

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, September 10, 2008.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Wayne Horsley - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chair
Legislator Cameron Alden
Legislator Lou D'Amaro
Legislator John Kennedy

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Joe Schroeder - Budget Review Office
Joe Muncey - Budget Review Office
Barbara LoMoriello - Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Ben Zwirn - Deputy County Executive
Carolyn Fahey - Economic Development
Charles Stein - Suffolk Community College
George Gatta - Suffolk Community College
Dodie Tschirch - VP Business & Government Affairs - Cablevision
Joan Gilroy - Director of Government Affairs - Cablevision
Sara Chaikin, Cablevision
Pat Connolly - Suffolk County IT
Doug Miller - Suffolk County IT
Pat Halpin - Former Suffolk County Executive
Brendan Stanton - Aide to Chairman Horsley
Debra Alloncius - AME Legislative Director
All other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:10 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Will all Legislators please come to the horseshoe? Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to the Economic Development, Higher Education and Energy Committee meeting of September 10th. Would we please all stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

SALUTATION

Please let us stand for a moment of silence for all those who protect our freedoms across the seas.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Thank you very much. Please be seated. Good afternoon, everybody. Sorry about our tardiness, but the Parks Committee ran a little over and we always like to work with our fellow committees because it will happen with us, I'm sure.

We have no cards, so what I wanted to do, we have several presentations to be made. The first one involves Cablevision. Cablevision recently presented a proposal that they are well in the works of putting into place on Long Island, and that is a Wi-Fi proposition for Long Island. And this is being led by Dodie Tschirch, the Vice President of Business and Government Affairs at Cablevision, and Joan Gilroy, Director of Government Affairs at Cablevision, and I believe Pat Halpin, who is a consultant to Cablevision.

This is a very important discussion in my mind in that Suffolk and Nassau presently has been working for a number of months to complete and work towards making a wireless Wi-Fi system on Long Island, which has it's up and downs and frankly has, in my mind and to I know most of the members of the committee, somewhat behind schedule. We'll leave it at that. But we wanted to hear today what Cablevision has in mind and what the timelines are to some degree. We are keeping this very open. Some of the issues that Cablevision will be bringing forth may not be the entire project at this point in time because it is a work in progress, and certainly we respect Cablevision and their own personal timelines.

With that, I'd like to invite up Dodie Tschirch and Joan Gilroy, and Pat, if you'd like to join them and join us at the table. I, frankly, applaud Cablevision's vision on this matter. It's something we saw several years ago as an idea and a concept that Long Island needs for economic development for the people of Suffolk County as well as Nassau.

By the way, Nassau, unfortunately, because I gave them last minute notices, weren't able to be here, but they've asked for complete updates at the completion of this meeting so that we can assess where Suffolk and Nassau County should go in the near future concerning this most important project. Dodie, would you like to start? And welcome, by the way.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Thank you. I'm very happy to be here. And thank you for inviting us today. It's nice to be here with some good news which we can share with the members of this committee. I thought -- my remarks are going to be relatively brief and certainly if anyone has any questions I can try to answer them. If I can't answer them I'll get back to you with additional information.

So, as you have stated, Cablevision has embarked on a plan to provide outdoor Wi-Fi service across our footprint in places where our customers congregate. That might be a downtown area, a community park, or what we call waiting locations, like commuter rail platforms and parking lots. We're pleased to offer our customers with Wi-Fi enabled devices the ability to check e-mail, surf the

web, find restaurants, and download music, all wirelessly while they are away from their home or office.

Our initial deployment, which we first discussed in May, will be complete in two years, so that's 2010, and will be activated in phases. The first activation occurred just last week, September 4th, Thursday, and communicated to the public that we have a Wi-Fi service available in commercial and high traffic areas throughout Nassau County, in part of Suffolk, mainly the Babylon area, and on the commuter rail platforms and station parking lots across Long Island.

Cablevision believes that delivering the best and most technologically advanced services to our customers is key to our growth and success. So some providers charge their internet customers monthly fees for wireless data services and force customers to buy additional equipment. Optimum Wi-Fi is free, available to all current Optimum Online High Speed Internet customers who are using Wi-Fi enabled devices, with no limits on usage and allows connection speeds up to 1.5 megabits per second, providing a very fast wireless internet experience.

So customers using laptop converters, portable Wi-Fi enabled devices like iPhones or iPods can access Optimum Wi-Fi through a simple sign on screen. Then once the customer logs in using their Optimum ID and password, the network delivers the Wi-Fi -- the wireless internet access.

Wi-Fi, as the County may know since you have already done so much research on this, is the most common wireless standard, and it is the same standard that people employ in their wireless home networks. It's also worth noting that more than 50 percent of our Optimum Online customers are already using Wi-Fi routers in their homes, so a significant portion of our customers are familiar with the benefits and the flexibility wireless internet provides.

Any device that is certified by the Wi-Fi Alliance as adhering to the standards and that has a browser will be able to access the Optimum Wi-Fi Network. So a customer need only go to www.OptimumWi-Fi.com to view tutorials on how to access Optimum Wi-Fi with a variety of mobile devices. OptimumWi-Fi.com also offers access to coverage maps, illustrating the areas where the service has been activated and will allow our customers to track the deployment into new areas of activation.

Cablevision currently provides high speed internet service to more than 2.4 million customers, and more than 51% of those homes, which are passed by our fiberoptic network. By the way, that is the highest penetration of any broadband service in the country. So whether our online customers reside on Long Island or whether they are from other parts of our service territory, which might be Westchester or Connecticut, New York City, New Jersey, they'll be able to access the Wi-Fi Optimum Network while visiting or conducting business here on the Island.

