

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER ENERGY AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Energy and Education Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Wednesday, December 15, 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Wayne Horsley, Chairman
Legislator Steven Stern, Vice Chairman
Legislator Tom Cilmi
Legislator Ricardo Montano
Legislator Lynne Nowick

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
Yves Michel, Commissioner, SC Department of Economic Development
Carolyn Fahey, SC Department of Economic Development
Gail Lolis, Deputy County Attorney
Basia Braddish, Suffolk County Attorney's Office
Jack Caffey, Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Bob Martinez, Aide to Legislator Montano
JP DiMartino, Aide to Legislator Horsley
Debbie Harris, Aide to Legislator Stern
Paul Perillie, Aide to Legislator Cooper
Joe Schroeder, Budget Review Office
Joe Muncey, Budget Review Office
Lori Taggart, Suffolk County Community College
Steve Tricarico, Intergovernmental Relations
Peter Quinn
Dot Kerrigan, AME, 3rd VP
Joe Burns, Joe Burns Contracting
Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Would we all please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Salutation)

And may we please stand for a moment of silence for those men and women who protect our freedoms both home and abroad.

(Moment of Silence)

Please be seated. All right. Good afternoon everybody and welcome to the December 15th meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Education and Energy Committee meeting. It appears that we will have a very interesting presentation by the Long Island Regional Planning Council. But before we do that, first of all, do we have any cards? I had -- Mr. Quinn said there were no cards out there. Is that --

MR. QUINN:

I signed in at the desk.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I have all the faith that you would have written out a card, so why don't you come up, Mr. Quinn, and be heard at the Public Hearing.

MR. QUINN:

Good afternoon, members of the committee. My name is Peter Quinn, long retired but former energy, environment and education activist. I'm here because in August -- on August 5th I went to Briarcliffe College where Senator Schumer was speaking and I asked him -- I was the only citizen non-politician to speak, but I asked him a question about LIPA and the potential for convening a public hearing, because the rating agencies and the bonding firms have given us over a period of years roughly \$600 million in debt service, amortization and interest payments. And I felt that under the circumstances the economy of Long Island could improve substantially if we held a public hearing where we invited elected officials like yourselves and with Senator Schumer presiding and inviting the rating agencies and the bonding firms to explain for the public why they can't reduce interest rates given the nature of the economy where we're paying six-and-a-half percent interest on the bonds that they float annually, that's long-term, and the short-term bonds of roughly 4%. I thought, well, as long as many politicians are talking about reducing education costs, capping them at 2%, the very least we ought to do is to say -- oh, I turned it off? I got it again, I guess. Although I occasionally boom out so I don't even need a microphone. At the very least we ought to be able to do is cap those interest costs. And Senator Schumer was receptive.

I called -- I sat down and spoke with Gerry Petrella at the Melville office and they're considering the potential. I knew that because of the campaign over the fall and now the policy issues that we weren't going to be able to do it until spring, but it seems to me timely that as long as people constantly talk about taxes, then we ought to be talking about rates on Long Island. And if we're going to talk about sustainability for the Island it just seems prudent to me that we ought to have that Public Hearing where the Senator presides and invite any politicians that want to come and any members of the public who want to come and anybody who wants to make comments about that cost. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Quinn. Would anyone else like to be heard, seeing that I don't have any cards? We're good? All right. Terrific. Before I start with our presentation, I understand that we have a gentleman in the audience who is -- who's on a tight time schedule, authorizing a lease agreement with Joe Burns Contracting. Carolyn, is that the one that you wanted to talk about? Why don't you come on up and give us why you want to take it out of order, first of all, is there -- and then we will.

MS. FAHEY:

Well, just Mr. Burns is here. He runs a business, he came in from the East End to be here in case there were any questions from the committee members. It would be nice for him to be able to get back to business.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And we certainly want to have business in Suffolk County. So I'll make a motion to take 2201 out of order.

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Montano. It is now out of order and we will hear 2201. ***2201, Authorizing a lease agreement with Joe Burns Contracting for use of property at Francis S. Gabreski Airport. (Co. Exec.)***

Carolyn, your floor.

MS. FAHEY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. As members are well aware, Gabreski Airport still has a handful of facilities and buildings that were there when the military occupied the property and when it was turned over to the County. One of those buildings is a 300 square foot concrete block building along County Road 114 that's been vacant for probably 15 years. We used to have various different contractors in that property. Mr. Burns approached the airport, asked if there was a possibility to lease it for his residential building company, and we've come to agreements and a lease, a potential lease for your consideration.

As with any building at the airport that's used for non-aviation outside of the industrial park, the maximum lease the County can enter into is three years. That's as regarded by -- to be in compliance with our quick claim deed from the FAA and the DOD. So the lease in front of you is for Mr. Joe Burns Contracting, a residential contractor. The term is for three years. The lease rate based upon an appraisal is \$7,326 for the first year with an annual increase of 2 1/2% each year over the previous year's rent.

The facility will be used as an office, storage of residential building materials and vehicles. Mr. Burns is going to improve the property, the landscaping, the RCA for the driveway, put in some nice screening along County Road 114 and put some money into the building to suit his needs.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Are there any questions of either Carolyn or the contractor?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, I have one.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, of whom?

LEG. MONTANO:

Carolyn.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay, Carolyn.

LEG. MONTANO:

I have the lease agreement. You said that there was an appraisal. Is that in the package?

MS. FAHEY:

No, it's not. They typically aren't part of the package. Our Real Estate Division does it. That's how we base our lease rents on it.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. So then who negotiates the lease, the County Attorney's Office or the Real Estate Department?

MS. FAHEY:

With regards to the rental, it's whatever the Real Estate Office tells us is the going rate, that's what we charge. And then the other conditions, if they're applicable at all, it would be the County Attorney's Office, the airport, the department and the potential tenant.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. So it is based on an appraisal that you have; we just don't have it in front of us.

MS. FAHEY:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. All right. That will be it, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Just very quickly, Carolyn, square footage?

MS. FAHEY:

Three hundred square feet.

LEG. CILMI:

Three-hundred square feet? Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

It's interesting. Paul, you had 1,200 square foot? Is that an error?

MR. PERILLIE:

It probably is. I'm sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

No, that's okay. I was just questioning which one was correct.

MS. FAHEY:

I'm sorry, I'm being told it's 1,200. I'm sorry. I don't know where I got 300 square feet from.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You stand corrected.

MR. PERILLIE:

That's why we have everybody doing this.

MS. FAHEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So 1,200 is certainly a lot different than 3,000.

MS. FAHEY:

A lot different, and there goes the appraisal.

LEG. CILMI:

So if I could follow-up, then.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Oh yes, I'm sorry. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

At 300 square feet it wasn't a question, but at 1,200 it's a question. The monthly rental of \$610 a month, is that -- I mean, it sounds like you sort of relied on Real Estate to give you the -- can you speak to that at all, you know, the -- somebody help me. The rental rate, you know, speak to the rental rates.

MS. FAHEY:

I can tell you that Real Estate comes out and visits the property, looks at the property, looks at the condition of the property and then does the comparables.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And the comparables obviously match or come close.

MS. FAHEY:

Yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Carolyn, how long has the building been vacant?

MS. FAHEY:

I've been with the department 17 years. I don't think we've had a tenant in there any sooner than 15 years ago.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That says a lot in itself, yeah. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Is this the entire building?

MS. FAHEY:

Yes, it is.

LEG. STERN:

So just one tenant.

MS. FAHEY:

It's a stand alone building. Yes, one tenant.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

One quick thing by Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Next year do you think it's possible that the appraisal would be part of the package or is there a reason why the appraisal was not included.

MS. FAHEY:

I don't know of any reason why it's not included. I just haven't traditionally done it, but I could check into that, sure.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Are there any further questions? You know, let me just -- Mr. Burns, what type of contractor is he? Come on up. I don't want to get into an at length conversation, I was just curious as -- since you're from the east. Welcome, Mr. Burns.

MR. BURNS:

How are you doing? I am Joe Burns. It's a residential home construction business. Remodeling, new homes, renovations.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And how are things going on the East End for home renovations?

MR. BURNS:

It could be a lot better. I'm looking to renegotiate the price of this lease a little lower.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We have a motion to approve, second. But things -- are they picking up?

MR. BURNS:

They seem to be getting a little bit better. I'm just hoping to get this equipment, like my trucks and my trailers out of my house and keep peace at my house is basically the main thing. And this

building has been an eyesore in the community, which I've live for over 20 years, it's been empty and abandoned, basically, for 20 years.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yeah, that's what I just gathered. I had a feeling that was the case. Do you do green work or what types of home remodeling do you do?

MR. BURNS:

We do try and do green work as much as we can within the budget constraints of the customers, and we look forward to doing more.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

There we go. Okay, all right. Just curious. All right, thank you very much, Mr. Burns, and good luck with this building. We're expecting a very pretty building by the time you're done, there you go.

MR. BURNS:

Me too.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Carolyn, is there anything else you'd like to add on this?

MS. FAHEY:

No, I'm just trying to find out where I got my 300 from but that's okay.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I don't know, but we love -- never mind. Is there a motion?

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Motion on the floor by Legislator Cilmi, second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It has been approved.

(Vote: 5-0-0-0)

MS. FAHEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

You're welcome. Okay. I have -- apparently I do have another yellow card or a yellow card. Josephine Passantino apparently would like to address the committee.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Hi. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, I can.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Thanks. Yeah, I've got the button pushed down. It seems low today. Anyway, good afternoon. My name is Josephine Passantino. I'm AME's First Vice President. I'm also the unit president for Suffolk County Community College White Unit. I'm addressing the body here today for the

committee because back in April of 2009 Suffolk County and the College signed a sponsorship service agreement, SSA, which granted Suffolk County Community College fiscal autonomy from the line item justifications of its Operating Budget to the County and the Legislature. This was for the purpose of the sponsorship service agreement. Unfortunately, this document created some serious problems at the college for the employees and the AME members. And for AME members throughout the County as well as within -- without resolve, and regrettably AME was left to file an Article 78 against the college and the County as joint employees.

As frustration -- as we are going through this, you were sent an E-mail by a member of my college unit board, which I need to clarify at this time, and I realize that due to the lawsuit that the Legislature has -- most likely is prohibited from discussing on this matter and I seek no response at this time. I just want to make you aware of what really is going on so that when they're looking for the resolve they'll be able to make some sort of decision.

Suffolk County AME represents 7,000 workers, members of the County civilian workforce. The County has a multiple of departments and 800 are at Suffolk County Community College. AME has categorized the County departments into 33 units for effective representation. Suffolk County Community College encompasses three of those units; SCCC White Collar, SCCC Blue Collar and SCCC Security. These three units contain approximately 670 members; 400 full-time and 270 part-time employees. SCCC employees, who are AME members, have been forced out of the deferred compensation plan that was offered contractually, afforded to all County employees. Even though the SSA clearly provides for this inclusion and that it was because of the IRS recognition of the college and its EIN number, the employee identification number, rather than having its workers on the County payroll. As you know, that the college has their own autonomy and they are implementing their own payroll, so we're not going to be paid through the County anymore.

SCCC has been advised by the New York State Deferred Comp Board Chair that the college employees may now participate into a State plan. However, it is not cost free to the employees as in our Suffolk County deferred compensation plan. Promotional opportunities for both SCCC employees and our AME members at large throughout all County departments. When taking a Civil Service test, SCCC employee's will not be County-wide promotional list and vice versa, County employees will not be on the SCCC promotional list. And you may wonder why that really is important, it just limits the pool of where people can be promoted.

The loss of County service and seniority rights are in jeopardy. The SCCC workers no longer will accrue County time, only college time. This is based on the decision by New York State Deferred Compensation Board that the College is no longer a department of the County, thus all employees become college employees. There is no reference to the clearly stipulated joint employee status. County status is uncertain for items like longevity, Benefit Fund, salary appeals. The transfer of college employee union dues and pertinent information of Suffolk County Audit and Control, AME and the Benefit Fund, has all been negatively impacted.

Benefit Fund, under the college payroll system, there is no procedure to place -- for members to be participating, required information to be provided to the Benefit Fund. In addition, the college HR Department has thus far refused to provide AME, citing privacy issues, with the information as currently provided to AME by Audit and Control, which enables AME to provide fair representation of its AME members.

In the meantime, while we hope to have avoided litigation our lawsuit will run its course. Nevertheless, thank you for allowing me to present this information to you at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. Ms. Passantino, thank you very much. As you know, we -- you are in litigation with both the County as well as with the College?

MS. PASSANTINO:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And I was knee deep in that Plan C negotiation for things like that so I'm well aware of what you're referring to. We can't comment on this.

MS. PASSANTINO:

No, I was --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

But we do appreciate you coming down here.

MS. PASSANTINO:

I did understand that and that's why I'm stating the facts, and I clearly stated that I know you're not going to respond to us. We understand that. We're going to let it take its course in the courts and we appreciate anything you can do.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Right. Do you want to ask a comment on this?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Mr. Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

I don't want to go into the lawsuit, but I think we're -- can you just refresh my recollection where this lawsuit is right now?

MS. PASSANTINO:

Well, if --

LEG. MONTANO:

If it's the lawsuit I'm thinking, I thought that was over.

MS. PASSANTINO:

We have currently two Article 78's in the courts.

LEG. MONTANO:

That the College brought?

MS. PASSANTINO:

No, that AME brought against the College and the County.

LEG. MONTANO:

Oh, okay.

MS. PASSANTINO:

And also we have a grievance in with Labor Relations and we're waiting for arbitration. And it's just -- unfortunately these things take a lot of time, and rather than -- I'm going to say in my opinion it would be easier if we could straighten out the problems instead of going that route.

LEG. MONTANO:

It's always easier to settle, but the lawsuit is between AME and the College, is that what you're saying?

MS. PASSANTINO:

And the County also. The County was served in those actions, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. And that's at the trial stage? In other words, that's in the Supreme Court? If you know, I'm just curious.

MS. PASSANTINO:

They're in the midst of fact finding. I know that there was some attorney changes along the way, so there's paperwork that was needed and there was responses, so I think the next day is in January that they would be responding.

LEG. MONTANO:

The reason I'm asking, I haven't seen those pleadings, so I'm not -- I wasn't clear on what you were saying. Now I understand. Thank you.

MS. PASSANTINO:

I could just say it in the simplest -- there was an agreement that was made, without all the words, and it changes --

LEG. MONTANO:

Agreement between whom?

MS. PASSANTINO:

Excuse me? It was the Legislature with the County and the College.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MS. PASSANTINO:

To give them autonomy because that's what Plan C was.

LEG. MONTANO:

The Plan C thing, right.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Right.

LEG. MONTANO:

That I'm aware of. That's the litigation I'm referring to. You are saying there's other litigation.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Well, the thing is this made all these other things happen. In April of this year, just to give you information if you'd like, what happened was they had town hall meetings at the College. There

was -- they invited Civil Service there to do a presentation and that's when our members found out that they were not entitled to make -- be on the promotional lists County-wide. So it meant that -- and the funny -- the irony of it was there were two people hired in March, and they were hired off promotional lists County-wide, but in April they said because of the 2009 agreement they were no longer allowed to get promotions within --

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. That's probably more information than we need at this time.

MS. PASSANTINO:

That's part of our problems, that, you know, people are being -- they're losing opportunities to get promotions.

LEG. MONTANO:

But it's in litigation.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Absolutely.

LEG. MONTANO:

And that's really where it will be resolved.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Okay.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thanks.

MS. PASSANTINO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Ms. Passantino, just quickly. I just have a quick question now. Those people that are concerned about the issue of deferred compensation, that they have to go to the State and whatever, are they now participating in the State plan or are they just out in left field not deferring compensation.

MS. PASSANTINO:

They're out in left field; they're not participating.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Ouch. Okay. Thank you. All righty. Would anyone else like to be heard? We're good. I'd like to then go to the presentation, which is from our Regional Planning Council with Michael White and my good friend John Cameron and Cara Longworth. They're going to enlighten us on sustainability of Long Island. And something we all would like to have is to be sustainable. So at that, certainly, Michael, are you the lead on this, or our guest leader of --

MR. CAMERON:

I'll start.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

John, oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Welcome.

MR. CAMERSON:

You need to depress continuously to be heard?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

To press continuously, yes. Just as long as you're not depressing us.

MR. CAMERON:

Thank you, Legislator Horsley. I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to present to you the results of almost two years of work by the Regional Planning Council and its consultants in the development of our sustainable strategies document, which is the first phase of our sustainability plan for Long Island. Again, John Cameron, I'm the Chair of the Regional Planning Council, joined by Michael White, our Executive Director, and Cara Longworth, our Deputy Executive Director.

As I mentioned, this is the result of almost two years of work, detailed work in coordination with both counties, the County Executive's Office, the Legislative representatives, planning departments, as well as representatives of the towns, villages, cities and various stakeholders. We were assisted on the development of the plan with the Leadership Advisory Cabinet, which was chaired by Bob Catell. You may know Bob, former Chairman, CEO, of National Grid. We had some business leaders and governmental leaders on that cabinet, which assisted us in the guidance and the development of the document.

What we'd like to do for you today is, it will take a little time, but I think it warrants your time. A significant amount of work went into the development of this plan, and basically we developed the strategies into four thematic areas. First being tax and governance, second being the economy, third being environment and infrastructure, and the fourth being equity. So what we'll do is I'll turn it over now to Michael White and he'll lead off with the first phase of the plan and then I'll resume with you, okay? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you.

MR. WHITE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. We're going to roll through our PowerPoint here. As John said, so you know, what you're going to see today is really a brief outline of a summary document called the Sustainable Strategies Report. We presented a hard copy as well as some backup tech reports to the Chairman. I think you all should have a disc which has this document and hundreds and hundreds of pages of supporting documentation on the work. So you can load it up, look at it, print what you want. And if you have any questions certainly or want hard copies we would be able to present that.

So let's start off here. Take a look at our approach recognizing from the get go that get Long Island, like suburban communities around the country, faces an uncertain future. Today Long Island faces an affordability crisis that threatens our cherished quality of life. That's what we're know for in the region. But despite these challenges, Long Island has a tremendous opportunity to recognize it is possible to be affordable and prosperous, protect our natural resources and bring a return to economic growth and strength.

A little bit about the process. As John was describing, it's been quite a long time getting this teed up and getting some work product to present to you. We began with a regional visioning initiative and workshop. This was actually something that we pretty much inherited when we first became a Regional Planning Council that both Nassau and Suffolk Counties were working on. This was work that was sponsored by our metropolitan planning organization, the New York Transportation Council. It was very important to establish a baseline of information, begin that public outreach trying to

build a consensus around our alternatives for growth in Nassau and Suffolk County.

As John also explained, we created right from the get go a leadership advisory cabinet, a diverse group of community leaders, visionaries, and influentials, if you will. We worked through visioning and goal setting charettes with these members of the cabinet, various county agencies, county governments, local governments and stakeholders, to identify the pressing issues of Long Island, some of the drivers with respect to those issues, and certainly importantly the points of intervention, where could we make a difference to address these issues. A great amount of work went into data collection and of course coordination with active studies. We wanted this piece of work, as it continues to be, to be informed and build upon all the great work that's presently been done and going on on Long Island rather than reinventing the wheel. We worked around the assets that existed. We created baseline future forecasting information taking a look at the trends in these respective issues and thematic areas. That, by the way, is presented a lot in the technical reports which are attached to the sustainable strategies document.

As a work of -- as a result of this baseline work and the data collection we also created something called the Long Island Information Clearing House. So we had our team, including the consultant team, probably go through over 900 documents from around the County and creating a synopsis on each one of those as how it was relevant to the work that we're taking forward. And this is going to be made available on a link to the planners, other community members and governments and even private enterprise so there's a body of work out there to take a look at. And then through the summer, this past summer, we held a number of workshops with respect to our sustainable strategies in each one of the thematic areas, with the idea that we needed to refine the strategies that we're bringing forward.

So what you're going to see today is just one piece of what we like to call a lasting and, in fact, growing resource, the Long Island 2035 Regional Visioning Workshop Findings Report -- these are all on the disc, by the way. The Long Island Visioning Initiative Final Report, the Sustainable Strategies Report, which is really the document we're going to walk through today, the technical reports on governance, economy, infrastructure, and transportation, land use and equity. A gathering of data from work with our Education Working Group, a rationale for the Long Island Regional Planning Council involvement, crisis and opportunity in Long Island K through 12 public education system. You'll see that in our first tax and governance strategy. We'll give you some details on the action plan with respect to that issue. Number ten is the action plan on the education work group. Eleven, the series of documents and memorandum and notes surrounding these stakeholder and community outreach workshops.

We've also included in this document the Long Island carbon footprint analysis. This was a piece of work that was really sponsored for the most part by the Rauch Foundation, but both Nassau and Suffolk County, LIPA, National Grid and the Regional Planning Council were involved in gathering information and putting together this baseline or benchmark footprint for Long Island, which gives us some information to go forward to see how we're doing in terms of reducing that footprint and again, the information clearing house.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Mike, can I just ask a quick question on your -- do you -- did you have to vote on it? Did the Planning Board vote on the findings of all these matters that you're about to show us and was it unanimous? Or how did that vote go?

MR. WHITE:

We have -- we've not really taken a formal vote per se. The Council has been at each one of the meetings. The Council has been engaged in really setting the scope and we had a report to the full Council at our December meeting, and the word was we want to go forward with Phase II, but we

really wanted to start to get the work out to all of the involved and interested parties here.

MR. CAMERON:

We actually, Legislator Horsley, we are intending to put it for a vote at our January meeting, but our Council has been intimately involved in the various thematic areas etcetera, but throughout really a morphing of this whole plan, but we intend to have a vote for that at our January meeting on the plan.

MR. WHITE:

And one of the important issues related to the vote is that what we really want to present to the Council at the January meeting is some priority issues connected to these strategies. In other words, when you see these, we can't do everything. A lot of things to be done. We've got to create a focus on a handful of the priority items. That's why we're also looking for input from you on those items, and then we will wisely use our funding going forward to make the biggest difference.

MR. CAMERON:

As Michael has stated, what we're doing is we're meeting with various stakeholders, in particular the elected officials, to try and get any input and critical comment, if you will. We'll bring that back to the full Council at our January meeting because we do plan to issue our list of priorities for the coming year, at least for the first six months and then for the year, as to which action items should take the emphasis from the plan and from the Council. So any comment we welcome today and we met yesterday with a Nassau County representative, the Presiding Officer of the Legislature, and we're going to be meeting with their Planning, Energy and Environment Committee also. And then we're looking to full Leg's hopefully at both counties as well as the County Executives. And we'll be rolling that out, we'll be meeting with various media outlets as well to get the public dissemination and the public information out there also.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And then at the end of the day we'll come up with an action plan, is that what the thinking is?

MR. CAMERON:

Yes, that it is. Michael will get to that at the end, talk about next steps after this.

MR. WHITE:

Sorry about that.

MS. ORTIZ:

Yours stays on.

MR. WHITE:

I don't have to hold on to it.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Who knew?

MR. WHITE:

Who knew?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay.

MR. WHITE:

I'm so used to standing up with the button. Sorry. Okay. So our ability to act today and leave behind the status quo can restore the promise of an affordable, high quality of life for all of Long Island, to position Long Island for the requirements of a sustainable 21st century community. Our Long Island Regional Planning Comprehensive Sustainability Plan addresses tax and governance so we're really looking at a change in the way governments and schools conceive, plan and deliver and finance services. Our economic strength to improve our competitiveness, to create a more business friendly climate on Long Island. Our quality of life, our cherished beaches, parks, farmland, drinking water, open space and marine resources. And equitable communities, housing, jobs and a high quality of education for all.

