1	STATE OF NEW YORK
2	ORLEANS COUNTY LEGISLATURE
3	/
4	
5	PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING
6	
7	CREATION OF A DISTRICT COURT
8	IN ORLEANS COUNTY
9	/
10	
11	
12	HELD AT: Orleans County Legislative Chambers
13	14016 Route 31W,
14	Albion, New York 14411
15	
16	DATE: Wednesday, July 19, 2023
17	
18	TIME: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	REPORTED BY: SUSAN M. RYCKMAN, CP, FORBES COURT REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
24	21 Woodcrest Avenue, Batavia, NY 14020,
25	(585) 343-8612

1	PRESENT:
2	
3	LYNNE M. JOHNSON, Chairman;
4	WILLIAM H. EICK, Vice Chairman;
5	MERLE DRAPER, Member;
6	JOHN FITZAK, Member;
7	EDWARD F. MORGAN, Member;
8	JOHN C. WELCH, JR., Budget Officer;
9	JOSEPH CARDONE, ESQ.,
10	Orleans County District Attorney;
l 1	JOANNE BEST, ESQ.,
12	Orleans County Public Defender;
13	JOSEPH FULLER, Committee Member,
14	Town of Albion Justice;
15	BRUCE SCHMIDT, ESQ., Committee Member.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	•
23	
24	

1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE
2	JOSEPH CARDONE	9
3	JOANNE BEST	26
4	JOSEPH FULLER	41
5	BRUCE SCHMIDT	51
6	MIKE ZELAZNY	64
7	DENNIS YOUNG	66
8	SHERRY DAVENPORT	70
9	DEAN PULEO	73
10	DEB BERRY	77
11	DON NIPPER	79
12	MIKE ZELAZNY	80
13	STEVEN COLON	81
14	ED GRABOWSKI	81
15	JIM SIMON	84
16	DICK DeCARLO	86
17	JOE MARTILLOTTA	88
18	JOSEPH CARDONE (Question and Answer:)	90
19	DAVENPORT/CARDONE	92
20	YOUNG/CARDONE	96
21	JOSEPH FULLER	99
22	KELLY GREGORIE/CARDONE	101
23	JOANNE BEST	102
24	JOSEPH FULLER	105
25	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON	106

1	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I would like to
2	call the information session to order, and
3	because there's so many here that we don't
4	know, I thought we could go around the room
5	and introduce ourselves before we start this
6	process.
7	If the woman in purple would start
8	here in the front, tell us your name, and
9	where you're from?
10	MS. PAUL: I'm Susan Paul, and I'm
11	from Albion.
12	MR. COLON: Steve Colon,
13	Lyndonville.
14	MR. JURINICH: Bill Jurinich,
15	Lyndonville.
16	MR. LAURICELLA: Paul Lauricella,
17	Lyndonville.
18	MS. LAURICELLA: Sandy Lauricella,
19	Lyndonville.
20	MR. PULEO: Dean Puleo, Office of
21	Court Administration.
22	MR. GRABER: I've got no voice.
23	Dennis, you do it.
24	MR. YOUNG: Dennis Young, New York
25	State Magistrates Association, President. And

1	Gary Graber, he is our legislative chairman,
2	and past judge in the Town of Darien.
3	MR. GRABOWSKI: Ed Grabowski, Town
4	of Shelby.
5	MS. KLUTH: Debbie Kluth, Town of
6	Kendall.
7	MR. KUJAWA: Joe Kujawa, Town of
8	Ridgeway.
9	MR. ROOT: Rick Root, Town of Barre.
10	MS. BERRY: Debbie Berry, Village of
11	Medina.
12	MR. BERRY: David Berry, Town of
13	Ridgeway.
14	MR. FISHER: Richard Fisher, Town of
15	Ridgeway.
16	MR. HURLEY: Kevin Hurley, Town of
17	Carlton.
18	MS. NIEHAUS: Kim Niehaus, Carlton.
19	MR. NIPPER: Don Nipper, Magistrate
20	in the Town of Palermo, Oswego County, and
21	Director for the New York State Magistrates
22	Association.
23	MR. GAUDIOSO: David Gaudioso, Town
24	of Kent.
25	MS. YOCKEL: Debbie Yockel, Town of

1	Carlton.
2	MS. SWAN: Margaret Swan, Town of
3	Barre.
4	MR. POGUE: Sean Pogue, Town of
5	Barre.
6	MR. MOY: Vick Moy, Town of
7	Clarendon.
8	MS. CORNICK: Denise Cornick,
9	Village of Albion.
10	MS. ALLPORT: Jaime Allport, Town of
11	Albion.
12	MS. WILLIAMS: Lynne Williams, Town
13	of Ridgeway.
14	MR. ASHBERY: Gayle Ashbery, Town of
15	Carlton.
16	MS. LEWIS: Sue Lewis, Holley.
17	MR. SNYDER: Mike Snyder, Albion.
18	MR. DeCARLO: Dick DeCarlo, Carlton.
19	MR. MARTILLOTTA: Joe Martillotta,
20	Albion.
21	MS. BENTLEY: Laura Bentley,
22	Carlton.
23	MR. KNAPP: David Knapp, Holley.
24	MR. RIGHTMYER: Gerry Rightmyer,
25	Town of Murray.

1	MR. ZELAZNY: Mike Zelazny, Town of
2	Shelby.
3	MS. ZELAZNY: Mary Zelazny, Town of
4	Shelby.
5	A SPEAKER: Murray.
6	MR. SIDONIO: Joseph Sidonio,
7	Murray.
8	MR. BELL: Jim Bell, attorney for
9	the Town of Albion.
10	MR. ELLIOTT: Tim Elliott, Village
11	Trustee from Medina.
12	MR. RIVERS: Tom Rivers, The Orleans
13	Hub.
14	MR. WILSON: Scott Wilson, Orleans
15	County Jail Superintendent.
16	MEMBER MORGAN: Ed Morgan, County
17	Legislator.
18	MEMBER FITZAK: John Fitzak, County
19	Legislator.
20	MEMBER DRAPER: Merle Draper, County
21	Legislator.
22	MEMBER EICK: Bill Eick, County
23	Legislator.
24	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Lynne Johnson,
25	County Legislature Chairman.

1	MEMBER WELCH: Jack Welch, Chief
2	Administrative Officer.
3	MR. FULLER: Joe Fuller, Albion Town
4	Judge and Orleans County Magistrates
5	President.
6	MS. BEST: Joanne Best, Public
7	Defender.
8	MR. SCHMIDT: Bruce Schmidt,
9	attorney.
10	MR. CARDONE: And Joe Cardone,
11	District Attorney.
12	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I want to thank
13	all of you for coming. And then just a few
14	housekeeping things to go over.
	We have some presentations we're
15	going to make to you, then we will open it to
16	
17	the public. Every one of you will have a
18	chance to say whatever it is you need to say,
19	to be heard, and put on the record.
20	And at the end, our District
21	Attorney and our Public Defender will answer
22	whatever questions were posed. If we can't
23	answer them tonight, the only thing we ask is
24	that you leave us your name and your email,

and we will send you the answers.

So with that, I will turn it over to our District Attorney, Joe Cardone.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you, Madam
Chairman. Again, I'm Joe Cardone, Orleans
County District Attorney. There are a few
housekeeping matters I'd like to bring to your
attention as well.

There is a number of related printed materials regarding all of this. They are posted on the county web site, they're just recently posted, and we're going to try to post that this evening through Zoom. And it should be on the screen as well. So you will be able to access those materials there rather than printing them all out and passing them out. I know we have a number of people watching this on Zoom, and it will make it a lot easier for them.

We will continue to add documents to that as we go forward, and this over the next few weeks and months.

The format for this evening is there are four speakers, including myself, Public Defender Joanne Best, Judge Joe Fuller, and then Retired Judge Bruce Schmidt.

Following that, we will have a period of time to permit people to make any comments or ask any questions. We would ask that you limit your time to three minutes, and we'll try to be somewhat accommodating where we can.

So really where I would like to start out this evening is kind of give you a historical perspective on all of this.

As I think many of you know, the justice court system has been in place in New York State, basically, since its conception. It was codified under the Uniform Justice Court Act of many years ago. Under the Uniform Justice Court Act, by law, there are to be two town justices, at least two town justices, from every township in a particular county. And that has gone on for many, many years. It is not required that you be an attorney to be elected as a town justice. Basically, you're winning an election based on votes from the community. There is no requirement of any prior legal education or experience in order to become a judge.

After you're elected as a town

justice, there are requirements for certain training that have to be done upfront, and then required to have training each year thereafter.

The system that's been in place for many years now has really met with criticism for a long time. I have in front of me a series of newspaper articles from the New York Times that were posted in 2006. At that time it was a situation where the Upstate Justice Court System was under a lot of fire, and the New York Times did a series of articles about the Upstate Justice Court System, and claiming that there were many injustices that were being done.

And they start out by saying that -they quote by Governor Al Smith back in 1906,
where then he said that the justice court
system was a farce in those days. And these
are his words, not mine. That it was an
outworn system. It was said by Franklin D. Roosevelt
in 1926, and that it is a feeble office
respected by no one. It was a comment made by
a commission also commissioned in 1920 -- in
the 1920s to look at that.

Now, I have been practicing here in Orleans County for 40 years doing criminal work. I can tell you, I have experienced the town justices throughout this county. I've had nothing but respect for them, and I think person to person, each one of them has done their utmost to do a great job while they've been in office. But this really isn't about that.

So I would like to kind of explain where we're coming from this evening, and we want to start just by telling you that, really, Orleans County has been in the forefront of any place in the State of New York with respect to court consolidation and reform.

When I started in 1992 as District Attorney, there were 24 judges, village and town justices, throughout Orleans County. We are now down to 11. And how did that happen? Well, under the Uniform Justice Court Act and particularly Section 106(a) of the Uniform Justice Court Act, it permits neighboring townships to reduce the number of justices in each of those townships from two to one, and

merge those two courts. And that's exactly what happened here in Orleans County in 2006. It was done initially with the Town of Ridgeway and the Town of Shelby. To my knowledge, that's the first time it's ever been done in New York State. And those courts were reduced to two town justices. Those town justices were -- each was elected from one of those townships, but they have jurisdiction over both townships of Ridgeway and Shelby.

The law was changed the following year, whereby it indicated that two or more contiguous townships could do that. And so in just a couple years to follow, the Town of Yates also participated in that consolidation. And now, technically, the west end of Orleans County is actually one court, with each of those justices having jurisdiction throughout the entire west end of Orleans County.

Now, of course, there were village courts at that time, too. There was the Village of Medina and Village of Albion.

Those courts dissolved back in the mid 2000s, and that eliminated four justices full-time, and I think also acting village justice in

each of those jurisdictions.

So our system operated for a number of years in that fashion. Over the years to come, the rest of the towns, with the exception of the Town of Albion because of the volume in that court, followed suit not by using 106(a) to reduce the number of judges, but basically, a resolution, as I understand it, was passed in each of those townships by the town boards to reduce the number of judges from two to one. And so we have it today, again, that if you take the ten townships and add one more for the Town of Albion, because there are two town justices there, that's where we get the 11 judges that are in office today.

The justice court system in the State of New York is an extremely important system. It has not only jurisdiction over vehicle and traffic matters, misdemeanors, but it also has jurisdiction — initial jurisdiction over felony cases. It's said that the justice court system in the State of New York, there's something like 2.2 million cases a year throughout the State of New York,

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that 85 percent of the dockets in the justice court system in the State of New York are vehicle and traffic matters.

The State of New York is just one of eight states in the country that still permit non-lawyer judges to be judges. And that over the years has met with a lot of criticism. It's said that if as a criminal defendant you have the right to be represented by an attorney, you should also have the right to go in front of a judge who has legal training. And unfortunately, many of our town justices are having to deal with a lot of laws in their courts that are just as complicated, legal issues and cases, that are just as complicated as we see in the superior courts in county court and supreme court. So they've had their work cut out for them over the years, and with, you know, frankly, not often a lot of They do get some assistance from the support. Office of Court Administration, but the Office of Court Administration primarily is there for the superior courts.

The problem with a lot of the justice courts over the years is that the

facilities that they've had to exercise court in, frankly, are not sufficient. Just in terms of day-to-day court proceedings, but also holding trials in those courts, and not adequate facilities for juries. And security often gets to be a problem in local courts.

So with all of that, the State of
New York, for many years now, has been looking
at, well, what do we do? How do we improve
the system?

In 2006, then Chief Justice

Judith Kaye commissioned a study to be done,
and a very lengthy study, which is in the
materials, that was an Action Plan for the

Justice Courts of the State of New York was
actually done and printed.

And I think it's fair to say that the upshot of that study was that we really need to look at the population, the demographics, and geography within the counties in Upstate New York, and let counties choose what system best suits them.

In 1964, the New York State

Government passed what is now known as the

District Court Act. And that was done

primarily for Long Island. Because of its geography and being such -- along counties

Nassau and Suffolk, they looked for a different form of court to better suit the needs of its population. And in 1964, district courts were established in Suffolk and Nassau County. And since that time, there have been no other district courts, that I'm aware of, anywhere else in the State of

New York. Although, the District Court Act is available to all counties and jurisdictions throughout the State.

1.1

1.8

Probably many of you are aware that there is currently some legislation in the State of New York, I think it passed the Senate, I'm not sure if it passed the Assembly, and it certainly hasn't been signed into law at this point, but they're taking the position that the hundred most busiest courts in the State are going to be required, if this law passes, to have lawyer judges in those courts. I don't think that Orleans County possesses one of the hundred busiest courts in the State, but that's going to be determined by the Office of Court Administration and also

3

45

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

the Division of Criminal Justice, if that law actually passes.

So what have been these complaints about the justice court system? What do they feel that the problems are? In addition to the court facilities, which frankly, are often a difficult expense for the towns. Most courts, in particular in this county, we have what's known as District Attorney's Night. Which is usually one night a month in the less busy courts and maybe two or three times in the more busy courts in the county. problem with that is it often delays cases. You may appear on a case on District Attorney Night one time a month, it gets adjourned. It's adjourned for another month, and as you can imagine, there's a lot of reason for different adjournments and cases that, frankly, should be resolved fairly quickly are often spread out over many months to get resolved.

With a district court, what is anticipated is that that would be a full-time court. It would run 9 to 5 every day, and with that, hopefully, streamlining some of

these cases and resolving them in much quicker fashion. That's better for the defendant and it's better for victims in our case.

And it's, under what we're discussing, it envisions there being a centralized district court somewhere in the center of the county, most likely in the Town of Albion or Gaines or thereabouts. No particular facility has been acquired or determined to be the spot at this point, but we know that the county over the next few months, depending on what happens with this proposition is, in fact, going to look to what alternatives there may be. It would likely be owned by the county, and maintained at county expense.

The judges in a district court would be full-time judges. We're proposing that there be two district court judges. They are elected district court judges. They are actually, as I understand it, employees of the Office of Court Administration, as would the supporting staff, and actually paid as State employees and not local employees.

The concept behind it is that by

having the centralized court, many of the problems we deal with now with transporting inmates to various courts on various nights would all be centralized. The various offices within the county, whether it be the district attorney's office, the public defender's office, the probation department, that would all go through a centralized location.

We feel that in a county as small as Orleans County, that a centralized, one centralized court, will be sufficient for those no matter where they live in the county. We all share one Walmart, we all share one Department of Motor Vehicles in a centralized location, and it wouldn't be a matter of traveling more than 10 or 15 miles for anybody in this county to get to that centralized court.

The district court is something that has been studied for a long time. There's been several different studies, and those different studies are actually posted on the web site, as I've told you. But most recently, the New York State Bar Association came out with this report, which is a Task

Force on the Modernization of the Criminal Practice. And the remarks that they make in the -- in the recommendations are as follows:

2.5

That the current justice court system must be replaced or revised in order to meet the demands of due process in an efficient and effective judicial system.

Instead of some 1200 plus courts with 1800 justices of whom 1,000 or more are not attorneys, many of whom are part-time justices, due process demands that all justices be attorneys.

And it goes on to say that the fair and efficient administration of justice in New York State is dependent on an effective and well-operated local court system. The inescapable conclusion is that the current justice court system must be replaced.

Minor changes have not met the requirements of due process in the protection of the rights of the accused as well as the rights of the people.

Offering counties, towns, and villages the opportunity to voluntarily evaluate and adopt costly changes, economies

of scale, and efficiencies by consolidating court functions has not produced the desired effect.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So with all of that, in this county, pre-COVID we did form a committee in this county to look at whether it is feasible to consider a district court in this county. And that committee has consisted of myself, Judge Schmidt to the left of me, also Joanne Best from the Public Defender's Office, the Magistrates Association has been represented by their president, Joe Fuller, and we've had members of the legislature involved as well. Mr. Draper and Mrs. Johnson and Mr. Fitzak, I think, is also on the committee as well. And we've looked at this for a number of years now, had many discussions about it, and tried to come up with what makes sense to do here.

And frankly, this is just something we are putting out to the public, not to in any way harm any other association or -- and this is not about the magistrates association or the district attorney's office or the public defender's office. It's really about

our community, and what system best serves justice in our community.

We feel that it's really incumbent upon us, as part of the criminal justice system, to move forward as technology moves forward, as laws, frankly, are getting more complicated in this state with respect to various procedures and whatnot, to really do what we can to make this the best system for Orleans County. And that's what our focus is on is Orleans County.

So to that end, we have put together a proposal with respect to studying district courts and perhaps having a referendum this fall to vote on whether or not there be a district court system in Orleans County.

But I want to explain a little bit about that process. Over the next few weeks and months, it's my intention to get out to as many groups as I possibly can, and give as much information to the community as possible, and answer questions that there may be about what it is that we are proposing in terms of the district court.

If in fact, it does make it to the

ballot this fall, which is what our goal is, and even if voted in, frankly, that's really just the beginning of the process. In order for it to be established here in Orleans

County, it has to be done by home rule. Which means that the next step of it will be to go up to State government, where I'm sure it will be debated in the assembly and in the senate.

This is a major change in the State of

New York. But I think a number of other counties are looking at what it is that's happening in Orleans County with respect to this, and perhaps are looking to follow suit as well. For many, many reasons.

There are a lot of pros and cons to this. There is a lot of detail to all of this. But I don't want to go on and take the time of the other speakers here tonight, but I certainly will answer questions.

We feel we can streamline many of
the things that are going on with the justice
court system right now. A couple years ago
the State required us to start what's known as
a CAP Court, which is a Centralized
Arraignment Part of the Justice Court System.

Whereby every morning now, we have arraignments at 8:30 in the morning and 7:30 at night with respect to any arrests that are made by the county. And that requires a town justice to go to our county jail, where a public defender is required to also go to the public -- to the jail at that time, and arraignments are done. The district attorney's office appears by telephone. And it's, you know, frankly, would not be happening, but for the work of the Sheriff's Department and the Orleans County Jail and the support that we're getting from them in making this function on a daily basis.

1.0

Now, I don't want to mislead you.

There are days when there are no arrests and there are no CAP courts. But through the district court system, that would all be replaced. We would have arraignments first thing in the morning and last thing in the day to accommodate the requirements with respect to arraigning defendants in Orleans County.

Frankly, I could go on for quite a long time here, and certainly want you to have as much information. At this point I'm going

to give it to my other colleagues, and let them have some comments. And certainly, I want to answer any questions that any of you have at this point. So at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Best.

2.4

MS. BEST: Thank you. So I'm

Joanne Best. I'm the Public Defender in the

county, and I've been in this position for

about six years. Was a practicing attorney

privately in this county for about 15 plus

years before that. I'm very familiar with all

of the justice courts.

And as Joe said, you know, we're not here to criticize the justice courts or take away from the great work that they've done over the years in this community, but we are looking at the changes on the horizon and how we can address that.

I think part of -- part of the push for this over the last three years is that the State, through the State Bar Association, the Public Defense Associations, the District Attorney Associations is moving towards consolidating different functions in general. And I have always been of the opinion that

it's better for us to do something on our own, and set up a system that works for us, rather than have a State agency tell us how we're going to impose this on our community, our -- our departments, and our citizens.

1.0

At this point we're in a very good position to have kind of the upper hand in saying that this will work for us or this won't work for us, and tailor it to our specific needs. Because we aren't Suffolk County we aren't Nassau County. And I think it's helpful for us to take as much time as we need to make sure we get it right.

And I think that as you read the papers, and just look around at how things have gone in this county over the last two decades, there are less attorneys in this county now. There are less town judges in this county now. They have recently raised the rates for assigned counsel, which I'm not sure if everybody is aware of that. But that is putting a huge burden on our offices to attract attorneys into our county because, quite frankly, people can live in other counties that offer possibly more -- more

civil -- civil and community functions and things than, maybe, Orleans does. So we're working at a deficit with attorneys, and if the State does say, well, the town courts are going to have to be manned by attorneys, we won't have attorneys then to represent litigants.

And this isn't just about the criminal aspect of it, it's also about the civil aspect. And that is a big important factor in this whole process as well, because the small claims court could now be heard in a district court, which increases the limits and the filing that people would be able to pursue, rather than having to file it in supreme court.

So there are a lot of benefits to doing this, and one of the other benefits is that we would be down to, basically, one -- definitely one full-time attorney judge and possibly two full-time ones, but we could also work off of a part-time judge.

A lot of other counties have what are called city courts, and we can't have a city court in this county because we just

don't have the population to do that. Those city courts coexist with the town courts that are established in those counties and communities. They still have functions in those — in those jurisdictions and in those counties, and that's what we're proposing as we try to move forward and come up with something. A plan that would work for our specific community is not to eliminate the town courts. And I know one of the public notices did say about eliminating/abolishing the town courts. That has never been the intention of the committee or any of us in any way, shape, or form. So we're talking about having them coexist with the district court.

2.2

Some of the other benefits of having that is just the consistency for people that have to go into court. Our system, as Joe mentioned, in New York State is extremely cumbersome. I believe that we have 11 different levels of courts in this State. And it is one of the most complicated courts — court systems in the US. Just as an example, a lot of states have — their highest court is called their supreme court. In our State it's

the Appellate Court or the Court of Appeals, rather. So that's -- just even that terminology causes confusion for people sometimes.

So having some of this streamlined so that people aren't going to multiple courts and trying to take care of different problems and in different townships, missing court dates, and things like that, we can handle it in a more streamlined fashion.

Plus, we would have the oversight of the Office of Court Administration, which can provide us a lot of assistance. They have — there's funding that's available through the Office of Court Administration, which as Joe mentioned, we would have — the judges would be paid for through that office as well as the clerks and a lot of the other support staff.

As far as Joe had commented that the district court would have to be a building owned and maintained by the county, that doesn't necessarily come out as a bad thing.

As far as I know, the -- the main courthouse in Albion is also technically owned by the county, and is leased back to the Office of

Court Administration. So there's a lot of sharing of services that occurs there.

The district court could also take place right in the existing courthouse.

That's always a possibility, too. After the renovations were done to the courthouse several years ago, there are three fully functioning courtrooms in that facility now, and as many of you probably know, we have one primary judge, which is Judge Church. We have other judges and a support magistrate that come in on certain days, but there is room there to also try to promote having it right at an existing facility.

I know that a lot of people have already kind of been talking about whether or not this will be cost effective, and what we should do as far as who's going to pay for the costs and what are those exact costs going to be. The cost effectiveness part of this is — is pretty important, I think, because first and foremost, I mean, the court's are not in any type of capacity as money generators.

None of the courts are set up for that purpose. We're not looking at that we're

25

supposed to be in the black all the time when a court system is operating, whether it's justice court, supreme court, family court. But if you look at some of the figures that have been proposed from the Magistrates Association, it appears that there was approximately \$450,000 budgeted county wide for all of the town courts. So that's the combined amount. And that in the last two years, in each of those last two years, they have operated at a loss of approximately \$150,000 per year. So when you look at that, you're really looking at \$600,000 a year. \$450,000 in costs, and \$150,000 in losses. at the -- not trying to say that this would definitely be a wash or it would be financially beneficial, we don't know that for sure because we're not sure how many staff we would actually need. We anticipate, we know the numbers, probably need at least two full-time court clerks, maybe an associate clerk, and as I stated before, at least one full-time judge and possibly a second full-time judge that would operate the court from Monday through Friday, normal business

hours, from 9 until 5 o'clock. Also taking into consideration the CAP process that we need to comply with, and that would -- that runs every single day of the year. That is holidays, weekends, evenings, and that would still -- we would have to set up something that would comply with that. So that might be where the part-time judge in a district court would come into play, that they would have to alternate weekends, or there would have to be some sort of standard set up to accommodate that as well.

I think that having the district court would prove to be highly efficient for everyone involved in the community. It would benefit our office, the district attorney's office, the probation department, the jail, the local police departments, because we would have one central location.

Right now we have, I think, five or six different agencies, police agencies, within the county, and they are writing tickets for various things, whether it's traffic, misdemeanors, violations, things of that nature. They have to know for sure which

day is the DA night, and when that ticket or that person would be returned to the court. If there's any change in a monthly schedule for a particular justice court, the officers, and not at any fault of theirs, but they might be looking at a master schedule rather than at an email that came through saying that we're not having court tonight or we're switching our court night to another day. So now you've got people showing up for court when there's not even court in session. So I know that doesn't happen a lot, but nonetheless, it does happen.

It would also help with the fact that right now the CAP court is set up, as we stated, twice a day, every single day. The town justices are supposedly on a rotation for morning sessions and evening sessions. Not all of the town justices participate in that, which is fine, and we have it staffed properly, and it's working. But just to put it out there as far as the cost of that program, right now there — if you figure there's 365 days in the year, a full day, if a justice's called in on the morning session and

(585) 343-8612

the evening session, they're entitled to a stipend of \$250. So when you multiply that out, that comes out to a little over \$91,000 per year. And we won't hit that ever, and I'm not going to lie and say that we've ever come close to that in the years that that's been in operation, but the potential is there. And that's a cost that OCA is already paying for this CAP program in our -- in our county. So that would be taken care of, and that money would not be set aside for the CAP purposes, it would now go to the district court purposes.

There are other problems that are associated with CAP, as far as people sometimes are waiting and waiting for hours on violations because they're in need of having an Order of Protection placed against them, and they have to wait until the next session. If we have the district court, those people aren't waiting. They are getting arraigned in a much quicker fashion. And I know a lot of people are of the position that they're Defendants, and if they have to wait, they have to wait. Or, we're tired of hearing

about catch and release. These same individuals are going to get released or processed no matter what the -- what the situation is, but now we're imposing upon the jail to hold these individuals on extremely minor offenses that they're charged with because they have to wait for some sort of administrative Order of Protection, having their driver's license suspended, or something of that nature. With a district court, we could facilitate them and process them through a lot quicker, and take care of the case loads that we have.

Kind of going into, again, the lack of attorneys in the area. This is not just an Orleans County problem, this is a statewide problem. And Joe can tell you as well as I can, that all of our offices statewide are having huge, huge problems of hiring attorneys, younger attorneys to come in, and then retaining them. So it's a -- it's a very big problem. And this would cut down on the amount of having people scheduled in this town court in a morning session, and having somebody else scheduled in an evening session

in a different court, and then possibly another court. We're pretty good in this county as far as not having overlapping courts, but there -- there are times that that could happen or that they run close together.

Having some courts in the morning, some courts at night, it's also cumbersome for the people that are using the court system, not knowing if they should be in court in the morning, if they should be in court at night, what day that there is a clerk there because they're not fully staffed throughout the weeks, most of the clerks are marked time. So even if you go in to file a small claims action, you might have to go back a couple of times, or a landlord/tenant matter. You may have to go back a couple of times in order to actually get there when somebody is available.

So again, we're not looking to eliminate the justice courts, and I think that they would still serve a very important function in this county. As far as code enforcement, they could still handle landlord and tenant issues. Traffic issues would still be something that could -- would go through

there, and even certain criminal matters would still be able to be handled in the town and justice courts.

Overall, the argument, I think, has been that the town justices do get training, and we're not disputing that they get training. But they're not getting the same training as an attorney. And that's not to say that all attorneys are good judges because I'm not going to sit here and say that that's true. And the amount of training doesn't make you a better person or a better professional, if you will, but having that training is something that is ingrained in us for seven years, basically. We go through four years of college, three years of law school. We have continuing legal education classes that we're required to go through.

The actual judges, district court judges, supreme court judges, county court judges, they are required to go to a basic judge school every year for refresher courses. They are constantly being supervised by the administrative law judges and the Office of Court Administration.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I know that the town justices also have training, and their training is on an annual basis also. And they have a resource center which is manned by attorneys. So when they call the resource center to get support or information, they're talking to attorneys because that's who is staffing that resource center.

So I think overall that there are -there's been some concerns, and there's been people bringing up very good points about how will people get there, and how are we going to pay for this, and what's going to come of it. And some of those things are fluid questions, and we don't have the answers to them just yet. And I don't know that we will until we get to the point that the community has -- has more say in this. But I can tell you that right now, we do have some of the figures, and that it's -- it's going to be the same or less as what the town justice combined costs. if the towns want to keep their town justices in place, that's fine. We're not looking to eliminate them.

So at this point in time I do think

that we should be ahead of the eight ball instead of behind it, and start talking about what is the appropriate way to do this. And not talking about whether we should or shouldn't do it, it's how do we accomplish this so that we are in control over how it's going to be set up in our county, rather than in a year or two or five years being told what we're going to have to do. And I think that too many times we've been in that situation, that the higher population areas of this State dictate what we have to do in Orleans County, Genesee County, or other smaller counties.

And I think this is a great opportunity for us, because it is going to happen. There are other things that are going to get consolidated, and that's going to include possibly town assessors, code enforcers. There's just people that are -- we just don't have people that are willing to take on certain positions. Even the fact that we've consolidated some of the town courts and the village courts, that has helped tremendously, but there are not a lot of people looking at filling those positions as

1 we're sitting here now.

So I thank everybody for their attention, and I know that this is bothersome to a lot of people, and I think the thing that's most bothersome is whenever there's a change, and we don't have all the answers.

Not knowing is probably the hardest part of it.

And if there are questions that people have, all of us will be more than happy to research what we can, and get the answers to you as quickly as possible. And I think that having the county web site is a great vehicle for that. So we can keep questions updated and the information flowing to everybody that's interested about it.

So I thank you again, and if there are questions, as Joe said, we would be more than happy to address those at the end of the presentation.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you,

Joanne. And at this time we'll pass it on to
the president of our County Magistrates

Association, Mr. Joseph Fuller.

MR. FULLER: Thank you. Excuse me,

for those of you who don't know me, my name is
Joe Fuller, I'm a Town of Albion Judge,
retired police officer out of the Village of
Albion. I've been a judge for the past nine
-- going on nine years now, and I'm currently
the President of the Orleans County
Magistrates Association.

So to clear something up real quickly, I've been getting a lot of questions from people in the public asking me why I'm in favor of this because of what they're reading on the hub with my name on listed to this committee. I'm not in favor of this at all.

Our Orleans County Magistrates Association is not in favor of this at all. So I am going to go over some details here.

This past Monday we had a meeting in the District Attorney's Office for the District Court Committee, which I attended.

And DA Cardone who runs the meeting, basically said, it's impossible to come up with costs for this. Every township he's gone to, I've talked to town supervisors and board members, he's been very vague on information that he's presenting. So I'm going to give you some

numbers, and these numbers are, basically, easy to get by making a few phone calls to the Office of Court Administration, the Eighth District, and talking to the local town boards and stuff like that.

So first of all, let me pull it up,
I'm having troubles. District court
proponents have not presented any estimated
costs. Currently New York State is
\$10 billion in deficit, and in the -- in the
fiscal year '23/'24, per Spectrum 1 and Fox
Business, New York State is financially
bankrupt, with a current debt of \$269 billion.

Assemblyman Steve Hawley, who we have spoken to, as well as the Eighth District Court have both told us there is no line item budget for district court.

In 2022, all town -- town courts' total budgets were approximately \$567,000 versus \$974,000 for one district court, which would include two judges, two clerks. Now those judges' salaries would be about \$200,000 a year with benefits, give or take, and that's set by -- by the State. Those court clerks' positions would probably be up to \$80,000 a

year plus benefits.

District court would be a financial disaster. Estimated costs could be up to \$3 million a year.

Fine revenue's for last year alone, just for Orleans County, totalled \$322,839, of which the county only received \$33,000 -- \$33,280 in 2022. Orleans County District Court would have to spend \$90 to collect just \$1 in fine revenue.

Infrastructure. So they could buy land if they want, like it was talked about. But I'm going to be honest with you, I sat in a meeting where they said that they are looking at buying the GCC building in Albion. That's where they want to put the -- your district court. That building is assessed at \$450,000. Potential costs up to a million dollars to purchase that. At least \$1 million to renovate that building, which would create thousands of dollars in lost tax revenue to local communities. That means town, county, school, and village tax revenues are lost, especially if you live in the village, Town of Albion, Town of Barre, Town of Carlton who

would absorb some of those tax revenues.

Town court facilities have long been paid for, and yes, some of the buildings aren't the greatest, but they're paid for.

Orleans County taxpayers would be funding any and all district court infrastructure.

Presently there's 86 percent of Orleans County budget is New York State unfunded mandates.

We used the Public Defender's budget back in 2016, which is \$321,725 versus last year's budget of \$1,587,383, of which \$1.3 million comes from New York State, five times the cost. If funding is withdrawn, a tax of 73 cents per thousand, or 7.5 percent increase in your county tax rate would be -- would be put in place.

Per New York State Law, at first arraignments the Defendant must be represented by an attorney. New York State can and will eventually remove this funding.

As you know, the State is bankrupt, and they are going to eventually say, it's time for the county to pay for things, which falls on us.

Why haven't the proponents of the district court investigated the New York State Town and Village Justice Consolidation Plan?

Just look at what happened in Ridgeway,

Shelby, and Yates. There was no infrastructure costs. Costs would remain the same or somewhat lower.

Is district court proposal just another way for lawyers to drink -- drink from the public trough with a \$200,000 salary? And I want to touch on that. They -- they said that they do not want to eliminate justice courts. They would like the justice courts to remain so they can handle traffic and civil. So we're going to pay a district court judge \$200,000 to do a third of our job. Actually, two -- two judges they're proposing.

Hypothetically, if Orleans County
District Court were to be funded by New York
State OCA, does the Orleans County Legislature
really believe that New York State can and
would fund the remaining 59 counties?
Probably not, with their current financial
issues.

Now, I want to $\operatorname{--}$ on the bottom of

this I want to point to a couple things on this slide. Our town courts administer justice fairly across the county. Sentencing fines are within the New York State guidelines. Most of the cases that we handle, the district attorney's office or the public defender's office or private attorney work out a plea agreement. They bring that to us, and ask us yes or no if we will accept it. We're going on their recommendation this is good. We're also going on by our training, and usually we accept those deals and administer the fines and sentencing as appropriate or set by the State.

Town justices also live in communities, and they're the courts closest to the people, versus a district court where many people would not know the judge.

Establishment of a district court in Orleans County defies common sense. The creation of a district court, if voter approved, will be irrevocable, it's more lawyer driven Albany/New York City type Government equals higher taxes. Bottom line, more government always equals higher taxes.

1 2

Now, our courts, I said, are closest to the people. Judges are directly elected by local communities. Most judges are active in their community. People feel more comfortable with them, especially when they go in front of them.

Town judges are held to the same training and ethical standards as other judges in New York. And just for the record, seven of our twelve current judges in Orleans County are retired law enforcement or correction officers, including one judge who was an attorney and also taught criminal justice for several years.

Now, on March 28th of this year, the Orleans County Legislatures created a District Court Committee, which is Resolution 137-323. To this date, and I'm on this committee, there has been no report or no study.

The only study that is being referenced is the one by the Bar Association right here, which is written by attorneys for attorneys.

Inconsistencies from the county.

What should we believe? First, let's start

with the public hearing notices. On Saturday, July 8th of this month, the public hearing for this meeting was -- was put out with the words abolishment of current town and village courts in Orleans County.

So apparently, someone didn't read that or someone didn't like the negative feedback. So on the 13th, about a week later, the notice was amended to remove the wording, abolish town and village courts.

Now this week we also, at our meeting, were handed the local law that the county's proposing. I asked, did anyone read this local law?

Let's start with the salaries

portion of it. OCDC-5, which is in the local

law, Orleans County District Court Meeting.

Number 5, New York State pays the salaries.

On the very next page, Item Number 7, it

states, all salaries, compensation, expenses

shall be included in the county budget. Who's

paying for what? Are the Orleans County

taxpayers paying for this, or is OCA paying

for this, which is also paid by taxpayers.

County says town courts will

(585) 343-8612

continue to handle traffic and civil cases. We're going to pay a judge -- two judges \$200,000 each, which is \$400,000, to do a third of our job. Does that make sense?

We also said -- they also have told us that they want us to handle traffic. Well, Item Number 9 outlines procedures relating to traffic offenses. The county wants to take that away from us.

What are some concerns. Why is there a rush to put this on the ballot? There's been no study, no report issued. What is the county hiding? What are they not saying? Who will benefit? Will the towns benefit, will the county benefit, or some person going to benefit in this county? And I have my opinions on that.

Just last night a resolution was passed in this room by the legislators to put this on the ballot. There was one legislator who asked, why are we putting the cart before the horse? And I -- I agree.

Remember, Orleans County is a rural and poor county already taxed to the max.

Just look at the recent property tax

reassessments. Does anyone want to pay more taxes?

New York State is financially bankrupt with, like I said earlier, a \$269 billion debt. More government equals higher taxes.

And lastly, I am just going to leave you with this: This same body of government, the County Legislature, just a few years ago, when -- when this body was talking about selling nursing home, they promised the taxpayers of this county that our taxes would go down. How did that work out? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much, I appreciate your comments. And lastly, we'll turn it over to our Honorable Bruce Schmidt, retired Gaines Town Justice and attorney.

MR. BRUCE: Good evening, everybody.

I'm in a unique position because of the fact
that I was a town judge for 12 years and
retired, I've been a member of the New York
State Bar Association for quite a few years,
I've been an admitted attorney in this State
for over 50. I practiced in every court in
Western New York. I've done appellate work,

I've been on both sides of the issue as a Plaintiff in civil cases, representing the State in other cases. I've been a town prosecutor, county prosecutor, State prosecutor, and likewise, have done significant criminal defense work and significant civil defense and claims work.

I also, by the way, was a police officer. So while some of those folks in the current position as justices, I join them in having that as a background, and that's how I got through law school.

I come at this from a different position. I was first asked on this committee because at that particular time, I was the President of the Magistrates Association in our county. Likewise, I've been President of the Bar Association in our county, was elected as a member of the Erie County Bar Association Board of Directors some time ago.

I had the opportunity to see the change in courts, to see the change in things as they moved along, and for the most part, they have been better.

And I am asked to speak here because

I come from a perspective that I also was on staff of the Minority Leader in the New York State Assembly. So I do have a little background in how legislation goes on in our wonderful capitol.

This particular plan we're presenting because of the fact, I believe honestly, that many on the committee are trying to get ahead of the game, as Joanne Best so eruditely said. My experience has been that when you look at the legislature currently, if you don't think things are happening because of five downstate counties, you must not be reading any of the papers that I am.

Notwithstanding the zeal that our two elected representatives, Senator Orr and Assemblyman Hawley take, the proof in the pudding is what happens. And what happens down there is what they want to have happen, and they don't care who we are or what we are. When we are the sixth or the fifth smallest county out of 62, with a population of about 40,000, and that's, I guess, dwindling somewhat, we certainly don't have that

presence that, maybe, a county like Erie, or Town of Tonawanda has 200,000 people, or the County of Monroe, et cetera, and et cetera.

1.5

So the only opportunity that we have to get our foot in the door is that when we have the opportunity where we can make that particular change, is try and get our foot in early on the game. We have seen how, just by looking at what's happened relative to the new thing that's going on in our county, thanks to our legislature here and Cooperative Extension United Way, of getting broadband out to everybody. Well, a lot of people, a lot of people, got it before we did, even though we were early in the game. But we didn't have that opportunity to have input like we do here.

I looked at certain things that have happened in my lifetime relative to the court system. In Erie County we were at that particular time, way back when, started to judge, if you will, the judges by evaluating them. Everybody thought that was, you couldn't do that, that was terrible, and we didn't. So now in most counties, we have an

evaluation system for those people who are judges and those people who are seeking the position of being a judge. We even have it, if you've seen TV, to evaluate people for the supreme court, for the Federal bench, for the New York State Court of Appeals, the highest judge, people are evaluating them. That was a change. It's now become accepted. It wasn't in the beginning.

The same thing with another situation. The new administration, if you will, in the Court of Appeals, has indicated and looking for a lot of money for attorneys to be arbitrators. What in the world is that about? Way back when they started a program in Erie County called Alternative Dispute Resolution System. That's where matters of up to certain misdemeanors could be sent out to an arbitrator or it could be sent out to a mediator. That is something that is changing, and now the court system wants that to happen. Very rarely has that occurred in this county. It's an opportunity for us, it's also a change.

Likewise, we've all heard about the

bail law. We've also heard about the revision to the bail law. And my colleagues here on the bench and in this room know that the revisions of the bail law, while touted, did not give any new bailable or qualifying offenses. It changed some of the opportunities for judges to have more input, but nothing new occurred to put some of the people back for bailable offenses that many of us wanted.

2.3

We now also see downstate that they are looking at doing what they call a Clean Sweep Act, and that is where if you have a misdemeanor, why after three years, it just goes away and disappears. Same thing with certain felonies, after eight years, it disappears and goes away.

They also are now proposing that there is a bill where your conviction or your plea is never ever final. You can challenge that some time later on. So just imagine how that's going to affect us when and if it does occur. And to think it doesn't occur, look at whatever else has come out of Albany. Look at what's happening there.

This procedure, it's got some flaws, and that's why we're having a public hearing. The one thing that I certainly liked about it is that if we get in the door with this thing as a district court, we've established it, this district court plan, separate from others and other recommendations, is it does avail the towns of the opportunity to do what they want to.

And by the way, the State

Magistrates Association indicated that in the report that District Attorney Cardone mentioned, seeks to strip the municipalities of their judiciaries because of the fact that the report does not take into consideration that there is a legislative process in each town, the supervisor's executive and the town board as the legislature, and of course, the people that can make a determination.

Well in our plan, that remains. In our plan, that remains, that the town, the people, the supervisors, and town board, ultimately, can make a determination. The town people want to maintain a justice court system, then it's maintained.

In the plan that's provided, it satisfies what the people in downstate are clambering about. And what they've clambered about since the then Associate Judge in the Court of Appeals became the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, and that is that they believe that any offense where a person could receive jail time, that person should have an attorney being the judge. Okay. So we do

that.

The question of finance, I'm not going to get into, I'll leave that for District Attorney Cardone and Public Defender Joanne Best.

But there is a couple other things that are not really stated. Judges, in the report by the State Magistrates Association indicated that it was only those individuals who were justices in the town justice level were getting what you might say as educational matters. The other judges, as indicated, get that on an annual basis also. They get that on an annual basis. They also have lawyers on staff all the time, and that's what the justices in the court system here rely on the

-- the judges down in Albany in the resource

center. They call up looking for help and

assistance. Most judges that I'm aware of

have at least one clerk who's a law clerk, and

his or her job is to do that, and do other

kinds of situations and pleadings.

So this is not looking to take away, in my opinion, the justice court system.

Which in my opinion, as Mr. Cardone's is, the people that are in this room that are judges and even those before, I've enjoyed being in front of them. I was one of them, you know.

And I think they work very hard at it.

But the realty of life is, that unless we get our foot in the door, New York, Downstate New York, is going to tell us what to do.

What's happening? Well, in March of '22, there was a movement in the legislature for an amendment to consolidate all of the 11 trial courts. What do you mean by that?

Well, you have family court, you got trial court, you have county court, supreme court, different other kinds of courts. And the example being made was, that if some person is

going through a divorce, it's quite possible as an ordinary human being to have to be in family court for a custody matter, to be in supreme court for a divorce matter, to be in county court for a potential criminal matter, and that could mean, essentially, three different attorneys who might have three different fields of expertise. And so the movement was to try and consolidate all of those courts into a supreme court. That was in front of the legislature in March '22, as an attempt to do something about courts.

1.1

Moreover, when I looked at this situation and this bill, I really was thinking of a couple things. I thought, first of all, you know, this is a little bit off the wall because, really, why do it now? And then I thought, well, for crying out loud, I went to school, there was a book called Future Shock by a guy by the name of Toffler,

Alvin Toffler. And really, that was saying, hey, this is all going to happen, you people are going to be shocked when you see this, and say, you might as well prepare yourself for it. But he also had a caveat in there, that

if you're going to prepare for the future,
look at the old. Don't just throw the old out
because it's old. This is what we've done.
We've evaluated, I think, we want to keep the
justice court system, and we have the
opportunity to step forward and do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, when you -- when you look at a lot of things, when you look at failure, failure isn't all covered in books. Success is a thousand fathers and mothers. If we don't do anything, it's going to happen. I think if you read the newspapers, and I'm sure all of you do, and I know that's an oddity for people like me, reading newspapers. you listen to TV or look at Facebook or if you're online or whatever it is, the reality of life is going to be that as a small county, they're going to put their foot down, and unless we have something in place, they won't listen. If we have something in place on the district courts new accomplishing and come forward, then we're probably going to be accepted, and as an asterisk, and then we can move forward. This is the opportunity to get together and come forward and act.

There is another thing that

Judge Fuller mentioned about some people have
a reason. If this thing we propose were to go
in place today, the only people in this
county, in this room, who would lose their job
would be me. I am a Deputy Public Defender
for purposes of the CAP Court only. The only
person who has a vested interest would be me
because without a CAP Court, there's no need
for me. And part of the reason I have the job
is because of the fact that Joanne mentioned,
the lack of attorneys, the lack of the
opportunity for attorneys to be here.

So I say to you honestly that, hey, for me, life has always been shut one door, open another. And if that happens, the best thing for this county is to move forward before they tell us what to do. But this is why we could have an opportunity to do it.

So I don't want to get into the financial things and all that. Just as an individual who's been around the courts and served as a justice in our town courts here.

Also, I've also participated in the mediation program that was mentioned that's there and

the arbitration program. My feeling is, let's look at this program, perhaps we tweak it, but I think it's the best thing going forward.

As far as the cost is concerned, I really believe that when you look at the issue, this is a State cost. And we don't, you know, when it comes to getting money from the State for our schools, we want to make sure we get it so somebody else doesn't get it. When it comes for looking for money for highways from the CHIPS money, we want to make sure we get it because somebody else will get it. The same way here. I can oppose an argument, but the reality is, if we don't get it, somebody else will likewise get it.

So, that's my feeling. I do have some of the other information that I can share with you, but I just wanted to say that I believe it's in the best interests of our county to be ahead of the game, as opposed to, as Joanne Best said, behind the eight ball. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Bruce, I so appreciate your comments. So now, finally, we'll open it to the public. To keep this

thing moving along, we're going to try to limit you to three minutes.

We have a microphone, Scott. If you would just raise your hand to be called on, we'll give you the microphone, and you can state your comment for the record.

And then like I said, at the end, our District Attorney and our Public Defender are willing to try to answer some of your points that come up through the evening. And if not, we will be in touch with you otherwise. And the town you're from, also, please.

MR. ZELAZNY: Mike Zelazny,

Z-E-L-A-Z-N-Y, Town of Shelby. I do want to

clarify a point of information, which I'm not

sure what this is. It was stated in The

Orleans Hub today that this was a public

meeting to be held tonight at 7 p.m., but the

sign-in sheets indicate that it is a public

hearing. And I think Mr. Schmidt indicated it

was a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, I can correct that. This is just a public information meeting. There will be legal

public hearings to follow, but we haven't
proposed a local law to adopt this yet.

MR. ZELAZNY: Okay. Could those sheets be corrected out there then because my name went on a sheet that said public hearing, and I would rather not have that --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We will take care of that. Thank you.

MR. ZELAZNY: And I have no clear cut decision in my mind about what's good or what's best for the county as of yet, that's why I'm here trying to find out some information.

But just a couple of observations in listening to some of the people talk. If we're already at a low number of attorneys available in the county, then employing two more by the county is going to decrease the number available to represent people, whether it be in a court system or for other needs, you know, that we need attorneys for.

And just discussions on the State.

There is no guarantees with anything for any

State funding. I don't care if it's, now

yesterday, or tomorrow. And there's also no

guarantees on any State mandates either.

Because even though we may be first, it may
help to be first to do something like this,
but there is no guaranty that five or seven
years or ten years down the road they don't
change and say, you still have to do something
different.

1.5

1.8

So just a couple of observations.

And again, it's not meant to be against this idea, and I'm just bringing up a couple observations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Zelazny.

MR. YOUNG: Good evening. My name is Dennis Young, I'm President of the New York State Magistrates Association. Our organization represents the interests of, approximately, 2700 city and retired town and village judges. There are currently some 1195 town and village courts in New York State. They constitute 60 percent of the entire judiciary, and for generations have been properly referred to as the courts closest to the people. Each court is presided over by a town or village justice all of whom have been

elected by their local communities and extensively trained by the Office of Court Administration to the point where you hear people say that our education is almost equal to what's taught in law school, fuck Miss Public Defender. These judges are the very definition of a public servant, and I'm honored to speak on their behalf.

The mission of the New York State
Magistrates Association is to develop better
methods and desirable improvements in the
administration of local courts. To promote
education, interchange of ideas, bringing the
judges to that end, and to promote appropriate
legislation for these purposes.

I am following the resolution of the Orleans County Legislative Resolution 137-323 since its passage by this body March 28th, 2023. This legislation passed a resolution to authorize a study for the establishment of a district court in Orleans. No numbers were named, no qualifications cited, and to my knowledge no actual study has yet been undertaken or shared with the public. No actual financial information has been put

forth to support any alleged cost savings.

There is little doubt this committee did not seek to gather or share information with the legislators to make an informed decision. It appears they instead started with one person's conclusions that local courts should be abolished for the convenience of county staff, and replaced by -- replaced by State-run district court. Thus, totally eliminating any local choice and control.

Town courts are staffed and budgeted at levels deemed appropriate by their respective town boards. As such, they operate in a fiscally responsible manner, reporting annually to local elected officials. Do you really believe New York State would be more financially conservative than your own local government.

Those fiscal constraints contrast to the majority of State-paid judges who receive salaries exceeding \$200,000 and a multiple support staff, including highly paid clerks, law clerks, court clerks, stenographers, secretaries, technology staff, and security. It is estimated that each of these State-paid

judges, together with his or her staff, cost taxpayers roughly \$1 million. How is this fiscally responsible?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To add insult to injury, by giving up local courts, the towns would also give up revenue of those courts now provided, and cut off local access to litigants. Does anyone here want to explain to their constituents how this improves these courts or your communities? It smacks of the latest attempt by the New York State Bar Association, of which there's only 15 percent of the attorneys in the State that are actual members of the association, and specifically a committee on which Mr. Cardone serves to advance the Bar Association goals in providing increased opportunities for their members, and likely himself, and to dictate who can serve in our local governments.

Whether or not to establish district court is a weighted decision, and one that should be entered into only after considerable data has been collected in consultation with those who are affected. There -- there's no reason only two counties have such a system.

To send this to a county-wide vote at this point fails to examine both the expense and resulting impact to your communities.

Please reject this poorly conceived and hastily fashioned seizure for the voters' rights to determine who they would choose to serve as their judges. Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. And I need to remind the audience that we will only accept respectful comments. So going forward, just keep that in mind. Next.

MS. DAVENPORT: Good evening. My name is Sherry Davenport. I have been a town justice in the Town of Summer Hill for the past 28 years, and I'm a past president of the New York State Magistrates Association.

I was alerted to the passage of the Resolution 137-323 by a local justice here who expressed their grave concern to me. Since that time, I've been following it, what little information has been publicly available.

Having worked in a county attorney's office for over 20 years, working with legislatures and -- and legislative staff,

this is a very strange process that you've undertaken here.

1.6

First, the resolution pushed the study to name an unnamed committee. There was no information as to who that was. This means that you are -- this group is not a public body. You are appointed by legislators to do a study, and report back to the legislature. And that apparently has not happened. So I'm not sure why we're here this evening. But there are a lot of unanswered questions that I have.

I understand most of the members of this committee are county employees. Not only would that tend to skew any recommendation, but you've assembled a group of people who don't necessarily have the insight or perspective that many outside stakeholders could offer.

Were there any other alternatives to abolishing local courts that were considered?

When can we see the study that you've supposedly undertaken? Are your legislators planning to send this to the constituents without any substantive information for a

vote?

1.0

1.4

2.4

There was -- my concern is, you have passed a resolution last night, the county legislature, to go to a public hearing without the benefit of having a local law to send to public referendum, I should say. To send to a public referendum. You have absolutely put the cart before the horse.

You have not done the proper steps that the Municipal Home Rule Law requires that you do. There is a process for passing a local law. There is a process for submitting it to the Board of Elections. Having it passed, having public review and input. None of that has happened here.

The proposed local law, I believe, was put together by a district attorney or one member of your committee. This is not from a member of the legislative body. It is not proper. And just so that you are aware, there is substantial case law out there about referendums going to the Board of Elections without being — being vague, and not explaining well what that subject matter is. And they are subject to abolishment. They

don't have to put them on the ballot if they are not proper.

So I would just hope that you would please take a moment, go back to the legislature, who is the proper body for this kind of discussion, give them your study, let them make a determination because that's what the electors of Orleans County have elected them for, and go through the process of the Municipal Home Rule Law requires, and do it properly.

There seems to be a real rush to judgment here, and I am not sure why that is. And it just causes everyone to want to shine away from it, so I don't think you are doing yourselves any favors.

I thank you greatly for allowing me to speak here this evening, and I hope there will be others who do the same.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. PULEO: Good evening. My name is Dean Puleo. I'm with the Office of Court Administration, and the court administration has not taken a position on this. And there is a reason we don't have any skin in the

game, frankly. Right now, you -- home rule is home rule. The Office of Court Administration assists justice courts. That that's my job.

I do want to clarify a few of the items, but Mr. Schmidt said he wants to open the door, get his foot in the door. Once the State takes control of that court, that door's going to swing wide open, and OCA takes 100 percent control over any of those courts. And that's something that you should consider.

As far as training goes. Yes, back in 2006 there was a scathing report, and Judge Kaye came out with recommendations, an action plan, and that's been instituted since then. The Office of Court Administration, without cost to the town, provides justice court support. We have a full-time staff, five people in Albany available to town justices, myself here in Erie County, my assistant Janeen Wilson. Every one of these justices. And I cover eight courts by the way, the entire eighth district. Every one of these justices, and every justice in this county have my personal cell phone. They call me at night when they're on the bench and have

a question. I'm happy to help. I've come out in person and assisted with -- with helping.

1.0

Judge -- Mr. Schmidt also talked about three different courts, a divorce. We have an answer to that, it's called Integrated Domestic Violence Court, and that's -- that's already instituted.

The CAP Court was designed with a plan. And that plan had staffing and funding and monies and -- and a clear path as to how it was going to be handled. You're still going to need that CAP Court because you will have two justices that have to be covered 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. So nights, weekends, holidays, one of those justices is on vacation, one of the justices is ill, somebody's going to have to be there to do those arraignments. That CAP Court is still going to be required. We're still going to be paying for that, whether you have that or not.

We provide the computer. We provide the software. We provide the support. These are all part of the -- all part of the action plan from 2006.

When you talk about attorneys and judges and their salaries, those clerks, just to clarify, this isn't a clerk like we think of a town clerk. This -- the law clerk is an attorney. So for each judge you have a law clerk. That job starts at \$120,000 a year, and that's mandated by OCA. That's something that -- I don't know if that's been considered.

But that's -- whether funding is
there or not, I can't say. I can say that I'm
not aware of any funding. I'm not aware of
any budget lines. I'm not aware of where the
money for this might be coming from.

But I just, I did want to clarify —
I did want to clarify particularly that
training requirement. As Judge Young
indicated, we've done an awful lot of
resources and time, making certain that judges
are up-to-date and up to speed. Last year, 13
judges in this district, in the Eighth
Judicial District, were remanded to chambers
because they didn't complete their training
that was required. That's something that —
we monitor that. Thirteen judges, we took

them off the bench, said you can't be a judge until you finish this. That's how important that is to OCA. So to say that these judges are not really adequate and trained, I have to strongly disagree with that.

2.2

And you're getting this from the horse's mouth, and some people might suggest that I'm more akin to the other end, but to have this conversation, just it boggles my mind how -- how this committee can suggest that you can have this district court and have town courts coexist. This is clearly an abolition of these town courts. And I can't see any other -- any other way out of this. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MS. BERRY: Debbie Berry from the
Town of Ridgeway. I've worked in the court
system and at the county clerk's level, so I
have experience budgeting for both
municipalities. And I can say that when you
do your budgeting, you have to present that to
the public. How can the public know what's
going to happen to our taxes? What's going to
happen to the county versus the State? You

know, there's only two district courts in the State. How are we jumping on board as Number 3? I'm not sure that's what we're ready for just yet because we don't have numbers to know what to do with that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is Justice Most Local, it is a report by the Special Commission on the Future of the New York State Courts from September of The existing justice court system 2008. reflects the needs of the community. Every town and village board writes local laws that directly relate to their specific needs. These laws are given teeth by the local courts that are familiar with these local town and village laws. The reality is that a district court system would not be familiar with those kinds of local village and town laws, making those local laws impotent and not reflecting the needs of a local community. That was a letter to the commission dated September 6th 2007 from Honorable Dan Dale, Portville Town Justice.

I just think you have to take everything into consideration when you're looking at this, and get a report written so

1 that we can see what's going on. And again, 2 I'm not sure why it was done so hasty, and why 3 we're only given notice so short. 4 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. NIPPER: Don Nipper,

N-I-P-P-E-R. Some spell that with a K.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, I want to thank all the corrections officer. I'm a retired lieutenant from the Department of Corrections, I work across the road. I want to thank the Orleans County Sheriff's Office for protecting us here and have a safe place to hold this meeting.

Judge Fuller, thank you for bringing But I guess the people to your left that up. are trained as police officers, peace officers, they still think they need attorney judges.

I'm from Oswego County. gentleman said you have to eliminate CAP. city court judges in Oswego CAP were unavailable today. There's three Defendants waiting to be arraigned at CAP Court tonight. Oswego County we have a new court opened up, the Village of Phoenix. They are waiting for a new ORI number because the State, it's been so long since they opened up a new court, they forgot how to give out the proper ORI number.

As far as being a New York State taxpayer, I don't understand how one county is trying to abolish and do away with CAP Court. You have presidents in the Civil County Magistrates Association that I fought very hard for to get into CAP Court.

With that I'm clear. Thank you for your time -- oh, one more thing. If this is true what Judge Fuller said, you put this to a vote last night before this meeting, I don't think that's very fair or consistent, something judges believe in.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. ZELAZNY: Mike Zelazny again.

Just very briefly, I just want to clarify.

When I said earlier about you can't -- how did

I state about New York State? Oh, that there
is no guarantees. And I didn't mean that
derogatory against New York State. It's just
that we are, ultimately, responsible and
fiscally responsible for our own decisions,
just like we are in our own household.

Nobody's going to really take responsibility and know for sure what we can afford and what we cannot afford unless we make our own decisions. That's what I really meant by that.