We think that the value proposition of Optimum Wi-Fi as an expansion of our Optimum Online High Speed Internet Service, and actually as an extension of our Optimum Triple Play, will allow us to continue to attract new customers and also to cement the relationships with our current customers over the long haul.

As I mentioned, Wi-Fi is already available in commercial and high traffic areas in Nassau and a portion of Suffolk. This is positive for our customers and for the County's since we know of no other consumer Wi-Fi Network with that amount of coverage. Suffolk County should be commended for its early focus on the benefits and appeal of a widely available wireless internet access.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to come in and update you on our deployment. If you have any questions we will try to answer them.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Dodie. I appreciate that. So are you saying that -- this is self-serving, by the way -- that because of Suffolk's interest and Nassau's interest that this prompted you to move

forward with this project?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I would say that we actually --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Say yes.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Yes, yes. We had our toe in the water looking at this for a long time, but I will say that when the Counties put out the RFP, it certainly made us -- it brought attention to it and it made us focus on it.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

There you go, Dodie. Good answer. I'm kidding, but that's good to hear anyway.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Yeah, I think it is good that we both believe in the technology, which is really what this is all about.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We do. That's exactly the case. Let me ask you -- I have a couple of quick questions. I know Legislator Stern has some and I'm sure there will be others from the other Legislators. I was curious, because again, this is an economic development tool as well as it is for our residents. How does industry become Wi-Fi? Do they have to have the Triple Play in their businesses? How does that work?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Anyone has to be a customer of ours. If a business or an industry is not an Optimum customer, they won't be able to take advantage of the network. It's really that simple.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

But would they have to have the Triple Play where they would have to have the phone system and --

MS. TSCHIRCH:

What someone has to have to take advantage of this service is the online service. So, yeah, they could forego voice if they chose to do that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And that would be enough to get them to be able to access the system.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

The person just needs the online service.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. You know, I had heard so much about grand slams and things like that. But that's not for -- the businesses do not have to deal with that.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

No.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Very good. I know that you say that you log in, we just go to this tutorial and it will pretty much give us -- an access code, is that what you envision or?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You basically use your existing -- if you were to go online to your account you use the same pass code and information that you do to get into your Optimum Online account. That registers you, and

once you're registered you don't have to reregister. It will activate in your device that's Wi-Fi enabled. The Optimum will come up --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So you need a wireless card?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You don't need a card. Well, I'm thinking of my blackberry actually, but it will come up and it shows what wireless services are available and Optimum will come up first and foremost once you're in and registered. So it's relatively easy. And as I said, there are tutorials that are available at the website so that people can sort of work through that, figure out if their device is enabled, etcetera.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So being that I live in Babylon Village can I get on to this right now?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You should be able to.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And I am a customer.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You should be able to. Do you have a Wi-Fi enabled device?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I believe so.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I think you should try it.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I would have to go look at my daughter's computer. I know my laptop is not -- my table model is not.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I think the confusion about what's Wi-Fi enabled and what's not is one of the reasons that we actually developed the tutorials, to help people answer the questions of what they need to do and whether their devices will work.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. You know, and if you can't answer this, you know, I certainly understand. You know that the Long Island Wi-Fi proposal, the County's proposal, we had discussed it as going to be -- certainly it is going to be there for an Island proposition. Are you looking in the future phases at growth or what are you thinking as far as -- are you able to answer that?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I'm not sure I understand.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Where is the system going, I guess, at the long run. If we are going to make a decision on Long Island Wi-Fi it would be good to know that, you know, that you're covering similar areas that we were going to cover.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Our plan over the two year period is to cover the commercial and those commuting areas in our

entire footprint. I think perhaps another difference between what the County originally envisioned and what we're offering here is that we are focused on an enhancement for our customers, so the service will be available. It will be available sort of, you know, throughout the entire footprint. I can't say everywhere because you have to really look at the map to see where it is, but --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Nor were we, by the way. We certainly weren't going to wire the Pine Barrens.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Right, right. But, yes, that is part of our plan. We'll stretch all the way out to the East End.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Parks. What --

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Interestingly enough, and again, you know, if you actually will go online and take a look, if you can look at the map, because most of the development thus far has happened in Nassau. We are just really over into Suffolk with this first phase. The parks are included. I can't tell you at this point in time what that entails in Suffolk. We'll have to wait for the announcement of availability of service here, but I can tell you that in Nassau we are looking at parks.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So if I was to go to Jones Beach that would be covered?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

That's a possibility. I don't know every park, I apologize, so I can't give you an example. But I know that we are in some of the parks in Nassau.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. It is your intention to be in the parks.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. I'll pass at this point to Legislator Stern and then I am going to get back to you because I have a few more questions.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. STERN:

Just a couple of quick ones. If I am a business owner and I'm an Optimum customer through my business but not necessarily at home, although I don't know why anybody would do that, but if I'm in one lotion and not the other, do I still qualify as an Optimum customer for purposes of getting online if I am not using it out of my home?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You know, I'll have to get back to you with that. I haven't heard that we're differentiating at all, but I certainly will get back to you to clarify that.

LEG. STERN:

But it is not the other way around. If I'm a customer at home, then I qualify -- even though I'm not necessarily using it for some other account. I don't know if I understood the significance of the 51

percent statistic that you had quoted earlier. I'm wondering if you can go back to that. You had said that there are X amount of residents, you know, living on Long Island, you service a certain percentage of those residents. Then you went on to say something else about 51 percent. I don't know if I understood that.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Right. Throughout our service territory we have 2.4 million customers. Of those customers, 51 percent of the homes passed have -- more than 51 percent of the homes passed have our fiber optic network and are our high speed customers. So if you look at -- if you look at the number of customers really that have the high speed service, 2.4 million, you can see that we already have a very high interest in internet services. We hope that this will then drive that even higher. And I also mentioned that we know that of the internet customers that we have, there's already a very high usage of wireless routers in the home, so they are already familiar with this type of technology.

LEG. STERN:

And do you have any idea of what your next area of activation is going to be? Because I have to tell you, the thought of my good friend Legislator Horsley being ten times more productive than me because he's in Babylon is killing me right now. So where are you going next?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

It's a frightening thought, isn't it?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I can't disclose that at this point in time, but I can reassure you that the construction is moving along very rapidly. So we will be making another announcement very soon.

LEG. STERN:

I will leave it at that. Thank you.

MS. GILROY:

Well, you're Huntington. You can't be too far away, Steve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We're just -- Babylon is just a breakaway of Huntington anyway, so. Let me ask a quick question and then I am going to give this to Legislator D'Amaro. Do you see, and this is a long range, do you see any synergies that the County may have with Cablevision on this project now or in the future, you know, the use of our buildings or anything else, anything that would assist us in looking at the two projects.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You know, I have to say that I think it's too soon to tell. We certainly would always be interested in partnering in some way with the County or Counties where we provide our service. At this point in time we are, you know, this is the very beginning of our build out and we're just -- we're really just focused on the construction at this point in time. But I think it is fair to say that we're certainly open to suggestions in the future, just that we haven't --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That we would have a dialogue?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Right. The door is open, we just have -- we have not focused on it at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

But the door is open.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

The door is open.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That's good to hear. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. Okay. So I live in Babylon. I have a wireless router and I have a laptop and when I go on the internet with my laptop that little icon pops up and tells me there are wireless networks available, being my home network, and I go into that. And I am also a Cablevision subscriber and have optonline and all of that. So with this new service, I can eliminate the wireless router in my home?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

The way we're describing this is really an outdoor network. We are constructing on the poles, we're putting wireless devices on our strand, on our existing strand on the poles. I can't guarantee, then, that that signal is going to penetrate inside your home. This is really an opportunity for those people that have the service inside the home to take that experience outside the home at no additional cost.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So if I left my house and I went to a local park, let's say, within Babylon --

MS. TSCHIRCH:

With your laptop.

LEG. D'AMARO:

With my laptop, then I could log on through my account and have internet service.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

That is the idea exactly.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So in order to do that, as you have stated, this is really a service to your customers, and it's a wonderful service, but the program that we were looking at here in Suffolk County was accessible, free public access at no taxpayer expense, which is something very different.

I'd be interested in following-up on the question from the Chair about how we can go from the pay service and then take our vision of providing a real economic development tool where if you come and do business in Suffolk County you may actually have free Wi-Fi service, which I guess would compete with what you are doing. So are they mutually exclusive?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

At this point in time I can only say that really we're just really -- we're focused on an enhancement for our customers and we honestly haven't thought of a business model that goes beyond that. But that's not to say that we won't think along those lines in the future.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you. And I can't wait to go home and try it tonight. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. D'Amaro. I'm going to throw in questions, just a quick one, and then I'm going to go back over. Your news release estimates a network speed of up to 1.5 megabits per second. Can you put that into context? Does this mean we can watch videos, movies, download songs, you know, what does this mean?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I wish I knew. I know that you can download songs.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Can I watch, you know, Rambo or something?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I am technically challenged, and I know that it is considered to be a very fast speed, but I can certainly, you know, sort of paint a better picture for you. I can get back to you with more information.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. I just wanted to see what that meant. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thank you for coming in to talk to us about this. I marvel at this. I'm still trying to figure out, you know, the HDTV. But nevertheless, I've set a goal to get there from here. I am a little bit more familiar with your -- the framework of how you operate in the various municipalities, the towns and the villages, through the franchise agreements and the licensing agreements when it comes to our television pictures that we see. Is this something that is analogous to that, or is an outgrowth, or is it something that really is just a product offered by you that's not necessarily regulated at all. I'm curious.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

It is not regulated. It is not regulated by those local franchise agreements, so it really is just an outgrowth or an add-on of a product that we already have available, which is the on-line service. Because we already have pole attachment agreements and we have the strand already on the poles, we put a piece of equipment on that strand. So we already have the pole attachment agreements so we don't have to get permission. If we were a new provider that came to town we wouldn't --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Which was one of our hang-ups, John.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I'm somewhat intrigued by that as well because -- for a whole variety of reasons I don't want to go into, I know much more about stand than you'd ever want to know. But the -- you had negotiated access rights with LIPA or Verizon perhaps, to have the Cablevision equipment on those poles, and so now you are adding to whatever it is as far as these specific devices and you come on and you repair and you service and you do all the things that you do. So now as you go ahead and activate these things, you'll be getting this capability to get out there and get outside of the four walls of either a residence or a building?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Right. That's right.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So it does sound like it is something that would be -- it would be probably very beneficial for any kind of business that would be involved in tracking, package distribution, delivery, even surveying or anything outdoors based where folks are going to have to be accessing that kind information, reporting or doing anything along those lines. I'm just wondering how it is going to manifest itself as it begins to get out there. Also, I'm from the Smithtown area, and again, I guess this must be a business decision as you look at where you want to go.

I'll go back to some of the statistics you originally quoted, though, too. Two point four million customers in your service area. Does that take the whole Tri-State area that you service?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Yes. That's our entire service area.

LEG. KENNEDY:

How many customers do you have in the County of Suffolk?

MS. GILROY:

Now I would say about 460,000.

LEG. KENNEDY:

About 460,000.

MS. GILROY:

Four-hundred and sixty, 470,000. Around there.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And we have about 550,000 discrete parcels. So does that mean basically 80 percent of the parcels with a structure that could have a television you folks service or is it multiples of that? I'm just curious. I mean, basically, you are it. There are a couple of other providers out there, small, I don't want to say their names, but I'm just curious how much of the market you occupy at this point here in Suffolk County.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I don't have that information with me. I just have the, you know, the footprint information[.|.|.] I do know that at least pockets of Long Island seem to be early adapters when we have introduced new services, so I think it's fair to make a guess that the penetrations, the high penetrations that we have, exist on Long Island as they do elsewhere. So certainly it's not, you know, the penetration of Cable itself, but the penetration of the online customers, about 51 percent. I think it's just fair to probably use that same number.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Fifty-one percent of the 480,000, so roughly maybe what, 220, 240,000?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I'm not sure of the number that Joan's quoting, but we have a lot of customers. You are right, I think we are still the major provider.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. At this point basically an offering that the company has elected to move to, but nothing that's necessarily from an oversight level, be it either federal, state or even with us saying this is the parameters of the market, this is how you operate, this is what the relationship --

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Right. That's our understanding.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. Before I -- I'm going in between because I just don't want to overwhelm them with my questions and be the only show. I got a question. Two years ago I guess it was, whenever it was, there was a bridge that fell down in Minnesota, Minneapolis. Do you recall that? It was a tragedy. And there were no communications for the Police Departments at that point in time. Once the bridge went down everything was shut down. The Emergency Services could not communicate with each other except that they had just put up a Wi-Fi system and it just happened that that Wi-Fi system was operative. They were able to communicate over the Wi-Fi system, which I thought one of the reasons why we started discussing Wi-Fi to begin with was in case there was ever a tragedy, a

hurricane, or whatever the issue may be.

Is there any discussion, any thought within the business model that if under an emergency situation that our police services or whomever, Homeland Security, etcetera, could somehow access the Wi-Fi system for communication purposes? That's a big question, I know.

LEG. ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman. Homeland Security can take over private corporations if there is a national disaster or a national emergency declared. The President has that power.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Thanks. And we are not looking for that power, but I just wanted --

LEG. ALDEN:

We should have that power to take over private industry.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That doesn't sound like the conservative Republican that you are.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I don't know the direct answer to that, but I can say if you sort of look at it from another way, where people have a device in their possession when something like that happens, that they could then go out and access via the internet a source where they can find out -- get information. But you are talking about one way, I'm talking about the other way.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I'm talking about the Wi-Fi network. Is that a thought that Cablevision should take a look at, what happens if there's, you know, the bridge falls down.

MR. HALPIN:

Legislator, I'm pretty familiar with emergency communication systems. Suffolk County has a very robust emergency communication system --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I know that.

MR. HALPIN:

-- with all kinds of redundancies. One event like a bridge going down is not going to cripple your emergency communication system. And, frankly, it's probably much more robust and sturdy than infrastructure that, you know, any entity would have that's hanging wires on poles, frankly. So I appreciate your example, but I think in this particular case we can be pretty well assured that the County's emergency communication system, especially in light of post 9/11, there has been a lot of work and money that's been spent by Suffolk and Nassau and New York City and others to really ensure interoperability and the ability to communicate with all of your first responders.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

How are you doing? I just had a question on the technology. Is that microwave technology, the devices you are putting on the pole? Do you know?

MR. HALPIN:

It is not. No, these are very -- it's a very low frequency technology, as you know, when you

explored it with your Wi-Fi. It is a standard, you know, Wi-Fi criteria that is used. This is no different than anything else that's going on around the country. What you need to know is that this system, when it is fully operational, will be the largest of its kind in America.

LEG. ALDEN:

But, Pat, my -- and the point I'm coming from, I've had some groups that I am affiliated with, and they are breast cancer groups and things like that. They are still afraid of, you know, some of the devices and some of the technology we are using, and if it's microwave and even some of the other broadband type of things. There's no definitive answer whether it causes cancer or doesn't cause cancer, but there is the concern out there that it might. So to eliminate any of those people's concerns, is it safe to say that this technology is safe or it's not questioned?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I think it is safe to say that, you know, because this technology is already used in wireless routers in the homes, it's just as safe.

LEG. ALDEN:

That's what I wanted to hear. Thank you.

MR. HALPIN:

You know, the FCC sets these standards and wireless routers, cell phones themselves, are way below the federal standards in terms of what are the emission standards for those applications.

LEG. ALDEN:

Just to pick up. Our former County Executive made a great point that unfortunately after the cowardly act of terrorism that was perpetrated on this country, it did expose some weaknesses in certain communication and we did make all kinds of arrangements to eliminate those weaknesses. So on the emergency basis I think we're, you know, light years ahead of where we were pre-911. Can it be improved even further? Probably, but I think in that regard we're pretty solid. I wanted to pick up on that point again. And that's exactly why he would know about emergency communications, because he actually used them, both on a smaller level over in Babylon, and then on the larger level.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Alden. I stand --

LEG. ALDEN:

Well, not corrected.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Now I understand. Let's go to the issue of cost, if I may, and I don't want to get into any trade secrets or anything else like that. The Long Island Wi-Fi, the figures that I recall being bandied about to put together the final system was an investment of approximately \$140 million. How does that compare to Cablevision's ultimate vision as what this is going to cost to put this together?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

What was the 140 million?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That was a figure -- we're not sure. That was the cost to actually, to erect the system.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Oh, the system that had been proposed by the County.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That had been proposed, yes. That's where the bid came in. That was part of the RFP process and the dollars that were talked about. What do you feel about that? Is that something that -- were we in the ballpark there, knowing the answer.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I don't want to answer that particular question because I'm not sure what was envisioned for the architecture. But I can say that, you know, we are in a somewhat unique position because we already have an infrastructure in place, so that's very helpful to us. What we have said publically is that the deployment of this system will cost approximately \$100 per cable customer. I'm not sure how that matches what the County thought it would cost.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

The investment, then, did I read it, in the range of \$300 million. Is that something that --

MS. TSCHIRCH:

It may be that you saw that in print and -- well, we didn't -- we haven't made that leap, but we do have 3.1 million customers and we're saying that it's about a hundred dollars a customer.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That's pretty good. I'm either very sharp or I read well.

LEG. STERN:

Well, you have Wi-Fi by your house.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I have Wi-Fi, right.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

It has been bandied about in the press.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I had heard. That was the number that I had heard. It is illuminating to us to know that, you know, that how many dollars are put in to your system to make it a success. And you did not have the pole charges that were on the horizon, so to speak, that the E-Path project would have had to have to extend it. So I don't think that was in the initial figure either, which would have probably made it to those kind of dollars. All right. Are there any further questions?

LEG. STERN:

Just very quickly. What -- can you explain, what does it look like, the devices that go up on the poles. Are they large, are they relatively small? How many of them go up on poles in the particular area to service the area?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

You know, I'm not sure that I have that information with me. I could actually even send you a picture because we actually do have some mounted on poles. It's a piece of equipment, I wouldn't say it is as large as this piece of equipment. It has two little antenna's that come out on either side of it. But I can certainly, you know, if you are interested, I can send that along to you easily enough.

LEG. STERN:

I'd be interested in seeing that. And do you know how frequently they need to be placed on the poles to service a particular area? Is it one, is it two, is it 20, to serve Babylon?

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I'm not sure what the coverage is, but I can get that information to you, too.

LEG. STERN:

I'd be interested to know that.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

I assume there probably are variables in there, but we will be happy to get that kind of detail for you. Not a problem.

LEG. STERN:

Very good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Excellent. Anything else from my fellow Legislators? Mr. Connolly, Mr. Miller, are there any questions that you guys would like to ask? Come on up. You're good?

MR. MILLER:

We're good.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. These two gentlemen were part of the County's team involving the RFP and everything else involving the County project. All right. We're good I think. I appreciate the fact that you are here and I certainly wish you the best of luck. It's good to see economic development in Suffolk and Nassau Counties.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Thank you. We're very, very excited about this initiative.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

As you should be.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We are in this together, so that's good. Thank you very much.

MS. TSCHIRCH:

Thank you.

MR. HALPIN:

Thank you.

MS. GILROY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. At this time my first apology of the day is to Ms. Fahey. But it was a very interesting topic, wasn't it?

MS. FAHEY:

No apology necessary. It was quite interesting.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You are going to talk about downtown revitalization, update, status.

MS. FAHEY:

I do have handouts based upon the request of the panel.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All righty. Welcome, Carolyn. It's always a pleasure.

MS. FAHEY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. As directed through Resolution 418 of '08, when the Legislature adopted the 2009-2011 Capital Program, the four and fifth resolution directed the department to prepare a status and update report with regards to two Capital Programs, 6412, the traditional downtown revitalization and specifically rounds three through seven, and CP 6418, which is the Downtown Beautification and Renewal Program, specifically rounds one and two.

Just a little brief history. The Downtown Citizens Advisory Panel, of which I am the County Executive's appointment and the elected Board Chair, was created through Resolution 444 in 1997. The main goal was to advise the Legislature on ways to enhance and revitalize our downtowns. A 20 member panel was created. One representative from each Legislative district, one County Executive appointment, and the Director of Planning and/or his representative. In your packet, the top page gives you a listing of the current membership and the appointments.

As you are aware from our previous conversations, round one through four were recommended to the Legislature based on a traditional member item concept where the pot of money was divided into 1/18th and each Legislator got to recommend which projects were funded from their district. The downtown panel really just became a conduit for those recommendations.

In 1995, the panel decided that it was more worthy of the projects and the efforts that were put into them to create a scoring system that would score the applications on a merit based process. Rounds five, six and seven that this Legislature has subsequently approved were recommended based upon that merit based scoring system.

In your packet you have what round eight's merit based scoring system and the points were that were allotted. It has basically stayed the same for the last three, four rounds, with a little bit of tweaking with each round based upon experience and the applications.

In 2007 the County Executive -- and it is good to note that change in program process and the review process was awarded a National Association of Counties Award to the panel because they've taken an existing program and enhanced it and they did receive a NACA award based upon that new scoring system.

In 2007, because the panel had created the scoring system, the County Executive asked the panel to make recommendations to his Capital Program, which is 6418. Round seven, that was adopted last year by this Legislature, both programs were reviewed by and recommended by the Downtown Citizens Advisory Panel.

In the packet the resolution that brought me here today has asked for a status and an update of those specific rounds. In your packet the first page with the red heading is a combination of the two programs. You'll see on the left Downtown Revitalization, three, four, five, six. The transfer to 001 are several resolutions that were adopted by several Legislators that then transferred the money over to our Capital Program and enhanced some of the projects that were already in existence. That was done in 2004, 2005, 2006. In 2006 this Legislature determined not to allow that process anymore. So you've only seen a few of those projects transferred over.

The second column, Downtown BNR, is the beautification and renewal. Three are the three rounds that have been awarded to date. That's the County Executive's program. You'll see a combination of the number of grants awarded, number completed to date, and the total amount of money that has been awarded for those particular rounds.

And then the two other attachments you have actually are itemizations of the two programs actually listing the round, the agency, the grant award, the status and the project. It gives you an idea as to what's complete and what's not and where we are with each project. It also allows you to determine which projects are in your districts, in each Legislative district.

So the resolution that has brought me here has asked to give you a status and an update. To date for the rounds that were requested we have 151 different grant awards, of which 85 are complete, for a total of \$4,026,000.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Fahey. We're digesting it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, go ahead, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you. Carolyn, thank you. I appreciate it. It's good for me to see some of what the various dates and rounds are for some of the funding that we've had. As you know, Legislator Nowick and myself have over the course of the past couple of years, as did my predecessor, focus on downtown revitalization in the Smithtown area. Recently we've had an awful lot of conversation about what has become something that has arisen, I guess out of a policy decision, I believe a policy decision on the part of the administration, to change the nature of the funding from I guess pay-as-you-go to bonded funding. In making that decision, now needing to demonstrate some kind of an inherent nexus in the underlying reality that's being improved and this notion of the easement running in favor of the County of Suffolk. My concern is, is that some of these awards were made before I think that policy decision was made shifting the nature of the funding?

MS. FAHEY:

No, no. When the County Executive and Legislature adopted the 2007 Capital Program, in that program the funding mechanism was changed from G money, pay-as-you-go money, to bond money. So it's round seven when the bonding financing came into play. The applications that were requested and accepted for round seven did note that there was the easement requirement that had to come into play. So any round, any award that was made was made with the understanding that the easement was required.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But let's go then to I guess the one, two, three, fourth page of your handout which is a round five award of 90,000 between both Legislator Nowick and myself, which is as of this date not yet complete. It goes to lighting, sidewalks, and a center aisle development. That grant is not subject to the easement requirement?

MS. FAHEY:

That 90,000, correct. Subsequent grant in round seven through the Smithtown Chamber would be.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So round six is not subject.

MS. FAHEY:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It's an issue because obviously we have a focus on it and we are going to continue to try to focus with it and we have to get it resolved.

MS. FAHEY:

It is an issue, but we were clear in the application process for round seven and round eight which this Legislature will see at its next meeting. At the September 16th meeting the round eight recommendations are going to be laid on table. Round seven and round eight applications specifically noted that the easement is going to be required by the owning municipality.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, that brings me to the next area that I wanted to raise with you. I'm concerned with the recommendations that you are going to be making to us for round eight, because I know in particular that Smithtown has not procured those easements yet, and therefore what had previously been, I guess, something that was going along in sequences is now no longer eligible in this round.

MS. FAHEY:

Correct. The program has changed because of the funding mechanism, but it is not something that the applicants were not aware of. So when they applied, we required that you are going to have to be able to get the easement from the owning municipality.

Bond Counsel has given the County Attorney an opinion that in order to move forward with bonding these projects there are two main criteria. One, the project must be on municipality owned land, and two, that municipality must be willing to give the County an interest in that property where the improvement is being made for the term of the bond. Those criteria were laid out in the application for which organizations submitted. So they were well aware that that was going to be, and the municipalities that supported those projects through resolutions were well aware that that was going to be a requirement of the program.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I think several of us, or at least I know a couple of us, have encountered some issues, particularly where we are talking about main streets to the state roads running through some of our downtowns and what's still at this point an apparent unwillingness on the part of State DOT to provide that easement. And we're talking about what's going to be necessary to get that done. Again, my concern goes to what is the aggregate amount, then, of what the recommendation is going to be from the panel that we are going to be asked to consider coming up.

MS. FAHEY:

It's a million dollars worth of granting between the two programs, but none of those projects that are being recommended have that easement issue.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, categorically they're not there because of the fact that we have this unresolved matter.

MS. FAHEY:

Correct. We tried desperately. When the County Executive and the Legislature changed the funding mechanism for the program we asked DOT to come to the table. We said come sit with us, let's figure out a way that you will issue easements that would allow these projects to move forward. They said we don't issue easements. We won't even talk to you about easements. We couldn't even get them to the table.

When round eight came around we again asked DOT. We had community groups going to the DOT. Your district -- Legislator Beedenbender was in touch with Assemblyman Englebright who talked to the DOT and the DOT said no. We have a project up in Rocky Point on a small vest pocket park that a local community group has a stewardship agreement on with the DEC. I spoke directly with the DEC and they said no, we will not issue easements.

Based upon that information, the panel had to determine whether or not they even submitted to you

projects that were fundable, and they decided not to. They decided to move forward, submit to the Legislature through round eight those projects that were viable and could be completed in a timely manner, because completion of the project is one of the criteria's that they score on. And then move forward and try and resolve the issue.

They did agree that if the issue were to be solved for the next round, and there is money in the '09 Adopted Capital Program for these two programs, that those projects that had to be withdrawn from consideration would receive addition weight in the next round if we could settle the easement issue. We are working with local delegation, the County Executive's Office is working, I believe, with the Governor's Office. I know, John, you have been working with Senator Flanagan's Office. We're all trying to get DOT to the table to at least work out this issue.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And I appreciate, you know, the part that you have facilitated and we'll continue in concert to try to ask our State representatives to, you know, resolve this issues. Otherwise, we're faced with the prospect, many of us, who got, you know, downtowns with State roads running through it, of just being categorically excluded.

MS. FAHEY:

There were five or six projects that were withdrawn from consideration because of the issue. And, you know, the panel felt very, you know, very sorry for these organizations. They spent time on the applications, the local municipalities spent time, but when applications are submitted we do require that the local municipality submit a supporting resolution so they understand the conditions and criteria of the contract that they are going to have to sign.

In conversations with Brookhaven Town, they knew that the State would never issue an easement, and yet they still supported the application through resolution, which kind of put the panel in an awkward position. You know, the town would never be able to get DOT to give them an easement on Jericho Turnpike in Centereach, but they pushed the project forward anyhow. So it kind of put the panel in a very awkward position. We deliberated as to whether or not to submit to this panel, to this body, projects that we knew could not move forward at this time.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And again, I'm not suggestion that it is up to you folks to have to resolve what the externalities are. Nevertheless, I think some of us, I know I, and I am going to make the request of the Chair, that we have some follow-up dialogue here because I think otherwise meritorious projects are being excluded, and excluded unfairly.

Tell me a little bit, though, about the greater weight. You have very graciously given us the point schedule for a project. Will this then be modified for round nine?

MS. FAHEY:

I don't know. This might be tweaked a little bit, but the panel had decided not how much, but they did decide that they would consider giving additional points to those projects if we were to settle the easement issue. That if those projects were resubmitted, that they would give them additional consideration and points. How they are going to do it we haven't come up with that mechanism yet, but we've all agreed that it was the right thing to do, that if we were to settle the issue, that these projects be given consideration and extra weight.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. I don't want to monopolize the dialogue. Thank you. And, you know, I'll certainly let you know as soon as I get the opinion, and hopefully this will be a joint meeting with Senator Flanagan.

MS. FAHEY:

Again, that's round eight. It's not the status that I have been asked to give today, but you will be seeing it as a resolution laid on the table at the next legislative meeting.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Are there any further questions from the Legislators?

MS. FAHEY:

If I could, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to advise the committee that at your Tuesday full Legislative meeting you are going to see a Certificate of Necessity at the request of the department to the County Executive. Currently, the air traffic control services that are provided at the Gabreski Airport are providing by the Air National Guard. Though our joint use agreement that the County has with the Air National Guard they are responsible for providing air traffic control tower services. The County does not require a tower, therefore, we don't pay for services as a general aviation airport. It's not something that we're required to have.

During the last BRAC process, one of the issues that came to the surface was that this was probably one, if not -- one of a handful of guard bureaus in the country that carry this cost. So we agreed during the last BRAC process to try and find a way to take that cost off of their table, but at no additional cost to the County. The FAA has an Air Traffic Control Tower Contract Program where through them the County would become the conduit to pay for these contract services. It would use the County to flow through the money from the FAA to the County to an FAA contracted agency to run the tower, and it would take that cost off of the books of the Air National Guard. Currently it is about \$680,000 a year that the Guard is paying for.

So the CN -- the deadline for this program and acceptance into this program was in August. The FAA has given us until September 18th to sign on. So we're coming to you with a CN that would allow the County Executive to negotiate an agreement with the FAA and with the Air National Guard to allow the County, as the sponsor, to apply for this program and be the conduit for that funding. The negotiations that need to take place are to ensure that down the line if the FAA funding either is below 100 percent or might be gone all together, that the responsibility for those services go back to the Air National Guard and not back the County.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Carolyn. Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

The contract is going to be with FAA and the Air National Guard?

MS. FAHEY:

No. The contract will be with the FAA and the County. The only agencies that can apply for this program are airport sponsors and the County is the airport sponsor.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. So then we're going to contract with the Air National Guard to provide --

MS. FAHEY:

No, we currently contract with the Air National Guard, that they are responsible for providing services.

LEG. ALDEN:

Who is going to provide the service?

MS. FAHEY:

It's a contract agency. The FAA has a listing of air traffic control contract agencies that they work with, that they do through bid and RFP. We will be using one of those at the direction of the FAA.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right now doesn't the Guard use personnel --

MS. FAHEY:

No. They have a contract agency.

LEG. ALDEN:

Oh, they do.

MS. FAHEY:

Yes. They contract out for it at 680,000 a year.

LEG. ALDEN:

To direct the military aircraft.

MS. FAHEY:

To provide air traffic control services for the tower and encompassing what they need to do for the military, they take care of the civilian.

LEG. ALDEN:

That's a surprise, because most military air traffic control is, you know, it's not civilian, it's military air traffic control.

MS. FAHEY:

This is a contract agency.

LEG. ALDEN:

Out there.

MS. FAHEY:

Yes. And I think you would find that at most general aviation airports where you have military facilities and general aviation combination that they use contract. They don't have the personnel to do that and the liability involved with anything else.

LEG. ALDEN:

So these contract agencies, they're in that union, right, that has an agreement with the Federal Government.

MS. FAHEY:

Yes, with the FAA.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Carolyn, is it a given that this grant would be received?

