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MS. BIRNBAUM: Good morning, everyone.
This is a meeting of the Commission On Legislative, Judicial and Executive Compensation.

It is Monday, February 22, 2016 at 11 a.m.
I would like to thank all the commissioners for being present for our introductory meeting to the second phase of our activities, to look at legislative and executive compensation, having completed our first phase, I must say on time, and I thank all the commissioners for their interest and great work.

This is a meeting to determine what and how we are going to accomplish our second phase.

The interesting thing is I am presiding -- I am Sheila Birnbaum -- and I have no vote in this. I am just the presider.

MR. LACK: Thank you for continuing in that capacity.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
So I think I would like to start out by asking the commissioners if they have any thoughts that they want to talk about up front about the Commission's second phase of its work. We will then talk about possible hearing dates, when, where, and what data and research that the Commission would like to see in order to assist it in doing its work and
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coming to a conclusion.
Why don't we start at one end or the other.
If any of the commissioners want to make any
statement or make any comment?
DR. HEDGES: No.
MR. LACK: I have some comments to make, only because I really don't know what our basis is to go ahead.

Probably, I think, we will need some -- I think need some research, specifically with respect to the executive compensation, department heads, et cetera.

I think we should distribute to each member of the Commission the full statutory list of department heads that we are talking about and their current values, keeping in mind that these values are now, by January 1st, 2017, 18 years old. The last raise was enacted on December 18, 1999 by the legislature -- 1998, effective January 1, 1999. So it will be 18 years since they have had a raise. Now, in addition to those statutory department heads I think we should also get the list of their senior staff people, deputy commissioners, counsels et cetera. Because in the way of all the things, once these poor people who haven't had raises
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for 18 years finally get a raise, and obviously it is not going to be a 3\% raise, their deputies, for all these years, some of whom I assume have gotten raises, and I don't know what their values are, are certainly going to be looking to fill the gap between whatever their values are and the new department-head salary. We don't set those, but we in fact are doing that. We, in effect, will be setting the governor's salary, although constitutionally we don't do that. Because by raising the salary of the Attorney General and the Comptroller, one assumes, at least in my 24 years of legislative experience it has always happened, that the legislature by joint resolution, which is what it has to do under the Constitution, will raise the salary of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor. So we have to be able to consider that, as well.

Our enabling legislation also says we are supposed to look not only at things like inflation, but in areas like academia for competing values.

And I was somewhat surprised to see, Roman, an old colleague of yours, Bob McKenna, who was, I think, deputy in Ways and Means, as you are all these years, and a very, very capable guy of course, became the governor's budget director, has now taken a
Proceedings
position with a fancier title, Senior Vice-president
of Finance, in effect Budget Director, of one of the
constituent state universities, happens to be the one
from my old senate district, Stony Brook, in which his
salary is $\$ 400,000$ a year.

Now --

MS. REITER: Good for him.

MR. LACK: I think that's great.

By the way, he is not only very smart, he is now brilliant.

And it is within the pension system.
But, you know, he is over twice what the Governor of the state of New York currently makes.

The new Senate Majority Leader, since he is my successor, that's his district as well, in Stony Brook, and the Speaker, that's his alma mater, and they are now full time in their jobs, that's more than $300 \%$ of what they make. So somebody is missing something.

I have nothing against very large values in the SUNY system for SUNY professionals, by that I mean deans of medical schools, provosts, named professors, publications up the ying-yang. But this is an administrative job in the SUNY system which several people at this table, not necessarily me, I am way out
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of it, but certainly Roman, are certainly qualified to do at a huge salary.

So I think we should inquire of SUNY of senior administrative-type values, what they are in the SUNY system, as something else for us to look at as we ponder these other types, these other types of increases.

Next, looking at the legislative values we could just do a simple inflation or we can look at other things, as well, if, first of all, there is a legislative session going on. As I read in the newspapers, the governor is calling for a limitation on outside income. Whether or not that will happen or not, none of us know.

The session will go through June, I assume. He will first try to do it as part of a budget package, by April 1st, and if that is not successful in something that emanates towards the end of the session. That should give some consideration to us as we consider legislative values.

Then there is -- we should also get the information that New York City developed for that rather gigantic salary increase that the New York City Council just got.

Of course, we have no power to override the Proceedings

Constitution. The legislature under the Constitution is a part-time job, but who knows what's going to happen during this legislative session, although there have been public sentiments, at least of the Senate, that they don't want a full-time legislature. I don't think the Assembly said anything one way or the other publicly, as opposed to some private comments by members of the Assembly. But who knows what develops. Of course, that's a multi-year situation.

But if something develops that a resolution is passed for first passage this year, that's something we should look at because we consider raises for the next four years which would be after second passage. And then although it is subject to referendum, I don't think we much have to worry about the results of that, at least from all the polls that I have looked at. So we should get some information on that as well as to where we are going to go.

And hypothetically, while we can't invade the Constitution, I am just throwing this out, and I have not talked to anybody about it, certainly nobody in the legislature, can we set up a bifurcated system in which legislators announce that this is their full-time job, and they earn salary $X$, by a filing that they give to the respective secretaries of the
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Assembly and the Senate, and therefore earn X. If not filed, they earn Y. Obviously a lesser number than X.

So I don't know if anybody in the
legislature is at all interested in that, but at least it is something that we could explore and go on from there.

As well, we have to also look at if there is going to be something like a full-time legislature we need to consider how things like per diems and that type of thing works. Also, how to handle the issues as they now exist. Is that something we want to get involved in or not? But to develop information on that.

As I said, there is a lot of research.
I think that has to be done on a comparison basis to see where we are.

And, of course, we are going to have a range of public hearings in which we are going to get input from, I assume, around the state, of people who have questions. And that in and by itself might produce even more for us to look at.

So I think we have a full range of work to look at. I am just sorry it has been 18 years.

Unlike our judicial thing where there was a basis of the Federal District Court salary, whether
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you wanted it as it was, like I did, or a percentage of it, like Fran was talking about, it was working off of the same number one way or the other. We don't have that here. So we are sort of all in an exploratory area that we have -- no one in the state has ever been in before. So it is interesting.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Fran?
MS. REITER: The only thing I would say is I agree with Jim that we need -- there is a lot of research that has to be done to inform all of us as to how we are going to want to proceed.

So one of the points Jim made regarding the legislative values, we don't know the parameters of the legislative job at this point, what it may be --

MR. LACK: Correct.
MS. REITER: -- at the end of the
legislative session.
The end of the legislative session is in
April.
MR. LACK: That's not true. The end of the legislative session is in June.

MS. REITER: Is in June, rather.
The budget will be --
MR. LACK: Some people always say it is
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April. I totally agree with you.
MS. REITER: So --
MR. LACK: But that's not necessarily true either.

Unless the opinions of the Attorney General have changed -- Mitra, you might know that better than me -- you could pass resolutions until August and still be counted as the first passage of a legislative constitutional change.

And believe me -- look, Governor Cuomo has been fantastic. Which is why -- no offense to him, he has taken the job at Stony Brook -- he would have been a great budget officer. He has all these budgets done on time for the years he has been there.

But my point is I spent many years in the legislature in which we didn't do budgets until August in which we were heavily considering things of meaty weight, and surely how the legislature acts as on subjects of meaty weight weigh way into August. I grant you this year it won't be after August, it is a campaign season, but --

MS. REITER: Okay.
MR. LACK: -- until the constitutional date, which would be August something or other, I think that is still something under consideration.
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Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.
MS. REITER: The point I am trying to make is that this is fluid. And we don't -- if we had all of this comparison information, all of this research in front of us right now, we still wouldn't know what it was we were defining. Right?

We may know at some future date in this process. We may not know. We may have a good idea. We may know what's being discussed.

The only point I am making is that I could foresee a situation where we have a series of initial public hearings, we look at all the research that's gathered, and then we wait and we wait and see where this process is headed. Because what each of us may feel comfortable recommending as a part-time salary may be irrelevant if in fact the legislature decides to go full-time.

MR. LACK: Can I say one thing, one piece of research I forgot?

That is I have read surveys, usually done by newspapers, of X number of legislators who, based on their filings, are full-time or not earning outside income. So we also have to have somebody look at the 2013 filings of the legislature as to the number with outside income. Because I see all different kinds of
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numbers.
Again, my apologies for interrupting you. But that's right to your point as to how many, quite frankly, are full time now, at least financially, as opposed to the Constitution.

Sorry again.
MS. REITER: I am just saying that I think the notion that we are going to have a couple of hearings down here, upstate, and then we are done, I it think is unlikely. Because I think that before we can reasonably come up -- each of us come up with our own notion of what would be the right thing to recommend could change radically as a result of the actions of others. So to an extent we have to let this play out.

I could see us having a series of meetings and then not doing anything for a couple of months and then coming back together again based on what happens during the session. And which may or may not be sufficient to inform us.

Subsequently, we are going to have to do something. But in an effort to do something that's as relevant as we possibly can to what the situation is, I just wouldn't rush this.

The second thing we had discussed very
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briefly, and certainly no decision had been made, but we had had discussions about the nature of the public hearings since we were now going to be going upstate, as well.

I see that Syracuse has dropped off --
MS. BIRNBAUM: No, it hasn't. We just don't have a date for it yet.

MS. REITER: Okay.
MS. BIRNBAUM: Where the third place should be, either Syracuse or Rochester or Buffalo.

MS. REITER: But my point being that we had talked about it so that we didn't have to do excessive traveling.

And we have two distinctly different things that we have to deal with here, executive and legislative, and the executive is not as fluid as the legislative situation is. We talked about maybe a format like we do a morning hearing on one and afternoon hearing on the other so we don't have to keep going back.

I just put that out there. I thought that was a reasonable approach. It might make for some very long days. Although my suspicion is the executive compensation public hearings will not be as active or as well-participated in as the legislative
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will.
MR. LACK: I think you are absolutely correct.

MS. REITER: But I thought that was a good idea that I think you raised, Madam Chairwoman, and makes sense to me.

MS. BIRNBAUM: We will get to a discussion of that. That's definitely on the agenda.

MS. REITER: Other than that, I think the only observation $I$ will make is that we will look at a lot of data and we will make comparisons to other situations.

You raise my good friend Bob Bennett has a new salary. And because SUNY -- and by the way, the values and the administrative costs of SUNY and CUNY are now coming under much greater scrutiny. So I am not sure that that's not going to change as a result of the politics of it and the ongoing discussions that are going to be had during this budget season. And the Governor has certainly shined a spotlight on it. So I suspect that that issue may be dealt with, as well, having nothing to do about what we are doing.

I would just state for the record that I think that if you start looking at things like executive compensation, not-for-profits and things Proceedings
like that, you run the risk of conflating two things that really aren't the same; that public sector values, and ours, are incredibly low. So it is not what I am suggesting.

And I know firsthand what the horrors are of trying to manage a state agency where the commissioner is paid less than the four people who report to him or her. So that is something that we clearly have to take a look at.

I agree with Jim that looking at the three or four highest-paid people in an agency is something we absolutely should do. I just throw out there that people who go to work in government, there is an expectation, it should be on their part, and also I think on the part of the taxpayers, that public sector values are different and are generally lower than one is going to find even in the not-for-profit sector.

So I think it is good to look at those things. I am just not sure to the extent to which that kind of research should necessarily inform where we end up.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Thank you.
MS. REITER: I have been both. I ran
not-for-profits. I made far more running
not-for-profit. And I was worth every penny of it. I
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had large budgets and great responsibility.
I had greater responsibility as a public servant, far greater, and dealt with far more money, but I had no expectation that I would be paid in government even what $I$ was paid to run a fairly major not-for-profit.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Okay.
Let's move on and get other comments and then we can go back.

DR. HEDGES: At some point I would like to talk. I thought perhaps we were going to stages before substance. That's cool. Not a complaint. At some point I have some comments.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Absolutely.
MS. REITER: I wasn't going to say anything, except I can't sit next to Mr. Lack and not --

MR. LACK: We are in agreement so far. Let's not either of us say anymore.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Mitra, you want to make some comments.

MS. HORMOZI: I look forward to all the information.

Something to consider. I understand public servants certainly should have an expectation of making less than not-for-profits, and absolutely in
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the private sector. Is it worth, just to throw it out there though, comparing what our state pays compared to other states? Or even --

MS. REITER: Absolutely.
MS. BIRNBAUM: We will definitely do that.
MS. HORMOZI: Okay. Great. That was my only comment.

MS. BIRNBAUM: That's on our list.
MR. JOHNSON: Nothing to add.
MR. COZIER: Nothing to add this the point.
MS. BIRNBAUM: Back to you.
DR. HEDGES: With the starting point that Jim provided, there are a couple of obvious places to look for some contextual information.

With respect to legislative salaries, since that's where we ended up, maybe we continue there for a second.

One obvious thing is find out what other states are doing. NCSL, National Conference of State Legislators, typically retains a database for things like that. It would be one phone call. He happens to have been a president of that organization. Maybe he can help us there.

MR. LACK: It is already being sent over as of this morning.
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DR. HEDGES: With respect to legislators -MS. BIRNBAUM: To see if they are presently worth it.

DR. HEDGES: -- we have a number of legislators that are sort of local that are relevant, too; New York City Council, the county legislators of some of the bigger counties, Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester particularly, but perhaps Erie and Monroe, as well. Their job descriptions are somewhat different from each other, as well as from the state, but again a point of reference.

Since I mentioned the New York City Council as one of the those legislators comparable to the County legislature in other parts of the state, perhaps some other big cities would be relevant, as well; LA, San Francisco, Chicago, Miami, Houston, would be kind of the obvious places to look there.

Not unrelated, although certainly quite different, would be the Congress. That's a legislature that is long term at higher values, but we should probably know what they are.

With respect to the executive branch, I think that Jim is right that we should simply add it to the list of what the values are because we are not sure exactly what the universe is without getting it
written down someplace.
But with respect to that, I agree that the senior civil servants should be included in the list. Even though they are not in our purview, it directly effects the workings of the agencies.

