

**FINANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES
of the
Suffolk County Legislature**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Finance and Financial Services Committee was held at the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium on Thursday, **September 6, 2001** at 9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Chairman
Legislator Maxine Postal, Vice-Chair
Legislator Martin Haley
Legislator Cameron Alden
Legislator William Lindsay

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Sabatino II, Counsel to the Legislature
Fred Pollert, Director, Budget Review Office
Victoria Siracusa, Budget Review Office
Linda Burkhardt, Legislative Aide to Presiding Officer Tonna
Nancy Manteiga, AME
Fred Richman, AME
Todd Johnson, IR/County Executive's Office
Bob Maimoni, Suffolk County Department of Health
Bill Faulk, County Executive Budget Office
Ken Knapp, County Executive Budget Office

Minutes Take By:

Kimberly Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

We will convene the Finance and Financial Services Committee meeting. All members are present. I understand Legislator Haley is late but he will be arriving shortly. Will everyone please stand for a Pledge of Allegiance to be led by Legislator Lindsay.

(Salutation)

Thank you. Please be seated. We have one card filled in, Nancy Manteiga. Good morning.

MS. MANTEIGA:

For the record, my name is Nancy Manteiga. I am Second Vice President of the Association of Municipal Employees. With me today is legal counsel Fred Richman. I would like to apologize for Phyllis Garbarino's absence, but she is chairing the meeting of our Board of Directors today so she apologizes for not being here. We are here on her behalf to speak

about Introductory Resolution 1812.

I would like to thank Legislator Caracciolo for sponsoring this legislation, but we do have some major concerns regarding a resolved clause – a whereas clause. I think it would be best that legal counsel, Mr. Richman, go into details on that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Please do.

MR. RICHMAN:

Good morning. It is a pleasure to be back before you once again on this matter. I have had the opportunity to review the resolution and two things, two issues came to our attention. One was the elimination of retroactivity. We understand in this financial climate fiscal responsibility, and although we wouldn't have proposed such an elimination we understand and we can live with the elimination of retroactivity to these people.

However, we do have a problem with what I will refer to the fifth whereas clause. We feel that this paragraph is inappropriate, unnecessary, and can very well result in an objection by the County Executive if we are successful at passing this resolution through the Legislature. We feel that it is inappropriate in that this body does not and should not defer to AME in the passage of any legislation. I am not aware of any other legislation that defers to AME when it passes – when this body passes it.

Nevertheless, I think it is safe to assume, and we have been here numerous times, we have had conversations with you, that we are proponents of adjusting what we believe to be this inequity and taking care of it. We have been proponents, have been in support of this, and worked tirelessly over the last year and a half. To suggest that we might challenge this piece of legislation to me seems incongruous.

(Legislator Haley entered the meeting at 10:03 a.m.)

And finally, we believe that to suggest or to put into the legislation a paragraph referring to the unilateral authority of the Legislature could very well result in an objection by the County Executive and it is our goal to see this problem adjusted as quickly as possible. It is not our goal to pass a piece of legislation which isn't going to be successful in the long run. I don't think that this fifth whereas clause adds anything or takes anything away from this piece of legislation, which to refresh your recollection is just simply to continue the policy of this body going back to 1980. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee members? Legislator Lindsay.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Mr. Richman, I think – I mean, this is the first time that I have read the proposed legislation. But I think what the concern there, and maybe Legislator Caracciolo could expand on it, is that we are treading on kind of shaky ground here and we wanted to make it crystal clear that we are not interfering with the collective bargaining process by this resolution. What is your suggestion, just to strike that resolve all together or whereas all together or to have it modified?

MR. RICHMAN:

My suggestion would be to leave it out. However, if that was a concern of yours, I think simply language to the effect that you stated that the Legislature does not intend and does not believe this action violates the collective bargaining agreement would be sufficient. But it is my belief that the absence of this paragraph does not change the intent and certainly there wouldn't be any actions brought by AME to suggest in any way that this violates the collective bargaining agreement, the same policy that has existed.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. With respect to that whereas clause that contains the language unilateral authority.

Specifically what is the objection?

MR. RICHMAN:

The concern from AME is that – and obviously I don't speak for the County Executive, but it is likely that seeing language of unilateral authority to enact such a resolution, and it may be the case that it is within the purview, and I believe it is within the purview of the Legislature to pass this action, I believe it could very well – the buzz words could result in some objection. And if the paragraph doesn't add anything to the resolution, I don't think it is necessary to possibly create a problem.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

In the event that the scenario that you have outlined were to play out, it ultimately would come back to the Legislature and with a vote of 12 or more affirmative votes, that veto could be overridden. If he struck down this resolution based on that language in that whereas clause that you have concern about, it still comes back to the Legislature.

MR. RICHMAN:

That's true and I understand that process. However, and I get back to my original point, if that paragraph doesn't add anything to the resolution, then the fact that it is not in the resolution doesn't take anything away from the resolution, doesn't change anyone's position, and I might add that the 1980 resolution doesn't have any whereas paragraphs with respect to this aspect.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Is there anyone here from the Department of Law? I know Bob Maimoni is here from the Department of Health. Did you want to speak on this resolution, Bob?

MR. MAIMONI:

No.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All right. I just wanted to give you the opportunity. Is there anyone from the County Executive's Office that wanted to speak on the resolution specifically as it relates to this whereas clause language?

MR. JOHNSON:

Todd Johnson, County Executive's Office. I am prepared to talk on this specific issue but I know Bob Maimoni has some brief comments.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay, fine. That would be welcomed. But before Bob comes us, perhaps Legislator Alden could ask his question.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Actually, I have a couple. Nancy, you are still in the process of – correct me if I am wrong, but at one of the last meetings you said while you have reached an agreement there are still some ongoing type of negotiations, I guess, between you and the County Executive's Office on this last contract. Is that true?

MS. MANTEIGA:

Legislator Alden, I don't believe at that last meeting I was present. I don't know if that conversation took place with Phyllis –

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I am trying to recollect. I think that she had said that there were some points that while the agreement was in place -- then there were some points that would be negotiated out at future times. My question is are we still – are you guys still in negotiation type of talks with the County Executive's Office?

MS. MANTEIGA:

We already have the collective bargaining agreement that has been signed and passed. I think what you might be referring to, and Fred, I think there was conversations with Labor Relations concerning this?

MR. RICHMAN:

No, there hasn't been any ongoing negotiations with respect to this individual group. Subsequent going back in time if you remember through the process there were discussions, there was an arbitration. The arbitrator felt that it was in your purview, not her purview, to continue this policy if you so chose, so there hasn't been negotiations.

The process that takes place with respect to the contract is we will be meeting and preparing a new collective bargaining agreement implementing our stipulation of agreement that you ratify, but we can't change that. It is just actually putting it in place.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

That answers my question. You are not really in negotiation over these issues. I believe it was Mr. Greene that brought up at one of the last meetings when this was not fully debated but there was a partial debate on it, there was a ruling where AME went in and basically had declared that we did not possess the ability to interfere with the collective bargaining agreement. I think he pointed – and I am not trying to be an advocate one way or the other, but just so that is – we have to look at that.

You had asked for a ruling – I am trying to remember the exact time it was. Maybe Legislative Counsel could elaborate a little bit more. I am trying to recollect the argument that was made against us doing something like this resolution right now.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Paul?

MR. SABATINO:

Maybe I can answer all of the questions just to go back in history. When the request was initially presented to the Presiding Officer at the end of last year, he had turned it over to me. Despite the fact that there is a lot of legislative sympathy to attempt to effectuate the objection, the problem is that there is – and I indicated I think two meetings ago there is a 1982 PERB ruling that was the result of an action that was brought by the predecessor union to AME which challenged a legislation action which unilaterally by virtue of resolution upgraded and upstepped positions of employment.

Even though I disagree with that PERB ruling, I think it is not meritorious, that is the law of the land. In fact, that very decision was cited in a recent challenge to legislation that Legislator Guldi and Haley had adopted a couple of years ago with regard to another employment situation. So the very same decision was cited as recently as last year.

