

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, March 8, 2006.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Wayne Horsley • Chairman

Legislator Rick Montano • Vice•Chair

Legislator Tom Barraga

Legislator Jon Cooper

Legislator Lynne Nowick

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan • Counsel to the Legislature

Joe Schroeder • Budget Review Office

Joe Muncey • Budget Review Office

Renee Ortiz • Chief 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

James Morgo • Commissioner • Economic Development

All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:45 P.M. *)

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. Will you, please, all join me for the Pledge.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And may we all stand for a moment for those veterans who are protecting our freedoms across the seas.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. All right. Good afternoon[. |. |.] This is our March 7th meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Education and Energy Committee meeting. We have a fairly long agenda, so I would like to commence right away. What I would like to do first is in the open portion, I have •• I am taking out of order CAAP, C•A•A•P presentation to the Suffolk County Legislature. And the reason why they are doing this, and they may run over their three minutes, but not much over I've been promised, is that because •• I should make this meeting notice now •• that on the 27th, we have Mr. Catell coming from KeySpan, National Grid, will be here on the 27th, Monday the 27th, and that will prove to be a very interesting meeting. And then following on our regular Wednesday date, will be Mr. Kessel from LIPA, who will be addressing all those issues that we would like to ask Mr. Kessel and was never able to. So that is •• this will prove to be a very interesting meeting in itself, which I think will draw a lot of interest from across Long Island.

That being the case, we are dealing with several involving the CAAP group, this would be the Gabreski Airport. I thought it would be responsible on our part, since we're hearing both sides, that we spend a few minutes with a presentation concerning CAAP and their feelings towards Gabreski Airport, which is, of course, under the jurisdiction of this committee. May I introduce Mr. Russell Engle of Quogue as well as Bill Berrien, who will be give us a presentation. Gentlemen.

MR. ENGLE:

Thank you, Mr. Horsley, and thank you representatives on the committee. We will brief, and we will go straight through. You have a copy of the presentation.

Who is CAAP? We are citizens coalition that is seeking to stop pollution and aviation growth at Gabreski. We were founded in 1998 and had early success in so doing. Our recent efforts, however, have been reignited by new airport lease applications, which •• many of which are before your committee. And frankly, that could negatively impact the fragile ecosystem at the airport itself.

Who supports CAAP? We are not alone. We have many, many citizen groups, committees, community groups, everything ranging from those in East Quogue to •• all the way to Remsenberg, including Westhampton, Westhampton Beach, Quiogue, Quogue, etcetera. And these are groups, who like us, share the thought that says this is a very special place, this is not, if you will, traditional airport. And we will share with you what that means as we go forward.

Our concerns. Gabreski Airport lies right in the middle of the Long Island Pine Barrens. I know that you are well aware of what that entails, but let us simply say that it is •• the Pine Barrens are adjacent to the actual runway that is currently on this airport. It's beneath the airport •• directly beneath is the sole aquifer that we rely on, not only we in the adjacent town, but we in the surrounding town as our sole source of water. Literally, since we are a beach-oriented community, our backs are to the water.

It's a state designated groundwater protection area and Suffolk County certified critical environment area. And it's already been designated, as you're well aware, as a superfund site due to previous pollution. So what we find is it's already a polluted airport that happens to be in a place that if someone said we should build an airport there, no one would be allowed to do so.

CAAP concerns. What you see here is a picture, a satellite picture, that will point out some 18 different sites, you'll see it better, it's a little bit difficult one, but 18 sites already that have been cited that are contamination sites, most of them due to petroleum. Part of the problem here is airports are not necessarily a tidy place, but this one in particular in being untidy in the past has a dramatic and direct affect on the groundwater. That is something that cannot A, continue and B, be expanded.

Further CAAP concerns. Clearly our concerns relate to pollution. From fuel spills, deicing runoff, as this may or may not turn to a 12 month a year rather than just more oriented toward summertime use, fuel farm leakage, especially with the current plan or thought of huge expansion of fuel storage, the impact, as I said, of the single source aquifer below, ultimate impact on our drinking water, and frankly, a great concern over increased aviation, especially from stage one and stage two aircraft, but I would argue from aircraft in general? Why? Because it has an impact not only on the air,

which affects the Pine Barrens, but also noise pollution and ultimately, the groundwater below.

Aviation, therefore, especially for not just your local flier who might live there, but fixed based operators and those who are in the charter or time share. We feel it is unwise to expand aviation and risk even greater groundwater contamination. Our concerns, therefore, are we oppose the granting of leases to business jet fleet operators and to more than doubling the operations of Long Island Jet Services, which is there under a nonexisting current lease as it turns out.

These operations will have a great tendency to transform a relic of World War II that was built for a totally different purpose, and turn it into a 24/7 true commercial oriented airport. Something that none of us, I believe, would wish to see happen. If we read the FAA, it is predicted that takeoffs and landings may, in deed, triple in the next four to five years. So our reasons for concern relate to certain applications that are ending both now and in the future for expanded FBOs and charter type services at Gabreski.

These operations will often bring flights that have nothing to do with our community, but simply might provide, if it were set up that way, as a less expensive than LaGuardia, Islip and other locations as a holding place, almost a stopping•off place to park, refuel, and frankly, the buck stops where we live, and it's called pollute, right where we live in an area where we can't allow it to happen. There are current plans afoot for 80 new T•Hangars, 50 of which will be for new planes brought into Gabreski and numerous larger hangars that potentially might come as well.