MS. FAHEY:

Yeah, it's one of the reasons why we are doing the CN. There were a couple of conditions that the FAA wanted to see adhered to, one of them being we have an obstruction issue from the tower to the end of one of the runways, so we are in the process of clearing that right now. There was some equipment issues that the Air National Guard was going to take care of, and a little bit of renovation to the tower, you know, minor things that needed to be done. But, you know, our concern was that this cost didn't fall back on to the County. So the CN just authorizes the County Executive to

negotiate, to ensure that it is fair to all and then execute the agreement if the negotiations move forward.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Any further questions? Carolyn, thank you very much. We appreciate you coming down here today and keeping us informed on this important project of yours, because we're all interested in it. Thank you very much.

All righty. That being the case, we will move to the tabled prime.
Everyone with me?

TABLED PRIME

1708, Adopting Local Law No. 2008, A Local Law amending the Suffolk County Empire Zone Boundaries to include Nanz Custom Hardware, Inc., (SCTM No. 0100-067.00-01.00-024.091). (Co. Exec.)

I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

LEG. ALDEN:

Abstain.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Alden abstains. **(Vote: 4-0-1-0 Abstention: Legislator Alden)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

1770, Reappoint member to the Suffolk County Community College Board of Trustees (Frank Trotta). (Browning)

I did get a phone call from him and apparently his note said that he was out of town this week. So I move to --

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Make a motion to table?

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'll offer a motion to table, Mr. Chairman. And also, I just want to ask on the record is this a holdover appointment? How long -- if Counsel knows when the term expired and how long of a holdover it's been.

MR. NOLAN:

It expired June 30, 2007, so he's been there I guess over a year.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Over a year holdover?

MR. NOLAN:

Yup.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I would encourage the Chair to reach out to Mr. Trotta and ask him to please make the next meeting so we don't continue with the holdover so we can make a decision.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, otherwise it fall into a holdover issue. Okay. So I have a motion on the floor. I don't think I got any seconds. Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Let's get a motion on the table first. Is there a second on the motion to table? Legislator Stern makes the second to table. Do we have a second on the motion to approve?

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Alden to approve. So they are both on the table. Open for questions.

LEG. ALDEN:

It was mentioned just a second ago, though, about our holdover status. Is this affected by any legislation that prohibits an extensive period of holdover or --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Not yet. Where are we at, George?

MR. NOLAN:

The bill that we're talking about, the holdover bill, would not apply to appointees to the Community College Board. It would only apply to the four department heads who are termed, appointed to a fixed term of office. So, no, it would have no obligation here.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. ALDEN:

I don't mind as far as bringing in somebody, you know, especially in a holdover position like this, but traditionally what we've done if it's a reappointment, you know, they haven't shown up, we haven't required their presence. But a Community College might be, you know, a different category that we're creating that on any reappointment or appointment that we want people from the Community College to show up? I'm just drawing it to everybody's attention that traditionally we haven't asked reappointments to come in, even if they were holdovers.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That being the case, we have a tabling motion on the floor.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What if I offer this for a suggestion. Obviously I think any, you know, Legislator certainly has a right to go ahead and question any appointment we make, whether it is a first time or new appointment or whether it's a reappointment. Like Legislator Alden, I believe that generally when we do have somebody who's been in term in an office we don't ordinarily ask them to come in unless we have a particular question. If it is a matter of questioning or having a dialogue or a discussion with Mr. Trotta, what if I offer instead a discharge without recommendation and we have the conversation at the General Meeting on Tuesday.

LEG. ALDEN:

Actually, can I respond to that?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You are welcome to respond to that. You guys fight amongst yourselves.

LEG. ALDEN:

It's not a fight. I probably wouldn't support a discharge. I think I'd like to see any of the appointments to come in and talk to us at this point, so in light of the -- and I'm not going to say issues, but in light of some of the dialogue that we've had, all right, I will say, in light of some of the issues I think it's very important. Whether this resolution gets killed or not we are still going to have that dialogue because there's going to be a number of vacancies that occur in the near future and we need to do something with Suffolk County College, so.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair. Having been involved firsthand in some of the issues we've had most recently with the Community College extremely extensively, I'd say I'll withdraw the motion to approve and support Legislator D'Amaro's motion to table. But then I'm going to make the request that for any appointments that we do with this Community College, be they reappoints or new appointments, that we ask each and every one of them to come in here because there was a significant amount of dialogue that went on about some fairly weighty and important matters with the Community College.

LEG. ALDEN:

That's fair.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I can't argue that. And also, through the Chair, if I could respond.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Through the Chair.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I appreciate you supporting the motion. My intention here is only that this is, you know, the college has a substantial budget. We deal with it just about on a daily basis and I would just encourage having a dialogue with trustees as they either come up or if there are new candidates. I'm not -- you know, I know there is a policy. It was a policy before I got here that if it's a reappointment the person doesn't need to appear. To tell you the truth, I would rather do away with that policy. I think if you are going to take an accountable position in County government, you know, come on down for five minutes and let's talk about it. So that's where I'm coming from.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. We'll leave that as far as this committee is concerned is that it will be for the college appointments, which is, by the way, a seven year appointment.

LEG. ALDEN:

I think it's very important, and actually Legislator D'Amaro raises something that is a paramount, really, issue with us. There are some major questions as far as our relationship even with Suffolk Community College going forward. I think, you know, in the past I liked the idea that reappointments, you know, you don't really make them come down, but this is a special, really a special event, I think, with the college and we're looking at a whole new future, really, with the college one way or the other. I support your idea of bringing them all down.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I don't want to go to other appointments for other committees, but as far as the College Board, I absolutely agree. All right. So we have a motion to table. We've withdrawn the approval motion. All those in favor of tabling this appointment? Seconded. So moved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**. Meeting adjourned.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:33 P.M.)