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MR. FAHEY: Why don't we begin. It is ten a.m. Good morning, everyone. I am Judge Eugene Fahey. I am retired from the New York State Court of Appeals. I am the Chairperson of the Commission on Compensation for the Judiciary Legislature and Executive Employees. The Commission, as everyone knows, meets every four years per statute. The Commission's decisions effectively become law, unless overruled by the legislature.

Today is our first and, I believe, our most significant hearing. We're going to hear from a series of witnesses over a three-hour period. I'm going to ask that we follow a couple of ground rules.

The first ground rule is I'd like to try to limit any presenter to ten minutes, at the most. Anything that you have in writing, of course, hand in and we'll take it into consideration. So, if your testimony is longer we're happy to accept it.

The second thing is there will be some questions from my colleagues, which I'm going to ask them to be modest and limited in their question, but $I$ can't count on it with these people. You just never know. They're a free willing lot, but I'm going to begin by introducing them. I'm going to start by going to my left.

To my left is Helene Blank.
MS. BLANK: Good morning, everyone.

## Hon. J. Zayas

MR. FAHEY: Next to Helene is Victor Kovner. MR. KOVNER: Good morning.

MR. FAHEY: And next to Victor is Nadine Fontaine. MS. FONTAINE: Good morning.

MR. FAHEY: To my right is the Honorable Jeremy Weinstein, retired.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Good morning.
MR. FAHEY: Next to Jeremy is Theresa Egan.
MS. EGAN: Good morning.
MR. FAHEY: Finally, on my far right is Robert Megna.

MR. MEGNA: Good morning.
MR. FAHEY: All of us were appointed either by the chief judge, the governor, speaker of the assembly or the majority leader. We hold our position pursuant to that appointment.

I'm going to begin today with our first witness and call forward our newest Chief Administrative Judge, who we are pleased to hear from, Joseph Zayas.

Good morning, Judge.
MR. ZAYAS: Good morning, Chairman Fahey and fellow Commissioners.

My name is Joseph Zayas. I am the, as the Chair has indicated, the brand new Chief Administrative Judge of the State of New York and I appear before you today on
behalf of our brand new chief judge, Judge Rowan Wilson, the unified court system and the entire judiciary.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to discuss the vital need for a increase in compensation for the over 1300 state-paid judges and justices presiding in New York's trial and appellate courts. Next week we plan to submit a detailed report to the Commission that expands on the points that I'll be making today.

What I'm urging the Commission to recommend is not novel. In 2011, the first of these Commissions to be convened recognized that the appropriate benchmark for evaluating the compensation of New York judges is the pay of our counterparts in the federal judiciary. But, unfortunately, in recent years, our salaries have not kept pace with those of the federal judges, or, for that matter, with rising inflation.

So, we are asking to be restored to a position of parity with the federal judiciary next year and that cost of living adjustments be implemented over the following three years so that that parity is maintained. And the value -and this is really important -- that the value of judicial paychecks is not further diminished.

The statute established by this Commission, which I know you originally helped to write, Commissioner Kovner, lays out several factors that should be considered in
evaluating the prevailing adequacy of compensation. One of them, naturally, is inflation. The extraordinary inflation is an issue that $I$ submit the Commission must give very heavy weight to this year.

Judges' pay in New York has not changed since 2019. When on the recommendation of the 2015 Commission Supreme Court judges' salaries matched those of Federal District Court judges, and the salaries of our other judges were calculated based on that benchmark.

I'm sure you are all well aware that during the ensuing four and a half years we have experienced historic rates of inflation. The cost of living has grown significantly by 20 percent as measured by the Consumer Price Index. And New York, of course, was already an expensive place to live in to begin with.

No one goes into public service for the paycheck. Still, judges and their families obviously are not immune from the rising cost of living. Having seen their salaries stagnate for four and a half years, judges have experienced a 20 percent loss in the value of each dollar they earn. What this means is that judges are effectively earning $\$ 35,000$ a year less than they were earning in 2019. The state has clearly taken account of these economic realities when it has come from the compensation of its public officials. And rightly so.

In recent years, almost all state employees have received significant pay increases through collective bargaining. By April 2025, these increases will amount to about 14 percent in the aggregate. State legislature have also received large pay increases. Their salaries have grown by almost 80 percent over the past five years, including a $\$ 32,000$ raise that took effect at the beginning of this year, making them the highest paid state legislature in the country.

At the same time our governor's salary has been increased by 25 percent. Meaning that New York also now has the highest paid governor in the United States.

All of these raises were, in my view, well deserved and well warranted. In stark contrast, however, judges' salaries have remained stagnant, even as the cost of living has increased dramatically. This unfair disparity must be rectified by this Commission.

It is not difficult to predict the adverse consequences that will result from four more years of frozen wages. Judiciary morale will suffer. Experienced judges will leave the bench for more lucrative positions in the private sector, as well as government and academia. And talented lawyers, who we want to seriously consider the judiciary as a career choice, will decline to do so.

The combined effect will be that New York's
long-standing pride in this judiciary as the best in the nation will be jeopardized. And the complex commercial litigation, the important criminal prosecutions, the sensitive disputes involving children and families, and the questions involving our cherished civil liberties that New York's judges address every day may no longer be resolved by the best and brightest of the legal profession.

The solutions to these problems is one that has been embraced by prior Commissions and before that by the legislature. In 1999, when the legislature last adjusted judicial compensation it made the salary of a New York Supreme Court justice equivalent to that of a Federal District Court judge. Your predecessor Commissions from 2011 and 2015 agreed that that was the appropriate benchmark and there were several reasons for this.

For one thing, they recognize that New York State judiciary is a co-equal branch of government, and that it is necessary to set compensation levels for judges that make clear that their work is valued and respected. Those Commissions, moreover, saw the federal judiciary as setting, quote, a benchmark of both quality and compensation, end of quote. And they felt that New York should seek to place its judiciary on par.

The 2015 Commission identified another advantage of maintaining pay parity with the federal judiciary.

The salaries of Federal District judges are adjusted based on a annual cost of living adjustment received by other federal employees. Consequently, consistently aligning with the pay of the federal judiciary ensures that when the cost of living rises New York judges will continue to be fairly and competitively compensated. The affect of not doing this is well illustrated by the fact that since 2019 the salaries of Federal District Court judges have increased by over $\$ 20,000$ to $\$ 232,600$. And during that four-year period they have been paid nearly $\$ 50,000$ more than New York Supreme Court justices.

I would, perhaps, be remised if I failed to acknowledge that not everyone who has served on past Commissions has agreed that the pay of the federal judiciary is the correct benchmark to use in determining the appropriate compensation of New York judges. This was indeed an issue that was vigorously debated by the 2019 Commissions.

I would simply urge this Commission to carefully review the reports of your predecessors and the reasons that the 2011 and 2015 Commissions embraced federal parity. And I believe you will conclude that this benchmark is logical, fair and sustainable, as the legislature also concluded prior to the establishment of the Commission.

Now, since you are going to be hearing next from
the Budge Equity Director, let me briefly address another factor that the Commission must consider and one that is doubtlessly on many of your minds: The State's ability to pay for those salary adjustments.

To be sure, the State's projected economic outlook is somewhat uncertain. We, in the judiciary, are not oblivious to that. It's worth noting, however, that the 2011 Commission recommended increases to judiciary salaries during what it called, quote, a unprecedented budget crisis, end of quote. It did so because it recognized the importance, even when the economy is less than ideal, of fairly compensating New York's judges.

What we are proposing is not excessive. The total cost will be 34.5 million in the first year and a estimated 4.6 million for the modest cost of living adjustments in subsequent years. Thirty-four point five million is a mere one percent of the judiciary budget and a tiny, tiny, fraction of one percent, really 300 ths of one percent of the total State budget.

Moreover, in considering the course of these perspective salary adjustments, it is important to acknowledge that the Commission's decisions in 2019 and 2020 by declining to maintain federal parity saved the State over $\$ 40$ million over the past several years. A time during which the governor's and legislature's salaries increased
and rightly so, but judges' salaries were unfairly and substantially diminished in real terms.

The final point I want to make is in the next few years our court system will have our work cut out for us. New York's courts are breathtakingly busy even in ordinary times, but since March of 2020 things have been far from ordinary.

The tremendous progress that our judges and other court employees had made, significantly reducing the case load backlogs were incredibly largely undone by the strict restraints that were unavoidable during the pandemic. Particularly, in the Family and Criminal Courts we need to address these delays and we need to do so expeditiously. I have no doubt that New York's judiciary is up to this challenge, but this satisfaction with frozen salaries and the attrition that inevitably comes with long periods of stagnant pay will make this critical work immeasurably more difficult.

Indeed, in my view, further erosion of the value of judicial salaries will likely cause a exodus of our most experienced judges at a time when their collective experience at case resolution is most needed.

It would not surprise you that I have the highest regard for the judges in what we affectionately call our court family. They are serious, hard working public
servants who do the important work of dispensing fair and equitable justice in millions of cases per year. I am not asking that they receive a raise certainly not as that term is generally understood. I am simply asking that the value of their paychecks be restored to the level of their federal counterparts and not be further diminished over the next four years. It's the right thing to do and the state can afford to do it.

Thank you for your attention. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

MR. FAHEY: Thank you for your presentation.
Mr. Weinstein.
MR. WEINSTEIN: Good morning, Judge Zayas. Judge Zayas and I had the pleasure of working together as administrative judges in Queens.

Just give me a very brief history. You were originally appointed to the criminal court. And what year was that?

MR. ZAYAS: That was 2003. But if I could go back even before that, because I've been with the court system for 26 years, and I'd like to tell you that when $I$ was a law clerk to Judge Acosta in Civil Court in 1998 I worked as a law clerk. And every year that I worked as a law clerk I got a COLA increase. So as a law clerk, after April 1st, I got a little cost-of-living increase and then after a few
years you not only also get a raise which was based on your years of service.

MR. WEINSTEIN: So from 2003 to 2012, those nine years when judges went without any pay increase and they had already not gotten one since 1999, so 12, 13 years, could you speak to the morale of the judiciary in the courts at the time.

MR. ZAYAS: I think it's unquestionable that morale was low. Absolutely low. It was on judges' minds. When your compensation is stagnant for a very short period of time, two or three years, judges will hang in there. But if that gets repeated time and time again, judges begin to -- I mean, it's so natural that they begin to feel like they're not appreciated, especially as they see other members in other branches of government getting the cost-of-living increases. And it hurts. It hurts them.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Just two brief questions.
So if there's no judicial raise from this Commission going forward that would be a eight-year period and that would concern you as well that we would be mirroring the lack of morale in terms of that.

MR. ZAYAS: Right. My sense is judges will hang in there with a -- I keep mentioning four and a half years with stagnant compensation, but it's not going -- It's really five years because even if, and maybe say this more
hopefully, even when you hopefully recommend parity that's five years. That means five years they were experiencing stagnant compensation. And they are willing to do that one time. Begrudgingly. And with low morale. But when that happens yet a second time it has, I think, a drastic effect on the judges basically.

MR. WEINSTEIN: One last follow up. You did kind of address it. During that nine-year period when judges did not get a pay raise and this four-year period, did you, as a Administrative Judge and now Chief Administrative Judge, see any diminution in the work ethic of the judiciary, in the dedication of the judiciary? Were there issues or problems that we should know about?

MR. ZAYAS: I think that judges with the integrity that they have and their commitment to public service are not going to stop working. They're going to work just as hard, but with attrition you lose experienced judges. So that's really going to be the effect.

As a judge myself -- 20 years I've been a judge, almost 21 years -- I think 12 or 13 of those years I didn't have a cost-of-living increase.

So, my wife was a nurse in a state hospital and every year she got a cost-of-living increase. Maybe one or two years she didn't. My three adult kids, they get a cost-of-living increases and they'll say, Dad, did you get a
raise this year? No, we didn't get a raise. But you got a cost-of-living increase, right? Because everybody gets cost-of-living increase. No, we didn't even get a cost-of-living increase.

So the majority of my time on the bench I suffered through stagnant and for long periods of time compensation. So I think it's a real problem that the Commission, the creation of the Commission was designed to solve.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Thank you.
MS. BLANK: Good morning, your Honor. Thank you for 20 plus years of service to this state. What I would like to ask you, because you did give us a lot of numbers to consider, in response to Judge Weinstein, what comes to my mind is can you explain in real terms how this stagnation of salary for the third branch of government has affected, whether it's yourself or colleagues that you know as far as their ability to live and provide for their families, especially now in light of unprecedented inflation in this country.

MR. ZAYAS: That's a good question. So I just think about myself. I drive a -- not to make this personal -- I drive a 2013 Highlander that's scratched up and beat up. I cannot buy a new car. It's unconscionable that somebody who graduated from Columbia Law

School, committed to public service, can't afford because of the uncertainty. So I have a 2013 black Highlander that is parked in my driveway and my wife drives a 2012 CRV. So its affects like that. The high cost of interest rates all of a sudden. The high cost of mortgages. We live in Queens. So the high cost of living is causing judges to really struggle.

MS. BLANK: Thank you, your Honor.
MS. EGAN: Thank you again for your comments. They were very educational and those numbers I agree with my fellow commissioner.

The question -- and I know the position has been for several years -- the federal parity model. Let me ask you your thoughts on if there was another model or another system established that gave judges the judiciary a more regular look at compensation. Is that something that you think would work?

Because I'm listening to and I absolutely understand a huge gap in between times that you actually have compensation with you where you can have certainly have negative effects on one's morale, but, again, recognizing, I think you mentioned it, there's certainly in different areas here in state government people are getting raises, a different system that's not related to federal parity.

You also referenced as a law clerk you got raises.

We also referenced that there are people that are not getting COLAs. So we're trying to find that. And recognizing that in 2019 there was a pretty vibrant discussion in regard to using the federal system as a parity.

If there was another system that we could agree on that would give you a more regular look, is that something that the judiciary could live with?

MR. ZAYAS: As I said in my testimony, the legislature got a $\$ 25,000$ increase right away. So we'll take that. I'm not trying to be facetious, but that is something that happened. The governor received a very substantial and we think those were warranted and well deserved.

If you look at -- For example, I'll give you court employees, the contract that we just completed with them last year. I think it was two percent first two years and then three percent the next three years, or maybe three percent -- two percent and two percent, and three, three, three, or two, two, three, three, three. That added up to 14 percent. That type of increase is more than the 10 percent catchup that we're trying to get.