So what are we doing about that? Frankly, this forum, and we thank you for

the opportunity, Mr. Horsley, to help tell not only the Legislative side, we are addressing this in all levels of government, not limited to just the County, through letters, press releases, etcetera. And we've engaged Legal Counsel in that regard to help us enhance our message. Within the community, as you have seen, we have community support from all the neighboring communities and are working with them, not just raising funds, but frankly, getting the word out, because all of our efforts are to maximize public awareness on the problems affected by aviation growth.

That said, we recognize your needs. You're sitting here with a budget deficit at Gabreski. We believe we may be on the same page if we view it properly. For example, we think shared goals are no incremental pollution, neither groundwater, air, noise due to any expansion efforts whether they be PDD or aviation related; two, I think we both share a support of the 106. We, indeed, fought for that most recently when the Pentagon pending closing it down. We believe we share to make the thought that says a goal to make Gabreski self-sufficient financially, however, with an appropriate-sized PDD.

It's through the development zone that we think we have an opportunity to address the financial ills such as they may be at Gabreski and not through the aviation growth. So our goal, therefore, is to halt aviation growth, number one, and number two, to definitely not turn Gabreski into another Islip.

Plan of action. We propose no significant proposal go forward without a full environmental review, and this really must affect the cumulative impact, not sequential, not one by one, but rather what might it all mean. Again, please understand, this is where we live, but more important, it's our source of water, and it's in the middle of the Pine Barrens. Therefore, we urge to all vote no on LI Jet negative declaration, which if you don't, it would then potentially go through and thus expand LI Jet quite dramatically. Further,

demand that LI Jet, Excel Air and other mass aviation users need a SEQRA review. This also relates naturally to their environmental impact. This is not just a normal airport that was made for that. It's a special place.

Hold all the lease decisions. It may be difficult, but we would urge you to do that until completion of the Gabreski master plan, which in and of itself must assure that any of those growth aspects relate to nonpolluting growth. We're willing to work jointly to development a sound realistic•sized PDD and help give Gabreski a solid financial base in a viable nonaviation economic base. We feel it's important, that said, that we maintain an advisory role at the local level on all leases. Currently, it's the LSC, if there needs to be a revision of that, we plan to work with you to make sure that there is local review, obviously understanding that the Legislature reserves all the authority to actually grant the leases.

Finally, we do have a wish to work together. We can help promote redevelopment efforts for Gabreski, but we need to be certain that they will not add to pollution of any sought. So we urge you not to have a rush to lease and to take the time and focus to get it right, because please remember, we live here, we vote here and we care. And we thank you for your time and attention.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Engle, for your presentation today. Are there any questions for Mr. Engle at this point in time? Just a quick point I'd like to question you on, and I don't want to belabor the issue, You talked about how the property is contaminated, that it was a superfund site, bringing in more up•to•date fueling capacities where they have containment capabilities for a fuel spill, where they have •• they have a DEC approvals and rigorous DEC approvals, doesn't this actually •• wouldn't bringing in more modern areas of

fueling processes, wouldn't that actually better the airport itself than what is presently there? I've seen and heard of some of the things that are actually there right now, which some of them sound outlandish. But I'd like to get just your opinion. Wouldn't bringing in something new be better for the airport?

MR. ENGLE:

Let me answer that by giving you a direct example. Long Island Jet, two years ago, two and a half years ago, supposedly one of these modern groups, if you will, had a fuel spill of some 700 gallons of jet fuel, they denied it at the time, it was cited by a pilot who happened to observe it, and long story short, they said, no, no, no, it never happened, not at all what we do in our modern up•to•date operation, we're not like the local little old boys who just have their little plane. And low and behold, six months later, they finally, A, had to admit, yes, they did, B, had to in so doing, therefore, begin to engage in the cleanup of what they had done all of six months earlier.

So my overriding concern on this is that it's funny how quantity is not necessarily health. And quality is sometimes theoretical and not realistic. And if you add quantity and you add a whole different source of potential pollution of the whole deicing, when you make this year round, this is a summertime community in most places, when you make this year round, you then add deicing. Long Island Jet, just to use another examples, had said that they do not do deicing, and yet, if you look in the true background, you realize that they do. And that's now. What will happen when all the modern commercial jets come in and out on a regular basis, commercial in the sense of, say, a net jet or a rent a jet, on a regular basis? Well, they'll need to be deiced, and guess where that goes? That goes straight down in the aquifer. Bad idea.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Interesting. Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation today. We will be taking this all under advisement as a committee, and we'll be keeping in touch.

MR. ENGLE:

I'd like to leave one though with the committee. It was brought up by the Presiding Officer. Would it make sense if at a stage as you are deliberating our little area, if we might be able to invite you to come out and visit Gabreski to have an up close and much better idea than a satellite picture of what we are facing? We would love to do that, and I'll leave it with you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I think that's an excellent idea. I'm sure the committee would be on board with something like that. I have •• I think my extensive research in the area •• I've been to the cafe that's there, and it's the marvelous cafe I've been to, Belle's is it? I plan to get there as well as, I'm sure, the committee. I think that's a good idea. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MR. ENGLE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

May I call Ken Stein. Clifford Hymowitz. These seem to be another days. I'd like to introduce •• we're doing our presentation now •• I actually received

this press release that was handed to me just before the meeting, and this is Carrie Meek•Gallagher, by the way.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Hello.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And the comment was, Carrie Meek•Gallagher has intimate detailed knowledge of the trends and issues impacting Suffolk County and will provide us with a strong spring board for smart growth planning, said the County Executive on your appointment to the Planning Board. And I wanted to congratulate you on that, but that is not the reason why you are here.

Carrie represents the Rauch Foundation who puts out an annual Long Island Project Index, which is 2006. As you may have saw several months ago, there was an extensive article in Newsday entitled, " The Tipping Point •• At The Tipping Point." And the Rauch Foundation brings up very interesting points on our economy, on our government and our way of life on Long Island. And with that being said, Carrie, welcome, and we look forward to hearing your presentation.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Thank you. And I do have copies of the Index Report, And I will give those to you afterwards. And before I get started, I want to introduce a couple of my colleagues who joined me here today. First, we have a member of our Advisory Committee, Joe _Scadutto_ , and he heads up an initiative on Long Island called the Called Long Island Life Sciences Initiative. If you're not familiar with it, I say, you know, take a look at it, and Joe could get you information on that. That's an important initiative for economic development on Long Island. And also respecting the Rauch Foundation, Patsy Randolf, who handles all of our PR and communications and other special projects of the foundations. And John McNally who is a consultant to the foundation.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Carrie, before you start, let me just •• Joe, your fare is when? This is important for our economic development.

MR. McNALLY:

The 2006 Life Sciences Industry Summit will be held at the Hilton Long Island on Route 110 on Thursday, May 4th, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. And just to give you a sense of the program, we'll have corporation showcases throughout the day highlighting emerging and expanding companies on Long Island, emerging technologies from our academic institutions on the Island and addressing a series of strategic issues in growing the pharmaceutical biotechnology medical device personal care companies on the Island. I welcome you all to attend. If you have questions, I have cards with me. I'll be happy to spend some time with you after the meeting.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. And I may add that several years ago, I did a presentation there, and it is one the premier operations that I found towards economic development, and you do a great job. Thank you very much. Carrie, I'm sorry.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Thanks. Basically this year, one of the new features we added to the Index, which is an annual status report about Long Island and highlighting the trends and issues of importance, is comparisons with our peer regions throughout the county. And we thought this was important, because we have to understand where we are and how we measure, not only against yourself over time, but how we compare to these other peer regions, which we now find yourself competing with for talent, for investment dollars, for jobs and other economic opportunities.

And then we do every year we do something called a special analysis. This year our special analysis focused on government and specifically the cost of government on Long Island. And not surprisingly, we found that government is a big business. If you look at the •• between the two counties, all this is levels of government, so I think this included 359 different levels •• you know, different government entities, although we have other 901 different government entities on Long Island. They spent \$16 billion as of 2003. That's the last year for which full data is available from the Office of State Comptroller. And most of it •• over half of it •• about half of it goes to schools and then third •• about a third is spent by counties, because the counties, again, include social services, law enforcement, those more expensive elements.

Then we took a look at what are the top ten most expensive services provided. And that's these services here, and those services actually comprise 86% •• almost 86% of the total expenditures by government. And then we looked at if you took a five year trend, 1998 to 2003, which expenditures had increased the most, and it was in the area of educational instructional services, employee benefits and then this category called shared services. That includes things like BOCES, it's predominantly BOCES.

So we know that we're spending a lot of money, it costs us a lot. Well, how are we paying for government here? Again, not surprisingly, as most people know, it's local sources of revenue. A little bit more in Nassau than in Suffolk, because Nassau gets less money back from the state and feds •• less aid from the state and feds than Suffolk does as of right now. But in general, we're spending about •• we support about 75% of our local government directly.

In taking a further breakdown, you can see that most of that money, about 60%, comes from property taxes. That, of course, is what everyone is complaining about, about 24% from this category called all other, that's all the special fees that local governments impose. Sales tax is only about 15%, and then interest and earnings were a small sliver.

And no wonder people are complaining about property taxes, because, yes, in Nassau County they do pay the highest property taxes compared to all our •• the peer counties that we looked at. Long Island, if you combine Nassau and Suffolk, came in third, but it is 2.5 times the national average that we show here. Suffolk is still towards the bottom of the pack of peer counties, but I am sure that will be changing as we continue to grow and develop.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Not the Suffolk County Government.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Right. But the school budgets, the cost of education will continue to go up there.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Mr. Zwirn is in the back of the room going, yes, that's correct.

MR. ZWIRN:

I needed a defibrillator for a second.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

So what we found now is this troubling combination of both high taxes and high housing costs that is getting more people •• more and more people are considering leaving. So here we showed the year over year change from 2004 to 2005 and by age breakdown of people considering leaving, either some what likely or very likely to leave. And you can see that there was a jump, 70% of 18 to 34 year olds considering leaving in the next five years, and then the next biggest group is the people •• their parents age, 50 to 64 year olds, 64% are thinking of leaving in the next five years.

And in combination with that, you have people •• an increasing number of people are reporting difficulty in meeting their rent and mortgage payments, monthly rent and mortgage payments. And this shows, again, the change from 2004 to 2005. Overall, though, the biggest •• the biggest increase if you go back just to 2003, there was almost a 20% jump in people reporting difficulty paying rent or mortgage. So it went from 35% in 2003 to 54% in 2005. So probably as a combination •• you know, as a result of this combination of high taxes • high housing cost you had in 2005, the highest number of voters turned out to defeat first time school budgets. And almost a record number of budgets that failed first time around last year was actually a little bit more.

And then we looked at Long Island compared to New York State. Thirty • six percent of first time budgets failed on Long Island as compared to only 12% state • wide, that's three times the state • wide average of first time school budgets failing. So people are getting out and expressing their frustration with the taxes. But on a positive note, they seem to be ready for something new. We specifically asked three questions related to school and school funding policy. One was, would be will be to shift •• or do you think it's a good idea to shift from a property tax to an income tax to fund education? Fifty five percent of people thought that was a good idea. We also asked

about pooling commercial property tax, and again, 76% of people thought that was a good idea to pool commercial property taxes and redistribute them, you know, say County-wide as opposed to keeping all of the tax revenues from commercial properties only within the school district where they're located. The one where we're split is school district consolidation. It's about 46% in favor and 48% opposed.

