

**CONSUMER PROTECTION and GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Consumer Protection and Government Operation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Thursday, **February 6, 2003.**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Cameron Alden - Chairman
Legislator William Lindsay - Vice-Chair
Legislator Lynne Nowick
Legislator Angie Carpenter

ALSO PRESENT:

Paul Sabatino - Counsel to the Legislature
Ed Hogan - Aide to Legislator Nowick
Warren Green - Aide to Legislator Alden
Meghan O'Reilly - Aide to Presiding Officer Postal
Charles Gardner - Director of Consumer Affairs
Joe Muncey - Budget Review Office
Fran Siems - Aide To P.O. Postal
Nicole DeAngelo - County Executive's Office

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

1

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:30 A.M. *)

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Good morning. Welcome to the Consumer Protection Committee meeting, and we'll start with the Pledge, and we'll have Legislator Lindsay lead us in the Pledge.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

We're just going to take one moment of silence for the Columbia Crew.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Thank you. Okay. We don't have any cards, so Charlie, I'm just going to ask you if you can give us a little update on what's going on, like, heating oil supplies and reserves and things.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Good morning. The latest heating oil price survey, which was conducted about ten days ago, we haven't been able to do it, normally we'd be doing it every week, but we don't have enough staff to keep that schedule up. But it has kind of leveled off at a high price, but certainly nowhere near the record highs that we had. We're roughly equivelant to what the price was two years ago. We're about 40 cents a gallon, which is quite a bit, 40 cent a gallon more than last year, but about same levels as two years ago. Gasoline is up. The low for gasoline in the County is about \$1.55, the average is about -- the average is about \$1.69, \$1.70, which is about ten to 12 cents higher than a month ago. So and -- and given the all of the possibilities worldwide, obviously it's anybody's guess. But there are no problems with supplies or anything. We had received a call two weeks ago that one of the largest terminals, which is the old North Hill Terminal in Holtsville was out of fuel oil on Friday. So we made some inquiries, and they were, but it had nothing to do with supplies. It was -- it was that week of the real bitter cold, and they just kind of sold more oil than they were expecting to. And at that time, they had plenty of oil backed up and a harvest coming in, but they were in the middle of a delivery of gasoline which takes about two and a half, three hours. So they had to wait for the gasoline to finish coming through the pipelines. You know, they had plenty of fuel oil right behind it, so they did close for a couple of hours, but it didn't do anything to the market.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

How about that lawsuit that we have, was is it, Turnpike Appliance or something like that?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Active Appliance.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Active Appliance.

2

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Well, we -- it's still on appeal. As you know, they have a new attorney. It's on appeal. The interesting thing is that last week I sent another 31 cases over to the District Attorney's Office. So not

only is he continuing to generate complaints and continuing to work without a license, he's continuing to do what's he's done in the past; shoddy work and overbilling, ectetera. I'm hoping that the hammer this time -- this might be the time that we can really crack down on him, because part of the decision late last year that led do this current appeal was an order by the Judge, essentially a court order, to refrain from continuing to operate without a license. So the case that we are building -- putting together now in cooperation with the District Attorney is besides working without a license, is a violation of the court order. And Judges tend to take that pretty seriously and personally, and they don't really like that.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Good. Charlie, are you seeing an increase in complaints about unlicensed contractors or is that pretty much about the same as it's been all along?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Not an increase, no. But unlicensed home improvement contractors continue to be the number one category of complaints, unlicensed home improvement contractors. But not an increase, no. It's relatively -- as far as the number of complaints that we're getting, it's about flat, which thank -- I have to say, I'm kind of happy about that simply because it let's us reorganize a little bit and get back on our feet. Don't forget we went from 45 to 33 in the office. So the fact that complaints didn't spike is helping us quite a bit.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Now, there's a reserve account, right, that reimburses --

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Restitution fund.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Right. What was the condition of that at the end of the year?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

We're in -- we're in very good shape. In fact, the County audited that fund, and we just got the results, the unofficial results, about two weeks ago. They -- there was one -- one instance where a check was deposited in the wrong account, you know, out of, I don't know, several hundred of them. Other than that, we basically passed the test with flying colors.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Great. Anybody else have any questions?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

And by the way, we're in good shape as far as the balance. If you remember, we increased the restitution fund to pay in to the fund from

\$50 to \$100 a couple of years ago, and we said that we would monitor it and come back if we decided we either had to look at another way of

3

raising funds or increasing it again. But for the past couple of years now, we've been maintaining 100 to \$120,000 in reserves. So we're still in good shape and we see no need to increase that.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Great. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Charlie, that -- just to pick up on that, that fund is used to reimburse somebody that was conned that we can't track down.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Only if the work was done by a licensed contractor. That is one of the reasons we keep harping constituents and consumers to make sure that you use a licensed contractor. I mean, a licensed contractor, it's just like somebody that has a license to drive a motor vehicle, it doesn't mean that you are the best driver in the world. Having a license doesn't mean that you are the best mason or roofer or anything else in the world, but at least if the job get fouled up, and you had that work done by a licensed contractor, then that licensed contractor goes out of business, disappears, moves from the state, whatever and cannot be located or has no assets, the consumer can then access the restitution fund for a refund of up to \$500. It generally takes on the average about six to eight months to get that money back, because they are certain steps you have to pursue. You have to go through out office, the you have to go th Court of Competent Jurisdiction, you have to get an order by the Judge for an amount of money, then I send it to the Sheriff, the Sheriff makes every effort to collect, then the Sheriff gets back to me in essence, in plain English in saying we tried to get the money and the guy's gone, then the consumer gets the money.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I had another question, but I'll --

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

LEgislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Just to clarify, did I just hear you say 500, I though it was 5000?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

If I said 500, I misspoke, it's 5000.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Good. Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

The other thing that -- you were just talking about you loss of staff, and we're glad that you are holding your own. I know we dealt with an issue last year about the process servers, we delayed implementation of that legislation, wasn't it last year?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Yes. We delayed it until July.

4

LEG. LINDSAY:

What's going to happen when that kicks in?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Well, I'm hoping that we don't forget the other part of the discussion. At the time we delayed implementation, and there was, I think if you look back at the minutes, we said that we would revisit the legislation because of the way it is worded, it is totally different from any of the other occupations that we license.

LEG. LINDSAY:

License the servers themselves instead of the companies.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

That's right. And remember that I had a big problem with it as far as being able to enforce it and administer it really, it's the administration of it; the issuance of the new licenses, taking the applications, giving the tests. Remember, there are some tests that have to be completed and passed successfully by the applicants before they can even get the license. And that was when we had a 45 people, and we had a big problem with it, because you're looking at conservative figures of seven to 800 new licenses. Now, that we don't have that 45 people, we went down to 33, we have three clericals thank God just before the end of the year, so we're up to 36. But we did lose the investigators. There are two things -- two points to consider; number one, that legislation as it is written now would require that all people who do this work would have to be licensed, even those who work for someone else. That is absolutely and totally different from any other occupation. If a home improvement contractor who has a license or an electrician who has a license with us, he might employ literally 200 people. Those 200 people do not need a license from us. All of the work that is done by those people goes back, it's the responsibility of the licensee. This legislation would require that everybody gets a license. And I don't understand the purpose of that, I don't see what purpose it serves.

LEG. LINDSAY:

How many companies do you know of in the County that are process servers?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

We were able to identify only about 40 to 50 tops.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So it's a matter of either licensing 40 to 50 --

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Which we could handle.

LEG. LINDSAY:

-- compared to 700.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Which we could not handled. And I fail to see -- this is my opinion, I fail to see the purpose that it serves. We have been operating the office for close to 30 years now without requiring individuals

5

licenses of everybody who, let's say, does electrical work or plumbing work or roofing work. The boss, the guy, the fellow who took the test and passed it, that work is his burden and his responsibility.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Do you know offhand, because I don't recall the legislation, what the fee was for the process server?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Well, now it will be \$200 per, because -- in fact, I brought with me -- thankfully we had the legislation passed, and this one piece of paper now replaces about 14 pieces of paper, because all the fees are uniform now all the licenses. We used to have exceptions and except and but this and but that and, you know, an application was \$25 for this one, bit was \$50 for that, they were zero in some cases, late fees, shelving fees. Now, I have one piece of paper. So the clerical -- regardless of the type of fee, it's all the same. And that was thanks the to new legislation that came through this committee late last year. So it's -- it's \$200 per year. But I have to caution you that the remarks that we made last year were in the context of an office with 45 employees, we now have 36 employees. We were very concerned about being able to implement this legislation with 45 people, obviously with 37 it just exacerbates that concern.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

We have a new representative also Fran Siems is here representing the Presiding Officer, and as this is the Presiding Officer's legislation, I think it's appropriate that Fran is here, and she can actually help us track this and maybe coordinate an effort between this committee, you and the Presiding Officer to either modify this bill or delay the -- you know, the implementation of it in some way, shape or form. But we've got to make sure that you've got enough people to implement it or modify the form.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

I am confident that the office would be able to implement this law if it were the same as all of our other licensed occupations. We could handle 40 to 50 new licenses. We cannot handle seven to 800, because don't forget seven to eight -- it's -- it's -- when you get down the level of people who are working for other people, even if we were able to get over the initial spike, okay, we got 800 licenses, let's say, you now have to worry about every time somebody else is hired. It would be, like, if an electrician had 100 people working for him. It's one thing for that electrician to take the test and get the license. If we had to license the 100 people who work for him, let's face it, some employees work long time -- a long time for some companies, other people work for a month or two and they get fired, and they hire somebody else. Every time somebody came on board that company, we would now have issue a new license. So it's not just the initial licensing, let's get over the spike and then take it from there. It's let's get over the spike, which I don't think we can handle, but then we would have every time somebody quits or moves to another company, we would have to be either renewing with another

6

name, giving him another license, revoking that license. It would be -- I mean, is it doable? Sure, sure it is, but not with the number of people we have it's not.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Perhaps when they consider modifying it and, you know, Fran, maybe you can take this back to Maxine, perhaps there would be some way, because of the nature of what they do and the interaction so -- so clearly with the public and the nature of what's happening, I would imagine that was why the bill was written up to license them individually. But if you change it to the companies, maybe you can require on a quarterly basis that the process server that holds the license must forward a, you know, notrized copy of the employees that they have that are in fact serving summons in the County of Suffolk. And that they have to do this, put the onus on them. At least you have it on file, and maybe you're not having to do anything about it, but at least it makes the guy who has the license feel some onus, some responsibility, to keep, you know, this list current, and as he fires or hires new people that it has to registered, you know.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Well, I would just offer -- I mean, that's doable, but I would just offer this comment that the licensing is somewhat self-policing for the people who work for the licensee. And I'm just speaking with 30 years experience in the license -- because we have been licensing for so long. If there are no complaints and there are no problems, we have to assume that that things are okay. In the process serving business, it would be the same thing. If we started getting complaints from a Judge, from attorneys, from District Attorney, from the County Attorney, whatever, from consumers whether or not somebody is listed on a registree of the owner would be immaterial, because if John Jones was listed for ABC Process Serving Company, or if John Jones was not listed, if he did something wrong, we're going back to the owner of the company. It doesn't matter whether he was listed or not. And if there are no complaints and no problems, well, I mean, go back to the electrician, do I really care who -- who are the hundred people working for the electrician? Not if -- not if we don't any complaints and he's abiding by the law and everything is fine.

LEG. CARPENTER:

But with the process server it seems to me that you could put something, a provision in the law that if the process server company did not, in fact, register the employee and there was a problem, that the fine, whatever the fine is would be doubled.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Yes. We could do that in the sense that that would be similar to -- we have salesmen licenses for, for instance, in the home improvement business, people who go to consumers homes and the don't do the work, they don't do work necessarily, but they were the ones who write up the contracts and complete the sale, they need to have the -- they need to have the salesmen's license. It's not a trades license. So we can have something like that. But again, not even -- even that, Angie, if you got into that with the tremendous number of people -- in other words, if we have to then start issuing some type of card or ID card other than just taking the registree and saying, okay, there it

7

is, these are the people who work for that --

LEG. CARPENTER:

A lot of it is perception. If you are making them feel that there is this legal requirement that they have that they've got to quarterly, you know, forward a notarized listing of their employees, you know, whether or not they've changed, quarterly they've got to update, you know, to keep their license current blah, blah, blah, and that if there is a problem with any of their employees, a complaint, that whatever penalties would be issued would be doubled in the case if

they were found not to have complied with this requirement that says they have to register them. You really wouldn't be involved at all except, you know, you're making them -- the more legal and important you can make it seem, the more they're likely to do it.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Charlie, is the employers required to be licensed as well as the employees?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Yes. For process servers you mean?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Yes, everybody is. Everybody is. Everybody needs a license.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Is there a test involved?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Yes. And besides the test --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Unless we grandfather the 700 existing ones, you'd have to give 700 tests right away?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

That's right.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Holy Christ.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Understand -- understand that we only give about, I think, it's about 400 tests a year now for electricians, the written and the practical, we only give about 400 a year. Remember, when you give a test, not everybody passes, so they are retests and retests. And we work with the people, we set up the boards. When you make a test, you have to have several tests, because you have to keep rotating, you can't just have one test, you have to keep rotating the tests. So you need somebody to come up with multiple tests. Just the administration of those 400 tests -- don't forget we have -- we have an electrical two and electrical one investigators, two of the best people in the country, by the way as far as running that office. We have two people

doing that. So you start talking about issuing a new licenses, that's

one administrative problem, but then you have to give the test, monitor, proctor, mark. And understand, before the test, they have to attend a seminar. So who's going to -- so we've got to give that. They have to have a training session first, then a test, then the license.

LEG. NOWICK:
Charlie.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:
All doable. All doable with adequate staff.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:
Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:
That test for the process servers. If the 700 existing process servers had to be licensed, is there a time frame, say over a period of three or four years, that they have to get their test so they can keep their job, or is this immediate?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:
It's immediate.

LEG. NOWICK:
Then the only other way would be then to make it over a period of years. That might be a consideration.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:
I don't have of the law in front of me. But, no, there's no -- there's no time -- there's no phase-in period or anything, no.

LEG. NOWICK:
We might have to look at that, you know, phase it in. Anybody already existing working in a position, working for a business, you have five years before you lose you -- or however many years.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:
Understand, there's really nothing -- when I say nothing new in the proposal that we either haven't encountered before or do now. So we know -- we can pretty much gage the effects of everything that is or is not included in the proposal. We can say, okay, that mean this, this means that, we don't have this in, we should have. You know, we're very experience in the area. We've been doing it for a long time.

LEG. NOWICK:
I know you are.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

The comments, you know, we have to take them in context. Charlie's indicated that if we just did the companies, he could actually do that, he could give the tests and things like that. And I think Legislator Carpenter's comments and suggestions might work in very well if we require those company just to supply a list of people.

9

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

I just want to take a moment. I know we didn't have a prayer, but I want to thank Legislator Lindsay for his religious comments, sort of like a prayer so. Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

The only down side with going with the companies versus the individual process servers is the revenue. Because if you guesstimate 700 process servers, you're looking at \$140,000 as opposed to 40 companies that would bring in 8000. But then again, how many more staff people would you need to do --

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Of course. And that was not -- but I just want to make a comment. I don't know if somebody else put it in, but we did not put that -- that revenue is not in our budget. That's not part of our -- Joe.

MR. MUNCEY:

Not in 2003, that I'm aware of.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

The County Executive didn't pick that up?

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

No. At the time it was still kind of, you know, being flushed out. That's not -- I didn't put -- I know I didn't, I don't think put -- that revenue is not in the budget. So, I mean, I understand what you're saying, but it's not going to take away from anything that is hard and fast right now where, you know, somebody is saying, okay, we're going to lose that money. There's no money in the budget to lose right now. That's why this is, you know, a good time to act.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Any other comments or questions? And I want to welcome Alexandra, our new Chief Deputy Clerk. Hello. All right. We'll going to the agenda then.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment. I have the lobby traffic

for the year. If you remember we are just finishing up now our process of having all of our almost 14,000 now licensed people have their photo and their signature are now stored in the computer. So we're kind of like up-to-date with a lot of other places where you can now just go in. We have your photo stored, we have your signature stored. We knew that for a two year period, because that's the renewal process -- the renewal time frame is two years, that everybody was going to have to come into the office at least once, but then from from then on for many minor changes, our contractors would not have to come into the office anymore, because we would have this information stored in the computer. We also knew that it would be a serious and significant impact in the lobby. But we were hoping with our fingers crossed that it would -- it would decline.. And it is. Our lobby traffic historically had been about 600 people per month. For the

10

last two years, that increased to as high as 1700 people a month, no new staff understand, no new staff. But for the last six months, it has steadily declined, and as of December we were back down to -- we were down to 1200 people a month. Still double what we were historically. But from the 1700, we peaked and we've gone down every single month. And we expect that by hopefully now, maybe by March, by the time we catch up with the people who just haven't gotten around to doing what they have to do, we should be back down to a much more manageable levels of probably about eight to 900. So it was a prediction that we made a couple of years ago that thankfully is coming true. And I just again want to point out that we did not hire -- there were no permanent or semi-permanent staff hired to handled that. The people on staff took care of that spike. And hopefully we'll smooth it out even more.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Good. Maybe every year like a couple of meeting just update on us on that whether it continues to decline. Good. Thanks.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

(P) 1696-2002 Adopting Local Law No. -2002, a Local Law to toughen fines for item pricing violations within Suffolk County. (ALDEN)

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Okay. Now we'll go the agenda, 1696, it's a tabled resolution. I'm going to make a motion, second by Legislator Lindsay. All those in favor? Opposed? That's TABLED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1952-2002 Adopting Local Law No. -2002, a Local Law to require retail food establishments to disclose salt, sugar, fat and carbohydrate contents to purchasers of food products. (POSTAL)

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

I think Legislator -- Presiding Officer Postal told me that she is still working on that, so I'm going to make a motion to table that, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in those favor? Opposed? Unanimously TABLED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 2057-2002 Adopting Local Law No. -2002, a Local Law updating regulations for precious metal exchanges and dealers in secondhand articles. (CARPENTER)

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Motion to table by Legislator Carpenter, seconded by myself.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

May I make a comment on that? We're still in support of that, 2057, however, I got -- we have a question on one section, I just want to put it in the record, because we don't really understand. And it is Section 345-39. For the record, in the last sentence, this is we're talking about the bond, Legislator Carpenter, such bonds shall remain enforced during the entire period for which the license is valid.

11

The director -- this is the sentence now that causes us concern -- director may establish rules and regulations concerning the amount of a bond to be posted upon proper notice to the licensee. In the first sentence it says that they will -- the bond will be an amount shall submit a \$5000 bond. So the last sentence kind of -- we're not sure where we're going with that or what the intend of that is, Ang. And what would we give -- usually when I do -- when I establish rules and regs and we have a public hearing and it's for you anybody or everybody that might want to come, then I report the result of the public hearing and the rules and regs to the Legislature. So this says the director may establish rules and regulations concerning the amount of a bond to be posted.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Well, the only thing that's new is upon proper notice to the licensee.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Right, and I --

LEG. CARPENTER:

So would that not be the public hearing notice. I mean, I'm not sure they felt it needed to be added, but I'll question that. We have a meeting set up with the Police Department and the dealers again next

week, I believe. So we can check on that.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

In other words, if that sentence was removed, I don't see how it would change.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Well, not the sentence, but the phrase.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Because it says that every applicant for a PM license, right, shall submit a \$5000 bond. So why would -- why do we need, you know, concerning the amount of bond to be posted? I'm just asking the question. We just don't understand it. It says they shall submit a bond -- not up to, it says shall submit a \$5000 bond.

LEG. CARPENTER:

But that sentence was existing anyway. What got added was upon proper notice to the licensee.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Right. And that must be coming from -- I guess from the dealers or something who are -- you know, remember that section has always been -- it's never been -- we didn't have anything to do with the bond. So the fact that it was there -- I'm just saying this might be the time to correct it. With that phrase added, it makes it even -- I mean, the law as written says you will submit a \$5000 bond. It doesn't give me any leeway.

LEG. CARPENTER:

But it's giving you leeway, I guess, to establish rules and regulations concerning the amount if it has to be changed. But if so, then you have to give them proper notice, but I'll check on that.

12

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

You know, I don't see any leeway in it for me to do that. When -- by statute it says you will submit a \$5000 bond, you know, except -- it doesn't say except if, you know, the director directs otherwise or something like that. It just says you shall submit a \$5000 bond. So that's the only question I have. Other than that, it's fine.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I'll have Brian call you directly, that might be easier.

DIRECTOR GARDNER:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. CARPENTER:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

We have a motion, we have a second, all those in favor? Opposed?
Okay. Unanimously, that's TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 2297-2002 Adopting Local Law No. -2002, a Charter Law directing
Suffolk County action to roll back cable television rates in Suffolk
County. (ALDEN)

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

2297, I'm motion to table. Actually, it's in public hearing, so
motion to table, seconded by Legislator Nowick. All those in favor?
Opposed? That stands TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0).

SENSE RESOLUTION

(P) 1-2003 Memorializing resolution requesting United States Congress
and State of New York to roll back basic cable television rates.
(LINDSAY)

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'd like to move that.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:

Motion to approve, seconded by myself. All those in favor? There's a
question on it, Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I'm always in favor of rolling back rates, but just, Legislator
Lindsay, what does that mean roll back the rates, to what?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Right now, the federal government under the FCC has the authority over
the cable television industry. And we're simply asking them to
excercise the authority they already have. I mean, they've been kind
of walking away from that authority with the deregulation of it. And
what the resolution simply does is ask them to get back into that
industry and resume -- reassume that power that they had initially.

LEG. NOWICK:

Not even just to stop the rise of the rates, just to even roll them

13

back, is that --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah. It isn't specificas far as amounts.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:
Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:
The one thing it does say in here which I think is pretty clear is that to roll them back to a level consistent with the cost of living, so that, you know --

LEG. NOWICK:
I'd like to cosponsor that one.

CHAIRMAN ALDEN:
So we have a motion, we have a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Okay that's carried unanimously. APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0).

The rest of out -- the items have been tabled subject to call, so unless anybody has anything else to bring before this committee? No. Okay. We stand adjourned. Thank you.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:05 A.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY