

**SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE
PUTNAM COUNTY LEGISLATURE
CALLED BY THE CLERK AT THE REQUEST OF THE CHAIRWOMAN
HELD IN THE
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512**

Thursday

April 24, 2025

6:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 P.M. by Chairwoman Sayegh who requested that Legislator Jonke lead in the Pledge of Allegiance and Legislator Ellner lead in the Legislative Prayer. Upon roll call, Legislators Gouldman, Addonizio, Russo, Ellner, Jonke, Birmingham, Crowley, and Chairman Sayegh were present. Legislator Montgomery was absent.

Legislator Crowley made a motion to add a public comment section to the agenda items after debate but before voting allowing each member of the public who wishes to speak once for a period of 3 minutes; Seconded by Legislator Russo. All in favor.

Item #4 – Enter Into the Book of Proceedings – Veto of Resolution #108 of 2025 – County Sales Tax Rate to be Established at a Rate of 3.75% was next.

Chairwoman Sayegh stated the Veto of Resolution #108 of 2025 is entered into the Book of Proceedings.

Item #5 – Reconsideration – Vetoed Resolution #108 of 2025 – Putnam County’s Request for the County Sales Tax Rate to be Established at a Rate of 3.75% for the Period from December 1, 2025 through November 30, 2028 was next.

Legislator Birmingham made a motion to reconsider Vetoed Resolution #108 of 2025; seconded by Legislator Jonke.

Legislator Crowley stated she reached out to both the Outside Auditors and Bond Counsel. She read a response she received from Bond Counsel. She stated there are also five (5) letters from supervisors and towns that she would like to discuss, and she believed that it was a poor decision not to work towards a compromise.

Legislator Gouldman questioned why any Legislators would support the reduction in the sales tax rate. He stated by supporting the sales tax reduction you are not listening to the people of Putnam County because a recent survey of residents concluded that 72% of respondents wanted lower property taxes and 19% stated they would like a portion of the sales tax revenue to be distributed to the towns. He stated every town supervisor and village mayor in Putnam County, except for one, has passed a resolution supporting the sales tax compromise. He stated the County recently settled four (4) union contracts, and the Commissioner of Finance Michael Lewis stated this will cost approximately \$2 million over the next year. He stated the Putnam County employee health insurance will increase over the next three (3) years. He stated there are also economic factors outside of Putnam County that we cannot control such as inflation, interest rates, tariffs, and federal government budget cuts. He stated they received a letter from the Secretary of Transportation that stated the United States Department of Transportation distributed

substantial financial assistance to many projects throughout the country including Putnam County, however, if Governor Hochul does not change congestion pricing by May 21, 2025, this funding will be lost. He stated the projected short fall that will occur in New York State is approximately \$6.2 billion in 2027 and \$7.1 billion in 2028 and because of these uncertainties by reducing the sales tax rate can put the County in a vulnerable situation budget wise. He stated the Commissioner of Finance Michael Lewis stated lowering the County's sales tax rate is not fiscally responsible. He stated that as mentioned by Legislator Crowley, our Bond Counsel stated that any action that requires the County to deplete its resources by not ensuring adequate revenue sources would not be consistent with best practices and would not be advisable. He stated sales tax is paid by non-residents and residents. He stated he would prefer to lower property taxes and give funding back to the towns. He stated that he would be voting no on this resolution.

Legislator Jonke addressed Legislator Gouldman's question pertaining to why any Legislators would vote for this reduction in sales tax. He stated the County is holding a significant amount of money in fund balance which is the taxpayer's money. He stated that the County would be collecting more sales tax revenue next year. He expressed his opinion that it is not a good idea to take money from taxpayers when there is a surplus. He stated when he first voted for the sales tax extension in 2017, the unassigned fund balance was \$15.8 million and now it is \$90 million. He stated the total fund balance in 2017 was \$39.7 million and currently it is \$100 million over that amount. He stated sales tax is collected on phone bills, gas purchases, electric bills, retail purchases, car purchases, and more. He stated there has been a dramatic increase in sales tax revenue due to the Wayfair litigation settlement, as well as massive inflation over the past few years. He stated he is voting yes for the 3.75% tax rate. He stated there has been misinformation about the County giving some money back to the State, and this was incorrect. He believed it was time to take a step in the right direction and allow our taxpayers to keep their money by giving them the relief. He believed there was no reason why we could not lower the sales tax rate as well as provide a property tax reduction. However, the greatest beneficiaries of property tax reductions were utility companies and New York City. He stated that the resident's property tax is light compared to the school taxes. He stated there is no reason to continue accumulating money in the fund balance.

Legislator Russo stated the Legislators were elected by the people to make sound and lawful decisions. She stated these decisions should be fiscally responsible and grounded in long-term stability for Putnam County. She stated the resolution to reduce the sales tax in Putnam County from 4% to 3.75% would result in a loss of approximately \$5.3 million in revenue which she believed would result in serious consequences. She stated this reduction would ultimately force the County to increase their reliance on property taxes. She stated we cannot be spending down the County's savings account on capital projects, union contracts, health insurance and expect to continue to have a large fund balance. She stated there have been some opinions that said maintaining the fund balance is gluttony. She believed this perspective failed to acknowledge that the cost of operating expenditures had significantly increased. She stated that many town highway Superintendents and Department of Public Works (DPW) representatives have spoken about the rising cost of materials and equipment over the past few years. She believed the fund balance had appropriately increased with the rising costs. She stated prior to when she took office, the Legislature had made progress on easing the tax burden on the residents, bringing it to its lowest rate in nearly two (2) decades. She stated this was due to the strong economy and competitive sales tax rate that allows us to fund essential services without overburdening homeowners. She stated there is a historic opportunity

that has been presented to us, a compromise supported unanimously by every town supervisor and village mayor in the County. She stated that local government would receive a share of sales tax revenue to address infrastructure issues that directly affect our residents. She believed that in overriding this veto they would be ignoring the voices of the local leaders and risk shifting more of the tax burden back to property owners. She stated she would not vote to override County Executive Byrne's veto. She supported putting the residents first as well as funding the communities fairly.

Legislator Birmingham stated he would be voting to override this veto. He stated we are sitting on the largest budget to fund balance ratio we ever had. He stated the nonrestricted fund balance is approximately \$134 million out of a \$205 million budget. He believed there was room to make meaningful but not a significant reduction in sales tax. He stated he represented District #7 which has the poorest census tracts in Putnam County. He stated sales tax falls upon people who can least afford it and when he voted on things like this, he thinks about all the people including the people who are affected by this the most. He believed the reduced sales tax percentage could make a difference for some of these people. He believed we should strike a balance. He did not think giving $\frac{1}{4}\%$ of sales tax back, which was approximately \$5.3 million, was an obscene amount when looking at a fund balance of over \$134 million non-restricted funds, particularly when the County Executive mentioned in the State of the County Address his proposal of giving the largest real property tax cut in the 2026 budget. He explained that he would be his strongest advocate of that proposal. He believed that Legislators Gouldman, Crowley, and Russo brought up good points regarding the uncertainty about how outside factors may affect the County. He explained that he has been in public service for approximately 40 years and over the years he has seen many ups and downs including recessions. He stated he viewed this $\frac{1}{4}\%$ decrease as meaningful for the people who truly need it. He stated he has been told about a large real property tax decrease but also, he has heard that there is too much doubt about the economic forecast. He questioned which one it was. He stated he was glad there will be public comment at this meeting, and he respected people who have a different opinion than him.

Legislator Ellner stated he did not appreciate the fact that people were not treating the sales tax reduction as well as a property tax reduction as mutually exclusive events. He believed that both could be done. He stated he would vote for a property tax reduction if one was proposed. He stated we are not addressing the question of whether County Government spending was out of control. He stated that we currently have the largest budget in the history of Putnam County. He believed that \$11 million of that budget increase was one-time capital projects. He stated this was not the County's money, it was the residents' money. He stated his personal county tax bill was approximately 12% of the school district bill. He stated that he would vote to override the veto. He believed that the Legislature had lost the ability to agree to disagree, which he believed only created problems.

Chairwoman Sayegh stated she would also vote to override the veto. She explained that, as mentioned by Legislator Gouldman, there were unknown future spending increases for capital projects, insurance premiums, or contracts. She stated these were not undesignated funds and they were budgeted for each year to account for those unknowns. She stated that those were not included in the \$90 million undesignated fund balance which was made up of taxpayer money. She stated we were not stopping sales tax from occurring and the minimal .25% reduction would be meaningful to many residents. She stated this was not the government's money, it was the people's money. She stated that

we were not depleting the \$90 million undesignated fund balance, we were just slowing down the revenue received and keeping the money in the pockets of the people.

Legislator Addonizio stated there were two (2) public misconceptions, one (1) was that the County was giving back \$5 million a year to the State. She stated that this was not true. She clarified that the topic we were discussing at this meeting tonight had nothing to do with sharing sales tax revenue with the municipalities.

Legislator Crowley stated she did have some concerns about this topic. She stated the Outside Auditors have not yet responded and given the Legislature a fiscal report on what were designated and undesignated funds for this year. She stated the Legislators were elected by the people and that was who we represent. She stated there was a poll and it was concluded by this poll that people wanted the funds given back in property tax. She stated the compromise to raise the sales tax to 4%, which historically every Legislature had voted for, could provide several benefits. She believed it would strengthen the towns' ability to improve infrastructure without property taxes increasing and would provide stable and sustainable revenue for the towns. She stated if the sales tax rate decreases the towns will lose the critical funding needed which may lead to budget shortfalls or force the local government to raise property taxes. She stated over 70% of residents were in support of the proposal. She stated the proposed sales tax revenue sharing with equal distribution ensures that the revenue generated allows smaller towns and villages to benefit from this revenue which helps address disparities in resources between different areas in the County. She stated addressing the sales tax rather than that the property taxes would have a minimal impact on the taxpayers. She stated sales tax is considered less of a burden for homeowners because it is distributed to all consumers including visitors to the County. She stated slightly increasing the sales tax can encourage local economic activity, spread the tax burden fairly, help ensure the County's infrastructure, services can support residents and visitors, and help avoid cuts to essential services. She stated that a well-maintained infrastructure is important when it comes to attracting new businesses, residents, and investments in Putnam County. She stated this proposed increase in sales tax to 4% will help keep Putnam County financially responsible and support the needs of the community. She stated she would be voting no on the 3.75% sales tax rate.

Legislator Jonke clarified that he supported sharing sales tax and ARPA funding with the municipalities in the past. He explained that he was talking about how much sales tax revenue we were collecting. He clarified that he has not said anything about sharing or not sharing sales tax with the municipalities. He stated that the County Executive conducted a survey which he believed was not scientific. He stated the survey allowed him to vote five (5) times. He questioned how vetoing a sales tax cut was tax relief. He stated he was concerned that we have too much of the taxpayer's money and we need to stop taking funds from them.

Legislator Addonizio explained that the proposal to share sales tax revenue with the towns and villages that was brought forward by County Executive Byrne would be to share 1/9th of 1% of the sales tax revenue. She stated that each municipality would receive a minimum of \$50,000 in local tax relief. She clarified that the topic being discussed did not pertain to sharing sales tax revenue, which Legislator Jonke mentioned that we were not opposed to.

Legislator Birmingham requested that the audience refrain from raising their voices. He stated he would like to hear what they have to say.