LEG. NOWICK:

I'm sorry to interrupt. Who was polled?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Sure. Part of •• there's three pieces to the Index, there's indicators and research special analysis and then we do public opinion polling. So we actually polled 1200 Long Islanders. There was a sample size of 1200 Long Islanders, a random sample, and then we over-sampled 200 African Americans and 100 Latinos.

LEG. NOWICK:

Nassau and Suffolk?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Nassau and Suffolk, yep.

LEG. NOWICK:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

The margin of error would be?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Three point five.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

So then we always look at a number of economic indicators, and one of the things we look at is average pay per employee, which here we compared to our peer counties. So you see here's Long Island, the yellow line, we're still higher than the US, which is the blue line, but we're lower than all of our peer counties. If you look at the high, Santa Clara County, which is Silicon Valley we're about 40% below. And then the next lowest compared to us was Bergen County, and we're still 18% below in Bergen County in terms of the average pay of employees, and that's people who work on Long Island.

We also look at value added for employee, measure of productivity. And, again, we're still doing better than the US, Long Island in yellow, the US in blue. But, again, look at our peer counties, the only peer county lower than us in value added was Fairfax County, Virginia.

Something that we looked at this year for the firm time was unionization

rates. And it was surprising to me, but I'm not really that familiar with unionization rates, so maybe it's not so surprising you, but if you at just overall, 27% of our employees on Long Island are covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements as compared to about 13.8% in the US. And if you break that down by sector, public sector employees, 72% of public sector employees on Long Island are covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements, compared to only about 13% or 14% of the private sector employees please.

And then we look at something that's considered a real measure of innovation in the economy, venture capital financing. And this shows just against Long Island over time, our peak year was in 2000, you know was, irrational exuberance was going on throughout the country, so that was high everywhere. But 400 million dropped way down. Last year, we got \$22 million in VC financing, that was up 24% from the year before, but still that's fairly low, especially when you compare it to a place like Silicon Valley, which is a top attractor of VC financing in compared to what's being given out across the United States. So in 2005, we got 22 million, Silicon valley got 4 billion, and all United States-wide there was 16 billion given out. So in percentage terms, Silicon Valley got 26% of VC financing last year, we got less than 1%, we got one-tenth of 1%. So that's certainly an area for improvement when talking about economic development issues on Long Island.

Another area where we can use some improvement, especially considering the wonderful facilities, research facilities we have on the Island, is getting back more federal research and development dollars. 2004 was actually a ten year high for us, we got a billion dollars in federal research and development dollars, but as a percentage, it's still less than 1% of all of the federal R&D dollars given out that year[.|.|.]. And if we look at where we are attracting the money, about 8% of the R&D dollars that the Department of Energy gives out comes to Long Island, and then we also get from the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services, but both of those are less than a percentage. And that money is

predominantly going to Brookhaven National Lab, Cold Spring Harbor Lab and Northrop Grumman.

So another, well, surprising trend to me, between 2003 and 2004, is that incomes fell at every level. The biggest drop being in the 20th percentile. And actually, if look at the time from 1997 to 2004, that's the only percentile where income fell in that time frame. Both •• the rest of income levels also are increasing incomes. And while incomes may have fallen, certainly our home prices did not follow suit. We look at something called ratio of home price to family income, and that ration had doubled in just six years. It was at 2.4 in 1999 and 4.8 last year. Compared to our peer counties, though, we actually don't look so bad. Westchester County is the least affordable and Suffolk actually is the most affordable of our peer counties. So we're not doing too badly.

Then we look at transit ridership, and Long Island Rail and bus combined was •• saw a decrease overall, saw a decrease for actually four consecutive years, whereas neither of the peer agencies had seen a four year consecutive decline in ridership. Although apparently, that trend was just reversed. I mean, bus ridership has actually been going up. It actually increased 23% over this time period whereas rail ridership decreased about 1%. But I just saw in Newsday recently that, in fact, for the first time in 2005 •• which is not here, that would be the next year •• rail ridership had increased for the first time in five years. So we might see a change in that next year in that trend.

And then we look at an indicators called ambulatory care sensitive condition in•patient discharges. That's really a proxy measure of uninsured •• people who are uninsured and not having access to quality primary care. It means that, especially in the areas shown in red and in orange, these are people that went to the emergency room for treatment for a condition that could

have been prevented. And they actually went to the emergency room and had to be hospitalized for a condition that could have been prevented or treated better or managed better if they'd had access to prime care. So it's things like ear infections and diabetes, high blood pressure. And this is the zero to 64 population, so it doesn't include seniors.

So we're complaining about our tax dollars, but at least we are still getting a good return on that investment, because Long Island students are still outperforming students from Westchester County and across the state on the two benchmark exams that we look at; fourth grade English and eight grade Math. And then if you disaggregate those results, this shows Long Island School District on average, so this includes all the test scores. And this just breaks out just those students in the high•needs districts, which there are now ten districts on Long Island that are considered high•need by the State Department of Education.

There's still a gap, about 15%, on fourth grade English, but as you can see, that gap in just four years from 2,000 to 2004. Similarly on eight grade Math, again, there's still about a 31% gap of Long Island students on average in high•needs districts, but, again, the gap has considered •• has narrowed considerably over the time period. And what's important is that the high •needs school districts, while there's only ten of them on the Island, there's over •• there's now •• about 15% of the student population in public schools are in those high•needs districts, and those districts are seeing increasing enrollment.

So then we look at what we consider indicators of students being at risk of performing poorly in school. And one of them is the number of students with limited English proficiency. And, again, you look at Long Island on average, 4.4%. High•needs districts are three times as likely •• or have three time as many students that are limited English proficient. And interestingly, now,

again, this is New York State as a whole, but Long Island actually has a higher percentage than New York State as a whole or Westchester County.

Then energy consumption. Probably not a surprise to anyone sitting on this committee, we are consuming more energy, both natural gas and electricity. We looked at a time period, roughly the same time period for both. And in both cases, residential went up about 20% and commercial went up about 13% for both types of energy consumption.

We're also recycling less. So garbage is down slightly from 2003 to 2004, but over the •• from 2002 to 2004, we're actually recycling 27% less. Pesticides use. This is, of course, of considerable interest to a lot of the groups. And I'm sure that the folks that were just presenting ahead of me would have interested in hearing about this, but our pesticide use, what this is showing is that the orange dots show commercial applications, the larger the dots, the more pesticides that were applied. And then blue are agricultural •• and it's actually not what was applied, but what was sold for agricultural purposes, because they don't have to measure it after the fact. The darker the blue, the more pesticides were sold for application for agricultural purposes in that area. And this is one area where we also do compare yourself to Westchester County, and Westchester County is using more pesticides than us.

So taken all together, I think there's a lot of indicators in here that show that we need to do some work to improve where we are going in the future. The most important thing to consider, we're one region. Long Island is not just Suffolk, but Suffolk and Nassau together. And we have one future, and if don't work together in new ways to help address some of these challenges, that future may not be as bright. Thank you. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to take them. I also have copies of the report, which •• and there are highlight sheets here. I didn't get a chance to insert them.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Gallagher. Let me start out of with just one question. I did a little research and looked at your book. Page 31 you talk about the income per household, and you say that in page 31 that the 80th percentile group earns approximately \$145,000, okay? And the median household in Suffolk County earns \$85,000, and the 20th percentile earns approximately \$42,000, per family of four?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Right. That's for all of Long Island. It's all adjusted to represent a household of four. So there are certain manipulations that are done that •• that's why if you look in the peer county chart upfront, the numbers will be slightly different, because those numbers are taken directly and there's no manipulation done to make them representative of a household of four, whereas the household income distribution indicator is manipulated to make it representative of a household of four. And it's also what they •• what's done, and this is kind of standard practice is it's averaged over three years so that any big jumps from year to year are taken into consideration. So when you do see a drop, it's always been, you know, averaged out over kind of a three year period.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I see. Okay. Thank you. Moving on then, knowing that 145, 85 and 42, according to your notes on page 85, you talk about Fannie Mae defines a home as affordable if the purchase price is no more than 2.5% times the buyer's annual household income. Now, obviously, that's correct because you said it's correct, and then •• because of the 2.5 times the 80th percentile, which is 145, is only \$362,000, and your talking about the average home in Suffolk 400,000?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Approximately in that range. And I understand from •• I heard on CBS News today that's it's •• in the last year it jumped 10% more, even though people think that prices have leveled off or not gone up, they talked about 10%. Are we saying that only people over •• within that 20% •• percentile able or capable of buying a house in Suffolk County?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

yeah. If you took that strict definition, and as they found •• I mean, a lot of places around the country, especially in California, I think, they said there's only about 14% of the population of the entire state of California that could afford to buy a house there.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We're pretty close to that, because you're saying 20, I'm figuring even with that, it looks like it's under that.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Right. Obviously, there have been other mitigating factors that in play over the past several years; the low interest rates, the •• all types of new high risk •• what we would call high•risk mortgage packages that banks and other types of lending institutions are offering people where you can put no money down, you can actually get more •• I mean, you can do •• you can take on a larger mortgage even than your house so that you can enroll all the closing costs into it.

So that's certainly •• now, we haven't ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Or layering more debt than what you can afford.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

right. There's a lot more debt than people can afford. So it actually would be something interesting to try to figure out, how many people have taken on those very high-risk mortgages and how many people really are leveraging themselves beyond what they can afford.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And if trouble occurs, there they go, they join that little group that you had of people that are going into bankruptcies.

Certainly the Legislature is looking at affordable housing issues this week. I bring that up because we'll be •• we'll talking about the Balboni Bill and DiNapoli tomorrow at eleven o'clock. And I thought that was important just to •• because it so accentuates and it so states our case that we really have to do something about affordable housing issues on Long Island.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

I mean, one of the other thing •• and we haven't been able to get the exact figures on this, but probably in the future we will look at it more closely, is that there's a much lower stock of rental housing on the Island than there are in other large metropolitan •• you know, suburbs of large metropolitan areas, so there's less housing choice. So if you aren't willing, ready or able to purchase a single-family home, you really don't have a lot of other option, not legally at least. Obviously, there are a lot of illegal apartments, and that's where we house our student population of the 20 Higher Education institutions that, you know, a majority of the those students are living in illegal apartments, basement apartments and over the garage apartments. But there's a much lower rental stock on Long Island than even in places, you know, Westchester County and even Fairfield, Connecticut. So it's certainly of concern as trying to provide housing choices for people through all stages

of their life to be able to live here.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. Any other further questions of the committee?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

All right. Well, I'd just like to reminds you about our website, www.longislandindex.org. Every index is up there, every poll report, there are five poll reports, there are three indexes now, and there are other special research reports that are up there. So the full report that was done on the cost of government on Long Island that we used •• you know, selected pieces of information in our special analysis is up there. And you can also actually look at something called community profiles. So that's on a community by community basis, so Babylon or Kings Park, Smithtown, you can actually go and get all of the census data that's available about that community and compare it to any other community on Long Island. That's a very, very useful tool. And I'm sure that it would be of interest to you as you are, you know, responding to queries from various constituents. All right. Well, all my contact information is in the report, so if you have follow•up questions, you can certainly get in touch.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Ms. Gallagher, thank you and thank you on behalf of not only the full Legislature, but also for all Long Islanders. It's a good •• it's a good thing you guys do in putting this together. It's very interesting and it keeps us informed. That's great. Good job.