The Long Island 2035 Regional Comprehensive Sustainability Plan provides a call to action. As said from the beginning, we're not just providing information. We want to get endorsement and implementation on action steps. The analysis and resulting strategies reflect the interconnection of economic infrastructure, environmental and social systems.

To secure a sustainable future the Long Island Regional Planning Council presents the following sustainable strategies. First, with respect to our first thematic area, tax and governance. Our vision, is the governance -- the sustainability plan seeks to establish an expenditure and revenue model that maintains, if not strengthens, the positive aspects of governmental services; remedies government shortcomings first and foremost by addressing the omnipresent property tax challenge; devises ways to make government at all levels more affordable than it is today.

Our first strategy: Maintain and improve academic achievement and ensure equal educational opportunities for all in the K through 12 system, while containing school costs to ease the property tax burden. So Long Island is known for our high performing schools, although it's widely recognized that the high educational achievement is not universal around Long Island. Individuals and companies are attracted to our region to a great extent because of the reputation of our public schools, but at the same time our region is burdened by some of the highest property taxes in the nation, the majority of which are attributed to the school component. Long Island cannot thrive as a region without a quality and affordable public education system that offers equal opportunity for success to all students, regardless of race, socioeconomic status, community resources or learning abilities.

Here's -- just to move off the presentation for a moment. This first one we present as really being an item that we took on right from the get go in great detail. What we heard loud and clear from everyone was property taxes, property taxes, property taxes, and the deal with property taxes it was the schools. And we created a model for what you're going to hear about later in terms of taking our initiatives forward into action items. We created a model with this one by forming an Education Working Group where we actually assembled a working group of school superintendents, school board associations and representatives, BOCES representatives, and indeed the teachers union. And we have come up with a 12 point action plan that was basically negotiated through this group that presents action items, both with respect to the issues surrounding equal opportunity and improving educational achievement, as well as cost issues. And this is presented in the full document under the TG1, but I've also had a separate handout made, which is the plan of action.

So on those 12 items -- so we've focused A number one, on number one was the region's collective resources, our political muscle, our fiscal might and educational expertise on elevating achievement in our persistently lowest achieving school districts that produce students who are unable to realize their potential and closing the achievement gap among Long Island school districts to enhance our region's performance. And so sometimes it seems some to leave behind those school districts that are not doing so well and focus on the Intel scholars and the well performing school districts. Right out of the box we realized that we have create a --

LEG. MONTANO:

Excuse me. Do you have a handout on that?

MR. WHITE:

Yeah. There should be a handout, the Plan of Action.

MR. CAMERON:

In front of you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Do you have?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes. Sorry.

MR. WHITE:

I'm not going to walk through the action items on each one of the strategies, but this one I want to walk through because it really comes out as, again, the model of how we really want to get to action items and to know that here we're dealing this omnipresent issue of property tax burden from educational quality and from cost.

MR. CAMERON:

Michael, if I may add, as we all know, a key issue affecting sustainability on Long Island is property taxes, and what you'll see in the document and in particular in the school document, we have significant detail on these items. But FYI is property taxes represent today on Long Island approximately 8% of the median income, 8%. What we've projected over -- and with the assistance of our consultants, over the next 25 years of our planning period that that percentage of income that's attributable to property taxes will go up by 70% to over 14%. Our consultants have told us on a national scale that once you approach 10%, you're getting to a basically a crisis point of unsustainability. Our projections are for over 14% of median income attributable to property taxes unless there is a significant change in the paradigm, which approximately 70% of the property taxes comprise of school costs, we're at a crisis. And we need to make a change in the way business is done and you'll see that from the number of strategies that we have here in our school report.

And, frankly, we had discussion amongst the Council. People say how would you get the teacher's union, the superintendents, to agree on these items. And we say basically we know that we've hit the end of the road here, the goose is dead, and that either we're going to need to deal with these challenges that we have or, frankly, there's going to be blunt instruments that are imposed upon our education system. And the educators themselves, those professionals involved in the education system, will not be able to control what happens.

So that's why we, after eight months meeting 19 people around the table, actually to realize that after the eight months we'd had unanimity on a dozen items, and you'll see these items are quite significant, that it was very, very telling that they would actually work with us on this. So I just want to emphasize that property taxes are -- which is why this is the number one item here dealing with the containment of school costs and also the equity of the distribution of education on Long Island. So I want to emphasize that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

John, was that tipping point?

MR. CAMERON:

The tipping point, our consultants tell us that once your median income, if 10% is spent on property taxes you're at a point of unaffordability. We're at eight right now and heading radically, as you all know, with pension costs, Medicaid costs in the State, which also translate back to the County, we know that, health care costs and salaries, that with 70% of those property taxes comprised of school costs we're projecting that in 25 years that those costs will be 14%, 70% higher than they are today as a percentage of median income. So it is a major, major challenge for Long Island. Mike?

MR. WHITE:

Okay. So if I could --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Hang on. This is a process --

LEG. MONTANO:

What process are you going to use?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Mike, which would be better for you?

LEG. MONTANO:

Brief questions, it's up to you.

MR. WHITE:

Appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That's fine then.

LEG. MONTANO:

You said we're at 8% now and that we're headed for 14. But -- and ten is the point where we -- we reach unsustainability. When do you project we're going to hit 10%?

MR. CAMERON:

Within the next five to ten years, which could be, if -- based on the rapid increase in pension costs and other costs it could be less than five years, but we're projecting it in the next five to ten years.

LEG. MONTANO:

And the other question I had, very briefly, is on number five of your handout here with the school consolidation. What are you recommending for that, because obviously there's -- do you have specific recommendations for that?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I think you're going to be getting into that, right?

LEG. MONTANO:

Oh, you're going to get into that? Then I will hold it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes. Hang on for that.

MR. WHITE:

Okay. So let me go along. On the second one that we have is the funding or rescission of unfunded State imposed mandates on our school districts. This is something you hear about all the time, specifically with respect to special education. The State requirements are much higher than what even the educators believe they need to be in terms of applying the system and spending the money wisely.

Replace or expand secondary school course offerings using technology more efficiently. This might be an opportunity to not have the AP physics teacher in every district, but perhaps have teachers shared and teaching services shared in and among districts.

Promoting initiatives to restructure Long Island high schools to optimize student opportunities and maximize return in educational investment with a specific consideration of expanding BOCES offerings, creating partnerships with Long Island colleges, universities, businesses, labor and trade councils and large employers. There needs to be a close look at that eleventh and -- particularly eleventh and twelfth grade of what our students are doing and what they're getting and where they're going in that educational system.

Number five, this idea of pursuing State legislation to further incentivize consolidation of school districts where appropriate. You know, we have 125 school districts on Long Island. There are opportunities for consolidation. There have been some consolidations in the past. There's talks to create that consolidation, but we've clearly heard is that unfortunately the way the system operates now, there -- at least it appears to be, and the perspective is there's winners and losers with respect to the consolidation. Overall we believe it can make sense and taking into account furthering educational opportunities within the districts as well as the financial benefits over the long-term, but it looks like it requires some -- at least incentivized legislation and perhaps funding from the get go to make that happen so school districts are focused on the capability.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yeah, there was a report this morning, I read it in the paper, about consolidation, and they're talking about incentivizing those issues. Is that in tandem with you or do you guys do that separately?

MR. WHITE:

No, we have been having -- as John pointed out, we've been working eight months with superintendents, the teacher's union and the school board associations and, in fact, we have another follow-up call tomorrow afternoon with respect to furthering the Legislative agenda. So we're getting this information out and we're trying to --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And they're picking up on our agenda and whatever.

MR. WHITE:

It's been a great teamwork actually, yes. We're taking this collaborative approach we feel is working.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Well, it sounds like the carrot on the stick is coming from Albany. That's going to be a big deal--

MR. CAMERON:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

-- into the future.

MR. WHITE:

Okay. Number six is this issue with respect that not only school districts face but local governments face and that's really the need to have a full assessment of the New York State Retirement System. The cost of that retirement system are straining now to local governments and school districts and it's not looking like it's going to get much better.

Number seven, working with local governments, school districts, representatives, BOCES and State government officials to explore and assess alternatives for health insurance coverage. Suffolk County, with great respect, has a plan that others would look toward in terms of some of its efficiencies. The New York State health insurance needs to -- health insurance program needs to take a close look upon their costs and services.

Number eight, reform and supplement the State's foundation formula funding to provide a more equitable distribution. We hear about it all the time and it's true, Long Island doesn't get its fair share. More needs to be done with respect to that State funding.

Investigate the feasibility potential advantage of regional employment structure, potentially even a regional collective bargaining for school district employees. This would really provide an opportunity for teachers moving from district to district and getting good teachers in all the districts.

Number ten, transform the schools into multifunctioning neighborhood centers, more contact with the schools, nutritional programs, adult education, even health services.

And number 11, something that everyone in this County in local government talks about is workforce and affordable housing. We believe this number 11 is really a change in the paradigm. The fact is that for too long school districts have been opposing workforce housing and multifamily housing and rental housing on the idea that it would present too many students and cost them money. The data shows indeed that this kind of housing is tax positive to the school district, and so what this represents is a collaboration to get school districts looking to have rental housing and multifamily unit, next generation housing in their communities.

And finally, number 12 is really keep this group moving forward so that we're moving forward now with a Legislative agenda and we're taking an annual report basis. Come back within two years, if we're not seeing these actions and the action items that come out of this making a difference, we go back and revisit this issue before that tax level gets to the revolt level. So we feel there's very great promise in that collaboration. So that was a little bit more detail on that item because, again, that becomes what we believe is a working framework to get the actions done. Get the people in the room on a collaborative approach to work with us.

Second strategy on tax and governance is enhance shared services for local governments and school districts. Cooperation and shared services can erase artificial barriers that increase costs. We know that Suffolk County, as an example, some of the -- some BOCES -- even Nassau County is working on this. We believe there's much more room to enhance those opportunities and shared services with local government and school districts for initiating cost savings.

Number three, streamlining government permitting and approval processes for significant projects, develop a one stop shopping process where permitting and approvals are coordinated and managed in a single forum, adhering to a strict timetable upon which developers and the governments can rely, which fosters economic growth. County of Suffolk, again here the Suffolk County Planning Commission is working on their portal; that's moving forward. It's a great model. It should be enhanced and grow to all of our municipalities on Long Island.

Number four, expand health care reform coverage and foster cost containment to include Medicaid and Medicare costs. So in a region where we have so many high quality health care institutions and a heavy public investment and care for the poor and elderly, the fact is that one in ten Long Islanders are still without coverage, and the high cost paid by individuals and businesses are simply not justifiable. With the recent passing of the health care reform coverage will be greatly expanded, but coverage gaps will still continue. We recommend that several existing and emergency non-government programs be expanded to assure that all Long Islanders have access and we continue to support and expand our cost containment initiatives.

Improve voter turnout. So what we see and you hear all the time is the special districts, the school districts, the fire commissions, the County government, town government, all the elections that go on. And what we believe most importantly here is that we just find the mechanism to improve voter turnout. Voting in State, local and Federal elections is a key component to citizenship and engagement on sustainable strategies, but voter turnout is not what it should be. We want to really create initiatives to raise awareness, streamline election dates perhaps, and improve access and so significantly boost the voter turnout, get people paying attention to these elections or what it means to their pocketbooks. John, on economy.

MR. CAMERON:

Thank you, Michael. Our vision on the economy is that we all recognize that these are difficult economic times and frankly, the Council, through its work, believes that it's necessary that we initiate some steps that can actually have a material effect on the economy on Long Island here today. Our plan emphasizes high impact alternatives that can produce gains in not only the midterm but also the near term and achieve a Long Island that accomplishes higher paying and more abundant jobs and more affordable business and friendly environment, an industry mix that's focused on bringing net new dollars into the economy including more export industry, new funding of sources, as well as keeping Long Islanders' money on Long Island. Also we want to ensure that we have the ability to attract and retain our young workers and also that we have a better educated and prepared workforce for the 21st century.

Our first strategy -- our first strategy is to build consensus for regional economic strategy and implementing entity. Much like, if you will, the research triangle in North Carolina or Silicon Valley, we believe Long Island needs a vision, needs to be represented by a regional economic strategy, one which can be perceived not only by Long Islanders, the metropolitan area, but also off Long Island to attract businesses to the area, with a cohesive vision for what Long Island wants to be and how we are going to grow this environment.

Number two is leveling the economic playing field for business retention as well as to attract incentives for businesses on Long Island. We want to create a set of government, Legislators, and locally supported business retention attraction incentives that can reduce local taxes, energy costs, as well as the capital -- increase in capital investment on Long Island, while reducing the cost and increasing competitiveness and creating jobs here on Long Island.

Frankly, our data indicates that New York State is regarded, has been ranked, really, as the number one state in the country as being the most adverse to business, to business growth and business retention in the United States. We're even worse than California right now, which is probably -- steals a lot of the headlines nationally. Long Island also has a lot of negative ratings on a regional basis with regard to business friendly environment. We need to turn that around if we're going to be able to retain our businesses and actually attract new businesses to Long Island.

Number three is marketing our Long Island assets nationally, again, to attract new businesses and workforce. And we believe here that we have a highly educated and productive workforce. The data substantiates that, but we need to market that effectively. Right now that's not being

marketed effectively, so as a result it's very difficult to attract workers or new businesses to Long Island when we have such adverse publicity, if you will, as well as the challenges of high taxes, lack of diverse and affordable housing and other challenges. We are in a business unfriendly environment so we need to turn that around if we're going to be able to grow our economy here on the Island.

Number four is creating a new industry and competitive job base, one which we believe can grow, and home energy efficiency, distributed energy generation and renewable energy technologies. As we're all aware, Long Island has very high energy rates, typically regarded as the third highest rates in the United States. While that is an obstacle, it presents an opportunity, an opportunity to create new industries which can actually reduce our energy costs and provide not only economic growth, but can create jobs and can actually spur the creation of cottage industries, if you will, in energy conservation businesses as well as renewable technologies. And we believe this is a great opportunity for Long Islanders and for our economy.

Number five is enhancing supportive resources for high tech start ups. Again, the data indicates that not only Long Island but also the New York metropolitan area does a poor job of working with our research institutions in rolling out, if you will, start up companies. In particular in the high tech areas. California, Massachusetts, even Washington, the State of the Washington, do a much more effective job at working with our universities and research institutions to create these high tech start ups.

Long Island is not unique, but New York City also does not do a good job in this. So as a result, what we've seen where approximately ten years ago, back in the 90's, Long Island had about a quarter of a billion dollars a year invested in venture capital. Right now that's down to less than \$10 million a year. From 250 million a year down to less than ten. What does that tell you? It tells you something's wrong. We don't have the business start ups. If you look at the patents, the patents aren't been created. The venture capital is not here. You know, the signs are not good. We have a highly educated, again, and productive workforce, but we're not capitalizing on that resource, so we need to do something about that.

Number six is establishing mechanisms to train our workers for the 21st century jobs. We looked at the education, we looked at our education report. You'll see that there's significant data that's in there as well as in our sustainable strategies document. We're not graduating even out of our high schools students that are well versed and what are called, if you will, the sciences, technology and math skills. We need to buoy that if we're going to grow these high tech, high paying jobs. We're not doing that effectively on Long Island. Frankly, our education system is -- we're teaching teachers to teach or to go into other soft sciences or Liberal Arts, but that's not where the higher paying jobs are and we need to expand in the more technical areas.

Number seven, stimulating development --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

John, can I just interrupt on that? Quick question on that.

MR. CAMERON:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

One of Michael's points was that the reasons why people come to Long Island is because of our high level of education and that people enjoy our educational opportunities here on Long Island, and you're telling me that we're dropping the ball all over the place. I mean, it seems like there's a contradictory --

MR. CAMERON:

They're not contradictory -- is that overall -- unfortunately if you look at it, and just last week there was publicity on, again, on the Intel winners on Long Island. Unfortunately, four or six students that are excelling nationally is not necessarily representative of the core, if you will, of our educational system. We may have Ward Melville and Jericho and Half Hollow Hills, a few, we have some outstanding school districts on Long Island. But, if you will, if you look at the data, and we looked at this where actually the median SAT scores for Long Island, median, believe it or not, where the median is nationally. We would never believe that. And we don't want to debunk here a myth, but what we're saying is that in particular in the science and math areas not only are we not excelling nationally, but frankly, you look at the data, we're getting our you know whats kicked internationally. And in a flat, global economic environment today China, India even some of the smaller Asian countries, are having our lunch with regard to technology.

If you look at the renewable energy, we talk about renewable energies here. Where do you think all these solar panels and where does the technology come? It's coming out of China, okay. The signs are not good. We're not only exporting -- you know, they're not only our debt provider, but they're also taking our jobs. And if you look at what we're growing here on Long Island it is not in the high tech, high paying areas. The areas that are growing, frankly, are in health care and in retail, lower paying jobs. But if we want to grow it with higher tech jobs, we need to start educating our young people to go into what's called STEM, science, technology, engineering and math. That's where the higher paying jobs are. Until we start educating young people to do that, they're not going to be looking to go into it.

While, again, we have some high performing school districts and some students are going -- you're going to see the Ivy League schools that are frequented by, that's going to get the press. But overall you look at the core of what we're educating here on Long Island and it's not the excellence that we would have hoped for. And that's -- I'm telling you, as a result of a significant amount, almost two years of work and working eight months in detail with our schools group, too. We need to do a better job, especially in certain areas. Okay?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON:

The next item, seven, is in order to have an affordable and sustainable Long Island we need to stimulate the development and preservation of mixed income workforce housing options. You've seen the data before. Frankly, the percentage of our housing stock that is rental is about 16, 17%. Westchester County is double that. New York City is 250% of that. Our competitive counties that compete with Long Island for jobs and businesses in northern New Jersey, the Essex, the Bergens, etcetera, they got more than double the rental housing. On Long Island, you know, we're an ownership community.

Well, frankly, young people getting out of the college, if they're getting out of college or looking to go into the workforce, not only can't afford to buy the single family three or four bedroom home with the white picket fence, is they're not looking to do that. They're looking for mobility because they haven't settle down or where they even want to work yet. So we need some more diversity, not only in the type of housing, but also in the price of our housing that we provide.

Number eight is frankly to develop a Buy Long Island First strategy for promoting Long Island's products, goods and services and establish a framework for the networking of local producers and consumers. We talk about this on the national level, buy American. We talking about buy New York State. What about Long Island here? We export a significant amount of our economy off Long Island, and yet we look and say how do we keep our workers here. The multiplier effect that

we can create by buying Long Island products, goods and services, by having a growth in our Long Island economy here, that will stimulate multiplier effects in the growth of our tax base, in the number of jobs. We believe this is going to take a focus to do this and also marketing effort, significant marketing effort for us to advance this agenda.

Number nine is leveraging the health care, life science, green energy, brown fields remediation, and Homeland Security industries as growing employment sources. Again, if you look at all these different items we have here, they're technology, they are science oriented, but they are higher paying jobs. Anybody who works in these areas -- for the most part in these areas here, requires a significant education here. So it directly ties back to education. But these are all areas where Long Island presently has significant expertise, has significant capability, but we're not capitalizing on it. We need to do that. You look at each of these areas here, they are significant growth areas. They're going to grow somewhere, and we're saying Long Island has the resources to do it if it has the focus and the will to implement it.

The next thematic area, third thematic area, is environment and infrastructure. And the vision here again is, again, one Long Island theme. We get our drinking water all from the same aquifer. You know, the aquifer doesn't know regional or municipal boundaries. It's one Long Island aquifer and we believe that we need to take that philosophy, not just from our aquifer, from our marine resources. They're all interconnected, and that we need to recognize that we're one Long Island here. All our highways are interconnected, our resources etcetera. So what we want to do is we want to use this regional perspective in parlaying our strengths and opportunities here to try and develop strategies which can make it sustainable for the foreseeable future. So not only protecting our Long Island aquifer, but also repositioning our transit for intra-Island and travel as well as a New York City commuter service. And we'll have different strategies in each of these areas.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

John, quickly on the water issue. Suffolk has gone to great lengths to protect its waters, protect the aquifer, protect the Pine Barrens, secure land and all those wonderful things we're doing. Are you saying that we should share them with Nassau? Is that something that is -- is that what you're saying?

MR. CAMERON:

What we're saying -- yes, actually you'll see some of our strategies, and actually we've used Suffolk County as an example when we met yesterday with the Presiding Officer of the Nassau County Legislature, Peter Schmitt, that the model that Suffolk County has adopted, in particular Suffolk County Water Authority, and the opportunities that could be parlayed if Nassau -- if there were more on a regional basis planning from stewardship as well as possibly funding. This is going to resonate with you when we talk about sewers, economic development. You'll see this all ties together. But we're with you, preservation of the resource, protection of our open space, but also economic growth and how we can accomplish that. Hopefully you'll see that these all tie together.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I think the one time that we went out in recent years on the sewerage issues was soundly rejected by Nassau County when we said well, would you like to share, you know, on this and we'll pay you for the usage of your sewage capabilities and they said no.

MR. CAMERON:

But think about it.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I'm not arguing that we shouldn't be.

MR. CAMERON:

But there is a reason why; think about it. If you have excess capacity in a sewage treatment plant that could be an opportunity. And if they look at it as an opportunity --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

As is water.

MR. CAMERON:

As is water. So it wasn't as much as they didn't want as much, I think, the Suffolk County sewage coming to Nassau, it was still that reserve capacity can provide more growth potential for Nassau County. And I know that Suffolk County is moving forward with, it appears, with Bergen Point with an expansion there. We all know that that is a tremendous asset. Sewage treatment capacity is an asset for economic growth and you'll see --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I couldn't agree more.

MR. CAMERON:

Okay. Next is we had also accommodating new growth sustainability through pedestrian transit supportive development, and that's particular in our downtowns. We're looking to consolidate our infrastructure providers in water and waste water area. We think there's an opportunity there. We know that there could be significant resistance, but we'll talk about that. Looking to seek opportunities to diversify the energy supply and establish programs for renewable energy supply, and in particular in the conservation area also, and providing increased emphasis on the conservation of our resources whether they be consumables -- it could be water, it could be natural gas, it could be electricity, various resources we believe we need to be conserving. And lastly is also securing significant financing for major improvements that improve Long Island's connections to the greater region's transportation infrastructure.

One great challenge we have today, and you'll see we have this in a number of areas, is you're going to hear it everywhere; government's broke. Government's broke. Well, that doesn't mean that we let our bridges fall down, our roads collapse, or our waste water treatment plants defile our natural resources. We need to do something. It's incumbent upon you and all those that are in elected capacities or in positions of authority to make sure that we preserve and enhance our natural environment and our economy, not only for ourselves, but for our children and our grandchildren. So this is a challenge today. It doesn't mean it's insurmountable, but we have some ideas on how we can possibly deal with this. But financing of infrastructure is one of the major challenges that we face as a society today.

The first one we have is creating alternative, local and dedicated funding sources for Long Island's infrastructure and the environment as well as transportation. We believe by creating dedicated local funding sources on Long Island, and in both Counties, along with municipalities we can work together, construct and maintain the necessary transportation and environmental infrastructure and leveraging State and Federal funding opportunities. We think that there could be some excellent opportunities, whether in the creation of an infrastructure banks by possibly utilizing pension funds, whether they be in construction industry or even public pensions, that can help provide funding and financing for infrastructure, needed infrastructure that we have in this State and in particular on Long Island. We think there are some major opportunities that warrant significant pursuit. And as a result, we've actually contacted the State Comptroller's Office to be meeting with him to discuss the potential on public pensions as well as we've also had some discussions with some of the local construction unions. So we think this could provide some of the necessary funding, and not necessarily be coming out of the coffers of local municipalities.

Secondly is creating vibrant transit supported communities, again, on Long Island here. We can't keep building out the Island and expect that everybody's going to get one person per car and jam up the L.I.E. or our local transportation network any more than it is today. We need to capitalize on the opportunity of transit and locating our businesses and residential down closer to our downtowns can facilitate that and make us more sustainable. Again, this is a sequence to that, is on transit serve job centers. If workers are living closer to the downtown, if we can locate our businesses closer to our rail stations and our transit served areas, there is a greater opportunity for sustainability and getting cars off the road.

Fourth is implementing a meaningful suburban transit system on Long Island. Here we have some major planned, if you will, in the planning stage infrastructure projects with regard to our transit system. It's critical that we have the expansion of the Farmingdale to Ronkonkoma second line, which we don't have right now. You're not going to be sustainable. You've got a reverse commute there or get significant commute and development in Suffolk County without that second track. We also need the third track in Nassau County, which is on the main line, which has encountered some resistance. We're coming out very strong. We need the third track if we're going to be sustainable here on Long Island.

We also believe we need a very viable Long Island regional bus system. Nassau, as you know, you've probably been reading about the battle it's having with the MTA over financing of their bus system. We know that Suffolk has a different funding formula. We're saying Long Island needs a viable bus system, not only for those less advantaged, but in order to make travel on Long Island more cost effective and more sustainable.

And lastly is we also believe that there's opportunities with bus rapid transit. You look, for example, on the Route 110 corridor, which has really become the commercial epicenter, if you will, for Long Island if you put both Nassau and Suffolk together. The 110 corridor offers significant opportunity. And we've had Supervisor Bellone in the Town of Babylon has worked very diligently on trying to get that, development of the Farmingdale station which would help also east west, but also on the north south transit there's bus rapid transit. We think there's opportunities on Long Island and whether it's a private or a public/private partnership it doesn't matter, whatever's most cost effective, but we believe we need to be implementing that.

Next is creating a dedicated funding source for mobility improvements in the transit supported developments. Whether these be user fees or not, we need to, again, getting back to infrastructure, we need to focus on infrastructure, whether it's on the roadways or on transit, on dedicated funding sources to ensure that there's a continuum of funding for the long-term. If you look, MTA's basically been doing capital plans on a two year basis. There's no way to make a long-term capital plan like that. They're in the middle of projects, major projects, Second Avenue subway, east side access, with no guarantee of subsequent year funding, so they could be stopped right in the middle of it. That's not even talking about the other projects which directly, more directly, affect Long Island.

Number six is pursuing the viability of establishing Long Island as a federally designated MPO. The Federal funding, which comes to various areas, in particular in transit funding, goes through right now NYMTC, which is the local planning -- metropolitan planning organization. We're saying is Long Island we don't believe is getting its fair share. It's just New York City is the big dog, is taking the lion's share of the money. If Long Island were a metropolitan planning organization we believe we could advance and champion Long Island's issues, our challenges and our opportunities, and go after funding directly to the Federal Government. You know, we've got 2.8 million people here on Long Island and we'd be moving much larger than the vast majority of MPO's in the United States. We believe we've got a critical mass here. We've got our own unique challenges separate and apart from New York City and even from the northern Hudson area. We need to be able to champion

them and we think if we create ourselves, we're able to be designated as an MPO, we can more effectively do that.

Next is improving and creating connectivity to include off Island connections and network expansion. This could be a tunnel off Long Island. You've heard about it talked about. We're just saying is it warrants exploring. Right now you can't even get freight off Long Island. You can't get freight effectively on and off Long Island. There's bottlenecks. You've got to basically go up the Hudson to be able to go up around Albany and come back Kingston, I believe it is, and come back down to get to New Jersey. We don't have an effective -- What is it, Mike?

MR. WHITE:

Almost Albany.

MR. CAMERON:

Almost Albany. To effectively be able to get across the Hudson River is -- we need to get freight effectively off of Long Island, and you'll see we focus on that on another item here, the next item. But also we think getting people on and off Long Island rather than going through the five boroughs of New York City would be much more cost effective and make us more sustainable. We are literally a geographical cul-de-sac if you look at it. Anything that comes in through New York City onto to Long Island it's got to go back the same way or one of the five or two boroughs of New York City. We should be able to get off the East End of Long Island.

We are recommending a feasibility study for a deep water port on Long Island. I announced that at a meeting last, a week news flash. I don't know if you're aware, there is a major shipping port already on Long Island, deep water port. Everybody goes, "Where?" It's in Brooklyn. It just doesn't happen to be in Nassau or Suffolk County. If you look at -- Suffolk County is the number one agricultural county in New York State from a revenue perspective, yet how are you getting products off Long Island? You put them on a truck and they go on the L.I.E. and go through the same traffic as everybody else, jamming it up, spearing more greenhouse gas emissions and adversely affecting our health and welfare as well as adding to our cost of doing business here on Long Island. We're saying we should be studying the feasibility of a deep water port here on the East End of Long Island.

Lastly on transportation we believe we should take action to manage our congestion and make transit more competitive. To the extent that we're successful in getting cars and trucks off the road, it would greatly enhance Long Island's opportunities for sustainability. Expanding our active transportation options, that's in our downtowns. Right now I think you can't go a week without hearing about somebody getting run over on a bicycle or for jogging -- roads aren't safe for pedestrians and our downtowns, we need to make them more friendly for bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

On infrastructure, this is a major item here which I alluded to earlier. This is a major item, is to implement a plan to protect Long Island's natural water resources, again, this is our aquifer as well as our marine resources, through the creation of a Long Island Water Resources Management Board. Again, modeled similarly to a -- much like the Suffolk County Water Authority. We're not doing top down mandated planning here, but we're saying if we create a board which could provide the opportunity for water districts to fold, sewer districts to fold in, not only will it provide greater stewardship of our resources, but it also could provide the funding mechanism for major infrastructure improvements.

In Nassau County the issue for them is principally is upgrade of waste water treatment plants. You may be reading about it. They are having some significant challenges at the major plants. You're looking at multimillion dollar upgrades. In Suffolk County the issue is principally is the creation of

sewers, okay. Without sewers you're not going to get density, you're not going to get the economic development that we need in our downtowns to grow our economy. Yet I can tell you from my engineering company, from doing the studies and doing the planning, that if you look to amortize the capital costs as well as the fixed operating costs over the community that is solely served by that sewer system, it's not going to be affordable. In almost all of the areas you're going to go in it's not going to be affordable. When you talk \$20,000 a year for somebody to connect to a sewer all of a sudden as opposed to running their cesspool, they're going to say you're out of your mind. What we need to do is expand the denominator, whether it's town-wide, County-wide or Island-wide, we look at it and say the community that takes workforce housing is providing the economic development potential in the neighboring town for workers, creating workers, providing workers for those businesses in those area.

If we look at one Island, one resource and basically we're all in this lifeboat together, if we work together we can expand that denominator and the cost per individual will be driven down tremendously. We can make sewers affordable. We can make treatment plants affordable. It's, frankly, when you look and say when the Pine Barrens were acquired. That was looked at with a regional vision. It was looked at as a vision, not just the people who are living next door or the people who are going to frequent or try and do a walk through the Pine Barrens. We are looking at it as you're protecting the aquifer. We are looking at it saying we should be looking at this as Island wide and we think there is a great opportunity. There is not only stewardship, but also financing.

And if you look at -- also I can tell you is when New York City talks about cost of doing business in New York City, everybody's says, you know, it's more expensive to do anything in New York than anywhere, right? You know what the cheapest resource, the one resource that is less in New York City than the median nationally? Water. Water. Long Island we're the same way. We have cheap water and what we're not saying is that we should just drive the cost through the roof, but how can you encourage conservation, how can you amortize improvements if you've basically such a cheap resource, and that is a great resource we have. We have high quality aquifers. We need to preserve them, protect them. But there's an opportunity here and I think it warrants it, further investigation as to how we can capitalize on it.

Second is developing a regional energy strategy. An earlier speaker, Mr. Quinn, spoke about this. We believe we need a regional strategy, one which capitalizes on potential for energy conservation programs, to realize a more affordable and reliable and diverse low carbon energy supply. Work with LIPA, work with all the providers. There's a great opportunity here. The cost of energy provision on Long Island is so high we think it's an opportunity.

Third is creating a Long Island wide zero waste management plan as part of a regional strategy. We're not naive enough to think that we're going to create a completely recyclable waste stream and we're not going to have waste to be disposed of, but what we're saying is that that should be our goal. We'll never get there, but if we keep aiming to more cost effectively reduce the amount of waste that we dispose of -- I don't know if you're aware, but approximately 40% of the waste generated on Long Island goes off Long Island. It goes in trucks and it goes on the L.I.E. and it heads to distant points west in West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, even Michigan, okay? So we're not only sending the garbage there, but the cost of disposing there, we might as well be putting hundred dollar bills in those garbage trucks because that's what we're doing. We're paying to have the material sent out of state and basically supporting economies in other states. We're saying -- getting back to one Long Island. We should be looking at more cost effective ways of recycling our waste, reducing the amount of waste that has to be disposed of and also taking care of business at home. It makes us more self-sufficient but also can enhance our economic growth.

Next is protecting our Island's beaches and marine resources. The Council, me particular, I think you probably all would agree one of the great reasons we live here on Long Island is our great natural resources. We have phenomenal resources, our beaches, our marine resources. They add to the quality of life, not only for the recreation and the tourism, but we as Long Islanders know that we have a phenomenal natural resource here and this should be at the top of our -- anybody's list here, is preserving the quality and make sure that we're not defiling this and that we protect this for generations to come. So that's an important focus for us.

Number five is developing a climate change resilience plan to anticipate sea level rise. And what you'll see here, we have a disclaimer in the report. We're not interested in getting into an argument as to how much the climate is going to be changed, how much sea level is going to rise. We're just saying is we as a Council, we've done a lot of investigative work. We believe that we are actually consuming resources and basically oxidizing organic material from the earth, putting it into the air and we're changing our environment. We believe that we're going to affect the climate. To the extent that that happens we'll observe over time. We're just saying we're an Island; plan for it. If the sea level is going to rise, we should plan for it. If it doesn't rise as much as a lot of the scientists are planning for now, that's fine, but at least we planned for the future rather than encounter a crisis down the road.

Next on our list we have is coordinating an emergency preparedness plan across Long Island. This is not only for natural disasters, hurricanes etcetera, or even, if you will, earthquakes, but in particular homeland security and terrorism. We live next to the number one terrorist target in the world, and as a result we could have fallout. We had fallout from 9/11. There's still the potential. We believe that we should be prepared for this. The eventuality of it, we have a new creation of the Morrelly Homeland Security Center in Bethpage that both Nassau and Suffolk are working with. We think there are opportunities here not only to protect ourselves for the future, but also for economic growth.

On land use we look at establishing development guidelines that serve to protect our open spaces and protect the natural environment. Development should occur in planned areas. We shouldn't just look and say because there's open space it's cheaper to develop in wide open areas. Suffolk County had the vision with the Pine Barrens is that we should look at this and protect our natural resources and preserve our green spaces to the extent that we can, but we should be recycling our old antiquated areas, our brown field areas, our strip malls, failed strip malls etcetera, and we should be looking to target that. And recognize that counties don't have land use control, you have planning, but we should be working with the planning authorities in the towns, village and cities to make sure that happens.

In conjunction with that is developing land use regulations and overlay guidelines. These overlay guidelines can strategically direct whether development should occur, where planners and economic development professionals believe that development should occur.

And part of that, again, is also protecting our farmland and ensuring local food access. We know that the Legislature is supported, I believe it was Legislator Vivian Vilorio Fisher's initiative with regard to food access, and we're saying is we have -- in particular Suffolk County farming is a major component, major opportunity here in Suffolk County, is why not capitalize on that and why not getting back to our Buy Long Island First? Why not support that, preservation not only of our farms for open space but also economic development. Why can't the farms on Long Island be providing local produce to our schools? We think it's a great opportunity. The schools are a tremendous purchasing power and working with them and healthier diets etcetera. We think it's not getting too socialistic here, but there's an economic development potential and also for health care and provision of healthier youth today.

Fourth is protecting our neighborhood character and providing for location compatible and appropriate development. Again, looking this is all part and parcel of our development, where the development should occur. We're not looking to change out our single family home areas and the zoning. What we're saying is that our downtowns, there is opportunity definitely for the multi family. And preserving character, if you will, of Long Island, and much of it in our single family home areas. That being said, I'll turn it over for a fourth thematic area and final area on equity back to Michael.

MR. WHITE:

With respect to equity, and part of the classic sustainability plan of environment, economy and equity, our vision -- the goal of this plan is a Long Island that attracts, retains a diverse population, benefits from contributions from all groups, and rewards them with Long Island's traditional advantages. A range of housing options available to all Long Islanders, school systems that offer a quality education to all children. Decent working and living conditions as well as ladders of economic opportunity for the immigrant workforce on which key industries rely. A vibrant civic and cultural landscape which promotes natural awareness and respect and which adds to Long Island's attractions for businesses and workers.

First strategy, develop a fair share housing action plan for creating a necessary next generation and mixed income workforce housing. So what we really want to do is a build a regional consensus on the definition of desirability of fair share housing, the strategy, where the housing can be constructed with distribution throughout Long Island, and an action plan that commits all communities to clear targets and timelines. We need the workforce housing, we need next generation housing, we need mixed income housing. We are indeed working with Nassau and Suffolk County to get the monies through a HUD sustainable communities grant to actually initiate part of this strategy.

Next one, establish an immigrant Task Force to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities of an emerging immigrant population. So we think developing a Task Force to address the needs and challenges of low wage immigrant workers in the agriculture, construction and hospitality and other industries that depend on them.

Number three, catalyze social and economic development through arts and cultural programs. So we want to promote and support arts, cultural and youth programming, particularly in low income minority and immigrant communities. Implement development models that strengthen and build upon existing cultural assets that are likely to succeed in catalyzing and growing downtowns, neighborhood revitalization, creating affordable spaces for cultural production, as well as space for not-for-profit organizations. Arts and culture programs are a tremendous economic driver for all of Long Island and really need to be enhanced.

Number four, establish training, educational employment centers for technical jobs in low income and minority communities. Long Island's low income and minority communities suffer from high rates of unemployment and under employment, especially among young adults. These young people often lack the training and skills that they need to qualify for technical jobs that offer the best prospects for stable employment and upward mobility. Nationally the most successful models link outreach and supportive services with job readiness, technical training, and pre-apprenticeship programs to provide a ladder of opportunity and options to young people who face these barriers on employment.

And finally number five, meet the health needs of an aging, diverse and sedentary population. Health care is a major industry on Long Island providing central service, service of very high quality which greatly enhances the attractiveness of the region, playing an important role in our regional economy as well. As an increasing number of Long Islanders become older and as Long Island

becomes more ethnically diverse, access to quality, affordable health care will grow in importance as both the quality of life and economic issue for individuals and businesses alike.

So to wrap up a little on the next steps, which was asked about when we first started actually, is so we're doing these presentations, county state and local governments. We are going forth on a broad public outreach, which would include public meetings as well as the development beyond our own website and internet platform with respect to this work, and being able to indeed have sentiment analysis with respect to some of the action items and planned items going forward. We're going to use the model that we talked about with our educational work group which is establishing work groups in each one of the thematic areas to identify and assist us in those action items that will take these strategies forward. And, of course, the continuation of that education work group, which as I explained first thing out this afternoon, has been a very successful collaborative approach and we will put that to work immediately.

So we thank you for the great amount of time that you've given us here. There is a lot of information on that disc, there's a lot of information supporting this summary report and certainly willing to take some questions and look for your continued support. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much to all of you. It's really appreciated and enlightening. It's kind of like a lot of the stuff a lot of people have been talking about for a long time but put into one document. So that's appreciated. Legislator Cilmi, I understand you have a question.

LEG. CILMI:

Not so much a question but a statement. I frankly have to say that I'm just thrilled with the depth and with the intellectual honesty of the material that you presented. It's -- particularly with regard to the significance of the challenges that we face economically here on Long Island, and also with regard to our educational competitiveness internationally. And I -- I very much look forward to working with your group in developing the action plans that are necessary to implement and to advocate for some of the changes that are necessary to develop on these ideas.

So, again, let's talk to one another, because some of these things that you've talked about today are things that I've been talking about for a couple of years very, very vocally. And congratulations to a good job.

MR. CAMERON:

Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. We all know, too, and I have to tell you this personally as the Chair, put an incredible amount of time in conjunction with staff, personal time, pro bono time, as well as my other Council members. Our great fear was -- the last thing we want to do is put all this time in and come up with another study that sits on a shelf. We're putting this time in to try and make a difference. And the challenges -- and people say how are you doing it. Well, the first step took a lot of work, the jury is still out, are we going to be actually able to implement these recommendations. And, frankly, the Council itself, we can't do it alone. Together we can't even do it alone. But we need to educate the populous here on Long Island. We need to bring these other decision makers, elected officials with us as well as other business leaders, and say we're not going to take it anymore. We need to turn the tide here and it's going to take all of us to do that. When you look and say, you know, who's going to depend upon this and I say go look at your kids, look at grandkids, if you have grandkids, I said because otherwise we're leaving them with an unsustainable product, and it would be shame on us if we do that.

LEG. CILMI:

With respect specifically to the economic challenges that you talked about at the beginning, if you spoke to the people in Detroit 30 years ago and said to them that they would have failed

economically, and they've truly failed economically in Detroit today, none of them would have believed you. And so I have been saying for some time that unless we make significant changes to some of these issues that you've talked about, we could very well be in the position that Detroit is in today. We are talking about, you know, 50% vacancy of houses and businesses and we are talking about 25% graduation rates of high school kids. It's just tragic what's happened there. And, you know, to a great extent I think that many folks have had their heads in the sand as to how significant the challenges that we truly face are. And so, again, I think you've brought them to light in this summary of this report. And again, congratulations.

MR. CAMERON:

Thank you. I would just like to add that we're not trying to be sort of throwing cold water on everybody's face, but as my wife says, you know, stop at the cocktail parties, you're depressing everybody. And I said you know what, everybody should know this is a reality. You want to know where we're going as a state, I said, you know, fast forward not only to California, look to New Jersey. They have a Governor that is trying to at least turn the tide. But look at Illinois, look at Michigan. And I said go look at what's happening in Western Europe. If you're not paying attention don't get angry with people who are telling you, you know, like the sky isn't just falling, is that this is unsustainable, and unless we make changes it's not going to be there. So let's be realistic about it. If you want to put your head in the sand you can do that, but not everybody is going to do that and we're not going to do it. We're going to tell you this is the truth and this is what we need to do.

MR. WHITE:

As we said first thing, and we appreciate the comments. It really does present a call to action and we've tried to lay that out and hopefully we're going to create that roadmap with you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Very good. Thank you very much. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you. I'll just take a different tactic. I have been here seven years now, been here somewhat longer than Legislator Cilmi, and to me if I were grading this paper or this report I'd give you an A, but in reality I don't see that there is -- unless there is something in the disc that deals with specifics, this really is, you know, deja vu all over again. We have been hearing this --

MR. CAMERON:

If I may.

LEG. MONTANO:

Go ahead.

MR. CAMERON:

It's unfortunate, this is a presentation. If you look at the document that's there we have examples of what needs to be done, action items, what the role of the Planning Council would be, where this has been done similarly in other of the country, absolutely. In all deference --

LEG. MONTANO:

That's what I'm looking for. You know, like --

MR. CAMERON:

No, absolutely. This looks like, honestly this is like a highlight tour, you know, a drivethrough.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes, this is up there --

MR. CAMERON:

You're on a tour bus here.

LEG. MONTANO:

This is up there and I want you to come back to earth.

MR. CAMERON:

Absolutely, we agree.

LEG. MONTANO:

The report that came out yesterday, the preliminary report on the census, shows us where we are at. Our population is getting older, our property values are going down. The increase in immigrant population is real, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. The consolidation of the school districts we have been talking about that for 25 years. Your most important point was that when it comes to sustainability if we are at 8% today, within five years we are at 10%, and that's the point where we are not sustainable.

MR. CAMERON:

Right.

LEG. MONTANO:

So, you know. But I'm really looking for, you know, they used to say during the old days, where's the beef? Give me some specifics. It's nice to say that we are going to do more for minority students, it's nice to say that we are going to, you know, sell produce to our schools. But show me the details, because we have been sitting here, at least I've been sitting here for seven years, waiting for the specific projects that are going to go through. Where's the money, you know, we are borrowing ourselves out of existence. You name it, it's there. So what I'm asking is, and I don't mean to be critical to the report, I know you've done a lot. But it really is -- we are aware of these issues. So what's, and I don't want to do it now, but you are telling me that in the disc there are specific recommendations and projects and dollar amounts and timetables as to how we are going to do this?

MR. CAMERON:

This, for example, I just opened it up to buy Long Island First. If you look on the left-hand side we talk about the contacts, what the proposed actions are. We have five new term actions, we have two mid-term actions. We have the implementation on it, responsible entities, the approvals required, the key steps, cost, the financing structure, the challenges, what the role of the Planning Council is. We have case studies about --

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. I will look at that. That's basically what I was saying.

MR. CAMERON:

You are not wrong. The devil is in the details and we agree.

LEG. MONTANO:

The devil is in the details and I'm looking for the details.

MR. CAMERON:

We agree. We are on the same page.

MR. WHITE:

We could have actually spent this much time on probably two of the strategies. We really wanted to roll out the overview and present the document so we can come back and as we get some reactions to those specific items.

LEG. MONTANO:

I agree. You've got to give this to us in piecemeal.

MR. WHITE:

Yes.

MR. CAMERON:

And just to give you an example, to talk about tax and governance.

Our number one strategy, of course, is on the schools. And everybody is focused on the cost of education, but what we're saying as a regional planning entity, if you will, one Long Island is -- we are recognized for the excellence in education. We still have four of the least -- poorest performing or recognized as the poorest performing school districts in New York State. What we're saying, shame on us if we don't deal with this. We made that our number one priority and we have -- and you will look at the details. We believe we have some excellent recommendations to try and deal with this. Is consolidation going to happen over major districts like that? Let's not be naive. You've been talking about it for 25 years, we know that. It is appropriate in certain areas. Are we going to have, you know, a Brentwood and a Half Hollow Hills, or a Garden City and Hempstead merge together? We are not going to be naive. But on the other hand, in Roosevelt you could have a very smart young person, which I'm sure there are, but there is no physics AP class.

And we talked to, we had the Superintendent of Rockville Center and adjacent districts say we were willing to do it, we couldn't get the schedules coordinated. And you look and said cyber education. We need to, again, consolidation frankly is not the answer. It is not the silver bullet because if you don't reduce the personnel cost, if you just top -- take the top few percent of administrative salaries etcetera, the majority is really in the classroom. And you've got 70 to 80% of the cost really is in personnel. Until you start shrinking personnel, you are not going to reduce cost. So, we agree with you, there's --

LEG. MONTANO:

We'll deal with the specifics another time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Very quickly. Legislator Montano, I couldn't agree with you more. When I was listening to the presentation I guess my initial reaction was, you know, these are the things that we're spending an awful lot of time on, where are some of those details. I took a look at some of these, I was thumbing through as you were speaking. One of the, I think, the most unique things about your report here is the in depth analysis that you went through, background information, a lot of statistics and maps and graphs and that was all kind of good. What's that?

LEG. MONTANO:

Do you have --

LEG. STERN:

No, Legislator Horsley, he's the most learned man in the room right now. Legislator Horsley knows all the information.

MR. WHITE:

But if you want us to make hard copies we will.

LEG. STERN:

But then I started thumbing through the analysis and you're absolutely right, what makes it a unique report is not just restating the challenges, but going through a very detailed analysis, actually, of what the action steps are. And I think what you should really be commended on here is not just suggested action steps in general, but pretty specific. And even going so far as to in each and every one of your suggestions pointing out a particular case study on where it's been implemented. Now, that's not to suggest that what's been done in other parts of the country would be appropriate --

MR. CAMERON:

We know that, sure.

LEG. STERN:

-- here, but it certainly gives all of us, I think, a meaningful starting point, and so congratulations. It is going to be very helpful for all of us.

MR. CAMERON:

Thank you. We invite you to look at it at your leisure.

LEG. MONTANO:

Mike, could you send me the hard copies? It's easier for me than working off the computer.

MR. WHITE:

Absolutely, absolutely will do that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just thought it was interesting, too, talk about being all inclusive, your point about voter apathy. Boy, God bless you if you can get people out there to vote, because you are right on target with that one.

MR. WHITE:

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON:

It was interesting, I was just thumbing the channels last night and one of them, one of the major New York City networks actually was doing somewhat of an expose on special districts in Nassau County, on water districts and fire districts, because yesterday was special election day. They talked about how many voters and it was less than 3% of the electorate came out to vote yesterday in this one district, and they talked about the cost and whatever. Our focus, frankly, is not just voter education, but if you look at the special districts and the school districts, the numerous voting days through the year, there is no coordination. People don't know it. There's a voting day tomorrow? Who knows about it. So if the electorate doesn't know about it they are not going to be engaged. So we believe we should talk about possibly two voting days a year.

LEG. NOWICK:

Also that's a point that I always thought, that's double the cost if when the school district has a vote in May and then two weeks later another election and then in November we have other elections.

That's like double.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

The libraries, because they don't want to be in with the schools because they don't want their votes to go down because they don't like the schools.

LEG. NOWICK:

Thank you.

LEG. MONTANO:

If I may.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, sure.

LEG. MONTANO:

Just on that last point with voting, because I hear that a lot because my district is considered, as are other minority districts, low voting districts. But the reality is unless we see change, unless you give people a reason to vote, they are not coming out. And you need some specifics to give people that incentive. It's nice to, you know, talk about platitudes and we need to do this and we need to encourage. It ain't happening unless you put some real concrete stuff on the table.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

There's also the laws of the State of New York on voter participation that has to be changed. I mean, opening up elections rather than making them an exclusivity, whether it is absentee registration, you know, making it a criminal offense if you lie -- you have to fall into a certain amount of categories of why you were voting absentee. The list goes on about how our antiquated voting registration process is. We all have our work cut out for us.

So I think what we need to do is we've got to start talking about your action points and how do we start making those action points work. Some of them are a little difficult, but some of them are doable. And some of them could actually start in places like this committee, like the Buy Long Island First. I mean, that's something that I could work with with our counterparts in Nassau County and start something like that. I mean, that's doable. You know, consolidating school districts, I agree, is a tough thing, but I think we can do it.

MR. CAMERON:

You'll leave for another Legislator.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I asked Legislator Stern, what's our term limits? I'm kidding.

MR. WHITE:

I would also say as part of the next steps not only do we want the feedback on those broader items in terms of the action items and understanding some of the those case studies and how they could apply. And we have done our best with our consultants who work on an international, national and local basis to identify case studies that look like they could work here with some adjustment to our uniqueness.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I agree.

MR. WHITE:

But we also want to identify those first priority items, and I think Legislator Horsley, you were just saying, the Buy Long Island one, is like yeah, let's do that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Let's do that, yeah.

MR. WHITE:

And there's probably a number of those. It is not exactly like low hanging fruit. They're easy, but they're very doable, and that's the kind of reaction we want to get. So if we can start to produce some of those successes we can back up to some of the harder stuff. But this --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Let's talk and let's start putting something together. Okay. I'm getting pressure, you know. Okay. Gang, we really appreciate this, coming down to speak to us today and let's not forget that we met. Because that's what oftentimes -- oh that was nice, we'll see you later and that's the last you're here.

MR. WHITE:

We will be back and we appreciate your attention and continued support and open dialogue.

LEG. NOWICK:

Thank you.

MR. WHITE:

Thank you.

MR. CAMERON:

Thank you very much. Appreciate it. Thank you.

LEG. MONTANO:

Have a good holiday.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We're going to move to the rest of the agenda. First is tabled prime.

Tabled Prime

2056, Adopting Local Law No. 2010, A Local law to enlarge the membership of the Citizens' Advisory Board for the Arts. (Lindsay)

Do we have any motions on this?

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We have a motion to approve. Do we have a second on the motion? Second by Legislator Montano. We're all set to go on this one? Okay? Is there any other motions? We're all right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It has been approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

Okay, legislation *2104, A resolution to implement the Community Pride and Renewal Program and to amend the 2010 Adopted Capital Budget to provide funding in connection with the Community Pride and Renewal (CPR) Program and Downtown Beautification and Renewal (CP 6418).*
(Co. Exec.)

LEG. MONTANO:

Motion to table.

LEG. NOWICK:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We have a motion to table, second by Legislator Montano. Seconded by Legislator Nowick. On the motion, let me recognize Mr. Kent.

MR. KENT:

Thank you. I was hoping we could discuss the proposed amended version of this. I think it was distributed to you earlier.

LEG. MONTANO:

When you say earlier, I just got it a little while ago, like maybe five minutes ago.

MR. KENT:

Well, it was filed on Monday so I --

LEG. MONTANO:

I'm talking about your memo here. Is that what you're talking about?

MR. KENT:

The memo and -- well, actually the amended resolution was filed in the Clerk's Office on Monday together with the memo that was attached to the --

LEG. MONTANO:

Is this the memo you're talking about written by Amy Engel?

MR. KENT:

Amy Engel, yes. It was forwarded on Monday to Brendan Chamberlain. It was filed with the amended copy of the bill, which you should have also received. I had it circulated just to make sure you had it in hand, which was filed on Monday in the Legislative Clerk's Office.

This was discussed at length at the last committee meeting. We listened to the committee. We heard your concerns and we proposed amendments in an effort to address your concerns. The whole goal of this proposed project is to provide leverage to seed money, similar to what was being discussed by the -- during the presentation. This will be a local dedicated funding source to allow local governments to take the seed money that we're providing and leverage it against their own funding so that they can realize a project that might otherwise go unrealized. And if I can walk you through -- you know, this will be like an infrastructure bank as the Regional Planning Council was recommending. And I could walk you through the changes we made to it that I think address your -- address the committee's concerns, and I think we've improved it. With your -- as you had requested I think we've made some improvements to the bill.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Right, I see that.

MR. KENT:

I could walk you through them if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

If we can do it in a reasonably, you know --

MR. KENT:

I'll do it as quickly as possible. I'm pretty fast on this stuff. If you look the prior -- the cap project for downtown revitalization and downtown beautification and renewal, that was funded this year \$500,000, Legislative money under CP 6412. This restores another \$500,000 under 6418 to bring it to the historic level of a million dollars. Five-hundred thousand of money from the Legislature, \$500,000 from the County Executive and that money is used for downtown planters, beautification projects, and they're determined on a competitive basis by a committee.

This project 6422, this resolution creates a new project, 6422, that funds it with two million dollars for larger scaled projects. Again, like I said, this would be leveraged seed money. Local municipalities will put in matching funds in order to attract the County's money. And it's designed to financially support infrastructure necessary for larger scale projects such as development around transportation hubs, which the Regional Planning Council was also discussing. So this type of regional transportation hub, a TOD as they are called, will allow -- those type of large scale projects with matching money will be invested in the community to leverage this County money, which is two million dollars. The goal is to have one project in all ten towns based on meeting the very strict criteria which is contained in the fifth Resolved clause.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

So, Chris, for that you -- instead of making it -- didn't you have it like one not per town, but per village and you broke it down --

MR. KENT:

No. Before we had it one for every Legislative District.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

That's what it was, yes, okay. I knew it was close to that.

MR. KENT:

And we had it at a maximum of \$100,000. We changed to a minimum of \$100,000, let the applications go into the committee, let the committee decide which ones are most meritorious, and see if we can fund these at a minimum of \$100,000, and there's two million dollars total in the project. This is money coming out of other capital projects that are going to disappear at the end of the year. They usually -- most of these projects were ones that were -- the estimated cost was higher than the actual cost and there was money left over in these projects.

This would take two million dollars of currently budgeted money, transferred into this new capital project and have it appropriated so that it can survive, have applications come in that will be scored based on local match, and feasibility of projects and desirability of projects in meeting the criteria as listed in the fifth Resolved clause.

If this doesn't come out of committee today this project will disappear and we'd have to divide it using 2011 offsets if we can identify those. We think going forward it's just -- puts money into a capital project. We'd still have to -- the project proposals will still have to go to the committee and they will still have to come back here to be bonded sometime in the future. They'll be subject to

the five year rule so that we'd have to expend this money within five years from the time the money is appropriated.

If there are any questions I can go through the fifth Resolved clause and show you how we made changes to the criteria, which we think improve the overall scope of the project and I think it meets a critical need to provide this seed money that can be leveraged by local communities, to commit local money along with the County money to do local development projects.

LEG. MONTANO:

Question.

MR. KENT:

And if you look in the fifth criteria or the fifth Resolved clause it shows you how the awarding will be done. It will be based on local commitment of funds. Sixty percent will get you a certain amount of points. If a locality gets between 60 and 75% of a project budget they'll get a higher award of points and higher than 75% percent of a project they'll get even more points.

We also changed the membership of the committee that will be doing the reviewing. It includes -- we've added the Chairman of the environment and energy -- excuse me, Economic Development and Energy Committee and it includes the Presiding Officer's representative, the minority leader's representative and then departments. Representatives of the Department of Parks, Planning, Economic Development and the Law Department. That's seven members of that committee will make determinations based on applications that are received that are eligible pursuant to that criteria.

LEG. MONTANO:

Questions.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yeah, just two quick questions. If this money is available and a town doesn't want to do -- to match the funds, they can't take it at all? In other words, if a town has a project for 100,000, can they come to you and say we would like you, us, the County, say we would like the hundred thousand but we don't have the money to match it, can they still get the money?

MR. KENT:

Well, it would be scored against other applications received. So if a town comes in with 50% match or 60% match, that project would be scored higher than the town or the municipality that's coming in with no match. So there would bonus points awarded based on matching funds.

LEG. NOWICK:

So it's possible for them to get money, but it's a sliding scale depending on how they match it. Another quick question because we're really running late. This two million dollars that's there, if we were not to use it for these projects where would that money go to? Was it a capital, is it an offset, is it capital money?

MR. KENT:

It's capital money if it's --

LEG. NOWICK:

So it's already there, so to speak, if we don't use this, where does this capital money go to? Does it pay off another something else or where -- it just goes into never never land or what happens to it.

MR. KENT:

If it's not bonded within five years it would just disappear.

LEG NOWICK:

So if we don't use it we don't actually bond it.

MR. LIPP:

Robert Lipp, Budget Review Office. Basically what happens it's a capital -- specific capital project and it can only be used for that purpose, nothing else.

LEG. NOWICK:

So if we never use this, if we don't do this and we never use it, we never bond it, it never happens.

MR. LIPP:

Correct. But the intent here is if you authorize the appropriations it gives the Comptroller the authority to issue the bonds once the projects have been letted. And what happens is once the first dollars have been letted then the project can last for -- into perpetuity, really. The five year rule is for five years if you haven't spent a penny then it would be rescinded, the project, but it could be used for anything else.

LEG. NOWICK:

Thanks.

LEG. MONTANO:

Chris, how are you? I was on the list. It's -- we don't have a lot of time to discuss this. I'm not going to support this under any circumstances. It's nice that you added the Chair of the Legislature's Economic Development and Higher Education and Energy Committee, but I still count four to three. There are four County Executive appointments to there's -- one is the Commissioner of Parks. I'm not sure what role the Commissioner of Parks would have in making these appropriations. We're giving \$2,000, we're essentially giving -- the way I look at this, we're giving a blank check for \$2,000 -- two million, I'm sorry. Two million dollars, you know for -- the way I see it, we might as well just cut a check for two million to the friends of Steve Levy so he can go around and campaign next year. There's no way that I'm going to support this kind of resolution. All right? Especially on the last day.

The argument that we should do this because we're going to lose it is not the way to rush things through. All right. I don't know how my colleagues feel about this, but I see this very clearly as not the time and not the way to do it, and certainly not to spend the money there. We have a project that I supported initially, that's the \$500,000 for downtown redevelopment that's done through the Downtown Redevelopment Committee, and five hundred that was appropriated through the County Executive. This is an eleventh hour bill that I think, quite frankly, stinks.

MR. KENT:

The reason we have the Parks Commissioner involved is because we believe that some of the projects that come in will be parks type projects. We think local --

LEG. MONTANO:

You also control -- you also control --

MR. KENT:

Excuse me, I didn't interrupt you, Legislator. Please let me --

LEG. MONTANO:

That's all right, it's my house. You also control the four appointments and that's really the issue.

MR. KENT:

The reason -- you asked me why we included the Parks Department.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, I said I wasn't sure why it was there. I didn't ask you to answer that. I think I know the answer. Chris, not to be rude, if you want to answer it, go right ahead.

MR. KENT:

That's okay. It's too late.

LEG. MONTANO:

I'm not going to vote for it no matter what.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I we got the point. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Chairman. Chris, can you discuss with us the -- if there are any criteria in terms of the types of projects? You said these are for -- this money is for larger infrastructure type projects. Are there any criteria that limit the types of projects that might be available to us here?

MR. KENT:

Well, if you look at the first two projects -- first two criteria in the fifth Resolved clause. We're looking for projects that are going to be sponsored by a town or a village, and we're looking for them to request the funding through a resolution from the town or the village. The reason why I say larger scale projects, the downtown money is more for like planters, aesthetically -- beautification projects that improve a downtown area aesthetically. This is more for infrastructure type of support for a larger scale project. So if a town or village comes forward, they have a million dollar project and they're willing to put up, you know, 700,000, they can make an application to us and we the County could match it with \$300,000.

LEG. CILMI:

Infrastructure projects such as sidewalks, roads.

MR. KENT:

It could be a sewer line, it could be a water line, it could be brick along a roadway. It could be -- it could be something to that nature. Something of infrastructure that would be bondable for the useful life of the project.

LEG. CILMI:

With regard to the scoring of these projects, how will they be scored in terms of their propensity to drive economic development in the communities that they're in?

MR. KENT:

As I was going to answer before, it could be economic development or it could be recreation and that's why -- or something to do with promoting community pride, that's why we call it community pride. Towns and villages are finding a hard time coming up with sufficient capital to do their

projects. We thought this would be seed money. A lot of the towns are running really tight budgets, too. A lot of them are laying off people and we felt this was a way to help those towns by providing some seed money that will help them leverage their own money to complete a project. So we thought it could be a parks or recreation project, something for children, something that could drive economic development, but not necessarily economic development. And projects would be scored one against the other. They'll be competitively -- they'll be seeking this grant money competitively.

LEG. CILMI:

So all the applications will come in, theoretically, at once generally speaking and be scored at once with one another?

MR. KENT:

Yes. We would anticipate that we would put out some type of an advertisement, give them a date certain to file an application. We would provide an amount of time. It might also be in phases. You know, we might do a first round of funding of projects, find perhaps they're not quite -- not all the projects are deemed eligible. We might limit the amount of money that could be available. We could go for a second phase where more projects could come in. But we'd hope to do it all at one time. Either group them or do them all at one time.

LEG. CILMI:

Last question. Is there a minimum level of local support that would have to be achieved in order to be eligible?

MR. KENT:

We don't identify a minimum level, but we will score higher based upon a greater level of local support or local financial commitment. We're looking for 50% if possible or higher.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Or possible?

MR. KENT:

Fifty percent or higher.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Fifty percent or higher, right. Okay. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And Montano.

LEG. STERN:

You know, I think I would certainly feel more comfortable if these were monies that we had that we were going to make available to assist towns and other municipalities in economic development projects. But we don't have this money. It's bonded money. So the question is do we go out and continue to bond, which I'm sure all of us share that ongoing concern, to lend that type of assistance? It's something that we do when we're called upon with particular projects, but here we're not talking about particular projects, we're talking about a pool. And we haven't been

presented with some of these particulars, and for me that's a concern.

The other concern that I have here is when we were here last time around we were talking about an amount of \$100,000 that was a maximum, really, that would be our assistance. Now we're talking about a \$100,000 minimum that would be the type of assistance that we provide. I just think that it's nebulous. We don't really have a clear picture of what type of projects we'd be assisting and certainly I would feel more comfortable if the municipalities that we would ultimately work with had greater flexibility in picking and choosing smaller projects, larger projects or somewhere in between. We went from one threshold on the extreme to the another. I just don't know if it allows for the kind of flexibility we would need going forward.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah. Thank you. And I was -- essentially agree with Legislator Stern. And that's the point I was going to make. I would much rather see you come in because what you're asking us to do is just go out and bond two million dollars and turn it over to this committee and it will never be seen again by people like myself who's not on the committee, as opposed to coming in, and the way you describe it, you're not even clear how you're going to work this out. So this is just taking the money and putting it there and bonding it when you should, in my opinion, come up with your program, your initiative, and then come up with those programs that you think are deemed worthy to fund and then come back to the Legislature and say we want to fund these particular programs. That to me is the more reasonable way of handling this situation as opposed to writing a blank check.

The other thing is I think Legislator Stern makes an excellent point here is that the last time we were talking about a maximum of \$100,000 per Legislative District. We had two million dollars, but we only have 18 districts, so we weren't even sure where the \$200,000 is going to go. The way I read this one is there's a minimum of 100,000 and each town is going to get 100,000, or can this money go to one town? How are you going to address that issue? Does each town get a part of this?

MR. KENT:

Is at that a question you want an answer --

LEG. MONTANO:

That's a question.

MR. KENT:

That's a question you want an answer to this time?

LEG. MONTANO:

That's a question I want an answer to.

MR. KENT:

Okay. No town is guaranteed any money. It would be based on program eligibility. The goal is to fund a project in each of the ten towns and to give them a minimum of 100,000. Are we cutting them a check? No, they're going to be putting in requests based on proposed projects in their town or community.

LEG. MONTANO:

I got you.

MR. KENT:

And we will be determining the eligible projects based on a review of their applications.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay?

LEG. MONTANO:

Again, I think it would be more prudent, especially in these times, when we're talking about the level of bonding, to have these projects come before us when they're deemed worthy, not in this fashion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Question, Chris. With respect to what Legislator Montano just eluded to, or asked, is there a way that we can amend this bill to have the committee that's described in the bill be sort of the recommending committee, but have each of the projects associated with this funding come before the full Legislature? You know, maybe this committee first and then the full Legislature afterwards for approval?

MR. KENT:

If you're telling me with that amendment or we will put in -- you know, we'd have to put in a CN at this point for the next meeting. If that's something that you want us to do and you would support it at the next meeting I could see if we could do that amendment, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Just to reiterate for Legislator Montano is that, through the Chair, my suggestion to Chris was that or my question to Chris was that could we amend this to have the committee that's presently described in this bill be a recommending committee rather than an approving committee, and have each of the projects that's associated or applied for that win their recommendation come first before this committee and then before the full Legislature for approval. It's sort of what you were suggesting in your last statement. And I think Chris is saying that if we can -- if they can come forward with a CN at the meeting on Tuesday for approval -- I mean, I would support that if the Legislature is going to have some oversight as to each project that's presented by this committee.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, let me just say I can't speak for my colleagues, but as far as I'm concerned, this bill should be DOA, and if you want to introduce a C of N that's your privilege. I have some real concerns about issues here. I mean, you know, we can go on and on. We're talking about closing the nursing home because we're losing "X" amount of millions of dollars, but yet we're taking two million dollars to bond it for a speculative idea that's not even -- not even before us, not even fully thought out, so that's something that we can take up at the next meeting. That would not satisfy the concerns that I have. It still doesn't change the composition of the committee and it doesn't change -- so once we get a project before us we're simply voting up or down. We're not having an opportunity to have input and we may not even be able to look at the other projects that came before the committee to see if we thought those would be more worthy than what's before us. I think you need to go back to the drawing board on this. That's my personal opinion and that's the way I'm going to vote.

MR. KENT:

Mr. Chairman, if I could be heard on just that point.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Surely.

MR. KENT:

You would have representation because the Chairman of this committee would be a member of the review committee that would be presenting to this committee, so there would be an opportunity to be heard at the vetting level, which would be the committee that's reviewing the projects before they came over to this committee for recommendation to the full Legislature.

LEG. CILMI:

If I could just add to that.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. CILMI:

If the projects that come before us individually or if the recommendations that come before us individually don't meet with this committee's approval and then, again, with the full Legislature's approval, the money would remain and if I'm correct, it doesn't get bonded until it's used. Is that correct?

MR. KENT:

That would be correct in this case.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. With that being the case, do I have any motions? Oh, we have a table motion. Is there any further motions? Okay. We have a motion to table on the floor. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It's been tabled. *(Vote: 5-0-0-0)*

Introductory Resolutions

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right. The next motion, *2146, To extend the deadline for the Task Force to Study the Feasibility of Suffolk County Community College assuming the operation of the Vanderbilt Museum.* *(Horsley)*

Now again this is -- I'll make a motion to approve. What this is is to just extend the look see that we're already in the process of working with.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Stern.

LEG. CILMI:

Just on the motion, if you could.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. CILMI:

Chairman, could you describe to us what's, you know, where we have gotten so far, to some extent, however cursory, and, you know, another year.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

What would make the difference?

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Well, I think just basically there have been an input by members of the College to the point of is there a -- is it feasible that we could have classes on the North Shore, is it something that might make sense. Lori, are you prepared to speak to this or?

MS. TAGGART:

I don't know --

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

This is Lori Taggart, by the way, from the College.

MS. TAGGART:

Lori Taggart, Suffolk County Community College. I'm not privy to the meetings themselves. I do know that several meetings have occurred. There have been ongoing discussions about opportunities that might be explored in terms of classes, in terms of the assets that are currently available at the museum being an opportunity for students to undertake unique and, you know, and varied educational opportunities. I don't know any of the specifics, but I do know that they have been ongoing.

LEG. CILMI:

As long as the College has been engaged in the conversation.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, they have been engaged and President McKay has advised me that they're interested, but beyond that, I'm not sure.

MS. TAGGART:

It's all the logistics.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

It's not a commitment.

MS. TAGGART:

Right. There's a lot of logistics, obviously, that would have to be discussed.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Right. And Kevin Peterman has also been heavily involved with this and he has asked to have this extended as well, so that's the reason. Okay? I have a motion on the floor to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. *(Vote: 5-0-0-0)*.

The next one is 2201, which we have already done. *2226, Accepting and appropriating an amendment to the College Budget for a grant award from the State University of New York, for a Community College Workforce Development Training Grant Program for People's Alliance Federal Credit Union 90% reimbursed by State funds at Suffolk County Community College. (Co. Exec.)*

I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. *(Vote: 5-0-0-0)*.

2227, Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the State University of New York for a Community College Workforce Development Training Grant Program for Bridgehampton National Bank 90% reimbursed by State funds at Suffolk County Community College. (Co. Exec.)

LEG. MONTANO:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. *(Vote: 5-0-0-0)*.

And that ends our business for today.

LEG. NOWICK:

This is the last meeting of the year.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And I know that everyone appreciates my meetings because they are short and concise. Have a great holiday everybody.

(The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.)