

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HIGHER EDUCATION

and

ENERGY COMMITTEE

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy 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 Wednesday December 14, 2005.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Lynne Nowick • Chairperson

Legislator Angie Carpenter • Vice•Chair

Legislator Brian Foley

Legislator Jay Schneiderman

Legislator Cameron Alden

MEMBER NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Jon Cooper

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mea Knapp • Counsel to the Legislature

Joe Schroeder • Budget Review Office

Joe Muncey • Budget Review Office

Ilona Julius • Deputy Clerk of the Legislature

Ben Zwirn • County Executive's Office

Carolyn Fahey • Economic Development

Charles Stein • Suffolk Community College

George Gatta • Suffolk Community College

Bob Wieboldt • Long Island Builders Association

Tracy Stark • Town of Riverhead

Christopher Castro • Solar Community

Lauren Hill • Long Island Association

All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:52 A.M. *)

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Good morning. We'll start with the Pledge to the Flag led by Legislator Foley.

SALUTATION

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the committee meeting for Economic Development, Higher Education and Energy. We have a few cards. Jim, you can come up if you would like. Jim, do you want to tell us ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes. First of all, good morning. Merry Christmas, Happy Holidays, whatever you think is appropriate. The first two resolutions I would like to speak about involve the Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Resolutions IR 2098, 2099. I'd like to ask Carolyn Fahey and Tony Ceglie to join me for these two.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Sure. Jim, I see Tony Ceglie did fill out a card, so we're going to put that aside.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

They maybe several that you want to put aside after I go through these.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

These resolutions, 98 would impose a moratorium for any new construction at the airport for six months, and I do want to speak to this resolution, and 98 impose new landing fees. When we were before you at your last committee meeting, we suggested that to be on the safe side to wait to we get a written response from the Federal Aviation Administration in response to what both of these resolutions do. I do tell you that the Citizens Advisory Board out at the airport did recommend a moratorium on new construction, on leases that would be before the Airport Lease Screening Committee and that Legislator Schneiderman who joined us on the board of the CAB at its last meeting amended his bill in recognition of some of the things that were asked by the Citizens Advisory Board. That being said, I would like to ask the airport manager to give his view as a trained airport professional why it would be unwise to act precipitously on these before we hear in writing from the FAA. So, Tony.

MR. CEGLIO:

Just in general, speaking to the FAA several days ago, we asked for their input on both of these resolutions. Verbal they said you can't do them. It's going to take a little bit longer, however, to get that in writing, because it has to go through their legal department. What could happen if we do impose these resolution without their review and approval is they could restrict our future grant funding, and they could also impose possibly penalties on the airport.

I would recommend that we wait for their verbal concurrence or views on these moratoriums and the nighttime restriction before we do anything. There has been some past experience on this at other airports, especially with the increased landing fees at night. It is in conflict with a law passed by Congress in 1990, the Airport Noise and Capacity Act, which states that you can't impose restrictive nighttime curfews at airports. So I don't think it would be a good idea to do that one.

The moratorium, in addition, there are some companies that have just to light, one of which has an aircraft at the airport now that has been approved, not •• has been approved by the full committee, but it is an airport •• a company that has airport •• airplane at the airport, it is a company the employees 300 people, it's the 17th largest company on Long Island, it's a company called AMCO. They would like to build. If they had to wait for a moratorium, it's a possibility they may not •• they may not build and they may go somewhere else also. So I don't think it's a good idea for that reason that we impose a moratorium on everything for six months.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I speak to this? First, Mr. Ceglie, you had said you spoke with the FAA regarding both the bills, and they said that they couldn't do them. I also spoke with the FAA, and they only said on the nighttime curfew bill that that was a problem. They said on the moratorium bill that that was a matter of local determination, so I'm curious as to who you spoke with at the FAA.

MR. CEGLIO:

I spoke to _Otto Ceriani_ , who was recently the acting manager of the airport district office.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I spoke with Robert _Manuza_ , who I think you also know too, right?

MR. CEGLIO:

Right. He's the current acting manager.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Also, on AMCO •• on AMCO, they're proposing, if my recollection serves me, a large hangar for a corporate •• corporate jet, at least one jet, right? Is it just one jet?

MR. CEGLIO:

Correct. They have had a jet at the airport for about 20 years. They're proposing to •• and it's currently housed in an existing hangar. They'd like to build their own hangar to house the aircraft, not do any fueling or anything, but just build a hangar and a ramp space for it.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now, the genesis for this moratorium request comes out of fact that the airport is updating its master plan, which will determine what future growth is

possible at that airport or acceptable at that airport. And you have said to me in conversations, and you can correct me on the record if I'm wrong, that you expect to have that master plan updated, completed within a six month period; is that correct?

MR. CEGLIO:

That's correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So the idea was to wait that period out before we started doing any construction at the airport that might turn out to be non compatible or incompatible with the recommendations of that master plan update, assuming that we have full community involvement in the preparation, which I believe we do at this point of that master plan.

MR. CEGLIO:

Correct. But just to make a point on the master plan and what it does, it will not state that we should restrict aviation development at the airport, that's not what an FAA master plan will do. And it also won't say that you can build X number of hangars. It will allocate land for future aviation development.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes. But there is certainly a cumulative impact to whatever happens at that airport, particularly in terms of noise and how that noise affects the surrounding community. So typically when we do out environmental reviews, we ought to be looking at the cumulative impact, which we can do through the context of this master plan update. So all I'm asking for is just to wait

out that very short period so that we know where we're going with this airport, the community knows where we're going with this airport, and the things that are not acceptable will be frozen, and the things that are acceptable can move forward. And we don't know yet what's acceptable and what's not acceptable.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

You know, Madam Chairwoman, I don't agree with •• disagree with anything that Legislator Schneiderman said. However, I think the point that Jay spoke to someone at the FAA and received information and Tony spoke to someone else at the FAA and he received information really speaks to the reason why we should have something back in writing whether it's permissible. Perhaps, Tony, you could get the FAA to expedite their answer, and we could have it sooner than later, maybe by the end of the year.

MR. CEGLIO:

I will do my best.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I absolutely think •• I do think putting something in writing will protect us as well you, legislator Schneiderman and all of us. I think that that's the wise way to go.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The only problem that I see is that this is the last committee cycle of the year, so I'm going to have to reintroduce the bill. I would rather see it discharged even perhaps without recommendation, and then on the floor if we don't have writing by next week, it's possible then we can just table it on the floor. If we don't have something in writing by next Tuesday ••

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I don't think there is a chance in you know what that we're going to get something in writing by Tuesday since we've been waiting already two weeks.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll make a motion to discharge.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Maybe all of you know better.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll make a motion to discharge then without recommendation.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Are we on the agenda.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We're not there yet, but when the time comes.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Can I move on then?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

2154 would establish a local development corporation, a Suffolk County local development corporation with the single purpose of facilitating the creation of small •• that's the next one in order isn't it? 2154 would establish small business incubators in economically distressed communities. And I have one of the members of Brentwood who would be very interested in working with us, and that's Chris Castro. Can I have Chris come up? Chris is a small businessman now in Brentwood. He has the Solar Cafe, which is set to open very shortly, right?

MR. CASTRO:

Very shortly, yes.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay. Did you want to say something about the small business incubators, why you think they would be worth while on your community?

MR. CASTRO:

Yes. Good morning to the Legislature, all the Legislators here and to everyone else that's here for these very important issues. I think the incubators are a very important and effective vehicle for developing businesses in less affluent communities such as mine. As a businessman in one of the communities, I know the challenges and the obstacles that one can face in communities that are not known for developing these great success stories in businesses.

To that affect, I think these small minority business incubators can do a lot in bringing hope and maybe clearing some of the obstacles that may be in the way of a local businessman that has maybe a good idea. These are good people with good ideas, but is intimidated by the obstacles and the problems faced with start•up businesses. Certainly affluent communities are not known for their great start•up businesses, but I think a lot has to do with the fact that they're intimidated by the process itself. I think an incubator in some of these communities might afford these people an opportunity and give them the vehicle by which they could develop these ideas and turn them into very sound respectable businesses. And who know, from there on, take off and become very, very successful businesses.

I think that this is important in all communities, but especially in minority or less affluent communities. The development of an organization like we are talking about today at the Suffolk County level, I think, would make it easier to then go into these less affluent communities and get some property and bring the right organizations and give them these opportunities to develop these incubators, which will then afford an incredible benefit to the local members and residents of the community. So I strongly support this, and I think it's a great idea, and I think the Legislature should pursue this.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The Local Development Corporation is a vehicle to assist through over a variety of ways; transferring property, making funds available. If you have no questions, I'll move on to our next one.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I do have a question. In this piece of legislation, it says support incubator programs in low income and diverse communities in Suffolk County. What is the definition? Does it have a definition of low income in this piece of legislation?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

There is no definition here, Legislator Nowick, but there is an understanding of what involves a low income community, it's the percentage in the census track in that community of folks who are under certain income level, it's usually under 50% of the median income for an area. And it also is defined by unemployment rates, if the unemployment rates reach a certain level.

Frankly, the way that this envisioned of going is that there are communities that have already expressed interest. The three that have been •• that have come forth are North Amityville, and in North Amityville, they have the North Amityville Economic Development Council, NAEDC, which is looking at a property there to establish one, Huntington Station and Brentwood and North Bellport. And all four of these communities share certain characteristics; they are low income communities as per earning levels, unemployment rates, they are minority communities, and they are communities where there have been people like Chris, local small business people who want to get some economic development in the way that predominates Suffolk County, that's through small businesses.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Jim, when it says in the legislation to establish a Suffolk County Local Development Corporation, is that a kind of like a public bonding kind of a corporation, is that what it is?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's a 501 C3, it's a non•for•profit corporation. It can do bonds, but that's the •• it can issue bonds, but it's not what this one would be doing. This one would be more of a vehicle for conveying loans, for conveying property. It's a way that government •• not government, it's a way for •• to convey property from government through the LDC to a property to be used for an incubator where you cannot do that directly.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

So if a small business wants to start up and needs a loan, they would go to this development corporation, and what the development corporation •• so

where does the money come from?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

There is in this •• mentioning in this legislation the Job Development Authority, which the LDC could convey the loan to the small business. But the real reason for this LDC is for an entity to hold the property where the incubators would actually be located. It would be •• it's similar to a community development corporation, where a community development corporation can actually take title to property, it's a non•for•profit, and the LDC would be the entity that would hold the property that would presumably get from the County, and there small business would incubate ••

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

So the County would let the LDC hold the property, and the small businesses, would they lease the property? They would lease the property from the LDC, is that it.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

They would be residents, if you will. They would incubate at the property where they would have counseling, where they would learn how to do a business plan, how to begin. And also, as you indicated, they would be able to access loans, not from the County, not from the LDC, from other entities, and the folks at the incubator would be the ones training them, giving them the instructions on how to establish a small business.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

So they wouldn't actually lease the property. They wouldn't pay any money.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

They would rent ••

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

They would rent?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes, they would rent.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

As we do with the other incubators that are ••

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Right. I know it's similar to, I think, maybe the Judicial Facilities Authority the way that works where somebody would lease. Okay. Could I just ask Counsel if you see anything major that would be a problem with this, or what is your professional opinion?

MR. BARRY:

I think the only question would be what you brought up earlier, the lack of definition of low income communities to the extent that any federal or state monies could pass through to these low income communities, if there is a different definition in the state and federal programs then what we give. I could see problems with implementation, but that may not be a concern.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Jackie Caputi was talking about drafting the bill and the definition, Counsel, about low income communities. Jackie, why don't you ••

MS. CAPUTI:

Sure. Good morning. Lynne Bizzarro of my office did review this piece of legislation, and she told me that she intentionally suggested that change, because she wants to give the LDC the flexibility to make that determination, decide if any want to define it and/or apply it on a, you know, case by case basis of what they determine to be low income, felt it gave them more flexibility and won't tie them into the definition that might be contained in the Federal Law or in the County Code, and then those might change, and it wouldn't be, you know, it wouldn't be clear what •• so we felt it was preferable to give the LDC that discretion, that's why we drafted it that way.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. Thank you for that information.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Thank you. Thank you, Chris. I've been eager to get to this next one, because this is one that I am very excited about. This is IR 2330, the Telephonics. Now, I don't know how much explanation you need, because I was here two weeks ago talking about Telephonics, you had the public hearing out in Riverhead, and you closed the public hearing. You remember all this? This would be the first regionally significant project on Long Island, one of the first in the state. We have folks from Telephonics here. I don't want to take any more time than is necessary. If you have any questions or if you would like them to come up on this.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

No. We did hear from them two weeks ago, but if anybody else has any questions, speak up. Move on to the next.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

The next matter is •• and there are some folks who are going to speak on this at the public portion, and this is a time sensitive issue, I am talking about IR 2376. It's the redrawing of the boundaries of Suffolk County's Empire Zones subzones. And while I frankly see it as pretty ministerial, it has to be completed by the end of the year.

I faxed you all a letter, I faxed the entire Legislature a letter yesterday on this subject, which I hope everyone received. The State Legislature required the redrawing of all Empire Zones and subzones so that they would be contiguous within the zone. Now, that sounds rather, in language, contradictory, because I always thought contiguous meant next to. Their definition of contiguous is that if you have infrastructure of any kind in a subzone; a highway, railroad tracks, that infrastructure has to be part of the zone. In other words, it can't be carved out, everything has to be whole within the zone.

I don't know the reasons for this, but this is what the state decided. Therefore, we had to •• and all the folks in the County subzone •• as you know, it's the County zone that we operate in cooperation with Riverhead Town, every subzone had to redraw its maps, they had to be accepted on the local level, whether it's Wyandanch, Southampton •• I'm sorry, Babylon, Southampton, Riverhead, and that's been a process that we have all gone through. We had to do Gabreski, for example, the 48 acres in Gabreski, the map had to be redrawn. It's ministerial, but it's also necessary that we get it finished before the end of the year. Carolyn, did you want to add anything on this?

MS. FAHEY:

The County's Economic Development Zone, the Empire Zone has six subzones. And when Jim talked about the contiguous zones, it has to be contiguous within themselves. The state actually refers to them as blobs, lack of a technical term, I guess, on the state's part. But each subzone needs to be contiguous within itself. So when the state passed the budget and the program reforms in the summer, it directed each zone to go back, look at your subzones, reconfigure them so that they are contiguous within themselves and then we submit them by January 1st of this year •• of next year.

Jim talked about the memo that was faxed to the Legislators. The timing on this is very time sensitive. Since they need to be established by Local Law, this resolution was introduced today, we're going to ask as the letter stated

that the public hearing be closed on Tuesday and this it be discharged by committee with the needed 12 votes, and then voted on at the end of your session on Tuesday. In order for us to proceed with the state, we need to have these boundaries reestablished by the end of the year. The boundaries really do not change very much at all from the boundaries that the Legislature approved a few years ago. They are 25 acres in Babylon, in the Wyandanch area, 48 acres at Gabreski Airport, about 1100, a little more than 1100 up at FCAL, which is the former Grumman Facility in Calverton, and then there's three smaller parcels down in the downtown of Riverhead, one in •• and one in Riverside. So we have six subzones, which all add up to our 1280 designatable acreage.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And someone is here from Riverhead to speak about its process. And someone is here from Babylon who will speak during the public portion. I don't know if anybody's here from Southampton, but we have been working with all of them and they've passed the necessary legislation.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

But substantively, there's no difference. It's just •• what you're doing is just to create ••

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Why do we have to do anything for Babylon? I don't understand that. Oh, maybe because Wayne is here now.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay. Any further questions?

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

I guess that 2330 would include Telephonics Corporation into those ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

No. Telephonics is separate region.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

That's right, it's going to be its own separate Empire Zone.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's going to be on the west side of Park Ave, it's very close to where Telephonics is right now.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Well, I think we all understand the importance of the Empire Zones. Thank you for bringing it to your attention again. Is there anything else?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I just have two more; 2358 and 2363.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

You're working backwards.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

You mean that I did the tabled ones first, yes. Just that 2358 and 2363 are both bonding resolutions that you've had in your Capital Program. The first one, 58, is really pretty easy. It's, again, for the •• I'll use the state's term • the blob at Gabreski for the planning for the subzone at Gabreski for the infrastructures, which you have seen before.

Legislator Nowick, 2363 is the resolution that you are sponsoring involving the energy efficiency for workforce homes. And you and I had several conversations on this, and the idea for this was to include green building, energy efficient building for the long term affordability of any homes that are build under the •• using the County's •• either one of the County's two subsidy programs. And this is the infrastructure program, and it adds energy efficient appliances to the definition of what infrastructure is. And it provides subsidy to builders who would add the energy efficiency into their building. So that's 2363.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

As it relates to 2363, I have met with the different builders, LIBI, and we have •• I did have a piece of legislation that was going to be a separate piece of legislation, and we were going to incorporate these Energy Star appliances, but we worked together to help the builder, so to speak, if it's going to cost a little bit more money, to also help foster workforce housing. So I want to thank you, Jim, for helping me with that and working together.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And if •• I've concluded all the resolutions, both tabled and new, I want to thank this committee for being really responsive and responsibility in working with you. This is the last committee meeting for the year. And as you know, I came on to the administration in September of its first year, and this was the committee that I worked with the closest. And you folks have always been responsive, always available, and I appreciate •• in a little over a year, I learned a great deal, and you've been all very helpful, so I wish you the best for this Holiday Season.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Thank you, Jim.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Can I just ask Budget Review for a comment on 2358, appropriating funds in connection with homeland security?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes. 2358 is in conflict with two resolutions, Resolution 1317, which was adopted at the last General Meeting, appropriated, \$500,000 from this project, modified the Capital Program for use in Blydenburgh Park to sure up historic structures there. IR 2383 is the Legislature's resolution that modifies the Capital Program, reschedules \$22 million for jail construction and also uses •• this Capital Project, 5735, uses 1.6 million from that for the jail. So this resolution, 2358, would be oversubscribed if it was adopted.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

So this is oversubscribed. Okay. Thank you very much, Lance. Anybody have any questions about that?

LEG. ALDEN:

Yeah. Maybe Ben could get us a couple of answers on it if there's a plan to come over with a CN or something if we kick this one out.

MR. ZWIRN:

Thank you very much. I would ask that we get this at least out so I •• if we have to do it by CN, we can discharge it without recommendation at least so we get it to the floor. This is news to me. I'll ask the budget people what happened, but we would like to get it at least the floor today if possible with a discharge. I'll get back to you with an answer before the General Meeting.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you, Ben. Okay. We have a few cards. Anthony Ceglio already ••

okay. That's moot. Lauren Hill.

MS. HILL:

Good morning. My name is Lauren Hill, I'm here to represent the Long Island Association. I'd like to read into the record a letter written to Honorable Lynne Nowick from Mitch Pally, Vice President for Government Affairs for the Long Island Association. The Long Island Association wishes to express its strong support for Resolution 2330, which would amend the Suffolk County Empire Zone boundaries to allow for a new manufacturing program at Telephonics Corporation in Huntington and the creation of over 50 new jobs in Suffolk County.

Recent state legislation allows the County to amend the boundaries of its Empire Zone to allow projects of regional significance to take place in a county, such projects meeting a variety of standards including the creation of over 50 jobs, 50 new manufacturing jobs. This resolution before your committee would allow Suffolk County to take advantage of this new program and provide the Telephonics Corporation to create a new manufacturing facility in the Town of Huntington.

Long Island's manufacturing sector continues to lose jobs, and this new program will allow for the addition of jobs in that sector and allow Telephonics to compete with companies in other states. The addition of new manufacturing jobs in Suffolk County is essential to the continued viability of our economy, and this legislation will create such new jobs. The Long Island Association urges this committee and the full County Legislature to approve this resolution and provide new jobs for our residents. Thank you.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you very much. Ann Marie Jones.

MS. JONES:

Good morning. My name is Ann Marie Jones, and I'm Director of Downtown Revitalization for the Town of Babylon. And I'm here representing Supervisor Steve Bellone. And I'm just in support of Resolution 2376, which is a redesignation of the Empire Zone boundaries. Ours is in Wyandanch, and we made some minor changes to conform with the new legislation, and we would appreciate you passing it in a timely fashion. Thank you.

LEG. ALDEN:

Ann? Through the Chair. Lynne, is that all right.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Ann, did you have public hearing on any changes that you made on the boundaries?

MS. JONES:

We had •• yes, we did. We had a resolution passed where did change the boundaries and we did have a public hearing.

LEG. ALDEN:

Good. So everybody that would be affected or would have been affected, they had an opportunity to come down and speak to you guys on it?

MS. JONES:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you. Christopher Castro, we've already spoken to him. Bob Wieboldt.

MR. WIEBOLDT:

Good morning. I'm Bob Wieboldt, and I represent the Long Island Builders Institute, and I'm speaking on behalf of •• in support of Resolution 2363. For a word of background, I think the choice of energy efficiency equipment and the quality of energy saving over time is very important to limited income applicants for housing. We have a very, you know, expensive energy package on Long Island for homeowners. But when you try to qualify low and moderate income for homeowners for homeownership, you have to worry about cost. So you fight for every dollar, and the house tends to be build to code.

Now, our energy code in New York is comparable to any other in the nation, and it's fairly •• much more energy efficient than it was, let's say, 15 or 20 years ago in our housing; our installation is full thick and our window requirements are right up to par, etcetera. But it is possible to go beyond the energy code. There's a program called Energy Star that KeySpan and LILCO put forth, where in effect, by upgrading your appliances and energy equipment, you can save 30% on the fuel bill over a code house built to, let's say, the 1998 code.

The problem is that it adds significant cost to the house. Significant in the range of maybe five, \$6000, five to ten, depending on how it's done. It can also be accomplished by just better construction and design, tightening duct work and doing things like that. But if you really want to get into, like, a solar energy package or a heat exchange or any other physical device that might actually save money and be more efficient, like the highest level SEERs for heating plants and for air conditioners, that sort of thing, it's going to cost some money. It will be at the high end of that five to \$10,000 range.

Now, Energy Star, and I was working with Lynne Nowick on this trying to draft a bill to use the Energy Star as an example because it's out there, but their program incentives change from year to year based on NYSERDA and the Utilities Agreement. Right now, you can cover almost \$5000 in cost, but the biggest component of the benefit of going to be an Energy Star house if you're a builder is that they give you cooperative advertising. Problem with new construction on an affordable basis, you tend to have waiting lists, you tend to have lines, there is no real advertising need, so you don't see these projects advertised. And the ads that are put out advertising things like lotteries are usually done as a public service by the newspapers.

So there is no way that that money could flow back into the houses.

So there's a need for an additional subsidy to keep that price low enough to qualify as many buyers as possible. This is an ingenious way of doing it. It basically says that eligible costs for use of some of the monies you've got available now for affordable housing infrastructure goes into the house somewhat and includes major •• major appliances and energy equipment. That would allow somebody to upgrade to the highest level SEER oil burner or gas furnace or whatever and achieve energy efficiencies, which would save long term dollars for the homeowner.

And when you look at Long Island's fuel bills, particularly in a year like this, they can get as high as taxes, as a major cost of construction. And you have principle interest, taxes and utilities. So the idea of keeping all of those costs down is a good one. Up to now, affordable housing hasn't paid any attention to that utility side. So that can be rather dramatically adverse to the homeowner. So LIBI thinks this is a good program and innovative.

We also may be approaching the Suffolk County Legislature next year, because we are working on a program called LEEDs, which I think you're familiar with with the commercial and governmental buildings. The LEEDs program for commercial buildings allows state tax incentives to flow to incorporate those into basically credits, to incorporate that energy efficiency. No similar program exists in residential. And one of the things our industry is doing with Albany is to try to work on a residential affordable housing package where state tax credits can be brought to bear too, and that will actually enhance this program. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you, Bob. And I also would like to thank you for working with me on

the energy efficient program and for input in that. I think that together we did address or we are starting to address the utility questions, which I have always believed is •• when people use the term workforce housing or affordable housing, I do believe, and I've always said it, that affordable also means can you pay your utility bills. And so we have a start here, and I thank you very much.

MR. WIEBOLDT:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Tracy Stark.

MS. STARK:

Good morning. My name is Tracy Stark. I'm the Suffolk County, Town of Riverhead Empire Zone Coordinator. I administer all the six subzones or the Empire Zone, and I am here in support of Resolution Numbers 2376 and 2330 as well. We appreciate you working expeditiously to take action on this legislation so we can remain in compliance with the state regulations that were recently amended. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Thank you very much. I guess we have no other cards. Is there anybody else here that would like to address the committee? Hearing no one, I will go on to the agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

2098, to impose a moratorium on aviation related construction at Francis S. Gabreski Airport pending Master Plan adoption (SCHNEIDERMAN).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'd like to make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

There's a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. FOLEY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to table.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Seconded by Legislator Carpenter. Motion to table by Legislator Foley, seconded by Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

On the motion, Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'll support the motion to table, but if we receive the correspondence, then I would also support on the floor a motion to discharge or motion to approve out of committee.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to table. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Opposed, Legislator Schneiderman. **TABLED (VOTE:4•1•0•1 • Opposed: Legis. Schneiderman • Not present: Legis. Cooper)**

2099, amending resolution No. 673•2004, to impose a fee for late night landings at Francis S. Gabreski Airport (SCHNEIDERMAN).

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

This one in fairness probably should wait until the FAA comments.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman, seconded by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? **Tabled (VOTE:5•0•0•1 • Not present: Legis. Cooper).**

2154,adopting a Local Law authorizing the establishment of a Suffolk County Local Development Corporation for the purpose of developing business incubators in low income communities in Suffolk County (COUNTY EXEC)

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion by Legislator Carpenter, seconded by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? **Approved (VOTE:5•0•0•1 • Not present: Legis. Cooper)**

2307, authorizing contract to provide services for the promotion of tourism, convention and sports event businesses for the Suffolk County Department of Economic and Workforce Housing (COUNTY EXEC).

Has to be tabled for ••

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

We have received responses to the RFP, they hasn't been analyzed, so it has to be tabled.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Okay. I have a motion to table by myself, seconded by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? **Tabled (VOTE:5•0•0•1 • Not present: Legis. Cooper).**

2330, adopting Local Law amending the Suffolk County Empire Zone boundaries to include Telephonics Corporation, Suffolk County Tax Map No. 0400•104.40•01.00•110.000 (COUNTY EXEC)

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. FOLEY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to approve by Legislator Alden, seconded by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? **Approved (VOTE:5•0•0•1 • Not present: Legis. Cooper).**

2358, appropriating funds in connection with Homeland Security at Francis S. Gabreski Airport (COUNTY EXEC).

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. FOLEY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to discharge without recommendation, seconded by Legislator Foley
All in favor? Opposed? **Discharged without recommendation. (VOTE:5
•0•0•1 • not present: Legis. Cooper).**

**2363, appropriating the 2005 funds for infrastructure improvements
for Workforce Housing/Incentive Funds (COUNTY EXEC).**

I will make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Alden. All in favor?
Opposed? **Approved (VOTE:5•0•0•1 • Not present: Legis. Cooper).**

**2376, adopting Local Law redesignating the boundaries of the Suffolk
County Empire Zone (COUNTY EXEC).**

Is has to be tabled for a public hearing, correct?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

We need a public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

See, there is a benefit sometimes of holding the public hearings in committee, because we can get it all done right away. Now, a question to Counsel, can we discharge this pending ••

CHAIRPERSON NOWICK:

No. We have to table for a public hearing on Tuesday. The public hearing will be Tuesday. Motion by Legislator Nowick, seconded by Legislator Alden. **Tabled** for public hearing. **(VOTE:5•0•0•1 • not present: Legis. Cooper).**

I see nothing else on the agenda, so this meeting is concluded. Thank you.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:35 A.M.*)

_ _ DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY