

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

A regular meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Tuesday, December 11, 2012 at 10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Lou D'Amaro, Chairman
Legislator Jay Schneiderman, Vice-Chairman
Legislator Wayne Horsley, Member
Legislator Tom Muratore, Member

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Lynne Nowick - Excused

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator Bill Lindsay, Presiding Officer of the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Robert Lipp, Acting Director, Budget Review Office
Gil Anderson, Commissioner, Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Sarah Lansdale, Director of Planning
Justin Littell, Aide to Legislator D'Amaro
Catherine Stark, Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Ali Nazir, Aide to Legislator Kennedy
Paul Perillie, Aide to Legislator Gregory
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office
Nick Paglia, County Executive's Budget Office
Colleen Capece, Budget Office
Rick Brand, Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Gabrielle Skolom, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

BF 12/11/12

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 10:12 A.M.)

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome come to the Budget and Finance Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature, and please rise and join the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance led by our Deputy Presiding Officer, Legislator Wayne Horsley.

Salutation

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. This morning we are going to first go to the public portion. To the Clerk, have there been any cards filled out?

MS. ORTIZ:

There's one being filled out right now.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Frank Boulton. Come on up, please. Good morning and welcome.

MR. BOULTON:

Good morning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Please go ahead.

MR. BOULTON:

My name is Frank Boulton. I'm the CEO and founder of the Long Island Ducks professional baseball team here on Long Island. We play in Central Islip in Bethpage Ballpark, and I know that you have a resolution in front of you today to transfer funds from the reserve fund that was set up originally when the ballpark was built for the long-term benefit of the -- of an aging ballpark. In other words, you know, as -- believe it or not, we're headed into our 14th year with the ballpark and things actually wear out. You know, mechanicals, seats, lights, et cetera.

Now we recently with Super Storm Sandy had an extraordinary event where the ballpark roof blew off, and it's going to cost approximately about the amount of money that you're transferring. I believe it's \$650,000. And whereas I'm sure Statewide Roofing is now up on the roof as we speak today, they would like to get paid. I know that everyone, every municipality across the country, you know, is cash strapped.

My concern here today is yes, there is a pool of money that's \$796,000, but that fund was not really created for an extraordinary event. So I would like to know or urge that we have a game plan to replenish that fund going forward, because there are going to be needs as the ballpark ages, and actually we have started conversation to lay out a game plan for the next six to ten years to look at what's going to need, when it's going to be needed, how we're going to fund it.

There is some good news in all of this, is that the original bonds that were floated are now their -- the principal and interest is waning. So whereas in 2008 the indebtedness -- the debt service on the bonds was 563,000, next year it will be 359,000 and the debt will expire in 2019 at 146,000. So the good news is that there will be a positive variance. The ballpark throws off anywhere from 800,000 to a million a year in the naming rights. And again, I apologize if some of you don't know this, but I think it's important to know. The County gets 100% of the naming rights, so that money goes to the County and we play a lease that's based on success. So anywhere from 800 to a million annually, and that's good. It's been very steady over the course of the last 13 years. So there's going to be a larger positive variance to drawdown from, and I suggest that going forward that we look to those monies to be able to replenish this fund for the long-term health of the ballpark.

Example, and I hope everybody here has visited the ballpark occasionally and seen that we keep it incredibly clean. Over the last 13 years we've only had to tap this fund for somewhere between four and \$500,000 on long-term capital replacements. But going forward, seats that were supposed to last seven years are now in their 14th year. We take care of them, we bought extra parts, we repair the springs. We make sure that every seat is sat in before any of our fans come into the ballpark. We make sure that things are maintained well. We have a full-time staff person in the maintenance department. We make an investment and repair and maintenance every year, and of course we take care of it like a battleship. You know, you start at one end, you keep working around and then you get to the end and you go back the other way. So I'd like to, and I've said this often, that I think that the Suffolk County ballpark, Bethpage Ballpark, is the best maintained County building in Suffolk; one man's opinion. But I'd like to make sure it stays that way for the long-term use.

So I thank you for your time today. We'd be happy to field any questions that you might have, and I hope -- not only -- one of the other things that I might point out and I have to, because that when the roof blew off yes, that needs to be replaced and it is being replaced, but there's also damage. I invested, you know, over \$700,000 in the restaurant and there's some significant damage there. And we have been working DPW and everybody's getting to see what insurance covers what but, again, we're using this fund that is a long-term replacement fund for an extraordinary event, so I just caution that we have a game plan going forward to replenish that fund.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Frank, thank you and I'm sure all of us have been to the ballpark. I know I have and it is very nicely maintained and I appreciate what you do there. The Presiding Officer had a question this morning for you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah. Mr. Boulton -- well, I was going to ask about the insurance. There is insurance that will cover some of this cost?

MR. BOULTON:

That we own? That we have, that the Long Island Ducks --

P.O. LINDSAY:

I don't know. Robert, do we have the insurance on the roof or would it be the Ducks? Or is there insurance?

MR. LIPP:

It's a County owned building. We would have to check into whether or not we do have insurance. We usually self-insure so it's probably no, but we'll check to make sure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I see Mr. Anderson just rising out of his seat. He probably has the answer. Our Public Works Commissioner, Gil Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning. Generally the way it's divided up is the structure would be the County's responsibility. The operational, I mean, things like desks and chairs would be more towards the Ducks. As Robert said, we are self-insured, so it would come out of the County coffers for something structural as the roof. This was a major repair. We are going to apply to FEMA for reimbursement to this, but at this point we need this money to move forward immediately.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And just, Mr. Boulton, I guess you were getting to the point of replenishing this fund by some kind of refinancing of our debt?

MR. BOULTON:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No?

MR. BOULTON:

No, although that's, you know, entirely possible that we would -- you would want to make that investment at that particular time in your building, but I think that what I was getting at is that as the debt, you know, diminishes, as the principal and interest, like any mortgage or any debt service on a bond will go from probably a high of seven hundred and something in the beginning to in '19 down to 146. There is a positive variance on what the ballpark cash flows back to the County in its naming rights and the lease payment that is widening to the positive, to the positive variance. Taking that money so you don't have to go out to the taxpayers, taking that money, having a game plan to apply it towards a game plan, which we are just about talking about the long-term health of the ballpark. I mean, those expenditures.

You can do a couple of things. You can fix the lights now at 90,000 or \$100,000, or you can wait until you have to take the light poles down, you know, and because they are not working at all and change the entire and then have to deal with the different change in the wind loads on the poles and have to build structures, and that's a million dollar job. We priced that out and we priced out what it would cost for the next six or seven years.

We want to stay in front of it, you know, it's important for us to stay in front of it, what we have to fix, when we're going to fix it, how we going to pay for it, how we going to finance it, and I think there's a positive variance that if we're intelligent and we go forward together -- and one of the reasons you don't see me a lot here is because we do have a good working relationship. I'm just here to caution that this extraordinary event, which hopefully FEMA will replenish some of those funds, this fund really, really is for the long-term health. It's when the oil burner goes, it's when --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, but what do we have to do to accomplish what you're proposing?

MR. BOULTON:

First of all, we have to know about it, you know, so that's really my purpose of today. Then we have to say okay, this is a pool of money that we need to tap in today because of this emergency, but we have to be aware that we need this fund going forward to be able to replenish the things that are going to wear out. I mean, you know, like the Commissioner said. If a urinal breaks, I fix it. If the ballpark were to sink, it would be the County's responsibility. Those are exaggerations, but you know, in a case like this the roof blew off. We want to stay ahead of things that we need to fix so we don't have catastrophic events. It's very similar to LIPA and their trees, you know, you got to stay ahead of it.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Frank, let me ask you, and I have a few Legislators that have questions, but just conceptually the County owns the ballpark. You are the tenant.

MR. BOULTON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

And there was this fund, this pool of money put aside. It's contributed to, I believe, by the County over time.

MR. BOULTON:

No, out of -- it's \$90,000 a year that was -- it was set up in the Empire State Development Grant. Empire State Development Grant granted \$14.4 million for the construction of the ballpark. At the time Legislator Carpenter suggested that we create, my words not hers, a sinking fund for the long-term health of the ballpark.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

All right. So what happened is now you have this roof repair, which is an unforeseen repair, but in effect what you're saying is this fund that was set up for maintenance and improvements from normal wear and tear, the money in that account is already planned for and spoken for is what you're saying in effect.

MR. BOULTON:

Well, I think theoretically it's spoken for because, you know, everything has a useful life. We can maintain it, we can try to stretch out, like we have with the seats. I don't think anybody that's been to the ballpark thinks the seats need to be replaced tomorrow. Why? Because we take care of them. But there will be things that just don't live past -- you know, oil burners.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Right. So if you want to maintain a class A ballpark, as things wear out they need to be replaced. And your concern is if we tap into this fund for this unforeseen repair, where does the funding come, or do we have funding in place or are we aware that we need funding for the maintenance and the upkeep going forward.

MR. BOULTON:

I think it's yes to all of those, but I think more or less I'm also here to say I think that if you look to certain things like the debt on the bonds that are rolling off that there'll be a positive variance so we have a source of funding. We just have to understand that it's there and apply it. You know, nobody could see --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Your concern is that down the road if this fund gets mostly exhausted now that we will delay doing the necessary upkeep down the road.

MR. BOULTON:

I think that's a possibility. So, again, staying in front of it makes us all smarter, has a game plan, and we can go forward.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

All right. So you don't necessarily object to using this fund to repair the roof. You just want to know that there will be funding available going forward for the other items that are going to come up. And, Commissioner Anderson, if you would just wait one minute I have a question for you.

MR. BOULTON:

He's quacking. It's like a duck farm.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Oh, is that what it is? I thought you just lost interest in the conversation.

MR. BOULTON:

Not planned, not planned. Gil and I don't have that worked out. No, but all I'm here to do is say, you know, we have been smart, we've done a good job, we want to continue to do a good job. Nobody saw Super Storm Sandy and I'm not opposing that we use this money because it's there and we probably should use it. What I'm saying, just so we all agree, that we need to replenish this fund in the near future and the funding is there if we apply the positive variance. We need to stay

successful to have that positive variance and that's my job. That's where we come in.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Right. I appreciate that you're pointing to a source of funding to replenish, but of course as with most of our funding that flows into the County, General Fund and into the budget, it's accounted for, so to speak. So I wanted to, if I could, just ask the Commissioner a quick question. Gil, would it make sense to perhaps leave this fund intact and do this unforeseen repair as a capital project? Would that make more sense for the County as the owner of the building? Because we do want to have funding available to maintain the status of the park, you know, in excellent condition. It's important to the success of the tenant, which is then important to the success of the County. So would it make more sense to do this as a capital project? Could we do that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I think at this point, because of the immediacy or the urgency of this matter, I mean, there's obviously a gaping hole in the roof. It has to be repaired, it's actually underway now. We need to access the funds right away, and this was really intended as a rainy day fund, you know, something God forbid like this happens. I believe Mr. Boulton's concern is how do we replenish it.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And I think that's something that -- a discussion that has to be had past this on how we get the funds back in there to get the kitty back, you know, to where it is now so -- for the future. If we go through a capital bonding it's going to take, you know, it's going to take a few months to get everything in process and to get everything moving, so my recommendation is we have the funding, let's move ahead and access it now, and then we'll go back and look at, you know, this -- how we replenish the fund itself.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Yeah. And that's really just part of the big picture of the budget itself, where do we find \$600,000 to put back into this segregated fund in our budget.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. But I think as Mr. Boulton pointed out, you know, as we -- and I would -- obviously we'd have to have a discussion with Budget in there, but certainly as the bond is paid off we now have additional funding that could be put towards that. So, I mean, I think --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Well, yeah, but that's all anticipated in the General Fund already.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

This is an unforeseen expense.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

So it's in the mix.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

We would have to find that funding, but it is helpful to know that at least that there is a reduction in debt service occurring.

MR. BOULTON:

I have it here if you'd like to see it.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Yeah, and it's fine, and that there's sources of revenue in the sense that there's the lease payments and the naming rights, I believe, also as a source of revenue to the County.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

MR. BOULTON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Right. So, you that, you know, you can at least justify replenishing the fund because the County is in -- the ballpark is in the black, not in the red, is the point I think we're making here. Or less in the red, anyway.

MR. BOULTON:

No, we're in the black and we have been since day one.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Well, fair enough.

MR. BOULTON:

Which is a point of pride for me and should be for all of us.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Right. So you're not, Mr. Boulton, you're not necessarily opposed to the immediacy and tapping into this fund at this time, but you do want to raise the concern that the fund needs to be replenished if we want to keep the ballpark where we want to keep it. You know, at the level of repair.

MR. BOULTON:

I think that's fair as well as there are other damages inside the ballpark past the roof that we're going to have to address before we throw out a first pitch next year. You know, we're in the process of working with the County and DPW in assessing those damages.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Is there sufficient funding to cover that as well?

MR. BOULTON:

Well, there's \$196,000 left. I do think there is a light issue that we're going to have to address, but, you know, again, that's why the dangers of drawing down too much on this fund, but as long as we do have -- as long as there's a part two to this, you know? There needs to be a part two is what I'm saying today, and before we gut this fund, and I know that's a strong word, gut this fund -- before we deplete this fund.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Uh-huh.

MR. BOULTON:

You know, we need to be smart about -- you know, so there isn't any emergency because, you know, our schedule starts and we play those games. If we lose games because we don't have lights or we lose games because we have other health and safety issues for our fans, well then there's a loss of revenue. And then the loss of revenue, we share revenue so, you know, it has this snowball effect that isn't for the positive. So we want to be ahead of it. That's my real main concern. It's not like oh, we got this pile of money, let's go use it.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Legislator Horsley had a question and then Legislator Muratore.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, just quickly, I think most of it has been answered. Gil, to you I think my question goes you had mentioned just in passing well, I think the seats would go to this fund. How is this determined, how the moneys are drawn down in the future. Who makes that decision? Is it your decision is that Frank's decision, is it a committee, you know --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

When you start getting into that minutiae it almost has to go back to the County Attorney to see in the contract what's ours, what's theirs, and that's what we're working on.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So it is spelled out in the contract. That determines --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There is a line drawn in how you interpret it, yeah.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Where and how the monies are spent in the future.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. In the meantime, as Frank said, what we're doing is we're looking to assess what the damages are beyond just the roof replacement. We're looking, you know, there are interior damages due to the rain getting in. And as we assess what that damage is, we will then also determine, you know, what's theirs, what's ours.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And you bring it to the County Attorney; is that how it works?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe the County Attorney -- we would identify what the issues are and if it's not clear-cut between the two of us we would then bring it to the County Attorney for some type of decision. I don't know the level of detail right now that we're at.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So they are like the arbiter of the sinking fund.

MR. BOULTON:

And luckily we haven't been in front of the County Attorney for this because it's been pretty much clear. I'll give you an example, the flat roof. Now, the flat roof, and we all know flat roofs are always difficult, the water goes somewhere. It happens to actually go into my office.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations.

MR. BOULTON:

Yeah, really, it's been wonderful, and it's been that way for 14 years, I might add, but I have a way of putting pans on the top and, you know, you can deal with certain things. But when it gets out into the public, when it is public health and safety, then we have some issues. But when -- to your point, when you fix a flat roof and it starts to look like a quilt, well then it's time to replace it. It's outlived its life. You know, and we're just about on top of that, you know, and anybody that's been on top of our flat roof --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Are you saying, Frank, that this is fortuitous?

MR. BOULTON:

No, no, not at all. I'm just saying that you can patch something so much before then it becomes somebody else's responsibility, as per our contract, and that's a really good example I think. You can patch it, you can patch it, you can patch it, and then you go you know what? The guys come in who are the professionals --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And then there's a hurricane.

MR. BOULTON:

-- and say this needs to be replaced and we go okay, because we've tried as hard as we can to keep it, and we do. And I think, again, the spirit of cooperation has been terrific. We have a point of pride out there and we just need to keep it going in the right direction.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right. Now, the follow up question to that -- and thanks, I appreciate that comment -- is to you, Gil. Again, is there a commitment that if we do get the big check from FEMA that moneys are going to go back to the fund? I mean, how does that -- how and when is that made, that determined?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's still a work in progress. What will be identified to FEMA is the individual impacts to the County, so there's management costs, there's cost to maintenance and repairs. Similarly, this will be submitted under a project worksheet and if approved, we'll get a certain amount of funding for that. At this point it hasn't been determined. We know we're going to apply for it --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So it has to go back to that if that's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

If the moneys were spent for this purpose it has to go back -- if the check comes in from FEMA because that's part of the FEMA expenses.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, how it comes in as revenue I don't really know, it's just that it would be --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Because I can just see the big check coming in and everyone going well, you know, you want to put it in a sinking fund, I don't know about that. We need it, you know, here, there and everywhere.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. Again, I would defer that question probably to Budget only because is there a revenue line that could accept that fund specifically for the ballpark? I don't know, you know, if that was the case.

MR. BOULTON:

Actually, I have an example of that in Bridgeport. A couple of years ago they had the tornadoes flow through Bridgeport one afternoon. They applied to FEMA and they got the money to fix the ballpark up in Bridgeport and it was dedicated towards that ballpark.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So it does come --

MR. BOULTON:

So, I mean, whether our internal mechanism works that way, but certainly FEMA directed that money to the ballpark.

MR. LIPP:

Those funds should be like -- sort of like regular grant funds as long as it is identified that that FEMA money is for Fund 620, the ballpark. There shouldn't be an issue and you can do a resolution at that time.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So there's no choice, Rob, is what you're saying. If the monies come in and that's where the expenses were against, that's got to be returned to that fund then.

MR. LIPP:

Right.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

It's not arbitrary.

MR. LIPP:

Exactly.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

As long as we have the mechanism, and I know that -- I just received word that, you know, Budget management has committed that any funding we get from FEMA will go back into the appropriate revenue line for the ballpark, so.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Yeah, but then it comes down to a timing question because you have a deadline, you have an opening day deadline, and there's a lot of variables here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Just so -- I mean, we're still, you know, we have approval on the funding from Irene, which was last year, and we still haven't got the actually funding yet. So it's going to take some time.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Yeah. So I think what the point Mr. Boulton is making is that, you know, he understands the urgency and immediacy, fix the roof and, you know, there's a pot of money sitting there, let's use it, but we also -- there has to be a part two, as you say, whereas these other expenses are coming up before the opening day, we need to find funding, whether it's going to be FEMA reimbursement or,

you know, where it's going to come from, and that's going to be an issue we're going to have to deal with. Legislator Muratore, did you have a question?

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes. Well, first of all, Mr. Boulton, thank you for bringing the Ducks to Long Island. I was a season ticket holder for like 11 years, but as my colleagues will tell you, when you become a Legislator you have no social life, you can't get out to ball games or anything like that. And I commend you for your foresight into looking into, you know, having moneys available in future in case we run into situations like this so we don't lose the Duck and we don't lose the stadium. And I hope my colleagues will be listening to you and paying attention and doing what we would like -- you were actually looking at I guess, what, \$600,000 right now to fix the roof? Is that what the cost is, out of the 739,000 or 796?

MR. BOULTON:

I believe the cost is about 650.

LEG. MURATORE:

Six fifty? Okay.

MR. BOULTON:

And, you know, to their credit they're up there, Statewide Roofing is up there working hard to try to put us back together again, you know, through some difficult weather, and they don't even really have a --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They have a contract, but they are doing this on good faith.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yeah, because I think, you know, you are one of the few entities in the County that really brings money into the County, not only from the park, but from everything around it, you know, people stop in the shopping centers there and people go to the restaurants, the hotel. So you are doing a great job and I hope we can really work with you and help you get that stadium back to where it should be.

MR. BOULTON:

Thank you and we will, and we'll work this out. And plus that if there needs to be -- I mean, there's other creative ways, we can think out of the box if the Ducks need to do some repairs and take a -- there's lots of ways we can tackle this as long as we go forward in an intelligent fashion and we continue to work together. And we have, so we should be able to.

LEG. MURATORE:

And this is the way good businesspeople think, and that's why they are successful when they think that way. And hopefully we can start to think that way and be as successful as you are. Thank you for coming.

MR. BOULTON:

And I got to get you back as a season ticket holder.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay, all right. Thank you. Four great seats, right behind home plate.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

All right. Thank you, Legislator Muratore. Legislator Schneiderman had a question, Mr. Boulton.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sure. I'm glad that you have this sinking fund. I just want some clarification, because I understand that you are going to -- maybe this is more for DPW. You are going to go to FEMA to try to get reimbursed for the work. Frank, before you step away, you said there's already some guys out there doing some roof repairs?

MR. BOULTON:

Well, yes. Statewide Roofing is on the job doing some work out there.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

On that flat roof area.

MR. BOULTON:

Not on the flat roof, on the curvature -- you know the roof is curved?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, okay. A different section.

MR. BOULTON:

Yeah. That goes over the sky suites, the restaurant, my office.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And that was not damaged -- that's not part of what --

MR. BOULTON:

The actual roof blew away. It lifted --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Which roof? There's a flat roof and a curved roof.

MR. BOULTON:

The curved roof is what we're talking about right now. We're not addressing --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, that's where the 650,000 is going.

MR. BOULTON:

Right. We're not addressing the flat roof at this point, but we're going to need to, I think we all realize that, in the future. So this is just --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. I got a little confused over that. So that you have guys working on the curved roof now?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

MR. BOULTON:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So, Gil, I guess my concern is this. If we use this money from this contingency fund I want to make sure it goes back. I don't know if you've had an opportunity to inspect the roof. You know, FEMA isn't likely to build us a brand new roof. They basically maybe will compensate for the value of what was lost in putting it back. So this 650,000, is it building us a brand new roof or is it just fixing storm damage?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's putting in a brand new roof.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So how much of that, in your professional opinion, do you think might qualify for FEMA reimbursement?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Hopefully the whole thing. It really is, I mean, it was damaged during the storm. It's storm related. It's certainly justifiable getting the money from FEMA. The question is or I guess the statement that needs to be made is it's going to be a while before we get that funding if we get approved.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

But you think we'll get it all.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, we'll get probably 80 to 90% of it back.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You know, any other improvements such as the flat roof, those could go into capital projects, you know, and be bonded at a later date. Obviously they have to be identified, we have to develop the planning and everything else. This is just an obvious emergency repair to that arched section of roof that was torn off.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The repairs that are being done, I guess that's just to keep the stadium operational that's being done right now, Frank, the roof repairs?

MR. BOULTON:

Yes. Actually, every night we have to cover everything over with baggies and I've had to move my desk and the restaurant now you could -- you can't today because they're concentrated there, you could see the sky. And also in the sky boxes you can see the sky. The whole roof -- you know, I'm not sure if the entire roof is being replaced. I think like 80% of it is. So, you know, 80%, is that the whole roof? It's pretty much the whole roof.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Who is paying the repair company that's out there now, is that the County or is it you guys?

MR. BOULTON:

It will be the County.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The County. Okay, and that's part of that 650 then.

MR. BOULTON:

That's why this is necessary.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. I understand.

MR. BOULTON:

You know, again, it's just a matter of knowing that this is an extraordinary situation. Here's this

pool of money. This money, by the way, was put into place by the grant, the Empire State Development Grant. If you look back to \$14.4 million, one of the ways Suffolk County got that grant was to pledge that they would, in fact, put this \$90,000 aside in this fund that would be created as a, my words, sinking fund for the long-term health of the ballpark, to protect their investment as well, which is very understandable I would think.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is that 650, that is an estimate from the company that's currently doing the work out there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The 650, is that -- the 650,000, is that the estimate from the company that's currently working there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gil, does that have to be competitively bid or not?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

These are our annual contractors. We've gone out to bids, basically it's a T&M contract. It's for situations like this where we have immediate need, you know, again, the roof blows off of this building. You know, we got to get somebody in right away, we can't go -- so we have contracts with roofers, with --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Gil, can you just step up to the mike, please. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Oh, sorry. We have, you know, contracts with -- annual contracts with roofers, general contractors, electrical contractors, plumbing contractors, so that when situations like this arise we can address them right away.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's like a requirements type of contract.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Anything you'd like to add in conclusion, Mr. Boulton?

MR. BOULTON:

No, just thank you for your cooperation and looking forward to many more years of Ducks baseball at the ballpark.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Same here. Thank you for --

MR. BOULTON:

And have a great holiday, everyone.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Yes, you too, happy holidays to you as well.

MR. BOULTON:

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Is there anyone else present this morning who would like to address the committee? If not, we're going to proceed to the agenda. I would like to just hold in abeyance for now the first resolution, 1073 of 2012. Also, please note for the record that Legislator Nowick has an excused absence from the committee today.

I'll offer a motion to take resolution ***2215 of 2012, Amending the 2012 Adopted Operating Budget to transfer funds from the Suffolk County Ballpark Fund to repair storm related damages to the Suffolk County Ballpark (Bethpage Stadium)(Co. Exec.)***, take that out of order.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. The bill is now before the committee. Legislator Schneiderman offers a motion to approve Resolution 2215 of 2012.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Second by Legislator Muratore, and I'll call the vote. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***. That resolution has been approved so the repairs, the immediate repairs, can go forward and Mr. Boulton we'll work with you and look forward to working with you on the rest of them.

MR. BOULTON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Thank you. As I said, we're going to skip 1073 of 2012 for a moment. I'll call the next resolution.

Tabled Resolutions

1703-2012, Adopting Local Law No. 2012, A Charter Law to adopt tax policy prior to Election Day ("Taxpayer Awareness Act Part I)(Cilmi). I'll offer a motion to table.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Second by Legislator Lindsay, the Presiding Officer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is***

included in the vote) (Vote: 5-0-0-1)

1704-2012, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to require open deliberations in budget amendment process ("Taxpayer Awareness Act Part 2") (Cilmi). I'll offer a motion to table.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Second by Presiding Officer Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

1705-2012, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to improve transparency and participation in setting spending priorities ("Taxpayer Awareness Act Part 3") (Cilmi).

I'll offer a motion to table. Second by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

1947-2012, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to establish multi-year budget plan (Cilmi). I'll offer a motion to table, second by Legislator Horsley.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

On the motion, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, just really to Robert. I mean, in effect we have multiyear projections. I mean, we don't adopt future budgets, but we do our projections of what our budget will look like going forward.

MR. LIPP:

This would actually provide additional years. For instance, typically in March, so let's say March of 2013, we would present our budget model projections through the end of 2015. This would require an additional two years, so it would force us to look further out.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But my point is that we do some of this now. It's just not as far out as he wants to go.

MR. LIPP:

Exactly.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. There was a motion to table pending that has received a second. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

I'd like to also skip over 2083 of 2012 for a moment. Going to Introductory Resolutions.

Introductory Resolutions

2178-2012, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and charge-backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature (Control No. 908-2012)(Co. Exec.).

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman to approve and place on the Consent Calendar. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

2208-2012, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer By: County Legislature No. 375 (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second, and without objection, same vote. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

Now I'd like to go back to Resolution 2083 of 2012. It's the last tabled resolution on the agenda. ***2083-2012, Authorizing the County Comptroller and County Treasurer to close certain Capital Projects and transfer funds (Co. Exec.).***

I believe there is a representative of the County Executive's Office here, is that correct, who would like to address this bill? Hi.

MR. PAGLIA:

How are you doing?

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Hi. Just state your name and title for the record, please.

MR. PAGLIA:

Nick Paglia, County Exec Budget Office.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Mr. Paglia, good morning and welcome to the committee. This bill would closeout certain projects. I believe this is something we do at the end of each year. Did you have any comments or were you here to answer questions?

MR. PAGLIA:

It was tabled. I believe you wanted two projects removed off the addendum and that was done.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

That's been done.

MR. PAGLIA:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Does anyone have any questions of Mr. Paglia? Okay. Then I will offer a motion to approve. Is there a second?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Second by Presiding Officer Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***. Thank you, Mr. Paglia.

MR. PAGLIA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

All right. The last resolution is actually the first on the tabled portion of the agenda. It's Resolution Number ***1073-2012, Amending the 2012 Operating Budget to transfer funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund (Fund 404) and amending the 2012 Capital Budget and appropriating funds for the Village of Northport for Wastewater Treatment Collection System Improvements (CP 8193) (Spencer).***

This morning -- that bill is now before the committee. I believe Director Lansdale is here to address some questions we had at the last meeting, and I believe Commissioner Anderson was here on this also. And it's my understanding that in order to even consider this bill that we are waiting for a recommendation from the Sewer Infrastructure Committee, if that's the correct name of that committee, not that they have any binding authority, but it is a prerequisite to taking action on this bill to get a recommendation from that committee. And I would like to ask either one of you if you could give us an update as to where that committee is and what the timing might be where we can expect that recommendation.

MS. LANSDALE:

Good morning. So I've been asked to give a brief update on the Sewer Infrastructure Committee. That committee was created by Resolution 625 of 2011, which created a seven member committee and members include the Planning Division, DPW, Health, Economic Development, a representative from the Presiding Officer, a representative from the Minority Leader and the County Executive. So we've had several meetings and I'd like to just briefly update you on where we are with things.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

What is the date that the committee was created did you say?

MS. LANSDALE:

August 17, 2011 is when the resolution was signed by the previous County Executive.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. LANSDALE:

So we have reached out and done extensive research as a committee to New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation to look at the 2010 New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Act and look at other models within New York State and other places to create a criteria and a ranking system. That's what the task of the committee -- that's one of the tasks outlined in the law. So we've done that.

We've had several conference calls and meetings with EFC, the Environmental Facilities Corporation. I'm happy to report that at the last Sewer Infrastructure Committee meeting we adopted a criteria, a rating system for potential projects in the future and currently we are working with the Budget Office. There are several outstanding issues that still need to be resolved and we're hoping to do that by the end of this year. Currently we need to look at the longevity of the funding and looking at the future cash flow, and we're also looking at the terms and the financing, and we have a draft application currently.

One to have hang ups of this committee was that there was a lawsuit filed by the Pine Barrens Society and there was concern that making any funding decisions before that lawsuit was settled would bind the County. If we made decisions proactively to fund projects and then we were not -- the lawsuit was not settled, that there could be potential liability that the County would be on the

hook for that money in the future. So that lawsuit was settled this August, August of 2012, and then the work of the committee proceeded with developing actually two rating forms. One for construction ready private and municipal sewer upgrades, sewer system upgrades, as well as the decentralized sewer -- septic system upgrades. The law spells out two areas of priority funding.

So that's -- we're happy to report that that work is complete and now we're just running through the draft application form that feeds -- that's related to the criteria and working through some County and non-County projects and requesting funding so that we finalize and tweak the application, so that it's an application that works. And we'd like to bring that back to the Legislature, both the criteria and the application form, for your review and approval. Gil, did I miss anything?

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Commissioner Anderson, please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I think Sarah's, you know, the detail that she provided basically explains where we're at. We've looked at, you know, both issues, the expansion or upgrade of sewers as well as the, you know, the decentralized septic systems. We've had extensive discussions with EFC and State agencies as well as DEP in the City looking at the UNESCO Watershed Project that they've initiated, how they funded that, as well as projects for similar decentralized systems to the west of the Hudson River. You know, we've done some extensive stuff. There's a few little things that have to be tweaked out and we hope to get that resolved before the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

So we start with an obvious need for sewer projects, upgrades or new sewer systems and infrastructure in place. This committee, in effect, acts as a gateway to those projects. Is that correct? In other words, that because there are so many needs we need to prioritize. And so what you've done after getting over the hurdle of winning the lawsuit, you're now in a position where you've developed criteria. So when we look at all these potential sewer projects, whether it's new or upgrades, this committee can now prioritize that based on a criteria that you've now established and then accept applications from -- for all of these projects, whether they're municipal or even private I would assume, as we're trying to determine where to put our resources, which of course are limited. Is the committee also charged with looking for funding or is that something outside the scope of this committee?

MS. LANSDALE:

The committee is looking at that and we're looking at how we can be stewards of this funding and that's why we've --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

What funding exactly are you speaking to when you say this funding. What funding?

MS. LANSDALE:

The funding in excess of the 140 million --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay, I see.

MS. LANSDALE:

-- right now, and that's why we're working with the County Executive's Budget Office and looking also at the -- we've requested information from BRO looking at future cash flow projections.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Are County projects included in this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They can be, yes.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

They can be.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well --

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

But need not be, is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Generally the criteria would be if we were to expand, I'm just throwing this out, that we would expand a sewer district. Because that isn't contained within the sewer district, it wouldn't be accessible. Essentially you're going to -- if I expanded Sewer District 5 and it's not -- I'm not expanding the district boundaries, but I'm going to create an area outside of it that's going to connect in, that external area could be -- could apply for the funding and access it. Otherwise, if it's within the district it could simply access the Stabilization Relief Funding. So that's the intent. We're looking at where they don't have -- where there isn't access to the Stabilization Relief Fund and the projects are really shovel ready. That's the intent. We want to use that to fund construction. We don't want to study it, we don't want to plan it. We're, you know, really looking to get the shovel in the ground.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. Now, the facility that's addressed in the bill before the committee this morning has been on this agenda for some time, and I don't have all the details. Perhaps Legislator Horsley has a little more information on this, but I know there's a need here that's been identified, I believe through the State DEC if I'm not mistaken.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

A consent order.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

A consent order, thank you. And, you know, that would be something we want to address, but what you're saying is now this is the type of thing or type of need that would have to make an application now to this infrastructure committee and get thrown into the mix and be ranked. Is that the procedure we can expect now?

MS. LANSDALE:

Yes, that's right. That's actually set forth in the legislation itself, that one of the tasks of the committee was to create rules and regulations for the administration of the program as well as to establish a merit based scoring system to evaluate projects, applications for funding, awarding additional points for leverage of outside non-County funding as well as advancing the principals of smart growth.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. And how soon can we expect that a project of this type can actually make that application, submit the application.

MS. LANSDALE:

Well, there's some outstanding issues that still need to be clarified and we hope to clarify and finalize the application by the end of the year. So once that's completed then we'll be in a position to release that for -- as a request for proposals or some formal way of releasing that application so that everyone has an opportunity to apply for the funding.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Right. Okay. Thank you. Are there other questions? Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah. Hi, Sara, and I think that you spoke very well as to the issues relating to the fund and some of problems we've confronted, but I think we should be clear and upfront. The issue that has not been decided, and I think it's fair to talk about our internal concerns, is there is approximately, and we're debating the dollars, but about \$48 million in the fund, give or take. BRO and Budget has, you know, differing opinions on when the dollars will expire or run down and how quickly.

But the question is in like say for instance the situation in Northport. I think that most of the committee members and Legislators agree that there is a serious problem with the Northport system. We'd like to help out, we'd like to, you know, give them a hand. But the question becomes then now does this money, is it a grant or is it a low interest loan, is it a share? That component and that question has not been answered, and that is where I spoke to Sarah last night and that question has to be answered for the, you know, to -- that recommendation has to be made to the Legislature hopefully by the end of this year. That's our goal. And then the applications -- once that decision's been made, I think we're pretty much a go.

MS. LANSDALE:

Yes, we've made tremendous progress on the criteria and the application, but there still are fundamental questions that we hope to resolve by the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

This is funding, if I can just jump in, this is funding that potentially can go to other taxing jurisdictions; is that correct?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

So we need to really think through. It's not like an Open Space Program where we're expending funds but we're getting in return ownership of the property. Here we are providing funding to other municipalities or other taxing jurisdictions, so I guess that broadens the scope of exactly how we provide financing. Is it an outright grant of funds or is it somehow financed, so that's an interesting question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, and it should come back to us to answer that final, that final question, once the recommendation is made. It's fundamental, the word just -- when it rolls off your tongue, Sarah, it sounds so light, but it is fundamental, how this program goes forward. Because we could spend down the dollars. There's like programs like the Ronkonkoma Hub, for instance. Certainly we want to work with the Ronkonkoma Hub, but how much do we give? All those questions have to -- and is it a grant, you know, where do we go with those \$38 million. Because we don't know if those moneys are going to be there into the future and what our goal is, is to start the growth of sewers in Suffolk County. And that's the bottom line to this whole program and it is more difficult than we originally anticipated.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Legislator Schneiderman and then the Presiding Officer.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think it's really important to resolve this question, because if you don't get the money back then it's not a revolving fund, it's going to deplete and we won't have this opportunity again. Two, you have the fundamental questions of fairness. You basically would take -- if you don't get the money back you are giving money to tax districts, lowering potentially their tax because they won't have to pay for the infrastructure improvements, and what you do to one you ought to do for all. There are many of these districts and if all the money goes to one or two it's great for the taxpayers in that sewer district, but it's -- the other taxpayers aren't getting that relief. I think we need to get a policy determined early on this that is fair, that achieves the goal of spurring sewage treatment facilities, but at the same time, you know, is equitable to all of the -- all the County.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, my question to the committee, and maybe some input from the two Commissioners. Why wouldn't we handle this fund like we would handle 477 money where at times, it's rare, but we at times we use 477 money to buy equipment or some kind of infrastructure for a village or a town that shows a need for that equipment in order to maintain the water quality in that part of our County. In that case I don't believe there's a payback program. I think it's a direct grant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well I think with regard to that specific issue there's certainly nothing that says, and it is, I believe the intent of the legislation was to also provide funding if needed for municipalities that did come across similar to Northport, where they have an internal immediate need to make repairs to continue their system's ability to, you know, treat sewage and provide a clean effluent. Now, again, the question comes out do we provide that as a grant or do we give them a low interest, no interest loan similar to the Stabilization Relief Fund. That's still -- and that's what we're kind of dealing with right now. There's been arguments for just going with a grant, there's been arguments for, you know, a low interest loan. Obviously we want to replenish the fund so it doesn't disappear at some point in the future. So, I don't know if that answered your question.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, I could see the argument for replenishing the fund. My fear is, you know, like Northport Village, if it had to be paid back, I don't know whether they'd have the ability to pay it back, and I don't know whether the fund would ever be used.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, our concern right now is to try and get this out there. As a committee we would then review the different projects. Similar to Water Quality Review Committee or as you said, you know, the Farmland Preservation, and then make that recommendation to the Legislature based on -- and, you know, whether it goes in as a grant or a low interest loan and then, you know, the Legislature as a body would make that decision.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Well, that's a very valid point because we're in the business of protecting groundwater here for 30 years through open space acquisitions and other programs and 477 water quality funding. This could be viewed as a matter of public policy, just another component of that. So to give the money directly without a repayment is also something that should be under consideration as part of the County's larger objective for groundwater protection and environmental concerns. So I guess you plan on resolving this issue by the end of the year if you're going to allow applications beginning in the new year, I would assume.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, and I may add that these consent orders, I believe they're coming due -- Northport is not the only one at this point. Riverhead I think has got a monumental tab out there, in which they're not going to be able to finalize as well. I think theirs is like \$18 million, you know, to finish up the work -- to make it more -- to make it consent.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, and this is really in response to the Long Island Sound Study --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And I believe it's either June or July of 2014 everything has to be completed. We're under the same order for our plans.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right, it's to reduce nitrogen and the like. So it's a difficult question. And, you know, I think that, you know, Legislator Lindsay's comments are right to the point. Those are the types of things we should consider, is it a grant. Maybe it's a share. That's where, you know, if you put in two million, we put in two million. That type of thing. Maybe that's the way to go and then make it that two million of ours part of a grant process as long as they've got skin in the game.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, that certainly as part of our ranking that's one of the criteria's that we've talked about is, you know, if you come in with no ability to contribute to the project, you're going to be ranked maybe a little lower than if you come in with a 50% share, I can pay for half the project but I need funding for the remaining half. That gives you a little bit better. Everything is ranked based on priority, based on the situations such as this.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And then on the flip side of it when it becomes a County operation, say like in the process of the -- say the Ronkonkoma Hub, maybe that doesn't pertain to that because this is our moneys. Those are the kind of questions that we're going to have to sort through.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And certainly a recommendation would be provided by the committee and, you know, it would be the purview of the Legislature to change it, you know, as you see fit or agree with it, hopefully.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay. To the Clerk, is there a motion pending on this bill?

MS. ORTIZ:

No, not yet.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

No. Okay. Are there any other comments from the committee or Director Lansdale, Commissioner Anderson? I want to thank you for coming down today and giving us the insight and the status of the Sewer Infrastructure Committee. We look forward to you completing that work by the end of the year. We appreciate that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table.

BF 12/11/12

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Motion the table by our Vice-Chair, Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Second by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Nowick; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

There is no further business before the committee this morning. I'll offer a motion to adjourn. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? We are adjourned. Thank you.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:09 A.M.)