NEW YORK STATE SENATE

THE STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

ALBANY, NEW YORK

March 14, 2024

11:33 a.m.

REGULAR SESSION

SENATOR SHELLEY B. MAYER, Acting President

ALEJANDRA N. PAULINO, ESQ., Secretary

P R O C E E D I N G S

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senate will come to order.

I ask everyone to please rise and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the assemblage recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.)

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: In the absence of clergy, let us bow our heads in a moment of silent reflection or prayer.

(Whereupon, the assemblage respected a moment of silence.)

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Reading of the Journal.

THE SECRETARY: In Senate, Wednesday, March 13, 2024, the Senate met pursuant to adjournment. The Journal of Tuesday, March 12, 2024, was read and approved. On motion, the Senate adjourned.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Without objection, the Journal stands approved as read.

Presentation of petitions.

Messages from the Assembly.

Messages from the Governor.

Reports of standing committees.

Reports of select committees.

Communications and reports from state officers.

Motions and resolutions.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Good morning, Madam President.

On page 34 I offer the following amendments to Calendar 460, Senate Print 5424, and ask that said bill retain its place on Third Reading Calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The amendments are received, and the bill will retain its place on the Third Reading Calendar.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Madam President, there's a privileged resolution at the desk, Senate Resolution 1952, by Leader Stewart-Cousins. Please take that up and read its title only.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Senate Resolution 1952, by Senator Stewart-Cousins, Resolution in response to the 2024-2025 Executive Budget

submission.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Madam President, as everybody knows, this is the one-house budget resolution we'll be taking up today.

Let me remind my colleagues that there's a total of two hours we have allocated for debate on this resolution. That is by agreement with the Minority.

As usual, our Finance chair, Senator Krueger, will be answering questions for the Majority.

We are ready to proceed with the debate.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator O'Mara, why do you rise?

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Madam President. I have a few questions of Senator Krueger on the one-house budget resolution that we're here about today.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Of course I do, Madam Chair.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

On this one-house budget, how much greater is the spending in this budget over what the Governor had proposed in her Executive Budget?

SENATOR KRUEGER: It's 8.7 billion, Madam President.

SENATOR O'MARA: And if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: So for a total spending of what amount this year?

SENATOR KRUEGER: 137 billion, 920 million.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Of course.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: We had a revenue consensus meeting just I guess two weeks ago now, I think --

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

SENATOR O'MARA: -- where there was a consensus that was reached between the Executive and both houses of the Legislature that there was an anticipated 1.3 billion more revenues expected than what had been expected at the time the Governor came out with her budget proposal.

So how are you making up the gap of 1.3 billion to the -- how many billion did you say you were increasing the budget? Because that was a different number than I have.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So we're going up 8.7 billion.

And you're correct, there's the 1.35 billion that we came to revenue agreement greater than her original Executive Budget. So that explains part of it.

We also found that there were additional monies that we could redirect. And we

also increased new revenue. So we have something called the MCO tax; that's all federal dollars that will bring in $4 billion more per year in federal reimbursement in Medicaid, we believe for a three-year period. So actually up to 12 billion over the three years.

We have done some personal income tax changes to the highest-income payers of personal income tax in New York State. And we have also done an increase for corporate taxes for companies with net profits of over $5 million a year.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if Senator Krueger will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Of course I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: So we're -- the new taxes, the personal income tax and the corporate franchise tax, is totaling how much in new taxes to be generated?

SENATOR KRUEGER: About 3 billion

between the two of them.

SENATOR O'MARA: The increase is you're adding a half a percent -- through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you yield, Senator Krueger?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I do, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: You're -- the proposal is to increase the income taxes on the highest earners in the state by increasing the rate a half a percent?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, that's correct. And these are people with income, for PIT purposes, of over $5 million a year is the first level gets it. And if they are over $25 million a year, then there is a higher rate for them.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you

continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: So if we lose one of those top-bracket taxpayers because of the increase in taxes, based on all the taxes that they pay in New York State, that one individual, how many middle-class-family taxpayers -- say, the median of the state -- how many of those people does it take to make up the loss of the revenues from that one individual leaving the state?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Through you, Madam President. We actually don't believe people will leave the state on this amount of change in their PIT based on their income levels.

And the research on people leaving the state is that it is not the wealthiest people who choose to leave the state based on their tax burdens, it is actually other people who have been leaving the state. And we've actually been increasing the number of millionaires.

And in this case, it's the 1 percent of the 1 percent that are being hit, and they're

not actually making the decisions to leave the state based on their taxes.

Just as an example, if you are $25 million, the increase in your taxes will be $100,000. If you live here and your taxes go up $100,000 on 25 million, with all due respect, it would cost you more than 100,000 for the moving company probably.

So we're not concerned that these people who are making unbelievable amounts of money in the State of New York because of the State of New York -- because we have the infrastructure they need for their businesses, we have the educated workforce they need for their businesses. We have communities they want to live in. We have clean air and water here.

And that they are not going to leave because there is a de minimis increase in their taxes, even though all of us might think a 100,000 increase is a lot of money. But most of us here -- I suspect all of us here -- don't have $25 million in income a year for PIT purposes. Let's remember, if you have this much money in income for PIT purposes, your actual earnings and wealth, that you are radically above that.

Because we have so many mechanisms for sheltering revenue from taxes, that these are people who have far, far greater wealth than the calculation of what they might actually fall into as a category just for PIT taxes.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you.

Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: A hundred thousand increase to that individual, what -- $100,000 more than what does that individual pay annually?

SENATOR KRUEGER: That individual now, at $25 million, is paying for PIT in New York City -- New York State, excuse me -- $2.478 million. And it would move them, again, from a 10.8 percent rate to an 11.3 percent rate. So their taxes would be going up again approximately $100,000 on their current tax bill.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to

yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Again, Senator Krueger, on the revenue consensus meeting we had -- and you were there, and we had three expert economists testifying, each of which was invited by either the Democrat Majority in the Assembly, the Democrat Majority in the Senate, or the Democrat Governor invited those economists to come testify, correct?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes. Usually the Republicans may also invite. I just am not sure why you didn't this year.

SENATOR O'MARA: I don't know the answer to that either.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay.

SENATOR O'MARA: But based on my next question, I don't think we needed them.

Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you

continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: You recall me asking at the end of that meeting, to the economists, of what their thoughts were on why we have such an exodus of people from New York State leaving? Open-ended question, why we're losing manufacturing businesses in the state, why we're losing financial industry jobs in this state.

Every one of the economists chosen by the Democrats to testify at that revenue consensus meeting immediately said "High taxes is why people are leaving. In fact, one of them was testifying remotely from -- I forget where they said, South Carolina or North Carolina, and he said, "All my friends down here that came from New York say we got out of there because of the high taxes."

So how does exacerbating the high-tax issue in this one-house budget proposal by raising billions of dollars of more taxes, how is that going to help our exodus of population in New York or the fostering of businesses and

creation of jobs in New York? How does raising these taxes help that?

SENATOR KRUEGER: So in fact we are not increasing the taxes on 99.5 percent of New Yorkers. And we are in fact continuing and extending a middle-class tax break that was going to sunset at the end of this year, and we're extending that?

Yes, a reduction in taxes for middle-class New Yorkers that was scheduled to end in '23, we are extending for three more years. So we're actually doubling down on our commitment for lower taxes for the middle class. And those in fact are the people that the demographic data show are making decisions about staying or going.

Although, interestingly, demographic data also shows that many of them are moving to Connecticut and New Jersey where the taxes actually aren't lower for them, but the housing costs are lower. So I'd love to get to a discussion about what we can do to lower housing costs in New York, because I actually think that's a much bigger issue, affordability of housing.

But in fact, again, the data shows that the ultrawealthy are not leaving because of tax purposes. They do like warmer weather as they get older, both not as wealthy New Yorkers and wealthy New Yorkers. But we also find that they are continuing to have businesses and do businesses here in New York, even when they choose to be what's often referenced as snowbirds, with homes in multiple places.

So depending on who you talk to, what time of year, you're going to find lots of New Yorkers, especially who can afford to, who have second homes in warmer areas of the country. As has been the case probably for most of my life, at least. I'm not sure about everybody's life.

And the tax increases on corporations -- again, not the small businesses, not the medium businesses, not our neighborhood stores, but, rather, companies with net incomes of greater than $5 million. And interestingly, because of the pandemic, when we saw so many people shift to online economic activity, those companies have seen massive growth in their profits. And this difference in their corporate

tax obligation to New York will have absolutely no impact on whether they continue in business or whether they continue to sell to us here in New York. Many of those corporations are not based in New York.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you.

Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: While I certainly disagree with that outlook on the impacts of increasing taxes in the manner that's being proposed here, we'll move on to some other issues.

And general spending overall since there's been one-party control in Albany, since the fiscal year '19 budget, the All Funds budget has increased over $75 billion -- a 44 percent increase in that few years. Yes, we've had inflation, but that far outpaces inflation. And the state operating funds in that same period has

gone up almost $38 billion, a 38 percent increase in that five-year period. Not a trend that is making New York State more affordable.

Why is it -- and how can you justify massively outpacing inflation with these increases in the budgets since there's been one-party control here in Albany?

SENATOR KRUEGER: While inflation is one measurement of costs -- which is not even across the board -- I think when we're looking at spending in the State Budget, the real question is, are we spending beyond what we can afford?

And so in our Senate one-house budget of $137.9 billion, that would show 35 percent growth over five years. And if you look at five-year tax receipts to the State of New York, that's actually grown 40 percent. So our rate of spending is still below the growth rate of our revenue.

And we've also, at the same time, been able to increase our reserves in New York State, which we I think all agree, both sides of the aisle, is critically important. So that the Senate one-house would leave the State of New York with reserves of $19.8 billion,

14 percent of our state fiscal plan.

And we have an explanation for how we're going to pay for the increases we have suggested in the budget on a recurring spending basis. Including, by the way -- because no one asked yet -- for the corporate tax revenue we're going to hopefully collect, 50 percent of that is going to be used to help pay down the Unemployment Insurance Trust that we've all been hearing on both sides of the aisle is a great frustration to smaller and medium-sized businesses who had to pay out unemployment during the pandemic and now, as we all are, are left with an obligation to pay back the federal trust that we borrowed from.

And we don't have the money, but if we support our corporate tax proposal, half of that is going to go to pay down that cost, which is a significant win for our small and medium-sized businesses, as we've all been hearing. So I actually think some of them might really appreciate that also, Madam President.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Those businesses and in fact every business -- I'm glad you brought up the UI debt that we owe the federal government that we've done nothing on at the state level to reduce -- or minimally reduce, since that was built up. These businesses, small, medium and large-sized businesses, have been paying a surcharge on that since that debt was incurred.

So now we're going to charge them even more to pay this down going forward?

SENATOR KRUEGER: So I don't have all of the numbers for you right now, but we actually believe, if we put this money into the UIB, this will actually mitigate and resolve that problem for many businesses.

(Off the record.)

SENATOR KRUEGER: So if we put in money in -- excuse me. My colleague and friend is correct that there is a surcharge that they

pay every day. We still owe the federal government this money. That's the law. Not our law, the federal law.

So the quicker we get money in -- and we will be able to use this tax revenue for that -- for that purpose, that will decrease the number of days anybody will face that surcharge.

So we believe that this model actually decreases the total cost these businesses will have to be paying because it will reduce the time frame of completing our obligations to the federal government.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Okay, then on this model, then, we charge businesses more to help pay down that debt that we haven't paid down, that most every other state in the country used their federal COVID aid to pay that down that

they incurred. So we're going to charge businesses more to pay that down. And it's about $7 billion that's owed right now.

Under this proposal, how many years is it going to take to pay that down?

SENATOR KRUEGER: So we know it would be a much shorter time period. We can't right now run the numbers for you of how long it would take. But we know for a fact it will reduce the number of years it will take to repay the federal government, hence reducing the number of years that the businesses will have to owe this surcharge.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: The interest on that surcharge, the interest on the debt on the UI is about $250 million a year, is my understanding.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, my staff is agreeing.

SENATOR O'MARA: There's a balance due of about 7 billion, roughly?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

SENATOR O'MARA: And the surcharges being paid in past years is just going to cover that $250 million of interest due every year, is that correct?

SENATOR KRUEGER: It covers the interest and pays down some of the principal. And we can probably get you tables that lay that out, but I don't have that formula in front of me.

SENATOR O'MARA: That would be helpful for the final budget debate here. Thank you.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Okay, yes. Yes.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The

Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: You mentioned that we have about $19.8 billion in reserve funding in New York, which is great. And I concur that that's important to have. But if we -- how much are we using of the reserves towards the funding of this budget, to balance the budget?

SENATOR KRUEGER: The current year surplus we're estimating to be using, based on our obligations into the reserve, is about 300 million. Not significant on the total.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: I would again concur that that's a reasonable amount based on the amount of reserves that we have built up.

But I would think using another 250 million of that on that surcharge, and paying down on the UI debt, would also be a warranted

use of that and take that expense off of our businesses and employees.

SENATOR KRUEGER: That can pretty much just be a difference of opinion. We think that taking 50 percent of this new revenue from the highest-profit corporations will actually significantly reduce the interest costs into the fund and bite into the principal more.

But if you're saying wouldn't it be nice to do another 250 million towards this, I'm not going to tell you no. That's, you know, something that could be considered but was not for this one-house.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: How much funding is in this one-house budget for the illegal immigrant crisis in New York City?

SENATOR KRUEGER: We did not change

the Governor's proposal, which was $2.4 billion.

SENATOR O'MARA: So we're -- through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: So we're raising taxes on New Yorkers and New York businesses at the same time we're sending $2.4 billion to New York City for the migrant crisis. That doesn't make sense to me, that we're doing this funding and we're doing absolutely nothing to limit the inflow of these illegal immigrants into our state. And our sanctuary policies continue to foster that and in fact encourage that.

The -- in addition to that 2.4 billion, I believe there's also a cost for Medicaid, which has been expanded to include at least a portion of this illegal immigrant population that's come in.

SENATOR KRUEGER: I believe -- excuse me, Madam President, through you. I

believe my colleague is referencing the Essential Plan, which is separate from Medicaid. And I know my colleague Gustavo Rivera would like to answer that. But I just want to respond to the earlier part before I hand it to him for the health insurance part.

Yes, we have migrants coming to New York. Technically, it's New York State. They just happen to mostly be choosing to land in New York City because we've been the center of immigration in this whole country since before we even had the Revolutionary War. That's where people came through.

So New York State has an actual obligation to ensure that we are taking care of the migrants coming here. And yes, it costs the state some money. But you know what we learned from migration in this country over hundreds of years? Very quickly, especially if you do it right, migrants get absorbed into our communities and into our economy and quickly end up being taxpayers, generating more revenue for our state than the costs that they may be using in their early months and years here.

And I just find it fascinating that

we forget that part, because I read about this going on in other states in the nation. There are cities and states who are paying for migrants to come there because they recognize what a real value to their employers and to their communities and their tax base to bring new people in.

And there's a history in New York State -- including in all of upstate New York, not just in New York City -- of having taken that position with various communities at various times and with great successes.

So we hear from our workforce that more workers are needed. We hear from employers that more workers are needed. We hear from the farm economy that more workers are needed. And there is true opportunity here, not just, quote, unquote, a downside of costs in the early process.

And of course the bigger issues are federal, not State of New York or City of New York. But I would love now to turn it over to Senator Gustavo Rivera to talk about the Essential Plan form and what that means. Thank you.

If that's okay.

SENATOR O'MARA: Yes.

SENATOR RIVERA: Through you, Madam President. So I figure that you are referring to -- I figure that the Senator is referring to a program we included in our one-house which we have passed as a stand-alone bill in this house, and that is referred to as Coverage for All.

So that -- just so that everyone is on the same page, we are talking about -- the most recent numbers, Madam President, say that in 2023 the State of New York spent about $850 million in Emergency Medicaid because, let's not forget, undocumented people are still people, so they will get sick and they will wind up in our emergency rooms.

So there's actually a federal program, Madam President, that actually would give us somewhere in the neighborhood of $430 million that then we could use, with the federal government's permission, to extend the Essential Plan to a whole host of undocumented folks who will then no longer need emergency Medicaid because they would have the Essential Plan.

So in all -- for all intents and purposes, through you, Madam President, we are doing this as a way both to save the state money as well as to secure better health conditions for these individuals and the communities that they live in.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Madam President, if -- I'm not sure if this next one will be for either of these. But last year at the budget time we were kind of caught off-guard at the last minute about the Governor's reduction in the enhanced FMAP payments to counties that is totaling about $626 million to county governments across the state. Twenty-five percent was phased in last year, another 25 percent to be phased in this year unless we do something about it.

And last year everybody kind of threw up their hands and said, Jeez, that's a surprise.

What's in this one-house budget or the Governor's budget -- I haven't seen anything -- that deals with this reduction of eFMAP payments to the counties that was promised

when that enhanced FMAP payments were put in by the federal government?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Senator Rivera may have a second answer, but I want to start us off with the fact that we actually did increase funding for Medicaid by $1.9 billion in our one-house. Much of that can be used for the distressed hospitals to address this issue in counties that may find that the formula with the FMAP changes that you pointed out went in last year have left them with a problem. So --

SENATOR O'MARA: Which doesn't -- how does that help our counties?

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator O'Mara, are you asking Senator Krueger to continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Just finishing, we also increased Medicaid rates by 1.6 billion, which we recognize will help healthcare institutions and providers throughout the State of New York.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield. And --

SENATOR KRUEGER: Me or -- sorry.

SENATOR O'MARA: Probably you, Senator Krueger. But --

SENATOR RIVERA: If I may --

SENATOR O'MARA: Gustavo is eager to get in here.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Rivera.

SENATOR RIVERA: On the extension of the Essential Plan that we were just talking about, that actually would save counties money as well, because of the chunk that would be covered -- that is covered by counties now would be covered by this federal money that we'd be getting.

Thank you, Madam President.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, then. How much of this total 626 million is going to then be helping the counties out? Counties administer the Medicaid program across the state, and they're taking this hit on money that was directed by the federal government, enhanced FMAP payments, to go to the counties. Yet we're now intercepting that.

So how much are they going to benefit from what you just described? Which I

don't think is much of a benefit.

SENATOR RIVERA: Through you, Madam President. I have to ask the Senator for clarification. I'm not exactly sure what the question is regarding. I would -- if the Senator could rephrase it or say it again, just to make sure that I get --

SENATOR O'MARA: Sure. You just made a comment that the change in -- which program, I'm not sure which program you're talking about. But it's going to -- that's going to benefit the counties. How so? And to what extent, compared to this $626 million cut that they're looking at?

SENATOR RIVERA: Through you, Madam President. The one that I'm referring to is not in reference to that particular cut.

What I'm saying is as far as Emergency Medicaid, the cost that is currently -- the chunk of it that is currently picked up by counties would be included. So therefore the counties would not be responsible for it if we were to get this money from the federal government that we are referring to as Coverage for All.

And through you, Madam President, it's around 220 million. So again, that will be a hit of $220 million less to counties across the state.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you.

I think I've exhausted my time at this point, unless there's time at the end; I'll pass it off to some of my other colleagues here.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. Thank you.

SENATOR O'MARA: I guess they want me to continue.

(Laughter.)

SENATOR O'MARA: So I will.

The -- through you, Madam President, if the Senator would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm enjoying this. Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: I'm sure you -- I'm sure you are.

Just -- I think just one last

question from me here, then. There's an expenditure in here of $10 million for the Reparations Commission. What is that money going to be used for? Are there --

SENATOR KRUEGER: Staffing and moving forward the commission's obligation under the law we already passed to make recommendations to New York State on addressing the concerns of reparations.

So we believe that is over an 18-month period of time. That is what the law lays out. And so it's $10 million, but we believe it would be spent over the course of two fiscal years. And there's a commitment to hire specific staff to come up with specific recommendations. And after that it just gets handed to us as a report, and the Legislature and the Governor and I believe the people of New York will all have an opportunity to review that and the recommendations, and then we decide what happens next.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you

continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Ten million seems like an awful lot for staff for an 18-month commission. The commissioners that have been appointed there, they're not paid, to my understanding. Yet 10 million towards the Reparations Commission, yet an extremely important issue regarding our education funding and Foundation Aid, you're proposing setting up a Foundation Aid commission to study changes in the Foundation Aid, which is the largest portion of our State Budget, but we're only allocating a $1 million request for that. How do you balance those two out?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Because when we asked the question what -- how do we come up with a better answer on Foundation Aid, the good news is we have models that have been used in other states in the country, and we have looked at the costs they needed to spend to come up with a new analysis, and it has not been -- it has been consistent with the number we recommended.

You also don't have to go back 400 years of history to do historic research, demographic research, economic research, actually family histories of who, what, where, why over a 400-year period. So it's a less work-consuming project to deal with the Foundation Aid formula, which I believe was last changed in 2007? I'm looking at the chair of the Education Committee, who happens to be on the podium, so can't necessarily answer. 2007 was the last time we changed this? So it's a little different than revisiting questions from 400 years ago.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you. Thank you, Senator.

Thank you, Madam President.

If I could just speak on the resolution for a moment.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator O'Mara on the resolution.

SENATOR O'MARA: You know, this is another very concerning budget, as we've had over the past six years now, one-party control in New York, increasing spending by over $74 billion. That's -- $74 billion is larger than the entire budgets of 37 states in this

country. Certainly there's a lot smaller states than New York, without a doubt. But there's two larger states than New York: Florida and Texas. And combined, New York State budgets spend more than them together.

There's a larger state, California, twice as many people as New York, yet these budgets that are being passed in recent years are outspending California per capita at a rate of one and a half times.

This is not sustainable. It's certainly not helping the affordability issues that we have in this state, which has caused an exodus of tax-paying New Yorkers to other states.

Comptroller DiNapoli, along with the Business Council president, Heather Briccetti, did an op-ed this Monday -- I'm sure we've all seen it -- about the real loss in population, and that the population loss is directly affecting the tax base. That's tax revenues that that side of the room loves to throw around. And we're impeding that by these policies and people leaving New York.

New York has lagged every other state coming out of COVID and getting jobs back.

We've had a decrease in manufacturing jobs in this state since before COVID, and we're continuing to lose manufacturing jobs. We read about it almost weekly, of New York companies in manufacturing when they're making the decision to streamline or downsize or whatever, and they're multistate operations, they're choosing to shutter up in New York and do their operations in another state.

Corning Incorporated, in the district I represent -- I believe it's the only Fortune 500 company with its headquarters in upstate New York -- they just shut down -- they've laid off hundreds of people in the last two years. Fewer and fewer people working in their world headquarters based in upstate New York. They just shut down a manufacturing line with over a hundred jobs, moving that to another state.

They just announced investment in a new plant in solar -- solar energy manufacturing for panels, a $900 million investment in the state of Michigan. About a thousand jobs, I think, there that aren't coming to New York. Corning Incorporated, for the last couple of

years now, has more employees in the state of North Carolina than they do in New York State. And it's a growing trend. And we're seeing it from other businesses around the state.

Probably equally concerning to the budgets in this state that we're concerned about in this room is the loss of financial industry jobs. The income and revenue generated from the financial industry is over 25 percent of state revenues. We've been losing those jobs to other states in recent years, and now the state of Texas has more financial industry jobs than we do in New York State.

I'd like somebody to explain how we're going to get those jobs back at some point. This is a trend that is crushing New York State, and it's going to crush the budgets of this state and it's going to crush the programs that the majorities in this house love to spend on.

It's shortsighted, it's not responsible. And it doesn't bode well for the future of New York State. We need to change this trend. We need to be encouraging job growth. We need a strong manufacturing sector. And we need to save the financial industry in New York State.

It's a recipe for disaster that we're headed on right now.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Thank you.

Senator Helming, why do you rise?

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you, Madam President. If the sponsor will yield for a few questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Certainly.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you, Senator Krueger.

If we could start with Department of Public Service Article VII, Part O, the RAPID Act.

SENATOR KRUEGER: The which act, I'm sorry?

SENATOR HELMING: So the RAPID Act expedites permits for major renewable energy projects, the mega-solar, the mega-wind farms.

In the Governor's budget she included the RAPID Act. I did see that the

one-house also includes the RAPID Act with a change and modification, which I agree with: It exempts or carves out prime agricultural lands.

But my question is in the Governor's budget, she included the ability to use eminent domain, the forceful taking of private property. Does the Senate one-house budget include the use of force of eminent domain?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Madam President, through you, I know that our chair of EnCon is looking forward to answering the question. Is that okay with you, Senator Helming?

SENATOR HELMING: Yes, absolutely.

SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm going to defer to our EnCon chair, Peter Harckham.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Harckham.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you.

The Senate language neither concurs nor agrees with the Governor on that point. We will negotiate that point.

What we have done, as you have referred to, is protect prime farmland and make

some other modifications that we're suggesting. But we have neither agreed nor concurred with the Governor on that point.

SENATOR HELMING: Madam President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Harckham, I think, will you continue to yield?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Senator Harckham, does the one-house reject the Governor's proposal on eminent domain?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: It neither rejects nor concurs. That will be negotiated as part of the ultimate budget negotiations. At this point we are suggesting new language, but there will be a three-way negotiation on that point.

SENATOR HELMING: Madam President, if Senator Harckham will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The

Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: In New York State we pride ourselves on making sure that there's funding for conservation easements, for the protection of development rights, and doing so much to make sure that there's adequate green space, et cetera.

In the Governor's proposal on the RAPID Act it would allow for these mega, mega, mega solar and wind projects to be built on conserved lands, lands that not only has the state heavily invested taxpayer dollars in, but private investors have participated in too.

Does the Senate one-house reject building on conservation lands?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: The powers of ORES have not been expanded. The office was shifted, but there are no new powers in terms of shifting to conserved open space.

What I will say is that in the Environmental Protection Fund we have added a lot more money for farmland protection, which we know is an issue near and dear to many of our upstate colleagues as well.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you,

Madam President.

On the bill real quickly. Do you --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Harckham on the -- excuse me.

Senator Helming on the resolution.

SENATOR HELMING: Close. Two H's.

The use of eminent domain for building large-scale solar and wind projects, other energy projects, the use of conserved lands, is something that I wholeheartedly disagree with and I believe that the public is overwhelmingly going to disagree with once they realize that this is in the budget. Hopefully it will be out before the final budget. Taking away private property for the state's benefit is just something that I will never, ever support.

But shifting gears, if Senator Krueger would yield for a few questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Senator Krueger, I think this is a subject that you're the right

person to ask. I know we've had many conversations about cannabis. I've been very critical of the Office of Cannabis Management and the way they've just blundered everything, how they've slow-rolled-out the permits and are nowhere close to being where they need to be.

So my opinion is this has led to, by not issuing the number of permits they should have, it's led to the proliferation of illegal pot shops. And now I understand, through the budget, that there is going to be a shift, if you will, in who can enforce the closure of these shops. It's going to go to local municipalities and local law enforcement.

Is there any funding in the Senate one-house budget for local municipalities or local law enforcement specifically to help with this?

SENATOR KRUEGER: (Pause.) I wanted to make sure we all got it.

So the good news is we do believe that when you look at the Governor's full proposal and a few things that we added to her proposal in our one-house, we are absolutely making it far more possible to do giant sweeps

throughout the state and close down these illicit stores in a relatively short period of time, as you and I have talked about and as you and I completely agree we need to do.

It doesn't create new money from the State Budget for local authorities, but it allows local communities to pass their own laws that include additional fines, additional money that can be collected themselves if they choose to, depending on what model they choose to go.

They will have the power to padlock the stores after an initial review shows that they have illegal products there. They will be able to, in fact, then take people to court on various categories, not just illegal cannabis. Because they may have illegal cannabis, but they're also selling other products -- potentially those products become illegal also when they've ordered the store closed.

So in my discussions with OCM, they're fairly confident that if the locality wishes to take a more active role and do more things, that they can in fact pass those laws and they can in fact collect more revenues for themselves.

SENATOR HELMING: Through you, Madam President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: It sounds like another unfunded state mandate.

But shifting gears now and going to housing, the one-house budget proposes $40 million for the construction of one-to-two-family small in-full homes. And there are targeted areas where this money is going to be used, apparently. These are the large cities outside of New York City -- Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, Syracuse, Rochester.

My question is -- and I had the same question when we had the HONDA program and so many others -- why is it limited? I have small cities in my district, like the City of Geneva -- I know there are many others around the state -- who would benefit from infill projects. Is there any chance in the final budget we could expand?

SENATOR KRUEGER: And you were seeing my colleague Senator Kavanagh who wants to answer questions for you. So if it's okay with you, I will now sit and we will all look at Senator Kavanagh.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Kavanagh.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Madam President.

Yeah, so the program we are proposing is a brand-new program that would -- is intended specifically to deal with the fact that there are several large -- several significant cities upstate that have been identified as having a great deal of vacant land that often is owned by the municipality and would be appropriate for this kind of development, proposing $40 million -- again, it's a brand-new initiative that's first in this bill -- you know, in the Senate resolution.

And it would, as you note, address five cities. I think it would certainly be an appropriate conversation during the negotiations to figure out whether there are other localities

where that kind of program would also be effective.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you.

Madam President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Senator Kavanagh, we've had conversations about rent stabilization in the past. And when we look at rent-stabilized housing units that are being renovated through the grant program that is proposed in ELFA Part AAA, has there been any thought to who will occupy these units?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. The program that we are proposing, there are a couple of different aspects of this resolution that are intended to address the fact that there's housing in the state that needs maintenance and renovation in addition to our efforts to construct new housing.

This particular proposal that my colleague raises is intended to address the fact that there are some significantly dilapidated units within the rent stabilized stock. And of course that is in New York City as well as Westchester, Rockland and Nassau County.

And this program is proposed to renovate those units so that they can continue to be available as housing stock and they would continue to be occupied as rent-stabilized apartments and typically at pretty modest rents.

So basically the affordability, to the extent those are restricted to certain folks, they would be -- rent stabilization doesn't have rules about who can occupy, but it does have rules about what the rent is appropriate to be charged. And those laws would all still apply to these units after the renovations.

SENATOR HELMING: Through you, Madam President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR HELMING: So is it fair to say that these rental units, once they're renovated, brought back online, could possibly be and will likely be occupied by people who earn substantial amounts of money -- more than, say, the average New Yorker?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, most residents of rent-stabilized housing across the system -- and of course there are more than a million rent-stabilized apartments. This is housing for about 2.5 million people. Most of those are people of quite modest means. But the rent stabilization program does not and has never had -- you know, in its many, many years has never had a bar against renting to people at higher incomes.

There have been some provisions in the past where people could deregulate the units entirely if they happen to be occupied by households above certain incomes. But again, rent-stabilized units have never been income-restricted. So we're not changing that in

this particular resolution today.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you.

Through you, Madam President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Senator Kavanagh, does the Majority support means-testing to ensure that those rent-stabilized apartments go to the people who need them the most?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, that's not before this house today.

I certainly would not support the massive displacement that would come if we were to impose that policy on thousands, perhaps millions of New Yorkers, but depending on what terms we might impose.

But that is not -- you know, that's not before -- you know, there's nothing in this budget resolution that addresses that issue one

way or the other.

SENATOR HELMING: Through you, Madam President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

SENATOR HELMING: To be clear, Senator Kavanagh, we're talking about the proposal that's in the one-house budget, and it talks about increasing the number of units that are brought back online.

So my question had nothing to do, in no way was connected with displacing people who currently occupied -- it's about these new houses that are coming online. We know we have an issue. What are we doing to ensure that those rent-stabilized apartments will be occupied with people who need them the most, the people -- there should be some means-testing.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, we've had this debate in this chamber on the floor, and many folks on the other side of the aisle have frequently attempted to

repeal the tenant protections that are the rent-stabilization laws entirely. And there are actually bills that have been introduced in the committee that I chair and my colleague is the ranker of that would eliminate many of the tenant protections we've put in place that are intended to ensure that rent-stabilized housing is available for people and affordable.

So, you know, if -- if this -- if somebody wanted to impose some additional constraints on this particular funding stream to maximize the likelihood that it's available as affordable housing, I suppose we can consider that. But that would be contrary to -- you know, the dynamic here for many years has been the Majority in this house protecting these laws, ensuring that rent-stabilized units are available to people who need them, and folks on the other side of the aisle trying to gut those protections entirely.

So it would be -- it would be welcome if we could have a debate about how to maximize the likelihood that people have access to affordable housing. This particular program is about units that are in existing housing, they

are often already available at very low rents -- and we need that, we need units at very low rents -- but they are unavailable at the moment because of significant physical problems of the units.

What we're proposing is that it would be worth spending public dollars to get those units up to code, up to standards. This is something that landlords, small landlords in particular in my district, have expressed a desire to see, and they were trying to address that issue here.

I have not had -- I certainly haven't had property owners tell me that I should prevent them from renting those units to people of more significant incomes. But, you know, if that were something that were of interest, I suppose we could entertain it.

But again, we have millions -- we have a million apartments. This program is probably about 400 or so of them. So, you know, I think the goal here is to integrate this program into a much larger set of laws that are really the bedrock of protecting housing, making it affordable for people in New York.

SENATOR HELMING: Madam Sponsor, I'm going to switch gears. So if Senator Krueger would yield to a few questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I do. We'll see if anyone else jumps up to want to answer. But let's give it a try.

SENATOR HELMING: I'm biting my tongue because there is so much I want to say in response to Senator Kavanagh, but I know it would be out of line. We could have those discussions offline.

But shifting gears, as I said, the one-house budget includes $15 million for a farmworker housing revolving loan program.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes.

SENATOR HELMING: Which I think is great, because we need to provide farmers with assistance to build this much-needed housing.

But what I'm hearing from farmers across the state is that they're looking for the expansion of the investment tax credit to include the construction or renovation of farmworker housing. I know this has been a discussion

they've had with so many of us in this chamber.

Is that expansion of the investment tax credit in the one-house budget?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm just looking -- I'm looking at my Agriculture chair just to see whether she thought it was an appropriate question for her.

SENATOR HINCHEY: I'm happy to take that.

No, that is not in here. But as chair of the committee, we've heard from a lot of farmers that this housing proposal for farmworker housing is actually incredibly needed and necessary, which is why we put it forward through this budget.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you, Madam President. If the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Hinchey, do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HINCHEY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Yes, the Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you very much, Senator Hinchey.

I -- I appreciate what is in the budget. And again, I've heard from probably a lot of the same people you have that they support it.

But my question is, does the one-house budget include expansion of the investment tax credit for the construction of new farm housing and the renovation of existing? And it's really that renovation of existing that is so important.

SENATOR HINCHEY: Our budget does not include that, no.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you.

Madam President, if Senator Krueger would yield for a question.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Indeed.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR HELMING: Senator Krueger, there is I believe $25 million proposed in the one-house budget for volunteer firefighter grants for capital projects, I believe, et cetera.

And one of the snags that we've run

into is that we have some volunteer firefighting departments that may have one or two paid people on staff, and so they're prevented from applying for the grants. I think the threshold is 80 percent have to be volunteer. If you're slightly above that, you can't apply.

Is there anything in -- and I've sent letters to the Majority asking for changes to this program. Is there any discussion going on there? Is there any chance that in our final budget we will open up the grant application process to those departments that may just have one or two paid firefighters?

SENATOR KRUEGER: (Pause.) Thank you. Thank you for that question.

We added 25 million additional to what the Governor had been offering. And we are more than happy to open up the discussion with the Governor about why you are correct and we should allow that.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you, Senator Krueger.

Thank you, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Thank you.

Senator Martins, why do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, if the sponsor would yield for a couple of questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Senator, we're voting on a resolution, on a one-house budget resolution that increases the State Budget to $246 billion. Can you tell us why it doesn't include a repeal of Tier 6?

SENATOR KRUEGER: (Pause.) Thank you. So the good news is, we do reform Tier 6 in a variety of ways, and we back that with state dollars.

So the first change is we make the final year's calculation from five back to three, which makes it equivalent to the Tier 4 formula for retirement.

And we also -- and we continue -- the previous tiers had exclusion of overtime in the calculation of the pension, which is also to

the advantage of the workers and is viewed, is my understanding, as a significant improvement by those in the labor union world who have been lobbying us for changes.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Madam President, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes, indeed.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

I'm well aware of the effort to reduce vesting from five years to three years, and frankly I support it. But, you know, in talking to our public employees, the various collective bargaining units that are out there, including our teachers, the one thing that they have asked for unanimously is the repeal altogether of Tier 6. And it's I think an item that has been widely discussed, supported, I believe by both sides of the aisle.

And I understood that with an increase in a budget of 13 or 14 billion dollars,

that there would be room to give relief because the need is real. I understand -- Madam President, through you -- that we're having a hard time recruiting and retaining qualified employees to work not only at the state and local level, and for our schools. So I'd ask again, beyond the limited five year to three year vesting, is there any effort or anything else in this budget that would repeal Tier 6?

SENATOR KRUEGER: So apparently my colleague Senator Gianaris would love to give you more answers.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So I'm going to sit now, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you.

I want to remind Senator Martins that this is the most significant effort to roll back the mistakes of Tier 6 that he supported when it was established in 2012, when many of us -- those of us who are here long enough to have been here on that vote -- did not.

And so I appreciate that now

Senator Martins cares about the public workers, but they had the same opposition when he and his colleagues voted to establish Tier 6 in the first place over the obligations of our conference.

And so what we have done in this proposal is take the first real significant steps to roll back the mistakes that Senator Martins and his colleagues established, and we're very proud of that.

Thank you.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Martins on the resolution.

SENATOR MARTINS: On the resolution, thank you.

Just to clarify, I was here in 2012, Madam President, and I'm certainly grateful to my colleague for bringing that up. I'm well aware of the votes that I've taken. And I'm certainly willing to acknowledge that under the circumstances, understanding where we are now 12 years later, the projections that were there in 2012 as far as savings to the state and to our local governments I don't believe have been

realized.

And certainly to the extent that they haven't been realized and to the extent that we recognize they haven't been realized, Madam President, I find it odd and frankly incredibly hypocritical that we are sitting here talking about an issue that is claimed to be opposed and yet we have the opportunity to repeal it wholesale to give relief to our public employees, and yet we do nothing.

So I find it incredibly hypocritical that here I stand, someone who did in fact vote for this in 2012, telling you that I would support a repeal, and yet the question -- or the answer that I get back is that I voted for it. So here we are.

Madam President, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes indeed.

SENATOR MARTINS: I have a question regarding the New York Housing Opportunity Corporation. I'm hoping you can answer some questions for me, perhaps Senator Kavanagh?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Do you mind if the Housing chair takes it?

When my colleagues jump up, I get what they are hoping to have happen.

Thank you, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Martins.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Madam President.

I want to ask -- you know, I see here that there is a requirement for consultation with local governments with regard to their local zoning authority. But in fact if the corporation does not believe that it is in their best interests or they don't believe that the locality is properly responding to their requests, that they can override the local zoning authority of those communities by a two-thirds vote. Is that right?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, yes.

Just to anyone who might be tuning in late, we're talking about a new proposal in the Senate resolution that would create a new program similar to the Mitchell-Lama program of

many years ago, where the state in a very short period of time constructed an enormous amount of housing to meet the needs of that generation. That housing is still available in many of our communities. And yet the rate at which we've produced housing has not kept up, so the Senate is proposing a brand-new initiative to build housing, particularly focusing on building housing on state land.

And yes, this as proposed, if the state were building housing on state land after consultation and several other procedural steps that are in the bill, they would be able to proceed with construction notwithstanding local rules that might prevent a private developer on private property from building on that.

And by the way, it is not unusual for state agencies not to have to comply with village and town and city and county rules when they are doing the work of the people on behalf of the state on state property.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you

continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So would this effort be subject to SEQR and subject to a SEQR analysis on a project-by-project basis?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: (Pause.) The -- this -- I just wanted to check with our staff here. But this bill does not alter the requirements of SEQR. So there may be circumstances where a project -- you know, SEQR would apply if SEQR would otherwise apply. There's nothing about these projects or this program that alters the requirement of SEQR.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Would these projects be administered by the local building department for permitting purposes and oversight of construction?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, these would be constructed in the normal way that, you know, construction occurs, which -- and when state governments build things, they typically get permits from local building departments and other authorities that approve those things. And this bill doesn't change any of that.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Madam President. Through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

SENATOR MARTINS: Would these projects be placed on the tax rolls and be subject to local taxation by the local communities and school districts?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, the bill does permit the

granting of payments in lieu of taxes through these projects. So they're not, strictly speaking, property taxes.

But again, it is not unusual when state entities -- state entities are not generally subject to local property taxes. But typically it is something -- a payment in lieu of that tax that is intended to basically be the equivalent of the revenue that might be generated by property taxes.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Would the payment in lieu of taxes be determined by the local community?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. There are provisions in the bill that require consultation with the local

community, as I mentioned. But ultimately it would be this entity that, again, would be overseen by, you know, all of us as a state entity. But that state entity would put these deals together and determine the amount of property taxes that are appropriate. Again, presumably in consultation with the local government, as is not unusual.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So I understand the effort here is to promote and build affordable housing. So will there be a means-testing with regard to access to housing in these units?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. Yes, there are various -- there are various different models of housing that

might be built with various affordability requirements. But the expectation here is that we -- not just the expectation, the provisions of this are intended to construct housing that is affordable but not necessarily at the very lowest levels of income.

There are provisions in here that would provide housing for people in middle-income households as well as lower-income households.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So is it -- is it fair to say that this housing will be geared towards an area median income and a percentage of area median income? And if so, can you tell me what your expectation is with regard to what that area median income percentage would be?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you,

Madam President, yes, the mechanism that we use to talk about affordability in this bill is, as it is with most housing programs, the area median income.

Area median income is a number, a set of numbers that are set, that are defined and calculated by the federal government for basically every part of the United States. There's an area median income for each area, typically, in a metropolitan-area basis, which reflects the -- you know, the income of folks in that market who -- who are looking for housing in that market.

The bill sets a maximum of 165 percent of area median income. And that number would actually vary widely depending on what part of the state you're building in. But it also permits and it would be our anticipation that additional state subsidies might be used to lower -- to also provide units for people at lower incomes.

And again, this is an authority that would have the ability to develop housing in a very wide range of contexts. And presumably the economic viability of the project, the -- you

know, the condition of the site and the local needs for housing would be the factors that you'd want to consider in determining which projects make sense where.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So there are people who would argue that 165 percent of area median income in certain areas could be an awful lot of money and is not, in fact, affordable.

But, you know, if we're pivoting for a second to an affordable housing crisis that we all understand exists and we've all spoken about and has been a priority in this state certainly for years, can you tell me do you know how many units -- rent-stabilized units or rent-controlled units -- in New York City, of the 2.3 million I believe you mentioned earlier, are occupied by

people earning above New York City's average median income?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. Just to clarify, also, I mentioned that the number my colleague was citing before -- I think it was a slightly larger number, actually, but that was the number of people who live in those units. There are a about a million -- just for clarity, there are about a million households in rent-stabilized housing in Nassau, New York City, Westchester and Rockland counties. And I don't have those -- that data at my fingertips here. Of course that's not the subject of the budget resolution we're discussing today.

But as a general matter, people who live in rent-stabilized housing, the overwhelming majority of them make very modest incomes and certainly substantially below the 165 percent AMI that we're talking about that we were just referencing.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you

continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

SENATOR MARTINS: So if I'm -- if I were to tell you there are 835,000 out of the 2.3 million I referenced earlier who have an income of over $100,000 in New York City in rent-stabilized housing, would you agree that if we're dealing with affordability and the median income in New York City being $78,000, that we have a responsibility as we look at the affordability crisis to look at people who are affluent, some earning multiple multiples of area median income who continue to live in rent-stabilized apartments that should be occupied by people who are means-tested to live in there, don't you think that would be a great step in terms of providing housing for people who are socioeconomically challenged and are looking for housing?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. The area median income in the New York City metropolitan area -- which includes my district and my colleagues' -- for a single person living in a single-person household is

$98, 900. The area median income for a two-person household is $113,000 a year. For three persons, $127,100. And for a four-person household is $141,200. That is the area median income as calculated by HUD and by the Census Bureau.

That, we understand -- again, I'm -- if my colleague wants to check, I'm reading off -- HPD has a particularly clear and straightforward, you know, website that presents these numbers. So if my colleague or his staff wants to take a look, they're welcome to do that.

The rent-stabilized housing in New York City is overwhelmingly occupied by people of modest incomes who would not be able to afford to live in our city in market-rate housing without -- without this program. This program has been in place for decades. It is the bedrock of why New York City is a place where teachers and firefighters and police officers and social workers and, you know, storekeepers have been able to live in our communities. It's the bedrock of the economic diversity of our city.

And there are -- it is true that the program is not means-tested. And by the way, no

formal representative of property owners that I'm aware of has ever suggested to me that we ought to pass a law that requires them to rent apartments to people of lower incomes rather than people of higher incomes. Generally, property owners prefer tenants of higher incomes because they are more able and reliable rent payers.

But for what it's worth, if that is a proposal that my colleagues -- who seem interested in that today -- would like to propose, you know, it certainly could be proposed.

But there is no proposal that I'm aware from the many representatives of rent-stabilized housing that have very well-paid lobbying operations that has brought to us to make that change to that housing. If you did it in a very aggressive way, it might displace a lot of people. If you merely said very wealthy people can't live in rent-stabilized housing, you would be talking about a very small number of people.

SENATOR MARTINS: Madam President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator

Martins on the resolution.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Madam President, on the resolution.

You know, I don't think I or anyone else have mentioned repealing rent stabilization, rent control. Haven't talked about it at all in terms of repealing it. And we understand the importance that it has to New York City and, frankly, to many communities downstate in the metropolitan area.

What I am talking about is affluent people, rich people living in rent-stabilized apartments when this house continues to talk about the need for affordability in housing. Affordability in housing, that we have to have housing for people who have limited means. And yet we continue to ignore the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of people living in rent-stabilized apartments, paying below market rent, that are affluent and well above what they would otherwise qualify for if they were means-tested today.

So we're talking about building housing in communities across New York State, including in my district, controlled by someone

who's appointed by the Governor and by the Majority in this house and the other house, who are going to make decisions with regard to building affordable housing. And yet the Majority in this chamber refuses to look at the housing in the immediate area where you yourself live, and in your district where you have rich people, affluent people, living in apartments who are making multiples of area median income. Look at the facts.

So why don't we talk about those hundreds of thousands of units and means-testing them so that rich people can afford to pay their own rent and make those same units available to people who are looking to live in New York City and in the metropolitan area and can't afford to do so?

So I don't want -- Madam President, I don't want to hear about lobbyists and owners and what they want to do and how they want to do it and they're not asking for this. It's not about what they're asking about.

It's whether or not we have the courage of our convictions in this chamber when we talk about a commitment to building affordable

housing, and whether or not that includes going back and looking at the affordability of those units that have historically served as the bedrock of our housing in New York City and in the metropolitan area, and make the decision that we should have years ago, which is make it means-tested, allowing for the opportunity for those people who aren't making what some of those people who are living there right now are making -- give them the opportunity to live in an affordable apartment.

Madam President, with that, I'll sit and allow another one of my colleagues to continue.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Borrello, why do you rise?

SENATOR BORRELLO: Good afternoon, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Good afternoon.

SENATOR BORRELLO: I'm looking for some answers on new Part HHH, specifically Ag & Markets. Who would --

SENATOR KRUEGER: And my colleague Senator Hinchey would love to answer those

questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Hinchey, do you yield?

SENATOR HINCHEY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Thank you. Excuse my back while I ask the question into the microphone.

We're now three years into what we have passed, the legalization of recreational marijuana in New York State -- three years now this month. And we are now proposing a bailout for pot farmers of $128 million. We all, I think, can agree that this has been an abject failure. I think it's been said on both sides of the aisle: Somehow New York State has managed to screw up pot. I don't know how that happens, but we did.

With that said, are we aware of any other states that have had to bail out their recreational marijuana business?

SENATOR HINCHEY: Through you, Madam President. As far as we know, not in other states.

But we are incredibly -- we feel it's incredibly important to make sure that our ag producers and our farmers receive the support that they need.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HINCHEY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Senator Hinchey, I agree. You and I have actually worked together on that topic, because I have farmers, new farmers in some cases, in my district that are struggling because of this botched rollout of recreational marijuana.

But part of this bailout, it looks like it's 128 million; 60 million for cannabis farmer loans, 40 million for cannabis farmer grants, and 28 million for farmer tax credits.

Do we have any idea how upside down we are in the State of New York so far with the rollout of recreational marijuana? We've got the Office of Cannabis Management that's filled with

six-figure employees. We have -- obviously there's a whole cost of trying to enforce the illegal shops. Do we have any number as to how much New York State taxpayers have lost because of the botched rollout of recreational marijuana?

SENATOR HINCHEY: Through you, Madam President, I don't right now have any numbers on the broader spectrum of cannabis across the state.

But I think it's incredibly important to recognize and acknowledge that these are growers who we asked to grow the product for the market. And so the 128 million here is to cover the losses that they would have seen since the rollout was delayed, and making sure that they have the funds to be able to stay in business moving into the next growing cycle.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HINCHEY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: I agree with

you. I just don't see an end to this. Because we still haven't really, you know, pulled out of this tailspin so far.

But with that being said, there is -- there appears to be an allowance that would give a portion of those funds, they can be like suballocated or transferred to any department, agency or public authority. Why would we take that away from Ag & Markets? Unless I'm misunderstanding that.

SENATOR HINCHEY: (Pause.) Through you, Madam President. We had this program originally running through Ag & Markets because this is a farm relief package. But a number of these programs will be run through ESD, because they have the mechanisms to be able to do the tax piece and the loan piece, which is very normal. But starting with Ag & Markets, since it's actually an ag program.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HINCHEY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The

Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: My last question on this. Even though there are a lot -- most of the farmers are absolutely struggling. But there are a few that are doing all right. What are the requirements going to be for accessing these funds? Do we have anything set in place to ensure that this is going to those that are most in need?

SENATOR HINCHEY: (Pause.) Through you, Madam President. First of all, this package is only for the conditional cultivators. So there's a limited number of farmers already in this package. And they have to establish that they've actually experienced financial losses. So that could be default on loans or other types of things like that.

But there are mechanisms in place to make sure that the money is actually going to the farmers that have experienced losses over the last year.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Great.

Madam President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: On the resolution, Senator Borrello.

SENATOR BORRELLO: On the resolution.

Thank you, Senator Hinchey, for your answers.

I just think we all should look around and say to ourselves, how has government been able to screw up marijuana in New York State? And it's really easy to point out to the fact that we have not only allowed the black market to flourish, but we've also really destroyed the ability for us to create a good infrastructure for the legal market.

So this is a real problem. It's a real problem. But you know what? We knew this was going to be a problem three years ago when we debated this bill originally. Myself and my colleagues, we all said this was going to happen. But nobody wanted to listen. So I realize that now we've got to dedicate even more than funding.

But this was sold to the people of New York State as a panacea. There was going to be this amazing new market, this amazing new industry. And it was going to create hundreds of millions of dollars a year in tax revenue. And we're going to have all these potrepreneurs all

over New York State that are going to be making money. Look where we are now. The only people making money are the people that are doing it illegally. Those are the only folks making money right now.

So this has been a sad rollout. And we need to fix it. And I'm glad we're going to help our farmers, but I don't see an end to this until we start doing, first and foremost, what we should have done. If people are selling pot illegally, if they're a storefront -- I don't care if it's in New York City or it's in my town or wherever it is, those folks need to go to prison. Okay?

Fines, seizures? Those are just a cost of doing business for these folks. They'll just add that into the cost of doing business. They close, they reopen. Until you really have the spine to put people in prison for selling drugs illegally, this isn't going to end.

So, Madam President, with that I'll move on to the next topic. If the sponsor would yield on TED Part WW specifically with the electric bus mandate.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator

Krueger, I think that's my question. So I'm going to come down.

SENATOR KRUEGER: I'm sorry, I wanted to respond to earlier. But please, your question is fine.

If you don't mind, I would like to answer also on your cannabis questions first.

While I appreciate my colleague's points, just for the record, it's not a complete failure. It's going slower than we hoped. Although when you compare New York State's rollout of legal cannabis with the other states around the country, they also took at least two years. We're taking three years. That's frustrating. But nobody decided to bring whole lawsuits against the other states to prevent us from moving forward with the licenses.

And they are moving forward quite fast now. We in fact have people who created cannabis businesses in other states moving here because they see that they'll make more money as New Yorkers creating legal businesses. So we're actually seeing a growth in the number of people starting cannabis businesses, even though everybody says it's not working, it's going too

slow.

They actually expect, OCM, to actually have revenue to start to invest in the commitments of the original MRTA law by the new fiscal year, which is very encouraging. And they've been moving forward with the licensing.

You're totally right about our being blindsided by the number of illegal stores and the fact that in its own bizarre entrepreneurial way, we saw large corporations deciding to underwrite illegal stores. And that really has harmed us and has held us back. But we are trying to resolve that. We are improving that. And I believe the other sections of the law that we are putting forward in this budget will help us address that.

And frankly, the money that you asked about, and my colleague answered, we already had a loan fund built into the MRTA. And since people are asking for it now, we will trigger that, and it won't actually cost us money because it's a loan fund. You have to pay it back.

The grants, as she described, will be specifically to a universe of farmers who can

document that they are the ones who were harmed for that at least one year where there was not enough buying of their product. And we have tried to come up with a number of alternatives, and we stuck on this.

And finally, the tax credit was the request of people who pointed out that if they were in almost any other business of equivalent category, we would have given them a tax credit. But because they're not -- simply because they were eligible based on federal law for a matching state tax credit. But of course federal law doesn't allow tax credits for marijuana.

Therefore, they asked for a specific set of changed rules so that they can take the state credit they would have been able to take without our even having to deal with it. So I think that's a completely legitimate question by business that we're answering this way.

So yes, fabulous, everything worked? I'll be the first one to say no. And I wrote that bill. A complete disaster? Totally not true when you look at what we're doing compared to the other states who have been in business much longer who are actually saying to us daily,

Oh, we wish we did that. Oh, we're going to do that. Oh, we're going to do that.

So I ask everyone, let's have that discussion again in a year with these changes added this year, and we may all be able to have a very different set of discussions specifically to cannabis.

And now I will be happy to address the next set of questions.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I believe Senator Mayer will be on the question from Senator Borrello.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Oh, right. Thank you.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I also want to remind my colleagues that we have 30 minutes remaining in debate. There are still a half a dozen members beyond Senator Borrello. So we do intend to enforce conclusion of debate at 1:35. And so if the members go long, they're only taking time away from their colleagues, so.

SENATOR KRUEGER: So yes indeed,

we've changed Madam Presidents.

So Shelley Mayer, the chair of Education, will answer your questions.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: I want to make clear which section you're asking about.

SENATOR BORRELLO: It's TED Part WW, specifically on the electric bus mandate.

SENATOR MAYER: Are you referring to school bus?

SENATOR BORRELLO: Well, both school and municipal. But we can start with school. That obviously would fall under your --

SENATOR MAYER: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Yeah. So am I correct that in the budget we are creating a task force to study the impact of the electric school bus mandate? Is that correct?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Madam President. What we have done is in hearing the -- some of the complications in this rollout, we've created a zero-emissions school bus

committee which is going to be comprised of a large number of state stakeholders, hold hearings so that all of the people impacted can have their voices heard, and report back within a year's time on some of the impediments and challenges so that we can be mindful of the challenges while we continue to stay with the deadlines that were in the original act.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So we're going to move ahead with the deadlines, that you're not going to -- we're not going to suspend those deadlines while we get some answers to some very serious questions. Like are we going to be able to safely transport our children on these buses? Are we going to have enough range, particularly in the wintertime, when we transport our children on these school buses? Where is the money going to come from? Not just for the buses, but for

the infrastructure.

So we're not going to suspend this very short timeline of about -- less than three years while we answer those questions, is that correct?

SENATOR MAYER: Senator Borrello, as you know, the actual requirement does not go into effect until buses are purchased after 2027. We have adequate time both to look at any technical things that may require modification while at the same time to remain true to our commitment to move to a safer environment for our kids, which is the -- really the motivating factor with this change to electric school buses.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: You're saying the safety of our children. There are some major concerns. Electric vehicles tend to burn quickly and very hot. We really don't have a safety plan

in place in the event that a school bus starts on fire. We recently heard that the emissions from the burning of the tires -- because the tires are -- the heaviness of the weight of the school buses, actually the rubber tires actually disintegrate faster, leading to more emissions. Which, according to the study that we saw, was actually worse than that the emissions from diesel power.

So I guess in less than three years -- and schools obviously have to plan well in advance for capital purchases -- why are we not suspending this timeline when we really don't have any answers to those questions?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Madam President. First of all, schools are required to have a school safety plan that includes the use of electric school buses.

Secondly, the facts -- or the suggestion by my colleague that these are all facts that he knows, the fact is that moving to electric vehicles has been proven to be a wise and safer alternative.

And because we have heard concerns of the school bus companies, of the school

districts, we have created this committee which will have a very short turnaround to actually look at the details that may cause some concerns.

The other thing I would note is that the Governor proposed to add three full-time workers to the State Education Department to be focused on school bus issues. And we have urged NYSERDA to take an even more proactive role in educating those affected on the details of both financing and implementation of this requirement.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: In the interests of time, this will be my last question.

We have heard from school districts across the state about the costs of this. Is there anything in this budget that will improve the funding available? A paltry 500 million on what's going to be tens of billions of dollars is all we've got so far. Anything in the budget

that's going to improve the financial outlook so it doesn't devastate school property-tax payers?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Madam President. The Governor has proposed to include bond act funds in the calculation of reimbursable aid. We have expanded that to include federal funds, because there are federal funds available.

And if our provision is adopted, it will be even more beneficial financially for school districts as they move forward to comply.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, on the reso.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Borrello on the resolution.

SENATOR BORRELLO: I understand that we really need to dodge this topic a lot because everybody's heard from the school districts. It's going to be about $20 billion just to replace the buses. That doesn't include the infrastructure costs. And we're talking about bonds and loans and we're going to dedicate more funding maybe from the Environmental Bond Act.

It doesn't scratch the surface,

folks. You are all hearing it. We need to pump the brakes on this mandate before it's too late. Because schools are already starting to -- they have to make these purchases. And in some cases, they're getting lemons. We already heard that from the school district, that these buses are actually not working well, period.

But with that being said, Madam President, if I could just move on to the housing section in the reso. Anybody? Anybody?

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator, do you yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, I don't notice I'm being called on unless Liz Krueger is also standing.

(Laughter.)

SENATOR KAVANAGH: But I'm happy to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Thank you. Through you, Madam President. There's made mention in the budget a very vague terminology that the Majority in this one-house budget supports good-cause eviction, but there's really

no specifics. Can you explain exactly what the conference's, your conference's position is on good-cause eviction?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. As my colleague notes, the resolution says that this conference supports the basic principle of good-cause eviction as part of a broader agreement on housing that we're hoping to achieve in the next few weeks in the course of the budget negotiations.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So is it your intention to implement, as part of this budget, good-cause eviction as the piece of legislation sits now?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. I'm going to take that as the collective "you" and not my personal views.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Yes. Not you personally.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: The resolution states the conference's position. We intend to implement good-cause eviction, a bill that reflects the principles that are on the books in several other states that were -- you know, good-cause eviction has been on the books in New Jersey for many years. It's been on the books in California since 2019, Oregon and other places.

It is our intention to negotiate a version of good-cause eviction. Obviously if you wanted to say that we were going adopt precisely the terms of an existing bill, we could have done that. We are taking the position that the principle of good-cause eviction is important. It's something that many of us have fought for for a long time. And we have put -- the Senate Majority has put forth a very broad set of proposals on housing that really are intended to address this crisis throughout the state. And we think tenant protections in the form of good-cause eviction are an important part of that.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So is it the intention of the Senate Majority to perhaps more specifically outline in the final budget proposal what parts, if not all parts, of good-cause eviction will be supported as part of this budget?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President, yes, it is my expectation that we will negotiate in this budget some statutory language that provides the protections of good-cause eviction.

I mentioned the principle of good-cause eviction. The basic principle of good-cause eviction is that you can't be evicted from your home for no good reason. And good-cause eviction statutes tend to enumerate those. I don't think a sentence about the

principles of good-cause eviction that's included in the resolution is going to have much effect if that's all we say in adopted statutory language.

So yes, the goal would be to create a statute that provides those -- the benefits of those protections in New York.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Yes, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: You know, I understand that there's kind of a collision course here between trying to create more housing opportunities and, you know, really deterring those folks that are in the housing business through things like good-cause eviction from actually creating more housing.

So with that being said, one program that did seem to work well was 421-a, but yet the Majority has refused to renew that program. What is the plan to address those projects that are

already under construction that fall under the 421-a program?

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Through you, Madam President. I just have to begin -- I didn't hear a question mark, but there is not -- there is not, in my view, a collision course between the effort to provide tenants and homeowners who already have housing basic protections for the stability in their homes, and also trying to produce new housing.

We've done both of those things for a long time. We need to continue to do those things. The Senate Majority in this resolution is saying roughly the same thing about the provision that my colleague just mentioned, which is intended to -- which would be intended to permit projects to move forward in New York with some tax breaks and the tenant protections of good-cause eviction. That we are committed to negotiating versions of those that could be enacted in this budget in a negotiation with the Executive and our colleagues in the Assembly.

And, you know, we've had many conversations since that tax break has expired about how specifically to allow those projects to

move forward. But it is our intention to get both of those things done as reflected in this resolution in the course of this budget negotiation in the next few weeks.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Madam President, on the resolution.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Borrello on the resolution.

SENATOR BORRELLO: I think we've had a theme here today as we've asked a lot of questions, myself and my colleagues, about housing.

But just to address the point. The collision course is the fact that we are telling people in general that are in the housing business that you're no longer in control -- how much you can charge for rent, whether or not you can remove someone from the property that you own, whether or not you're going to be able to, you know, have the necessary means to build new housing.

That's what I mean when I say a collision course. These things are not exclusive. In fact, most developers are saying how difficult it is to build housing, to maintain

housing, you know, to actually make basic improvements to their housing, and maintenance, because of the restrictions, the handcuffs that are put on them by New York State government.

So this is a collision course, and we're going to have a problem ahead of us. Because unless we want to just have all government-run housing in New York State, the private sector has been devastated by the policies of this New York State Legislature.

And with that, I will yield my time. Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Tedisco.

SENATOR TEDISCO: Thank you, Madam President. I'm going to limit myself to five minutes. I'm looking at my watch here because there's several of my other members who I want to respect who want to say some things.

First of all, very quickly, we've had a lot of illustrations of why we're in the position that we are in, in terms of being number one in outmigration. This is the mother --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Excuse me, Senator Tedisco. Are you on the --

SENATOR TEDISCO: On the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Are you on the resolution?

SENATOR TEDISCO: On the resolution.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR TEDISCO: We are the mother of out-exodus in terms of this particular budget. It's the mother, this resolution, of outmigration and exodus from the State of New York. We've seen all the illustrations of that.

One of those was the discussion we had about our family farms, in not providing them a tax credit for housing. If you want to provide a tax credit that helps housing, it's not going to be just one bill or one piece of legislation, in relationship to this budget -- or any program.

I've got the bill. It's 8804, S8804. I got the number yesterday. It provides the same tax credit for farmworkers, for our farmers in the State of New York, as we provided last year for capital projects, building buildings so we can have production. And if you want to sponsor that, you can. But you should

put it back in this budget, that tax credit for farmworkers. One, it will help the economy. Two, it will help the homeless. Three, it will incentivize our farmers to get workers, because we have a dearth. Fourth, when there's an emergency, they'll be right there. Farmers respect that. When the weather's bad, they like to have their workers right there.

You've done a lot of bad to them, and people across this state, but this would really help them. So that tax credit bill is here, I have a sponsor in the Assembly, but you could put it in the budget.

Now I'm going to go to asking somebody to yield on our parks, parks and recreation.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Serrano, do you yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR TEDISCO: Thank you, Senator Serrano.

Governor Hochul put something in her one-house budget. It was one of the only good

things that was in there. It was nothing really helping affordability or public safety, which this also doubles down on, this resolution. But she put language in there that said every single park, all 200 parks, would have to put security systems in.

Is that in this particular resolution?

SENATOR SERRANO: Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator.

In the then-Parks commissioner's testimony on the Executive Budget, he indicated $53 million that was allocated by the Executive for things like security that the Parks Department would use for security cameras, et cetera.

SENATOR TEDISCO: Would the gentleman yield for another question.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Were you finished, Senator Serrano?

SENATOR SERRANO: I'm not quite done.

And in addition, in our Senate one-house, we added additional capital funds,

which again could be used for that, could be used for cameras, can be used for other security measures in state parks. So we've actually added to that -- to that notion.

SENATOR TEDISCO: On the resolution.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Tedisco on the resolution.

SENATOR TEDISCO: Yeah, we had a case in Moreau Park -- and this is not unique, crime across the state. Very little in this budget, zero in the budget that the Governor -- this resolution the Governor sent us. The girl was abducted, the man drove in, drove out. She wouldn't be alive today unless the man made a mistake and put a ransom note at her house and the cop was out there and they tracked him down.

Called the Parks department in the State of New York, the commission, and they said no, we don't have it. They put her in Moreau Park, going into parks and leaving parks. Not in the parks watching people swimming or picnicking.

I put a bill in for all over 200 parks and recreational facilities to have cameras as you go into a park and leave a park. It's a

commonsense safety feature. Hochul I believe had cameras in her bill. It was security. We're not sure if it's cameras or not, and I'm not sure if they're talking about cameras going in or leaving.

But it's a commonsense thing. We don't see a lot of common sense right now in terms of public safety.

In terms of this bill, as I said, it's the mother of all exodus budget resolutions right now, because it increases taxes, it increases spending, it does nothing really about public safety. And it's just going to make more people leave the State of New York.

We're number one in outmigration, one of seven states that lost another representative, projected to lose three more Congress people in 2030. You saw the last report that came out: Number one issue is affordability. Second is public safety.

So I'm going to have to vote no on this resolution, Madam President. And I urge my colleagues to go back and think about the $7 billion for taxes, $13 million in spending.

Unemployment money, when you talk

about small businesses -- all the small businesses are going to pay for that unemployment. Over 40 states paid for it at the back end through COVID. You're putting it on the backs of small businesses. When you say only 1 percent are millionaires, 99 percent are middle-income and lower. Sixty-five percent of this state says there's an affordability problem.

So it's not only millionaires we're talking about. We are talking about middle-income. When you say you're going to keep the tax structure for them, that was three years ago. There's inflation right now. If you put the same tax structure on the middle-income, you're increasing their taxes because of inflation.

This is a terrible resolution, budget resolution. And you've got to rethink the agenda. Because when 101,000 people are leaving the State of New York, you know your agenda is failing.

So let's go back and correct that a little bit. You're representatives, and that's what they're telling you.

Thank you, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Thank you, Senator Tedisco.

Senator Mattera, why do you rise?

SENATOR MATTERA: Thank you, Madam President. Would the sponsor yield for some questions? This is on the New York HEAT Act.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: On what subject?

SENATOR MATTERA: It's on the subject -- on TED Part P. And it's my good friend -- thank you so much, Senator Krueger. And I wanted to talk to you --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Krueger, do you yield?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Of course.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR MATTERA: And I was hoping that we can talk about cannabis, but we're not going to be doing that.

As I understand it, the legislation abolishes the 100-foot rule, which obligates a utility to connect to any customers within 100 feet of a gas line to a main line free of

charge. Utilities and companies I've spoken to that operate in this space have told me that this will lead to laying off 30 percent of good workers, good union workers, and nonunion workers in the plumbing industry, obviously with our utility workers, plumbers, pipe fitters. All these people, they'd be laid off.

Does this legislation contain any funding to retain or retrain those laid off workers?

SENATOR KRUEGER: (Pause.) Thank you, Senator.

So in this bill the answer is no. In other things we have done we've put I think $20 million into the Department of Labor for retraining of pipe professionals. And we put additional money into -- $25 million into NYPA. So that actually totals 45 million.

But I think your question is so important in the context of what we need to do and New York HEAT is just one piece of. We're all arguing back and forth, how can we go into a green economy? What will happen when we go into a green economy, whether we're talking buses or pipes or boilers.

Well, the truth is we actually know that in a new green economy we will have more jobs for all of these workers. Maybe -- and I respect, because we have talked about this many times, that you in fact come from a history of being a labor leader for plumbers. We all know that and respect you for that. There are going to be other models of work in a green economy with new jobs that nobody's even understood they were going to have an opportunity to get. There will be more jobs for people.

Actually, if we continue -- and this is something you and I agree on -- with expansion of geothermal energy opportunities, both one-on-one in individual houses or through networks, which are extremely exciting, they not only have zero-carbon footprints, but you put pipes in the ground. You're just not putting oil and gas through those pipes, you're putting hot water.

With electric buses, we're not going to be telling people you have to chuck every valuable bus that still should be on the road. We're doing it over time so it will be the transition.

The new buses will be electric. The old buses are combustion engines. New York City has electric buses all over the streets of New York City, and they seem to be working fine. And so we're paying people to build electric buses instead of combustion buses. We're paying people to drive electric buses instead of combustion buses.

And just because the question was asked earlier -- and I'm sorry, I'm going on too long -- it turns out electric buses can occasionally blow up. But they have a higher safety record than combustion -- and you're looking at the clock. Please let me -- keep going. Sorry.

SENATOR MATTERA: Please, I just want to do this, because my colleagues really wanted to get to speak.

You know, studies that I've seen indicate that these conversions could cost up to 50,000 for each one of our homes. What allowances does the legislation make to assist these customers with these costs?

I understand we have the low-income, but what are we doing about the middle class,

Senator? What are we doing to help our middle -- excuse me. I was supposed to say would you yield.

(Laughter.)

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Yes, you are supposed to.

SENATOR MATTERA: So sorry about that.

What are we doing about our middle class that can't put food on their table? The food insecurities, the lines around the blocks that I see when I'm there, with Long Island Cares and Island Harvest. What are we doing for the middle class, Senator?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. So if we were on NY HEAT, I would point out that that is pipes going into new construction, not conversions. And I believe this question is more what about buildings that need to convert, homeowners who need to convert.

The good news is we have a whole series of tax credits at the state and federal level. And even as we sit here discussing it, we are finding that the middle class are building their homes and converting their homes to the

alternative energy at higher rates than ever before. If you look at the growth in heat pumps in New York State, it's amazing how many people are actually using the tax credits and converting their homes and building homes using heat pumps and other sources of energy.

Yes, there is an initial cost, no denial. But you get so much savings over a relatively short period of time with an assortment of tax credits, which we are expanding in this budget. That I have to say Maine, now the coldest state in the nation, has more heat pumps going in than any other source of energy in their residences.

SENATOR MATTERA: On the resolution.

Just so everybody knows, New York State residents need to understand it's going to cost triple to quadruple with their electric bills --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Excuse me. Senator Mattera, are you on the resolution?

SENATOR MATTERA: Yes, I'm on the resolution.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: And

Senator Krueger, did you finish your answer?

SENATOR KRUEGER: I finished, and it's his.

SENATOR MATTERA: Thank you. And I just want to say it again, on the resolution, just fast. That's what it's going to cost. All New Yorkers, triple to quadruple with their electric bills, what's happening right now with this HEAT Act, what's happening with the CLCPA's mandates. Mandates are wrong, goals are good.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Rolison.

SENATOR ROLISON: Okay, thank you, Madam President. Through you, would the sponsor yield for a couple of questions in public protection?

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you, Madam President, I would love to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR ROLISON: And thank you. Through you, Madam President. In my read of this, Senator Bailey, there is a $25 million reduction in the State Police budget. Is that

accurate?

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you, Madam President, that is not accurate, actually. We have come up with a new and innovative way of making sure that local law enforcement is involved in the retail theft conversation.

Previously in the Governor's Executive Budget, $25 million had been allocated solely to State Police. What we have done at the behest of many people -- and we've listened to our constituents and other voices. What we have done is we've created something that gives some money to prosecutors, to local law enforcement, and also State Police as well.

So in summation, there is no cut. The money is distributed through DCJS. And it's going more to local law enforcement, which is what we hear often from folks on your side of the aisle.

SENATOR ROLISON: Through you, Madam President, would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Bailey, do you yield?

SENATOR BAILEY: Certainly.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR ROLISON: Through you, Madam President. I see that there is a new addition for retail theft when the aggregate amount reaches a million dollars. Is that accurate?

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you, Madam President. Senator Rolison, did you say a million dollars or a thousand dollars?

SENATOR ROLISON: It would exceed a million dollars, which would then create a Class B felony, which would be bail-eligible.

SENATOR BAILEY: Could you clarify what part you're getting that from, Senator Rolison, if you don't mind? Through you, Madam President, excuse me.

SENATOR ROLISON: Right. So Part WW creates a mechanism to aggregate the value of stolen goods from retail theft crimes.

SENATOR BAILEY: And the question is?

SENATOR ROLISON: Is that -- am I accurate?

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you,

Madam President, that's accurate.

SENATOR ROLISON: And through you, Madam President, where does the million dollars come into play?

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you, Madam President. Senator Rolison, what million dollars?

SENATOR ROLISON: The aggregate value of the stolen goods. Over a 90-day period.

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you, Madam President, I think that there's a misunderstanding. It's not a million dollars. We're talking about the aggregate for a crime of grand larceny, which is a thousand dollars.

The million -- it is not a million-dollar, you know, threshold for grand larceny. That would be quite a large threshold for grand larceny. Through you, Madam President.

And what the intent of the legislation is, if I may --

SENATOR ROLISON: Yup.

SENATOR BAILEY: -- is, you know, sometimes people steal amounts up to $999. And so that prosecutors would be able to charge aggregate crimes that occur within a three-month

period as a grand larceny crime, as opposed to Class A misdemeanors.

SENATOR ROLISON: Through you, Madam President, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Bailey, do you yield?

SENATOR BAILEY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR ROLISON: So if an individual is involved in shoplifting, retail theft crime, and they are arrested once or 100 times, they are treated the same currently as it relates to bail.

SENATOR BAILEY: Through you, Madam President, in the hypothetical alleged, if the amount that was taken is under a thousand dollars, that would be accurate.

Which is why we have taken steps in this one-house to remedy what is currently happening so that we can be more responsive to the occurrence of retail theft happening in our state.

SENATOR ROLISON: Madam President,

I'll yield the rest of my time.

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR BAILEY: Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Okay. Senator Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield for questions on TED Part 0 regarding the RAPID Act?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Which act is it?

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Krueger, RAPID Act.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: The RAPID Act.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The RAPID Act. I think there were questions previously about that.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Yes.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Senator Harckham would love to give that answer.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Harckham, do you yield?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The

Senator yields.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Senator.

The Governor's proposal for the RAPID Act allowed ORES to ignore local law and regulations to advance the goals of the CLCPA. Did the one-house proposal reject that provision, or is that still included?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Through you, Madam President, the Governor's proposal does not change any of the language in the law that currently exists. All the Governor is doing in her proposal is moving it from the Department of State to the Department of Public Service.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Madam President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Included in the Governor's proposal, though, is an ability for the -- for ORES to overrule local

law. And my question is, will local law be overruled regarding zoning, et cetera?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Through you, Madam President. The provisions of ORES do not change. Those stay -- again, nothing has changed either in the Governor's proposal or our proposal. The way ORES works is for those larger projects, they take into account community input and weigh against some of the larger factors. And some projects have been denied based on community input.

But again, nothing in the Governor's proposal, or in the Senate one-house, changes what's already in law. It simply moves it from one agency to another.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Do you continue to yield?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Absolutely.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: The Senator yields.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: So the RAPID Act also allows for engaging stakeholders and municipalities to develop

guidelines regarding agricultural land.

My question is, does the one-house provide for similar working groups to minimize adverse impacts on other sensitive environmental areas such as coastlines?

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Through you, Madam President. In the Senate one-house we have actually strengthened protections for prime farmland and agricultural land.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Madam President, that concludes the debate.

Please call the vote, and we can move on to vote explanations.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Webb to explain her vote.

SENATOR WEBB: Thank you, Madam President.

As I rise to speak on our one-house budget that appears to have unanimous support --

(Laughter.)

SENATOR WEBB: -- I want to thank Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins, my colleagues, all the staff and members who have worked tirelessly on our budget.

I also want to lift up -- because during the debate there was a lot of conversation around what are we doing to support --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Can we have some order, please.

SENATOR WEBB: There were a lot of points with regards to what are we doing to support working families, those who are the most vulnerable. And this one-house budget proposal is doing all of those things.

And so as someone who represents the Southern Tier but also someone who has also advocated for a number of resources for underserved communities on a number of issues that we're touching upon in this budget -- such as education funding and supports, especially for small and rural communities which I represent -- we are providing -- continuing to provide funding

to support our educators and staff as they continue to educate our students.

And so we have pushed back against the proposed cuts. We are continuing to make historic investments in our schools, increasing school aid by $747 million, to name a few of the investments. We are also making historic investments in higher education, as we are reforming the TAP program by raising the maximum threshold for TAP eligibility.

In addition, we are addressing and continuing to advance efforts to address the need for quality, affordable, safe and secure housing. And we are making significant investment in reforms aimed on this issue, also providing protections for tenants and simultaneously supporting development across the state and providing provisions for homeowners or for those who are aspiring to be homeowners.

We are continuing to deliver on our commitment to climate goals and a sustainable future. Our budget proposal includes NY HEAT, which will save our constituents the money on their utility bills.

As the chair of the Women's Issues

Committee, I am happy that our one-house budget addresses the need to support and protect reproductive and maternal health, including 10 million to support an increased Medicaid reimbursement rate for reproductive care and medication.

I also want to lift up, as I close, that a number of the reforms that we're looking to support, including childcare, which are also integral for workforce development and job security, are areas that we continue to invest in. And so --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Webb, how do you vote?

SENATOR WEBB: As I conclude, I proudly vote aye and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Webb to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Harckham to explain his vote.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you very much, Madam President.

I will be voting aye on this

resolution. I want to thank the Majority Leader. I want to thank Senator Krueger.

There are a number of things in this budget that are beneficial to all of us all over the state. We have heard a lot from all over the state about the need to restore the cuts to 50 percent of our school districts -- Republican districts, Democratic districts. We did that.

We heard a lot about the need for universal school meals -- Republican districts, Democratic districts. We did that.

For those of us outside of the city, the need for universal pre-K -- Republican districts, Democratic districts. We did that.

We heard the need from Republicans and Democrats about the need to restore funding for clean water funding. That money goes to Republican districts and Democratic districts. We did that.

We heard the need to restore funding and increase funding for our roads, our CHIPS program, for our local municipalities and for the State DOT highway program because our roads are in such poor shape. That's in Democratic districts, Republican districts. We fixed that.

We heard about the need to adequately pay our direct care support workers who care for the neediest among us. That happens in Republican districts, Democratic districts. We did that.

And finally I just want to say, on the notion of the transformation to clean energy, to my good friend Senator Mattera I would say we also put in $90 million for two geothermal heat projects on SUNY campuses, one in Buffalo, one at SUNY Purchase. All that work goes to unionized plumbers, steamfitters, operating engineers. That's the future.

Norway is 90 percent heat pumps and thermal networks. Towns and villages, thermal networks. That's the future. That's today. That's what's in this budget.

I vote aye, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Harckham to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Liu to explain his vote.

SENATOR LIU: Thank you very much, Madam President.

I speak in enthusiastic favor of this Senate budget resolution. This was crafted

after hours and hours, days and days and weeks and weeks of deliberations, consultations with our constituents, and debate with our colleagues.

And in particular, I thank you, Madam Chair, for your leadership and also the leadership of our Majority Leader, Andrea Stewart-Cousins, on the issues of education, education that preserves funding for school districts all across the State of New York, and also ensures that we will be able to govern and operate our schools in the best manner possible for all New York City schoolkids.

Madam President, in particular I want to point out one item in the budget resolution that speaks to New York City's requests for additional borrowing capacity. The City of New York, as you know, has requested $12 billion of additional bonding authority. That is a massive increase in the city's borrowing authority. In comparison, the last bond authority that the State of New York received was a $4.2 billion bond authority for environmental projects.

I strongly urged -- and I am happy to see that this is in the resolution -- that if

the City of New York will get this additional bonding authority, that they first must prioritize school construction, especially when their capital construction plan for schools in New York City is at the lowest it's been in many, many years.

There cannot be any serious effort on the part of New York City to comply with class-size mandates that we passed here in this chamber unless they are serious about their school capital construction plan. And so that is why it's important that that be a proviso in granting the city additional borrowing aid.

Thanks so much, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Thank you.

Senator Liu to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Weik to explain her vote.

SENATOR WEIK: Thank you, Madam President.

In this budget we see the creation of the New York Housing Opportunity Corporation, which largely removes local control from our communities. We see a push to legalize ADUs.

The budget -- this budget ignores

the many viable concerns about the rapidly approaching deadlines for electric school buses.

It spends 2.4 billion on illegal migrants, yet offers no repeal of Tier 6. Even after holding two public hearings last year to find ways to grow our public-sector employees and keep people working here in New York, the number-one plea of teachers and civil service agencies during those hearings was to repeal Tier 6 so we can grow our workforce. And yet this budget does nothing to do that.

This budget that aims to spend $246.2 billion does not prioritize New Yorkers. Instead, it grows government control and greatly raises taxes and makes New York State much less affordable.

And for that, Madam President, I'll be in the negative.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Weik to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Ramos to explain her vote.

SENATOR RAMOS: Thank you, Madam President.

I rise on behalf of the children in my district to vote aye on this one-house

resolution. Two years ago I passed the Child Poverty Reduction Act, which requires that we cut child poverty in half by 2032. Because of the dysfunction in Washington, we have regressed in our fight.

There are critical measures in this resolution that will help us fight this economic and social evil. First, we are updating our temporary disability insurance system by enacting progressive wage replacement so low-wage workers can use the safety net, and updating the benefit to be a true wage replacement.

Aligning the system with paid family leave makes sure pregnant people have a longer runway to care for themselves and their growing family.

I'm thrilled that both the Senate and Assembly are advancing an iteration of the Mothers and Infants Lasting Change Allowance, making New York State a national leader in exploring poverty reduction via guaranteed income.

Hearing the success stories during this budget cycle from mothers who have benefited from modest cash grants during their pregnancy

has been nothing short of transformational. These mothers use this money to buy diapers and formula, leave abusive partners, and pursue higher education. And this is how we lift from the bottom up.

I'm also grateful that my bill to improve street safety around our public schools has the support of my conference. Yesterday afternoon my community and I lost an eight-year-old boy to a reckless driver who didn't yield while turning. His three-year-old brother was also injured.

I have heard this story too many times during my tenure as Senator. Thankfully, this resolution includes Sammy's Law and my scrambled crosswalks bill.

There's so much else to be proud of: Tier 6 pension reform, rejecting school cuts and Medicaid cuts, new tools to combat wage theft, a plan for housing and tenant protections, serious funding for the expansion of mental health treatment courts, and taxing the rich to fund our communities, to name a few.

I'd like to thank the outstanding staff of the New York State Democratic Conference

and my exemplary staff. I'd like to thank Senator Krueger for her work as Finance chair, and our leader for her strength as she heads into three way negotiations.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Ramos to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Sepúlveda to explain his vote.

SENATOR SEPÚLVEDA: Thank you, Madam President.

I rise also to vote in the affirmative for this resolution.

Budgets are an indication of priorities of our conferences. And I know -- I recently visited Taiwan. In Taiwan, healthcare is considered a human constitutional right. We haven't reached that anywhere near in this country, but we should. And if you look at what we've done with Medicaid, we've increased the 3 percent rate; a 10 percent increase in inpatient/outpatient for hospitals.

One of the most important institutions, health institutions in my district is St. Barnabas, which is bleeding money and

needs a lot of assistance. And so for these hospitals that are in a critical situation, to allocate $1.5 billion for these financially distressed hospitals are going to save a lot of lives in the district that I represent.

And on the issue of housing, we have $250 million for the Housing Access Voucher program; 500 million for NYCHA; 40 million to repair rent-stabilized apartments and to create housing legal assistance for the residents in the community.

On education, $4.5 million for English language learning students that are disabled; 138 million to expand TAP that will allow part-time students to attend proprietary institutions. On the hunger front, 65 million for hunger prevention and nutrition. And compelling us to participate -- or asking us to participate in the national school lunch program, and breakfast, so all the schools in our districts are required to offer breakfast and lunch, in many cases where that is the only breakfast or lunch a child will have.

On capital projects, important for me, an institution in my district that I share

with Senator Serrano, Hostos College, $150 million for capital improvements.

On corrections, 1.6 million -- small amount -- for families to visit to take their children to visit parents that may be incarcerated. It is not a child's fault if they are separated from a family member because the family member's incarcerated, and we should do everything possible to help them establish these kinds of relationships.

It aligns the definition of serious mental illness and mental hygiene. And on the crime front, I know one of the biggest problems we have is retail theft crimes, and we're addressing that in this budget as well.

The cannabis industry, which once we get it straight I believe will be awesome --

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Sepúlveda, your time is -- your time is up.

SENATOR SEPÚLVEDA: And last but not least, getting New York City back to participate in AIM funding. In his infinite wisdom, the last governor took us out. We want back in, because that will bring hundreds of millions of dollars to the City of New York.

I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Sepúlveda to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Brisport to explain his vote.

SENATOR BRISPORT: Thank you, Madam President.

I rise to vote in the affirmative and to remind us that, through her artfully misleading speeches and press releases, Governor Hochul seems to have created a false collective memory in Albany, a strategic fiction in which two years ago she took swift action to make the transformational investments needed to move the childcare sector out of a state of crisis.

In reality, our Governor successfully negotiated to limit New York's childcare investment. As a result, New York's childcare educators are still earning less than 96 percent of occupations in our state, and the continued exodus of professionals from the sector has left massive childcare deserts from Buffalo to Brooklyn.

On Friday Cornell released a report showing that adults in nearly half of households

with young children are kept out of the workforce because of unmet childcare needs. Our Governor has essentially thrown a sponge at a bursting dam, taken a bow, and walked away.

We in the Legislature now bear the responsibility of holding the Governor accountable to finally align her actions with her public claims. Yet this one-house budget resolution does not do that. In fact, it rolls back on our own commitments to childcare. Two years ago this very body voted on a one-house resolution that said in 2024 we would push to invest $4.1 billion in the childcare sector. Today's resolution cuts that proposed investment by about 50 percent.

To make matters worse, the harms of our reversal on childcare investments stand to be compounded if we fail to stop the Governor's effort to tie childcare more closely to employment, a policy nightmare that is simultaneously cruel to families, inequitable to children, and a drag on our economy.

Today's one-house resolution is an improvement over the Governor's incredibly irresponsible proposal in many important ways,

and I feel compelled to support it and fight for all these improvements to be maintained in our final budget. But I strongly urge this body to rise to meet the scale of our childcare crisis. We cannot sit back and wait for the Governor. We cannot sit back and wait for the federal government. We must be the force that rises to meet this moment and make New York the first state to build universal childcare.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Brisport to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Sanders to explain his vote.

SENATOR SANDERS: Thank you, Madam President.

I want to commend Andrea Stewart-Cousins, the Democratic Majority, the excellent staff, and all who supported this budget resolution.

Many things about this budget will aid working people in New York State. There are so many that we can -- I won't go into them. My colleagues have spoken well.

I will point out one. I especially want to thank my colleagues for our stand on

reparations. Senator Krueger did such a great job that I didn't have to jump up. I was ready, but you were doing so good that you did better than I would, so I let you do it.

Reparations. The word itself, of course, comes from repair. So we in the Democratic Majority have taken great steps to ensure that all people have the equality of opportunity that America claims that it stands for and that New York insists that we have.

Now that we have a commission, may all the New Yorkers wish them Godspeed in their deliberations, and may we legislators pursue justice and wisdom. New York, like America, is not a perfect place, but we are fighting to help create the perfect union.

On behalf of the more than 50,000 New Yorkers who died in the Civil War, most of whom were white, I want to vote yes on this budget. God bless the Union. God bless New York.

Thank you. And thank all of my colleagues.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Sanders to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Rhoads to explain his vote.

SENATOR RHOADS: Thank you, Madam President.

This is only my second year, but I kind of feel like this is a little bit of Groundhog's Day. You know, every year we have budget hearings. Every year we have experts who come in and tell us that the reason that people are leaving this state in droves -- 1.5 million over the course of the last 10 years alone -- is because we are taxing too much. It's taxes that are driving people away.

New York is the second-worst state, ranked by Forbes, for business. New York is the second-highest-taxed state next to California. And I must thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for attempting to make us number one in both. Not a distinction that we would want to have.

We have budgets that are about priorities. But this budget is making us less safe, it's making New York less affordable, it's making New York less free. And as we talk about priorities, we see no funding for Nassau University Medical Center, which was something

that we had requested. We see $20 billion that is going towards electric buses that will come directly out of the pockets of taxpayers, property taxpayers in their school taxes.

We see an effort to vacate convictions, which will greatly lower the evidentiary threshold and will lead to the disclosure of confidential informants, undercover law enforcement officers, creating a threat to their safety and security.

We see priorities like cutting $99 million in funding from the State Police, rejecting an expansion in the list of hate crimes. We see 1.5 million and 3.5 million in two different spots being taken away from faith-based organizations and for not-for-profit development, who service many of the disadvantaged populations that we have here in the State of New York. Yet we see $128 billion more being spent on cannabis, $2.4 billion -- I'll wrap it up.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Your time has expired.

SENATOR RHOADS: -- $2.4 billion being spent on illegal immigrants. The reality

is that our priorities are wrong.

I will vote no on this budget, and I encourage -- well, on this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Rhoads to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick to explain her vote.

SENATOR CANZONERI-FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Madam President.

There are several concerns that I have regarding this budget proposal. The New York Housing Opportunity Corporation, along with ORES, are designed to override local control, local officials that have been elected by districts that know better, that know about their local needs, about their local concerns. And I have serious concerns that shoving things down the throat of our local officials is not going to help with things like the CLCPA and affordable housing.

I also have concerns about the fact that we've heard from school districts about the need to overhaul our Foundation Aid calculation, the wealth ratios. There's not enough in this

budget to fix that problem, because that is going to affect multiple things.

I also think that the idea of congestion pricing, and what we're doing in not getting fare evaders, is going to hurt the people directly in my district, the 9th Senate District. And for those reasons, I'm voting in the negative.

Thank you, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Hoylman-Sigal to explain his vote.

SENATOR HOYLMAN-SIGAL: Thank you, Madam President.

I rise in support of this resolution. I want to thank, of course, Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins, our Finance chair, Senator Krueger, and all of my colleagues, including the staff.

This budget resolution really speaks to so many issues -- working families, fair taxation, seniors, schools, housing, climate, helping the most vulnerable.

I want to also point out the fact that we are allocating as a proposal a historic amount to funding Family Court in the State of New York, a vexing problem for so many of our constituents who are litigants in that maelstrom that exists.

I want to thank the Chief Judge for his support, and the Chief Administrative Judge in connection with this.

You know, Madam President, this is Sunshine Week. And I'm happy as well that our Senate one-house resolution includes a proposal to open up the courtrooms by allowing cameras for the first time, as well as assisting our local publications, something I hear about from many of my colleagues that newspapers and publications in our districts are dying. But in this proposal, we will provide them an outlet for as much as $200,000 per publication as a critical lifeline to small news publications struggling to keep journalists on the payroll to provide the crucial coverage that our communities rely on.

One national newspaper has under its masthead "Democracy dies in darkness." Well, that's a local issue too. Over the last 20 years

more than 20 percent of American newspapers have shut down. And in total, they employ less than one-half as many journalists as they did 20 years ago. In New York State, 190 newspapers closed. With this proposal, the Local Journalism Sustainability Act, hopefully we can turn that around.

I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Hoylman-Sigal to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Weber to explain his vote.

SENATOR WEBER: Thank you, Madam President.

As my colleague Senator Rhoads mentioned, this is also my second budget year, so a lot of what I'm going to say is probably similar to what I said last year, that budgets like this are unsustainable. This budget is $14.6 billion over the base, 13.4 billion over the Governor's budget. Truly unsustainable numbers, setting a dangerous precedent for years to come.

A budget resolution that has no significant middle-class tax cut and does things that I think makes us less safe.

You know, I was encouraged when the Governor released her budget that she included a major portion of Senator Hoylman-Sigal's hate crime legislation, which would have increased the hate crime offenses from 66 to 97 -- crimes that you would think would automatically and already have been included as a hate crime.

I'm extremely disappointed, and I'm sure my colleague is too, that that has been taken out in this resolution. And I'm hopeful that in the final budget version, that will be included. Because as we've seen since the slaughter of 1100 Jews on October 7th by Hamas, we've seen a 95 percent increase in hate crimes against Jewish residents, Jewish residents all across this state. We've seen a 90 percent spike in hate crimes between 2020 and '22 among all races.

So we need to really address this. I think that goes a long way to doing it, and I look forward that the things that aren't addressed and that are not being done properly in this budget get addressed over the next few weeks.

I'll be voting in the negative on

this resolution, hopeful that we can correct a lot of the things that I think are deficient in this resolution.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Weber to be recorded in the negative. Correct, Senator Weber?

SENATOR WEBER: (Nodding.)

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Ryan to explain his vote.

SENATOR RYAN: Thank you, Madam President.

This budget contains many housing proposals that are focused on expanding safe and affordable housing. We face many housing challenges in New York State, and there are regional differences in the challenges we face. Upstate New York, New York City, they are different housing markets and they need proposals tailored to their specific needs.

That's why I'm so excited about the policies that we've included in our one-house budget. I want to take the opportunity to highlight three proposals we included in our budget that really move the ball forward towards

obtaining the goal of regional housing policy.

The first one is my bill S8585. It's a bill that would create infill housing throughout upstate New York. They're a series of pilot projects, but it's a $40 million investment that will build one and two family homes in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany and Binghamton, all areas that really faced a demolition crisis in the eighties and the nineties.

The program will prioritize vacant lots, and it will help ease the housing market in those cities. It will add thousands of new homes to the municipal tax roll, which is also very important.

The second is S8591, and it creates a rental improvement pilot project. It creates $40 million to HCR to give up to $75,000 per rental unit. The priority is on small landlords and to bring units that are offline because of code violations back online. As a condition of receiving the grant, the landlord is required to rent at affordable rents based on the neighborhood median income.

And the third is changes to

Social Services Law. It's a bill that I have, 8622, combined with bills from Senator Kavanagh. But it will make changes to the law to make it easier to get emergency housing funds, one-shot rental deals. It's a $50 million appropriation.

And we think with these programs they'll be successful in bringing more housing to our upstate communities.

Because of these proposals and others, I proudly vote aye, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Ryan to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Cooney to explain his vote.

SENATOR COONEY: Thank you, Madam President.

I rise to support this budget resolution. And I want to thank our Majority Leader Andrea Stewart-Cousins, our Deputy Majority Leader Mike Gianaris, and our Finance Chair Senator Krueger for their leadership in today's vote.

I want to say that this budget truly delivers for the families and the people of upstate New York. As Senator Ryan discussed just now, in terms of our housing crisis there are

real solutions on the table, including housing access vouchers, to make sure that our families can stay and be safe in their homes.

We saw a record increase in financing and funding for our public schools. I want to thank Senator Hinchey for her leadership with universal school meals. This is huge as we combat poverty across upstate New York.

And speaking of poverty, this Senate put together a package which invests in upstate cities and zip codes that have experienced generational poverty for years. In the city that I am from and proud to represent, the City of Rochester, three out of five of the poorest zip codes in the State of New York are located in the district I represent. Yet we continue to have this conversation about how to break the cycle of poverty. We know how to do that, and this budget reflects that.

We also invested in our arts and our historic theaters. This is a wonderful way to celebrate being a New Yorker.

And let's also recognize that there are innovations and new ideas in this budget resolution. We talk about the science of reading

and making sure that we're preparing our students for learning and reading education.

This budget invests and expands the Dolly Parton Imagination Library Program statewide so that we can start to build libraries in the homes so that children can prepare through early education to be successful when they get to school.

This is what this budget reflects, which is innovation and respect for families both in upstate and downstate. Madam President, I am proud to support this resolution.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Cooney to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Hinchey to explain her vote.

SENATOR HINCHEY: Thank you, Madam President.

I rise in proud support for this resolution today. Our budget not only resoundingly rejects the cuts to education across our state, ensuring that every student, no matter where you live, including in our rural areas, has the funding that they need to get a good education.

This budget closes the gap in universal school meals. Last year we got a historic investment, making sure that our students and our kids across the state received breakfast and lunch. But we are now closing the gap for those that were left out, and we will continue to make sure that every student has breakfast and lunch at the end of this budget process.

Our budget includes a robust housing proposal, including our bill for a short-term rental registry to help our municipalities and communities like the Hudson Valley, and continues to invest in upstate housing investments to build more housing that works for our smaller communities.

I'm really proud also that this Majority has continued for four years in a row to secure the best budget for agriculture in our state's history. And contrary to some of the questioning that we heard today, we have the strongest protections for farmland across the state as well.

Madam President, I want to thank you for your leadership, because in this budget we

proudly say that EMS is an essential service and we will make sure that everyone sees that and feels that and believes that by the end of this budget process.

And I also want to thank the Majority and of course our Majority Leader for helping us put a stake in the ground to show that we are serious that the Mid-Hudson Valley deserves a Mid-Hudson Valley Transportation Authority for the communities and the residents that live in our area that today do not have access to robust public transportation, but we need it.

This budget also has strong tax support for our working families, and it moves the ball further in our fight against the climate crisis while bringing down utility costs for our residents.

This is a budget that works for the entire state, and I am proud to vote aye.

Thank you very much.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Hinchey to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Martins to explain his vote.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you,

Madam President.

You know, we're spending $246 billion and you'd think that with that, you'd leave this building and we'd live in a panacea, that people would be flocking to New York State from all over the country for the opportunity to live here.

But the opposite is actually true. We lead the country in outmigration, and we're spending money, Madam President, irresponsibly.

I can't support this resolution for a number of reasons, some of which I spoke about earlier, that it does not prioritize public employees and doesn't have meaningful repeal of Tier 6.

As for housing, if you live on Long Island, in the Hudson Valley and upstate New York, good luck going home and telling your local communities that their zoning has been usurped by a corporation that will be appointed by Albany, that will be able to impose housing even where the local community doesn't want it.

And as a person who lives in the MTA region and represents the 7th Senate District, my commuters go into New York City every day.

They're going to in short order be paying congestion pricing in New York City. And yet the Majority saw fit to strip everything in this proposal that had anything to do with holding fare beaters, turnstile jumpers and toll evaders responsible.

So Madam President, I have to ask myself -- and I ask everyone here -- why shouldn't we go home and tell those who ride into New York City on the Long Island Rail Road or Metro-North that they shouldn't have to pay their fares either? If the MTA is broke and we're putting congestion pricing in place in order to subsidize them, why are we not protecting the MTA by making sure everyone pays their fair amount?

I vote nay.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Martins to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Cleare to explain her vote.

SENATOR CLEARE: Thank you, Madam President.

I vote aye on this resolution, and I just want to point out some things that I'm really happy are included.

I want to thank Andrea

Stewart-Cousins, Senator Krueger, all my colleagues who worked so hard on advocating for funding and policies to improve the lives of all New Yorkers.

As was mentioned earlier, we funded the Reparations Commission. This is so important, so this commission would be able to do the thorough and comprehensive work it has been tasked with, and not just put in place to be unfunded.

I'm very, very happy for what we've done in housing. We need to do more, but we certainly have done a lot -- historic aid to NYCHA, New York City Housing Authority, historic aid has been delivered to that.

We have to preserve affordable housing that already exists and respond to what I hear most from my constituents or former constituents who have had to leave this city, who have had an exodus from this city. Rents are too high. We have to create affordable housing. And I'm very proud of what was put into this one-house in order to create that.

I also have to say, as chair of the Aging Committee, that we have finally funded the

LTCOP program at $15 million. We've added funds to the Expanded In-Home Services for the Elderly Program. We've also allocated $9.1 million to the Neighborhood NORC programs. And we've added a million dollars to support the notification supporting the Interagency Council of Elder Justice.

Our elderly are the fastest-growing population, our older New Yorkers, in New York. And we have to support them and make sure that we do more to make sure that their lives are comfortable and they are able to get the healthcare and the housing that they deserve.

We also put in money, in this cannabis conversation, to have a youth education program.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Cleare, your time is up.

SENATOR CLEARE: Thank you.

Thank you, and I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Cleare to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Mattera to explain his vote.

SENATOR MATTERA: Thank you, Madam President.

You know, this has been a very interesting topic today on everything. But I'm a proud union leader that creates jobs. I don't have jobs that are eliminated. And what's happening with this is jobs will be eliminated. And you know what? That's utility workers, union, hardworking workers. With the plumbers and the pipefitters, yes, hard workers. The nonunion world -- what about the contractors that are going to be losing jobs? And guess what happens -- that means they lay people off.

To Senator Harckham, I don't forget one time you said that some people were being -- taking advantage of this more than others with workforce. Yes. Sitting as the ranker on Energy, I care about green hydrogen. I care about sewage heat recovery expansion. I care about geothermal. I care about retooling our power plants, better investment than what's happening. Nuclear power. Carbon capture.

Solar, wind and battery storage is just going to cost all New Yorkers trillions of dollars in their pocketbooks. And that's the reason why people move to Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Texas. And

it's the truth. We lost 1.5 million people in the last four years because of mandates like this.

Senator Krueger, you did say something -- you know, and I appreciate you very much. But you did mention that, guess what, we need to do a better job to make sure we get these people to be retrained, because -- not in this resolution. This is showing that people are going to lose their jobs. And as a union leader, this is upsetting and upsetting to I think everybody here, especially anybody who sits on Labor, that people will be losing their jobs.

You know what's happening with New York State with this cannabis disaster? Total disaster, what's happening. It's not bringing any revenue at all to the State of New York. The farmers, I feel so sorry for them, what happened to them. We say, okay, we're going to do a better job. No. There was no plan at all, zero plan, what's going on with this. The black market is running rampant. We're driving down our roadways, and what do you smell? You smell cannabis.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator

Mattera, your time is up.

SENATOR MATTERA: Well, all I can say is I vote nay. We need a plan, not a ban. Keep our natural gas. Keep our jobs.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT MAYER: Senator Mattera to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Kavanagh to explain his vote.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Thank you, Madam President.

This -- there's a lot to talk about in this budget. I'm going to focus on the housing elements, just to say this resolution is by far the broadest, most ambitious housing plan that's been put forth in this state in a very long time.

It has, as we've discussed today, provisions to strengthen the laws that protect tenants and homeowners, including good-cause eviction, but also including a codification of the Homeowner Protection Program, which is the bedrock of homeowners who are facing eviction or foreclosure either because of mortgage problems or because of tax foreclosure.

It also has new provisions that add to what we did last year on deed theft, when scammers are trying to take people's homes from them and all too often succeeding.

It has a very large investment in legal services and the cost of lawyers and advisors for tenants and homeowners when they are facing, again, housing instability and potential loss of their homes -- $130 million and the creation of a new Office of Civil Representation to coordinate those services to make sure that they're available to the people who need them.

It includes very ambitious plans to help renters and homeowners with the cost of their housing. That includes the HAVP program which we have been pushing for several years now, a Section 8-style rental assistance program, but also a new program my colleague Senator Ryan mentioned to ensure that when someone is facing eviction because they can't pay their rent, that somebody is there to step in and pay the rent and prevent them from being evicted. That protects the renters, but it also protects the property owners, who otherwise in that circumstance often lose out on the rent arrears that have been built

up.

And we've got a program here to ensure that people particularly living with HIV have their rents, the contribution to their rents set at a reasonable amount.

We've got enormous programs here to increase production and renovation of housing. We are committing to removing artificial restrictions on density in New York. We're committing --

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Kavanagh, your time is up.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: Just one more sentence. We're committing to ensuring faith-based communities can build, and we are committing to address the various tax breaks that are necessary to New York City --

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Kavanagh, your time is up.

SENATOR KAVANAGH: -- and around the state to produce housing.

And with that, Madam President, and with your patience, I vote aye.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator

Kavanagh to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Helming to explain her vote.

SENATOR HELMING: Thank you, Madam President.

I want to start with a few positives. I'm glad that our collective voices were heard on education, and the restoration of the hold-harmless provision been included.

To give everyone just a quick example of how the Governor's proposed changes would have affected my predominantly rural district, Marion Central School District would have lost 1.2 million in Foundation Aid. That's a 13.5 percent decrease. The Governor's proposal alone forced them to put 30, 30 of their staff members on notice.

So I support the restoration of education funding and the proposed funding to study changes to the Foundation Aid formula. We need to do everything we possibly can to make sure the formula is up-to-date and distributes funding in a fair and reasonable way.

In regard to health, I'm glad to see that this budget provides for desperately needed rate updates, including those for our FQHCs.

However, this budget does little to nothing for New York State taxpayers, especially our working and middle class. In fact, the proposed budget threatens businesses and jobs with more and more regulations and higher taxes. Just last week, the 17th annual Business Leaders Survey reported that 67 percent of upstate business leaders say business conditions are getting worse in the State of New York. Seventy-six percent of business leaders in the Finger Lakes region reported the reason state government is the gravest detriment to doing business in New York State.

The budget proposed by the Majority also continues to grow the size of state government without addressing the glaring issues with our current state operations. Instead of learning from past mistakes, the Majority's budget also seeks to transfer even more power to the Governor's office. It fails to reject the use of eminent domain, the taking of private property. This is a threat to our public.

This budget will also strip --

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Helming, your time is up.

SENATOR HELMING: -- decision-making power from our local communities --

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Helming, your time is up.

SENATOR HELMING: And for these reasons and many, many more, Madam President, I vote nay.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Helming to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Stec to explain his vote.

SENATOR STEC: Thank you, Madam President.

Two hundred forty-six billion, with a B, dollars -- 13 billion more than the Governor asked for. Sixteen billion more than last year. That's just shy of a quarter of a trillion dollars. We're already the highest-taxed, most overregulated state in the country. We're setting new records here.

You know, when you start talking about $246 billion, it's hard to get your head around that unless you work with big numbers like that. So astronomers that work with distances in space, they start understanding that. But you

know how also they look at it? They look at it from relative. So relative, where are we now, $230 billion? That's bigger than Texas and Florida's combined state budgets. That's one and a half times per capita California's spending.

We are spending out of control, Madam President. Seven billion, seven billion -- with a B -- new dollars in new taxes in this budget one-house proposal. At the same time, though, we're going to cut $100 million from the State Police at a time when crime is rising.

We did not -- after all this money, $16 billion more above last year, you didn't fix Tier 6. We didn't do anything for our public employees that we can't hire. We can't hire corrections officers, we can't hire State Troopers. But there's two and a half billion dollars of New York State taxpayer money going to New York City for illegal immigration.

The priorities of this house and Albany are out of kilter. This is a reckless spending plan.

I firmly vote in the negative.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Stec to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Oberacker to explain his vote.

SENATOR OBERACKER: Thank you, Madam President.

You know, I spoke here yesterday when it was Maple Day, maple being one of the sweetest ingredients I think that nature provides. And being a food scientist and a chef, I always prided myself on being -- I could make anything palatable. I could make anything edible. I daresay today I have been proven wrong.

It is with much regret that I vote nay. There are certain ingredients in this budget that are palatable. The overall product is inedible.

I will be voting nay. Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Oberacker to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Mayer to explain her vote.

SENATOR MAYER: Thank you, Madam President.

And I want to thank the Majority Leader and our Finance chair and all my colleagues for an incredibly strong budget on

education.

There is not a child, a community, a family in this state that does not benefit but what this Majority did on education. Every single district will be benefited by the full restoration of Foundation Aid, restoring the inflationary factor at least, at a minimum, that is in the existing law, and rejecting the save-harmless change that the Governor proposed.

Providing a minimum 3 percent increase to every district, a minimum. And adding $1 million -- as requested by the State Education Department, I would point out to my colleagues -- for a comprehensive study of Foundation Aid, which must be done.

On top of that, we added 150 million in new funds for UPK; 12,000 new formula slots benefiting 400 districts; and increasing the minimum per-pupil rate for universal pre-K.

We've increased so every child will have breakfast and lunch in their school, in the entire state. We have invested in community schools, which I have seen firsthand are serving the challenges post-COVID of our families and our students.

We have added $5 million for a grant program in K through 12 to address antisemitism, Islamophobia, and anti-Asian hate. We've added $90 million for our nonpublic schools, to assure they have security during these very tough times.

And far more in the higher ed space.

This is a budget that reflects the values of this conference and, frankly, I would say the values of everyone in this chamber on behalf of children and families.

I am so proud of what we have achieved with my colleagues on behalf of every child. Regardless of whose district they sit in, we have done right by the children of New York State.

I proudly vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Mayer to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Krueger to explain her vote.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you, Madam President.

So I've been here 22 years now, my 22nd budget. I've never been prouder to be part of this Senate or this conference than with the budget proposal we have offered up this year.

And I know some of my colleagues think we're making all the wrong decisions, but I have to say it's not true. First off, I spent years here where we had budgets controlled by the Republicans that I would refer to as the tax and borrow budgets. We would borrow, borrow, borrow -- excuse me, the borrow and spend budgets -- because we didn't want to raise taxes, so we would borrow and spend and build up what we owed and what the next generation of people borrowed and then had to pay for.

And now, yes, we do some taxes, minimal, on those who can afford it. But we're not borrowing to balance our budget. We have a plan for a balanced budget. And as you've already heard from so many people here, there are really important things in that budget for every part of the state, whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. And we're already hearing that from people, that they know it and they see it.

And then I hear people going, we're going too fast in the direction of environmental change and energy change. Well, first off, we're not -- because the planet's burning up, so we ought to be doing something as fast as we can.

Second, it is not true that the green economy is going to leave everybody unemployed -- just the opposite -- or that it's going to cost us far more to do basic energy. The data is just the opposite. And even the issue of our too-high taxes are driving people out? It's not reflected in our economic activity.

And so just quickly, I want to point out the economy of the State of New York has a gross state product of over $2.2 trillion, $2.2 trillion, ranking us third in size behind the much larger states of California and Texas. And if New York State were an independent nation, it would rank the 10th largest economy in the world.

So the fact is businesses do come here, they do do their business here, and they will continue to, particularly as climate change forces people out of the southern states. I mean, the Southwest doesn't have water. We have water, and we're going to, and we're going to keep it clean. The southern states, the temperatures are terrifying. Just look at the news today about what is going on in the rest of

the country.

And research shows that the two states with the most promise for the next 50 years: Michigan and New York State.

So even those who've decided maybe they think it's nice and warm in Miami now, it's going to be underwater and they're coming back. And Texas, Arizona, Colorado? I'm sorry, but those states are in big trouble.

So we're looking forward. And we're building infrastructure that we need for the 21st century. And we're ensuring our kids are going to get the education they deserve. And that's what businesses want. They want solid infrastructure and they want an educated workforce.

And so I know we are heading in the right direction for the State of New York, and I proudly vote yes.

Thank you, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Krueger to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Ortt to explain his vote.

SENATOR ORTT: Thank you very much, Madam President.

I will try to be -- and I will be -- brief, because my colleagues on this side of the aisle have done a very good job of identifying and outlining all of the problems with the Senate one-house budget. Knowing, of course, full well that it's a one-house budget, which means it's really nothing. It's a political document. It's a marker in a three-way negotiation. That was true when we were in charge. It's certainly true with the current Majority.

But there's something I -- I want to speak to some of the comments that I've heard and sort of surmise -- when $7 billion in new taxes are some taxes, minimal -- maybe to somebody in Manhattan, but not to somebody in Niagara. Not to somebody in much of New York State. That almost crystallizes the problem, when $7 billion is just a little bit. Just a little tax increase.

When $245 billion -- when that's some money, I think that shows you the problem. If spending money made New York more affordable, we'd be the most affordable state in the country. In fact, we're the least affordable state in the country.

One of my colleagues said so when they voted themselves a pay raise. Got increased costs, because it's expensive to live in this state. Ironically, many of their policies are the very reasons it is so expensive.

New Yorkers know this. They're paying more for every factor of their life, and they're getting the same or less. And that is absolutely true here in the State of New York. Their quality of life has gone down due to crime. And even though the Governor had a very modest, almost window-dressing retail theft task force, that was too much for the Majority, so it's gone.

So crime, we know, quality of life crimes especially, in the subways, across most of our major cities here in New York, are up.

We know costs of basic goods and services are up. We absolutely know the cost of energy is going up and will continue to go up. The data does not say it will go down. It absolutely will go up. That's even if the infrastructure is there to support it and the technology is there, which of course it is not.

But $2.4 billion to an illegal migrant crisis which continues to be exacerbated

and made worse by the policies passed out of this chamber and the other one. One-point-six billion dollars to transport families of criminals -- no doubt, I hope, on an electric bus.

But the truth is that we are spending more and have spent more in the last six years since the Democrats took control of this chamber. All Funds is $75 billion more than the last budget passed when Republicans were in charge -- 75 billion. That is larger, as you heard, than 37 other states' total budgets. Just the increase. Now, you tell me how that is sustainable.

The Governor doesn't think it's sustainable. I don't even know if some of my friends on the other side of the aisle think it's sustainable. But no question, we have people in this chamber who will continue to advocate for more taxes, increased spending. Under the failed, misguided, misplaced sense that somehow that means we're making New York more affordable and we're helping more people. And if that was the case, we wouldn't have an exodus of people from this state.

My colleague, when she says people

aren't leaving, that is factually incorrect. We lead the nation in outmigration. We have for several years. It is very simple why. It is budgets like this, or proposals like this. That is why people have left this state. That is why they will continue to leave this state. They know, in spite of all the fancy speeches and the figures and the data points and some of the nice commercials -- they know the truth, and they're deciding, they're voting with their feet.

And that is why I, along with the members of this conference -- and I can tell you, if a lot of New Yorkers were here, they would join us in voting no on this Senate one-house bill today.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Senator Ortt to be recorded in the negative.

Leader Stewart-Cousins to close.

SENATOR STEWART-COUSINS: Thank you so much, Madam President.

First, I do want to thank my deputy leader, Senator Gianaris, especially for leading this long, important and spirited debate on the

floor. Thank you, as always.

And of course I want to thank his counterpart, Minority Leader -- I'm sorry. I think this happened last time -- my good friend Senator Lanza for what you do. And also let me again extend a happy birthday, because I missed it on that day.

And also to Minority Leader Senator Ortt for, again, always being a cooperative partner as we go through what we do.

I want to especially thank our intrepid Finance chair, Senator Liz Krueger. You know, I don't know how she does it, but she helped preside over 13 joint budget hearings this time around with our friends in the Assembly. And we did a little rough estimation -- and of course I want to give a nod to the Finance ranker, Senator O'Mara, as well -- they spent approximately 100 hours listening to testimonies and shepherding the Legislature's questioning along.

So again, that is incredible. And Senator Krueger, thank you very, very much.

I also want to give sincere gratitude to my senior leadership team, to all of

the staff for their hard work on this one-house budget, because we know that this is no easy task.

I want to especially thank the Senate majority members for your input, your hard work. It is so evident in this document. Your advocacies for issues in your subject area, as well as your individual districts, as well as the advancement of all of New York State, is inspiring. And again, I thank you every day for your work and your passion for public service and doing this right.

As you may be accustomed, I like to give the detailed timeline of where we are in the budget process. So I can confidently say that with our passing this bill we will mark the end of the beginning.

One-house resolutions are a statement of values. This year ours couldn't be more clear. The ongoing shortfalls in some of our most fundamental systems have weakened them to the point of crisis. And New Yorkers can't wait any longer. They're calling on us to advance policies that preserve our resources, protect our communities, and promote our

well-being.

This budget is a testament to just that and once again proves our dedication to fostering a state that champions affordability, equity and prosperity for every New Yorker, especially our working and middle class families.

With this one-house resolution we're supporting New Yorkers at every stage of their lives to ensure that they live happily and stay in our great state for the long haul, by bolstering our healthcare infrastructure and social programs, forging ahead on record education funding and career readiness training, ensuring that the housing market is stabilized and that our natural resources and energy production are primed for the future.

Through these efforts we will close the gaps that have kept residents locked in place and allowed too many to fall through the cracks when times get hard.

Instead, we'll chart a seamless pathway towards success, ample -- with resources every step of the way, and designed to benefit the many, not just the lucky few.

Protecting the future of New Yorkers

starts with investing in a good public education system. Our budget makes a monumental commitment by increasing the Governor's education spending, yes, by 1.2 billion, totaling $46.1 billion.

We're steadfast in rejecting any alternatives to Foundation Aid -- any alterations, rather, to Foundation Aid, and we're providing a minimum 3 percent increase for each school district, ensuring that our schools remain robust pillars of community and learning. This increase is a bold statement of our unwavering commitment to our students and educators.

Our conference was proud to lead the charge for expanding UPK statewide, and we continue towards that goal, with the infusion of an additional $150 million into universal pre-K.

Our $5 million initiative to combat hate in our schools will put tangible resources into fostering an inclusive, safe and supportive learning environment for our students.

And as part of building out our communities and creating stable places to grow, we must ensure that New Yorkers have a safe, stable, affordable place to call home. This is not only key to addressing the affordability

crisis, but also in allowing families to put down roots for generations.

Our approach to housing reflects a deep understanding of the urgency and complexity of the crisis at hand. The introduction of the New York Housing Opportunities Corporation, which I'm calling Mitchell-Lama 2.0, is a pioneering step towards creating long-term affordable housing solutions.

Our comprehensive strategy also includes significant allocations such as $250 million for the Housing Access Voucher Program, the principles of good cause, $40 million for eviction prevention legal services, and investments to encourage homeownership and help for current homeowners and small landlords, demonstrating our holistic approach to ensuring housing growth, stability and tenant protection.

Housing is a nexus of all social and economic growth, including workforce development. As we welcome new sectors to our state and continue revitalizing our economy, we must prioritize the people who power it. We always knew the key to New York's success lay in the

advancement of our working- and middle-class families. Which is why we are extending smart property tax relief, advancing the Working Families Tax Credit, a new $550 credit per child.

We're also supporting those who care for our children by investing $250 million in additional support for the Childcare Workforce Retention Grant Program, for a total of $500 million, because childcare is essential to keeping New Yorkers in the workforce and helping them thrive.

Our economic growth initiatives are tailored to foster innovation and support for small businesses, the backbone of New York's economy. That's why we advance a $5 million Working Opportunities Tax Credit and a $20 million Journalism Tax Credit, a powerful tool not only for our local employers but for the health of our democracy.

We are also advancing proposals and investments to deal with retail theft. And as a related effort, we are continuing our support of our legal cannabis market while empowering local law enforcement to crack down on illegal shops, so that good-faith business owners as well as

consumers can fairly participate in the regulated economy.

As we build our impressive new tech and cutting-edge markets, we have to remember our bread-and-butter industry: Farming. New York is one of the most prolific agricultural states in our country, yet many farmers financially struggle. That's why we're continuing to invest millions for our farmers so we can protect both our food chain and our planet.

None of those achievements would be possible without the countless workers who get up every day and make our economy run. Our resolution makes numerous strides in the spirit of labor and workers' rights. We're championing a 3.2 percent COLA for workers across human services and an additional $190 million initiative to support wage enhancements for direct service providers, while enacting reforms to ensure a fair and supportive workplace environment.

We also are making necessary reforms to Tier 6 to help attract and retain vital civil service employees. Our actions are geared towards acknowledging and uplifting our amazing

workforce.

And we are building out our physical infrastructure to help support this rapid growth by not only investing in the vitality of individual communities, but strengthening the entire fabric of New York.

I'm proud that we're seeking approximately $1.5 billion increased investment into our state's infrastructure. We all know that without attention, our infrastructure will only crumble more, and that's not good for local economies or community safety.

We're also putting forward a $698 million allocation for the Consolidated Highway Improvement Program, commonly known as CHIPS. And an additional $210 million for Aid and Incentives for Municipalities, AIM funding, which we know has been stagnant for decades. These investments are crucial for enhancing our transportation network, supporting local governments, and fostering community resilience.

The well-being of our communities extends far beyond commonsense labor protections and capital improvements. It also relies on a strong healthcare infrastructure and robust

medical services. That's why, in this one-house budget, we held the line on potential cuts and advanced a $1.6 billion enhancement to the state Medicaid program, ensuring comprehensive access to quality healthcare for all New Yorkers.

On the environmental front, our budget underscores a deep commitment to stewardship and sustainability by restoring $500 million to Clean Water Infrastructure Act funding -- we are taking decisive action to protect our water resources for future generations.

This restoration, alongside additional investments in reversing cuts to the Environmental Protection Fund and advancing climate legislation, demonstrates our unwavering dedication to preserving New York's natural beauty and fostering a sustainable future. Our environmental initiatives reflect a holistic approach to safeguarding our planet while ensuring the health and prosperity of all New Yorkers.

This budget resolution is not just a financial document. It's a blueprint for a more equitable, prosperous and sustainable future for

New York. It embodies our resolve to create a state that not only meets the current needs of its residents but also anticipates and prepares for the challenges of tomorrow.

As we move forward in a collaboration with Governor Hochul and our Assembly colleagues, we're committed to transforming these proposals into tangible outcomes that will propel New York State forward, ensuring that it remains a beacon of progress, opportunity, and inclusivity.

Thank you, Madam President, and I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Leader Stewart-Cousins to be recorded in the affirmative.

Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Resolution 1952, those Senators voting in the negative are Senators Ashby, Borrello, Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick, Gallivan, Griffo, Helming, Lanza, Martins, Mattera, Murray, Oberacker, O'Mara, Ortt, Palumbo, Rhoads, Rolison, Stec, Tedisco, Weber and Weik.

Ayes, 41. Nays, 20.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The resolution is adopted.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Returning to motions for a second, on behalf of Senator Comrie, I wish to call up Senate Print 485A, recalled from the Assembly, which is now at the desk.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 590, Senate Print 485A, by Senator Comrie, an act to amend the Public Authorities Law.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

THE SECRETARY: Ayes, 61.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The bill is restored to its place on the Third Reading Calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I offer the following amendments.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: The

amendments are received, and the bill will retain its place on the Third Reading Calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Is there any further business at the desk?

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: There is no further business at the desk.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Move to adjourn until Monday, March 18th, at 3:00 p.m., intervening days being legislative days.

ACTING PRESIDENT PERSAUD: On motion, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, March 18th, at 3:00 p.m., with intervening days being legislative days.

(Whereupon, at 2:49 p.m., the Senate adjourned.)