1.5

1.9

MR. COLON: Hi, Steve Colon from
Lyndonville. As a New York State Taxpayer, I
pay too much in taxes. So I think that common
sense needs to be done. Why pay somebody to
do one-third of a job when two-thirds is
already doing it? And I believe in little
government. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. GRABOWSKI: Ed Grabowski, I'm from the Town of Shelby. And I guess my question is -- and nobody answered it -- we live in a rural county where we have, what, the OTS bus system? So how are these people going to get to Albion to a district court? That's one of the points. I know it's been said, somebody said, well, they get to Social Services. That's a different fact. So a lot of the town and local courts, or the local courts, some of the people can actually walk there.

(585) 343-8612

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second thing about technology. I know Judge Young and everybody mentioned, well, kind of alluded to it. Town and village courts -- well, we don't have any village, they were eliminated. Town courts in the County of Orleans have everything that the other courts have. We have the courtroom program. We have Web DVS for protection orders. Security. We have comptroller reports that we have to put in. We have E-Justice, which is the background checks for everybody, and we have to go through background checks to get that access to that. And we're watched with all that. The judges who are in here know that. You can't just do that. We have E-Pass. We check people's abstracts for their driver's licenses, and we're fair with people. We have LexisNexis, which is a program to do research. We have access, and everybody's mentioned this, to the Resource Center in Albany.

About the full-time and part-time judges. They can't have a practice. And somebody brought up about the lack of attorneys in Orleans County. We are number 62

in the State. We have -- we're at the bottom. We have a county of 41,000 people. We have .06 attorneys, which means we have 24 attorneys in Orleans County. And a bunch of us are old, we're not practicing anymore. Some of them are working already in the county, and they would have to give up their practice. So I don't know how many would do that.

2.4

As far as in court, judges make the determination after the district attorney and the public defender present something to us. So we have attorneys in the courtroom. We have two of them. We have an assistant district attorney, we have a public defender or assistant public defender.

As far as contacting people, I know Judge Schmidt mentioned this, that about -- how people know what court they're going to. One of the things that we do in CAP Court, people know this, and in our regular courts is we get contact information from everybody, and we have them sign that contact sheet. How do you want to be contacted, and what's the easiest way to do that.

(585) 343-8612

1 The last thing I want to say, I don't know if anybody reads the New York Post, 2 3 but Comptroller DiNapoli was in there this 4 morning. There's an article. He predicts 5 that New York State is going to be \$36 billion 6 in debt with the deficit over the next four 7 years. So you can look that article up. So I -- well, no, that's four years he predicts it. 8 9 And it could be worse. He said it could be up 10 to 50 billion depending on how the economy 11 goes. We know how the economy is going, it's 12 going downhill. So thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, 14 Mr. Grabowski. Anyone else? 15 MR. SIMON: Are we able to make a 16 comment on Zoom? 17 A SPEAKER: Somebody on Zoom --18 MR. SIMON: Can you hear me okay? 19 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, I can. Go 20 ahead, Mr. Simon. 21 MR. SIMON: Thank you. Thank you, 22 Chairman Johnson. I quess I -- I just have 23 one comment. Jim Simon, Town of Yates 24 Supervisor.

I would suggest that the legislature

25

consider a resolution to rescind the decision to put this on as a referendum, and give the committee, the team that you've collected, time to actually produce a report that could then be made public. And then just go through the procedure again. Public hearing, you know, then we would be seeing all of the data that everyone's been asking about, and I think a lot of this tension that has built up rather quickly would dissipate.

So my suggestion is, revoke the resolution, the decision to put this to a referendum. It's premature, in my opinion.

Just last week our town board voted unanimously in the Town of Yates not to support a district court. Largely because we don't have information to say whether this is a good idea or not.

So gather the information, have the committee and the task force or whatever you're calling it do their work, and at that point -- but make it public so that everyone can start to understand what it is that's being proposed. And I thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Simon.

MR. DeCARLO: Dick DeCarlo,

D-E-C-A-R-L-O. I reside in the Town of
Carlton. I'm not unlike Judge Schmidt, I'm a
retired judge. I served on the bench in the
Town of Barre for six years. So I'm very
familiar with this process and what the judges
go through, the District Attorney, Public
Defender, what everyone in this room goes
through. I will commend everyone in this
process up to this point. There's been a lot
of work, a lot of thought, and a lot of time
put into it.

I will be very honest with all of you. I came here with questions tonight. I have more questions, unfortunately. And that's not how a public information hearing should be run.

I agree with Mr. Simon. Based on what I heard earlier, I think you have some procedural issues with this referendum being on the ballot. You may want to have a discussion with your own attorney about that.

I heard from the gentleman from OCA. There is no funding for this. They don't plan

on putting any money into it. I find it hard to believe that New York State's going to put any money into this.

I initially thought we were getting rid of town courts when I got here. We're going to keep town courts. So now we're adding another layer. Who's paying for it? If OCA's not, if the State's not, that's me, Joe Q taxpayer. Of which I pay a lot of taxes in this town.

To echo Mr. Simon's comments, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature, I think you need to strongly reconsider and pull this referendum back. Do I think this needs to be studied more, I absolutely do.

Joanne, Joe, you're right, it's coming. I question if we're out there in front and we get something in place, good for us, but folks, I've been around for a long time. I've seen one mandate after another come down from New York State, and they just do whatever they want, and they don't give a damn what we do up here in Orleans County. We may come up with a system that works for us, and it's great. And -- and when they get all

done with it, we're going to be stuck with it, and we may have to change. Who knows if we're even going to put in place what the future may be.

Pause, think about this, talk about this some more. Get some good hard numbers together. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. DeCarlo.

MR. MARTILLOTTA: Joe Martillotta,
Albion, M-A-R-T-I-L-L-O-T-T-A. I feel
strongly both ways. Yeah, I believe in small
government. But multiple layers of government
is absurd as well.

Orleans County, 40,000 people, approximately 5,000 students in our five school districts. We have 20 layers of government in this county. Ten townships, four school — five school districts, four villages, and a county government. Take away the 5,000, we're down to 35,000. I'm not a mathematician, but about 1,750 people we got a layer of government?

So, yeah, one court for the county, we're 40,000 people, that's a wonderful thing. But we have to study it. We gotta know what's

1 going on. It -- it's just mind boggling we're 2 talking about, oh, we're a small, you know, small community because we're the Town of 3 4 Albion or the Town of Gaines. Well, we're a 5 small community with a whole -- excuse me, 6 with a whole county, 40,000 people. 7 small. Twenty governments. It's -- it's mind 8 boggling. And how did we get there? Well, we use to do it with a horse and buggy, and it 9 10 took longer to get from one section of the 11 Town of Albion to the other corner. Now I can 12 get from the northwest corner of Yates to the 13 southeast corner of Barre or Shelby or 14 whatever, I don't know, just as quick with a 15 car. And if I don't have a car, call the 16 Sheriff's Department. What the heck, they'll 17 bring you. And we got how many -- somebody 18 said how many different layers of police 19 enforcement? You know, four, five, six, 20 whatever. It's -- it's -- duplication is 21 crazy.

22

23

24

25

Study it, do something. Let's become the City of Orleans for crying out loud. We already got the Florida league in our flag. You know, the State won't allow us

to become a city because then we would get more funding. Sorry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Martillotta. Anyone else?

MR. MARTILLOTTA: And I'm not going to be obscene because, you know, if I had to talk to Joe or Joe, you know, I could be. But not to all these nice people here.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Then I will turn back to our District Attorney to wrap up, if you can answer any of the comments that came up.

MR. CARDONE: Yeah, if I might just a brief comment. I certainly want to take your questions. Frankly, I think some of the information we've received tonight is skewed. And obviously, there would be debate if we were to answer as to some of the things that have been said that I think, frankly, are inaccurate.

But I do feel that it's important that the public knows what it is that we're proposing, what it is that we're potentially getting into. And to suggest that there's any motive other than the best interests of this

community or that somebody's up here for their own personal gain is just wrong. I contend that that is not the situation. I have a great respect for the Magistrates Association, they're here in numbers, and I think that's wonderful. And I want the rest of the community to be heard as well.

But having said that, if there's questions I will certainly want to take them. But you know, in the weeks and months to come, regardless of what position the legislature takes on the referendum, we certainly want to get more information out to the public.

And I can tell you that, you know, we put a request out to every township in this county for hard numbers with respect to the running of their courts. And repeatedly asked for those numbers. We got responses from three of them, and of those three, they weren't complete. I don't know, you know, why that is. I don't know why that we don't have the cooperation of local government in attempting to do something that is for the benefit of this community. Whether it's right or whether it's wrong. But I want you to know

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that.

So if there's questions, I will try and answer them. Yes, ma'am?

MS. DAVENPORT: Could you please explain the statutory authority for having -could you please explain the statutory authority for district court? I know it's Article 6, Section 16 of the Constitution that says you can have a district court, but it doesn't seem to include any reference to being able to maintain still a town and village court system and the district court.

And as the gentleman said from OCA, you open that door, the State takes over, you're done.

MR. CARDONE: So under our Constitution it calls for the justice court In -- in Suffolk and Nassau Counties system. there was a justice court system in place when they put the district court system into place, and nothing under current State law permits us to abolish a justice court. They just have been, frankly, rendered not effective in those They have very limited use in those counties. counties. And most things go through their

district court.

There was enacted a District Court Act in 1964, which is a separate act. You will find it at the end of McKinney's that's quite elaborate in terms of what's required, in terms of a district court.

You know, with all due respect to the Office of Court Administration, there's not — there's not a line item for district courts in our State budget. This is a long arduous process. If things went today through the State, and it got approved next year, we're talking a couple years at least before this would be put in place. And the funding would have to be put in place by the Office of Court Administration to fund a district court happening in this county with respect to their end of it. But there is — at this point, there's no line item that appears anywhere in the budget. It's something that would have to be budgeted by the State.

MS. DAVENPORT: I guess I'm still waiting for the statutory answer. So what is -MR. CARDONE: The statutory answer

is in the Uniform District Court Act.

and
ana
ct,
·
1
re
:
n
her
:]

mean?

2

1

MS. DAVENPORT: Yes.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARDONE: And they haven't. Ιt is a question why, to be honest with you. mean, these studies aren't -- you know, it's being said that this attorney is looking out for attorneys, and that these studies are all done to promote the Bar Association and whatnot. That's not the case. I mean, you really are humbling the integrity of our State Bar Association to take that position. These are people that put a lot of time and effort into studying these issues, and what they are saying, they're saying for a reason. well -- well studied. I mean, you know, to take a position that you need a written study from this group, these reports specifically address Orleans County and the situation within Orleans County. Those studies are made.

The finances, frankly, aren't made.

And those are unknown. And a lot of it is due
to, frankly, lack of cooperation from our
local courts, but also some of these amounts
are set by the Office of Court Administration.

I don't agree that the district court judge makes 200,000. My understanding it's more near 150/160,000. But whatever it is.

You know, our court's aren't in place necessarily to be a center for financial gain. They're there for justice. They're there to protect the interests of our community and the people in the community, protect the right of victims and defendants. And that's what our court system is about. And that's what we're looking to promote. Not any individual, not any agency, or anything else.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

Joanne, do you have any closing comments on any of the statements that were --

A SPEAKER: There is another question.

MS. BEST: I will let the gentleman ask the question first, and then I will -CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'm sorry, I didn't see a hand.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Cardone, you're maintaining you're going to rely on the Bar Association study to give to this legislative

1 body, and not have them do their own study to 2 draw their own conclusions to give the public 3 their study? You're going to rely on the Bar Association study, which is a very biased 4 5 study; is that true? 6 MR. CARDONE: No, it's not true. 7 You will see, and what's posted on our web site, studies that have been done by various 8 9 agencies throughout this State. 10 MR. YOUNG: And you will go by --11 MR. CARDONE: No, no. 12 CHAIRWOMAN JOHNSON: Excuse me? 13 MR. YOUNG: -- a 2006 --14 MR. CARDONE: Let me finish. 15 MR. YOUNG: -- New York Times 16 Article. 17 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Excuse me. 18 MR. CARDONE: No, no, no. Let me 19 give you a for instance. Here's a study by the Fund For Modern Courts as the Town and 20 21 Village Justice Courts, and what their 22 recommendation is with respect to forming 23 district courts. I invite you to take a look 24 at what we posted.

MR. YOUNG: I -- I've read it

25

1	before. But you're not going to conduct your
2	own study. Why don't you tell these people
3	you're not going to conduct your own study?
4	MR. CARDONE: That's not true. We
5	have conducted
6	MR. YOUNG: So where is it? Where
7	is the study?
8	MR. CARDONE: So you're talking
9	about a written study?
10	MR. YOUNG: Where is your study on
11	this proposal to show the citizens in this
12	county?
13	MR. CARDONE: And what are
14	MR. YOUNG: Your own study, not the
15	modern any of these studies.
16	MR. CARDONE: Study as to what
17	issue, sir?
18	MR. YOUNG: Where is your study?
19	MR. CARDONE: As to what issue, sir?
20	MR. YOUNG: The study on this
21	proposal? Have you done one yourself?
22	MR. CARDONE: Yeah.
23	MR. YOUNG: No, you're relying on
24	you're relying on those.
25	MR. CARDONE: We have assessed the

1 situation in our county with respect to what 2 our current court system is. I -- I think 3 what we'd like to do is put it to the 4 people --5 MR. YOUNG: Where is it in writing? 6 Where is it in writing, everything --7 MR. CARDONE: I'm not going to have 8 a dialogue with you. 9 MR. YOUNG: You don't have that. 10 MR. CARDONE: Not going to have a 11 dialogue with you. 12 MR. YOUNG: No, you don't have it. 13 I -- I'm done. 14 MR. CARDONE: Okay. Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, can you hold 16 one second. We have one more comment from up 17 here. 18 MR. FULLER: Listen, regarding his 19 question and what was at stake. I asked this 20 money -- in our meeting, I asked this to the 21 legislators, I asked this to Mr. Cardone, and 22 everyone in that room. If this is so beneficial to Orleans County, why are we 23 24 rushing this through without a study? 25 Now, you're saying this is your

study, Joe? The two and a half pages, three pages whatever it is, by Orleans County is written by you, not this committee. So why is this committee not -- in such a rush? Not me. Why are you and the rest of the legislators in such a rush to get this on the ballot, pass this? Because you know once it's passed, you can't revoke it.

MR. CARDONE: Yeah, so my response to you is, I'm not in a rush, number one.

Number two, you and your Magistrates Association have been a part of this committee since its inception. And I ask you, what has the Magistrates Association brought to this study, and what cooperation have we received from the Magistrates Association in promoting that study?

MR. FULLER: This is the second time we stand in front of this body and a legislature meeting with numbers and facts. You are going through the same thing, and you laughed at us. They're basically the same numbers. All you have to do is pick up a telephone and talk to people, and you will get the same numbers that we got.

MR. CARDONE: I -- i don't think I would, to be honest with you. There are a number of numbers that you set forth.

MR. FULLER: The bottom line is, what is the rush and what are we hiding?

MR. CARDONE: There is no rush, a

MR. CARDONE: There is no rush, as far as I'm concerned.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We have a question in the back.

MS. GREGORIE: Kelly Gregorie,
G-R-E-G-O-R-I-E, Murray. And I just had a
question about the positions for the judges
will be elected positions. So I just had a
question if you've thought about how long the
term for the judges will be, and if there will
be term limits on that?

MR. CARDONE: So under the District Court Act, the term of a judge is six years. That's established by State law, and they're subject to re-election every six years. Under Office of the Court Administration rules, mandatory retirement of a judge at age 70. So you do have those restrictions. I don't know of anything that restricts a judge from running for office as many times as he seeks

to do that. As long as he's elected by the community, he'll stay on the bench. As I know it. Is that fair to say?

A SPEAKER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

Joanne, had some closing comments.

MS. BEST: Just as a response to

Joe Fuller's comments about the Public

Defender's Office and the funding that we receive. This has been brought up twice now, and I addressed it once, but I might as well address it in this forum as well.

It seems to be that there's some concern or somehow the magistrates feel that the funding that the Public Defender's Office receives from the State has any bearing on this decision whatsoever, or that it's being used as an example for some reason.

The funding that comes through our office as a result of Hurrell-Harring settlement, and that was a statewide lawsuit that was settled several years ago. There were initially a handful of counties that were pilot counties that received funding to ensure that people had representation throughout

criminal proceedings.

That funding is part of a settlement, which means that you either do this, or we're going to continuously pay individuals that -- that aren't representative authorities, and we're gonna pay those -- those individuals separately.

So the funding that comes for us is through grants from the State, and if that funding goes away, almost every position in my office, including my position being full-time, goes away. I go back down to part-time.

Almost every one of my assistants is out the door, because they are paid for by funding.

So I'm not really sure what relevance that has to this discussion, but again, this is the second time now that it's been brought in the context of the district court discussions. So I just wanted to clarify that, that there's really nothing that should have any impact from our department on this district court discussion.

I agree with Joe Cardone. I agree with the comments that have been made. There is no rush on this. We are here tonight to

talk about this in an open way, get input from people to try to figure out what is the best solution.

If there's stuff that needs to be done or looked at further, we're willing to do that. There's no question about it. If what you're saying is you want a formal study of dollars and cents and estimates and -- and the amount of cases that would be heard by this, we can prepare that. That's not a problem.

We were looking at trying to get this on for the November ballot because, again, just to keep things rolling. But in the meantime, we can most certainly provide something that is in a written form and backed by supporting documentation, whether it's other studies that have been done, which everyone relies upon when they come to a conclusion. You don't just do your own, you rely on other people's statements and comments and things, too. So those would be incorporated into any final written study that people are looking at.

But that most certainly can be done, and it won't take us long to do that. But we

1.3

2.4

do need to have the cooperation from the local townships in order to do some of those -those calculations and present that in a fair and unbiased way. So we haven't gotten that, and that has been asked for several years ago at this point. And I think if we can get some of that information, we would -- we would gladly be able to put together something that would be a little bit more comprehensive than us making presentations this evening. So thank you for those comments and.

MR. FULLER: Joanne, just to respond on your line item that we used in our presentation, it is nothing against you or your department. We use it as an example because it is a State mandate. With the changing laws that everyone needs to be represented now at arraignments, that puts a lot of burden on your office. Basically, what we're saying is if that funding from the State comes -- we use that as an example.

MS. BEST: My people go away, too.

MR. FULLER: At some point the county's going to have to pick it because you know how busy the courts are.

not.

MS. BEST: They're not. They're

A SPEAKER: They have to.

(Everyone speaking at once.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments. I'm going to wrap this up, it's a little after nine, and we've been trying to stay on schedule. And I just had a couple comments to finish up.

Our first meeting on district courts was September 18th of 2020. So please don't be misled that this has not been studied by the committee for years. The first time the District Attorney came to the legislature was in September of 2020.

There were a couple remarks tonight about abolishing local courts. Never our intent, and I think the District Attorney made that very clear.

And as far as procedural issues that this legislative body has been questioned on, the only resolution that happened last night was allowing us to put it on the ballot as a referendum in November. We have a local law that has been drafted. We have not passed

this. We have not had the public hearings on the local law. What we did, under a time schedule, was pass a resolution allowing us to put it on the ballot. That's what happened last night.

So as far as the question on procedural issues and revoking resolutions, that — that's not what's at issue here. For the next three months you will be contacted on public hearings that the District Attorney and the Public Defender want to have in different towns. We have to have a legislature public hearing before we even consider the local law. But I wanted to assure you that due process has been met, and has been gone through our county attorney. And I know there were questions about that.

And we will advise you of the next public hearing. And I appreciate all your attendance. Thank you.

(The proceeding concluded at 9:03 p.m.)

* * *

STATE OF NEW YORK) ss: COUNTY OF GENESEE) I DO HEREBY CERTIFY as a Notary Public in and for the State of New York, that I did attend and report the foregoing proceeding, which was taken down by me in a verbatim manner by means of machine shorthand. Further, that the proceeding was then reduced to writing in my presence and under my direction. That the proceeding was taken to be used in the foregoing entitled action. SUSAN M. RYCKMAN, C.P., Notary Public.