But we think that the federal parity is the best because it accounts for cost-of-living every time. And sometimes the Federal District judges get a very small raise
because of whatever the economic situation is. So sometimes if you look at their scale, you know, one year they got a thousand dollar raise. It went up just a thousand dollars. Next year it went up two or three thousand. When inflation is particularly high they got a -- I think their last raise was a ten thousand dollar raise in one year. The problem we have is that we are always playing catchup.

So how do we, after having lost, after having experienced a serious diminution in our salary, the value of our money, how do we catchup to where we need to be without exacerbating that loss?

So as long as we get there and that was a -- So what I just explained to you with the people who work in the courthouse, that was 14 percent. I think that 14 percent is higher than the 10 percent that the federal folks got.

MR. MEGNA: Judge, just a point of clarification. The 34 million is the amount that would get you to federal parity. I just want to make sure I understand.

MR. ZAYAS: Yes. That would get up to federal parity in the catchup year. So when you have stagnant compensation for a period of time, that first payment is going to be significant. It was very easy in the last Commission for the Chief Administrative Judge to basically articulate small amounts because there wasn't a catchup. We had two periods.

MR. MEGNA: I get it. And I also know how the folks who are coming on next count the four and a half that you're talking about is a add-on to the 34 . So the second year cost would be whatever, 40 million or whatever. That gets you to federal parity, as I'm thinking about it. MR. ZAYAS: Right. MR. FAHEY: If there's no other questions, thank you, Judge. MR. ZAYAS: Thank you, Judge. (Continue on next page.)

MR. FAHEY: Our next speaker is going to be on zoom digitally and it's going to be the division of budget and here they are. Good morning, everyone. I'm Judge Eugene Fahey. I'm the chairperson of the committee. Why don't you introduce yourselves to us? Can you hear me? Let me stop you. Can you hear us?

MR. WASHINGTON: I can, yes.
MR. FAHEY: Go ahead and introduce yourself, Mr. Washington.

MR. WASHINGTON: Good morning, Judge Fahey, commissioners, on behalf of Governor Hochul I extend her greetings to each and every one of you, and all those folks in the audience today. My name is Blake Washington. I serve as the director of the division of budget and I'm joined today in Albany along side two members of my very talented staff, Matt Howard and Mark Mazzeroni (phonetic), both who serve as deputy directors to the division. And thank you very much for inviting us to attend today's hearing.

As you know I'm making a recommendation to determine the adequate (inaudible) salaries and acting legislation (inaudible) consider various factors such as oral economic climate, rates of inflation, changes in public sector spending, the state's ability to fund increases in decompensation. So through my brief remarks and slide deck
to follow we provide this context to better -- the decisionmaking process.

We'll jump right in. So the next slide, please. The good news where we stand today, just a little bit of framework where we are, framing, you know, the U.S. has avoided a recession to date. Many economists are still calling for some form of recession in the near, in the near term. A hard or soft recession is under debate, but nothing is guaranteed at this stage.

As the chief administrative judges as related inflation peaked through in 2022, and in the neighborhood of eight percent, as you can see on our chart. And that was well above the federal reserves target. It remains well above the federal reserves target, which is about two percent. That two percent rate being an acceptable level of growth for, for most families to bear as it relates to their own personal income. We know that the federal, the federal reserve is likely to hike interest rates in the near term because interest, because inflation is still not quite under control.

Next slide. We know that the labor market is cooling in the State of New York after very high levels of both pandemic (inaudible) we saw sky marketing employment from a real (inaudible) we bottomed out during the pandemic, no surprise to anyone on the panel. Yet our recovery lags
behind the rest of the nation. Our jobs grow to 1.6 percent, the budget is 2.4 percent for the rest of the nation for a variety of factors, but units of jobs are one thing. We can also look at personal income growth on the current year where the State of New York a little bit behind the rest of the nation 4.1 percent in the U.S., 3.7 percent in the State of New York. Next slide. And I think that the chief administrative judge really relayed a lot of these data to you, so thank you.

And, chief, there are real, real pressures facing every day New Yorkers. We know that in the last handful of years New Yorkers had seven percent less purchasing power than they had in 2019. New Yorkers are paying more for their housing costs as of 2022, substantially more than in 2019. The rent is up, food and beverage costs are up. We know that increased child care expenditures are up. All of these, these data, all these data points help to inform our recent budget where under Governor Hochul's leadership we were able to increase the minimum wage for most New Yorkers to $\$ 17$ an hour, $\$ 16$ an hour for the rest of the state over a three-year period, just to keep pace with inflation and just to meet the needs of every day New Yorkers and people that are on the bottom range of our salary scale. So all of these things are true, and all these things are, we tried to in different ways to (inaudible) mitigate, we tried to
mitigate these costs to the every day New Yorker, most recently.

Moving on to the budget, we currently sit in fiscal year 2024, so looking ahead to 2025 we project a budget of $\$ 132$ billion and with $\$ 6.6$ billion in increased expenditures coming to next year. Most of those expenditures relate to our school children (inaudible) with the Medicaid program. You can see also here our general state charges which relate mainly to fringe benefits for state employees those too are on the rise. But you can see just in general of our $\$ 6.6$ billion increase there are some several major components that are, that comprise the increase and are very, very tricky to reduce in any real way. In this chart we track state operating funds spending, we initiated the state operating funds relates to spending from our state general fund and any other state revenues that (inaudible) such as $V$ or surcharge.

State operating funds also (inaudible) so the trajectory of this chart is reflective of a handful of things , but first and foremost under Governor Hochul's leadership (inaudible) in the last handful of years. Reflecting the urgency of under investment and a bunch of different state programs over the duration that you see in front of you today. Over the last handful of years we've fully funded (inaudible) we've provided veteran support with

Medicaid (inaudible) we've made target investments in child care, Pre $K$, we've invested in balance reduction initiatives and we've provided some of the largest investments in SUNY and CUNY in well over a decade. So if we're looking -MR. FAHEY: Mr. Washington, Judge Fahey, excuse me for interrupting you. I've tried to limit everybody to ten minutes, and everything that you give us we're asking that you file it with us also directly to the commission. But there's going to be some questions from the commissioners. So I don't want to stop you. I want you to finish. If we go over, we go over, but I wanted to give you a heads up on that. I should have done that when you started. So you go ahead.

MR. WASHINGTON: Okay --
MR. FAHEY: What I'm saying to you is don't feel the need to read every charge. You can summarize it and just file it with us directly. That's perfectly appropriate.

MR. WASHINGTON: Got you.
MR. FAHEY: Okay, thank you.
MR. WASHINGTON: So let me just (inaudible) this spending chart, you can see the dotted line is a ten-year CTI trend (inaudible) nothing was done, no new decisions were made. The hard blue line relates to where we are under the inactive budget carrying in to the future. The red line
is where we, where we see ourselves going in to the future providing for (inaudible) and restraining costs. Go to the next slide. We have in fact over the last handful of years built up reserves in the State of New York (inaudible) you can see in the slide there's about $\$ 20$ billion of reserves, 19 and a half.

And we, we (inaudible) reserves as they are intended to exist, they are intended to address any unforeseen circumstances, economic downturns not for recurring operating expenditures. So while we have sufficient reserves to meet the rainy days or any calamitous things that may arise in the future such as the recession, these are not new for financial plan balance. Moving on, this chart we want to just provide for the panel to just show, to demonstrate that over the past. Particularly post pandemic we've had record tax receipts in the State of New York.

There was an upward trajectory immediately following the pandemic that fueled a lot that we reserved for future emergencies, for future expenditures. But in the, in the current year's budget we've revised downward in the neighborhood of $\$ 10$ billion of receipts, of actual receipts coming to the State of New York. So as a result we have a mismatch between expenditures and receipts somewhere in the neighborhood of approximately $\$ 10$ billion of which we
are going to be addressing in the upcoming year's budget. Next. This mismatch has driven out your budget deficits. 2025 we have a budget deficit of $\$ 9$ billion and you can see the deficit here in the neighborhood of over $\$ 30$ billion. The $\$ 9$ billion deficit here, just dealing with 2025 alone, that is the number one reported immediately post (inaudible) for budget and it does not include other unanticipated costs such as the cost of providing services to, for (inaudible) for migrant response.

These gaps have to be addressed by prudent management, by all state agencies and OCA as well. And we can't (inaudible) these gaps cannot be closed by raising, by raising taxes. The next slide will show that the State of New York has, our state only top PIT rate is third in the nation. If you live in the City of New York our PIT rate is the absolute top in the nation, exceeding all of our neighbors' states, New Jersey, Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Any increase here we (inaudible) and our national competition (inaudible) and of course outside PIT obligations prompt time (inaudible) to consider out migration as well. Next slide (inaudible) coming in to next year's budget, all which you've heard before, everyone on the panel reads the news, here are the items that we watch with a keen eye on every day of the week, but certainly
we're facing (inaudible) these are the things that only exacerbate our problems. We want to control for the immediate risks, but we also need to make targeted investments as we move forward.

And just looking at the slide you can see between the two of them where that's where our mind's eye is coming in to next year's budget. I guess just to recap, we do have a budget of nine -- a deficit of $\$ 9$ billion coming in to next year, a cumulative $\$ 36$ billion deficit related to a decline in tax receipts, a loss of federal aid, increased spending on school aid and Medicaid. And in a recent budget letter, a call letter we asked every state agency to scrutinize their current operating expenditures to seek efficiency so that we can mitigate the need for more difficult decisions coming in to next year's budget.

I asked the agency budget request (inaudible) the executive agency budget request be no greater than the amounts in 2024. And I just reiterated this call to everyone (inaudible) two weeks ago at a cabinet meeting held by Governor Holchul. So I expressed to my colleagues that this all requires fiscal management, fiscal prudence, but it also requires an engagement in partnership and that's my goal. My goal to state agencies is to call before you today. So I just thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to shine a little bit of a light on where we
stand as a state and what our pressures are, coming in to the next handful of years and obviously we're here as well to help, to answer any questions you may have.

MR. FAHEY: Thank you. Are there any questions?
Ms. Egan was first and then Mr. Weinstein.
MS. EGAN: Thank you, director, for your
presentation. Just a quick question, just state employees in general do they have a scheduled pay raise for next year?

MR. WASHINGTON: They do. It depends on which department you are in, but it generally is in the neighborhood of that two percent range that the chief administrative judge had indicated previously.

MS. EGAN: Okay, thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Mr. Weinstein.
MR. WEINSTEIN: Director, just to, with
Commissioner Egan's question, do you know how many employees there are in the State of New York? New York State employees.

MR. WASHINGTON: About 120,000.
MR. WEINSTEIN: What's that cost, if you know, to the state?

MR. WASHINGTON: Our personal service budget, we think it's approximately 30 billion. We'll put some precision on that for the board.

MR. WEINSTEIN: 30 billion. And they will be
getting a two percent raise next year, right?
MR. WASHINGTON: Give or take, yes.
MR. WEINSTEIN: Math was never my best subject, but that means you're talking about approximately $\$ 600$ million coming out of the budget for them as opposed to the $\$ 34$ million we heard from Judge Zayas?

MR. WASHINGTON: Correct, which we budgeted for the state, for the state (inaudible) employees. We have not budgeted for the judiciary yet.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Now I know you don't make policy but are you aware of any executive or legislative branch indicating to the public employees of New York all of whom are $I$ think terrific and are deserving of raises being told that they will not get any raise for the next four years?

MR. WASHINGTON: That is -- that has not been communicated by anybody on the executive branch.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Commissioner Blank.
MS. BLANK: Hi. Good morning. Let me ask you a question and really follow up to Judge Weinstein. So are there any other -- would you agree with me that the judiciary and the justice system is an essential service of the State of New York, to the People of the State of New York?

MR. WASHINGTON: As enumerated in the Constitution
absolutely.
MS. BLANK: Along the lines of what Judge Weinstein asked you, is there any other class of government employees that our state asks to wait every four years or eight years, in the past it was 11 years to get a raise while they are doing their essential service to New York? Is there any other class of employees that you know that works for our state that has had that happen to them in the past 20 years? MR. WASHINGTON: Beyond statewide elected officials, legislators and executive branch commissioners, there's no, there's no other limit on other state actors' abilities to receive increases beyond negotiated salary agreements.

MS. BLANK: And so the numbers that Judge Zayas was talking about and $I$ was listening carefully and looking at your charts, it's about $\$ 34$ million. It wouldn't seem, if I could, and math is not my strongest point either to have an impact on the state's budget as much as just the two percent salary increase that the other state employees will be getting next year, would that be a fair statement?

MR. WASHINGTON: Well, I think that, you know, budgets are a series of choices. It's a series of identifying where parities are. I know we're here today as, this review is one that takes precedence. We understand where -- we know the board is going to take, the commission
is going to take a keen eye to that. We want to provide the data we did just to provide you a bit of a context so that you know just the ordinary every day expenditures for the every day --

MS. BLANK: I appreciate that. But for our duty that we're charged by the law which is to take in to consideration the state's budget I think it's important for us to understand after all the presentations the real impact, if any, on the state's budget by giving the judiciary a raise that they haven't gotten in quite a long time because the numbers seem to be so small compared to the giant numbers that you were presenting to us especially in light of what Judge Weinstein and you just spoke about that the two percent raise that the state workers are going to get is $\$ 600$ million.

So I'm trying to put in to context as we are charged to do how that number, the 34 million would be, how it effects the state's budget and other people in the state. And, well, math isn't my strong point $I$ don't see a real effect. So I'm asking you as the budget people is there a real effect on that number in the state's budget.

MR. MEGNA: I have a question.
MR. FAHEY: Let him respond, Robert, okay. Go ahead, you can respond, budget director.

MR. WASHINGTON: It is a small number in the grand
scheme of the state budget. I just think that sometimes when we look at salary increases we do try to without fortune or favor look at who earned, the level of salary that's earned and we have to, you know, we have to appreciate that as a whole, that of that $\$ 600$ million or so, that's 130,000 employees that make substantially less than members of the judiciary so $I$ think it's just the prism you view it from is more important.

MS. BLANK: Thank you. MR. FAHEY: Commissioner Kovner is next. MR. KOVNER: Yes, thank you, Director Washington for that impressive presentation. We've just heard Judge Zayas, chief administrative judge, request, propose to reach federal parity which would be at a level of roughly ten percent, which would be roughly two and a half percent for each of the four years which it sounds like is just slightly over the over two percent that the state employees will receive in the next year.

But of course they are they can receive changes once every year while the judges are sort of locked up, setting aside the COLA issue for four years. Am I understating the very modest difference between Judge Zayas' proposal and what state employees are already scheduled to get?

MR. WASHINGTON: I can't necessarily (inaudible)
what the chief administrative judge has put forward. I'll just say that in the last ten years compensation from the state work force has been modest $I$ think in the previous ten years. The state work force and every day employees, many of which are employed by OCA, their salaries have increased by approximately 23 percent.

And compensation for the judges during the same period has increased by over 54 percent. So, again, it's just a prism that we went through in the grand scheme of things, which your point is well taken.

MR. KOVNER: Which years were those, Director Washington?

MR. WASHINGTON: It was from years 2014 through 2024 .

MR. KOVNER: I don't think you included the full period of 11 years in which there was no raise but you did include the period of the catch up after the new legislation was passed, am I correct?

MR. WASHINGTON: That's correct.
MR. FAHEY: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Megna.

MR. MEGNA: Sorry, Blake, I think a point for context though, relatively small numbers I think we have to agree that that 's true compared to the numbers that you talked about, Blake. But my recollection is the state work
force in 2011, '12 was probably more like 150 or $160,000$. So the idea that the state only makes adjustments based on salary, union-negotiated salaries, you know, it's also significantly reduced the size of the workforce over that period. Is that accurate?

MR. WASHINGTON: That's, that's accurate, yes. MR. FAHEY: There's no other questions?

Commissioner Fontaine.
MS. FONTAINE: Thank you. I just have one question with respect to the submission. I know that you indicated that there was a call letter submitted to all agencies. So in calculating OCA's budget would they also be required to demonstrate that this, any increase or proposed increase could be captured or within their budget as compared to the overall request?

MR. WASHINGTON: The call letter was sent to executive (inaudible) executive control, and I think that as it relates to the judiciary legislature I think that, you know, I think we all need to roll in the same direction as we get the budget under way so that we're actually being mindful of costs in the long term, mindful of sustainability in the long term, so --

MS. FONTAINE: But would OCA also be required to demonstrate whether any kind of, any proposed increase could be absorbed within their proposed budget? Or --

MR. WASHINGTON: We would hope so. I hesitate to use the word require because we don't oversee them, but we'd hope the judiciary would take my call letter to executive agencies, take the lead that the governor is putting forward and work in harmony with that.

MR. FAHEY: Seeing no other questions, Mr. Washington, thank you. You know, I recognize that you put your presentation together in a truncated period of time and we appreciate the professionalism with which you approached this and thank you for your time this morning.
(Whereupon, the following was recorded by Senior Court Reporter William Leone.)
(Continued on the following page.)

MR. FAHEY: Two points and then back to the hearing.

My goal is to take a brief break at 10:30. We just got a lot of old men up here. So 11:30. I'm sorry. That's how old I am, but Judge Weinstein got it right.

So we'll take a brief break about ten minutes around 11:30. We'll try from now on to limit everyone to ten minutes. I wanted to go a little longer with budget, particularly, after Judge Zayas spoke because so many of those issues are at the core of what we have to decide here.

So thank you for your indulgence of going over that ten minute restraint on everyone.

I also didn't mention at the very beginning, I want to particularly thank today the New York City Bar Association for agreeing to host this. This is a beautiful room with a number of pictures that represent New York's distinguished history of the judiciary. I'm looking at Ruth Bader Ginsberg, Sonia Sotomayor, and many of our other distinguished jurists. It's a privilege to be in this room and conduct a hearing in this setting.

Our next speaker is Justice Paul Wooten. First Vie President of the Judicial Friends Association.

Judge.
MR. WOOTEN: Good morning.
I'll be well aware of the ten minutes timeframe.

So, good morning, Commissioner Fahey and to the other commissioners.

On behalf of our president, Cheryl Gonzalez, one of the justices of the State Supreme Court and our members of the Board we bring salutations and thank you for this opportunity to speak to you on this very urgent matter.

The Judicial Friends Association was established in 1976 by a group of African American judges within the State of New York seeking a fair and just treatment of minority justices, staff and attorneys. We're the oldest established organization committed to racial equity in the field of law, for racial and language minorities in the State of New York. We serve to educate and to advocate on behalf of the judiciary, judicial and nonjudicial court staff and attorneys on issues of affecting the Court, in particular issues affecting racial and language minorities.

We go back to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Certainly, African Americans and Hispanics were labeled under Section 5 as racial and language minorities. In particular, we bring this forward on the issue of salary because we applaud the USC's commitment to racial and cultural diversity.

Just as a quick point, we are aware we issued a report on the systematic racism in New York State, which is on our website. We've reviewed questions of the Johnson's
report. We've also reviewed the New York State Task Force on Advancing Diversity and there's some very good things in there. But the point we wanted to make today is that we feel that there is a sort of professional brain drain as a result of the salary.

In other words, New York State has committed to the fact of racial diversity in the judiciary. And it states three reasons why.

One reason is because in order to legitimize the system in the judiciary you need people in the judiciary who look like you. So when people walk into a courtroom, whether it's Family Court, Housing Court or State Court, it legitimizes the system if they see workers who look like them and act like them.

Secondly, another reason is because it enhances the educational of the decision makers. In other words, when judges meet with other judges from other cultures or from other experiences it eliminates the issues of implicit bias and issues of discrimination and because it educates the decision maker in different aspects of different people.

What we're trying to point out is that as we look under the issues of diversity and I was going to read them, but I'm not going to read them because of issues of time, the issues of diversity have been going down.

On the issues of racial diversity, particularly in
areas of New York City we now understand that there's 20 million people in New York in the state of New York. You got about ten million in New York City. If you are just looking at African Americans, we make up about 15 percent of the state; in New York City, we make up about 24.6 percent. But if you're looking at the major courts where most racial minorities are appearing, whether it be the New York City Civil Court, whether it be the Family Court, whether it be the Housing Court, those are the areas where the racial diversity is the most stark.

And the question is is that the one reason why racial diversity is an issue is because you don't have the number of either Asian, Hispanic or black attorneys who go in to the system. It's not just a question of wanting to be a judge. It's the availability of how many attorneys are out there that can take the judicial path.

Now, we look at the ABA statistics this year and last year. They tell us that there's about 116,000 graduates every year from all the law schools throughout the country. African Americans make up about 9,000, which is about eight percent. And this is a 2002, 2001, 2000 survey. When we look at Hispanics who identify as Hispanics, it's about 16,000 . The number of whites who identify as whites is about 70,000.

So, the question becomes that we don't have data on
what happens in New York State, but we can extrapolate that the number of black, Hispanic or Asian attorneys that are available to go the judiciary track is very small. That affects diversity. That affects the legitimacy of the system. That affects the ability to eliminate inherent bias and discrimination in the system.

The single you send by telling judges that they will not get a raise for four years, particularly these judges who are in these courts, will affect those mentorships of those people who decide to be attorneys on the judiciary track.

So if we're taking that 9,000 every year, they have a choice of whether, according to the State Bar report that just came out, there's diversity in the judiciary, diversity in education, diversity in the corporate diversity in the law firms.

According to the $A B A$ report that came out, the median income of a small law firm as they define as under hundred, the median income of a first year law student is $\$ 120,000$. The median, 50 percent. But our opening for a first year law student out of a law school is maximum is about $\$ 86,000$. It's J24. So the assistant law clerk starts off $\$ 86,000$. Whereby, if $I$ go the law firm track I get a median in a small law firm of $\$ 120,000$. That number is similar when you look at the corporate first year.

So, the question is how do we get our future lawyers and graduates to take the judiciary track, as difficult as it is? And if we don't send the signal that we're going to able to compensate those judges so that they can live, that's going to be a problem. Particularly, the courts I mentioned. The mayor appoints all those courts. Those people have to live in New York. Family Court judges have to live in New York City. Criminal Court judges have to live in New York City. Housing Court judges have to live in New York City. So they're subject to the inflation and the GP index that reduces their buying power. Why should they stay? They have no reason to stay. They can do just as well or better outside in the private sector. But this is more stark, this is more severe for us in the system because it reduces diversity and undermines the system. MR. FAHEY: Thank you. MR. WOOTEN: Thank you. MR. FAHEY: Our next speaker is Judge Shahabuddeen Ally. If I mispronounced that please excuse me. MR. ALLY: No, Judge. You actually pronounced it correctly. I've been mispronouncing it this entire time. That's also a good way to start.

I'm keeping track of my time as well. Good morning. To the members of the Commission, my name is Judge

Shahabuddeen Ally. I am the supervising judge of New York County Civil Court, as well as the President of the Asian American Judges Association of New York. I understand your time. We are pressed for time. So I will do my best to refund time to the commission.

I do believe that there is a opportunity to submit
a formal written statement. I will take advantage of that and I would like to highlight maybe two points made by our chief administrative judge, Judge Zayas. Also, Judge Wooten. Always a pleasure to follow Judge Wooten because I begin by saying I agree with everything that he says about diversity.

The Asian American Judges Association. I'm not sure if you are all familiar with us. We are ten years old. Started in 2013. We count in New York State, if New York State has 3,400 judges, including town and village judges, we count 61 judges in our ranks. And like the commissioners talk about their math skills, $I$ do love math. That counts for 1.8 percent of our judiciary where the AAPI community in New York State hovers around and numbers are fluid around four percent. So we are drastically underrepresented in our judiciary.

The purpose of our administration, of our association is to promote diversity but also promote broad base diversity. Inclusion of all in our court system. Of
the 61 judges, we're fairly new to the bench. 74 percent of our judges and the raw number is about 48 judges have been on the bench for six years or less. That becomes relevant in a moment.

So I do support everything that Judge Zayas
mentioned regarding restoring the value of our paycheck, but also maintaining the integrity of our court system. That I'll get to also in a moment.

Out of 62 counties our judges are represented in only ten of those counties, with 87 percent of our judges in New York City, 53 including myself.

So when we talk about a PIT rate, which I had to Google when the budget director was speaking. I had no idea what a PIT was. It turns out to be a Personal Income Tax. Who knew. We're New York City and we have to be -- We are required to live within the five counties. I happen to be married to a judge, Family Court judge. We have a option to leave Manhattan where we reside but not leave the city. We're put in tough positions and tough circumstances. And 95 percent of our members are assigned to the trial courts, the very busy high volume trial courts.

Just for context of how new we are, the New York State courts or New York State in general has had a court system in some fashion for 357 years. We've never had a AAPI identifying judge in, Judge Fahey, your court, the

Court of Appeals. We never had one. We never had a Fourth Or Third Department. We only had one -- Judge Weinstein, you'll appreciate this -- We only had one administrative judge in the history of New York State. So we have a lot to do in terms of not even catching up, because we'll never catch up, but just to keep pace.

Pay parity in line of inflation restoring the value of our paycheck, those are all points we agree with.

But why does it matter?
AAPI community stands in a very different position, unique position. We are either immigrants, like myself, I. Was born out of the country and came here for the pursuit of the American dream. That is the opportunity. Or children of first generation.

If you know anything about a good Asian family there are only three acceptable professions: Doctor, engineer and the third space is blank. So we're already in a tough position when we decide to go into law.

The pursuit of the American dream is to make money. Let's put it that way, put it out there. So when you go into public service it's a choice. But it shouldn't be a choice between earning a living and doing or pursuing something that's great.

The choice is really for those of us who are in the profession a beautiful marriage of the law, scholarship and
public service. It fuels our soul. But it should also fuel our bank accounts. No one should be put in this position. No one goes into public service thinking they'll make a million dollars but we shouldn't go into public service thinking how are we going to pay for our bills as well. We are certainly no different as litigants that came before us in terms of trying to make our ends meet.

Something that I've seen personally in my role as the president of Asian American Judges Association is that I speak to individuals. I speak to individuals about their paths to the bench and whether or not the bench is for them. That's a individual choice. But my discussion with individuals is more of here's the process, here's how it could happen for you, you make that decision. Let me get folks who are in the private sector, making a lot of money. They have a good living.

The opening year of eligibility is ten years. Most of the judges wind up on the bench close to 20 years after experience like myself. That's a real big -- that's a real big sacrifice financially, right?

Those who are in the public sector, District Attorney's Office, Legal Aid, or as myself I was once a Assistant Corporation Counsel, I know we have a Assistant Corporation Counsel on the panel, you have to make that decision whether or not you have to go. So we have that
discussion.
And I go back and forth to folks about why I think the bench is great. And this has happened more than once and it's heartbreaking. When someone stops me during my pitch as to why should they join the bench and they tell me Sha, I literally cannot afford to join the bench at this point. I literally cannot afford. That's when my pitch stops because it would be unconscionable for me to say I want you to put yourself in my position.

Attrition is not really our issue because we've been we've been on the bench for eleven years. The real issue is attracting judges, attracting folks to come in. Our ranks will never grow. In fact, we lost three judges. Our ranks will not grow unless it's financially attractive to get the best.

When I was inducted in 2018 -- My mother was still alive. When $I$ was inducted in 2018 I had that moment with a parent where I said, Mom, did you ever think I would be a judge? She said, No, I never thought you would be a judge. I said, Well, that wasn't the answer I was expecting. So why would you think that? She said, Well, when we came to this country judges were viewed as the rich folks. Judiciary is where the rich would go. Luckily we debunked that myth. You do not have to be rich to be on the bench. But without this raise the bench is only comprised of those
who are able, talented and can financially afford to do so. Going back to the point of maintaining the integrity of our court system. We cannot get to the point where our bench is only comprised of those who could financially do so. There is a large population, close to 13 to 14 percent of our population that is eager to be on the bench. I have never once met someone who had a desire to be on the bench that said, I don't want to be on the bench. It's other reasons. I asked this Commission to really look into that, that finances and money should not be that consideration and it would be my honor to submit a written formal statement on behalf of the Association.

Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Thank you for your time.
Our next speaker is Judge John Collins, president of the New York State City Court Associations.

MR. COLLINS: Honorable members of the Commission.
Thank you for allowing me to testify this morning.
I'm John B. Collins, Junior. I'm a full time judge of the White Plains City Court. I'm also the president of New York State Association of City Court Judges. I represent over 170 judges that sit in our state, 61 city courts outside the city of New York. Our members are in cities range from Long Island to Plattsburgh, from Buffalo
to Albany, from big cities like Syracuse to small cities like Shirley, from suburbs like White Plains, to rural areas like Oneonta and every city in between.

We are often the only court that most New Yorkers will ever see. And because of our close relationship with court users we are highly customer-service oriented.

I am here today to advocate for three proposals.
First to establish parity among the City Court judges, New York City Civil Court judges, New York City Criminal Court judges and the Long Island District Court judges.

Second, to increase the salary of Supreme Court justice so that there is pay parity between the Supreme Court justices and Federal District Court judges.

Third, to implement future adjustments so that pay parity is maintained as of April 1st of a given year.

You've already heard much about points two and three, so I'll concentrate on my testimony on the first.

City courts in the New York State exercise broad jurisdiction. We preside over a full range of criminal matters, including felonies from arraignment to preliminary hearings, misdemeanors and violations from arraignment through plea or through trial verdict.

We also preside over civil cases involving disputes up to $\$ 15,000$, and commercial and residential
landlord-tenant cases arising in our cities. We have county wide small claims and commercial claims jurisdiction up to $\$ 5,000$.

At the beginning of the pandemic in March 2020, we were appointed as acting county court judges and immediately called upon to conduct arraignments in emergency proceedings all over our respective counties. When attorneys try to tell me that the courts were closed during the pandemic, I briskly informed them that the city courts were never closed and I was physically present in my courthouse starting in May 2020.

We essentially sit as Family Court judges when we act as they raise the age of accessible magistrates. Often handling these immediate important arraignments of adolescent offenders at all hours of the night.

We also handle local ordinance violations, including code, environmental and navigation violations. In addition, we adjudicate traffic violations and parking tickets. Many of us sit in centralized arraignment parts, hearing cases on nights and weekends, from not only our own cities, but also town and village courts in those counties as well.

We are on call all day, every day to conduct arraignments and to issue search warrants. Some of us are assigned to sit as acting Family Court judges. We are
periodically called upon to perform the duties of those courts when needed.

Many of us preside specialty or problem-solving courts to better respond to the needs of our litigants, court users and our communities, including domestic violence courts, opiate courts, drug treatment courts, DWI courts, veterans courts, human trafficking courts, and mental health courts.

Put simply, the duties and jurisdictions of most of our courts are greater than the Long Island district courts because both Nassau and Suffolk counties have a traffic and parking violations agency.

Indeed, jurisdiction of my court, the White Plains City Court, is the equivalent of not only three New York City courts - New York City Criminal Court, New York City Civil Court and the New York City Housing Court, but also two New York City administrative agencies: The Traffic Violations Bureau and Department of Finance Parking Tickets Services.

Judges of the Long Island district courts, New York City Civil Court and New York City Criminal Court now earn 93 percent of a Supreme Court justice's salary. Despite adjudicating the same cases as those courts, a full-time City Court judge outside of the city of New York earns just 90 percent of a Supreme Court justice's salary. We City

Court judges perform the same tasks as district court judges and the combination of what the New York City civil and criminal courts judges do. And we are asked to preside over even more categories of cases than all of those three courts.

We believe that fairness dictates that City Court judges should be paid the same as judges of the other courts. Nowhere is this pay disparity more acute and unfair than in Nassau County where the City Court judges in Long Beach and Glen Cove are paid less than their district court colleagues in the same exact county mere miles away.

Finally, the prior court merger proposal of 2022 would have combined city courts outside of the city of New York, district courts, New York City civil courts and New York City criminal courts into a municipal court that would had uniform jurisdiction and duties. Though not enacted, the proposal recognized the obvious - that judges in these four courts should be treated equally.

We respectfully ask that you adopt our proposals as your own. We thank you for your service and efforts.

MR. FAHEY: As former City Court Clerk, I want to thank you for your presentation.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you, Judge. I'm well aware you started your judicial career.

MR. FAHEY: I learned a lot. Thank you, Judge.

MR. COLLINS: I'm welcome to answer any questions the Commission may have.

MR. FAHEY: I'm trying to cut them off. They've been good so far.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Court.
MR. FAHEY: Judge Susan Bisceglia from the Magistrates Association.

MS. BISCEGLIA: Good morning, Chairman, commissioners. I'm Judge Susan Sullivan Bisceglia. It's an honor to be here this morning. I am a town judge in the town of LaGrange in Dutchess County. I'm also first Vice President of the New York State Magistrate Association and I'm representing them here today.

I'm also a past president of the Dutchess County Magistrate Association as well. I've been a judge for about seven and a half years.

I am here on behalf of our organization to fully request consideration of an increase in pay for the judges of county and village courts as it pertains to three areas. One, when they are assigned to a city court part; two, when they are assigned to another town and village court; and three, on the off-hour arraignment court parts.

There are approximately 3,150 judges and justices of the New York State Unified Court System. Approximately 1800 are justices of the town in village courts. I do echo

I'm here with Judge Collins of the city courts as set forth, because many of that also applies to the town and village courts as we are the courts closest to the people. We handle a wide variety of cases from criminal matters that we are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year.

Although we are considered part-time judges and paid by our local governments, typically it's a small fraction of the salaries given to the state-paid judges. Some as low as $\$ 4,000$ a year. As if you can imagine for being available $24 / 7,365$ days a year.

We also sit as accessible magistrates when the Family Court is not in session.

There are many responsibilities of the town and village courts.

When a town and village court judge is assigned to
City Court they, by statute, receive $\$ 250$ per day or $\$ 125$ per half day. When they are assigned to a town and village court other than City Court, they are only paid in the event that if it's a result of a death, disability or other incapacity of a justice in that receiving court or a vacancy in that office.

So, in other words, if you are assigned to that court for a case that there is a conflict -- and that happens many times -- there is no additional compensation
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for the judges.
Also, similarly, in a centralized arraignment part the pay structure is similar: $\$ 250$ per day or $\$ 125$ for half day. If you do the math I'm sure you can see that in comparison to City Court judges I would respectfully request that that consideration that there be a increase in that for our judges.

Town and village judges also, thirdly, should be considered for full retirement. We respectfully request that consideration. Presently, it is based on a percentage of the hours that the judge works. And that also is done on a yearly basis. And the judges may also perform many hours that are outside of court, as I'm sure you can imagine researching cases, rendering decisions.

Town and village courts provide a great service, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. We respectfully request your consideration here today.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here.
MR. FAHEY: Thank you, Judge.
Our next speaker is Adrienne Koch, who is president of New York County Lawyers Association.

Good morning, ma'am.
MS. KOCH: Good morning, Judge Fahey and distinguished members of the Commission.

I am Adrienne Koch, President of New York County
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Lawyers Association. Thank you for the opportunity to testify here on behalf of NYCLA, a bar association of over five thousand members.

Among the core values emphasized in NYCLA's mission statement are promoting the administration of justice, ensuring equal access to justice and advocating for strong independent judiciary. That's why we submitted an amicus brief in Larry versus Governor of New York, in which the New York Court of Appeals ruled in 2010 that the structural independence of the judiciary requires its compensation to be considered independently and on the merits.

It's against that backdrop that I come here today on behalf of NYCLA to urge the commission to recommend steps that will enable the compensation of our state's judiciary to regain and retain parity with that of its federal counterparts.

We believe that such parity is essential in the service of all of those goals as an administration of justice, access to justice and judicial independent.

The impact on administration and access to justice is straightforward.

This Commission's 2015 report noted that the salary of a New York State Supreme Court justice ranked 47th, nationally, among trial courts of general jurisdiction when adjusted for cost of living. Thanks in large part to the
work of this Commission we've come a very long way. According to statistics published by the Natural Center For States Courts in 2023 our cost of living rank is now 12. That's a vast improvement but we respectfully submit it's not good enough for the judges of our state, who we call upon to handle ever increasing dockets with stretched resources and to do so in a way that not only ensures access to judges for our states large and tremendously diverse population but also maintains New York's position as the commercial capital of the world. Adjusted for cost of living, the compensation of our judges lags behind that of their counterparts in Arkansas, Georgia, Montana, Pennsylvania and Utah, just to name a few. Of course, I mean no disrespect to the judiciary of any of those places who undoubtedly deserve every penny they earn and probably more, but given the heavy case loads and complex dockets that our own judges manage they are at least deserving.

There's more.
In absolute terms, without any adjustment for cost of the living, New York's judges are on par with what their federal county parts earned in 2019.
(Continue on next page.)

THE COURT: In 2019 those federal counterparts have received four pay increases then, since then, one for every year. Our state judges now lag far behind. In fact, this commission's 2015 report recommended raises that would fix the salary of a New York State Supreme Court justice at 95 percent of the salary of a federal district court judge and will continue to close the gap from there.

In keeping with that recommendation by 2019 our state judiciary had essentially achieved parity with the federal judiciary. That was great. But because unlike their federal counterparts our state judges have seen no compensation adjustments since then. We have backslid. They are back earning less than 95 percent of what their federal counterparts earn and in some instances it's quite a bit less. We don't want to wax in to the flat lining of judicial compensation that occurred in the years that led up to this commission's creation. But without some urgent intervention we will have exactly that. It's only going to get worse and our judges will fall further and further behind.

Let me add that these disparities are especially acute in New York City where NYCLA has its own home because of the substantially higher cost of living here. We understand the budgetary constraints that brought us to this place. And the commission is quite rightly directed to take
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in to account the state's ability to fund any increasing compensation. But that ability is only one of a number of factors the commission is directed to consider. Another of those factors is the national and federal comparison I mentioned a few minutes ago, another is inflation, which in the last four years has hit levels we haven't seen since the 1970s while our judges have continued to see no salary adjustments.

Indeed since 2018 prices have risen a cumulative total of over 20 percent. We urgently need a mechanism to ensure that judicial pay at least keeps up with the rapidly rising cost of living. Yet another factor the commission is directed to consider is the compensation received by professionals outside of government. I want to pause for a moment on that one.

We all hear about how compensation in the legal profession has skyrocketed and it's literally true that supreme court justices in New York County currently make less than first-year associates at some of the firms that appear before them. We recognize that government service is a high calling that has many non monetary rewards, but at the same time our judiciary must pay competitive salaries in order to continue to attract top talent. This actually brings me back to the third core value of NYCLA that I mentioned at the beginning of these remarks, a strong and
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independent judiciary. Fair compensation, compensation that not only takes careful account of the need to continue to attract and retain excellent jurists in an increasingly expensive world in which more and more is asked of them, but also demonstrates that we actually place a high value on our judges.

That is in NYCLA's view essential to the strength and independence of our judiciary. I want to say one more thing in that regard, it goes without saying that a strong and independent judiciary is indispensable to the rule of law, which in turn is vital to our democracy. But that is even more true now than it was when this commission completed its last report in 2020. In recent years we've seen judges both across the country and right here in New York come under personal attack, not only with criticisms that are at times vitriolic and against which judges are ethically prohibited from defending themselves but also with actual threats to their safety and the safety of their families.

NYCLA's own voice has been loud among those that seek to defend and support them with words. And we believe that this is important. But this commission now has an opportunity to defend and support New York's judges with more than just words. We strongly urge that perhaps more than ever it's critical to our democracy that judges be
fairly compensated and that the commission should take steps towards that end by restoring pay parity between the judges of our own courts and their federal counterparts and ensuring that we retain such parity going forward -- to be heard on these critical issues and for the important work the commission is doing and I'll also quickly add that we have submitted a written version of this testimony that contains lots of foot notes with source materials -- I've cited here.

MR. FAHEY: But what $I$ really like is it's exactly 11:30; you hit it right on the button. We're going to recess for ten minutes. Our next speaker is John Zoll.

MR. KOVNER: I just want to tell you, thank you for submitting your testimony in advance so we could review it before this meeting.

MS. KOCH: Oh, my pleasure.
MR. FAHEY: Brief recess. Ten minutes.
(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

*     *         *             * 

MR. FAHEY: Please be seated. Our next speaker is Judge John Zoll president of the association of criminal court judges in the City of New York. Good morning, Judge. Good afternoon, I guess, almost.

MR. ZOLL: I think it is good morning, Judge Fahey and to the rest of the members of the commission, thank you
for allowing me two or three minutes to address the commission on a fairly --

MR. FAHEY: That is music to our ears, Judge.
MR. ZOLL: -- on a fairly specific topic. If you want to just grant it I'll just walk away. So my name is John Zoll. I'm an acting Supreme Court justice sitting in Queens County supreme court criminal term, I'm also the president of the Association of New York City Criminal Court Judges. We represent approximately 120 judges who preside over matters in New York City criminal court and the supreme court criminal term along with my fellow officers, Laura Warden, Mary Benirana (phonetic), Jermaine Auguste. We take great pride in the work that we do.

Some of our judges who sit in criminal courts are elected civil court judges. But the overwhelming number of our judges are appointed by the mayor go through that vetting process and then at a certain point in their career they are hopeful that they are appointed as acting supreme court justices by the deputy chief administrative judge of New York City courts and they would then serve as an acting supreme court justice. At that point they receive the New York State supreme court salary. First let me thank the commission for the important work that it's doing for judicial salary review, second, we very much support and agree with the position of the Office of Court

Administration and our Chief Administrative Judge Justice Zayas and we support a statewide increase in salary compensation for all New York judges on par with the federal judiciary.

We make one additional request for the commission to discuss. We respectfully ask that the commission consider if it does in fact recommend an increase on par with the federal judiciary that it keep the existing differential, dollar differential not percentage differential between supreme court judge pay and criminal court judge pay which at this point is $\$ 14,700$. So we ask the commission to consider this. I think the exact amount would be 93.68 percent in differences. I make these, this request because judges of the criminal court work as hard I believe as any judge in the state or any other judges in the state; having done that, $I$ was in that position for a number of years.

These judges preside over all purpose parts with calendars usually approaching 100 plus cases per day, walk in to a courtroom entirely filled with citizens, defendants, accused people, and their families and they are trying to matriculate those cases, get them done. A criminal court judge is like driving a car, they participate literally in every single case, no one else can adjourn a case for them, they get the papers handed to them by a bridge officer.

They find out what's going on with that case, they engage with the district attorney, they engage with the defense counsel, sometimes they will have to take a plea. Nothing can happen in the criminal court without the judge handling each and every single one of those 100 plus cases a day. They are often asked to do the least by way of -I'm sorry, to do the most with the least amount of resources, sorry. And they will be asked to work night courts and average about seven weeks a year, exceeding almost 49, 50 shifts per year. Presently the percentage difference in salaries is 93 percent. When the first increase went through in 2011 the 93 percent equaled 11,100. That's the difference between the supreme court judge's pay and the criminal court judge's pay.

In 2015 it maintained the 93 percent difference, but that amounted then to what it is now, 14,700 difference. Should the commission -- again, we always ask that they do so, but if the commission recommended an increase to federal parity, now the difference would be $\$ 16,282$. I understand, you know, it's a very respectable salary. We certainly, you know, we agree with that, we know that.

But we just ask that you recognize that over time this really does diminish the criminal court judge's parity with the supreme court judge. To correct this or to fill in the gap to up to 93.68 percent would cost less than $\$ 150,000$
per year just for the New York City criminal court judges who would be receiving that pay. I just want to turn one additional comment, when Justice Weinstein was talking to Judge Zayas about morale, I just want to flow in very quickly that from 2004 to 2010 I was a supervising court attorney in Queens County Criminal Court.

I work for the supervising judge, Judge Deborah Stevens Modica, and during that period as we got in to 2005, '6, '7 and '8 and the financial crisis hit and that was going in to like years nine and ten of not receiving a salary increase, I worked with Judge Zayas, Judge Fernando Camacho, Judge Robert Recede (phonetic), Pauline Mullings, and I literally saw every single judge in Queens County Criminal Court every day during that period of time and to answer Judge Weinstein's question of Judge Zayas morale was at its very, very lowest, yet performance by those judges was at its highest. Performance never suffered, in fact, it increased. But when I asked them to cover multiple parts, to finish calendars in another part and start a bench trial at 4 o'clock, they never said no. They weren't smiling when they said -- but I mean, they always said yes, but they weren't smiling when they said it. And they never said no. But that, again, if there is a denial of an increase in salary we're getting in to that time period again where, you know, judges really become very dissuaded.

Judges back then, they hesitated to call in sick when they were dreadfully ill because of the consequences it would lead to their colleagues in a given day. Anyway, that really does conclude my remarks. We again just ask the court and the commission to consider and discuss the possibility of keeping the percentage difference, differential at 93.68 percent as opposed to 93. Thank you for your time.

MR. FAHEY: Judge, hold on.
MR. ZOLL: Yes.
MR. FAHEY: Just one brief question.
MR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you, Judge Zoll. You
mentioned the night shifts of the criminal court judges. Am I correct too that they are also asked to work weekends?

MR. ZOLL: Weekend nights. So the acting supreme court justices will do what's called AR 4, those are the day shifts but when I was last in criminal court I would do seven nights in a row of, of night court. It would start on Monday I think and go through Sunday -- no, I'm sorry, it would start on Saturday and go through Friday and, you know, seven straight nights and I think I would have to do seven or eight weeks a year, depending upon how many judges are staffed in that particular county. And take the bench at five, done hopefully at 1 o'clock.

If there's more cases that have to be done, as long
as overtime is okay in that particular borough you'd sometimes work until 1:30, 2 o'clock. And I can honestly tell you on Friday night after 12 o'clock on your seventh day in a row it's tough to smile. So that's what $I$ would say.

MR. FAHEY: Thank you.
MR. ZOLL: Thank you all.
MR. FAHEY: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Fran Hoffinger, chair of the New York City Bar Association counsel on judicial administration. Hello. MS. HOFFINGER: Hello. Just about good afternoon. And I've been cutting as I've listened to everybody so -MR. FAHEY: Do your best.

MS. HOFFINGER: I will be hopefully brief and I apologize if I'm repeating. My name is, as you know, Fran Hoffinger and I'm testifying today on behalf of the New York City Bar Association and its counsel on judicial administration, which $I$ chair. The counsel on judicial administration coordinates the work of several of the city bar's committees on issues that impact state and federal courts.

The counsel includes as committee designated members, representatives from the judiciary committee, from the state court's of superior jurisdiction committee, the federal court's committee, the civil court's committee, the
criminal court's committee and the litigation committee. The city bar is a voluntary organization of lawyers and law students founded in 1870 of approximately 23,000 members dedicated to improving the administration of justice. The city bar whose membership includes practitioners from a wide variety of backgrounds and disciplines has had a long standing interest in issues that effect state and federal courts.

I am a practicing attorney and I've been one for over 38 years, having appeared in courts all over New York City and Westchester, maybe once Upstate, including but not limited to state courts, supreme court including criminal term, commercial division, civil IAS parts, matrimonial and guardianship parts, criminal court, family court, housing court, surrogate's court, the Appellate Division and in federal courts in the Southern District and Eastern District of York and bankruptcy courts.

I serve on the judiciary committee of the New York Women's Bar Association and I was an administrator in 2007 and a panel member in 2005 of the New York County Democratic parties independent screening panel for civil court judges. Thank you so much for allowing me to testify today. Instead of focusing my remarks on the statistics that you've heard and will continue to hear and also some of the other things that you've also heard from many of the judges and many of
the other people testifying today, I'd like to just address a somewhat narrow issue of why raising the supreme court -I'm sorry -- the state judicial compensation is so important to creating and maintaining a high level, independent and high performing judiciary.

Simply put, if we want to attract the best, the brightest and the most talented judges we need to do more for them. Raising their salaries is a matter of respect and dignity, the same respect and dignity that we expect them to show to the litigants that appear in front of them and the attorneys that appear in front of them. If the state court salaries do not remain competitive fewer and fewer candidates will seek the position further harming our current understaffing and likely effecting the quality of the candidates who seek to be state judges.

Now, we've all heard and I understand that the state courts' salaries were previously raised to the same level as federal court judges, with supreme court's receiving the same salaries and the criminal, civil, family and housing court judges receiving a somewhat of a percentage less. And that's based on protocols that this commission previously recommended in 2015. But the federal bench received and continues to receive automatic cost of living adjustments, COLA adjustments, increases every year, while state court's judges did not.

So at a minimum the state court judges should be raised and indeed as Judge Zayas said, restored to the same level as those that the federal court judges with automatic COLA increases every year. We should not be putting our state court judges in the position of repeatedly having to come back and ask for cost of living increases. Judges are not paid the same as lawyers in private practice and often take a pay cut when they take the bench and enter public service. They are not expecting to make the same salaries as law firm partners in big law firms.

But those who are the face of justice in the state court should be treated fairly and with dignity and again in the same way that we expect them to treat us as lawyers and the People of the State of New York expect to be treated when they come in before them. Being a state court judge in New York is not easy, and judges routinely handle complex cases involving international businesses and financial transactions, and an enormous docket, family court, housing court, criminal court, consumer debt and other cases that effect the day-to-day lives of New Yorkers.

Furthermore, the people served by the New York State courts are varied and economically and racially diverse and many New Yorkers appear in court pro se, which means that not only do the judges managing heavy dockets have to do their own work but they also have to help
shepherd individuals through the court system without the assistance of counsel. Raising state court judicial salaries back up to the -- to the level of federal court salaries and adding an annual COLA increase by doing that we were letting the judges know that the people of the State of New York highly value their public service, and believe they should be compensated appropriately. I've also been told that the judges' benefits such as medical and dental coverage right now cover less than they did in the past, probably because of rising healthcare costs and particularly in New York City.

Anecdotally I learned one judge, a single parent who struggled to pay for much needed medical care which wasn't fully covered by her medical care as well as to pay for the college costs for her child. As you've heard, and as you know, of course judges in New York do not get location pay as the court attorneys do. And the rising cost of living due to inflation especially in New York City makes it more and more difficult.

So at the very least we should do what this commission recommended in 2015, pay the state court judges the same as their federal counterparts and have an automatic COLA increase, which may not have been recommended but we're suggesting that. We're asking for that. We need to let the judges who are doing a good job know, those who are working
hard to address the backlogs, making sure that motions are being decided and trials held without undue delays, treating lawyers and parties who appear before them fairly, you need to let them know that we appreciate them.

Many of our judges worked hard throughout the pandemic, some even doing double duty in covering other parts. I read that a number of judges assigned to the supreme court parts in New York City were covering family court emergencies when the family courts were closed. Those judges handled the backlogs in their own parts due to the pandemic, kept their parts open and running and also took on family court cases. We want to retain good judges and we want to keep on attracting the talented lawyers to service judges. But it is hard to do so if they don't feel that they are being treated fairly.

It's also important to do so to create a level of accountability for those who are underperforming. And raising their salaries will make the state court judgeships more attractive to well-qualified applicants, which will help weed out the poor-performing judges and improve how justices serve in our state courts. There are many other issues in the state courts that need to be addressed not the least of which include raising the number of supreme court judges statewide, addressing issues surrounding diversity and racial equity, addressing the non judicial staff
shortages and working to improve the physical condition of courthouses around the state and particularly in New York City.

The city bar just issued a report about eliminating the constitutional camp on the number of supreme court judges and we have a working group on racial equity in the state court that just issued a progress report and recommendations creating lasting reform in the wake of secretary Jeh Johnson's equal justice report. Both initiatives we hope will lead to much-needed improvements in the state courts.

But today we are here to address the critical need to raise judicial salaries for state court judges. It is a worthy first step and one that can be achieved in our continuing effects -- excuse me -- efforts to improve the state courts. Our judges deserve it. And the People of the State of New York deserve to have judges who are paid fairly. Adopting the recommendations of the city bar to raise the state court judges' salary to the current level of the federal judges with an automatic COLA increase is not only just it is equitable and it is the right thing to do. Thank you very much.

MR. FAHEY: Thank you. Our next speaker is Judge Ellen Spodek, president of the supreme court judges association of the City of New York. Judge.

MS. SPODEK: It's still good morning. I'm not rushing the day. Chairman Fahey, and the other members of the commission, thank you for the opportunity to speak today and provide testimony. My name is Ellen Spodek and I was elected to the supreme court in 2008 and currently serve on the supreme court second judicial district. I am president of the supreme court justice's association of the City of New York. It took over 20 years for a commission to be formed to consider judicial pay independently from the legislature. It was agreed by that commission and this commission's predecessor that the appropriate benchmark for New York State judges is federal judicial paying. And just as an aside initially New York State judges were paid more than federal court judges and the federal court judges look to New York State to determine their pay and somehow that got lost in translation. Despite this agreement actual parity was last achieved in 2019 and even then only fleetingly. The 2019/20 commissions declined to increase judicial salaries in line with our federal counterparts.

By way of explanation they cited fears of budgetary shortfalls and the Covid 19 pandemic. It is worth emphasizing, however, that the commissioner's economic fears did not come to fruition. We also lag behind the salaries of -- I'm sorry, did not come to fruition. In fact, the
state reported general fund operating surpluses at the end of 2020 and 2022. As a result of the commission's inactions New York State judges' compensation has remained frozen for four years.

Once again, our salaries significantly lag behind other state and federal, district court judges with far lower caseloads. We also lag behind the salaries of professionals in government and private practice. This disparity has resulted in a continuing pattern of chasing, temporarily achieving but then not maintaining competitive pay.

This is all against the backdrop of rising inflation and an increased cost of living particularly for judges in New York City. And even though I know that OCA considers Nassau and Suffolk and Westchester Upstate and as a Brooklyn born native I consider Westchester Upstate as well, but I've included them --

MR. FAHEY: Buffalo we don't.
MS. SPODEK: I know. My own geographical shortcomings --

MR. FAHEY: It's all perspective.
MS. SPODEK: So I included them in my comments.
(Whereupon, the following was recorded by Senior Court Reporter, William Leone.)
(Continued on the following page.)

MS. SPODEK: So the 2015 Commission, faced with similar statistic pay raises for New York State judges, recommended the restoration of parity between the salary of New York State Supreme Court justices and that of a Federal District Court judge. The Commission recognizes the distinguished nature of New York State court system and acknowledged that attracting and retaining a well-qualified judiciary depends on competitive judicial salary.

Restoration of parity of federal judges should be achieved particularly because New York is one of the only states that has not seen a judicial pay raise in the last few years. A review of the history of judicial compensation is warranted.

For decades, judicial compensation was used as a political bargaining chip never receiving independent evaluation. From 1977, when the State assumed responsibility for paying judicial salaries for all judges in the state it resulted in increase in pay of those salaries until 1999, a period of 22 years during which time judges received a pay adjustment only five times.

In its groundbreaking decision in Maron v Silver, a case in which the City and State Judges Association both participated, Court of Appeals found that judges were long overdue for a increase in pay and that a different approach to judicial compensation was needed through legislative
action. This decision led to the creation of the Commission on Judicial Compensation.

When the first judicial pay increase went into effect as result of the first Commission report in April of 2012, there had been a 13-year period without any pay adjustment for state court judges. We all remember this difficult time. Many assert that they felt disrespected and dissatisfied by the absence of pay raise for 13 years. A significant number of judges retired and left office due to pay stagnation.

Failure to achieve pay parity at this time would effectively result in a eight-year wage freeze. This would not only devalue the important role that the judiciary plays as a independent and co-equal branch of government, but also deter qualified lawyers from seeking judicial office.

Our performance merits this level of compensation, especially in light of the additional burdens that New York's judges face throughout the pandemic as we dispense justice in each day within courtroom closures and remote operations.

I believe it would be appropriate to discuss numbers and statistics that highlight my argument, particularly, that New York State judges, particularly Downstate, face a crushing docket and should be compensated for their efforts in managing the needs of a severe
overburdened court system in New York City.
There are 176 Supreme Court justices in the city of New York out of 374 in the state. That's authorized by statute to manage New York City's court system. The caseloads in New York City are staggering and increasing in complexity. In one year, 2022, New York's courts resolved more than 2.1 million cases across the state. During that same year the New York Supreme Court managed 314,420 civil filings and close to 30,000 criminal filings. That represented over 840 new filings per judge per year.

New York's Supreme Court justices also handled 152,485 new cases, 34,527 Notes of Issues, 152,762 dispositions and 31,027 settlements. Nearly half of all these cases were filed in New York City.

The success of the specialized Commercial Division also made the New York Supreme Court the designated venue for contract disputes where the parties are not residents of New York. New York State judges' caseloads are nearly double that of the federal counterparts.

Despite the additional workload, New York State judges continue to see wage stagnation year after year.

There continues to be a clear need for judges with the requisite legal training, experience and communication skills to manage and adjudicate the millions of cases filed each year which impact the lives of millions of New Yorkers.

Depriving judges of salary increases for eight years who will return New York to a time when qualified lawyers decline to serve in New York's court system in order to earn higher wages in the private sector. The pay disparities that resulted over time are striking.

Since 2019, federal district courts earned 47,400 more than New York State judges. In the years since 1990, federal judges have earned a staggering $\$ 655,200$ more than New York State judges.

When one ignores the cost of living, New York ranks ninth among all states for judicial compensation. When a adjusted for the cost of living, however, New York ranks 12th within a adjusted salary of $\$ 187,863$.

We all know that inflation and the rising cost of living directly diminishes one's buying power.

Since 2019, when judges last saw pay raises, the value of the dollar had dropped 20 percent. This means that New York State judges have taken the $\$ 35,000$ a year pay cut in real terms since they last received a pay increase. Downstate has particularly been impacted by the inflation. Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens and Nassau Counties, when nearly half the Supreme Court justices sit rank in top 15 most expenses urban areas in country in 2022, with the Cost of Living Index significantly above the national average. Mortgage rates have doubled over the past few years as home
prices have continued to sky rocket. This loss of significant buying power over the last four years should be remedied by this Commission.

While achieving and maintaining parities are a vital importance of our judges, outlays of funds required to do is minuscule in the context of a $\$ 229$ billion in expenditures in the State budget. We urge the Commission to adopt the OCA proposal, that the salary of Supreme Court justices remain at parity with Federal District Court judges, effective April 1st, 2024, and this parity be continued for the subsequent three years until the next Commission is convened.

Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Thank you. No questions. Judge Lebovits, are you testifying? MR. LEBOVITS: I am hoping to testify on October the 31st in Albany, if I may. MR. FAHEY: Sure. You signed up? MR. LEBOVITS: Yes. I sent a e-mail yesterday about that.

MR. FAHEY: That's fine. I want to make sure that I had everybody right on the list. Our next speaker is Honorable Susan Eagan. She is President of the County Associations of the State of New York.

Good afternoon.
MS. EAGAN: Good afternoon.
Commissioners.
Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you today and thank you for volunteering your time to consider this very important issues.

As Judge Fahey has indicated, my name is Judge Susan Eagan. I am an elected Erie County Court judge, Designated Youth Part judge, Supervising Criminal Court judge for the Eighth Judicial District and President of New York State County Court Judges Association.

I am honored to be here today, specifically on behalf of the County Court judges, but also on behalf of all of my Criminal Court judges in the eight counties of western New York. These judges, some elected, others appointed, are highly educated, dedicated and knowledgeable professionals that work hard to serve their communities everyday.

While county courts have both civil and criminal jurisdiction, the bulk of the caseload is criminal, which is intense and emotionally draining. We routinely handle cases involving unspeakable violence and volatile individuals. We are tasked with ensuring that criminal defendants receive the full benefits of their rights as guaranteed by the U.S. and New York State constitutions, while balancing the needs of the victims and society.

It is not uncommon for county court judges to preside over lengthy and contentious trials, consuming all of our time and impeding our ability to meaningfully address the other demands of our caseload.

Many of us have also been designated youth part judges. These cases requires significantly more time and attention, involving new and different hearings and fact-finding determination at the inception of the case. In short, our caseloads are heavy. This is stressful, time-consuming work, often involving difficult decisions about people's lives. The burden of this work is something that we often carry home with us. As well as the requirement that they be on call during off hours for emergency applications, such as search warrants, arraignments and temporary extreme risk protection orders.

Recent legislative changes have added to the load of the criminal bench, requiring us to respond to discovery disputes, bail hearings and parole recognizance hearings. Not to mention pistol permit applications.

Our judges have worked hard to understand the new legislation and apply it in the manner in which it was intended. We have adapted our schedules to accommodate the additional and short notice appearances required for bail applications and recognizance hearings.

Under the new requirements for the pistol permit
applications our judges must personally interview each applicant. In my county alone we had over three thousand pistol permit applications. So I think it is fair to say that across the state there are tens of thousands of these applications pending.

This is an executive branch function that has been placed on the judiciary. And we are doing our best to respond to the crushing volume of these applications. In addition to this traditional caseload, the vast majority of county court judges are multi-hat judges, sitting as Family Court, Surrogate Court and Supreme Court. Many of them are the only Superior Court judges in their counties. They are required to be conversant in virtually every area of law that becomes before the New York State courts.

Quite frankly, county court judges are used to fill the gaps in our judicial system. These, in my opinion, are the hardest working judges in the court system. The work they perform is critical to the individuals appearing before them, but also to the functioning of a civil society. Yet, our work is scrutinized and criticized like no other court in our system.

Topics such as law and order and crime rates are easy fodder for politicians and the media. Articles are written vilifying judges for being too incarcerative and
others for not setting high enough bail. While some might say this comes with the territory, we as judges are constrained to silence. We have traded our First Amendment rights and, in some cases, our personal safety for the common good.

The judiciary is a co-equal branch of government and the institution of the judiciary should receive the respect that it is due.

While I greatly appreciate the work of this esteemed Commission, many believe that it is disgraceful and degrading that we need a Commission such as this. New York State, a leader in this nation in so many ways, should have a system, a better system to compensate judges equitably and consistently, one that does not require us to specifically beg for just compensation.

I am not here today to ask for a raise for myself or my colleagues. I am merely asking for cost-of-living adjustments.

As this panel is aware, cost-of-living adjustments to salaries are made to ensure the purchasing power of a salary by adjusting the salary as the same rate as inflation.

Judges in this state have not received a cost-of-living adjustment since 2019. The inflation rate since 2019 is 19.58 percent. This should not be a political
issue. Cost-of-living adjustments should be based on established and reliable economic factors.

As a illustration, I adjusted my county court salary of 200,400 for inflation since 2019. Relative to the Consumer Price Index it becomes $\$ 167,489.01$. That is a loss of 16 percent. Relative to housing costs, it becomes 24143,601.55. That is a loss of 28 percent. Relative to the $S \& P$ 500, it becomes $\$ 132,063.10$. That is a loss of 30 four percent.

According to the U.S. Borough of Labor Statistics, the 2023 equivalent buying power of $\$ 200,400$ in 2019 is today $\$ 245,045.95$. That is a difference of almost $\$ 45,000$.

Before coming here today I reached out to the judges across the state to ask them how the lack of cost-of-living adjustments has impacted them. And what I heard is that they are not able to maintain their standard of living. They have the same rising costs as everyone else - food, housing, energy, medical expenses, taxes, childcare, college tuition, care for elderly parents.

We all made a choice to become public servants and with that we accepted that we were limiting our earning potential. However, we made that choice based on a certain salary. One that is now discounted by 19.58 percent. We have effectively received a pay cut.

We are people with children, grandchildren, parents
and spouses that depend on us. We deserve a salary that keeps pace with inflation. I am not asking for an additional $\$ 45,000$ a year for County Court judges. I am asking this Commission to give us pay parity with federal judges with guaranteed cost-of-living adjustments every year.

In addition, given the volume and breadth of work performed by the County Court bench, I am asking that County Court judges be compensated at the same rate as Supreme Court judges.

We have a new chief judge. And he has assembled his administrative team. I had a opportunity to meet with some of them and have heard them speak about Judge Wilson's vision for the courts and his leadership style. In my opinion, it is a new day in the New York State courts. There is decidedly different feel, one of optimism and support from administration. Morale is on the rise. I am hopeful that this Commission will choose to support the momentum that Judge Wilson has created.

Thank you for your time this afternoon. MR. FAHEY: Thank you. Our next speaker is David Scher, president of New York State Trial Lawyers Association. Mr. Scher, come on up. MR. SCHER: Good afternoon. And thank you for

## D. Scher

having me. I'm David Scher, President of New York State Trial Lawyers Association, NYSTLA.

NYSTLA has for over 70 years been the largest plaintiff lawyers group in New York advocating for safer and healthier society, to assure access to the civil justice system for those who are wrongfully injured, and to advance the rights and practices of legal representation by the public.

NYSTLA works with coalition partners nationwide on numerous issues to protect the rights of Americans, including consumer organizations, tenants groups, senior citizen groups, antigun violence groups and many other public interest organizations.

NYSTLA members represents victims every day and I mean every day in every single court in New York who have been injured, who've had their personal and civil rights deprived and who are seeking justice.

New York has the finest judges in the nation period. But for nearly a decade, this Commission has not approved a basic wage increase for those who served on the bench. Members of the state legislature, court workers and even the governor have all received raises in the interim. Our judges provide an invaluable public service to our citizens and the tireless work and commitment to upholding the law must be recognize.

In 2019, after a phase of the last salary increase, New York achieved a long sought after pay equity between New York Supreme Court judges and New York State District Court judges, but since then, however, federal judges have been awarded a needed cost of living increases during the time, by the way, record inflation as we know. And our state judges on the other hand have not. We have fallen behind. Indeed, when adjusted for cost of living payment of New York judges state-wide rank behind several comparable states, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Georgia and Arkansas, for example. It goes without saying that New York courts, particularly New York City, adjudicate some of the most complicated, financial, commercial, class action and other cases in the entire country.

It is absolutely essential, and I know we all agree, that New York keep and continue to recruit the top quality world class judges that we have long enjoyed here. We know what will happen if this Commission allows New York judicial salaries to languish. We know because in 2011, after New York State judges had been denied pay raises for a dozen years, the attrition rates skyrocketed, such that nearly 10 percent of our judges left annually. Our judges dedicate themselves to serve the public, even though they can earn top dollars in the private sector. We need to act now, respectfully, to retain talent and give
back to the courts as they give back to the people of our state.

New York State Trial Lawyers Association urges the State Commission to act swiftly and approve a pay raise that provides parity with the federal branch. The Commission must act now in the interest of all New Yorkers who rely on the courts to seemly uphold justice.

Thank you very much appreciate the time. MR. FAHEY: Thank you, Mr. Scher. Our next speaker is Honorable Leslie A. Stroth, President of New York Civil Court Judges Association. MS. STROTH: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Judge Fahey, judges of the Commission.

I am Judge Leslie Stroth. I'm president of New York City Civil Court Judges Association. In 2013. I was appointed to the civil courts Housing Court bench. In 2017, I was elected to the Civil Court, after which $I$ sat in Criminal Court in the Bronx for two years and New York City Civil Court from 2020 through 2021 during the pandemic. I was appointed acting Supreme Court justice in 2021 and will be an elected Supreme Court justice in less than a month. Knock on wood. MR. FAHEY: Congratulations. MS. STROTH: Thank you.

I'm here on behalf of the Civil Court justices to stand besides our judicial colleagues and supporters in urging this Commission to return to the federal benchmark in reviewing and hopefully raising judicial salaries.

As you know, the rest of the judiciary, including Civil Court judges, are directly impacted by your decision regarding the Supreme Court salaries, as all salaries increase the specific percentages of those salary amounts.

I'm also asking that you keep the percentage for civil court judges at least the same as it has been.

Much has already been said here today that I agree with completely but do not need to repeat. What I would like to do is describe for you who our civil court judges are, what they do and how the lack of increase in salaries to keep up with the increase cost of living impacts so many of our judges.

Although, all of our New York State judges are diligent, committed, hard working judges, the judges who sit in the Civil Court, which is frequently referred to as the people's court, are typically the first judges litigants see when they seek justice from the Court. Not only do our Civil Court judges sit in the Civil Court, but we sit often in the Criminal Court or Family Court before we return to the Civil Court. So we have to become proficient in areas of law some of us have never practiced.

In the Civil Court most litigants are unrepresented and they come to the Court as a last resort to resolve issues that they just can't resolve without the Court's help. They come for help with their landlord-tenant issues, consumer debt problems, small claims matters and other matters that affect their every day lives.

Civil Court judges handle these cases, no fault insurance matters, commercial landlord-tenant matters and name changes which impact the very identity of New Yorkers who come from that relief.

Everything that happens in the Civil Court has a direct impact on the lives of New Yorkers who appear there. As many do not have attorneys, they look to the judges to find justice and hoping to be treated fairly and with respect. They're Civil Court experiences will stay with them throughout their lives. And our Civil Court judges do all they can to make sure that those memories, that those experiences are good, that at least they feel that they were heard and treated fairly even if the result isn't what they hoped to achieve.

Most of the Civil Court judges come from lives of public service as Legal Aid or legal service attorneys, public defenders, 18-B attorneys, Assistant District Attorneys, Assistant Corp. Counsel, attorneys with city or state agencies, court attorneys and other areas of law in
which they have dedicated their careers to helping people. And for those not looking up, I was a public defender. We were never paid well, but we didn't do what we did for the money.

When they come to the bench and when we come to the bench the judges bring our public service background, our compassion, sense of fairness in equal justice and that same work ethic we always had as public servants. These judges have among the heaviest calenders of all the courts, sometimes upwards of a hundred cases a day. They work long hours, evenings, weekends, and sacrifice time with family and loved ones to dedicate themselves with this important work.

They also make financial sacrifices, as the salaries they make don't begin to cover the cost of living increases, inflation, mortgages, cost of raising children and many other expenses we have especially in New York City. But, again, we didn't become Civil Court judges for the money.

Even when we came to work every day throughout the pandemic and saw the signs by the elevator every day, signs increasing in number that said how many people in our court buildings had COVID, we kept coming. We did it for the people who needed us, the people who came to our courts even at our own risk and risk of the health of our families.

Civil Court judges often take the bench in debt from their expensive campaigns. It takes a long time to catch up for those just relying on our salaries. Given the work so many of us did as attorneys we don't have savings and investments and most of us have partners who are also public servants. Many continue, even as judges, to live paycheck to paycheck. Most Civil Court judges are sent out of their home counties to work in other courts for two or three years, or four, which often means increased travel costs in spending time to and from work, time away from family.

But Civil Court judges do not complain because they are so grateful and proud to do the work we can for our fellow New Yorkers, many of whom who live below that poverty line. They look at our salaries and think we're rich. How many families could our salaries feed?

Even although the Civil Court judges don't explain and don't ask they are entitled to be paid for the many hours of work they devote to helping New Yorkers have better lives, have piece of mind and find justice. There comes a point when the sacrifice is too much. And many of our best judges decide to leave the bench because they can't afford to send their kids to college, pay the mortgage, take care of their parents and otherwise support the families.

We lose outstanding, dedicated judges to the
private sector regularly and will keep losing them if the salaries don't keep pace with the cost of living especially here in New York City.

Worse yet, there are many qualified attorneys who could add to the richness of the diversity of our city on the bench, but they won't consider applying or running because the salaries are not enough. And they can't count on regular increases.

Even when Civil Court judges consider running for Supreme Court, they have to be sure that they have the resources to do so because of the expensive running and knowledge that they will again be a catchup period when our salaries won't allow us to keep up with cost. That would mean many judges who would consider running and great Supreme Court justices would not be able to do.

MR. FAHEY: Almost time.
MS. STROTH: I'm almost done.
OCA and our new chief judge and administrative judge has repeatedly and publicly announced their commitment to equal justice in the courts, to creating a diverse bench so that all litigants can see someone that looks like them and knows their experiences, be assured of fairness, to know that the bias and discrimination that have muddied the court representation is no longer tolerated.

If we are truly committed to these values and those goals, as I know we are, we have to help judges with many different backgrounds afford to become judges and do the work we love.

Thank you so much for considering my testimony and good luck in this difficult decision. (Continue on next page.)

MR. FAHEY: Thank you for your time. The next speaker is Judge Daniele Chinea. Good afternoon, Judge. MS. CHINEA: Good afternoon. Thank you for your time today.

MR. FAHEY: You're president of the housing court judge's association.

MS. CHINEA: Yes. So that will cut out the first three sentences. Thank you for hearing us this morning. My name is Daniele Chinea. I am one of 50 housing court judges serving New York City and I have the honor of being their president and I am here to speak on behalf of us in support of not only a pay raise for all New York State judges but also for pay parity for our housing court judges.

We currently receive only a fraction of what civil court judges make, 90 percent, and I would like to present to you why I believe that that is not fair or appropriate. I have submitted written testimony so I defer to that for any specifics. I just want to give you a quick update, a quick rundown of how we work. We are a subpart of civil. Sorry. We are a subpart of civil. And our judges are appointed by a advisory counsel which is, which is created by statute and we are approved by the administrative judge of New York State. We serve for five-year terms as opposed to ten years terms as most judges and that is part of why salary is a big issue for us.

We already have a disincentive to applicants and having such short terms. So also getting the lowest pay is sort of a double whammy, if you will. The reasons why I believe that we deserve equal pay is that we handle large-volume cases, 200,000 cases a year approximately, 35,000 motions a year approximately, and that does not even count the emergency applications which we hear every day and make up the bulk of our work.

We are also the only judges charged with maintaining the housing stock in New York City. That means dealing with housing court violations, building code violations and unsafe conditions for tenants. It also, we are the only people who are trying to keep rent stabilized landlords maintaining their properties despite their financial disincentives, as they would tell you. Housing court is an essential court. So essential in fact that we were told to come back to work in person full time on June 20, 2020 .

We did that as you would know many months before any vaccine was available and despite the fact that there was a moratorium on evictions throughout the state and federally. We were asked to come back and that was primarily to deal with the fact that there were people locking other people out of their homes and there were issues of building maintenance. Every day we seek to strike
a balance between the poorest and the most vulnerable residents of New York City and landlords and landlords themselves are a highly diverse group.

That includes tenants who have taken in a roommate all the way to corporate equity fund owners who own many, many buildings in Manhattan especially. This balance requires constant application of compassion and business understanding. We strive for fairness and decency every day to diverse -- user demographic. Many of the tenants and occupants remain unrepresented despite the rights to counsel bill passed by the city counsel. We, therefore, must always be engaged with and highly knowledgeable of our law.

Our laws change regularly and sometimes drastically. Some examples of that are the 2019 passage of the HRPPA, which revamped much of the rent stabilization quota and some notice requirements. And of course what went on with Covid where much of our environment changed and though we're working through a lot of that now we did deal with a lot of issues of first impression and some of those were litigated before the U.S. Supreme Court. We are statutorily obligated to inform unrepresented litigants of their rights and defenses in every case before agreeing to any settlement between the parties. This can be time consuming and difficult as many of our residents are in a much different educational plain than the lawyers they are
dealing with.
We are singularly charged with trying to maintain balance between a very unequal environment while also remaining compassionate about the realness of eviction. Our lower salaries are an impediment if we want to continue to attract the type of qualified applicants needed for the housing court bench. As you've already heard we are required to remain in the five boroughs, which is fine and totally understandable, but between having lower pay and five-year terms and having to live inside the city we have a lot of disincentives effecting us.

We are hard working judges. We are on the bench 9:30 to 4:30 every day. We have no -- time, we work long hours, we work weekends and it is an emotional court. So having these other disincentives does make it much harder for us to get qualified applicants and we need qualified applicants. We need dedicated people who have a passion for housing. So I do think that we should have pay parity.

MR. FAHEY: Let me wrap it up. Let me ask a question.

MS. CHINEA: Sure.
MR. FAHEY: I'm from -- in many of the courts Upstate it is. So I never served in housing court though. What I wonder is, is right now the housing court judges who are in New York City, housing court judges, the 50 that you
are apart of are they the lowest paid judges in the state court system?

MS. CHINEA: In the city court system.
MR. FAHEY: In the city court system.
MS. CHINEA: I don't know what town and village court judges make part time --

MR. FAHEY: They are apart of OCA. That's what I wanted to know. Thank you.

MS. CHINEA: Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: You're advocating to go to the
93 percent --
MS. CHINEA: I'm advocating that we all get paid parity with federal, but if we are not going to I'd like pay parity with civil.

MR. FAHEY: You want to be included in the current floor for everybody else?

MS. CHINEA: Correct. Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Judge Vincent Del Giudice, court of claims judge's association in part -- excuse me -- paragraph B, D and E judges. Hello, Judge.

MR. DEL GIUDICE: Good afternoon. I'd like to give you a little bit of my background so you have an opportunity to judge my credibility before you, all right. I'm the first generation of my family to graduate law school and this state saw fit to put me on the bench. I've been a
public servant for my entire 43 years of practicing law in New York State.

Although I graduated fifth in my law school class I felt it was imperative upon me to give back to society. I became a prosecutor, for 14 years. Then I became a defense attorney for the indigent and in 2002 I was appointed to the court of claims. For the past 17 years my colleagues have saw fit to have me as the president of their association. Now I represent the 56 court of claims judges that by statute are acting supreme court justices.

And we handle a multitude of civil and criminal cases throughout the state. You will hear from my colleague Frank Milano in Albany who represents the division A judges that handle the lawsuits against the State of New York. Excuse me. For the past six years I've been the judge in charge of the homicide part in Kings County. So I exclusively do homicide cases for all these many years. I just want to give you a personal experience. Having been a judge since 2002 I've lived through the 12-year hiatus of salary.

I am a proud father of a graduate of Fordham law school who when he graduated law school he was hired preadmission in a white shoes firm for $\$ 30,000$ more than his old man made. Well, very happy for my son, but I was very disappointed for my colleagues and myself. Now, I am not
going to bombard you with statistics; you've heard them all. Other people have resources so they can have statisticians do that. I don't, I'm busy trying cases. But I'm here to tell you folks that whatever decision you make has no impact on me, because next year I reach judicial -- and I'll be 70 years old.

So what I am saying here I am appealing to you for equity, that's what $I$ want, equity, not for me, but for my colleagues that come behind me, and for the people of this state, all right. Without keeping up with the cost of living increases, all right, we are consistently in a catch-up moment. Never made up the 12 -year deficit that I suffered through. And listen, I did it because I want to serve my state.

That's why $I$ did it, all right. I did it for the last several years and my colleagues without a cost of living increase. So, please, as $I$ will tell the juries as my first boss Marilyn Monroe, the DA in Bronx county told me, do the right thing. Give the judges a cost of living increase so we don't have to come here and beg. It's insulting. I don't mean to destroy your material here. MR. FAHEY: Put it up a little to the left there. MR. DEL GIUDICE: That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MR. FAHEY: Give us just a second. We'll fix it.

## E. Sassower

Our next speaker is Ellen Sassower.
MS. SASSOWER: Elena Sassower.
MR. FAHEY: Oh, I'm sorry, Elena Sassower, our center for judicial accountability. And we have one more speaker after that, Sebastian Doggart.

MS. SASSOWER: May I?
MR. FAHEY: Sure.
MS. BLANK: We'll pass them along ourselves.
MS. SASSOWER: We started with the statute, since seven of you are lawyers, one, a former judge of the Court of Appeals and --

MR. WEINSTEIN: Why don't you speak at the microphone.

MS. SASSOWER: Another one, a 25-year jurist. The starting point is always the statute. Since you have power under the legislative law would you like to swear me in to give probative testimony under oath?

MR. FAHEY: That won't be necessary.
MS. SASSOWER: Well, as I said when I testified in past hearings this hearing has been permeated by fraud by the judges and by the judicial pay raise advocates. And it starts with the statute. So I've handed up the statute, which was enacted through the budget unconstitutionally, and by fraud a ground for challenge. But let's start with the language of the statute, aside from the fact that you were
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supposed to be established as of June 1st, months ago, and you held your organizational meeting on October 2nd. Your charge is adequacy, adequate levels of compensation and non salary benefits. I refer you to Section 2 paragraph 1. I refer you to Section 2 paragraph 2, A, 1 and 2.

Nobody here testified that -- well, inferentially they implied that their salary is not adequate. In order to make that outrageous inference such as Chief Administrative Judge Zayas, who can't afford to buy a new car, since 2013, and his wife also can't afford -- okay, so what -- none of them identified their salaries that they've been making, that they've been paid.

So all of these judges are making upwards of 190, 200, 220, $\$ 230,000$ a year. They didn't identify their salary. And you didn't identify their salary. Because that salary is obviously nobody could look at that salary and say it's not adequate even in New York City. And of course they don't just get salary, they get compensation. You are commissioned on compensation. Compensation is larger than salary, right. Pensions, social security, healthcare, payments, which brings up the package $\$ 20,000$ a year, 30,000. What is it?

You didn't get any testimony about non salaried benefits. And when you put forward your materials in connection with your October 2 nd organizational meeting you
only put them as to salary knowing that that was a fraud. And you knew that the 2011 report of the commission on judicial compensation and the 2015 report of the commission on legislative judicial and executive compensation on which you are relying and pay raise, judicial pay raise advocates and judges are allowed are false instruments.

Because none of those commissions, okay, and the other incarnations examined anything but salary in violation expressly, directly of the statute requiring examination, evaluation of salary, compensation and non salaried benefits clearly made no findings, because they couldn't and raise salary. The judges took and have known since 2011 and all government officials in their highest levels have known that these pay raise reports are false instruments, violative of -- appeals. They are a larceny of the public fisc, but let's go further.

You allowed them to make claims for what they want. They want higher salaries. We all want more money. We all want more money. But that's not your charge to give them what they think they deserve, what they would like, what they believe they're entitled to. Your charge is adequacy and you haven't even inquired about non-salaried compensation non-salaried benefits, apart of them not identifying them identifying the salary figures --

MR. FAHEY: Hold on. Are you okay with that
microphone?
MS. SASSOWER: Yes, I'm sorry.
MR. FAHEY: You're fine. Go ahead.
MS. SASSOWER: Let's go to the factors that you are required to take in to account. The statute requires that you take in to account all appropriate factors including and the six enumerated factors are all financial and economic. But they aren't the exclusive factors. There are other appropriate factors, right. The most appropriate factor, the threshold factor is whether judges are doing their job, okay.

We have a judiciary that's pervasively systemically corrupt at trial, appellate supervisory levels and we are here today because of the corruption of the judiciary going up to the Court of Appeals on which Judge Fahey sat as an associate judge. And the now Chief Judge Rohan (phonetic) sat throwing the case. And I'm going to close by leaving with you the evidence as to which your duty is to make findings of fact and conclusions of law because this case center for judicial accountability against Cuomo et al and the last et al is Chief Judge DiFiore challenged the constitutionality of lawfulness of, of this, of what you are doing, of your violations, of the prior reports.

There needs to be findings of fact and conclusions of law as to what has been going on. That case is Exhibit $A$
as to the corruption that effects the judiciary at all levels. But I'm also going to leave with you where we're at now, B, Exhibit $B$ is the continuation of that case which is center for judicial accountability against Jacob et al and involves among other things complaints that Jacob sat on involving the budget, involving the pay raises.

These commissions and over -- within the jurisdiction of Jacob, the commissioner on judicial conduct, and one of the complaints that Jacob sat on, okay, actually purported to dismiss was a complaint against Judge Fahey and his brethren on the Court of Appeals for their fraud, for their corruption incentive for judicial accountability against Cuomo DiFiore. That case is now the Appellate Division Third Department.

I'm leaving you with the appeal brief so you can see, once again, how the judiciary comports itself when the issue is it's self interest in pay raises and what has been going on. Your duty and you have subpoena power and you must make findings of fact and conclusions of law with respect to the, with what you are charging under the statute, and the evidence. And the evidence in these two major cases broaden the public interest on behalf of the people of the State of New York is wholesale corruption within the judiciary at every level, which is exactly what I said in 2011 when I testified before the commission on
judicial compensation, and I said that the judiciary throws cases by fraudulent judicial decisions and I gave the case file evidence at that time, which was the lawsuit broadened the public interest on behalf of the people of State of New York against the commission on judicial conduct, which was thrown --

MR. FAHEY: Ms. --
MS. SASSOWER: -- by fraudulent judicial decisions going up to the Court of Appeals.

MR. FAHEY: You've gone 11 minutes. Everybody's got ten minutes. I'm going to give you a minute to wrap up.

MS. SASSOWER: Thank you.
MR. FAHEY: Go ahead.
MS. SASSOWER: So I will simply identify what I am leaving you with just as I presented the evidence to your predecessor commissions. I am leaving you with and the original, this is the entire case --

MR. FAHEY: Just leave it there.
MS. SASSOWER: -- against Cuomo DiFiore, with causes of action as to the unconstitutionality, the fraud, the unlawfulness of what has gone on here with respect to these pay commissions, which you are replicating, duplicating, I'm leaving that with you. The original is at the Court of Appeals, subpoena it. I am leaving you with the appellate record in the lawsuit against Jacob, et al, involving
complaints filed with Jacob involving these commissions, this scheme, the corruption and -- involving the attorney general corrupting the judicial process.

Lastly, I don't want you to believe that the corruption infesting the judiciary is only in cases of magnitude such as the cases that I have here presented. I have a, a independent report that $I$ wrote about a family court case out of Monroe County, a mother called me in distress because her child had been taken away from her. And she begged me to assist her.

Without charge I, I examined -- and I wrote a report that was, first, it's a sealed file. I think you should take a look at what goes on, and you should know this is only the first piece of it. But the corruption involving this report at the family court level, at the Appellate Division Fourth Department from which you come, Chair Fahey, you need to take testimony. You have subpoena power. You need to -- you need to examine the corruption in the judiciary --

MR. FAHEY: I'm going to ask you to wrap it up. MS. SASSOWER: Thank you.

MR. FAHEY: Thank you for your presentation.
MS. SASSOWER: Thank you, again, center for judicial accountability, the website is www.judgewatch.org. The documents substantiating my presentation are accessible
from the center link entitled New York's force of law commissions unconstitutionality and fraud in plain sight. MR. FAHEY: Thank you. Our next speaker is Sebastian Doggart, executive director of the families civil liberties union.

MR. DOGGART: Good afternoon, I feel a little like a cockroach on a wedding cake here because I think I'm one of the only non attorneys here, I'm not an attorney. I'm a journalist and a filmmaker and the executive director of the family civil liberties union and independent nonpartisan, nonprofit group assisting families across the U.S. who have been damaged by the court system. The application for pay raises for judges should just be, should not just be denied. There should be a complete suspension on any -- to judges against whom there are legitimate complaints and until effective judicial oversight is introduced.

Now over the last decade the FCOU has presented ample evidence, at least 15 separate reports to see why the New York Unified Court system is causing untold harm to our families. It has done so to the New York assembly, to the commission on judicial conduct, to the chief judge, to the attorney grievance committee, to the OCA and to the inspector general and nothing has been done. Now, all of you but one of the commissioners are attorneys, all judges, right, and --

MS. SASSOWER: Lawyers.
MR. DOGGART: Judges or attorneys. I do question whether this is a reassuring indicator of your impartiality or independence. Does the makeup of this commission really represent the population of New York? Why are there no social workers, no psychologists, no journalists on this commission? What you think are the optics to the public that six of you are zealous members of the Bar Association where we happen to be standing right now?

It's a beautiful building, but the Bar Association is a major engine of the whole judiciary racket and you are charged with deciding whether your fellow bar colleagues should get a raise. Do you really think that holding the commission here helps your credibility? So I ask you at least to put aside your natural allegiance to your fellow bar and to oppose these obscene funding requests and to help establish genuine oversight.
(Whereupon, the following was recorded by Senior Court Reporter William Leone.)
(Continued on the following page.)

MR. DOGGART: Now, in the report that we submitted to you yesterday we warned you of specific judges, agencies and public officials who are simply not doing their job. Worse, they are perpetrating fraud, waste and abuse on the public. And you must, please, use the powers of the pursestring that you have to protect millions of families from our broken judiciary.

Now, opinion polls show that public confidence in the judiciary is at a all-time low. People are not just disappointed.

You heard from Ms. Elena Sassower, as well. They are mad as Hell.

For the last 8 years the Center of Public Integrity has given the State of New York Judicial Accountability and Ethic Enforcement agencies a failing grade of an F. New York ranked 48 out of 50 states, in terms of judicial accountability.

Why?
Well, the organization which is supposed to oversee the New York Judiciary is the Commission on Judicial Conduct, the CJC, which is a sham.

Every facially, meritorious complaint and report presented by private citizens is either completely ignored or dismissed with a boilerplate letter. Its corrupt leader, Robert Tembeckjian, who has ruled the CJC unelected for 19
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years and has employment there for more than four decades That's longer than Vladimir Putin has been in power. Robert Tembeckjian, who has been rewarded with ever rising wages and benefits, he needs to be removed. And the CJC needs to be replaced with a genuine independent oversight body. Without accountability or recommending accountability, you will be paving the way with for more human tragedies.

Five years ago we warned the CJC and Chief Judge DiFiore, whose corruption has now mercifully come to the floor, at the conduct of a rogue Suffolk County judge -MS. SASSOWER: No, she hasn't. MR. DOGGART: She is no longer the chief judge. Hope Zimmerman. It was Zimmerman who willfully ignored the pleas of a mother of her seven-year-old child, Thomas Valva, was in mortal danger. Siding with the father, a NYPD cop, Zimmerman ignored evidence of the child's school and dismissed the mother's petitions. The result was Tommy Valva was put in a freezing garage overnight and died of hyperthermia. If Tembeckjian recommended Judge Zimmerman's suspension earlier Tommy Valva might, might just still be alive today.

We have also repeatedly warned that OCA and the CJC and we now alert this Commission about abusive practices of judges like Douglas Hoffman, formerly the supervising judge
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for the New York Family Court.
In addition to numerous reports of abuse and fraud upon the Court, Hoffman has been sued for sexual harassment by his own court attorney Alexis Marcus.

Now, in a error when we need to believe women, you'd have thought Hoffman had been at least suspended until the outcome of any investigation. Right? Not at all. Hoffman has continued to sit pretty on the bench at $\$ 250,000$ a year salary, ever rising. He's also used some \$2.5 million of taxpayer funds to defend himself from Miss Marcus's allegations.

In the meantime, a habit that he wreaks on family can be seen by all over if you visit his majestic courtroom at 60 Centre Street, he has ruled several years ago now at the beginning of pandemic that a three-year-old girl could not have meaningful access to her father. His crime? He exercised his right not to receive the COVID vaccine.

Now even 18 months after the end of this pandemic this girl still has no unfettered time with her dad. A trial on this matter started up finally after three years a month ago, but it just been postponed to March 2024. Six months away. Justice delayed is justice denied. And the judiciary should not be rewarded for such gross inefficiency.

MR. FAHEY: You'll have to wrap it up. I have you
at three minutes. Three more minutes. Is that enough time? MR. DOGGART: As with many judges, Hoffman shields himself from oversight by closing his courtroom from the public and the press. Just last week he ordered five separate court officers to bar entry from the public to a trial, simply because he knew the FCLU is making a documentary called Unfit to Sit about him.

Why would you continue to bankroll the black -this judge with $\$ 250,000$ a year?

Now, we recommend, ask you to recommend rewards also in a way judges are appointed to the bench. As a man who grew up in the U.K., while a proud U.S. citizen, I find it crazy that judges should be either Republican or Democrat. Britain doesn't have liberal or conservative judges.

The consequences of this politicalization of the judiciary is that defendants like President Trump can easily claim bias when up against a judge whose stated party affiliation is different. And this dangerously undermines confidence in the rule of law itself.

In New York, elections have been funded by the very attorneys who then plan to appear in front of a judge with no public information on what judges actually stand for. We also urge that this body please recommend legislation that brings cameras into our courtrooms. This
is not so much a First Amendment question, as a Second Amendment question. For our Constitution allows us to bear arms to stand up to tyranny. While in today's world is a tragic case of George Floyd shows the most powerful weapon we have is a camera. And that is why cameras should be allowed in our courtrooms, just as the public has accepted that the police need cameras to keep them honest so can you recommend that judges can no longer be allowed to operate in the shadows.

Salaries being requested are obscenely high.
Beyond adequate. They average over $\$ 250,000$ a year including the benefits. That exceeds even the governor's salary. Nothing said in the three hours of testimony I just listened to give any reason why they deserve another payout. So, please, the OCA application for renewed funding should be denied. Insist on independent oversight, cameras in courts and a reform of the procedures appointing judges. Thank you. MR. FAHEY: Thank you. That concludes our hearing for today. Commission will next convene on October 31st, at the New York State Bar Association offices in Albany and information will be on the web-site.

Thank you.

Bar Association v.
October 13, 2023

|  | \$4,000 (1) | accommodate (1) | 48:18;81:9;84:7; | adult (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 52:10 | 80:22 | 112:2 | 13:24 |
| \$ | \$40 (1) | according (4) | additional (7) | advance (2) |
| \$10 (2) | 9:24 | $39: 13,17 ; 55: 2$ | 52:25;61:5;63:3; | 59:14;85:6 |
| $24: 22,25$ | \$45,000 (2) | $83: 10$ | $75: 17 ; 76: 20 ; 80: 23$ | Advancing (1) |
| \$120,000 (2) | 83:12;84:3 | account (5) | 84:3 | 37:2 |
| 39:20,24 | \$5,000 (1) | 5:23;57:1;58:2; | add-on (1) | advantage (2) |
| \$125 (2) | 48:3 | 104:5,6 | 18:3 | $7: 24 ; 41: 7$ |
| 52:17;53:3 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathbf{\$ 5 0 , 0 0 0}(\mathbf{1}) \\ 8: 11 \end{array}$ | accountability (10) <br> 70:17;101:4; | address (11) <br> 7:6:9:1:10:13:13:8; | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { adverse (1) } \\ 6: 18 \end{array}$ |
| \$132 (1) 22:5 | $\begin{gathered} 8: 11 \\ \$ 6.6(2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 17 ; 101: 4 ; \\ & \text { 104:20;105:4,12; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 6 ; 9: 1 ; 10: 13 ; 13: 8 \\ & 24: 8 ; 60: 1 ; 67: 1 ; 70: 1 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 6:18 } \\ \text { advisory (1) } \end{array}$ |
| \$132,063.10 (1) | 22:5,11 | 107:24;110:14,17; | 71:12;79:4;80:3 | 94:21 |
| 83:8 | \$600 (3) | 111:6,6 | addressed (2) | advocate (2) |
| \$14,700 (1) | 28:4;30:15;31:5 | accounts (2) | 25:10;70:22 | 36:13;47:7 |
| 61:11 | \$655,200 (1) | 16:24;44:2 | addressing (3) | advocates (2) |
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| 130,000 (1) | 2 | 2019/20 (1) | 31,027 76 | 6 (1) |
| 31:6 |  | 72:18 | 314,420 (1) | 63:9 |
| 1300 (1) | 2 (5) | 2020 (8) | 76:8 | 60 (1) |
| 4:5 | 65:2;102:4,5,5,5 | 9:22;10:6;48:4,11; | 31st (2) | 112:14 |
| 13-year (1) | 2.1 (1) | 58:13;73:2;87:20; | 78:17;114:21 | $61 \text { (3) }$ |
| 75:5 | 76:7 | $95: 18$ | 34 (3) | $41: 17 ; 42: 1 ; 46: 23$ |
| 14 (6) | 2.4 (1) | 2021 (2) | 17:17;18:3;30:17 | 62 (1) |
| 6:4;16:21;17:14,14; | 21:2 | 87:21,22 | 34,527 (1) | 42:9 |
| 46:6;99:5 | 20 (11) | 2022 (6) ${ }^{\text {20 }}$ (11.21:14.50.12. | 76:12 |  |
| 14,700 (1) 62:16 | 5:13,20;13:19; | 20:11;21:14;50:12; | 34.5 (1) | 7 |
| 15(3) | 14:12;29:8;38:1; 44:18;57:10;72:8; | $2023 \text { (2) }$ | 9:14 | 7 (1) |
| 38:4;77:22;108:18 | 77:17;95:18 | 55:3;83:11 | 35,000 | 63:9 |
| 150 (1) | 200 (1) | 2024 (5) | 357 (1) | 70 (2) |
| 33:1 | 102:14 | 22:4;26:18;32:14; | 42:24 | 85:3;100:6 |
| 152,485 (1) | 200,000 (1) | 78:11;112:21 | 365 (3) | 70,000 (1) |
| 76:12 | 95:5 | 2025 (4) | 52:6,11;53:16 | 38:24 |
| 152,762 (1) | 200,400 (1) | 6:3;22:4;25:3,5 | 374 (1) | 74 (1) |
| 76:12 | 83:4 | 21 (1) | 76:3 | 42:1 |
| 16 (1) | 2000 (1) | 13:20 |  |  |
| 83:6 | 38:21 | 22 (1) | $66: 10$ | 8 |
| 16,000 (1) | 2001 (1) | 74:19 |  |  |
| 38:23 | 38:21 | 220 (1) | 4 | 8 (2) |
| 160,000 (1) | 2002 (3) | 102:14 |  | 63:9;110:13 |
| 33:1 | 38:21;99:6,19 | 23 (1) |  | 80 (1) |
| 17 (1) | 2003 (2) | 32:6 | 63:20;64:16 | 6:6 |
| 99:7 | 11:19;12:3 | 23,000 (1) | 4.1 (1) | 840 (1) |
| 170 (1) | 2004 (1) | 66:3 | 21:6 | 76:10 |
| 46:23 | 63:5 | 24 (2) | 4.6 (1) | 87 (1) |
| 176 (1) | 2005 (2) | 52:5;53:15 | 9:15 | 42:10 |
| 76:2 | 63:8;66:20 | 24.6 (1) | 4:30 (1) |  |
| 18 (1) | 2007 (1) | 38:5 | 97:13 | 9 |
| 112:18 | 66:19 | 24/7 (1) | 40 (1) |  |
| 1800 (1) | 2008 (1) | 52:11 | 18:4 | 9,000 (2) |
| 51:25 | 72:5 | 24143,601.55 (1) | 43 (1) | 38:20;39:12 |
| 1870 (1) | 2010 (2) | 83:7 | 99:1 | 9:30 (1) |
| 66:3 | 54:9;63:5 | 25 (1) | 47,400 (1) | 97:13 |
| 18-B (1) | 2011 (10) | 6:11 | $77: 6$ | 90 (2) |
| 89:23 | 4:10;7:14;8:21;9:8; | 25-year (1) | 47th (1) | 49:25;94:15 |
| $19(3)$ $24 \cdot 6 \cdot 72 \cdot 22 \cdot 110 \cdot 25$ | $33: 1 ; 62: 12 ; 86: 20$ | 101:14 | 54:23 | 93 (6) |
| 24:6;72:22;110:25 19.58 (2) | 103:2,12;105:25 | $26$ | $48 \text { (2) }$ | 49:22;62:11,12,15; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19.58(\mathbf{2}) \\ & 82: 25 ; 83: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 2012 (3) $12: 3 ; 15: 3 ; 75: 5$ | 11:21 | $42: 2 ; 110: 16$ | 64:7;98:11 |
| 82:25;83:23 $\mathbf{1 9 0}(\mathbf{1 )}$ | $12: 3 ; 15: 3 ; 75: 5$ $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}(\mathbf{5})$ | 28 (1) $83: 7$ | $\begin{gathered} 49(\mathbf{1}) \\ 62: 10 \end{gathered}$ | 93.68 (3) 61:13;62:25;64:7 |
| 102:13 | 14:23;15:2;41:15; | 2nd (2) |  | 95 (3) |
| $1965(1)$ $36: 17$ | 87:17;102:9 2014 (1) | 102:2,25 | 5 | 42:20;56:6,13 |
| 36:17 | 2014 (1) |  |  |  |