Richard Othmer, Town of Kent Highway Superintendent, stated he spoke with Town of Kent Supervisor, Jaime McGlasson. He stated that since 2020 the cost of paving a mile of a road increased by approximately \$50,000 and the cost of highway infrastructure went up approximately 46%. He stated that the Town of Kent does not have a tax base and they are 70% New York City Watershed. He stated they keep receiving regulations from the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) without any funding. He stated the \$240,000 would allow them to pave approximately four (4) miles of roads and the Town of Kent has approximately 216 miles of roads. He mentioned the increased costs associated with purchasing equipment. He stated this funding would mean a lot to them. He stated although the Town of Kent has a few stores and restaurants, they do not have a town center, therefore, they have no way to collect tax. He explained that without sales tax revenue sharing from the County the issues needing to be addressed by the towns would come out of the residents' pockets.

Chairwoman Sayegh explained that the sales tax sharing topic is a completely different issue. She explained that they were talking about the reconsideration of the vetoed resolution of the 3.75% sales tax. She explained that when the sales tax sharing resolution comes before us, we will have discussion on it at that time.

John Van Tassel, Town of Philipstown Supervisor, stated he encouraged the Legislators to leave the sales tax at 4% and to consider the possibility of sharing it with the towns and villages. He stated that the five (5) Legislators who voted against this, keep bringing up that they have an enormous fund balance and that it should go back to the public. He stated that there is a formula in place to allow the County to share the sales tax. He explained that it would be an enormous bonus for their budget. He stated that the Legislature was very generous in helping his town with an unforeseen water issue. He asked the Legislators to do the same again. He stated at the last meeting Legislator Birmingham stated that he believed in the 3.75% as well as the sales tax sharing.

Jackie Annabi, Town of Putnam Valley Supervisor, stated even though they said the sharing of the sales tax has nothing to do with the reconsideration of the veto, the way she understood this was that the 4% sales tax was combined with the sales tax revenue sharing resolution. She explained that paving, water issues, and other factors like this are funded by property taxes. She stated if the Legislature really wants to lower the property taxes that they should keep the sales tax at 4% and share the sales tax revenue with the towns and villages. She explained that having a high fund balance could harm the County's bond rating. She proceeded to read a letter she sent to the Legislators.

Andrew Jarrett, Village of Brewster resident, believed if the sales tax percentage was lowered, then another source of income would need to be found. He stated there is no reason to lower the sales tax when there are many people from the community who are asking the Legislature to leave it the same. He stated that it was previously mentioned in the meeting that County spending needed to be controlled, however, he believed they were not overspending if they still have excess funds. He stated he would be more concerned if the excess funds were smaller but since there is an excess the Legislature should be looking for a way to utilize this money. He stated he was asking that the Legislature keep the sales tax at 4% so they do not have to worry about not having enough funding later on. He stated the County should find things they can utilize the funds for. He explained that a comment was made about people buying an \$80,000 car. He believed that people buying an \$80,000 car were probably not worried about saving \$200. He believed that \$200 was

not going to stop them from buying an \$80,000 vehicle. He explained over the last year he had found more reasons not to trust some of the Legislators, and he was very disappointed about this. He stated he felt that every time he gets up in front of the Legislature to speak, he gets ignored and he was very disappointed in the Legislative Body. He stated he did believe the sales tax sharing was tied to keeping the sales tax at 4% because if they lower or raise the sales tax then it would lead to the towns receiving more or less funding.

Judith Farrell, Town of Philipstown Council Member, stated she supported the sales tax revenue sharing compromise. She believed there was a lot needed in the towns and villages where this funding could make a huge difference. She thanked the Legislature for holding this public comment session but urged them to listen to the people's statements. She stated the sales tax sharing would mean more to the residents than the small amount of relief they would receive from cut in sales tax. She explained that providing relief for the towns and villages had been discussed for years and this was a unique and historic opportunity for the County to provide this. She requested the Legislature to urgently act on this because she believed there would be cuts coming to all the funding and grants that the County received in the next few years.

John Maasik, Town of Philipstown resident, stated he was appointed to the Philipstown Parks and Recreation Commission over a decade ago. He advocated for the continuation of the sales tax percentage that was in place. He stated it would be important for the County to share the surplus sales tax to improve infrastructure. He stated in Philipstown they have a Recreation Center that was donated to them, but they had to continuously make improvements to it. He explained that the town has not been able to make any substantial improvements to it with the funds they have based on their tax base. He explained that it would really be appreciated if the County could share the sales tax revenue with the towns. He stated during Covid the building was also used county wide because it was identified by the Red Cross to be used as a shelter, therefore, by improving this building it would benefit not only the community but also the entire County. He believed this would only be possible if the sales tax was extended to 4%.

Legislator Addonizio stated the County fund balance surplus sharing program with the towns and villages is an agenda item for the Audit & Administration Committee Meeting on April 28th.

Pat Sheehy, Carmel Hamlet resident, stated she attended Legislative Meetings since the early 1980s. She explained around 2007 the County tried to raise the sales tax to match the sales tax rate of the surrounding areas. She stated it took years for the County to accomplish the sales tax increase because the Governor and State Legislators were opposed to raising sales tax. She believed if the County lowers the sales tax by .25% then they would decrease the revenue the County receives by approximately \$5.3 million. She stated this revenue amount will fluctuate from year to year and if the County wanted to raise the sales tax percentage back to 4% later on, it would be more difficult to get the State Legislature and the Governor to approve the sales tax increase. She questioned why there was a push this year to reduce the sales tax by .25%. She explained that residents would save approximately \$25 per year, which was approximately \$.48 per week which she believed would not make a significant difference. She stated for several years she had asked for revenue sharing specifically with the water and sewer district in the Carmel Hamlet. She believed it was the special districts that truly support the revenue coming in because without the districts they would not have the stores and restaurants in the town. She stated the property owners were paying to support the infrastructure that brings in

the revenue. She stated this revenue helped create the \$90 million surplus that the County was hoarding. She believed it would be beneficial to the residents if this surplus was returned or at least shared.

Stacy Tompkins, Town of Putnam Valley Board Member, thanked the Legislature for putting the sales tax revenue sharing on the agenda for the upcoming Audit and Administration Committee Meeting. She explained that the Legislators have the ability to change their minds and they should listen to the people and what they want.

Ned Rouch, Town of Philipstown resident, explained there were a lot of tourists who visit the town, and these tourists shop and spend money which ultimately helps people living in the Town and the County. He stated reducing the sales tax would reduce the amount the tourists contribute to the Town and County.

Kathleen Foley, Village of Cold Spring Mayor, explained that the minimum of \$50,000 on the compromise was equivalent to the majority of the County Tourism Office's budget. She stated she was glad they were discussing the sharing of surplus at the Audit & Administration Committee Meeting on Monday, but she believed it was cowardly to talk about it on Monday and not have it on the agenda tonight. She explained that the sales tax sharing is calculated by population and Cold Spring is only going to receive about \$50,000 which will only pay for garbage clean up. She stated this is an embarrassing amount of money that we are begging you to share. She explained that for her budget she is not allowed to hoard money like the County does. She stated she would take the funds and utilize it but believed it was a small amount. She believed the County should spend the money on infrastructure and roads to make people's lives better. She stated the towns know what their communities need better than the Legislature. She stated the reason they got where they are is because County Executive Byrne was willing to sit down with the town supervisors and have a conversation with them. She stated the towns and villages have been asking for sales tax sharing for years until they finally received \$5 million through the share the growth instance in 2022. She stated this had many compliance issues and was not very convenient for the Legislature. She questioned if the Legislature could provide a preview of what was going to be discussed at the Audit & Administration Committee Meeting on Monday. She proceeded to read the letter she sent to the Legislature.

Sherry Howard, Town of Putnam Valley resident, stated she would like to speak on behalf of Nick Durante, Town of Southeast Supervisor and proceeded to read a statement from him. He explained his absence from this meeting, as well as last week's conference, was due to pre-scheduled commitments made weeks in advance of these dates. He stated he had not significantly contributed to this matter because he was still evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of a sales tax reduction versus a property tax reduction and which option would benefit residents more. He explained he had not heard any solid sales tax revenue estimates but understood it was particularly challenging to estimate sales tax revenue accurately. He stated he supported the supervisors and County Executive Byrne's stance that the current tax rate should be maintained, and that property tax should be reduced. He stated the towns' budgets are being strained and any sales tax sharing assistance the County could offer for projects within the towns would be appreciated.

Christian Russo, Town of Putnam Valley Councilman, also read a letter on behalf of Village of Brewster Mayor James Schoenig, dated April 23rd to the Putnam County Legislature. He

stated he was in support of allocating sales tax revenue directly to towns and villages. He explained that it was becoming extremely difficult to stay under the New York State tax cap and these funds would help Putnam County communities that struggle to fund their budgets and help ease the burden to deliver essential services for our residents, such as; infrastructure projects, improvements in parks and public safety, among others. He understood the proposal to reduce the sales tax rate is being considered, but he was concerned that reinstating the sales tax back to 4% in the future could prove difficult should the need arise. He explained that visitors from outside of the County would also benefit from the sales tax reduction which would diminish the advantage for Putnam County residents.

Jaime McGlasson, Town of Kent Supervisor, stated she was not aware the public was going to be able to speak, and she had already sent a letter to the Legislature. She proceeded to read the letter. She urged the Legislature to support a fair and proven solution by maintaining the current sales tax rate and returning a portion of that revenue to local governments. She explained that due to a small commercial tax base, the Town of Kent does not have large reserves. She stated that the town relied almost entirely on property taxes which place a heavy burden on residents. She explained that within this funding, essential projects such as paving road, updates for parks, and supporting their newly formed emergency services department would either go undone or require significant increases in taxes for residents. She believed that the sharing of sales tax revenue was fair and directly benefited the people that live here. She believed that together we could build a stronger and more affordable future for Putnam County.

Jake D'Angelo, Town of Carmel resident, stated he listened to the press conference held by the town supervisors and read their joint letter. He believed the main message was to preserve the County tax rate and give the towns and villages their fair share. He stated this proposal gives the residents real relief. He believed that if the Legislature did veto this tonight the public would hold them accountable for putting their future at risk.

Chairwoman Sayegh requested that the letters which were read this evening could be emailed to putcoleg@putnamcountyny.gov.

Legislator Birmingham stated he would like to go over the mechanics of the resolution they have before them tonight. He believed that the vote to override would fail. He stated this is a two-step process and first step was the vote that occurred earlier in the month where the County Legislature and the County Executive request the State to extend or lower the tax rate. He stated after that a bill is created in both the Assembly and the Senate and then the State resolutions are sent back to Putnam County. He stated both of those resolutions are currently not with the County Legislature. He stated currently there is a Senate bill that was introduced a few days ago and it has not received any committee action but there is no companion bill in the Assembly yet. He stated the Senate bill is for the whole 1%. He predicted that the vote tonight would fail and the Legislature would receive the New York State bills to vote on. He read the resolved clause of the resolution before them to override the veto.

Legislator Addonizio stated that she wanted to make a motion to table the agenda item.

Chairwoman Sayegh explained that we were currently discussing and voting on agenda item #5 to consider overriding the veto.

Legislator Crowley clarified that there was currently a bill in the Senate which includes sharing the sales tax revenue with the towns.

Legislator Birmingham stated that inclusion was not mentioned in the bill that he read.

Chairwoman Sayegh called for a Roll Call Vote on the resolution to override the veto.