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Oh, now you have a question. Carrie. Legislator Cooper.

LEG. COOPER:

I don't know whether you can answer this, but I've heard different figures relating to the amount of tax revenues that are generated from Long Island residents that go up to Albany compared to the funding that comes back down to us from Albany. I've heard •• I think the LIA said there was \$4 billion differential. Do you have any hard information on that?

MS. MEEK • GALLAGHER:

We had •• we actually included as a piece of information in last year's index, and the latest year that we had data for was 2000. And we did •• you know, as a real kind of calculation, so it wasn't •• if you were going to do a fully, fully accurate scientifically validatable, you'd have to •• it would be a much more complex process. But if you just looked at income tax that was sent to Albany •• or, you know, tax that was sent to Albany versus state aid that we get back from Long Island, there's about a \$3 billion disparity. And that was about actually 50%. So six billion was going up to Albany and we were getting about \$3 billion back. So it was about a \$3 billion disparity. And it was similar with the Federal Government. Obviously, we were spending much more to the Federal Government, I think about 16 billion to the Federal Government, we were getting back about 13 billion. But that would be something to, you know, every five years or so keep your eye on how that's changing.

LEG. COOPER:

Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Morgo. Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Mr. Chairman, Committee Members.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

It's always a pleasure.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Before I start on the agenda, I just want to mention from my point of view that I'm delighted that Carrie Meek•Gallagher is going to be joining the administration. The Index is a great tool. As you know, I work with Planning very closely, so it's going to be terrific. I've used the Index both in my old life and in my current life, and it's a terrific tool. You asked, Wayne, about the affordability ratio. The only reason any young people in the middle class are able to buy homes on Long Island now is because their parents owned homes, the parents can take the equity that came out of those homes because of the incredible appreciation. And what we find •• what I found at the Housing Partnership now, they have 18,000, 18,000 Long Islanders who have inquired to try to find an affordable home through the Housing Partnership. That's a quantifiable number. And it's often those kids who

come from families whose parents never owned, often people of color who don't have the homeownership tradition that they're not able to ever buy because their parents can't give that gift, that equity gift, for the down payment and the closing costs. That's not what I'm here to talk about, but it happens to be a passion of mine as well.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We do appreciate that about you, Mr. Morgo.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Would you like me just to ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Why don't we go through starting with the Tabled Resolutions.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yeah. Both 1071 and 1072 you remember from the last time, through the intercession of Legislator Barraga •• I almost said Assemblyman Barraga again, old habits die hard •• but through Legislator Barraga we were able to get an answer from FAA, we shared that answer with you. 1071 deals with the moratorium and 1072 deals with higher fees, especially a \$2000 late night fee for any aircraft landing between the proscribed hours. Just to repeat, the FAA said neither one would stand up to their •• their scrutiny. And I do want to say something about the fees. We are looking into imposing new fees, but we're working with the FAA to be certain that those fees would

be acceptable.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Reasonable.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

So I would think that you would want to table these again, because they're not going any place administratively. We are not going to be able to impose them.

1143 is an important one, and I was glad that I was here for the presentation for the Citizens Against Airport Pollution. We •• the department agrees that there has to be a mechanism for citizen input, particularly local citizen input, on the leases. We agree that the Lease Screening Committee should be abolished, because it's an anomaly. The right to decide on leases is yours as the Legislature. But there should be a mechanism for the citizens to be involved. And the Citizens Advisory Board, which is meeting Thursday night, is going to come up with a suggestion. Hopefully that suggestion will be accepted Thursday night. And I or others will be able to present to you next Tuesday in Riverhead. The hearing was recessed to Riverhead. I may •• I don't know this, but I may ask you on Tuesday to recess it again if we don't have a mechanism. If we do and it's acceptable to you and we can go forward with it, then we could close the hearing.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Is the Citizens Advisory Board •• is it a possibility that they could take up

that jurisdiction? Does that make sense? I don't even know.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I don't think fully, Legislator. I think that a subcommittee of it •• and again, remember, it would be purely advisory, and they would have to do it on clear criteria so you could judge what they're talking about. And I also should mention, they mention the Long Island Jet lease, please remember, that has not come to you yet. That is still be negotiated with the County Attorney. The only thing that's come to you that's on the floor of the Legislature is the CEQ's recommendation of a negative dec. And at the last Legislative Meeting, I asked you to table that one month, remember that? So that may come. But the LI Jet lease is not before you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Is that under Environment? I don't see that here.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

It's on the floor, it was tabled on the floor. It was tabled on the floor. So it's going to come up again on •• the CEQ recommendation, which they asked you not to accept, is going to come up again on Tuesday's agenda.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I'm sure Mr. Nolan will keep us advised.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

All right. I'll just move long.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Go ahead, move.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

1153, I have had discussions with Legislator Cooper on this, we're in support of this piece of legislation. 1163, establishing a task force to study the feasibility of increasing revenues and promoting economic development by establishing a horse racing track in Suffolk County. Again, I've had discussions Legislator Cooper, I've talked to one of his constituent who was indeed passionate about the economic development possibilities of a racetrack. I would ask you to table this, though, because he is providing me with backup. I think the Legislator concurs.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

And finally, 1238. 1238 is the recommendation of the Cultural Arts Screening Committee. You have the all of their recommendations attached to the legislation. I have a member of the committee Ray Zaccaro who is here who is from the 14th Legislative District. And he can talk to you about, if you

have any questions, about how the determination was made for the distribution of funding for the cultural arts organizations. Also, I have from my office, from my department, Mitch Isabelle•Stark who is the person in charge of compliance for the department, and she is the liaison with the different organizations, and she knows about them very well. So if it meets your approval, I would like to ask the both to come up in case you have questions. Legislator Horsley, we spoke about this, and you said that it was on the revised agenda, so then it must be right.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

The question on 1238, George just asked me and I'm going to ask you then. The SEQRA ••

MR. NOLAN:

The SEQRA clause is just incomplete, at least the copy I have. I don't know if that's been •• I have not seen an amended copy of that.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I have it as the Third Resolved, George, but it's not in it's full form.

MR. NOLAN:

The resolution I have, it's in the First Resolved Clause, and it's incomplete, so.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Let me •• If I may. I'm sorry.

MR. NOLAN:

As you can see, you know, it's just incomplete.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Okay. Well, George, how should we •• should we put this in •• can you do it as a Scribenor's kind of thing?

MR. NOLAN:

How time sensitive is the resolution?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I don't think it is particularly time sensitive. You all know Michele.

MR. STARK:

Hi. Good afternoon. Well, we did schedule a meeting for all the arts organizations to get contracts at the end of March assuming that this would be available.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So this is holding up the contracts, is that what you're saying?

MS. STARK:

It would hold up the contracts, yes.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Any suggestions on a CN?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Michele tells me she copied this from last year's resolution.

However ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

George is much more thorough.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

I hear that.

MR. NOLAN:

I wish I had picked up sooner, so I could have given you guys a heads up. I apologize for that. One possibility is cleaning it up and bringing it on as a CN at Tuesday's meeting. I'm not even sure you need a SEQRA clause for this type of resolution. I'd have to look at that. The committee could approve it. If we determine that it really needs a proper SEQRA clause, then we could explore the option of maybe bringing it on as a CN. I'll leave that up •• I think we can proceed by voting it out.

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Irrespective of that, we would correct it. I frankly didn't look at that closely. On the subject, though, Michele and the representative from the committee are here. If you have questions, fine. If you don't have any, that's fine too.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Any questions from the committee? Good job, Michele. Anything else, Mr. Morgo?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Again, if you have any questions about the airport, we are always available. I just might mention, I think that the Community Advisory Board is coming to a meeting of the minds. I think you will see ••

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You think it will be some sort of group from the Community Advisory Board?

COMMISSIONER MORGO:

Yes. I think that you will have representatives of the Community Advisory Board at the full Legislature next Tuesday speaking about 1143. And I just want to mention, and I think George would agree with this, that there is misunderstanding about the Long Island Jet Lease. Somehow the idea has gotten out there that, you know, you guys, the Legislature is considering this, but it hasn't been given to you yet, Because the lease is still being negotiated.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. All right. Anything else of Mr. Morgo? All right. Let's move to the agenda. Starting with Tabled Resolutions.

1071. To impose a moratorium on aviation related construction at Francis S. Gabreski Airport pending master plan adoption.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to table by Legislator Cooper and seconded by Legislator Montano. Any further conversation? All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **Tabled (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

1072. Amending Resolution No. 673•2004, to impose a fee for late night landings at Francis S. Gabreski Airport.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

This will be also moved to table by Legislator Cooper, seconded by Legislature Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **Tabled (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

1143. Adopting a Local Law, a Charter Law to require all leases for property at Francis S. Gabreski Airport to be approved by the Legislature to streamline County government.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to table.

LEG. COOPER:

I think we have to table for a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Correct. Motion to table for a public hearing, second on the motion?

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Montano. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.
TABLED (VOTE:5•0•0•0).

1153. To evaluate the feasibility of establishing a renewable energy park on County property.

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Cooper, seconded by? I'll second that motion. All those in favor? Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Jon, just explain to me what the renewable energy park is.

LEG. COOPER:

The concept is to have the County issue an RFP to invite proposals from renewable energy manufacturers or university or others involved in the field and to get their ideas for setting up a renewable energy park on County •owned land. The County contribution would be to provide the land. The purpose is to encourage either R&D in renewable energy technologies or also possibly establishing right here in Suffolk County manufacturing of renewable energy technologies.

LEG. MONTANO:

So it's not really a park.

LEG. COOPER:

No, it's not on parkland.

LEG. MONTANO:

It's not a park. I'm not sure I'm getting the concept. It's just a place where they're going to set up a research and development center?

LEG. COOPER:

Either R&D •• as a matter of fact, I already met a couple of weeks ago with SUNY Farmingdale, and they are doing research in this field. We had discussions as to whether we would be able to partner with them in some capacity. They are also doing •• consideration doing work with Suffolk Community College in this area, and there may be a possible tie•in there. But the idea is to invite RFPs and see what ideas we come back with.

LEG. MONTANO:

What I'm trying to get at, and just for my own mind, this is commercial development?

LEG. COOPER:

It could be commercial development, but it also could be actually siting on County property a •• whether it's solar energy generating or it could be hydropower or any potential renewable energy technologies.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

There is a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Negative.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Barraga votes no.

APPROVED. (VOTE:4•1•0•0 • Opposed • Legis. Barraga).

1163. Establishing a task force to study the feasibility of increasing revenues and promoting economic development by establishing a horse racing track in Suffolk County.