So, what I had indicated to first Presiding Officer Tonna and to this committee is that if you try to unilaterally accomplish this goal through legislation to upstep or upgrade, you are going to bump up against that PERB ruling and be in violation of it. However, because there is a legislative desire to try to get past that hurdle, I tried to come up with something that would protect Legislators and also get around that ruling, and the only thing that I could come up with was the whereas clause that you currently see in front of you. I think Legislator Lindsay correctly stated that if it is purely a defensive protective measure.

With regard to the other issues, this can't be retroactive as a matter of law because this is not the executive of the collection bargaining agreement that goes back. Whether there was a desire to go retroactive or not, you could not do that.

The last point is that I think you just touched upon it, Legislator Alden, is that two meetings

ago I believe the Executive's representatives indicated on the record that they were opposed to the legislation in whatever form it took. So, this is not the clause that is going to trigger Executive disapproval. If those statements were on the record, you know, continue to be the position of the Executive.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Paul, in whereas clauses, they are more like dicta than actually binding. So a resolved clause would have been binding whereas when you put in a whereas clause –

MR. SABATINO:

Absolutely correct. The problem – you can't do a resolved clause here because the resolved clause is exactly what bumps up against PERB. So the best that I could come up with was I thought at least something in there which makes a representation that this is being done not to violate the PERB ruling.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Mr. Richman.

MR. RICHMAN:

I respectfully disagree with certain of Counsel's conclusions with respect to whether or not this piece of legislation would violate the PERB ruling of 1982. However, Counsel also referred to a pending case before PERB, and that case – and I think we all agree we have the right to disagree with each other on a variety of issues. And there is a case pending currently where AME objected to certain actions taken by the Legislature several years ago. However, that's whatever it is and wherever it is it stands by itself on its own feet. This is on its own feet as well. This is about getting back to the medical examiners and I think it is well taken that the whereas clauses are dicta and they do not – does not go to the merits of the resolution or the heart of the resolution and it is simply our opinion that it creates less more likelihood of a problem with the legislation than less of a likelihood.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Mr. Lindsay.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

I think the bottom line, and maybe Nancy could answer this, would AME support the legislation the way it stands now?

MR. RICHMAN:

We can't speak for Phyllis and AME in that sense. It is my – speaking from my gut without the authority of the Executive Board that we would still attempt to pass this piece of legislation through this body as well as the County Executive's Office. I think it is correct – Counsel correctly pointed out that there was some objection voiced by the County Executive's Office. I don't know if you can measure degrees of rejection, but they certainly weren't a proponent of this piece of legislation. It is our belief that it will make it more difficult with this whereas clause but certainly our intent is to enact the legislative policy from 1980. So my reaction is that we would be supportive of this piece of legislation in either event.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Are there other matters pending with the Executive Branch wherein the passage of this legislation could interfere with the successful conclusion of those matters between the union and the Executive Branch?

MR. RICHMAN:

Not that I am aware of. Just as I mentioned to you, we may have various matters pending where we disagree with the Legislature or that we disagree with the County Executive, but to succeed and to go forward in our activities we think it is responsible to take each issue as it stands. So no one – we don't tie this in with anything else, with this body or with the County Executive's body.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. Are there any other questions? Then we will bring up Mr. Maimoni. Thank you very

much. And Todd, could you have someone from the Department of Law and Labor Relations at our next committee meeting to discuss this so we can complete the record on where the Executive stands on this piece of legislation in its current form.

MR. JOHNSON:

I will bring back that request.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Bob.

MR. MAIMONI:

Good morning. This piece of legislation affects approximately 40 employees of the Health Department, and they are very valuable employees to us and they do a fine job. Our difficulty as a department, and the reason why we are not supporting this legislation, is because over the years the Legislature and the County Executive in their wisdom have taken other departments or segments of departments and added them to the Health Department. This is how this particular unit came to the Health Department along with part of Environmental Control for Environmental Quality, Handicapped Children's Program out of Social Services, the Office of Mental Health, the Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, all became part of the Health Department over the last 25 years.

As that has happened, many of these departments and offices came with vestiges, and that is what this was. This was a set of tonsils. These folks got this raise. They went from top pay to top pay when they got promoted. We are interested in equity and we have 1,600 employees. This legislation takes these 40 away from the other 1,560 and puts them in a separate class. We don't think that is fair. They are very valuable to us but so are the rest of our employees.

The way our collective bargaining agreement works right now, when somebody gets promoted they get like about a five percent raise and then they get their steps and increments going forward from there. This would make these 40 people different than the other 1,560 and that is why we take the position.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I can appreciate your comments. However, let me ask you who has legal standing in terms of representing all the employees within the Department of Health, the department or the Association for Municipal Employees?

MR. MAIMONI:

AME.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you. Mr. Haley.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

My question is – I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. Am I recognized?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Go right ahead, Bill.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Okay. This was a practice for some time, though, within the department and suddenly it changed. Am I incorrect about that?

MR. MAIMONI:

If I understand correctly, this was a practice that began when the Medical Examiner's Office was a separate entity and it was carried over after it became part of the Health Department.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

So it was in practice when the Medical Examiner's was under the Health Department.

MR. MAIMONI:

That is correct.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

And it wasn't arbitrary, it was instituted in order to attract these very highly qualified personnel, right?

MR. MAIMONI:

I would like to say yes because I believe that is what it was, but I can't say that from fact because I wasn't there when it was instituted.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Legislator Haley.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

So do you think that this is necessary now to attract people to these positions?

MR. MAIMONI:

No, I don't. A review of our staffing in this area shows that we don't have an excessive amount of turnover in this area. If we were talking about entry level people coming in off the street to the County we would probably support some kind of an in-step hiring plan to make a higher level salary to attract them in the door. But once they are in the door and they are in the system, the idea of them getting promoted and getting a 20 or 25% raise versus a five percent raise that everybody else gets we think is unfair.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

So you don't think that you have a problem filling these positions based on the existing system.

MR. MAIMONI:

No, we don't.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Legislator Lindsay.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Is there any vacancies in this department now?

MR. MAIMONI:

If you will just allow me a second.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I think you are getting an assist here from Todd.

MR. MAIMONI:

We currently have two vacancies.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I believe, Mr. Maimoni, and I don't recall you being present and that is understandable, when the Association of Municipal Employees first brought this issue to the Legislature or this committee several months ago. They did so with the justification being that there has been a significant amount of turnover and there have been retention issues in the department in this division and is that something that you are prepared to refute or?

MR. MAIMONI:

Allow me to read this excerpt that we send over in our comments. I think it addresses a lot of the issues you raise. "The attached referenced resolution proposed to move all the individuals of Forensic Science series to the top step of the salary plan. I have many concerns about this resolution. The department has not experienced any undue turnover in this title over the past four years. Indeed, the titles have been very stable. The average tenure of employees in the FS 1 title is 7.3 years. In FS 2 it is 14.5 years, in FS 3 it is 23 years. We currently have two vacancies in the referenced titles and have had very little difficulty filling the few vacancies that have become vacant over the past four years.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

That completely countermands what we have heard previously. So that is obviously something that we'll have to take note of and get back to AME to provide us with the information they did previously where they very explicitly pointed out where this has been an ongoing issue and problem and clearly in terms of comparability the people in our forensic sciences classes or titles are not being compensated equal and comparable to others in other jurisdictions. And in fact, those jurisdictions have been recruiting those individuals away from Suffolk County.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Legislator Haley.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

I think probably the best place to send this is to Budget Review to take a look at that. I think it is different to say that they need to be reclassified at a different grade as opposed to saying that they should all be at top step of existing grades. So it may be a classification situation that Civil Service could take a look at if there is in fact a concern or a problem attracting people to these positions. But I think Budget Review probably could give us an objective view of those two positions, one, whether there is in fact a lot of turnover, or the fact that there isn't any, or very little turnover. Then we could make a judgement based on that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Mr. Richman, would you like to respond to any of the discussion that has been taking place here?

MR. RICHMAN:

Thank you. The issue that was raised two or three hearings ago by AME, when you talk about retention, okay, Mr. Maimoni is correct. Most of the people have been there a long time. All of those people have been under the system that you implemented with your good judgement. Those people are at top step. They were promoted to top step and they were hired at top step, and that takes care of the comparability problem. There aren't a lot of vacancies. The problem is that if you take away the system that you had the foresight to put in place, you will be creating vacancies that won't be filled with the same degree of competence and that earlier on in the process, and I don't have it with me here today, but we have been back and forth over this. There have been, and it is not great numbers because we are only talking about a small group of individuals, there have been people hired at top step. So that over time you are going to create a situation where the employee who is here will be making less than the employee who is hired subsequent thereto. And there are one or two examples of that that have taken place already that we mentioned in previous hearings.

With respect to the suggestion that the matter might be better off going back to Budget Review, I would suggest that the policy that was implemented and that we are discussing has been appropriate over the last 20 years and has successfully dealt with the issues of pay and retention and that is why it is a good policy and that is why we urge you to consider it thoroughly, but sooner rather than later because we have been dealing with this issue for an extensive period of time already.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. And we will attempt to do that. Thank you all very much. Is there anyone else who would like to address the committee? Hearing none, we will go to today's agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS – PRIME

*** 1261 Adopting Local Law No. – 2001, A Charter Law to stabilize real property taxes by optimizing use of the tax stabilization reserve fund. Assigned to Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)**

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Motion to table by Legislator Postal, second by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. **(Vote: 5/0/0/0)**

*** 1262 Adopting Local Law No. – 2001, A Charter Law to streamline Suffolk County 5-25-5 debt policy. Assigned to Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)**

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Same motion. Is there a second?

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Second by Legislator Haley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. **(Vote: 5/0/0/0)**

*** 1264 Amending Section 719-6 of the Suffolk County Code. Assigned to Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)**

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Same – well, let's get an explanation from Counsel just to refresh everyone's memory.

MR. SABATINO:

This is a companion to 1261. This would simply do an amendment to part of the County Code if you were to amend 1261, which is the shorter.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Counsel, just with respect to 1261, 2 and 4. You and Legislator Postal and myself have been part of an executive legislative task force where these resolutions proposed -- proposed resolutions have been discussed. Could you just summarize the legislative perspective as to the import or benefit or lack of benefit that that – the legislative representatives see with respect to these resolutions.

MR. SABATINO:

1261 would change the dynamic in terms of how much money goes into the tax stabilization reserve fund at a minimum, but the key element that came out of those discussions is that it doesn't create new money. I think there is a perception out there that – the comment was made if this would have been in place the last ten years there would be \$100 million sitting in a tax stabilization reserve fund.

The problem is that if there was \$100 million sitting in the tax stabilization reserve fund, all the things you did over the last ten years wouldn't have been done. You can't spend the money twice. The money was used for a whole variety of initiatives which everybody, I think, knows and understands, and those were the collective judgement of the County. So passing this law doesn't create new money.

With regard to the second bill, which is 1262, that is the pay-as-you-go program and that's simply something that has been enshrined by the Legislature as a matter of policy. It is a judgement call, but pay-as-you-go since 1994 – actually it took effect in January of 1996, it was adopted in '94, has been one of the prime things that the County Legislature has asserted. My understanding from Budget Review is that it has been a central point at the rating agency meetings.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you very much. We will go to introductory resolutions. Prime 1812. That is the resolution we just discussed.

INTRODUCTORY PRIME

*** 1812 Amending the Classification and Salary Plan for Forensic Scientists. Assigned to Finance & Financial Services and Legislative & Personnel. (Caracciolo)**

I will make a motion to table until the next meeting. Second by Legislator Postal.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

We didn't vote on 1264.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I apologize. I'm sorry. I thought there was a motion and a second. So we will go back. There is a motion by Legislator Postal, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. Thank you. **(Vote on 1264 5/0/0/0)**

1812, motion to table until our next meeting. Counsel, what is the date of our next meeting?

MR. SABATINO:

It is the week of October 15th, so whatever that Thursday is. I believe it would be like the 18th.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Would the committee members note that meeting will start at 10:00 a.m.?

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

We meet on Wednesday, don't we?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

That is correct.

MR. SABATINO:

You're right. So it would be the 17th.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

The meeting notice will reflect the correct date and time. I would just like to let the members know in advance.

(Vote: 5/0/0/0)

*** 1838 To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and charge-backs on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature Control #677-2001. Assigned**

to Finance & Financial Services. (Co Exec.)

Explanation.

MR. SABATINO:

1838 would grant a refund for two parcels in the Town of Brookhaven based on a clerical error under State law. The error was there was a mistake in transcription. Numbers were transposed improperly.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Legislator Postal?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

Motion to approve and place on the consent calendar.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Second by Legislator Haley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved and placed on the consent calendar. **(Vote: 5/0/0/0)**

*** 1878 A Resolution amending Resolution No. 1187 of 2000, Bond Resolution dated December 5, 2000, with respect to the maximum estimate cost plan for the financing and the period of probable usefulness of the project authorized thereby. Assigned to Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)**

Explanation.

MR. SABATINO:

This has come from bond counsel. Apparently when a bond resolution was adopted at the very end of last year with regard to campground improvements there were three mistakes in the actual bond resolution. One was the dollar amount. It should have been \$865,000 instead of the 1.1 million. Secondly, a resolution that was cited in that resolution should have been 335 of 2000 instead of 820 of 1999. The third mistake that was made was that the period of probable usefulness should have been 15 years. Those three mistakes, which apparently bond counsel just picked up now, would be corrected by this resolution.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Motion by the Chair, seconded by Legislator Postal. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

And place on the consent calendar.

MR. SABATINO:

It takes a two-thirds vote because it is a bond resolution so you are going to have to –

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Approved. **(Vote: 5/0/0/0).**

We will go to introductory non-prime. The Chair is going to make a motion to approve and defer to prime committee 1797, 1846, 1869, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1879, 1890, 1891 and 1892. Is there any objection?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

You said to approve and defer to prime. Did you mean to defer to prime?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Defer to prime.

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Hearing no objection, we have a motion to defer to prime all of the preceding resolutions. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Deferred to prime.

INTRODUCTORY NON-PRIME

1797 Striking appropriations for the salary for the position of Executive Director Suffolk County Campaign Finance Board. Assigned to Ways & Means and Finance & Financial Services. (Pres. Off.)

1846 Allocating funding for pay-as-you-go financing for the painting of bridges at various locations (CP 5815.413). Assigned to Public Works & Transportation and Finance & Financial Services. (Foley)

1869 Amending the Department of Health Services, Division of Patient Care Services 2001 Adopted Budget to reallocate funds for a Contract Agency. Assigned to Health and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1871 Appropriating funds in the Capital Budget in connection with the Forensic Sciences Medical and Legal Investigative Consolidated Laboratory (CP 1109). Assigned to Health and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1872 Appropriating funds in connection with the addition to Tri-Community Health Center, Amityville (CP 4022). Assigned to Health and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1873 Appropriating funds in connection with improvements at the New Skilled Nursing Facility (CO 4057). Assigned to Health and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1874 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to campgrounds (CP 7009). Assigned to Parks, Sports & Cultural Affairs and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1875 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for improvements to historic sites and buildings – Chandler Estate (CP 7510). Assigned to Parks, Sports & Cultural Affairs and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1876 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for improvements to historic sites and buildings – Timber Point (CP 7510). Assigned to Parks, Sports & Cultural Affairs and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1879 A resolution authorizing the issuance of \$50,000,000 Serial Bonds of the County of Suffolk, New York, to pay the cost of the acquisition of certain environmentally sensitive parcels of land and the acquisition of development rights for the Farmland Preservation Program, each for and in accordance with the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection of and for said County. Assigned to Environment, Land Acquisition & Planning and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1890 Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Service Services to the Department of Health Services Division of Community Mental Hygiene Services for cost of living Alcohol and Substance Abuse Contract Agencies. Assigned to Health and Finance &

Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1891 Accepting and appropriating 100% state funds from the New York State Department of Health to the Department of Health Services, Division of Emergency Medical Services for the Regional EMS Program. Assigned to Health and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

1892 Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the New York State Office of Mental Health Services to fund Mental Health Projects in Suffolk County. Assigned to Health and Finance & Financial Services. (Co. Exec.)

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Deferred to prime. **(Vote: 5/0/0/0).**

Is there any other business before the committee? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.
Thank you.

(The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.)