By Roll Call Vote: Five Ayes – Legislators Addonizio, Birmingham, Ellner, Jonke and Chairwoman Sayegh. Three Nays - Legislators Crowley, Gouldman and Russo. Legislator Montgomery was absent. Motion Failed.

RECONSIDERATION – VETOED RESOLUTION #108 of 2025 - PUTNAM COUNTY'S REQUEST FOR THE COUNTY SALES TAX RATE TO BE ESTABLISHED AT A RATE OF 3.75% FOR THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 1, 2025 THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 2028

RESOLVED, that the County Executive's veto of Resolution #108 of 2025, to establish the County Sales Tax Rate of 3.75% for the period from December 1, 2025 through November 30, 2028, after Legislative reconsideration, is hereby overridden.

Item #6 – Approval – Putnam County's Request for the County Sales Tax Rate to be Established at a Rate of 3.75% for the Period from December 1, 2025 through November 30, 2027 was next.

Legislator Addonizio made a motion to table agenda item #6; Seconded by Legislator Jonke.

Legislator Birmingham stated agenda item #6 was a resolution to go to a 3.75% tax rate for a period of two (2) years instead of three (3) years. He stated this is a different resolution that was vetoed by County Executive Byrne. He stated he is voting to table this because of a technical issue needing the Clerk to sign this resolution.

Legislator Jonke reiterated what Legislator Birmingham mentioned and stated the Clerk was away and he did not believe they could get her signature quickly enough to get it to the County Executive Byrne within three (3) days.

Chairwoman Sayegh explained that another Special Full meeting would be scheduled when the Legislators could be present.

Legislator Gouldman believed this meeting tonight should have been scheduled when Legislator Montgomery could have been present.

Chairwoman Sayegh called for a Roll Call Vote on the motion to table this resolution.

By Roll Call Vote: All Ayes. Legislator Montgomery was absent. Motion Carries.

APPROVAL - PUTNAM COUNTY'S REQUEST FOR THE COUNTY SALES TAX RATE TO BE ESTABLISHED AT A RATE OF 3.75% FOR THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 1, 2025 THROUGH NOVEMBER 30, 2027

WHEREAS, in accordance with Chapter 113 of the Laws of 2011 and pursuant to Resolution #41 of 2011, Resolution #88 of 2013 and Resolution #38 of 2015, the Putnam County Legislature approved the introduction and passage of legislation for the continued authorization of Putnam County's sales tax to be increased from three percent (3%) to four percent (4%) for the period of September 1, 2007, through November 30, 2017; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Resolution #27 of 2017, the Putnam County Legislature approved the introduction and passage of legislation for the continued authorization of Putnam County's sales tax to be increased from three percent (3%) to four percent (4%) for the period of December 1, 2017, through November 30, 2019, however, the State of New York subsequently extended that increase through November 30, 2020; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Resolution #68 of 2020, the Putnam County Legislature approved the introduction and passage of legislation for the continued authorization of Putnam County's sales tax to be increased from three percent (3%) to four percent (4%) for the period of December 1, 2020, through November 30, 2023; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution #46 of 2023, the Putnam County Legislature approved the introduction and passage of legislation for the continued authorization of Putnam County's sales tax to be increased from three percent (3%) to four percent (4%) for the period of December 1, 2023, through November 30, 2026, however, the State of New York subsequently only extended that increase through November 30, 2025, which authorization is about to expire; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Putnam County Executive and Putnam County Legislature hereby support and request the introduction and passage of legislation authorizing Putnam County's sales tax rate to be increased from three percent (3.0%) to three and three-quarters percent (3.75%) for the period from December 1, 2025, through November 30, 2027; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk of the Putnam County Legislature is hereby directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to our State representatives in the State Legislature as well as the Governor and leadership of our State Legislature.

There being no further business, at 7:35 P.M., Chairwoman Sayegh made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Legislator Jonke. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Aubrey Dall, PILOT Intern