LEG. COOPER:

For the reasons that were outlined by Commissioner Morgo, I'd like to table this resolution for one cycle.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Second on the motion?

LEG. MONTANO:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Montano. Any considerations? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **Tabled (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

1238. Authorizing Cultural Affairs agreement funding for 2006.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Do I have a motion?

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve. Was there any subject to the SEQRA issue or?

MR. NOLAN:

What we'll do is take it up and vote it out of committee. We'll look at SEQRA issue to see if we need a proper SEQRA clause. If not, this can be voted on at the next meeting. If not, we'll advise the County Executive's Office, and they can consider a CN.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Nolan. Is there second on the motion? I'll make a second on the motion. Any consideration? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE:5•0•0•0).**

PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

No. 1. Procedural Resolution authorizing continued funding of law firm in connection with enforcement of LIPA settlement agreement against LIPA overcharge of Suffolk ratepayers.

Just so that everyone's advised. This is just a change in the name of the law firm. They dropped one of their partners apparently. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Why is the necessary for the County to contract with an independent outside law firm? I mean, we have a County Attorney's Office, I assume we have many, many attorneys on the payroll. Why it is necessary to contract this out, to get a specialized firm to do this? Isn't there anybody capable in

•house to do this?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

May I defer to one of the members that were last year when this was ••

LEG. MONTANO:

I'll take a stab at it. I don't disagree with you. What happened, however, was that this was passed last year. We did retain the firm, and this resolution is simply just to continue that. The question I have in my mind, when it came up last year it was initially, I believe, a \$100,000. I felt as an attorney that you're not going to get a lot for 100,000, that we were just, you know, going into a situation where we would have to sink more and more money. So maybe it's something •• or we will take up this year. I have no clue, and maybe I can ask Counsel •• I don't know if it's public information •• how much has been expended to date on this representation and where we are at? Now, maybe that's something we'll need to do in Executive Session. But I think this resolution just gives us the authority to move forward with what we did last year by changing the paperwork for the firm. That's all we're doing now, we're not hiring them.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And there's no additional dollars allocated •• this is monies that were allocated from last year. That doesn't answer your question, but...

MR. NOLAN:

This is just so basically we can execute the contracts, because they dropped a partner. The Procedural Resolution from last year had four partners, one left. We have to do the contract so they can get paid. We want to have the name of the right firm on the contracts. We'd like the committee to authorize that.

LEG. COOPER:

I guess to reiterate Legislator Barraga's concerns, you know, now that this opportunity is presenting itself, going back to the original question I know that there was some debate on this last year, why is this something that could not be handled by attorneys within the County Attorney's Office, why did we have to go to the outside and spend taxpayer dollars to hire outside counsel?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That's the question, Legislator Cooper.

LEG. BARRAGA:

That's the second time the question's been asked.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I think, from what I recall, the answer to that was that County Attorney's Office at that time didn't have the manpower, and also, it's an expertise kind of thing. And I think also we went through that with Broadwater, that that wasn't •• that there are some things that I would •• it seems like I remember that the County Attorney's Office does better than other things, and sometimes they don't have the ability. And that's why in such an important case, we decided to go outside as we did with Broadwater.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Which certainly makes sense. Broadwater wouldn't be questionable they have to deal with FERC and the Federal Government, and that's a specialized field of law.

LEG. NOWICK:

Right. There are a lot of things •• energy lawyers or in the case where there was bid rigging there was the possibility that maybe we had to go out of the County because those are expertise •• those are fields of expertise. But maybe it's something worth looking into again. We'll be going into Executive Session at one time with the County Attorney, we'll see where we are.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Taking a look at this again. Again, there has been work already done on this issue, right?

MR. NOLAN:

This litigation has been going on for quite some time, years.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And again, this is just a change so the contracts can be amended.

MR. NOLAN:

Right.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Did i have a motion on this? I lost it at this point.

LEG. MONTANO:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I have a motion to approve by Legislator Montano, is there a second on the motion?

LEG. NOWICK:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. BARRAGA:

In the negative.

LEG. COOPER:

Why don't you put me down •• since you don't need me, put me down as an abstention.

MR. NOLAN:

It takes a majority to vote it out. Three is enough then.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion approved. Legislator Cooper abstains. **Approved (VOTE:3•1•1•0**
• Opposed • Legis. Barraga; Abstentions • Legis. Cooper)

Now we'll move on to the **Memorializing Resolutions**.

M. 005. Memorializing Resolution requesting the State of New York Public Service Commission to review the proposed LIPA/KeySpan agreement.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I have a note here to refer this question to George Nolan on this issue about the dynamics behind this. But it's my understanding that LIPA has agreed to appear before the Public Service Commission.

LEG. COOPER:

Actually, Mr. Chair, it goes further than that. We really cannot move forward with this resolution. My understanding is this is not a Memorializing Resolution actually.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That's right.

LEG. COOPER:

This is a Sense Resolution, because express or opposition for a particular

bills. And we've voted that we no longer allow Sense Resolutions. So I guess this is improper.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

It's improper and it's also redundant, because I think that they've already done this or they're setting up a date to be before the Public Service Commission with this issue in mind.

LEG. MONTANO:

This should be removed from the agenda.

LEG. COOPER:

George, is it appropriate to withdraw •• how would we •• since it's not a Memorializing Resolution according to our rules.

MR. NOLAN:

I would suggest not making any motion on it, and then I believe it would die if no motion is made.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

There's no motion on the floor concerning Resolution M.005, and it will die.
FAILS for lack of a motion.

Are there any other issues for the committee? If not, I'll take a motion to adjourn. Motion by Legislator Barraga, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:55 P.M.*)

_ _ **DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY**