GLICK: I think that in that instance it's -- it probably could be either and would be a matter of working cooperatively.

MR. SLATER: And who are they applying to?

MS. GLICK: Well, the designated lead agency.

MR. SLATER: And so if a planning board is the lead agency and it's a collaborative effort between the applicant and municipality to apply for the extension, then the municipality is essentially applying to itself?

MS. GLICK: It is really about allowing -- the planning board could just deny it, right?

MR. SLATER: Right.

MS. GLICK: So it really is about allowing the applicant more time.

MR. SLATER: Okay. I understand. And there's no -- but there's no -- even though we say there's limited extensions,

there's no timeline on that limitation --

MS. GLICK: No.

MR. SLATER: -- and no limited extension application. You don't -- you don't get -- it's not three strikes and you're out.

MS. GLICK: You don't have three tickets and you -- you use them up.

MR. SLATER: Okay. Understood. And does that also apply for after an approval is given? Because oftentimes an approval can be given, but an application then has to continually go back for the extension of those approvals. Does the same -- does the same apply there?

MS. GLICK: It's -- it's not any different than what currently happens.

MR. SLATER: Okay. I appreciate that.

How much of the State is currently covered by the FEMA 100-year flood plain or is part of a special flood hazard area?

MS. GLICK: I -- I don't have that information. It changed, actually. I'm just thinking about my own district.

MR. SLATER: Right.

MS. GLICK: It's moved a few blocks in from the Hudson River than it would have been, you know, ten years ago. So I think that's -- that is one of the challenges, that it's continuing to, particularly in areas that have a lot of shoreline.

MR. SLATER: Understood. And -- and on the

environmental front. For areas that are dealing with water reservoirs, drinking water sources -- specifically I'm -- I'm personally thinking about New York City's watershed, specifically east of Hudson, west of Hudson. Are there special considerations given to those areas that this could be applied to in regards to the overall process of an application because of the additional requirements that are put on applicants through the DEP?

MS. GLICK: Well, my sense is that where there are these sensitive reservoirs that there are buff -- buffer zones already in place, and I think that water sufficiency is one of the issues that has been retained.

MR. SLATER: But going back to -- and I -- and I agree with you. But going back to the issue of the extensions, a lot of times applicants, especially in the Hudson Valley that deal with DEP, those applications have to go through another level of scrutiny because of the fact that they're in the watershed. And so is there anything that speaks to tying, again, the extension process that we talked about earlier with the additional review that's required currently? Do any of the reforms in the bill try to streamline that process?

MS. GLICK: I don't believe so. And personally, I would hope not.

MR. SLATER: Okay.

MS. GLICK: Because drinking water is increasingly a challenge, and we should, and I believe do, continue to protect

drinking water.

MR. SLATER: And I completely understand that. And again, as someone who's gone through the process I just know that that was a hurdle that I've heard from many, and I wasn't sure if the proposals today addressed any of that. But I appreciate your answers to my questions.

If I could pivot over to a Public Protection issue.

MS. GLICK: Thank you very much.

MR. SLATER: Thank you, Ms. Glick.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Pretlow.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SLATER: Safe by Design Act. I just have a few questions on that. This bill includes a provision to increase the security requirements for minors on social media platforms.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SLATER: And I'm personally glad that we're taking this step because of how critically important it is to protect kids online. I've got two kids myself, and -- and always something that I'm concerned about. But kids are kids, and as those of us who have them know all too well, what safeguards are there to ensure social media platforms prevent kids from getting around the requirements without their parents knowing?

MR. PRETLOW: I guess there are similar protocols that are in place for determining if underage individuals are on gaming sites, or if underage people are on sites that sell alcoholic beverages.

And if -- and if that's found out then the parents are notified that there's a suspicion that their children are on websites that were not approved by the parents.

MR. SLATER: Who's notifying the parents? So would I be getting notified by a social media company?

MR. PRETLOW: The app is supposed to do it.

MR. SLATER: The app?

MR. PRETLOW: Yeah. That's beyond me. Don't get me into apps because I'm not there. But the companies that run the apps are the ones that are responsible for notifying the parents.

MR. SLATER: And so if I could just ask a clarifying question on -- on -- and forgive me, Chairman -- but on -- in regards to the apps. So these are all social media apps that are publicly available; so, YouTube, Snapchat, Facebook, Insta, Twitter. All the other ones that I don't really --

MR. PRETLOW: Don't forget Myspace. Yes.

MR. SLATER: And of course Myspace. The most important one.

(Laughter)

Well done, Mr. Chairman.

We also know that -- I also have a concern about predators. How will social media platforms ensure that people aren't pretending to be minors to gain access to the ability to interact with minors on these platforms?

MR. PRETLOW: I know there's all sorts of

algorithms in place that use -- that's -- to take that. But the Attorney General has responsibility over that enforcement.

MR. SLATER: Understood. Thank you.

If I could pivot to workforce questions in regard to the unfunded liability restructure that's being proposed here. This bill will allow New York City to amortize their unfunded accrued liabilities for various New York City pension funds; is that accurate?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes. It's moving. Yes, that was part of the aid that was given to the City to help them with their deficit.

MR. SLATER: In a time of the fiscal crisis that we see the City with budget shortfalls and gaps, why are we approving a save now, pay later gimmick that will make the City pay more later with its current financial headwinds?

MR. PRETLOW: This is something that New York City had -- had requested. This was what your side had called a bailout in previous debates that we said was just giving them the ability to save money. It's similar to a mortgage, you know, or a -- or a bond. You -- they're allowed to make the payments, the actuarial payments that are required, but instead of doing it all in one step it's being spread over a number of years.

MR. SLATER: So it's like refinancing your mortgage, right, essentially?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. SLATER: Has the City done this before?

MR. PRETLOW: I believe so, but I'm not -- I'm not sure.

MR. SLATER: We -- so, well, you can't answer --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Slater.

Ms. Walsh.

MR. SLATER: Thank you very much for the questions and clarifications, Mr. Chairman. And Ms. Glick.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will Chair Pretlow please yield?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chair yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, I will.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chairman yields.

MS. WALSH: Thank you so much. So my question have to do with Part EE, elephant-elephant, litigation reductions, that section. So I don't know if you need to bring anybody in or defer to anybody else, but that's what I'm gonna be talking about.

MR. PRETLOW: Okay.

MS. WALSH: This part -- as you're assembling your team -- this part intends to reduce litigation associated with auto insurance claims by tightening the definition of serious injury, limiting noneconomic damages in certain circumstances, and barring recovery of damages for personal injury in certain circumstances.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So taking that one at a time. By tightening the definition of serious injury, do you have any concerns that some New Yorkers with soft tissue injuries would lose their right to seek damages?

MR. PRETLOW: Not being a doctor nor a lawyer, I don't feel qualified to answer that. I only know that it removes the 9180 standard.

MS. WALSH: Well, I -- I think specifically there are -- there are those of us who are concerned about people who, for example, suffer a TBI, or a traumatic brain injury, in the course of an -- of an accident, that that would be a -- a 9180 claim currently. Is there some other mechanism that has been incorporated into this section of the bill or any -- any other place that's gonna allow people like that to be able to recover for their injuries?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, I believe there are other sections of law that cover that.

MS. WALSH: Like, for example, what?

MR. PRETLOW: I can read you one of my notes.

MS. WALSH: Please, yeah. Thank you.

MR. PRETLOW: A medically-determined injury or an impairment of a nonpermanent nature which prevents the injured person from performing substantially all of the material acts which constitutes that person's usual and customary daily activities for not less than 90 days during a 180-day period immediately following the

occurrence of the injury or impairment. And the cat -- categories of serious injury that remain unchanged are death, dismemberment, significant disfigurement, fracture, loss of a fetus, permanent loss or use of body organs, permanent or consequential limitation of body organ, members or significant limitation of use of bodily functions or systems.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So out of that whole list that you just read, which was what 9180 used to cover, would you think, then, that -- that this would -- something like a traumatic brain injury would fall under an organ? It -- that the brain would be considered an organ or something? Because I've never (indiscernible) about that.

MR. PRETLOW: I would think that the brain is an organ.

MS. WALSH: You think it's --

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Okay. All right. Well, I don't -- well I'm not disputing that it's -- that it's that. I -- I just have never seen a case come through in that way under this. So maybe -- maybe this bill will create a whole new line of cases that we're not familiar with. But I am personally very concerned that people with traumatic brain injuries are going to be adversely impacted by this new definition of serious injury. But we can move on, absolutely.

So given -- pardon me. Under the second part which is talking about limiting noneconomic damage to $100,000 in the case of a serious injury, given infla -- how did we come up with the figure

of $100,000 as a cap on noneconomic damages?

MR. PRETLOW: That -- that was part of the negotiation. But those limited to the $100,000 are who were driving uninsured vehicle or when the driver is impaired at the time of the accident or when operating the car in commission of a felony. Those are the individuals that would be limited to the $100,000.

MS. WALSH: But isn't it -- isn't it true that under this section the cap is tied to individuals who operate or use an uninsured vehicle? I mean, what -- can we agree that the amendment was intended to curtail the legal rights of the impaired or uninsured operators of motor vehicles and not the innocent victims who were caused injury by those users and operators?

MR. PRETLOW: I believe it's just the operator that this is limited to. Not passengers.

MS. WALSH: So under that proposal would a passenger injured in a crash be subject to the $100,000 cap if they were riding in a vehicle that they did not know was uninsured?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So, similarly, if a child is being driven by a parent or family member in an uninsured vehicle and suffers catastrophic injuries, should that child's recovery be capped at $100,000 because of circumstances entirely out of their control?

MR. PRETLOW: No, it shouldn't be.

MS. WALSH: It should not be. That's very good

news.

Why did the proposed language use the phrase "operates or uses" instead of narrower existing statutory language of "operates"?

MR. PRETLOW: It just operate, as far as I know.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Stand by for one second.

(Pause)

MR. PRETLOW: It was there formerly but it was taken out in the negotiations. It just says "operates an uninsured motor vehicle and responsible under Article 6 of the Vehicle and Traffic Law for insuring such motor vehicle --

MS. WALSH: I see that. Thank you so much for that clarification. So we're looking at page 70 of the bill around the top. I -- I'm rereading it now. Thank you so much for that. Okay.

So it talks about how there will be the cap, the $100,000 cap on noneconomic loss if you're operating a motor vehicle while impaired at the time of the accident and convicted of such. Impaired by what? Does it -- does it specifically speak to alcohol, or is it more expansive as far as drugs?

MR. PRETLOW: It -- it's not defined, but it's generally drugs and alcohol.

MS. WALSH: Drugs and alcohol. Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: But it's not defined in the legislation.

MS. WALSH: Would that include -- would -- as far

as drugs, would that include marihuana?

MR. PRETLOW: You'd have to be convicted of a crime. I -- it is illegal to operate or -- a vehicle while impaired under marihuana.

MS. WALSH: That is true. Yeah. Although we don't really have great testing except for the drug recognition experts. And we don't wanna spend more time talking about how bad that whole system is. We've already been down that road before. But in any event -- so --

MR. PRETLOW: Remember Dr. Fox?

MS. WALSH: Yeah, yeah. It -- given inflation and the rising cost of long-term care, is there any mechanism to adjust this $100,000 cap over time, or will it remain stagnant regardless of any economic changes?

MR. PRETLOW: That -- that I can't answer. I'd imagine it'll change like everything else. But right now it's just $100,000.

MS. WALSH: Okay.

Moving on to the -- the -- kind of the third piece. It's amaze -- it just really was amazing to me that in a bill that was -- or a section of the bill that it's only two pages long, a little less than two pages long, there's -- there's so many changes that are kind of packed into it. The third part bars recovery for claimants if the culpable conduct attributable to the claimant is greater than the culpable conduct of the person against who the recovery is sought. So in other

words -- and it looks like it's only for auto -- automobile accidents, vehicular accidents that we're gonna be eliminating the current system of comparative negligence if the claimant's fault is greater than 50 percent.

MR. PRETLOW: Correct.

MS. WALSH: So -- so just a couple of examples. You've got a -- would a child who runs out into the street chasing a ball potentially be barred entirely from recovery if a jury found the child 51 percent responsible?

MR. PRETLOW: I can't see a jury finding a child 51 percent responsible if that child ran out into the street. I would say that would be 100 percent responsible for running out into the street. If you're talking about an individual that may strike that individual with a motor vehicle, that's up to you attorneys to figure out.

MS. WALSH: Well, I mean, we never really know what a jury's gonna do --

MR. PRETLOW: Right.

MS. WALSH: -- right? That's -- that's why people settle or -- or arbitrate -- Mr. Dinowitz. But I -- but that -- yeah, that -- that's a fact, Jack. But anyway, okay. We don't know. Does the State believe it would be fair for severely-injured children, pedestrians or cognitively-impaired individuals to lose all compensation because they are found slightly more at fault than a defendant driver?

MR. PRETLOW: This was presented to us. It's part of the Executive Budget and we didn't change it.

MS. WALSH: No, I understand. This is what the Governor proposed. But here we are. I mean, we've been through negotiations and this is what we've got to vote on now.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Yeah. In practical terms, how would modified comparative negligence affect passengers, cyclists and pedestrians in New York who may already face challenges proving fault against corporate defendants or insurers?

MR. PRETLOW: I don't think there -- I don't think there would be any change in what the jury decides in that situation -- or those situations.

MS. WALSH: There is a big change, because under our current law if -- if somebody is 30 percent comparatively responsible they can still recover. Under this they could still recover. But if they're 51 percent recoverable under this law now they're gonna be barred. That's a change. That's a big change.

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. But I think we're discussing what the -- who the jury decides is at fault, aren't we? And that would be up to a jury. And as you said earlier, we can't determine at this point what any jury will say in any situation --

MS. WALSH: Right.

MR. PRETLOW: -- because the facts are always a little bit different.

MS. WALSH: Right. But what we do know is that under our current system, before this goes into effect, that if a jury

came out and said that pedestrian child that darted out was 51 percent responsible, that child could still recover a portion for their injuries, where now under this law they will not be able to anymore.

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: All right. I'm hearing this is like -- this is what was negotiated with the Executive and we really couldn't change it.

MS. WALSH: Okay. My time I see is starting to be limited so I'm gonna move forward to the effective date. The effective date will include cases that arose prior to this budget vote. What would you say to those victims that are included in categories such as serious injury and will in some cases have severe financial distress since they will no longer be covered by the law?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Well, I -- I don't know what I would say to them. I would hope I wouldn't have to say anything. But if they have a serious in -- injury, I would suggest that they move their cases forward quickly.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Thank you for your answers, Mr. Pretlow.

Madam Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. WALSH: So, I chose to focus on this section because I've worked as an attorney on both sides of this. I have been -- I've worked in insurance defense, I have worked as a plaintiff's

attorney. And I really see these changes contained in only two pages of a bill that has over 60 parts to it as -- as being incredibly problematical. It is a big change that is being pushed forward in these three things that are being changed in the law.

Look, in any bill that's got 60 -- over 60 parts to it, there's gonna be things in the bill that we're gonna like, there's gonna be things in the bill that we don't like. And that -- we all have to balance that out and vote accordingly. I am grateful that we have some changes to the CLCPA. I'm happy to see some movement on it and the realization that it was unrealistic, such as the adjusted methodology for carbon emission evaluations and some feasibility studies. But I don't think it goes far enough to help everybody comply with it or to reduce energy prices in a meaningful way long-term. I am appreciative that the Death Gamble piece has been put in there. But as of today, our colleagues, Tuesday, May 26th, 56 six days late, we still don't have any financial plan. We haven't seen it. We're still working on it. It feels like we're flying the plane while we're out there -- or we're -- or we're flying the plane while we're trying to fix it. Much of the burden for things like Tier 6 fixes are gonna be shifted to local government and school taxpayers. We don't know because we haven't seen the full financial plan. I just think that fundamentally that's a very irresponsible way to budget and to do this process.

I'm gonna be voting no because there are -- I think for me, the benefits don't outweigh the burdens and the -- the downside of this bill. I'll be a no.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Eichenstein.

MR. EICHENSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. EICHENSTEIN: I rise today to explain my vote on this budget bill before the House. Like every omnibus piece of legislation on this floor, this bill is an expansive compromise. It contains initiatives that I deeply support. But it also includes provisions that I outright oppose. This is the nature of an omnibus bill. Ultimately, we need to look at the totality of the legislation and vote accordingly. On balance, I have concluded that the positive impacts in this budget bill far outweigh the shortcomings. Therefore, today I choose to vote in the affirmative. But I would like to take a moment to speak directly to my constituents and explain why this budget bill has earned my support.

Over the last three years we have witnessed many protests and harassment of Jews taking place outside of synagogues, Jewish community centers and schools. Peaceful protest is a constitutional right of every individual to express their views and opinions. Simply put, it is freedom of speech; one of the most cherished liberties in our nation. And it is our duty in this Chamber to protect that freedom. But what's playing out in the streets of New

York over the last three years is not simple expressions of free speech. Jewish New Yorkers are being targeted, harassed, threatened and intimidated simply because they are entering a house of worship. I represent a district with a large number of visible Jewish residents, many of whom attend house of worship regularly, multiple times a day. Send their children to Jewish day schools and Yeshivas. Participate in activities at Jewish community centers. When ordinary and peaceful activities are canceled or avoided because of fear of intimidation, something is deeply wrong. This is not the New York that ensures the safety of all New Yorkers regardless of their faith or backgrounds. Our children should not feel afraid to attend religious school. Our seniors, especially our cherished Holocaust survivors, should not feel anxious about participating in programming at community centers. Worshipers should not avoid attending services, house of worship, because the fear of being shouted at, harassed or physically attacked. This is not the American way. This State intervention is not only necessary because it has -- this -- because it has become critically urgent for the State to intervene following the New York City Mayor's veto of the City Council's School Safety Perimeter Transparency and Reporting bill. If New York City will not take the necessary steps to protect our children, the State of New York must act. And that is precisely what we are doing here today. The 50-foot buffer zone bill in front of houses of worship, educational institutions and community centers, which is included in this budget bill, is good legislation. It establishes a reasonable buffer zone while

also allowing local law enforcement the discretion necessary to assess each situation fairly and appropriately.

I would like to thank my Assembly colleagues, especially our Speaker, Speaker Carl Heastie, for recognizing the importance of this legislation. For giving it the time and attention it deserves, and for helping to ensure that all New Yorkers can feel safe and protected. No New Yorker should ever be forced to choose between their personal safety and attending religious services.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Jensen.

MR. JENSEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Chairman of Ways and Means yield for some questions on the --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chair yield?

MR. JENSEN: -- auto insurance reforms?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, Madam Speaker, I yield.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Throughout this budget process the Governor has argued that these auto insurance proposals had been necessary to lower insurance costs. Do we have a specific timeline on when New Yorkers will actually see premiums reduced?

MR. PRETLOW: As I said earlier, we don't have an actual number as to how much insurance will be reduced. We're

basing the proposal on what's happened in other -- other states. But the actual answer to your question is no.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. And I'm guessing, judging from the Governor's comments throughout this process that one of those states is Florida, correct?

MR. PRETLOW: I believe so.

MR. JENSEN: All right. In 2023 Florida passed insurance reforms similar to what we're seeing in this piece of budget legislation. And by last year, 2025 major carriers like State Farm operating in Florida had implemented rate decreases of up to 20 percent, and that overall costs in the State are 14-and-a-half percent lower than they would have been without reforms. Can you guarantee or can the Governor guarantee or can the Legislature guarantee that these reforms will result in a similar double-digit rate reduction for New Yorkers within the next few years?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, Mr. Jensen, I can't guarantee anything. But we're hopeful that based on the actions that we're taking in this budget bill that insurance rates will be decreased.

MR. JENSEN: So if rates don't drop by at least 10 percent because we can't guarantee that these reforms will actually have the intended effect, will the Department of Financial Services be empowered to force a refund to policyholders from the com -- from the insurance providers?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, the DFS has to approve any kind of rate increases that are requested by the insurance companies,

and the rates will not be artificially increased based on various things. What we're doing is just allowing them the ability to put certain aspects of their expenses as part of the premium policies. So we're taking away, let's say, their advertising really shouldn't be charged against the premiums that we all pay.

MR. JENSEN: So just to sum -- sum up. So we can't -- because we can't guarantee a similar outcome to what Florida has seen, there's no provision in this budget bill that would allow DFS the autonomy -- autonomy to claw back any unrealized profits -- or unrealized savings if these reforms don't have the intended result as what everybody on the floor below has been saying for the past eight weeks?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. I know you mentioned to our Ranking Member on Ways and Means that the estimated potential savings are up to $300 a year for policyholders. Does DFS -- I know you just mentioned that they will have to approve any rate increases. But I know -- you didn't -- you mentioned there is no mechanism to claw back any savings if none are created. Is there any mechanism in place about what comes next if these reforms don't have the intended result?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, what -- what we're doing now is we're requiring insurers to report excess profits with excess profits being returned to policyholders. So we've set a ceiling, basically, for the insurers, and anything above that ceiling has to be

refunded back to the -- to the policyholders.

MR. JENSEN: So are -- are we changing the profit cap that's already in place in statute?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. JENSEN: What are we -- what is it currently, and what are we taking it down to?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: 21 percent. And that's through -- that's through regulations. Yes.

MR. JENSEN: That's what we're lowering it to, or that's what it is?

MR. PRETLOW: That's what it is now.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. So what are we reducing that number to?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Excess profit is a gain for the three most recent calendar years combined, of which is greater than the anticipated underwriting profit plus 5 percent of earned premiums for those calendar years.

MR. JENSEN: I don't know what that means.

MR. PRETLOW: It means you take what they made, you average it out three years, and they're giving 5 percent above that. And anything above that is excess profit, which gets returned to the policyholders.

MR. JENSEN: So it's not gonna be standard for

every insurance carrier in the State -- who operates in the State, it's gonna be different based on every -- it's gonna be a percentage amount?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, let's say that it is the same as it is now. Yes.

MR. JENSEN: Well, every -- everything now is 21 percent. But if Pretlow Insurance is making a profit --

MR. PRETLOW: The standard is the same.

MR. JENSEN: Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: But the standard is exactly the same.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. Throughout the budget hearing process and memos and -- and different briefings to our friends in the LCA, there hasn't been any clear commitment from the insurance companies to actually lower their auto rates. If these new restrictions on how much compensation victims of auto accidents can receive don't occur, how will the profits go back to policyholders if we aren't seeing a cap on the funding -- or on the court settlements or awards?

MR. PRETLOW: We're capping the excess premiums. And I'm -- I'm pretty sure that with the fraud protections in place that the expenditures by insurance companies will be decreased, which would then increase their profitability, which would then translate to excess profits which will be returned to policyholders.

MR. JENSEN: All right. So profits are carrying a lot

of the weight in -- in the statute and throughout the debate today. How do we calculate profit and has that calculation changed from what it was before the drafting of this budget bill?

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. I can read you what I -- what I read a couple of minutes ago. Excess profit is underwriting gain for the three most recently calendar years --

MR. JENSEN: No, no, no. I understand that, Mr. Pretlow. But what is constituting the actual profit? The actual -- what makes up that number, not what the profit total is, but are we recalculating what profit --

MR. PRETLOW: It's -- it's -- it's -- it's revenue, but less expenses. Premiums are revenue expenses or what they pay out in claims.

MR. JENSEN: So it's only looking at what they're paying out versus what they take in? Premiums versus --

MR. PRETLOW: We -- we --we wanted to include investments but that's not there.

MR. JENSEN: You guys wanted to include? I --

MR. PRETLOW: Investment income is not part of it.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. Is advertising cost or executive compensation calculated as part of the loss in the profit calculations?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. JENSEN: Yes? Okay.

Okay. Moving into kind of the process about how

this is gonna happen. How do we ensure that these auto insurance proposals driven by the Governor, pun intended, don't result in insurance carriers unduly delaying claims or not offering fair settlements during any sort of pretrial -- pretrial settlement -- settlement conferences?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, we haven't changed anything in that regard in the budget --

(Indiscernible/crosstalk)

MR. JENSEN: So there's no mechanism to clear up any bad faith by either party in -- in a situation -- in an auto accident?

MR. PRETLOW: The current -- the current plime -- the current timing still applies.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. Twenty-one states have bad faith laws on their books if insurance companies are denying valid claims. Did the issue of having a bad faith policy come up in three-way negotiations?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. JENSEN: No? Not at all? Okay. Talking about -- I know our Floor Leader brought up this about definitions of operating or using. What's the difference between operating and using?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, one -- wait, one is in the bill and one isn't.

MR. JENSEN: Okay.

Moving on to fraud. I know that one of the

Governor's reasonings for pushing so strongly for this was the overarching fraud that apparently exists in these types of situations. And I understand that New York collects over $125 million annually through motor vehicle theft and insurance fraud prevention bonds that specifically fund rooting out fraud. How much of that funding that we allocate to go -- how much will we allocate in this year's budget to actually go after this apparently ubiquitous fraud that's driving up everybody's insurance rates?

MR. PRETLOW: The task force's amount being allocated, $3,093,000.

MR. JENSEN: So there's so much fraud we're only gonna give it $3 million.

MR. PRETLOW: It's -- this is an increase.

MR. JENSEN: Oh, an increase of $3 million. Okay. One of the biggest provisions in this two-page statute is that if rates are reduced because of these reforms, the insurance carriers have to notify policyholders of that case. What are the mechanisms will DFS use to verify that a declared rate reduction is actually linked to budget reforms rather than the general market fluctuation?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Well, that's up to DFS to determine how they do their rate --

(Indiscernible/crosstalk)

MR. JENSEN: So they get to create their own auditing mechanism?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, I did use generally accepted accounting principles, I would imagine.

MR. JENSEN: They're going to use a generally accepted accounting principles?

MR. PRETLOW: I would -- yes.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. It seems counterintuitive than everything else we're doing, but okay, fair enough.

Why are we codifying statutory language that would require private enterprise, private business like insurance providers to print State public relations messaging on consumer billing documents?

MR. PRETLOW: That was just -- it came up in negotiations. I don't know.

MR. JENSEN: Who -- who wanted the private companies to do public relations messaging for elected officials?

MR. PRETLOW: I'm not sure.

(Conferencing)

This is something similar that's already done with health insurance and I -- I can't identify who at the table said what.

MR. JENSEN: You can't or you won't?

MR. PRETLOW: I won't.

MR. JENSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Has there been any analysis on how much these notification requirements could increase costs on carriers to implement?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. JENSEN: And will that be taken out of their profits that they then have to report back on?

MR. PRETLOW: I don't think anything. Nothing.

MR. JENSEN: They wouldn't -- wouldn't have to add anything? Okay.

Moving on to a final provision. No, I think that's it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your answers.

MR. PRETLOW: Mr. Jensen.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Bologna.

MR. BOLOGNA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the sponsor -- actually, would the Chairman please yield for a couple quick questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chairman yield?

MR. BOLOGNA: My questions are going to be directed particularly with Part N --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. BOLOGNA: -- in the budget constrained rate proposals. So this bill is essentially requiring -- and if I understand this correctly, is requiring utilities to submit two separate proposals. One based on the actual projected operational needs and another constrained CPI growth. Do I understand that correctly?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. BOLOGNA: So the Legislature is asking utilities to submit one proposal based on operational reality and kind of another based on, I guess I'll call it like, political targets. Is that -- is that essentially correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes. That's all based on inflation.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So logistically, under -- under what circumstances would a budget constraint proposal be the preferred outcome to the Commission? Like who ultimately decides which one of these contingency budgets gets used and when does that happen?

MR. PRETLOW: Whichever comes the least expensive.

MR. BOLOGNA: So as a private utility company, how am I supposed to budget out, or -- or predict or make investments based on not necessarily knowing what my budget's going to be? Is that -- I mean, we're -- we're essentially asking a utility company to have two -- essentially two separate proposals into the future and they don't know which one they're ultimately going to go with. I mean, can you walk me through the process to which -- to how which one is going to be used, is essentially what I'm asking.

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Yeah, they have to -- they have to justify what their increase is going to be. They'll sub -- they submit an application, the Commission will ask them why are they asking for this amount of an increase, then they have to justify it. If they can't

justify the increase, they won't be given the increase. If they can justify it and it meets the parameters of the law that we're putting in place, then they will get that increase.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So if they have to justify their cost and they're still making the investments, still maintaining reliability, still complying with mandates and -- and they have to justify it, are we essentially saying that -- that the CPI proposal is not operationally realistic in the first place?

MR. PRETLOW: No. It's --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Pretlow, could you pick up your mic -- microphone? People can't hear you. Thank you.

MR. PRETLOW: Sorry. I'm having trouble hearing myself that's why I'm -- okay.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So, if you utilities are required to justify every expenditure above CPI for optics reasons, does that not create pressure to delay or defer long-term investment in infrastructure?

MR. PRETLOW: I -- I don't think so.

MR. BOLOGNA: So then at what point do things become emergency infrastructure? I mean, because that's kind of where -- where we are now.

MR. PRETLOW: You said what part of it becomes an emergency?

MR. BOLOGNA: Let me -- let me phrase it

differently. Right now, are utility companies required by PSC or this Body, whether it is to comply with CP -- CLCPA mandates, whether it is to upgrade the grid, whether it is to build up infrastructure, whether it is to maintain reliability. These are all things that we're requiring them to do anyway. Is that -- is that an accurate statement?

MR. PRETLOW: Right. This is the normal cost of rate setting, yes.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So I guess my question is -- is that if we -- if the State is interjecting itself into -- into where their revenues can come from, what their revenues can be, we're not giving them a predictability in terms of building out and -- and complying with what we're asking them to do in the first place.

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Was there a question? I didn't --

MR. BOLOGNA: Let me -- yes, there is. All of these requirements --

MR. PRETLOW: Right.

MR. BOLOGNA: -- expanding transmission, integrating renewable generation, supporting electrification, maintaining affordability. All of those requirements carry substantial infrastructure and operational costs, correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Correct.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So this is getting a little bit into the CLCPA, but we are requiring them to do a lot of that. So I guess my question is is a lot of the stuff in whether it's Part N, I think

M, S, a lot of it is scapegoating the utility companies in a lot of ways, but essentially, we're requiring them to do a lot of that. Is -- is this -- does -- does none of this fall on what this Body is requiring all the utility companies to do?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, we're requiring them to do a lot because we're looking out for the -- for the best interest of the ratepayers, which is the, you know, really the 20 million New Yorkers. There aren't that many electric companies that supply the power to the individuals in the State and we just want to ensure that the ratepayers, you and I, are getting the best bang for our buck.

MR. BOLOGNA: So are you suggesting that the utility companies are independently responsible for the rate increases that we have seen recently? Is that the implication?

MR. PRETLOW: Well -- well, they're responsible for the rates. They supply the electricity, they supply the infrastructure and we supply them with the funds.

MR. BOLOGNA: I -- I guess, but we're requiring them now to do -- go above and beyond. Basically what I'm saying is, for -- for what we're doing and what we have required out of the CLCPA and a lot of the -- the electrification mandates that this Body has required.

MR. PRETLOW: Well, I -- I think we're requiring them to basically guarantee the best possible or the lowest possible rate for the ratepayers.

MR. BOLOGNA: I would phrase it a little different.

I would say that a lot of what's in here - and I guess this is a question - would you -- is it a fair assessment that a lot of the -- the policies that are in here are attempting to politically distance ourselves from the real world costs that Albany is putting on utility companies?

MR. PRETLOW: I don't think so. I think that we're requiring utility companies, like I said earlier, to give the ratepayers the best possible or the lowest possible rate, because as was -- was stated earlier, that New York is one of the, you know, top five of costs for electricity and that's something that we'd like to get out of that top five.

MR. BOLOGNA: So, acknowledging that, that our response essentially in this budget then is to create revenue ceilings for utility companies. Is that an accurate -- is that a fair and accurate statement?

MR. PRETLOW: I wouldn't say a ceiling, no.

MR. BOLOGNA: I mean, we're -- we're capping what the revenue can be based on CPI, though, according to this because we're -- we're having different --

MR. PRETLOW: No, we're not capping -- capping their revenue. What we're capping or trying to cap is the amount that they pass on to the consumer.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. If -- if I'm -- if I'm selling T-shirts and you're capping what I can pass onto the consumer, you're capping my revenue.

MR. PRETLOW: Not really. You sell more T-shirts.

(Laughter)

MR. BOLOGNA: What -- what other private company do -- do we do this to in New York? I mean, I understand that these -- that these utility companies have a public role, but again, these are still private companies. I -- I'm not -- I guess, do we do this to any other private company in the State of New York?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, if -- if -- if the -- if the elect -- if the utility companies can justify a rate increase, they'll get the rate increase. We're not saying that they can't make any more, we're just saying that they can't generate excess profits and pass it onto the stockholders. We want them to pass that, those excess profits onto the ratepayers.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So in terms of the rates, in -- in terms of how these things are set, the Public Service Commission is there as is. So what is the current role of the PSC?

MR. PRETLOW: To over -- to oversee the activities of the utilities.

MR. BOLOGNA: So would you agree that the PSC reviews expenditures, scrutinizes rate increases, determines prudecy -- prudency, protects affordability? I mean, that's essentially what the PSC does, right?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. BOLOGNA: Okay. So a lot of these provisions in here are in a weird way micromanaging PSC. So are we saying that PSC has failed in doing its job in protecting ratepayers thus far?

MR. PRETLOW: No. We're actually giving them more authority and putting more teeth into their operation. Formerly, when a utility company would request a -- a rate and the PSC said no, they would go into negotiations and over the course of time that rate would automatically go in. Now when the PSC says no, no stands. So there's -- there's actually -- we're actually giving more authority to the Public Service Commission.

MR. BOLOGNA: Hold on one second.

(Pause)

All right. So I have one couple, final questions here. So if the PSC already has the authority to determine whether expenses are prudently recoverable from taxpayers, then why is the Legislature now sing -- singling out lobbying, advocating, advertising and organizational participation for additional statutory restriction?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, we don't think that the ratepayers should be paying the utility companies' lobbying costs, we don't think the ratepayers should be paying the utilities' companies charitable contributions, and we also don't think that the ratepayers should be paying for the attorney fees for the companies that are also used to lobby for us, or to us.

MR. BOLOGNA: So is the purpose of this legislation then to regulate rates or is it to discourage utilities from par -- participating in the policymaking process?

MR. PRETLOW: The purpose of this legislation is to have the lowest possible rates possible.

MR. BOLOGNA: I could go off with a number of ways that we could also go about doing that without all this, but I don't think we have the time to do that.

So with that, I have one final question. Hold on a second. Mr. Pretlow, I appreciate your patience in bearing with me here.

This is for Part VV. Not sure if it's the same group.

MR. PRETLOW: Bravo, Bravo?

MR. BOLOGNA: Victor, Victor?

MR. PRETLOW: Victor -- okay. CLCPA.

MR. BOLOGNA: Yes -- yes, sir.

MR. PRETLOW: Ms. Glick, do you want to handle this one or you want me to try it?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick, will you yield for CLCPA questions?

MS. GLICK: Sure.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick yields.

MS. GLICK: Please repeat the question.

MR. BOLOGNA: Oh, I haven't said it yet. It's all good.

All right. So Part VV, so it's Victor, Victor, makes reference to changing emissions reporting to have carbon emissions consistent with the treatment of bio-genetic carbon dioxide emissions under the methodologies of the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change [sic] at the United Nations. I believe this is referring to the

full lifecycle accounting methodology which is used throughout United States, the federal government and internationally. This should work to increase access to low carbon, low cost biofuels in a state once the Governor implements policies to meet the State's climate goal in 2028. Is that your sense of what is happening with this language?

(Conferencing)

MS. GLICK: Well, I would say that the -- the Governor's intention is to ensure that we aren't counting the emissions from biogenic emissions twice.

MR. BOLOGNA: All right. Fair enough. Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ms. Glick on the bill.

MS. GLICK: Let's shift gears. On the bill.

I will share my concerns and support around the buffer zone section of the bill with what was provided by my colleague, Mr. Eichenstein, in his speech on the bill. I believe that it is important to ensure that the rise in anti-Semitism is directly addressed by the State. Jewish New Yorkers deserve to be able to go to what we refer to as "sensitive locations" free of intimidation and harassment, which does not, in my humble opinion, in any way restrict people's constitutional right to protest. Protests directed at the actions of a government are appropriately directed to the consul of that

government and should not be at houses of worship. So, I'm pleased that we have come to a resolution on buffer zones.

Now, we've had a lot of conversation today around where we are with the CLCPA, which was put in place in 2019 based on a recognition that for too many years our dependence on fossil fuels has had an impact on the climate. Some of those recognitions go back a number of decades, but let me just say that the -- that the people working in the fossil fuel industry aren't, you know, for the most part, evil people trying to do something malicious. Fossil fuels have expanded our economies over the last many decades, but now that we know more, we have to address it. And what we now know is that both carbon dioxide and methane have in -- have warmed the climate and is changing, changing weather patterns and making more extreme storms that are impacting our lives and, you know, the closer you get to the end, it's like the old toilet tissue. The closer you get to the end, the faster it goes. So one should actually recognize that sometimes for future generations, you have to do something so that their lives are not as negatively impacted as we are seeing in many instances in our own State. Hundred year floods, 500 year floods are happening every few years. That's not just a trend that comes and goes, it is in fact happening around the world. The heat, you know, more people die from heat problems, the extreme heat than any other weather event and now we know we are seeing more and more extreme heat. We're experiencing fires in places we didn't before, forest fires which then actually increases the carbon in our

atmosphere.

So now that we know something more, the CLCPA was looking down the road scientifically. I know we don't want to hear about science, that becomes a story line I guess, but science matters. And scientifically, we can see that we have to change our behavior. And if individuals around the State get some support, some incentive that changes their behavior and they choose not to be as dependent on natural gas and they use more renewables, renewables actually will help us be more energy independent. And that will help other people who may not be in a position to make that same change because once they use more renewable energy, it reduces the pressure on their grid, it reduces the demand and maybe over time could actually lower prices. So we know that the Northeast is very dependent on natural gas, which is a volatile market and the geopolitical impacts that we are seeing now everyday make it more urgent for us to make the changes that actually will improve air quality, improve water quality and will make us safer and more energy independ -- excuse me, independent.

It hasn't helped that the federal government denies climate change, so yes, we see that there are some things that have happened in the last couple of years that make our progress challenging. But that doesn't mean that New Yorkers who have met many challenges over the decades won't meet this challenge. So while we have made some adjustments to the CLCPA to reflect the fact that we don't have the same level of federal support for commonsense

scientifically-based changes in the way we operate, doesn't mean that we shouldn't as New Yorkers invest in our future and the future of children and successive generations by making -- by making renewable energy the hallmark of our future energy policy.

So, I am not happy with everything that's in this bill, but as was pointed out, this is what we used to call a "Big Ugly" because it has things in it that you hate and things that you love. So, I'm gonna ultimately wind up supporting this bill, but recognizing that just saying that we want to be measured like everybody else isn't always the best course of action. And we have to recognize that methane is a pernicious -- more pernicious than CO2, less -- less long, but actually is far more damaging, and just because we're -- our science, our scientific evidence for -- led us to the CLCPA in 2019 when other states were not yet recognizing the same level of problem with methane doesn't mean that we can't address it going forward which is why there is more money coming in this budget to try to address both helping a transition to renewable energy and also addressing the fact that methane is a real problem. And I will say that it would be really helpful if the fossil fuel industry that flares excess energy at all of the -- the rigs and it's dangerous work. It's very dangerous work, so I appreciate that. And they need to do that to release -- to reduce the pressure, but they have to find less dangerous to the climate ways of doing that, and we have to renew our commitment to ensuring that we become leaders once again, leaders in environmental protection and environmental conservation. You

know, I won't be here, you all are gonna have to do a lot more work because your communities are going to face sea level rise, your communities are going to continue to face pressure from being tied to fossil fuels, your communities are going to demand because younger people are still taking science and still recognizing that science matters. And they're going to come back and ask you and I might in three years, they're going to come back and ask you to step up and do more.

So I appreciate the staff work that's been done to minimize the damage, but this -- the staffs on both sides work very hard for all of us who sit in these seats and I want to take the opportunity to acknowledge how hard the staff in this building works to serve all of us.

And with that, I withdraw my comments and will ultimately vote for the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Fitzpatrick.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. FITZPATRICK: I want to express my concern about what we are going to do with Tier 6. There's been a lot of talk about the need to fix Tier 6. I argue Tier 6 is not broken, never was and by attempting to fix Tier 6, we are going to break the back of our taxpayers and municipalities. What we're going to do here is pass the

mother-of-all pension sweeteners and what that will do is leave a sour taste in the mouths of our taxpayers and those who manage our municipalities.

If you ask the question, how many people -- or the argument is that we need -- we need to sweeten the pension to attract employees. That is not the real question because the defined benefit pension that public employees enjoy is far better than anything offered in the private sector. The question to ask is how many public employees are leaving public employment for a better deal in the private sector? And the answer is none. So we don't need to do this and if you want to do this, the proper way to do it is to do it through collective bargaining. Our friends in the unions believe strongly in collective bargaining, but they're not doing it through collective bargaining because that would mean putting something on the table to offset the cost of this. I've said in the past when I've been the lone note -- lone no vote on a number of pension sweeteners over the years that it is not -- it is not unfair, nor is it unreasonable to ask the other side to put something on the table to help manage the cost for our taxpayers. That's not happening here.

So what I -- what concerns me greatly is that we are now in a position where the advocates for this have the Legislature, have maximum -- maximum pressure, frankly, on us. We are now the highest paid Legislature in the country. We now have a very severely limited amount of outside income which means a lot of our friends here in this Chamber and in the Senate are going to be leaving because

this Legislature is becoming professionalized, if you will. Well, we're now career politicians. In fact, when the -- the defined benefit pension was granted to elected officials, you created the career politician and the defined benefit pension system that we enjoy, what does it reward? It rewards longevity. And how do you get longevity? Well, I can tell you through personal experience some of the advocates, they don't support people who say no to them. They only support people who say yes to them. And we are now in a position where if we lose an election, yeah, we're out of $142,000 of income, but we're also out of the defined benefit pension system. And that -- you're asking legislators to vote against their own financial best interest and that is not going to happen. We will vote against the taxpayers' best financial best interest before we vote against our own and that's why what we're doing here with Tier 6 I believe is so dangerous. We are going to put an incredible burden not only on taxpayers but also on the performance of the investment funds that help fund our benefit.

Think about it for a second. If you look at -- take an $80,000 pension, which is not uncommon in the public sector here in New York. Using a standard distribution factor of 4%, you would need a $2 million balance in your IRA or 401k to produce 80,000. Think about it for a second. That's a lot of money. That makes you a millionaire. So if you go back to the early 2000s when the market was doing well and the fund was in solid shape like it is now, the comptroller at the time, Carl McCall, couldn't see around the corner to

what was going to happen in 2008 when the mortgage market collapsed and we went from in our largest fund, the Employees' Retirement Fund, the largest of the eight funds in the State went from 114% of assets overnight to the low 80s. Now we're under 100%, we're underfunded. And contribution percentages had to go up, meaning our school districts, towns, counties, even the State of New York had to increase the contribution percentage of payroll to make up those losses. Even using a five-year average, what they call "smoothing" in the business.

So we need to be very careful when we sweeten these benefits that we can frankly afford them and I don't think we can. Our Governor has said -- she has said we are losing, our tax base is diminishing. We're losing people and businesses to other states. Our tax base is shrinking, and yet we are putting an additional burden. The -- the City of New York has asked to be of -- permission to kick the can further down the road because they can't afford to make their current pension payments. So what we're doing here is, I believe, fiscally imprudent, frankly dangerous and I believe we're setting the table for Tier 7 because we will need a Tier 7 if we do what we're doing in this bill with Tier 6.

Tier 6 is not broken. It was necessary -- it was necessary to keep this system fiscally stable so that all of us can enjoy the benefit of a retirement, 20, 30, 40 or more years down the road. We're going to put that in danger by going so far out on the risk spectrum here and sweetening these benefits beyond what we can

frankly afford.

So for that reason, I am going to be voting no on this bill. Of course, there are good things in the bill and there are bad things in the bill, but I think this, frankly, is the worse.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Keith Brown.

MR. K. BROWN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Chair of the Ways and Means Committee yield for some questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will Mr. Pretlow yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, I will.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Chair yields.

MR. K. BROWN: Thank you. Mr. Pretlow, just for the purpose of debate I'm gonna focus my remarks on Part R and Part V. I'm going to start out with the housing components first and then move over to the SEQR and then talk about some of the State properties in my region.

Just a general question, would you consider Part R and Part V policy?

MR. PRETLOW: Is that part of CLCPA?

MR. K. BROWN: No. This deals mostly with the SEQR amendments and the -- the housing provisions that are contained within that.

MR. PRETLOW: Well, is -- is your question on SEQR or what we're doing with SEQR?

MR. K. BROWN: Yeah. Would you consider it policy or is it budgetary in terms of financial --

MR. PRETLOW: I would call it policy. I would call it policy.

MR. K. BROWN: You would call it policy? I -- I just thought that we didn't put policy in the budget, but I could be wrong.

MR. PRETLOW: We put a lot of policy in the budget based on *Pataki v. Silver* [sic] which was instituted prior to you becoming a member of this esteemed Body. We formerly did not include policy, but after -- I'm not going to get into the history of it. I've -- I've been here I guess longer than most people in this room so I've experienced the whole thing. But yeah, it's policy and policy is in the budget and I can almost assure you that every governor will include policy in his or her future budgets, so it's here to stay.

MR. K. BROWN: Thank you for that clarification. I just -- because I've heard other members say that we don't put policy in the budgets so, now I'm crystal clear. Okay. With regard to the housing components, do urban areas include Nassau and Suffolk counties? And then -- I'll stop there.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. K. BROWN: And then what is the number of units that will be exempt under the new SEQR amendments?

MR. PRETLOW: It -- it depends if -- if it's -- 20 -- 20 units in a municipality with no zoning, 100 dwelling units in a municipality with zoning and 300 dwelling units in a Census-defined urban area.

MR. K. BROWN: Right. So --

MR. PRETLOW: So if the Census defines an area as urban, then they have a limit of 300.

MR. K. BROWN: So that sounds like there was an increase of what was originally presented in the Executive Budget. I believe it was 200 units.

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. And those units will be exempt if they meet certain criteria under the new provisions, correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. K. BROWN: Could you tell me why there was no mention of the word "affordability" in the new amendments?

MR. PRETLOW: You said affordability?

MR. K. BROWN: Affordable housing. The word "affordable".

MR. PRETLOW: That wasn't part of the -- the negotiation.

MR. K. BROWN: Right. Well, the reason I ask it is --

MR. PRETLOW: I -- I -- because I -- I'm pretty sure that in our One-House we did have affordability as an inclusion, but

that like the Minority participation, you know, the void did not make it through the conferences.

MR. K. BROWN: So I -- I know you're tall like me. I think you have to speak up a little louder because --

MR. PRETLOW: This thing don't go up anymore. (Indicating)

(Laughter)

MR. K. BROWN: So I just want to clarify because I thought the purpose of these amendments were to help assist with the help -- the affordable housing crisis that we're experiencing in this State. And just to refresh your memory because I know you were sitting next to me during the budget hearings, the Commissioner of HCR said, *the State is again laser-focused on housing affordability and making sure government works on behalf of New Yorkers*. So I ask you, Mr. Pretlow, why is there no mention in these amendments with respect to the word "affordable"?

MR. PRETLOW: Can I Defer to Ms. Glick for the answer to that question?

MR. K. BROWN: Can you -- I'm sorry?

MR. PRETLOW: Defer to Ms. Glick.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick, will you yield?

MR. K. BROWN: If she can afford an answer, sure.

MS. GLICK: Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick --

MS. GLICK: This is a disability for us to share the responses and so it may be a little awkward, but let me just say that the basic belief, which I believe would be embraced by your side of the aisle, is that as we increase supply and meet the demand the prices will drop. And so by trying to make it easier for units to be created, we will be driving more affordability into the marketplace.

MR. K. BROWN: Very good. So I'll continue on. I don't know if you're the best person to answer the questions, you can bounce back to Mr. Pretlow if necessary, Ms. Glick. But are there any changes with the pro-housing certification portions --

MS. GLICK: No.

MR. K. BROWN: -- of State law? And you're aware that with the pro-housing certification, it constrains some of our municipalities to be able to build more housing or affordable housing, correct?

MS. GLICK: Well, I don't know that it -- that's -- that -- I don't know that I would agree with that.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. So let me ask you, you're not afforded certain grant opportunities if you're not a pro-housing certified community, correct? Municipality.

MS. GLICK: Yes.

MR. K. BROWN: Right. So does this bill make it easier for municipalities that want to do affordable housing more grant opportunities to do so?

MS. GLICK: You know, municipalities are free to

impose whatever affordability requirements they might wish to add. This doesn't prevent that.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. I'll take that as a no.

With regard to the bill itself, I'm looking at the exemption sections under 5AA and 5-AA and 5B. Can you clarify for me exactly what is being exempted? And this is where we kind of blend between Housing and SEQR. So what types of development projects are going to be covered under the exemption and how does that impact SEQR?

MS. GLICK: Well, there are -- if housing is on a previously disturbed site, that would be something where there -- would have been perhaps a building existed and then was demolished, but there's water and sewer -- access to water and sewer connections. It would be exempt from a SEQR review with certain numbers of units differing from New York to other parts of the State.

MR. K. BROWN: So when we say "exempt," technically speaking, does that mean it's gonna be treated as a type 2 action under SEQR under Part 617?

MS. GLICK: It -- it would mean that it wouldn't have to go through a -- a SEQR process.

MR. K. BROWN: Right. So an applicant submits their EAF form and it's a determination on lead agency, I saw that we capped that at one year for determination of lead agency. By the way, why one year to determine something as simple as who's going to be lead agency?

(Conferencing)

MS. GLICK: Well, not every project is, you know, a single-family dwelling. It could be more complicated so there may be some reason why there may need to be more time taken because there may be a -- a decision that it is under, at least in the City, might be an HPD project and or it might be an -- an economic development corporation project and it's -- there are differences.

MR. K. BROWN: Right. But we've made it -- a specific change for a specific use. This is for multi-family housing, affordable or non-affordable and we kind of know --

MS. GLICK: We also included schools, right?

MR. K. BROWN: -- we kind of -- excuse me. Sorry, I'm --

MS. GLICK: We -- we also included schools so I -- there are different projects.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. Well, that's a whole nother question I want to ask in a second why we didn't include daycare centers. But let me stay on point. The question is, why since we have a specific use and we know what our zoning approval process is in our municipalities, why one year? I mean, that seems like something administratively, even putting three months at 120 days would be -- would suffice for a simple lead agency determination, no?

MS. GLICK: Well, that's your opinion.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. We -- we'll --

MS. GLICK: It -- it --

MR. K. BROWN: -- agree to agree.

MS. GLICK: -- it is an outlying -- it is the outlying number that doesn't preclude something being determined sooner.

MR. K. BROWN: Right. But my point is, if we're trying to fast track these projects and expedite them, that seems like an awfully long period of time. Let me go on.

The timing of the EIS to be completed is now two years, right? That also seems like an (indiscernible) amount of time. You couple the two things together, we're at three years. Have we really made any significant changes in the SEQR review for multi-family affordable housing?

MS. GLICK: Well, I think that the complaint has been that there are no time limits and that it has been represented that this could go on for many, many years. So, you may, you know, is the glass half full, glass half empty since there are no time limits and there have been those who have complained - say that in a very generous way - complained that it has gone on for several years, this is a response to that.

MR. K. BROWN: I get that. I -- I totally get that. But let me -- let me move ahead. The project gets completed, somebody wants to challenge that determination by the municipality, what is the statute of limitations to bring an Article 78 in that determination based on what I'm reading here in TED?

MS. GLICK: Thirty days.

MR. K. BROWN: Thirty days and when does that 30

days clock begin to run?

(Conferencing)

MS. GLICK: Once there is a decision as to whether it is an exempt or nonexempt project.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. I'm reading here, line 18 says, becomes final and binding upon the petitioner, but there's no clear date of when it becomes final and binding. In other areas of the town law or village law, what we normally do is we trigger that to when the determination is filed in the town clerk's office or the village clerk's office and we have that done here. It's vague and it should be clarified. So I'm asking you on the record, what date are we gonna pick?

MS. GLICK: Thirty days.

MR. K. BROWN: From when?

MS. GLICK: When the decision is determined as to whether or not this is an exempt or nonexempt --

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. You can't bring a challenge of a determination that is interlocutory and in the middle of the process, the court will grant the motion to dismiss. So therefore, that's really not an acceptable answer because that's not when the statute of limitations run. There is no triggering event built into this statute and it's unclear if somebody wants to bring an Article 78. So this is right for litigation, would you agree?

MS. GLICK: No.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. We agree to disagree.

Has this -- have these amendments in any way, shape or form changed the standing rules as they relate to the caselaw in the State of New York?

MS. GLICK: I don't believe so.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay.

(Pause)

Excuse me. One second.

(Pause)

With regard to -- I'm going to move onto the SUNY section in Part U. I don't know if that's you or Mr. Pretlow.

MS. GLICK: That would not be me, that much I know.

MR. K. BROWN: Thank you, Chair. Chair, any information about the SUNY Farmingdale, SUNY Stony Brook and the DOT land by Republic Airport? In particular, I'm -- I'm curious about the DOT land by Republic Airport. Do we know where that lies?

MR. PRETLOW: Is that in this bill?

MR. K. BROWN: That is in this bill. Part U. Authorized the repurposing of DOT and SUNY-owned real property.

MR. PRETLOW: Let me find that section, give me a second.

(Pause)

MR. K. BROWN: Sure. And I'm gonna ask a different question for your staff. Will these properties be subject to

local zoning?

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. You want to know the location? It's in Farmingdale on Concourse [sic] Street.

MR. K. BROWN: Yes.

MR. PRETLOW: Or Conclave [sic] Street. What about it?

MR. K. BROWN: Is it going to be subject to local zoning?

MR. PRETLOW: I'm not sure.

MR. K. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

On the bill, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. K. BROWN: So I just wanted to mention, Part VV, the extension of the deadlines under the CLCPA make the rules that were promulgated in 2019 more practical and less aspirational, especially the mother-of-all mandates --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

MR. K. BROWN: -- the school bus mandate.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Paulin.

MS. PAULIN: Thank you so much. I want to speak on the bill. And --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. PAULIN: -- and limit my comments to Part QQ.

This final bill and agreement represents a major victory for the Jewish community and other faiths that have faced an alarming rise in harassment and intimidation. As anti-Semitism and hate crimes continue to rise across our State and nation, it is essential that our houses of worship, religious schools and community centers have meaningful protections. I am so proud to have played a role in this legislation and I am especially proud of the role that the Assembly has played to ensure that the final language in this budget bill protects vulnerable communities while respecting constitutional rights.

Throughout the negotiations, the Assembly was focused on guaranteeing that the legislation would provide real world protections for Jewish institutions that have increasingly become targets of intimidation. I want to thank the Speaker, I want to thank Jen and Jen for their leadership, unwavering support and respect. A shout-out to Micah Lasher and a shout-out to Simcha Eichenstein who worked so hard to make sure that this bill is the best it could be.

One of the most significant accomplishments secured was an expanded definition of religious place of worship. Today, protections explicitly extend not only to traditional houses of worship, but also to Jewish community centers, to yeshivas and religious schools. Families, students and worshipers deserve to feel safe when attending these places. This legislation is a tremendous win and sends a clear, clear message that New York State does not tolerate hatred.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Gandolfo.

MR. GANDOLFO: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Chairman please yield for a few questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the Chair yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. GANDOLFO: I appreciate that. I don't have too many questions for you today. A lot of my colleagues have already received answers on some of the questions I was planning to ask. But I want to draw your attention back to the New York City amortization of their unfunded accrued liabilities. So it does free up some of that funding for New York City in the short-term, however starting in 2033 the liability will then increase; is that correct?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes. Absolutely.

MR. GANDOLFO: So in 2030 -- in 2034, it starts to increase significantly. How confident are we that New York City will not have a structural deficit that would require us to kick that can further down the road?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, hopefully the administration of the State in the current and future administrations between now and then see this as -- as -- it's like having a balloon mortgage basically and -- and make the appropriate actions or take the appropriate actions now so when that period does come they will have the finances to be able to pay it.

MR. GANDOLFO: Have the mayor or city hall provided any specifics on how they will avoid being in a deficit when the liability for this increases?

MR. PRETLOW: That wasn't addressed during the budget process.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. So we're just trusting that --

MR. PRETLOW: We're -- yes.

MR. GANDOLFO: -- in a couple years we'll be able to pretty much pick up double the liability that they would've had?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, sir.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay.

And now moving on to the school bus camera -- camera bureau portion here. So the enacted budget creates a formal administrative adjudication system for the stop-arm camera violations in New York State?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes.

MR. GANDOLFO: Do any local governments currently operate these school bus camera bureaus?

MR. PRETLOW: I don't believe so.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. Now, if a municipality has existing a traffic violations bureau, can they fold in the school bus camera enforcement of that into their existing --

MR. PRETLOW: I believe so, yes.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. And what if it's just a

parking violations bureau, would they be able to do the same?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: I think if they're given the authority to do it then yes, they will.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. Now does the State anticipate any counties or municipalities needing additional staffing or officers or administrative resources to operate these bureaus if they don't have something similar existing?

MR. PRETLOW: That was not comp -- contemplated, but if -- but if they do want to do it of course they can use the revenues generated from the program to pay the salaries of any additional staff that they may have to employ.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. The current -- and where the revenues -- they would have to use those revenues or would the State provide any extra support if they did have to comply with this and --

MR. PRETLOW: There's -- there is no State funding for that, no.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: Beside parking tickets and cities now -- we don't -- the State doesn't fund that, but several cities have parking violation bureaus. Some -- some have parking bureaus, some have -- they handle parking in different -- different manners --

MR. GANDOLFO: Are they required by the State to have those bureaus?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. But they would be required to operate a new bureau here even if they don't have a current traffic violation --

(Crosstalk)

MR. PRETLOW: I -- I believe so.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. And would you anticipate if it's an issue for some municipalities to hire people and expand their administrative functions here that the State could come back and offer some funding to assist and help them comply?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, that's not -- we're not contemplating at this point, but I think going -- going forward, any municipality that participates in the bus camera program would have to make the arrangements within their own community as to how it's going to be handled.

MR. GANDOLFO: All right. Thank you to the Chairman and thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Dinowitz.

MR. DINOWITZ: On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. DINOWITZ: I wanted to address a few issues, and like it was said earlier, this bill has some really good stuff in it and some really bad stuff and that's how it always is with a budget bill and ultimately we've got to decide how to vote. Given that, I -- I intend to

vote yes on the bill, but I wanted to talk about a few of the issues.

One, the reforms to Tier 6. I think it was probably 14 years ago on this floor when the Legislature passed Tier 6 and I know many of us were under a lot of pressure to vote yes on that. I voted no on that bill at that time and my reasoning was that I don't think it's right to treat people differently than each other. Kind of like a cast system. I don't -- I don't believe in the tiers, I never did. I'm Tier 4. I don't benefit from this legislation at all in terms of Tier 6 fix, but I think it's the right thing to do. I think it addresses some of the inequities that were created 14 years ago. So I'm very proud that we're doing this today and I look forward to seeing the positive impact it's gonna have on many, many State workers.

On the other hand, the CLCPA is something that many people in this Chamber work very hard to pass that and other important environmental legislation, important legislation to fight climate change and it is really very unfortunate that today we are backsliding on some of that legislation that many people fought so hard to pass. I think it's a mistake and I think that people down the road will pay for this dearly. I have two grandchildren who live in New York, they're 11 years old. They're the ones that are going to pay for the mistakes that we're making here today on environmental legislation. We should be going in the other direction and I hope that in the future we can back -- backtrack on our backtracking if that's possible.

Likewise, I am concerned regarding the insurance --

auto insurance legislation that's being passed here and was passed last week as well. I think we all agree that we want to fight insurance fraud, no question about it. My concern is that I do not want to see accident victims' rights change for the worse and I'm concerned that some people are going to lose out very inappropriately because of this legislation. Now, it would be great if our insurance rates went down and I look forward to that happening. Although, when I read the legislation I just couldn't find the part where it says -- where it mandated that our insurance rates are gonna go down. And you know why? Cause it's not in there. Now I discovered the way insurance companies can lower insurance rates; they can lower insurance rates. They can do that all by themselves, no one has to do anything else to make that happen. That could happen. So I think it's unfortunate that we don't have those guarantees in this legislation.

But the last thing I wanted to talk about was the -- the buffer zone in Section QQ of the bill. October 7, 2023, was the worst genocide against Jewish people since the Holocaust. The 1,200 plus people who were killed that day, and they weren't all Jewish, but they were in Israel, they lived there, they were Israelis or they worked in Israel. It was a genocide. 250 people were kidnapped. Many people were raped and assaulted. It was shocking that the very next day there was a huge rally in New York City protesting Israel. Now this legislation isn't about Israel, but it kind of is in a certain way. It's shocking that since that day over two-and-a-half years ago, hate crimes against Jewish people, but hate crime is against lots of other

people as well, have risen dramatically. And this hate is coming from both ends of the political spectrum, including people on the far left and people on the far right. So it's not from one political party or the other, but it's there and we have to recognize it and by recognizing this today I think this is a -- an enormous victory not only for the Jewish community but I think for all communities in New York. And I'm proud that the Legislature -- that the Assembly has taken the lead on making sure this happens.

Now the legislation creates a new crime of criminal interference with access to a place of religious worship. And it says, *a person is guilty of this crime when such a person with respect to an individual who was, or is, seeking to enter into or exit from a place of religious worship knowingly or intentionally obstructs or otherwise interferes with the entryway into or exit from a place of religious worship for the purpose of rendering passage by that individual unreasonably difficult or hazardous or -- or within 50 feet of the place -- from a place of religious worship, knowingly or intentionally engages in a course of conduct that places the individual in reasonable fear for their safety, and this includes not only houses of worship, but it includes education institutions, it includes community centers.* So for example, in my own community - and I think I mentioned this before - I -- I attend the Riverdale Y most days when I'm in the district because I go to the gym there. Years ago my grandchildren went to the nursery school there and right now there's not only a nursery school, there's a pre-K program there and there's

lots of other programming for young people, for old people and everybody in between. Institutions like that will also be protected under this legislation.

So I think this is a very important step for all of us to take and I'm proud that we're doing this on the State level. Sadly, on a City level, two bills that were passed by the City Council, one was -- one became law notwithstanding the -- how can I put it? There was no veto, there was no signature. But the second piece of legislation was actually vetoed, the one that would protect schools. But I think what we're doing here to -- today at least addresses that in part. This is important in this day and age when anti-Semitism, when hate crimes are higher than ever, higher than it's ever been, when the majority of hate crimes in our City, in our State are committed against people who are Jewish. But other hate crimes have gone up significantly as well, particularly against the Muslim community. This is -- this not only is a practical bill that will have an impact, but it sends out a message that we don't tolerate that kind of nonsense, that kind of hate in our State.

So I -- I thank everybody who was involved in helping to make this happen and I look forward to voting yes on this legislation particularly because of this buffer zone provision.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Norber.

MR. NORBER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Chair yield please for some questions regarding QQ?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Pretlow, will you yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Yes, I will.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. NORBER: First of all, this is a very good bill and I want to commend anybody who was behind it. It's an improvement. I know that before we were talking about 25 feet, but now we're talking about 50 feet which is much better than we are and we're definitely in the right direction. I'm going to try to understand a little bit better what the means of places of worship or prayer --

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. Mr. Norber, I'm going to defer your question to Mr. Dinowitz.

MR. NORBER: Okay.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Dinowitz, will you yield?

MR. DINOWITZ: Yes, and I just want to say that --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Dinowitz yields.

MR. DINOWITZ: -- 50 feet is 100% better than 25 feet.

MR. NORBER: Yes. It's a little bit better. Yeah, it is better. It'd be better if it'd be all over the State, but -- but we're definitely going there in that way. So if let's say I want to conduct a prayer service in my home. And you know how it is in the Jewish community. There's a Shiva, there's occasions in which I bring people

for a minyan or can even just to come together and to pray. Would that be considered under this law?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, let -- let me read the provision first, it's -- it's not that long. It says, *any building or structure that a reasonable person would know that religious adherence collectively recognize as a place to regularly, regularly gather for or hold religious services, observance, prayer, assembly, education, instructional or devotional practice including community centers and shall include its entrance, its exit, the parking lot and so on*. So --

MR. NORBER: But who decides that?

MR. DINOWITZ: -- so your -- your question is whether if you're having a -- a prayer service or a Shiva at your house --

MR. NORBER: Right. It's a regular service. It happens everyday for a certain amount -- even for 30 days. It becomes temporary service -- place for let's say a few weeks or whatever, but it is a place where people from the community come together and they want to perform a prayer service. So I'd like to know if that would be considered acceptable under this law.

MR. DINOWITZ: Yeah, I would -- first I would say that --

(Pause) (Mic issues)

It's working. I could shout, though.

So a Shiva is not something which is regular. It

happens for a -- a specified brief period of time. This deals with something which happens on a regular basis. But again, it -- it also has to do with the mindset of the person who is perpetuating -- perpetrating the bad act --

MR. NORBER: Okay. So it's subjective? Because that's another question I wanted to get to you here because who's deciding these things? Who decides what is a reasonable fear for one's safety? Is it the perpetrator? Is it the victim?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, ultimately, if -- if this is a situation where something is brought to trial, a judge or a jury would have to decide. But I think in the first instance a police officer would have to exercise their judgment as to whether somebody's -- our rights are being violated or not and it -- it's -- it's -- it's something which I think is usually easily discernible.

MR. NORBER: Okay. So -- so -- and so in that case I have to understand better how it would be played out. We'll make it simple; a woman with two children, babies, walks in the street. She wants to go to prayer service in the synagogue, all right? She has to pass by some demonstrators wearing masks, let's just say. Does she -- would she be able to fall under that area of reasonable fear for one's safety and can she go to a police officer or call or make a complaint in any form or fashion?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, it -- it -- it would certainly -- it would depend on what's -- what's being done. I mean, this is addressing, for example, demonstrations taking place outside

synagogues as one example. It could be any other kind of house of worship --

MR. NORBER: Right --

MR. DINOWITZ: -- but we know what --

MR. NORBER: -- but let's say a synagogue.

MR. DINOWITZ: -- but we know what's happened recently outside synagogues --

MR. NORBER: Right.

MR. DINOWITZ: -- because that's what's happened. But the potential is there for any -- any other kind of house of worship. The police at a demonstration, they can set up a -- a perimeter, then we have the 50-foot buffer zone as I mentioned earlier. The mere fact that somebody is there and you don't like the looks of them because they're wearing a mask which I -- which for some reason only people who seem to be up to no good do, but that's beside the point. The -- the -- their mere presence in and of itself is not -- is not the violation.

MR. NORBER: No. Of course that they're wearing a mask or a keffiyeh which is being worn by people who murder Americans and Israelis alike, Europeans in another country, that would be a form of harassment or putting a person under a fear of their own safety I would believe. I just want to understand who would dictate and determine that that's actually happening. I -- I mean, I made it simple. Outside a synagogue, a woman and two children and a man wearing a mask in front them saying something. He's saying I don't like something, doesn't -- not specifically on this lady.

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, first of all, it could be a man with two children and a woman who's wearing the mask, but that's also besides the point --

MR. NORBER: No. I'm just talking about the simple scenario where a woman with two babies going to the synagogue, outside a synagogue.

MR. DINOWITZ: It -- it depends on what's -- what's going on --

MR. NORBER: A demonstration.

MR. DINOWITZ: -- or what they're doing --

MR. NORBER: Fine. Let's call it a demonstration.

MR. DINOWITZ: Somebody -- somebody saying they don't like whatever, I mean, people have the right to say things we don't like, and this legislation is in no way intended to interfere with one's First Amendment right of free speech or to a protest. However, when somebody's speech or protest interferes with somebody else's ability to exercise their First Amendment rights, that's when this may come into play. Now, in a -- in a situation where there's -- there's a demonstration, for example, the police would have to exercise their judgment as to whether or not there's a violation here, and if there is a violation, they could issue a violation.

MR. NORBER: I'm just trying to find the point in where this becomes a Class B misdemeanor. What is the Class B misdemeanor in this scenario?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, I -- I --

MR. NORBER: Because I -- I was believing when I read this, when I'm reading this, it's a very good bill and it says, and if a person is wearing a mask or keffiyeh, with all due respect, First Amendment is very important, I know. But if they're wearing it outside within 50 feet of a synagogue, I would presume I would feel unsafe in some form. Not just a woman and children.

MR. DINOWITZ: I -- I -- I don't think the mere wearing of a keffiyeh is a violation of anything --

MS. NORBER: So the mask, the Hamas mask.

MR. DINOWITZ: How -- how -- how you look at a keffiyeh, you know, that -- that's how you look at it, but that in and of itself wearing it is certainly not a violation of anybody's rights.

MS. NORBER: The Hamas mask is still not a violation?

MR. DINOWITZ: Now -- I'm sorry? Say it...

MS. NORBER: The wearing of the Hamask [sic] mask on myself, Hamas, it -- that's still not a violation?

MR. DINOWITZ: Are you talking about a little mask or are you talking about -- I think I cut you --

MS. NORBER: I'm talking about the whole spiel, all right? I'm in black with the red bandana, you know what I mean. We saw that on October 7th. Whatever was worn by the terrorists of October 7th, if it's worn outside of a synagogue, is that not considered? That's my only question.

MR. DINOWITZ: I don't think the mere wearing of a

mask, even a full face mask, even though I think it's disgusting frankly --

MS. NORBER: Yeah.

MR. DINOWITZ: -- I don't think in and of itself wearing is it is a -- a violation or a Class B misdemeanor. It depends on the facts and circumstances. We did pass legislation last year, but it was very limited legislation. It also provided for a Class B misdemeanor. So again, you have to look at the circumstances.

MS. NORBER: So what is the circumstance? What would be a circumstance? What would the person need to be doing?

(Crosstalk)

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, if somebody's wearing a -- a full mask and is yelling and screaming, you know, *Hezbollah* and stuff like that and they're trying to block somebody from going into a synagogue, I would think that is a violation. However, if somebody is merely wearing something that makes them look ridiculous in my opinion, that's not necessarily a violation.

MS. NORBER: And if calling people, "baby killers" would that be considered? *You're a baby killer.* Let's say they go -- a person's going to a synagogue, is that a baby -- is calling them a baby killer --

MR. DINOWITZ: Oh, I think that's not a new thing, calling people "baby killers". Anti-abortion people have been doing that for years.

MS. NORBER: Yeah, but people going to

synagogues. Okay.

(Pause)

So -- and this -- this in no way has anything to do with -- all right. I'm just trying to find out what they need to do and that's pretty much what I'm getting at. If they don't beat them up, if they don't assault them, it's useless?

MR. DINOWITZ: It -- no. It -- it's not -- this -- this does not say that somebody has to be physically assaulted.

MS. NORBER: If they have a effigy like they just did in Montreal --

MR. DINOWITZ: If somebody is engaging in a course of conduct not simply wearing something we don't like or saying something we don't like or agree with, it would -- we're talking about something that goes beyond that. In my opinion, some of the things that happened recently at the -- a couple of synagogues, one on the East Side of Manhattan and one I believe in -- in Queens in -- in colleague Berger's district, some of those things went beyond what is appropriate because there -- it was more than just saying things. It was putting people -- instilling fear in people and probably deliberately doing so and so this is meant to address situations like that.

MR. NORBER: So how does this combat anti-Semitism?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, hopefully -- well, listen. We're not gonna change what's in people's heads. We're not going to

change the type of people who wear a Nazi tattoo on their chest or things like that. Some people think the way they think. But what it's hopefully going to do is make it more difficult for somebody to engage in the type of conduct that took place outside those synagogues recently and at least give people -- give police the greater guidance in how they can address that situation.

MR. NORBER: I'm not sure why it's so hard to just say anybody wearing a -- a mask that represents terror, why can't we make that into a law and that's it?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, some of us wanted to pass a law last year --

MR. NORBER: We've done it last week.

MR. DINOWITZ: -- on -- on masks, but it didn't happen that way.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: (Banging gavel)

MR. NORBER: Was that me?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: No. It was a little loud in here. Thank you. Keep going, Mr. Norber.

MR. DINOWITZ: I mean personally, I think unless you're wearing a mask for religious reasons or for health reasons, you shouldn't be wearing a mask. That's my opinion, but that's not the law.

MR. NORBER: There are laws in place in the State and Nassau County of course that a person who is wearing a mask for medicinal or religious purposes, that's totally fine. That's very easy to

-- to -- to -- to observe that. I'm just not sure why -- I thought, I really thought that this law would do something about the masks because the masks instill fear, and if it says it right here that intentionally engages in a course of conduct that places an individual in the reasonable fear for their safety and it does. Why not just ban this in the State level? That's the only thing, so... but thank you very much.

MR. DINOWITZ: You're welcome.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. González-Rojas.

MS. GONZÁLEZ-ROJAS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. GONZÁLEZ-ROJAS: I rise today with mixed emotions about this budget. Every day New Yorkers are forced to make impossible decisions on what to prioritize and today I'm forced to do the same. There are provisions in this budget that I strongly support and there are provisions that I strongly oppose, but I believe it's important to be honest with New Yorkers about both.

First, I want to acknowledge the long overdue Tier 6 improvements included in this budget. Public workers across our City and State including teachers, transit workers, nurses, social workers, sanitation workers and countless others have carried New York through some of our hardest moments. They deserve dignity, fairness and retirement security. Tier 6 has unfairly forced workers to

contribute more, work longer and retire with less. For years, labor unions and workers have fought for relief and this budget finally moves us in the right direction. That matters deeply to me and it matters to the working families across Queens and New York State.

At the same time, I'm [sic] also must be -- speak plainly about my concerns regarding the climate metric rollbacks included in this budget. Let me be clear: I do not support weakening our commitment to confronting the climate crisis. Communities like Jackson Heights, Corona, East Elmhurst, Elmhurst, LeFrak City have already experienced the consequences of environmental injustice; extreme heat, flooding, poor air quality and aging infrastructure. Climate change is not theoretical for our communities, it is personal.

We also cannot afford to delay meaningful climate accountability. The Legislature should push the Department of Environmental Conservation to establish and enforce stronger interim emissions targets through regulation so that New York stays on track to meet the goals of the climate law. When the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act was debated in 2019, we understood that early action matters. Front-loading emissions reductions, monitoring progress and making course corrections when needed is how we ensure New York delivers on its climate commitments. I believe we can and we must support workers and retirees while also advancing bold climate action. New Yorkers should never be forced into false choices between economic justice and climate justice.

Unfortunately, this budget process too often forces

legislators into impossible positions by combining unrelated policy issues into massive budget packages negotiated behind closed doors. Major policy changes that -- that deserve full public debate and review should not be inserted into budget bills at the last minute with little transparency and limited opportunities for amendments. That's not how a healthy democracy should function. Legislators should be able to evaluate significant policy proposals on their own merits; openly, transparently and with meaningful public input. We need structural reform of the State budget process so that non-fiscal policy changes cannot simply be shoved in the budget to avoid independent scrutiny and debate.

My vote today refects the reality of governing in an imperfect system. It's not a surrender of my values. I will continue to fight for stronger climate protections, environmental justice and a more transparent and democratic legislative process. I am voting yes because I refuse to deny hardworking union members and retirees the long overdue dignity and retirement security that they have fought years to achieve. At the same time, I want to be absolutely clear. My vote is not an endorsement of every provision in this budget and the climate policy changes included here should not be the final word. I will continue to fight alongside labor, climate activists and front like -- frontline communities to reserve -- reverse these climate rollbacks, to strengthen accountability and to push New York towards the bold environmental leadership that this moment demands. Our responsibility as legislators is not only to cast votes, but to continue

organizing, advocating and improving the systems that shape those votes. That work continues tomorrow.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Chair yield, please?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Pretlow, will you yield?

MR. PRETLOW: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Chair yields.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, Mr. Pretlow. So the first thing I want to talk about is the MTA bond rating aspect in this legislation. So --

MR. PRETLOW: What -- what part are you referring to?

MR. REILLY: So it's going to be, let's see, Part H. Extend the MTA's tax increment financing authorization.

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. It's a one-year extender.

MR. REILLY: What -- so what exactly does it do as to the extender and what -- what does it actually extend?

(Conferencing)

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. It's -- it's a TIF, which is a tax incentive program and it allows the MTA and municipalities to come to some sort of an agreement as to the development of that land.

MR. REILLY: Development of what? I'm sorry.

MR. PRETLOW: The parcel of land.

MR. REILLY: Oh, okay. Do we know which specific land?

MR. PRETLOW: No. I don't know.

MR. REILLY: Okay.

MR. PRETLOW: It depends on municipality and the MTA.

MR. REILLY: All right. So what --

MR. PRETLOW: Yeah. There -- there aren't any currently in effect and this just gives them the extent -- the time -- another year to extend if there should be a need for an agreement.

MR. REILLY: Okay. So this -- within this budget, is there anything that extends or puts forward the MTA borrowing aspect?

MR. PRETLOW: No.

MR. REILLY: No. Okay.

All right, Mr. Pretlow, if I can move to Part D, the stop New York City super speeders through intelligent speed assistance.

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. I believe that Mr. Magnarelli wants to answer those questions and I don't see him.

MR. REILLY: Well, it looks like he's not here.

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. I'll -- I will -- I will -- I will answer those. Just give me one second, I have to get some notes.

MR. REILLY: Do you -- okay.

(Pause)

Madam Speaker?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Yes?

MR. REILLY: Can we pause my time while they shift?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: No. There's no time pausing. You can ask a question --

(Laughter)

MR. REILLY: Oh. So really --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: -- or ask a different question and we will go find the Transportation Chair.

MR. REILLY: If he's not ready how can I ask the question?

MR. PRETLOW: Okay. I'm -- I'm ready for Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: All right.

MR. PRETLOW: This part authorizes the City of New York to require vehicle owners who receive 16 school speed zone camera tickets within a 12-month period to install an intelligence speed limiting device.

MR. REILLY: All right. What studies were used to establish the number and the amount of time for those violations?

MR. PRETLOW: I'm not sure what the study was used to determine this, but this was part of the negotiation and this is

what the final outcome was.

MR. REILLY: So do we know how those numbers were picked?

MR. PRETLOW: It's part of the negotiations, sir.

MR. REILLY: The negotiation between who?

MR. PRETLOW: Between the Senate, the Assembly and the Governor.

MR. REILLY: And do we know what data they used to actually come up with that?

MR. PRETLOW: I was not part of those negotiations. I don't know.

MR. REILLY: Okay. So as it relates to -- as it relates to this program, what safeguards exist to prevent inaccurate GPS readings, equipment malfunctions or improper device calibration from unfairly penalizing drivers?

MR. PRETLOW: Well, I -- I will refer that to Mr. Magnarelli who is now --

MR. REILLY: All right.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Magnarelli, will you yield?

MR. MAGNARELLI: I apologize for walking out for a few minutes.

MR. REILLY: No worries. No worries. Okay.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Magnarelli yields.

MR. MAGNARELLI: Yes. I think what'll happen is that you have a right -- they have a right to contest any type of installation of this thing. So when it's done, when the installation is done -- or when your -- excuse me. Let me move back. Vehicle owners have the right to contest the installation order. At that point in time, you can bring whatever you think is contrary to the installation at that point.

MR. REILLY: So what is the actual due process to contest the installation?

MR. MAGNARELLI: You can contest the installation and the City has requirements for the vendors that they have to adhere to.

MR. REILLY: What is the actual process for contesting that? Through which mechanism, through which jurisdiction? How do you --

MR. MAGNARELLI: It goes through the City of New York. The City of New York --

MR. REILLY: Which specifically?

MR. MAGNARELLI: -- they will establish it.

MR. REILLY: But which specifically? So which specific entity would a motorist or registered owner appeal to?

MR. MAGNARELLI: It would be designated by the City of New York or the mayor or the council of the City of New York. They will establish the coun -- council or the court or the tribunal that you have to go in front of.

MR. REILLY: So do you know how it works now when you contest a speed camera violation in New York City?

MR. MAGNARELLI: I do not.

MR. REILLY: Okay.

Madam Speaker, on the bill, please.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. REILLY: So what we're hearing is that this piece of legislation in this budget bill was negotiated and we don't even know exactly how due process is going to take place for motorists in New York State who travel in New York City. There is just no answers. But I will give you an answer of why we continue to go down this path.

In 2014, there was a pilot program with 20 speed cameras for New York City. It was a pilot program. It passed in 2014, long before I was here. It was a five-year pilot program. Within three years they expanded it to 100 cameras without even fulfilling the first five years of the pilot program. Fast forward, we extend it not only from a quarter-mile Monday through Friday, camera operation, we extended it --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick, why do you rise?

MR. REILLY: -- to 24 --

MS. GLICK: Will the gentleman yield to a question?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. --

MR. REILLY: Not right now. I'm going to finish.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The gentleman does not yield.

MR. REILLY: 20 -- 24 hours up to a quarter-mile circumference from a school instead of on the same street as a school. In 2015, New York City lowered their speed limit from 30 miles an hour to 25 miles an hour. No coincidence. They dubbed it Vision Zero. It was vision all right. Vision for $250 million a year on motorists. That's how much they make.

Fast forward to just this year. We lowered the speed limit in New York City to 20 miles an hour. No coincidence. This year, the new mayor lowered in certain school zones to 15 miles an hour. Think about that. 15 miles an hour. You gotta go 11 miles over to get a speed camera ticket. 26 miles an hour. Does that sound like a super speeder? I don't think so. This is nothing more than another money grab. And the reason why I spoke about the MTA earlier is because their bond ratings are tied to E-ZPass. And what they do is they collect funds all through this technology. All it is is a hit on motorists in New York City. We continue to pile on a tax on motorists, but we don't call it a tax. We siphon your wallet and the idea that someone going 26 miles an hour is a "super speeder" is ludicrous.

Now don't get me wrong, I'm not advocating speeding, but let's look at the pattern here. It used to be 30 miles an hour on a New York City street for decades. All of a sudden, this

Legislature back in 2013-'14 decided to make speed cameras a thing. Suddenly, it went to 25 miles an hour. I guess maybe people actually started slowing down so they weren't getting enough revenue. So what did New York City do? Let's go to 20 miles an hour. Hmm. We're back up to $250 million. All of a sudden, 2025 hits. Hmm, we're not getting enough. 15 miles an hour in certain school districts. I gotcha now. 26 miles an hour and I collect that $50 tax from you.

That's what this is about. It's about money. And you heard we don't even know what the due process is to ensure that when they put these interlocking devices on to measure your speed, how you can fight it. Because I'll tell you right now, a speed camera ticket is almost impossible to fight in New York City. Why? Because they don't listen. I've actually -- before I was in this Legislature, I actually had somebody reach out to me that the calibration on the camera had a truck that wasn't relate -- wasn't even in -- wasn't theirs. They got the violation. They still had to pay the $50 fine. It's absurd, it's a money grab. That's the sad reality here. We can try and fight and save people's lives by actually having police officers issue summonses and really go after the driver.

What's really ironic though, too, is that certain vehicles are exempt from this. Government vehicles, certain TLC vehicles and some -- some franchise carriers. Hmm. Can we name a few of those? Maybe UPS, maybe Amazon, maybe those drivers, right? But if you lend your car out to somebody and unfortunately they get a few speed tickets -- speed camera tickets going 26 miles an

hour, your registration could be suspended and you can have to get this speed monitoring device. Let's be fair to New Yorkers because this isn't fair. This is nothing but a money grab.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ms. Kelles.

MS. KELLES: So there are -- as many other people have said, there are several things in this --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Are you on the bill, Ms. Kelles?

MS. KELLES: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. KELLES: As I" ve noted and as others have noted, there are several aspects of this bill that are positive. And I wanted to thank all of my union members, all the union members across the State for all their incredible work on Tier 6. It is a pension system that has left so many people unable to retire without a sufficient pension to stabilize their family. And -- and the steps that have been taken are really important moves in a direction that will help many New Yorkers. So I want to thank -- I thank the union members who have worked so hard for this. And the Jewish community in my district has stepped up to speak out on the increased -- significant increased violence that they have experienced personally, and they've seen their communities experience personally.

I want to thank leadership for making sure that there are components of the language in QQ that both protect the Jewish community and increase the feeling of safety. And also protect and -- protect those who want to stand up for their -- for their rights to -- to picket and to hold strikes, particularly union members. But I do support those and I do think that both of those are very strong components of this bill.

But I wanna talk about, for the rest of my time, one of the most disappointing, heartbreaking components of this bill as a -- as an environmental scientist. This is a rollback of decades of my life and of decades of many other people's lives who worked very hard to counter the actions of our State as one of the greatest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions in the country and in the world. One of the components that is being rolled back in this piece of legislation are the methane accounting to go from 20 years of accounting for methane to 100 years for accounting of methane. Methane is in the atmosphere for a very short period of time. So by shifting our accounting to 100 years, what we're basically saying is that we no longer wanna follow the science. That we wanna add a whole bunch of zeros in to the estimate of the impacts of methane so it look like it's a lot less impactful, even though in reality it is very impactful. When we're saying that we're following the international U.N. standard by shifting, that is a lie. What we are following is the political arm of the U.N., which is the UNFCCC. Because if you look at what the IPCC is noting, they have acknowledged that the 20-year standard actually follows science.

One of another components in this is removing the accounting of biogas from the total accounting of our greenhouse gas emissions, essentially saying that it doesn't have the impact that we really care about when we're looking at our total impact on -- on the climate. This is deeply frustrating and disingenuous on the truth of our impact. And what has been so unfortunate is the number of calls that I've gotten since people heard of this language from the oil and gas industry that owns a significant amount of the biogas sector that is gleefully calling the office looking to roll in their business into New York State.

We are also seeing in this a removal of the upstream emissions for greenhouse gases, for fossil fuels. Transportation and -- and extraction and development of fossil fuels. We are removing those from the accounting of GHG emissions. So essentially, a lie. We are creating those greenhouse gas emissions by our consumption, but we're not gonna count them. So the numbers that we're gonna see will look so much better than the reality of the impact that we are having as a State so we can make ourselves feel better, stick our fingers in our ears, stick our heads in the sand and not acknowledge the true impact that we're having.

When we talk about Cap and Invest, we're rolling that back as well. It should have been released in 2024. The Governor put it -- it -- put it in her Executive Budget in 2023, saying that the drafts would be released in 2024, it would be fully implemented by 2025. We are years behind. We are now moving it to 2028. It seems to be

in direct response to a lawsuit that the Executive lost recently which will now go away. But this was supposed to be the funding to implement the CLCPA. And I will note, we have been doing actions that people will acknowledge, move us forward towards addressing climate change and reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. There are some things that we were doing. We were already doing those before the CLCPA was put in place. The reason we did the CLCPA is because we acknowledge that we were not aligned with the Paris Accord. That we were way behind. And the rate at which we were addressing our greenhouse gas emissions were below what we needed in order to stay aligned with the Paris Accord. So by rolling back the CLCPA in the way that we are, we are essentially saying that we are stepping away from our commitment to the Paris Accord.

I want to note also the rolling back of the timeline. We no longer will have a 2030 timeline. We will have a 2040 timeline, but it will be flexible and where feasible and economical. We will essentially only have a hard 2050 timeline. That is almost 25 years -- 24 years from now that we are saying that we will fully commit to our 85 percent greenhouse gas reductions. The problem is that we haven't been taking all the steps that the scoping plan outlined that we needed to take in order to meet the initial goal of 2030. We have not been taking those steps. There have been -- there have been reports that have shown that department after department after department of our government has not taken steps to implement the CLCPA, including meeting the specific needs of reaching the 35

percent for our disadvantaged communities. The one good thing in this entire thing is that we will be moving that from 35 percent to 40 percent. But if we don't enforce it, then how are we actually going to meet that goal? I'm very glad we're moving that 1 -- that 1 percent, but we have to have guidelines, clear guidelines from our Executive to every single department that they then follow in order to make sure that it is enforced. So we've already been kicking that can down the road. We need to see interim, interim targets by our DEC which statute currently allows through regulations that creates those interim targets. That says we will meet these steps or otherwise we will find us in 2040, still haven't done anything or any major steps in order to meet that goal. And then we will be able to say, *Well, meeting that goal is not feasible*. Well, a goal isn't feasible if you're not taking any steps to move towards it.

We are not acknowledging in this the fact that we are going to be falling back onto fossil fuel. We have seen movements in that direction from the Executive to fast track fossil fuel pipelines. To fast track nuclear, even though we know it is the most expensive energy, without any comprehensive independent fiscal analysis when the only nuclear that's been done in the last 30 years in the entire United States was $30 billion for 1.2 gigawatts of energy. If we're talking about 5 gigs, 4 or 5 gigs, we are talking about $100 billion, potentially, increase on our ratepayers. I want to see that fiscal analysis. So we know that the one fuel that has increased significantly in the last months, in the last year and has been predicted to continue

to increase, is fossil fuel. There are state after state that are saying we need to lean in to renewable energy infrastructure, to clean energy infrastructure, because that is what will reduce the cost of energy on our ratepayers, on New Yorkers. So if we want the most affordable pathway, then we lean into clean energy. It's not too late to do it. Even if we are rolling back our CLCPA. We have a week left of policy season. We should be doing big steps to make sure that we are not building massive amounts, the 11 gigawatts of data centers, even though all residents in the entire State consume about 6 to 7 gigawatts. Double, double that energy demand would be the data centers that are already on our NYISO interconnection queue. We need to address that to ensure that we have energy reliability in our State. We can't be leaning into that if we are going to ensure that while simultaneously rolling back our climate laws. And anyone who pushes into that is being incredibly disingenuous. Incredibly disingenuous.

So lastly, I will just acknowledge that the steps that we need to take, we need to -- when we do release that Cap and Invest, that Cap and Invest needs to be strong. It needs to have clear guardrails; clear guardrails with a floor on -- on the cost of the allowances, a ceiling on the cost of allowances. We need to reduce them significantly over time, encourage everyone to get on to renewable energy infrastructure, and make sure that the funding that we raise is invested in renewable energy infrastructure, upgrading our transmission line infrastructure. Making sure that we support our disadvantaged communities. We need to make sure our energy -- our

agencies are implementing the CLCPA. We still will have a law, although tremendously weakened. I am getting e-mails, hundreds of e-mails a day from my constituents, distraught because of this action.

As a climate scientist, this is one of the central focuses of my career. And because of that, despite the fact that there are things in this budget that I support with all of my heart like the fixes to Tier 6, I cannot support in whole this tremendous rollback that will set us back decades and lead to us being a part of the problem and not a part of the solution. The rollbacks in SEQR are an added blow to this.

I applaud our leadership for fighting. The reason that we are late is because our leadership fought so hard to prevent these rollbacks. And with all of my heart, thank you. And to the staff who worked so hard to prevent the rollbacks on SEQR, thank you so much. It's not what we would have wanted, but because of you it's less bad than it would have been.

Because of these rollbacks I am unable to support this and I will be voting no on this. And thank you so much, Madam Speaker, for the time.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ms. Levenberg.

MS. LEVENBERG: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. LEVENBERG: So, my constituents should

know exactly where I stand, and that's why I'm speaking on the bill. I have struggled with my conscience while reviewing this legislation. Theirs is real good in this bill. The ASAP Act is a meaningful step forward that will help us get more solar energy into the grid. There are utility reforms included here that I and other colleagues in the Westchester Delegation have really been pushing for as we continue to push back against ConEd and other utilities and their incessant rate hikes. I'm proud to see our work on this begin to bear fruit.

I'm also proud that we were able to offer some peace of mind to those of Jewish as well as Muslim faith who have been the target of hate crimes directed at them in their places which are sacred to them and to me. This bill takes significant steps to keep people safe in sacred spaces.

Also, I am happy to see we are continuing to take steps to level the playing field for public servants, our brothers and sisters in labor, and toward making it more viable to take those jobs by improving Tier 6 benefits.

But I cannot pretend that this bill does not take us backward in serious ways. As my colleague, the good doctor, just mentioned, the CLCPA rollbacks are incredibly damaging. And she articulated them way better than I can, but nevertheless. Especially the change to the way we account for the methane emissions. It's a retreat from science, as she described, and from the commitments that we made to our communities, and it is very difficult to stomach for so many reasons. And why are we now pushing back the timeline for

announcing new regulations until the end of 2028 when a full set of regulations was already nearly complete? And frankly, it's quite the opposite of supporting affordability. If we had put Cap and Invest in place and had rolled out the regulations as we should have, and if we'd gotten rid of the obligation to serve gas, and if we put our money into the sustainable energy rollout and innovation that was promised by the CLCPA, we would all be seeing much lower utility rates while working to combat climate change and all the escalating costs that go along with addressing it. My environmental justice communities in particular cannot take the hit of a new gas pipeline expansion which will leave them paying higher utility bills to build out another pipeline, and deepen our reliance on expensive fracked gas. It is truly disgraceful.

I'm also concerned with the rollbacks to insurance -- insurance protections, as my colleague mentioned, for those in auto accidents. And most likely, this will only stand to benefit the insurance companies; again, not ratepayers.

We keep finding ourselves in the same position. Late budgets that result in New York taking two steps back -- two steps forward and four steps back. We must do better than this, and we can by reforming the budget process. If we do not want to keep ending up back here, we need to work together as legislators, advocates and voters and fix the way New York passes budgets. For anyone listening who is also upset or even angry about this bill, I hope you will join me in pushing for a real solution to this problem.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. McDonald.

MR. MCDONALD: On the bill, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you. So, this is my 14th year, 14th budget. And I learned a long time ago that budgets are compromises, and today's bill is yet another example.

Individuals are rightly concerned about energy costs, housing costs, and auto insurance costs. And today I will be voting yes on this bill, as there is more than intent here, there is action. At the same time, there are very legitimate concerns.

Now, there's been comments made about we are rolling back the CLCPA. I'm not gonna get into that conversation, but I will say this: I do believe we are taking on a reset which is necessary. For years I've heard from constituents about their concern, our concern, about the dependence of fossil fuels and its impact on the environment. Yet they are also concerned that we are moving too quick and too fast. And whether it's true or not, they do feel, some, that this activity has led to increased energy costs, especially in regards to renewable energy. I respectfully disagree with those constituents, of course. As we know, there are many reasons why New York State and many other states throughout this country are seeing an increase in energy prices (indiscernible) a very simple, basic principle: Supply and demand. Demand for energy, especially

electricity, continues to grow dramatically as more households continue to add more devices as part of everyday living. At the federal level -- level, policy changes are causing an increase in sale of energy into an already expensive energy system in other countries, therefore reducing supply in the United States and adding pressure on prices here at home. We see it at the pump. We see it in our household energy rates we pay. And this budget tries to disarm the finger-pointing and to dive deeper into energy rates with what's called the Rates Commission, which is important. And I am hopeful that the year-long process brings all the stakeholders together to bring results that positively impact every single household.

I do believe we need to double down on continued investment and clean energy investments. Adding more energy options that are cost-effective like wind, like solar, like geothermal energy, will help build a supply of energy to meet that ever-increasing demand that I previously referenced.

This budget addresses the State Environmental Quality Review Act, known as SEQR. It is my hope as a former mayor who witnessed both the strengths and the weakness of the process that this will lead to increased housing opportunities. Because yes, housing and rent are two damn high. Once again, our housing supply is low, the demand is high. It is right that we seek to address this imbalance for future owners and tenants.

Auto insurance, as you know, is on the agenda today in this bill and I am 100 percent behind this reform. I believe after

much discussion we have struck the right balance to root out fraud, yet to hold auto insurance companies accountable. I am hopeful that with these reforms our Department of Financial Services is properly resourced to provide the necessary review to provide long overdue rate relief to ratepayers much like has been happening in other states.

And today we are also expanding on the work zone camera program which I believe is critical to protecting our hardworking highway workers who work day in and day out to make our roads and our bridges safer, yet at the same time putting themselves at risk. Earlier today myself and my colleague Mr. Bendett attended a memorial service for Robert Bort of Rensselaer County, who died a year ago almost to this day, doing the public work. He was, according to the Department of Transportation, the 59th line-of-duty death. I'm hopeful that expanding the work zone camera program will help prevent that 60.

In Robert Bort's honor and for the other reasons I mentioned before, I am voting yes, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Yeger.

MR. YEGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. May I speak on the bill?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. YEGER: Thank you very much.

First, I -- I agree with everything that the good gentleman from Richmond County yelled before; he's 100 percent

right. But that's not why I rise. Friends, this is the fourth budget bill, as you know, and we've spoken a lot about this today. And very few of what we have voted for and what we vote for today actually has anything to do with the budget. And the Exec -- and, you know, a lot -- a lot is written talking about this, a lot's talked about it, and -- and I'm sure there's, you know, blame the public frequently placed on the legislators, the ones who aren't getting paid for doing this. And that's okay, and I'm all right with -- with that. But what -- what the -- the fault really lies -- and where the fault really lies is on the Executive, which continually inserts and shoehorns items into these budget bills that have zero relation with the budget and zero relation with each other. For example, traffic camera violations have nothing to do with how the CPLR treats tort cases, and neither of those two topics have anything to do with environmental quality review, yet they're all in this budget. And it's a take-it-or-leave-it. You don't get to vote a little bit yes on this and a little bit no on that.

And so as so many of my friends here have said today, we have to make hard choices. Do we vote for something that on balance is slightly better than it is awful? Or do we vote against it because on balance it is more awful than it is possibly doing some good for New Yorkers? For example, perhaps you feel that the insurance reforms are going to result in money back in our constituents' pockets. If so, you might want to vote in favor of this. I don't believe for a second that a single thing we're doing today is going to result in a reduced premium for anybody in our State.

Nobody. If -- and -- and a member of the Legislature, of the Assembly, mentioned earlier today was talking about fraud and asking if there's any investment in detecting fraud. And the fraud that -- that has been focused on, of course, is a lot of fraud in -- in fraudulent insurance cases. But if you drive through the streets of the city where I live, the fraud you see is in ghost cars; fake plates, no plates, out-of-State plates. There's not a block in New York City that you go by down -- that you don't see plate after plate from Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Georgia, Texas, everywhere else. Very few New York plates at this point because they're -- the people of New York are registering their cars -- not all the people, many people -- are registering their cars outside of the City and State, in violation of the law, and depleting the insurance pool of their premiums which would result in lower premiums for everybody. And there is zero enforcement. Zero enforcement. Those are the same cars, by the way, that go up and down and get the speed camera tickets that are never enforced because there's nobody to go after.

We are on a balancing act. We are reforming, or at least tinkering with Tier 6. It's wise to do that. It's just, it's justifiable, it's right, it's righteous. Something that should be done and should have been done a while ago. We are not doing all of it. But the -- the -- the tradeoff that public servants who joined public service make is a little less pay for a retirement that is sufficient for them to live afterwards. And for full transparency, I gain nothing from this vote today. I'm not a member -- I'm not a member of Tier 6. This does

nothing for me. But it is the right thing to do. And it's in a budget bill that has a lot of junk in it; a lot of trash that has nothing to do with a budget.

We are voting today to amend the New York City Administrative Code to allow for the -- for a change in how pensions are am -- amortized. The effect of that, as a member spoke earlier today on this floor, is that the Mayor of New York will be able to -- no pun intended -- charge his grocery bill to a maxed-out credit card. The credit card is maxed out. He says it's maxed out. He says the City is broke, they're broke. I don't know how the City became broke as soon as he took office because it had a balanced budget last year. But the City's broke, says him. Every day he announces something that he's gonna spend money on, but the City's broke. And what he's doing with the broke city is saying, *I'm going to take today's bills and put them off to a henceforth some other time-elected Legislature, Mayor or City Council to pay those bills -- taxpayers to pay those bills*. Not his problem. The only time, or at least the most recent time that we did this was in the aftermath of 9/11. That is an emergency measure. We're voting on that today in this budget bill. Maybe it actually has something to do with the budget. It actually has numbers in that section, Part YY. So I guess -- I guess it's somewhat budget-related.

I would urge, by the way, because it's not a done deal when we vote in the -- the trustees of the pension systems all have to adopt it, and I would urge them if they're listening today, and if not,

you know, hopefully they tune in -- vote no. Don't -- don't accept that. Don't accept the amortization. Tell the City no. The City needs to pay its bills. The City needs to protect the pensions. And if they can't figure it out, then I can help them cut some things. I could just look at the press releases for the last 90 days of -- of announcements and this, that and the other thing, and help them find the savings. Not in this bill, it is -- is to be discussed in another bill, a taxation policy to help the Mayor solve the budgetary problems of New York City that he says are happening right now, but that tax -- the taxation policy won't take effect for another three years. So I'm not sure how that will help right now, but we'll talk about that in a day or two.

The -- again, not in a budget bill, but here we are, Part QQ of this omnibus -- this very, very, very, very omnibus bill. And many members have spoken about that and, you know, you kind of get to the part of the program where everything's been said but not everybody said it, so here I am. But I think it has to be said, as much as some good gentlemen and ladies spoke about this. The communities of New York where I represent them, other members who -- who represent neighborhoods that look like the member of the Legislature that's standing here speaking today, have been terrorized and tormented for the last several years by people who march on their houses of worship yelling, *Death to the Jews. Death to Zionists. Death to Israel.* Death to whatever. In my neighborhood just a week or two ago while I was up here on a Monday, in my neighborhood a block away from where I live -- it's not like I read about it in the

paper, I recognized it as I was watching the clips. I know these blocks. Mobs of masked thugs running up and down residential streets screaming the most vile things at and about Jews. Terrorizing Jews. We have a Mayor who's not interested in protecting a segment of New York City. It's okay. It -- he was -- you know, I believe in democracy. He won, and that's his policy position. His policy position is not everybody in New York City is entitled to the protection of law enforcement in New York City. There's no question in my mind the police were told to stand down that day. So the State of New York has to, in representing all New Yorkers, enact a measure that will protect all New Yorkers. It's important to remember that every one of our bills starts with the words, *The People of New York in Senate and Assembly* [sic]. This is what we enact. We represent the people of New York, not the Mayor. He is unable or unwilling to protect his own citizens in our City. So we step in. What are we asking? We're not restricting anybody's constitutional right. How do I know? Because the Constitution gives people the right to peaceably assemble. I've not one time in my life seen a protest, a march, in front of a house of worship of any religion that is in any way peaceable. I don't know what First Amendment right opponents of our desire to protect every single citizen of this State are trying to protect. I don't know what -- what First Amendment privilege they think there is. It doesn't exist. You do not have the right to wrap your face in a cloth where your identity cannot be seen and terrorize people who want nothing other than to go to their refuge, their place of worship. The

Mayor of New York seems to make a distinction; what are you doing when you go to that place of worship? Are you going there to play basketball in the gym? Are you going there for a religious service? Are you just passing by and you want to use the restroom? Frankly, none of his business. New Yorkers have the right to go about their day without being terrorized. And if we have a Mayor who doesn't think that that's important, that's where we step in. And I am incredibly grateful to Mr. Speaker for making this his -- a priority of his in -- in ways that -- that are truly admirable. Because they weren't a priority in the other Chamber or in the Executive, the way I saw Mr. Speaker making it his priority here. To make sure that this piece is not just in the omnibus mess of bills that we pass, but it's done rightfully, righteously, in a way that is enforceable legally.

And I will also remind folks as I've been saying for the last several months, if -- we all campaign for office, 150 members of this Body. All of us have a law that we have to abide by that says that we can't campaign within 100 feet of a poll site; 100 feet. That's a First Amendment right to hand somebody a piece of paper and say, *Please vote for me*, but we have a law in New York and the Election Law that says you can't stand 100 feet from a poll site while doing so. And the debate had been whether or not 25 feet is too much, is it okay? Is it something that's restricting anybody's right? *Oh, my gosh, you're taking it up to 50 feet. How awful are you?* This is the right thing to do, and I am grateful to every single member of this House who participated in making this a reality as we vote on this today.

So I don't have a clock; I don't know how close I am, but I'm gonna end as follows: You know, the -- we're gonna have this -- this show for the next several days. Six -- 40 percent of the budget's done, or at least the bills. And so there's six more bills, and some of them will have a lively debate, some of them will not. But the one common denominator in all that we've done -- perhaps with the exception of the first bill we did several weeks ago -- is that stuffed into these budget bills are very little to do with the budget. It's a lot about a lot of different things. But as I said, every bill that we pass has that preamble: *The People of the State of New York as represented in the Senate and the Assembly* [sic]. We represent them. We were elected to debate; to deliberately deliberate as a legislative Body, separate from the other House, and come to a conclusion of what makes sense for the people of New York. And when the Executive shoehorns and dumps junk into these budget bills, we don't get to do what the people asked us to do when they entrusted us with these -- with these jobs. And it's a mistake. And -- and Mr. Speaker has -- has said before that he's -- that this is not the way to do it, and -- and he's not gonna do this again. And I agree with him. He's right, we shouldn't be doing it. And I'm so grateful that we do have a Speaker who stood up on this who said that is the wrong way to do a budget. We should be talking about numbers. That's what the people asked us to do. And it's -- and that's why there's a deadline of March 31st. We get -- we come up here in January, it takes us two months to hock out a budget, and then we can spend the rest of the time doing --

doing legislative work. But the Executive Branch has -- has -- has nailed us into a room and said, *We're never gonna do a budget until you're about to go home. If you want to stay up, you can. It's up to you*. I'm happy to stay here. I know some of my colleagues may also be. But most are probably are not interested in staying here. That's okay, I don't blame you. The weather's lovely, I'm told, in Albany. I just think that there's a better way to do it. And I think that it was deliberately done to deny the people their voices in enacting legislation and in debating these concepts in a real way so that the people can see.

So I am grateful for the opportunity to speak. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Wieder.

MR. WIEDER: Madam Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. WIEDER: Today I rise in support of the budget bill before us just now; a budget that reflects our commitment not only to the fiscal priorities of New York, but also to their safety, dignity, and fundamental freedoms. Let me explain. Included in this budget is an important provision establishing a protective buffer zone to ensure that New Yorkers can gather to hold religious services, pray, learn, and participate in community life safely and without intimidation. Who would have thought that in this day and age we have to pass legislation for that? But here we are. At a moment when hate crimes

and anti-Semitic incidents continue to rise across our beloved State and nation, this action sends a powerful message that New York will not stand by silently in the face of harassment and fear. This measure carefully balances con -- constitutional protections, safeguarding both free speech and the right for -- of every New Yorker to practice their faith in peace. It is thoughtful, measured and absolutely necessary.

I want to thank the Speaker of this House for his leadership and stewardship throughout this budget process. The Speaker has led with thoughtfulness, patience, and a deep understanding of the issues facing communities across our State. His commitment -- and I've seen it time and again -- to bringing people together, listening to concerns, and ensuring that this Body responds to real challenges New Yorkers are facing has been instrumental in getting this done. At a time when leadership matters more than ever, his steady hand helped move this important measure forward and deliver meaningful protection of our communities.

I also want to thank my colleagues in this Chamber for recognizing -- and there were many and I've seen it firsthand as well -- for recognizing the urgency of this issue and working together collaboratively to get this done. Budgets are about values, and today this Assembly, the People's House, is making clear that protecting communities from intimidation and hate is one of our values. We are standing up for public safety, for religious freedom, and for basic, basic human decency.

I am proud to support this budget bill and I urge all of

my colleagues to vote yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Burdick.

MR. BURDICK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. BURDICK: I would like to thank the Speaker and his amazing staff for working so hard and tirelessly in making this bill the best it could be.

As an intervenor in both the ConEdison and the NYSEG rate cases, I am keenly interested in doing everything possible to provide for fairness and equity to our ratepayers who are struggling to pay their utility bills and stay in their homes. I applaud the Governor for her Article VII provisions which launched far-reaching discussions with the Legislature which led to substantive changes in the Public Service Law embodied in this bill. This bill contains the most comprehensive reforms in the rate-setting process in years and perhaps decades. It goes a long way towards leveling the playing field in the arcane and obscure process of setting utility rates and in making the process fairer and more transparent. I am grateful for inclusion of the essence of my bill directing the PSC to limit the extent to which utilities can recover from ratepayers the cost of the utility pursuing a rate hike filing. This is especially important given that tens of thousands spent on expert witnesses, consultants, the portion of employee salaries associated with the attendance and

participation, preparation or repeal of a rate proceeding and other related costs identified by the Commission. And so now to the extent that they exceed the amount that the PSC will set, the shareholders will need to pay that cost.

The provision that -- there is another provision very welcomed which requires the utility seeking an increase to submit what's termed a, quote, "budget constraint proposal" which provides that the utility's aggregate revenues would not increase by more than the average of the annual CPI over the prior three years. In each application for a major change in rates, the utility must demonstrate how any increase in aggregate revenues by more than the increase set forth in the budget constraint proposal is actually necessary to ensure safety, reliability, or the continuation of affordability programs.

There also is a provision to get more of a handle -- excuse me -- on the utilities' return on equity, including a requirement that the utility would be required to return to ratepayers all revenues derived from their actual return on equity in excess of their authorized rate of return.

I am deeply disappointed with the rollback provisions in the CLCPA, but I do wish to thank the Speaker and staff for doing their best to moderate the revisions. And while there will be a 1 billion Sustainable Futures Fund investment, we need significantly greater investments in renewably-sourced generating facilities to ensure that we meet even the extended timelines of the CLCPA under this bill.

Turning to the changes in SEQR. I have favored modifying the law to put a check on the law being weaponized that delay and frustrate perfectly worthy and valid projects. However, the original Article VII went too far, and throughout the budget process I expressed, as well as colleagues expressed, serious concerns about the extent to which the changes would hamper municipalities from protecting against adverse impacts such as traffic, capacity for wastewater treatment and public water supplies, as well as water quality concerns. Here, too, I wish to thank the Speaker and the terrific staff who worked tirelessly to negotiate the proposals and place some guardrails on these changes.

I'm a strong supporter of the fixes in Tier 6. It's a step in the right direction, and I applaud our partners in labor, the Governor and the leadership of the Legislature for bringing about these provisions.

Lastly, I wish to thank the Speaker for the work he did with his staff to ensure support for the $2 billion Galleria project in White Plains, which will be one of the most significant development projects in the State and will provide good union jobs and 800 affordable housing units, while also remediating brownfield sites. It will have a significant impact throughout Westchester County and beyond.

As we all recognize, every budget is the outcome of hard negotiations and compromise, and this one is no exception. As I have for each of the budgets since becoming a member of the

Assembly in 2021, I will be voting in the affirmative. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ms. Gallagher.

MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. GALLAGHER: This budget is 55 days late, and we will only have one full week to pass all of the remaining legislation we need to protect and deliver for New Yorkers. That alone is proof that this process is badly broken. But to roll back our landmark climate law as scientists are sounding increasing alarms about the livability of our planet and the federal government is rolling back all climate protections and investments in green technology, is a serious miscalculation. We've been told that addressing climate change is incompatible with affordability, but those of us who are paying attention know that those are repackaged oil and gas talking points. It is absurd to pretend that the CLCPA is responsible for rising costs. We have done basically nothing to implement our landmark law, and energy from the sun and the wind are free. We know what's driving up the cost of energy: The war in Iran. The cost of repairing outdated, leak-prone gas infrastructure. Tariffs. Data centers coming online to power our insatiable appetite for job-killing AI. Places ranging from Pakistan to Texas are taking advantage of the tremendous opportunity presented by renewable energy to reduce

utility costs, create green jobs and deliver more reliable energy. Not because they are leftists, but because it is cheaper and they know that they can count on it. New York can and should do the same. But instead, we are moving backwards.

I'm also deeply concerned about the criminalization of free speech and protests in this budget. I have participated in many peaceful protests at churches and synagogues in support of the rights of immigrants, the trans community, and including during my childhood when I stood up for those living with HIV and AIDS. Despite massive attempts to silence those protests in the 1990s, they saved lives. In a moment when fascist violence is on the rise, the fact that our State government would move to further restrict New Yorkers' ability to non-violently protest is also deeply concerning.

All of that said, this budget included something very, very important to me. We will finally stop super speeders in New York City in this budget. This is a policy I have championed for years in the Assembly. Super speeders aren't your average drivers. They are the top 1 percent of the most reckless, dangerous drivers on our streets. They are drivers who get speed camera tickets repeatedly, more than once a month. These drivers rack up 16 tickets or more in a year. According to New York City DOT data, drivers with 16 speed camera tickets in a year are twice as likely to cause a crash that results in serious injury or death. They are drivers like Miriam Yarimi, who my colleagues will remember mowed down Natasha Saada and her young children last year, killing their mother and two of the three

children who were holding hands while they walked across the street. I am proud to have championed this bill alongside advocacy partners, many of whom who have lost loved ones themselves. I have watched as these advocates come to Albany year after year, parading their pain and begging us to pass this bill. I fought for this bill for them, and because of them I will vote yes.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to be clear; this is not an easy vote for me. There are parts of this bill I fought hard for and I'm proud to support, and there are other parts I believe New York -- moves New York in the wrong direction.

My vote today is not a blank check, and it is not an endorsement of every decision made in this budget. And while this bill is not perfect, the Tier 6 reforms it includes are a long overdue victory for working people of New York State. For too long, Tier 6 has placed an unfair burden on our public employees, teachers, nurses and others who keep the State running. The reforms in this budget are a major win for affordability and fairness. We're lowering contribution rates and putting money back into workers' pockets. We're giving our teachers five years of their life back, allowing dedicated educators who have served 30 years to retire at 58 with the

full benefits they're entitled to. And we're boosting overtime-related retirement benefits for police, firefighters and other public employees. These changes will make a huge difference in over half a million New Yorkers, and I'm proud to stand with working families today.

However, I must express my strong opposition to the weakening of the CLCPA included in this bill. Rolling back our climate laws will not hurt -- help New Yorkers, it will hurt them. We've been told that our commitment to fighting climate change is too expensive and we need to scale back our approach to keep energy costs down. But affordability and environmental protections are not mutually exclusive; in fact, it's not renewable energy that's driving our energy affordability crisis, it's our over-reliance on fossil fuels. We've seen how this reliance on fossil fuels hurts us. Since the war in Iran began, prices at the pump have skyrocketed and New Yorkers have been forced to pay more than $1.5 billion in extra gas and diesel costs. Rising natural gas prices also drove up electricity and heating bills this winter.

The threat of climate change is not a theoretical concept for the people of my district. I first got involved in local politics organizing families against environmental disasters. In Lower Manhattan we experienced firsthand how Superstorm Sandy flooded out streets, shut down businesses and cost billions of dollars in damage to our community. Since that devastating storm, the City has undergone a years-long, multibillion-dollar effort to make Lower Manhattan resilient to the extreme weather events that climate change

is making more common.

But it's not enough to make our State more resilient to climate change. We must actively reduce our greenhouse gas emissions so we can slow down the warming of our climate. New Yorkers need real, durable solutions to fight climate change and address our energy affordability crisis. That means making sustained investments in clean energy that will protect New Yorkers from global supply shock, reduce harmful pollution in our communities and lower electricity costs. We must also push DEC to adopt enforceable emissions targets so New York does not fall behind on the CLCPA again. Shorter-term targets would force earlier action, regular progress checks, and course corrections with an emphasis on front-loading emissions reductions now, not waiting until 2030 or later. We made a commitment when we passed the CLCPA. We said New York would lead on clean energy jobs. On building a grid that works for working families. On reducing the emissions that are driving up costs and threatening public health. We pushed hard -- back hard against these changes, and I thank everyone who fought to protect our State's commitment to fighting climate change. In this fight, the Legislature fought for and won $1 billion in investment for clean energy, a significant step to get us back on track with this commitment. I will continue to fight for clean and affordable energy for our communities.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Otis. To let you know, you have about five minutes, sir.

MR. OTIS: Thank you all. Thank you all.

There are a few things worth highlighting in this budget.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill?

MR. OTIS: On the bill.

There are a few things worth highlighting in this budget; some have been mentioned, some have not, and so I'm gonna start off with a couple that maybe have not. The bill includes an important new right; the right to have your information deleted, held by data brokers through a centralized system. This is part of the data broker provisions of this budget bill that's a good improvement to help individual privacy.

The bill also includes improvements in our Safe by Design protocols that we have to protect children who are online, and these are important advances that will be recognized not just in New York, but around the country for the step that we're -- we're taking there.

It has -- it has been mentioned, but a little more detail on a utility rate process reform. We are changing the process by which the Public Service Commission evaluates utility rate increases. Our hope is that this is gonna help our -- our consumers, our constituents in terms of what kind of rate increases. One of the bills is the return on equity bill that's been mentioned. This is -- the bill's lead

sponsor was Didi Barrett, and that is incorporated in -- in this budget bill.

In terms of SEQR, lots of concerns about how the SEQR changes were going to affect the ability of local governments to do their job. I'm pleased to say that the final language included provisions that make it very clear that local governments have the ability -- even in an exempt project under these new rules related to SEQR -- if they have other kinds of land use decisions that they want to evaluate through their other local laws, those rights are not infringed by these exemption provisions in SEQR. We're gonna have to monitor how this works, because I have a concern that there's gonna be additional litigation costs to local governments over confusion about what these SEQR changes mean. But there's good language in the budget that hopefully will dispel that kind of lack of clarity and protect local governments. As a former mayor, I feel very strongly that we need to look out for local governments in those areas.

And finally, on climate I would say this: When we passed the Climate Leadership Act [sic] a number of years ago and we set targets, and targets are important, but it has always been that we have to worry about projects. Are we spending money to do projects? Are we changing laws to do projects? Is the private sector investing in energy transition? And that remains the same. And the challenge for all of us and the challenge for everybody doing business in this State is to get us cleaner air, a cleaner environment. And so whether we change the targets or not -- not thrilled about it -- but it really was

always about are we doing projects. Later this week we'll find out how much money we're spending this year in that category of spending to help do that work. But in future years we're gonna have to make sure that private sector and public sector commitment to do energy transition to clean the air, clean our lungs, that we're able to do that in this State regardless of what the targets were.

We have a lot of work to do in this space. There are new challenges ahead. I am voting yes on this bill, but we have our work cut out for us in terms of all of these issues. Thank you. I vote aye.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: A Party vote has been requested.

Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Republican Conference will generally be in the negative on this budget bill. But if there is anyone that wishes to vote yes, now would be the appropriate time to do so at your seat.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Majority Conference will proudly support this budget bill. For those

that would like to vote differently, they can do so at their desks.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Simone to explain his vote.

MR. SIMONE: To explain my vote, Madam Speaker. While there are many good things in this budget, there are plenty of things I don't agree with. I am proud to see us streamline environmental review for housing and infrastructure projects in this budget which will reduce duplicative review processes and accelerate approvals that can otherwise take years. It's too expensive and it takes too long to build housing. We've even lost congressional seats over it. And I know it's easy to say no to things, but I think Democrats need to start saying yes and start delivering on housing for every New Yorker in every part of this State. By reducing the timelines to build new housing infrastructure, we can make far greater strides in bringing affordability to New Yorkers.

We are also living through the climate crisis. You see it all around us. I live in a -- I represent a district that is -- that was flooded through Superstorm Sandy. I've seen small businesses lose their livelihoods, and I've seen the terrible circumstances climate crisis has caused among the poorest New Yorkers. From extreme flooding to rising insurance costs and growing strain on infrastructure, the costs of inaction are no longer theoretical. New Yorkers are paying them now. Spurring the growth of new housing within already

developed areas will increase housing supply and density, which has proven to be more environmentally-friendly than the endless (indiscernible) we have relied on for decades to house New Yorkers.

I do share the concerns that many of us have with the weakening portions of our climate law that may reduce short-term regulatory pressure while increasing long-term environmental infrastructure costs. More than 65 scientists from institutions including MIT, Columbia, Stanford and Cornell warn that changing methane accounting standards could understate one of the most dangerous greenhouse gases during the decade scientists consider most critical for climate action.

While I'll be supporting this overall budget, I share --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Simone. How do you vote?

MR. SIMONE: (Indiscernible/crosstalk) and our climate law through this --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: How do you vote?

MR. SIMONE: And I agree with my --

(Microphone cut off)

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Steck.

MR. STECK: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to explain my vote. In 1936 my Uncle Bob left Rock Island, Illinois to fight in the Spanish Civil War. Preserving democracy in Spain was an issue of principle. His picture is on my wall in my office for inspiration. I see climate crisis as an issue of principle that transcends

transactional politics. The Governor's proposals will increase costs, not lower them. All over the world countries are reducing their costs by pursuing clean energy. They are doing it in Australia, in Northern Europe. In China and many other places. Our State and our nation is falling behind due to outdated corporate ideology and continued subsidization of fossil fuels. It's not just about the environment. It is the only way New York State can reduce our energy costs.

Battery technology is advancing daily toward alternatives to lithium-ion batteries. Soon enough, my friend's concerns about children in the Congo will be obsolete. I am compelled to stand for the future, not to live in the prison of the past.

Further, allowing State agencies to authorize departures ad hoc from SEQR is yet another dangerous transfer of power to the Governor which seems to grow each budget year. Therefore, I vote in the negative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Steck in the negative.

Mr. Weprin to explain his vote.

MR. WEPRIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This year's budget includes several provisions aimed at lowering insurance premiums and no-fault reform. New Yorkers are facing rising insurance costs at a time when affordability remains a major concern for families, homeowners, drivers and small businesses alike. Strengthening efforts to combat organized insurance fraud, reduce abusive litigation practices, and modernizing outdated -- outdated

insurance laws are important steps towards improving the stability and affordability of the property and casualty insurance market in our State. The staged accidents, fraudulent claims, games and other forms of systematic abuse drive up costs for everyone and undermine confidence in the system. As the Chairman of the Assembly Insurance Committee, I am committed to ensuring that New York maintains a robust and affordable insurance mark -- market while ensuring that innocent New Yorkers who are legitimately injured or harmed can still assess the coverage and compensation they deserve.

I'm also very proud of the buffer zone legislation included in this section of the budget of limiting it to 50 feet to protect vulnerable New Yorkers and a rise of hate crimes throughout our State.

I proudly vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Weprin in the affirmative.

Mr. Dilan to explain his vote.

MR. DILAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As many have said before me, there are a lot of good things and bad things in this bill and I wanted to take a second to talk about the good things that I do like.

Tier 6 as a standalone measure I believe would have gotten a lot of support in this Chamber, and it's something that I wholeheartedly support, as well as the other labor actions that are being done in this budget. I think those are all good.

I think my colleagues who have spoke out on barrier zones, you know, I -- I support them. I support my constituents. Just a few weeks ago some of my constituents who are Muslim were practicing in -- in -- in their mosque and, you know, they got eggs thrown at them while they were entering mosque for prayer. And I think regardless of faith, you know, these barrier zones should help people practice their right to pray freely in this country. So those are the good things. Some of the things that I'm uncertain about is the auto insurance debate. And the one thing that I can say with certainty is that it didn't belong in the budget and probably should have had joint hearings in the Assembly and the Senate so we can vet this bill, but we don't get to do that. So I'm even as today I'm not sure what the right vote would have been.

But I have to say the things that are very concerning; the roll back of the CLCPA, very concerning. The SEQR changes, very concerning, especially without affordable housing. And then we get to the -- the issue of super speeders. I think some of my other colleagues have spoke on what it does. And I will agree that 16 speeding tickets is something you cannot defend, and I won't defend that. I agree that the Speaker's right. If you get 16 speeding tickets, a conversation should happen within the household. What I have a problem with is enforcement. So, this intelligent device --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: How do you vote, Mr. Dilan?

MR. DILAN: -- is a problem.

I vote in the negative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Dilan in the negative.

Ms. Glick to explain her vote.

MS. GLICK: Thank you, to explain my vote. I'm very concerned about some of the insurance reforms. I think that not so sure will get smaller, lower bills out of this, lower premiums. And if this was about staged accidents, that's a criminal justice thing and there should be real enforcement through the State Police, working with DFS and local DAs. But I think that there will be people -- unintended consequences. People who are gonna get hurt and not have recourse. So that -- that's very concerning.

The speed camera violations. As somebody who supported that, we have gotten report after report from the Department of Transportation showing that people who get a speed camera violation once or twice never recidivate again. And with -- yes, there are lower but more crowded streets. So lower speed limits have been implied. But you can do 30, which means you don't get a tick -- a ticket on West Street as everybody is crossing six lanes to get to a park. You could be -- you don't get a ticket until you're doing 41 miles an hour. And people are getting killed and injured. And that handful of people who do 16 tickets in a year deserve whatever they get. I'm not sure that just a device is the real answer, because who the hell is holding your foot to the pedal?

On the CLCPA, I don't like the fact that we've

seemingly eroded some of the goals or the way in which we measure methane. But the real issue is making sure that we continue to spend the money that moves us forward on renewable energy and gets people off of fossil fuels.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: How do you vote?

MS. GLICK: I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Glick in the affirmative.

Mr. Norber to explain his vote.

MR. NORBER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to say thank you to my colleague Dinowitz, the Speaker, of course, for putting together this bill. Part QQ is specifically, of course, is what I'm talking about.

Sadly, the only thing that the far left and the far right in this country can agree on is the hatred towards Jews and Israel and Zionists. And Zionism is just another form of saying Israeli. This is something since October 7th we've been having to deal with, confront. There's -- it's been open season and -- on Jews all over the country. And right now in Montreal there was a effigy of a Jew with a kippah, a yamaka, on, and that's what the world is coming to.

So again, sometimes we have to vote with our conscience. Of course most Minority will be voting in the negative. I am voting firmly in the affirmative for this bill because it's the right thing to do. We have to choose our battles, and of course for me, the first battle, of course, is to always choose what's gonna be protecting

our communities, any community, any minority, Judaism, Muslims, Christianity. Of course it's all important, and that should be our first and foremost most important thing we're doing here in the Chamber, is to protect our citizens.

So thank you again, and I'll be voting in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Norber in the affirmative.

Mr. Cashman to explain his vote.

MR. CASHMAN: Madam Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. I believe in a model of listen, learn and lead. And since taking office I have had repeated conversations with members of NYSCOPBA, their loved ones and many members of residents in my district. Today's budget includes the Death Gamble; an issue that has languished for 20 years. I have proudly partnered with leadership and my colleagues of this House to see the Death Gamble finally be enacted in this budget. The Death Gamble ensures that beneficiaries of line-of-duty death correction officers staff can receive their pension as if they were to retire on the date of that death. Currently, line-of-duty deaths do not allow for the benefits to be disbursed right now. This will -- this will guarantee those benefits are distributed like all State workers.

And let me conclude by saying this: No matter whether you are a teacher, work for DOT, are a corrections officer or a civilian staffer, you deserve a safe workplace. You deserve dignity

and respect. This does that. We have more work to do, but today I proudly see the inclusion of this in the budget and I also vote in the affirmative.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Cashman in the affirmative.

Mr. Eachus to explain his vote.

MR. EACHUS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the vote -- on my vote. Earlier one of my colleagues got up and talked about zero people leaving public service jobs because of Tier 6. I made a quick call to just one of nine of my school districts. Twenty-seven teachers left this past school year because of Tier 6, and over 50 vacancies have not been filled for over three years. I'd say fixing Tier 6 is important and something we needed to do.

I also wanted to comment about super speeders. Sixteen tickets in one year. If -- I don't know how they afford the insurance, or I guess they're driving without insurance. But we also needed to do something about that. Sixteen speeding tickets in one year.

And the final thing I'd like to say is that I'm very pleased that we got the buffer zone ironed out, as it may be. And there's a number of folks in my district that are very happy that we did something in that frame. So I want to thank the Speaker, his staff and everybody else that had parts of this bill -- fought for parts of this bill and came up with what is a good bill.

I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Eachus in the affirmative.

Mr. Chang to explain his vote.

MR. CHANG: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As all of us are contemplating what side we are going to vote, and parts of this bill are great, some parts are not. The one that I want to highlight is the -- the speed buff -- buffer zone that the other colleague mentioned about that. I support that. Sixteen speeding tickets, definitely we need to be (indiscernible). Especially folks who live in New York City, very congested.

And insurance fraud. We need to do something about that because that drives up the cost. Any legislation to combat insurance fraud is a good thing. It may not be the best, but anything to lower that.

And finally, the 50-foot rule on protesting on religious sites. Fifty foot is not enough, but this is a start. I hope we can find an amendment. I'd prefer to let local law enforcement on the ground make a decision, what is a safe distance for -- for protesters for public safety.

In this case I will vote in the affirmative for this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Chang in the affirmative.

Mr. Keith Brown to explain his vote.

MR. K. BROWN: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me to explain my vote on this non-policy policy bill. You know, in terms of -- there's always gonna be good things and bad things in each of these budget bills. And in particular, the Public Protection Part Y, Safe by Design Act. I'm particularly happy that -- that we're protecting kids online. I just want to know what took New York so long where other states have already done similar measures? As well as the Religious Worship Protection Act [sic]. I very much appreciate for all the synagogues that are in Assembly District 12.

It bears to mind that when you look at the things that -- I sat here for the last four hours listening to what people were saying that they really liked about this bill, many of which could have been handled outside of the budget as standalone bills and didn't need to be included in the budget today. But particularly with regard to Part R and the SEQR amendments. You know, I really want to be in favor of these amendments. But as you heard the debate, there are so many flaws in this particular legislation. You know, it just goes to show, we -- we just keep throwing a band-aid on these wounds that we have in the State. We have a housing crisis, yet we don't have any hearings. We don't have a comprehensive approach. We don't have a way to deliver infrastructure to our municipalities. The pro-housing certification is flawed in of itself, right? The grant process for trying to get grants for infrastructure is terribly difficult for our municipalities on Long Island. Then you add to it the many questions that were brought up, what if a municipality has more stringent

environmental standards? Does it erode home rule? Does it exempt projects subject to IDA benefits? Is it for condos, co-ops or just for leases? There's no opt-out provisions in the event that it makes sense to go forward with this -- this housing provision despite the fact that there might be some environmental challenges. So the bottom line is it doesn't address the affordability problem --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: How do you vote?

MR. K. BROWN: -- and we need a more comprehensive approach. And as such, I'm voting in the negative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Brown in the negative.

Mr. Jacobson to explain his vote.

MR. JACOBSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill has many good and some not so good things. Most importantly, this bill has many significant utility reforms. This bill will end automatic rate increases for utility companies. This change incorporates one of my bills. Currently, if the Public Service Commission decides that a utility deserves a zero increase, the utility would receive its requested increase. Now the utility rate will stay the same until the PSC grants a new rate. For too long, utilities have held customers hostage to their demands. Now if the PSC determines that the rate should be zero -- that the rate increase should be zero, it will be zero. There will no longer be automatic increases for utilities.

I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Jacobson in the affirmative.

Mr. Palmesano to explain his vote.

MR. PALMESANO: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I am voting in the negative, but there were a couple things I wanted to point out that our Conference has advocated for years.

First, as was mentioned, the Death Gamble for our State corrections officers. Year after year I watched this bill pass the Assembly unanimously and vetoed three times. Now we will have pensions protected for our dedicated COs and their families.

The second issue is the 20-year retirement for our New York City corrections officers to match what we did for the New York Police Department and Fire Department last year in the City. Both will help with recruitment and certainly retention efforts because we know they've been bleeding members. I just wanna give a big shout-out to our corrections officers at the State -- State and local level -- City level. Thank you for what you do for us each and every day. We appreciate you, so thank you very much.

Also, I'm happy to see about some changes here with the CLCPA. There's not enough, but something needed to be done. We have told you so for years. The problem the fact that we're still at net zero for 2040. That means no natural gas generation in 2040. That's not gonna work. That's not feasible. That's not an all-of-the-above approach. That's not gonna work. Especially when 60 percent of New Yorkers heat your homes with natural gas and 40

percent of our generation comes from natural gas. That will not help with reliability, affordability, feasibility.

Also, I just wanted to say how outrageous it is on this Rates Commission how you're taking away a Minority appointment. God forbid you have a difference of opinion on policy to bring better policy. But the worst thing is you're taking away expertise and knowledge -- knowledge that energy issues and how it works with generation, transmission, utilities, wires, poles. We have enough advocates who don't know about these policies. We need people who understand it. It's really a joke. And all you really seem to do is want a rubber stamp for your failed policies. This is not a -- you don't want an honest debate and discussion to get the best policies that need to be for our New Yorkers. But I'm not surprised.

So we will continue to push for energy policy -- prioritize energy affordability, reliability, feasibility, fuel diversity and energy choice, because New Yorkers deserve nothing less. I will continue to vote no.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Palmesano in the negative.

Mr. Blumencranz to explain his vote.

MR. BLUMENCRANZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today a little bit frustrated. As we sit here I hear people talking about the omnibus bill, there's good and there's bad. And it made me realize even though I support the buffer bill, I hate that it has to exist. And it has to exist in a way where the Jewish

community and its protection in New York is a bargaining chip in a budget process. We're sitting here and we are witnessing remove the hyphen not Jewish New Yorkers -- New Yorkers feel so unsafe that something like this is necessary. It speaks volumes to the way that we are looking at this situation. Harassment is harassment. Intimidation is intimidation. But because we have closed our eyes for so long, we need to create a buffer to make sure our community is safe? And that's something that couldn't stand alone in this Body; it had to be snuck into legislation regarding all sorts of different components of our budget? It makes me reflect and ask, where are our priorities?

I support this bill, but I question why it must be passed this way. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Blumencranz in the affirmative.

Mr. Raga to explain his vote.

MR. RAGA: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to explain my vote. This bill delivers long overdue public -- relief for public workers across New York State through meaningful Tier 6 reform. For years, public employees have called on this Body to address inequities within Tier 6. These are hardworking New York -- New Yorkers who kept our communities running through some of the most difficult moments in recent history and all history in our State. They deserve a retirement system that recognizes their service with fairness and dignity.

At the same time, I want to acknowledge my serious

concerns regarding provisions in this legislation that weaken aspects of our climate laws. Rolling back climate laws in our State will not lower our bills. The CLCPA remains one of the strongest climate laws in the entire nation, and it reflects our responsibility not only to meet our ambitious environmental goals, but also to protect front line communities already facing the impacts of climate change, like my Assembly District in Western -- Western Queens. We should be pushing the DEC to set and enforce regulation periodic emission targets to ensure that they don't fall or meet behind or -- or slowly get to their statutory goals within the CLCPA. And having short -- shorter interim targets will make sure that they'll be increasingly more likely to achieve those goals and meet them. As we move forward, I must ensure that affordability, reliability and sustainability should be pursued together, not at the expense of our climate commitments or our environmental justice communities.

My vote today reflects the need to deliver urgently the relief for public workers while continuing to fight to strengthen, not retreat from, New York's clean energy future. So I remain committed to working with my colleagues, our labor advocates, environmental stakeholders and impacted communities to ensure we uphold both economic fairness, but also climate responsibility.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Raga in the affirmative.

Mr. Bores to explain his vote.

MR. BORES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Each year, one of the ten budget bills is declared "The Big Ugly", and shoved into it is some ugly provision or two that all of us are forced to wrestle with. And this year might be the ugliest of all.

The rollback of the CLCPA is a historic mistake. It makes us the first state to legislatively roll back our climate law. And it leaves to our children a disaster, and one that we are not fulfilling our responsibility and actually caring for. I wanna thank the leadership of this Chamber for fighting back so much against this proposal. But we, as the Legislature, will have responsibility in the future to fix this historic mistake and to make sure that we are caring for future generations.

With that said, the rest that is shoved into this bill -- the extension of the Second Avenue Subway, Safe by Design features that are long overdue, Tier 6 reforms to protect our public workers, utility reforms, super speeders and the SEQR reforms -- make this, overall, a bill that I am voting yes on, and one that I think helps in many necessary ways. But make no mistake about who pushed for the CLCPA rollback and what we need to do to correct that in the future.

I vote yes.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Bores in the affirmative.

Ms. Seawright to explain her vote.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to

explain my vote. This budget provides for long-overdue changes to Tier 6 for our State employees. These changes will ensure that our workers who keep the roads paved, keep the buses and subways running and keep our parks beautiful and keep New York State running have an equitable contribution rate. These changes also recognized our amazing teachers throughout the State, ensuring that their pensions are stabilized and their hard work is recognized. I'd like to thank the unions who have worked so hard on fighting for these long-overdue changes to Tier 6.

Furthermore, I want to highlight the importance of the buffer zone legislation contained within the budget. The Park East Synagogue sits right near my district on the Upper East Side where I have numerous constituents that attend. We've seen multiple protests turn into violent, anti-Semitic attacks by individuals who have chanted phrases such as "We are Hamas" and waving the flag of a terrorist organization. Let me be very clear. This budget seeks to protect not just Jewish worshippers, but worshippers from all walks of faith.

I want to speak on the climate provisions included within the budget. I'm disappointed to see the rollbacks to the CLCPA included. At a time when ratepayers are seeing record-high energy bills combined with pricing uncertainty caused by the Federal Administration's various decisions, we should be leaning in on green energy like solar and wind power.

So today I cast my vote in the affirmative. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Seawright in the affirmative.

Ms. Rosenthal to explain her vote.

MS. ROSENTHAL: To explain my vote. In 2019 New York State passed the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act, CLCPA. It has -- it was considered one of the most, if not the most, ambitious pieces of climate legislation in the country. However, sadly, unfortunately and unnecessarily, we are rolling back the progress that we all trumpeted was possible. I think that various agencies in this government need to do their jobs. The Department of Environmental Con -- Conservation can set and enforce by regulation periodic emissions targets. It is allowed in the CLCPA that they can set these targets by regulation. We will not attain emission-free. We will not attain the targets that we set, and it is disappointing. And our future is not guaranteed in an environmentally sound way for our children. It's short-sighted.

Unfortunately, it's stuck in this budget with some other good provisions, as is usually the case. So I will be voting in the affirmative, but I think it is a deeply regretful way to legislate a climate law, especially as the federal government is rolling back all protections in our environment. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Rosenthal in the affirmative.

Ms. Shimsky to explain her vote.

MS. SHIMSKY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There

are a lot of good things in this bill, but there are two things that I feel the need to speak out on. The CLCPA rollbacks will damage our environment and public health by giving a quiet nod to gas and nuclear power; forms of energy that are obsolete, dangerous, and very, very expensive to build and maintain. In order to right these wrongs, we must pass the SUNNY Act and all other bills that will allow individuals, companies and localities to invest in and/or produce more renewable energy.

On utility regulation, there is a commission in here purportedly established to determine the causes of high utility rates, a question which we already know most of the answer to already. I fervently hope that this investigation will be comprehensive and completely transparent, and will result in a set of recommendations that will actually help the people. But the future on this is not assured, and the process needs public input and robust oversight to avoid corporate capture.

The war against climate change and for a clean energy future is not over, nor is the war for affordability. It continues every day in statehouses, national legislatures, kitchen tables and boardrooms all over the world. We can never assume that we have lost or won, and we must continue the fight, as our children's future has no choice.

That is why, Madam Chair, I have reluctantly cast my vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Shimsky in the

affirmative.

Ms. Pheffer Amato to explain her vote.

MS. PHEFFER AMATO: Thank you. Am I on? Hello? Good. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to explain my vote.

I vote yes. I think this bill is perfect. I think the work that we have done for our public employees is enormous. As Chair of the Government Employee [sic], which has no "I" in government employee, we have taken the approach 40 years ago to change that dialogue how to represent and stand up for our public employees. I have to give the -- hearing all my colleagues praise the changes that we've done for Tier 6, our correction officers, our State University workers, forestry, New York -- NYPD, for their recruitment efforts is to say thank you to the men and women who work behind the scenes in the Governmental Employee Committee [sic]. They worked tirelessly, numerous of meetings, hundreds of meetings, to listen to all the opinions to formulate the work that we have done today.

So I'm proud to vote yes and thank all the employees that have worked behind the scenes at the Assembly to help this come forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Ms. Pheffer Amato in the affirmative.

Ms. Simon to explain her vote.

MS. SIMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My constituents have made their views very known. For the record, we

are doing some good things in this bill like passing the ASAP bill. Utility reform measures. Improving Tier 6. Enacting super speeders; critically important in my district. And I have great empathy for the concerns of my Jewish colleagues, and certainly our constituents who are living in intimidation.

But the rollback to the CLCPA is a bridge too far. Weakening our methane accounting, the math, as the kids say, doesn't math. Weakening the regulations that will enable us to make progress on the environment and on affordability is not going to make energy more affordable.

Now, we know this bill is passing and we have to take concrete steps in the future. We have to pass the SUNNY Act. Virtual power plants. The data center moratorium and the nuclear moratorium so we can assess the costs and benefits of this energy.

I'm looking forward to continuing working with people, even though I will be casting my vote in the negative today. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Simon in the negative.

Ms. Romero to explain her vote.

MS. ROMERO: Thank you. On the bill.

This bill reflects something that I'm learning more about, which is compromise. I'm happy to see strong strides for our government workers, many of which are my constituents in the Capital City. We'll see reduced contribution rates for government

employees, those in higher education, law enforcement and fire.

We are seeing some utility bill relief, but let's be clear: That did not go far enough. I'm hoping with the utility rate case reform we'll see less greed from companies like National Grid. This will increase transparency and accountability in the process, which will help ratepayers. And I hope to see this play out in the long run with relief for my constituents who are suffering right now with massive increases in their utility bills.

But really, most importantly, I'm upset about the changes to the CLCPA. I care about our climate goals. And when we first passed the CLCPA we were the most aggressive in the nation. It didn't have to go this way, though. And the changes with this type of magnitude should have been modified during the legislative Session, out in the open with the ability to see the language and negotiate with colleagues and advocates the way that these types of changes deserve.

To be clear, I'm very upset about the CLCPA, and we did not go far enough on utility bills. But I'll be voting yes to support Tier 6 changes in strong support with organized labor. And I'm happy about the ASAP Act, and I'm really proud of the reforms for those that work in the Capital City, our government workers most importantly. Thank you. I'll be voting yes.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Romero in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

On the main Calendar, resolutions, page 3, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 1442, Rules at the request of Ms. Hunter.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim May 8, 2026, as Military Spouse Appreciation Day in the State of New York, in conjunction with the observance of National Military Spouse Appreciation Day.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Smullen on the resolution.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. On the resolution.

I rise today on Military Spouse Appreciation Day [sic] in honor of my wife Megan, who was a military spouse of 18 years. During our time in the Marine Corps from 1997 until I left the service in 2015, there was a lot of water under the bridge. Four deployments, including three combat tours in Afghanistan. Four children -- our beloved Molly, Haley, Lily and AJ, born between deployments, taken care of by their military mother, who was very good at it. And, in fact, after September 11th my wife was the key volunteer for the 1st Battalion, 1st Marines, taking care of hundreds of military spouses as we, the Marines, went into harm's way into Afghanistan after 9/11. We endured seven moves and too many schools for the children to count. And upon reflection, it's really the

military spouses that bear the true burden of service to our country. It's they who take care of the most important things to military people; their families. Not their units, but their families who are always there for them when they go and do the work of our nation overseas.

So on behalf of all the military spouses throughout history that have endured what it takes to make sure that America remains a free country, we say thank you for your service here in New York on Military Spouse Appreciation Day [sic].

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Chang on the resolution.

MR. CHANG: Thank you, Madam Speaker and I really thank the sponsor for this bill, which is much appreciated. I'm a 24-year Navy. My first late wife, nineteen years, been staying with me, with many multiple moves, a one full year of combat tour in Afghanistan and without her support, I would not [sic] able to do my duties and -- and continue on with the mission because she hold [sic] the fort at home, while her own parents was -- lay frail and passed away during my tour of -- of illness. So there's so many things that she has to take care at home while I'm away taking care of the missions. And I can say many other of my fellow shipmates in -- in the war zone also appreciate their families supporting them.

And thank you for the sponsor for this because we have to recognize they are unsung heros in our military family.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 1443, Rules at the request of Ms. Seawright.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim May 2026, as Older New Yorkers Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 1444, Rules at the request of Ms. Walsh.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim June 2026, as Reunification Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Walsh on the resolution.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am very pleased to stand again this year to talk a little bit about reunification month. This is nationally celebrated in June, and what it is is it recognizes that when a child needs to go into foster care, it's -- it's a very, very joyful moment when that child can be safely reunified with their family, with their -- with their birth family. Foster parents do an amazing job and the social workers that

are there to provide supports and interventions to the family do a fantastic job. But, you know, when your child goes into foster care, sometimes you have to do an awful lot of work to get to the point where you can have your kids returned to you. So when it happens, which is what we always want to happen, it is -- it is really, truly a thing to celebrate.

So I know that in -- in one of the counties that I represent, in Saratoga County, we hold the celebration every year for the last few years, where we bring in some families and we talk about the challenges that they faced and we celebrate with the children this great accomplishment. So while it can't always happen, when it does, it's really worthy of celebration.

And that's why I'm just so happy to support this resolution, asking and memorializing Kathy Hochul to proclaim June 2026, as Reunification Month in the State.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

Mr. Ra for the purpose of an introduction.

MR. RA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am very proud to have with us today a good friend and a constituent of mine. Ellen Andrasick, who is in the back, was recognized earlier today at a luncheon here in Albany as the Nassau County Senior Citizen of the Year. Ellen is one of those people in your community that is involved

in pretty much everything; always there to volunteer on behalf of the community, has been a very active member of the Community League of Garden City South for many years, as well as the American Lodge -- America Lodge of the Sons and Daughters of Italy. She's helped run their annual installation dinner, as well as their journal, making sure that they're able to continue to -- their work.

She has over the years, as her children were going through school, been involved in the PTA, been involved in youth sports through the PAL and like I said, she's just one of those people that is always there when the community needs somebody to step up and help with -- with a -- with a cause in the local community.

She's also joined today by Debbie Pugliese, who is our Deputy Commissioner from the Nassau County Department of Human Services, Office of the Aging and is always active in our community, helping make sure we -- she gets out there to -- to be there for our seniors and -- and make sure they have everything that they need and are able to take care of the various programs that Nassau County has to offer.

I ask that you extend to them the privileges of the floor and welcome them here to Albany.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On behalf of Mr. Ra, the Speaker and all members, we welcome our distinguished guests to the Assembly Chamber, extending to you the privileges of the floor. Congratulations to you, Ms. Ellen, on -- for your wonderful

award, Nassau County Senior Citizen of the Year. That's pretty spectacular. Definitely giving you the accolades you deserve for all the contributions to the community. So thank you so very much for the service to our community and for you being here today. Thank you both so very much for joining us.

(Applause)

Mr. Fall for the purpose of an introduction.

MR. FALL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On behalf of our colleague in New York County, Ms. Rosenthal, we have two special guests here from her district. Stephanie Garry, who is the Executive Vice President of Plaza Jewish Community Chapel, as well as Karen Elder, who is the Vice President of the Elder Group. They do tremendous work in her district.

If you could kindly extend to them, on behalf of Ms. Rosenthal, the cordialities of the House and welcome them, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On behalf of Mr. Fall, Ms. Rosenthal, the Speaker and all members, we welcome our distinguished guests to the Assembly Chamber, extending to you the privileges of the floor. Wonderful works that you're doing for the community and awesome for you to be here today. We thank you so very much for joining us again. Again, please come visit with us again. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, do you have further housekeeping or resolutions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: We have a piece of housekeeping.

On a motion by Mr. Lavine, page 32, Calendar No. 201, Bill No. A08052-A, the amendments are received and adopted.

We have a number of resolutions before the House. Without objection, these resolutions will be taken up together.

On the resolutions, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolutions are adopted.

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution Nos. 1458 through 1459 were unanimously approved.)

Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would you please recognize Assemblymember Smullen for the purposes of an announcement?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Smullen for the purpose of an announcement.

MR. SMULLEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There will be a Republican Conference tomorrow, Wednesday morning, time to be determined, via Zoom.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Minority Conference Members, please make sure you check your e-mail for Zoom time tomorrow morning.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, can you please recognize Ms. Clark for the purposes of an announcement?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Clark for the purpose of an introduction [sic].

MS. CLARK: Thank you. I am announcing Majority Conference immediately following Session today in the Speaker's Conference Room. Majority Conference immediately following Session.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Majority Conference, please make your way over here for immediate Majority Conference at the adjournment of Session.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned and that we will reconvene at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, May 27th, tomorrow being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

On Mr. Fall's motion, the House stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:37 p.m., the House stood adjourned until Wednesday, May 27th, at 10:00 a.m, that being a Session day.)