It is very much the case, as Fran has pointed out, that there are a number of agencies where those senior people make more than the directors. And that creates all sorts of difficulties. It should be part of our calculation even if not dispositive by itself.

In that same regard, in thinking about the compensation there are some oddities for some agencies where the statutory salary isn't the whole story. Oft times there is something that in some sense is off to the side but quite relevant. The obvious example, with headlines related to it from decades ago, is the Health Department with their research foundations. But that also speaks to what else is there. It also speaks to the senior people question, as well.

The research foundation of the various agencies, particularly the ones in the health area, oft times play a role in what the values for the senior official are. In Mental Health there is a research foundation that's built into the salary of
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many of the doctors so it kind of colors what it is you think about the agency looking --

MS. BIRNBAUM: Are you thinking of pensions and --

DR. HEDGES: Not so much pensions as just to explain compensation.

MR. LACK: They are outside the pension system.

DR. HEDGES: In the case of the Health Department the research foundation used to play a role that was like $50 \%$ of what the total compensation was.

MS. REITER: I am unaware of another agency

DR. HEDGES: I think Mental Health has a capacity for it. Whether they do it or not, I don't know. SUNY certainly has the capacity.

MR. LACK: It is a real problem up around Albany.

DR. HEDGES: It very much has been.
But that gets back to what do we think about the scope of this being. If we are talking about research foundations it instantly brings into question what kind of people are we talking about. Medical doctors are the obvious place where that happens a lot.
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For the SUNY faculty that are related to medical schools, that's a real common way of compensating. Just like it is in the mental health world where the New York Psychiatric Institute, the State Mental Health Department, Columbia, I think those faculty might get three values. They get Columbia salary, they get -- so having a sense of what that scope is like, even if we are not pinning it down and not being precise, to again give us context and we are not saying silly things when we are talking about this stuff.

And so my point would be the agencies, the senior people, and other compensation related to the agency on State payroll, not people who are not on State payroll.

With respect to SUNY and CUNY, I think the same questions should apply.

I am going to know from the get-go I am going to discount that. In the same way that I am not going to be terribly excited about exactly what do all the not-for-profits in the world pay as a point of comparison. Because I agree with Fran that public sector is different.

But we do have this anomaly. There are many people on public sector salary bases that also have Proceedings
other values, especially true in places where there are research foundations. So SUNY and CUNY, the medical centers in particular, I would like a sense of it even if we discount it.

In the Albany area there is a SUNY faculty member who is doing very well for SUNY and very well for the State and who is also getting paid an enormous amount, a small fraction of which is SUNY salary. Alain Kaloyeros at Nanotech is my example there.

But same thing is true for medical doctors and medical centers of the state university system. There are a number of people who are paid big bucks there, too. I think the senior staff at SUNY and CUNY are relevant. Again, I don't think to the point of lock-step, but at least something to think about.

The other big kind of anomaly that should be put into the research agenda, again, with a real grain of salt before we get going, before we fasten on it, but the bigger public authorities are relevant here, as well. Certainly in terms of compensation the ones we know are big are places like the MTA and Port Authority. But we also have a variety of other state-wide authorities that are relevant as well; the Dormitory Authority, UDC, being big ones. And they do lots of financing. The Power Authority being a big
one where we do a lot of public benefit work. But some of the others that are pretty big in the finance world, things like EFC, which we also have authorized in law as a place where we do bonding on behalf of the State, I think that would be relevant, as well.

With respect to the chief executive, I agree that our statutory charges there is not, you know, can we do something here because of the way the Constitution works, but $I$ think it is relevant. I think it is important.

I think it is important to keep in mind as we think about what compensation we are offering the senior official and in the state agencies, what is it the boss makes. And I think while we are probably not charged with doing anything about it, I think perhaps that should be part of our thought process. So not only the executive of New York State, senior executive, but perhaps some of the other big states that we think of as sort of comparables, the New York comparables, are California, Illinois, much as I might not like it, probably Florida and Texas, as well. But certainly that should be part of what we gather information on.

The underlying thought that we all had in mind when we were talking about judges, even though we
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are using -- at least I was using the federal judges as a point of comparison, was keeping up with inflation and keeping jobs attractive. So certainly having the basic information about inflation is part of what we should do.

Insofar as we have the capacity to get some sense of what other senior executives are paid, I think it would be useful to have some sense of at least a few of the big corporations in New York and a few of the big corporations that are not-for-profit in New York. Not because I want to peg them, not because I want to use them, because I do want to have that context.

You know, when we were as a country thinking about increasing compensation for the president, and we doubled it, I think was the last time it was changed, everyone knew that that was silly. It wasn't anything other than the symbol of this is the senior person that we want to make sure is not suffering a hardship to take the job. That really implied that at some level public service was thought that to be punishment. And I want to make sure that we have that concept available to us, if only to dismiss it in the form of here is what some senior executives based in New York are paid, both in the private sector,
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literally, and in not-for-profit.
MS. BIRNBAUM: I think what we need to do is sort of prioritize what $I$ think is going to be --

DR. HEDGES: As the priority, I would like to have the state legislators elsewhere. I would like to have the county legislators in New York.

I am being shown that we have some of that already.

I would like to have the executives of New York agencies, the very top, the ones we are talking about, and the senior people in those same agencies, the ones that we are aware we have management problems related to the number 2 and 3 and 4 person being paid more than number 1.

MS. BIRNBAUM: I think that represents to me the priorities of what we need to be looking at and then we can sort of come up with --

DR. HEDGES: Those to me are the priorities.
I think the next layer is the ancillary State, and that's the SUNY and CUNY executives, the presidents, the senior class of the executives, the vice-presidents, would be the way that I would kind of summarize that. And when I say president I use the term loosely, because in some places they are called president, some places they are called chancellor.
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But the senior executive.
And the public authorities. I would like the top ones so that we know what we are talking about.

In some sense that's the same comment as about the senior managers of an agency getting paid more than the head of the agency. We have public authorities in the state who are paid way more than the senior executives of the state.

MS. REITER: Because they haven't been subject to the same statutory limitations.

DR. HEDGES: Exactly.
And again, I don't know that that's lock-step. I just know that we have the data, this is what we have to think, but I think we have to have the information or we can't think clearly. Then $I$ would stop. All the rest are, to me, secondary. But it would be nice if we could have it.
(Whereupon, Tal Hahn relieved Michael
Barfield as the Official Court Reporter.)
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MS. BIRNBAUM: Okay. So we will create an agenda of research giving priorities to certain things. So I think we have sort of -- if the people want to make other comments, to the data research requests?

I would like to go back to the hearing dates. I think we had agreement to make the two hearing dates we had in mind. It would be March 10th, by New York City, and March 23rd in Albany. And if you would like, we could take Fran's suggestions, especially in Albany, and have the morning as a Legislative and afternoon as Executive. Or vice versa.

But I think it probably makes more sense to have people have slots rather than taking one or the other --

DR. HEDGES: With respect to the Albany hearing, and the notion of bifurcating, I guess I would suggest that we do the Executive in the morning, and Legislative in the afternoon.

MS. REITER: No problem.
DR. HEDGES: We don't want to have the scheduling problem a crowd might create. With respect to the Albany hearing itself, I know from my work life, and from reading the newspapers that it's budget season in Albany. And when budget season hits, there are literally no spaces available at all during that season
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for anybody.
MS. REITER: I would -- I have a guest room I
would give up at a great price. I could offer.
JUDGE LACK: I don't know about staying overnight. We are worried about parking the car.

DR. HEDGES: And more to the point, you can't get a space in those buildings during those weeks because they are booked already.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Well, I think we will make an effort right now to try to lock up some buildings in maybe Albany Law School or --

JUDGE LACK: Maybe we could borrow an Albany court building where the Court of Claims and 2nd Department is, would be one place --

MS. BIRNBAUM: Court of Appeals would be a lovely place. JUDGE LACK: I specifically did not mention that. That is not something OCA will be in favor of. And I totally understand and agree. But the Justice Building across the street from the Capital where the 3rd Department and Court of Claims is, is certainly a space we could --

MS. BIRNBAUM: All right.
JUDGE LACK: If the courts would care to
comment.

## Proceedings

DR. HEDGES: That is the point, knowing how hard it is to just get a place to park, if you are that close to the capital this time of year, you may want to think about going someplace a little bit else, you know, if you are talking about hotels and parking if you get to the north road side of Albany you will not have those problems.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Does it make sense to have the hearing a little later in Albany then?

DR. HEDGES: That would certainly obviate the crunch.

MS. BIRNBAUM: When would that be?
JUDGE LACK: Specifically after April 1st.
MS. BIRNBAUM: Would that make some sense?
JUDGE LACK: One, assuming an on-time budget
and, yes, I --
MS. BIRNBAUM: We could certainly -- I think people --

JUDGE LACK: I am away the first two weeks of April. Scheduled long before.

MS. BIRNBAUM: I understand. Let's just leave it where it is and we will hopefully be able to get a space.

JUDGE LACK: They -- you have to have a hearing in a public building. We will not rent a space in a
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hotel.
DR. HEDGES: Maybe a campus somewhere.
MS. REITER: Maybe a campus somewhere.
JUDGE LACK: We might also be criticized for picking an out of place location in Albany.

DR. HEDGES: I don't think for people who will come to testify it matters. They are all coming by car anyway. They might be happier coming to the campus. JUDGE LACK: We all might be happier since we don't have reserved parking spaces.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Can we talk about a third meeting which would likely be in April? And likely be -- I am sorry.

DR. HEDGES: Before we settle on a third, let me also offer these two suggestions:

I think an out-of-state hearing is a really good idea, but I also think considering an out-ofborough location and Long Island location would be a good idea as well.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Okay. You are talking about a fourth hearing now?

DR. HEDGES: Well, I think the notion of being available for the public to comment, you got to go where people are, and that is where people are. And certainly in the City the notion that everything happens in
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Manhattan is a point of irritation. And on the Island, the same thing is almost as clearly true.

JUDGE LACK: I will just sit here and smile. MS. BIRNBAUM: Let's get back to that question. If we are going to do a third one, upstate, it seems to me three possibilities; Syracuse, Rochester and Buffalo. Unless anyone has another thought.

Of those three, do people have thoughts of where they would think the hearing should be?

DR. HEDGES: I would argue that Syracuse is more widely available as an upstate location than either Rochester or Buffalo, not because there are more people there, but if you are anywhere in upstate New York, you are going to drive. And Buffalo is at the far end.

Rochester is a little less so. Syracuse is a lot less so for a big chunk of the state. I think those are the three conspicuous options.

JUDGE LACK: I agree. Syracuse is a lot easier.

MS. BIRNBAUM: So, just to move the conversation, if we chose Syracuse, would anybody object?

JUDGE COZIER: No.
MS. BIRNBAUM: Let's say Syracuse. And we will reach out to everyone separately as to timing so that we
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could hopefully, you know, have everyone available. So it will be sometime after April 15th.

When are you --
JUDGE LACK: April 15th.
MS. BIRNBAUM: All right.
JUDGE LACK: Monday, April 18th, actually. MS. BIRNBAUM: So it will be sometime after April 18th and we will reach out to everybody and get a date that works for everyone. Then the question becomes, $I$ think we need a meeting in New York City.

So do people think there should be a fourth hearing? I assume what you are saying is someplace in Nassau or Suffolk?

DR. HEDGES: Yes. And, you know, there are government buildings that work pretty well. The Government Center in Hauppauge is such a place.

JUDGE LACK: That is really hard for me, but okay. Where my office was for twenty-four years, thank you very much. I know where it is.

DR. HEDGES: Two other obvious places are Brooklyn Borough Hall and -MS. BIRNBAUM: I think if you are in Manhattan or Brooklyn it hardly matters.

JUDGE LACK: Part of the way we could measure that is what happens at the first meetings. Wait and
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see who and with what shows up with comment, and then, you know -- I mean, I will make it up, we could storm the gates at Syracuse and maybe say we have to go to Rochester and Buffalo. Who knows.

MS. BIRNBAUM: Let's at this point leave it at three. And after the first group's experiences, we could figure a fourth. All right. So that would take care of the public hearings.

I think we have an agenda for the data and research issues in some sort of priority. Are there any other issues that we need to discuss? And then of course we will set up time periods for us to make decisions. And as Fran said, there might be a hiatus for the hearings themselves. At that point we may need additional information, data, so I think we'll just keep the agenda open as to meeting dates after that instead of setting them down. Does that make sense?

MS. HORMOZI: That makes sense.
MS. BIRNBAUM: All right. Any other issues that we need to discuss before we see each other March 10th, probably in this building, but we will see what places we get -- we may want to get a place until we lock down these dates. And we will try this week to lock down the date in Syracuse, so we could pull all the things together.
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JUDGE COZIER: Sounds fine.
MS. BIRNBAUM: Any other business? We stand adjourned to March 10th. Thank you all. DR. HEDGES: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at this
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| 30:19;31:2 | 14:3;16:17,18;17:25; | 30:6,19,19;31:12 | may (13) | 2:2;13:19;17:26; |
| issue (1) | 20:8,18;28:5,13,18, | lock (3) | 9:16;11:8,9,9,10, | 27:11,18 |
| 14:22 | 25;29:14,16,20,25; | 28:11;33:24,25 | 15,17;12:20,20; | move (2) |
| issues (4) | 30:5,10;31:4,19;32:5, | lock-step (2) | 14:22;29:4;33:15,23 | 16:9;31:21 |
| 8:11;33:11,12,20 | 7,18,25 | 22:16;26:15 | maybe (8) | MTA (1) |
|  | large (2) | long (4) | 13:18;17:17,23; | 22:22 |
| J | 5:21;16:2 | 13:24;18:21;29:21; | 28:12,13;30:3,4;33:4 | much (8) |
|  | last (2) | 30:19 | McKenna (1) | 2:19;7:16;14:17; |
| January (2) | 3:18;24:17 | look (17) | 4:23 | 19:7;20:6,20;23:21; |
| 3:18,20 | later (1) | 2:8;4:20;6:6,10; | mean (3) | 32:20 |
| $\boldsymbol{J i m}(5)$ | 29:10 | 7:13;8:8,22,24; | 5:22;11:2;33:3 | multi-year (1) |
| 9:11,14;15:11; | law (2) | 10:11;11:13,24; | Means (1) | $7: 10$ |
| 17:14;18:24 | 23:5;28:12 | 14:11;15:10,19; | 4:24 | must (1) |
| job (7) | layer (1) | 16:22;17:15;18:18 | measure (1) | 2:10 |
| 5:25;7:3,25;9:16; | 25:20 | looked (1) | $32: 25$ meaty (2) |  |
| 10:13;18:10;24:21 | Leader (1) | 7:18 | meaty (2) | N |
| jobs (2) | 5:15 | looking (6) | 10:18,20 |  |
| 5:18;24:4 | least (8) | 4:6;6:9;14:25; | medical (6) | named (1) |
| JOHNSON (1) | $4: 13 ; 7: 5,17 ; 8: 5$ | 15:11;20:3;25:17 | 5:23;20:24;21:3; | 5:23 |
| 17:10 | 12:5;22:16;24:2,10 | loosely (1) | 22:4,11,12 | Nanotech (1) |
| joint (1) | leave (2) | 25:25 | meeting (6) | 22:10 |
| 4:14 | 29:22;33:6 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o t }}$ (7) | 2:3,7,12;30:13; | Nassau (2) |
| JUDGE (17) | legislation (1) | 8:15;9:11;14:12; | 32:11;33:17 | 18:8;32:14 |
| 28:5,13,18,25; | 4:19 | 20:26;23:2;31:16,19 | meetings (2) | National (1) |
| 29:14,16,20,25;30:5, | Legislative (19) | lots (1) | 12:17;32:26 | 17:20 |
| $10 ; 31: 4,19,24 ; 32: 5,7,$ | 2:4,8;4:13;6:9,12, | 22:26 | member (2) | nature (1) |
| $18,25$ | 21;7:4;9:15,16,19,20, | lovely (1) | 3:14;22:7 | 13:3 |
| judges (2) | 23;10:9;13:17,18,26; | 28:17 | members (1) | NCSL (1) |
| 23:26;24:2 | 17:16;27:11,19 | low (1) | 7:9 | 17:20 |
| Judicial (2) | legislators (9) | 15:4 | Mental (4) | necessarily (3) |
| 2:4;8:25 | 7:24;11:22;17:21; | lower (1) | 19:25;20:15;21:4,6 | 5:26;10:4;15:21 |
| June (3) | 18:2,6,7,14;25:6,7 | 15:17 | mention (1) | need (10) |
| 6:16;9:23,24 | legislature (13) $3 \cdot 20 \cdot 4: 14 \cdot 7 \cdot 2,6,23$ |  | 28:18 mentioned (1) | 3:10,11;8:10;9:11; |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Justice (1) } \\ 28: 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 20 ; 4: 14 ; 7: 2,6,23 \\ & 8: 5,9 ; 10: 17,19 ; 11: 17, \end{aligned}$ | M | $\begin{gathered} \text { mentioned (1) } \\ 18: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 3,17 ; 32: 11 ; 33: 12, \\ & 15,21 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 25;18:15,21 | Madam (1) | Miami (1) | new (19) |
| K | less (4) | 14:6 | 18:17 | 4:7;5:14,15;6:23, |
|  | 15:8;16:26;31:16, | major (1) | Michael (1) | 24;14:15;18:7,13; |
| Kaloyeros (1) | ${ }^{16}$ | 16:6 | 26:20 | 21:5;23:18,20;24:10, |
| $22: 10$ | lesser (1) | Majority (1) | might (10) | 12,26;25:7,10;27:8; |
| keep (3) | 8:3 | 5:15 | 8:21;10:7;13:23; | 31:14;32:11 |
| 13:21;23:12;33:16 | level (1) | makes (5) | 21:7;23:21;27:22; | newspapers (3) |
| keeping (3) | 24:22 | 5:14;14:7;23:15; | 30:5,9,10;33:14 | 6:13;11:22;27:24 |
| 3:17;24:3,4 | Lieutenant (1) | 27:13;33:19 | mind (4) | Next (4) |
| kind (6) | 4:17 | making (2) | 3:17;23:12,26;27:8 | 6:9;7:14;16:17; |


| 25:20 | 3:3;4:12;5:3,4;7:7; | 29:3 | place (9) | 25:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nice (1) | 9:4,6,14;11:19,19; | parking (3) | 13:10;20:25;23:5; | priority (2) |
| 26:19 | 13:19;15:17;17:19, | 28:6;29:6;30:11 | 28:15,17;29:3;30:6; | 25:5;33:11 |
| nobody (1) | 22;18:14;23:2;27:14; | part (8) | 32:17;33:23 | private (3) |
| 7:22 | 28:15;29:16;31:6 | 6:17;15:15,16; | places (8) | 7:8;17:2;24:26 |
| none (1) | ones (6) | 19:11;23:17,23;24:5; | 17:14;18:18;22:2, | Probably (6) |
| 6:15 | 19:23;22:21,25; | 32:25 | 22;25:25,26;32:21; | 3:10;18:22;23:15, |
| north (1) | 25:11,13;26:4 | particular (1) | 33:23 | 22;27:13;33:22 |
| 29:7 | ongoing (1) | 22:4 | play (3) | problem (3) |
| not-for-profit (5) | 14:19 | particularly (2) | 12:16;19:24;20:11 | 20:18;27:20,22 |
| 15:18,26;16:7; | only (9) | 18:9;19:23 | point (20) | problems (2) |
| 24:11;25:2 | 3:8;4:20;5:10; | parts (1) | 9:16;10:16;11:3, | 25:13;29:8 |
| not-for-profits (4) | 9:10;11:11;14:11; | 18:15 | 11;12:4;13:12;16:11, | proceed (1) |
| 14:26;15:25;16:26; | 17:8;23:18;24:24 | part-time (2) | 14;17:11,13;18:12; | 9:13 |
| 21:22 | on-time (1) | 7:3;11:16 | 21:13,22;22:15;24:3; | Proceedings (32) |
| notion (5) | 29:16 | pass (1) | 28:7;29:2;31:2;33:6, | 2:1;3:1;4:1;5:1; |
| 12:9,13;27:17; | open (1) | 10:8 | 15 | 6:1;7:1;8:1;9:1;10:1; |
| 30:23,26 | 33:17 | passage (3) | pointed (1) | 11:1;12:1;13:1;14:1; |
| number (9) | opinions (1) | 7:12,15;10:9 | 19:8 | 15:1;16:1;17:1;18:1; |
| 8:3;9:4;11:22,25; | 10:6 | passed (1) | points (1) | $19: 1 ; 20: 1 ; 21: 1 ; 22: 1$ |
| 18:5;19:8;22:13; | opposed (2) | 7:12 | 9:14 | 23:1;24:1;25:1;26:1; |
| 25:14,15 | 7:8;12:6 | pay (1) | politics (1) | 27:1;28:1;29:1;30:1; |
| numbers (1) | options (1) | 21:22 | 14:19 | 31:1;32:1;33:1 |
| 12:2 | 31:18 | payroll (2) | polls (1) | process (3) |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { order (1) } \\ 2: 26 \end{array}$ | 21:15,16 | $7: 17$ | 11:9,15;23:17 <br> produce (1) |
|  | organization (1) | 17:3 | 6:7 | 8:21 |
| object (1) | 17:23 | peg (1) | poor (1) | professionals (1) |
| 31:23 | others (2) | 24:12 | 3:26 | 5:22 |
| observation (1) | $12: 15 ; 23: 3$ | penny (1) | Port (1) | professors (1) |
| 14:11 | ours (1) | 15:26 | 22:22 | 5:23 |
| obviate (1) | 15:4 | pension (2) | position (1) | provided (1) |
| 29:11 | out (12) | 5:12;20:8 | 5:2 | 17:14 |
| obvious (6) | 2:20;5:26;7:21; | pensions (2) | possibilities (1) | provosts (1) |
| 17:14,19;18:18; | 12:16;13:22;15:13; | $20: 4,6$ | $31: 7$ | $5: 23$ |
| $19: 17 ; 20: 25 ; 32: 21$ | 17:2,19;19:8;30:6; | people (25) | possible (1) | Psychiatric (1) |
| obviously (2) | 31:26;32:9 | $3: 24,26 ; 5: 26 ; 8: 20$ | $2: 24$ | $21: 5$ |
| $4: 2 ; 8: 3$ | out-of- (1) | $9: 26 ; 15: 8,12,14 ; 19: 9$ | possibly (1) | public (19) |
| OCA (1) | 30:18 | 21;20:24;21:14,15, | 12:24 | $7: 5 ; 8: 19 ; 11: 13$ |
| 28:19 | out-of-state (1) | 26;22:13;25:12;27:4, | power (2) | 13:3,25;15:3,16;16:3, |
| oddities (1) | 30:17 | 14;29:19;30:7,25,25; | 6:26;22:26 | 24;21:23,26;22:20; |
| 19:14 | outside (4) | 31:9,13;32:12 | precise (1) | 23:2;24:22;26:3,8; |
| off (3) | 6:14;11:23,26;20:8 | per (1) | 21:10 | $29: 26 ; 30: 24 ; 33: 9$ |
| 9:3;13:6;19:16 | over (2) | 8:10 | present (1) | publications (1) |
| offense (1) | 5:13;17:25 | percentage (1) | 2:7 | 5:24 |
| 10:12 | overnight (1) | 9:2 | presently (1) | publicly (1) |
| offer (2) | $28: 6$ | perhaps (5) | $18: 3$ | 7:8 |
| 28:4;30:16 | override (1) | 16:12;18:9,16; | president (4) | pull (1) |
| offering (1) | 6:26 | 23:16,19 | 17:23;24:16;25:24, | 33:25 |
| 23:13 | own (1) | periods (1) | 26 | punishment (1) |
| office (1) | 12:13 | 33:13 | presidents (1) | 24:23 |
| $32: 19$ |  | person (2) | 25:22 | purview (1) |
| officer (1) 10:14 | P | 24:20;25:14 phase (4) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { presider (1) } \\ 2: 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19: 5 \\ \text { put }(2) \end{array}$ |
| official (3) | package (1) | 2:8,10,13,23 | presiding (1) | 13:22;22:18 |
| 19:25;23:14;26:21 | 6:18 | phone (1) | $2: 14$ |  |
| Oft (2) | paid (10) | 17:22 | pretty (2) | Q |
| 19:15,24 | 15:8;16:5,6;22:8, | picking (1) | 23:3;32:16 |  |
| old (3) | 13;24:8,26;25:14; | 30:6 | price (1) | qualified (1) |
| 3:18;4:23;5:5 once (1) | 26:7,9 ${ }_{\text {parameters ( }} \mathbf{1}$ ) | piece (1) | 28:4 priorities | $\begin{gathered} 6: 2 \\ \text { quite (3) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 3:26 | 9:15 | pinning (1) | 25:17,19;27:3 | 12:4;18:19;19:17 |
| one (20) | park (1) | 21:9 | prioritize (1) |  |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline R \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { relieved (1) } \\
\& 26: 20 \\
\& \text { rent (1) }
\end{aligned}
\] \& S \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { separately (1) } \\
\& 31: 26 \\
\& \text { series }(2)
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 8: 24 ; 11: 2 ; 12: 7 \\
\& 30: 14 \\
\& \text { sort }(7)
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline radically (1) \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 29:26 } \\
\text { report (1) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\hline \text { salaries (1) } \\
17: 16
\end{array}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
11: 12 ; 12: 17 \\
\text { servant (1) }
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 9: 5 ; 18: 6 ; 23: 20 \\
\& 25: 4,18 ; 27: 4 ; 33: 11
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \(12: 14\)
raise (6) \& 15:8 \& salary (16) \& 16:4 \& sorts (1) \\
\hline 3:19,21;4:2,3,16; \& Reporter (1) \& 4:7,10,11,16;5:6; \& servants (2) \(16 \cdot 25 \cdot 19 \cdot 4\) \& \[
19: 10
\] \\
\hline 14:14 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
26:21 \\
represents (1)
\end{tabular} \& 6:3,24;7:25;8:26; \& \begin{tabular}{l}
16:25;19:4 \\
service (1)
\end{tabular} \& space (4)
\[
28: 8,23 ; 29: 24,26
\] \\
\hline raised (1)
14:6 \& \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { represents (1) } \\
25: 16
\end{array}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 11: 16 ; 14: 15 ; 19: 15 \\
\& 26 ; 21: 8,26 ; 22: 9
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { service (1) } \\
24: 22
\end{array}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
28:8,23;29:24,26 \\
spaces (2)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline raises (3) \& requests (1) \& salt (1) \& session (8) \& 27:26;30:11 \\
\hline 3:26;4:4;7:13 \& 27:5 \& 22:19 \& 6:12,16,20;7:4; \& Speaker (1) \\
\hline \(\underset{4: 11}{\text { raising (1) }}\) \& research (18)
2:25;3:11;8:15; \& same (10)
\(9 \cdot 4 \cdot 15 \cdot 3 \cdot 19 \cdot 13\). \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { 9:19,20,23;12:20 } \\
\& \text { set (3) }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
5:17 \\
speaks (2)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \(4: 11\)
\(\operatorname{ran}(1)\) \& 2:25,3:11;8:15; \& 9:4;15:3;19:13; \& \[
4: 8 ; 7: 23 ; 33: 13
\] \& 19:20,21 \\
\hline 15:24 \& 15:21;19:19,22,26; \& 25:12;26:6,12;31:3 \& setting (2) \& specifically (3) \\
\hline range (2) \& 20:11,23;22:3,18; \& San (1) \& 4:9;33:18 \& 3:11;28:18;29:14 \\
\hline 8:18,23 \& 27:3,5;33:11 \& 18:17 \& settle (1) \& spent (1) \\
\hline rather (3) \& reserved (1) \& saying (3) \& 30:15 \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 10:16 } \\
\text { spotlight (1) }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 6:24;9:24;27:14 \& \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { 30:11 } \\
\text { resolution (2) }
\end{array}
\] \& 12:8;21:11;32:13 \& \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { several (1) } \\
5: 25
\end{array}
\] \& \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { spotlight (1) } \\
14: 21
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { reach (2) } \\
\& 31: 26 ; 32: 9
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { resolution (2) } \\
4: 15 ; 7: 11
\end{array}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Scheduled (1) } \\
29: 21
\end{gathered}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
5:25 \\
Sheila (1)
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
14: 21 \\
\text { staff (2) }
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline read (2) \& resolutions (1) \& scheduling (1) \& 2:15 \& 3:24;22:14 \\
\hline 6:12;11:21 \& \[
10: 8
\] \& 27:22 \& shined (1) \& stages (1) \\
\hline reading (1) \& respect (

$3 \cdot 11 \cdot 17 \cdot 16 \cdot 18 \cdot 2$ \& School (1) \& \[
14: 21

\] \& \[

16: 12
\] <br>

\hline 27:24 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3: 11 ; 17: 16 ; 18: 2, \\
& 23 ; 19: 3 ; 21: 17 ; 23: 7 ;
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

28: 12

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { shown (1) } \\
25: 8
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { start (3) } \\
2: 20 ; 3: 3 ; 14: 25
\end{array}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { real (3) } \\
& 20: 18 ; 21: 3 ; 22: 18
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 23 ; 19: 3 ; 2 \\
& 27: 16,22
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { schools (2) } \\
5: 23: 21: 3
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { 25:8 } \\
\text { shows (1) }
\end{array}
$$
\] \& starting (1) <br>

\hline really (5) \& respective (1) \& scope (2) \& 33:2 \& 17:13 <br>
\hline 3:8;15:3;24:21; \& 7:26 \& 20:22;21:9 \& side (2) 19:17;29:7 \& state (23) <br>

\hline 30:17;32:18 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { responsibility (2) } \\
& 16: 2,3
\end{aligned}
$$ \& scrutiny (1) \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 19: 17 ; 29: 7 \\
& \text { silly (2) }
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 5: 4,14 ; 8: 20 ; 9: 6 \\
& 14: 24 ; 15: 7 ; 17: 3,20
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { reasonable (1) } \\
13: 23
\end{gathered}
$$ \& rest (1) \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
14: 17 \\
\text { season (5) }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& 21:11;24:18 \& \[

18: 11,15 ; 21: 6,15,16
\] <br>

\hline reasonably (1) \& 26:18

result (2) \& $$
10: 22 ; 14: 20 ; 27: 24
$$ \& simple (1) \& 22:8,12;23:6,14,18; <br>

\hline 12:12 \& result (2)

$12 \cdot 14 \cdot 14 \cdot 18$ \& \[
25,26

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { 6:10 } \\
\text { simply (1) }
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 25: 6,21 ; 26: 9,10 ; \\
& 31: 17
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline recommend (1) \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 12:14;14:18 } \\
& \text { results (1) }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& second (6) \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|c}
\text { simply (1) } \\
18: 24
\end{array}
$$

\] \& | 31:17 |
| :--- |
| statement (1) | <br>


\hline | 12:14 |
| :--- |
| recommending (1) | \& results

$7: 17$ \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 2: 8,13,23 ; 7: 14 ; \\
& 12: 26 ; 17: 18
\end{aligned}
$$ \& sit (2) \& 3:5 <br>

\hline 11:16 \& retains (1) \& secondary (1) \& 16:17;31:4 \& states (3) <br>
\hline record (1) \& 17:21 \& 26:18 \& situation (4) \& 17:4,20;23:19 <br>
\hline 14:24 \& right (10) \& secretaries (1) \& 7:10;11:12;12:24; \& state-wide (1) <br>
\hline reference (1) \& $11: 6,7 ; 12: 4,13 ;$
$18 \cdot 24 \cdot 28: 11,24 \cdot 32 \cdot 6$. \& 7:26 \& 13:18
situations (1) \& 22:24 <br>
\hline 18:12

referendum (1) \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 18: 24 ; 28: 11,24 ; 32: 6 \\
& 33: 8,20
\end{aligned}
$$ \& sector (7) \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { situations (1) } \\
14: 13
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { statutory (5) } \\
3: 15,22 ; 19: 15 ;
\end{array}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { referendum (1) } \\
7: 16
\end{gathered}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|l}
33: 8,20 \\
\text { risk (1) }
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 15: 3,16,18 ; 17: 2 ; \\
& 21: 24,26 ; 24: 26
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
14: 13 \\
\text { slots (1) }
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3: 15,22 ; 19: 15 \\
& 23: 8 ; 26: 12
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline regard (1) \& 15:2 \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
21: 24,26 \\
\text { seems (1) }
\end{array}
$$ \& 27:14 \& staying (1) <br>

\hline 19:13 \& road (1) \& 31:6 \& small (1) \& 28:5 <br>
\hline regarding (1) \& 29:7 \& senate (4) \& 22:9 \& still (3) <br>
\hline 9:14 \& Rochester (5) \& 5:5,15;7:5;8:2 \& smart (1) \& 10:9,26;11:6 <br>

\hline REITER (20) \& 13:11;31:7,13,16; \& senior (19) \& $$
5: 10
$$ \& Stony (3) <br>

\hline 5:8;9:10,18,24; \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
33: 5 \\
\text { role (2) }
\end{array}
$$ \& \[

3: 24 ; 5: 2 ; 6: 5 ; 19: 4

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|c}
\hline \text { smile (1) } \\
31: 4
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 5:5,16;10:13 } \\
& \text { stop (1) }
\end{aligned}
$$
\] <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 10:3,23;11:3;12:8 } \\
& \text { 13:9,12;14:5,10; }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { role (2) } \\
19: 24 ; 20: 11
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 9,21,25 ; 21: 14 ; 22: 14 \\
& 23: 14,18 ; 24: 8,19,25
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& somebody (2) \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|r}
\text { stop (1) } \\
26: 18
\end{array}
$$
\] <br>

\hline 15:24;16:16;17:5; \& Roman (2) \& 25:12,22;26:2,7,10 \& 5:19;11:24 \& storm (1) <br>

\hline 20:13;26:11;27:20; \& 4:22;6:2 \& sense (12) \& someplace (3) \& $$
33: 3
$$ <br>

\hline 28:3;30:4

related (4) \& room (1) \& $$
14: 7 ; 19: 16 ; 21: 8
$$

\[
22 \cdot 4 \cdot 24 \cdot 89 \cdot 26 \cdot 6 .

\] \& | 19:2;29:5;32:13 |
| :--- |
| sometime (2) | \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { story (1) } \\
19: 15
\end{array}
$$
\] <br>

\hline related (4)

19:18;21:2,14; \& run (2) \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 22: 4 ; 24: 8,9 ; 26: 6 \\
& 27: 13 ; 29: 9,15 ; 33: 18
\end{aligned}
$$ \& sometere \& street (1) <br>

\hline 25:14 \& 15:2;16:6 \& 19 \& somewhat (2) \& 28:21 <br>
\hline relevant (9) \& running (1) \& sent (1) \& 4:22;18:10 \& stuff (1) <br>
\hline 12:24;18:6,16; \& 15:25 \& 17:25 \& somewhere (2) \& 21:12 <br>
\hline 19:17;22:15,20,24; \& rush (1) \& sentiments (1) \& 30:3,4 \& subject (2) <br>
\hline 23:6,10 \& 12:25 \& \& \& 7:15;26:12 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| subjects (1) | 7:22;13:13,18 | twenty-four (1) | 5:21;6:5,9,21;9:15; | world (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:20 | talking (10) | 32:19 | 14:16;15:4,17;18:21, | 21:5,22;23:4 |
| Subsequently (1)$12: 22$ | 3:16;9:3;20:22,24; | twice (1) | 25;19:24;21:7;22:2 | worried (1) |
|  | 21:11;23:26;25:11; | 5:13 | variety (1) | 28:6 |
| substance (1) | 26:4;29:6;30:21 | two (6) | 22:23 | worry (1) |
| $16: 13$ | taxpayers (1) | 13:15;15:2;27:7; | various (1) | 7:16 |
| successful (1) | 15:16 | 29:20;30:16;32:21 | 19:22 | worth (3) |
| 6:18 | term (2) | type (1) | versa (1) | 15:26;17:2;18:4 |
| successor (1) | 18:21;25:25 | 8:11 | 27:12 | written (1) |
|  | terms (1) | types (2) | vice (1) | 19:2 |
| suffering (1) | 22:21 | 6:7,7 | 27:12 |  |
|  | terribly (1) | typically (1) | Vice-president (1) | Y |
| sufficient (1) | 21:21 | 17:21 | 5:2 |  |
|  | testify (1) |  | vice-presidents (1) | year (4) |
| Suffolk (2) $18: 8 \cdot 32 \cdot 14$ | 30:8 | $\mathbf{U}$ | 25:23 | 5:6;7:12;10:21; |
|  | Texas (1) |  | vote (1) | 29:4 |
| suggest (1) | 23:22 | UDC (1) | 2:15 | years (11) |
| $27: 18$ | therefore (1) | 22:25 |  | 3:18,21;4:2,4,13, |
|  | 8:2 | unaware (1) | W | 25;7:14;8:24;10:15, |
| 15:5 | thinking (3) | 20:13 |  | 16;32:19 |
| suggestions (2) | 19:13;20:4;24:15 | under (4) | wait (3) | ying-yang (1) |
| 27:10;30:16 | third (4) | 4:15;7:2;10:26; | $11: 14,14 ; 32: 26$ | $5: 24$ |
| summarize (1) | 13:10;30:12,15; | 14:17 | way (13) | York (16) |
| 25:24 | 31:6 | underlying (1) | 3:25;5:10,26;7:7; | 5:14;6:23,24;18:7, |
| SUNY (16) | though (3) | 23:25 | 9:4;10:20;14:15; | 13;21:5;23:18,20; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5: 22,22,25 ; 6: 4,6 ; \\ & 14: 15,16 ; 20: 17 ; 21: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 17:3;19:5;23:26 | universe (1) | 21:3,20;23:9;25:23; | 24:10,12,26;25:7,11; |
|  | thought (7) | 18:26 | 26:9;32:25 | 27:8;31:14;32:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17 ; 22: 3,6,7,9,14 ; \\ & 25: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 13:22;14:5;16:12; 23:17,25;24:22;31:8 | universities (1) 5:4 | Ways (1) $4: 24$ | 1 |
| supposed (1) | thoughts (2) | university (1) | week (1) |  |
| $4: 20$ | 2:21;31:9 | 22:12 | 33:24 | 1 (2) |
| sure (5) | three (6) | Unless (2) | weeks (2) | 3:20;25:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 18 ; 15: 20 ; 18: 26 ; \\ & 24: 20,23 \end{aligned}$ | 15:11;21:7;31:7,9, | 10:6;31:8 | 28:8;29:20 | 10th (2) |
|  | 18;33:7 | Unlike (1) | weigh (1) | 27:8;33:22 |
| surely (1) | throw (2) | 8:25 | 10:20 | 11 (1) |
| 10:19 | 15:13;17:2 | unlikely (1) | weight (2) | 2:5 |
| surprised (1) | throwing (1) | 12:11 | 10:19,20 | 15th (2) |
| 4:22 | 7:21 | unrelated (1) | well-participated (1) | 32:3,5 |
| surveys (1) | times (2) | 18:19 | 13:26 | 18 (5) |
| 11:21 | 19:16,24 | up (15) | Westchester (1) | 3:18,19,21;4:2; |
| suspect (1) | timing (1) | 2:22;5:24;7:23; | 18:9 | 8:24 |
| 14:22 | 31:26 | 12:12,12;15:22; | what's (2) | 18th (2) |
| suspicion (1) | title (1) | 17:17;20:18;24:3; | 7:3;11:10 | 32:7,9 |
| $13: 24$ | 5:2 | 25:18;28:4,11;33:2,3, | Whereupon (1) | 1998 (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { symbol (1) } \\ 24: 19 \end{gathered}$ | together (2) | 13 | 26:20 | 3:20 |
|  | 12:19;33:26 | upstate (5) | whole (1) | 1999 (2) |
| Syracuse (10) | top (2) | 12:10;13:4;31:6, | 19:15 | 3:19,20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 6,11 ; 31: 7,11,16, \\ & 19,22,25 ; 33: 4,25 \end{aligned}$ | 25:11;26:4 | 12,14 | widely (1) | 1st (3) |
|  | total (1) | use (2) | 31:12 | 3:18;6:18;29:14 |
| system (7) | 20:12 totall | 24:13;25:24 | within (1) |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5: 12,22,25 ; 6: 6 \\ & 7: 23 ; 20: 9 ; 22: 12 \end{aligned}$ | totally (2) | used (1) | 5:12 | 2 |
|  | 10:2;28:20 | 20:11 | without |  |
| T | towards (1) $6: 19$ | useful (1) 24:9 | 18:26 work (8) | $\underset{25: 14}{\mathbf{2}}$ |
|  | traveling (1) | using (2) | 2:11,23,26;8:23; | 2013 (1) |
| table (1) | 13:14 | $24: 2,2$ | 15:14;23:2;27:23; | 11:25 |
| 5:26 | true (5) | usually (1) | 32:16 | 2016 (1) |
| Tal (1) | 9:22;10:4;22:2,11; | 11:21 | working (1) | 2:5 |
| 26:20 talk (4) | $31: 3$ |  | 9:3 | 2017 (1) |
| talk (4) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { try }(3) \\ 6: 17 ; 28: 11 ; 33: 24 \end{array}$ | V | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { workings (1) } \\ \text { 19:6 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3: 18 \\ \mathbf{2 2 ( 1 )} \end{gathered}$ |
| $30: 12$ | trying (2) | values (18) | works (3) | $22(1)$ $2: 5$ |
| talked (3) | 11:3;15:7 | 3:17,17;4:5,7,21; | 8:11;23:10;32:10 | 23rd (1) |



