

**GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING
& CONSUMER PROTECTION COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE
MINUTES**

A meeting of the Government Operations, Personnel, Housing & Consumer Protection 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 November 14, 2013.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Robert Calarco, Chairman
Leg. William Spencer, Vice Chair
Leg. Kate M. Browning
Leg. Thomas Cilmi
Leg. John M. Kennedy, Jr.
Leg. Ricardo Montano

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Leg. Sarah Anker, 6th Legislative District
Presiding Officer Wayne R. Horsley, 14th Legislative District
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Robert Lipp, Director/Budget Review Office
Benny Pernice, Budget Review Office
Samuel Chu, Commissioner/Department of Labor and Consumer Affairs
Robert Meguin, Commissioner/Consumer Affairs
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office
Marie Berkoski, Aide to County Executive
Charles Gardiner
Paul Perillie, Aide to Leg. Gregory
Amy Keyes, Aide to Leg. Calarco
Ali Nazir, Aide to Leg. Kennedy
Michael Pitcher, Aide to Presiding Officer
David Medina, NY State Department of Health
Mitch Pally
Eric Russo, Esq., attorney for Al Lofaso
Al Lofaso, President of ALR Residential & Commercial Development
Dennis M. Cohen, Chief Deputy County Executive
Jill Rosen Nikoloff, Director/Affordable Housing
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:34 PM

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Will all Legislators come to the horseshoe for the Government Ops Committee? Okay, we're going to get started with the Government Operations, Personnel, Housing and Consumer Protection Committee. I would like to thank everyone for coming today.

If we can all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Kennedy.

SALUTATION

PUBLIC PORTION

Okay, good afternoon everyone. We have no correspondence. We'll go right into the Public Portion. I don't have any cards. Is there any speakers out there who'd like to address this Committee? I see two. Come on up, gentlemen, and just please state your name for the record; and then the Clerk will give you a yellow card to fill out afterwards.

MR. MEDINA:

My name is David Medina and I'm here representing the New York State Department of our training facilities for a cross connection control.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Please go right ahead.

MR. MEDINA:

Sometime ago there was a change in backflow testing for Suffolk County. The change was made that Suffolk County plumbers needed to do the testing for backflow devices. Upon receiving State certification from the State Department of Health, they then go to Suffolk County Consumer Affairs and they receive a backflow test of certification from Consumer Affairs. The only exemption made was any water supply company can test within the scope of their work. All well and done.

The issue that we have is that somehow the issuing agency, the New York State Department of Health and its training facilities, were excluded from testing. So we're the agency that issues the backflow certification. Without it, no one could do backflow testing.

So to make this kind of simple without getting into a lot of detail, I'm simply here respectfully requesting that the New York State Department of Health and its training facilities be put back in its own program. Somehow we were dismissed from it. And we're not quite sure why.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Cilmi has a question.

LEG. CILMI:

I just want to make sure I heard you right. So you represent the organization that actually certifies those who do the backflow testing. And because of the law that we passed, you've been prevented from backflow testing.

MR. MEDINA:

That is correct. I'm not quite sure why.

LEG. CILMI:

So you've come here in support of Legislator Schneiderman's legislation.

MR. MEDINA:

That is correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. MEDINA:

You're welcome. Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Yeah, the law has to -- it actually has to go through a Public Hearing process, which would be on Tuesday at -- 2:30?

MR. NOLAN:

(Nodding in the affirmative)

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

So if you would like to come back next Tuesday at 2:30 to address the full Legislature about the matter, feel free to do so. It would be probably a good idea. I think there was -- the law, I think -- if I recall, the change made locally here is that we required only licensed plumbers or people working under a licensed plumber, master plumber, to do backflow testing. And I wasn't on the body at the time that they passed that law, but I think that's what the change that was put in place. So it might be useful for you to come in and testify before the full Legislature next week.

MR. MEDINA:

That would be fine. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Great. Thank you.

My next speaker is Mitch Pally.

MR. PALLY:

We're on? Thank you.

I thank you very much for giving us the opportunity. We're here on three issues, one of which we worked very closely with County Legislator Anker on, which is Resolution 1533, which requires a study of the ability of our higher education institutions working with the County and the State to build affordable housing for our young professionals.

As you are aware, this issue continues to be a major focus of the organizations on Long Island. We continue to lose young people at a rate far higher than any other regional area in the country, especially Westchester and Northern New Jersey, which are our competitors in this regard. And we're looking for any opportunity possible to build this type of housing for our young professionals. But getting the opportunity to do so with our institutions of higher education, may be an appropriate solution in some cases; obviously we've come up with other places, whether it's downtown Patchogue, whether it's Port Jefferson, whether it's the new project in Wyandanch, which is under construction, the project in Ronkonkoma, which will be the subject of a public hearing at the town on Monday night at the Planning Board, all of these opportunities exist but we need more.

You know, our population, if you've read Kevin Law's report in Newsday this week, continues to get older and older and older; and while those of us who continue to get older and older and older in our years enjoy that, the ability of Long Island to provide those services, we have to be able to provide opportunities for housing for our young people or our companies will not be able to succeed. And

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

this is an opportunity that we would like to try and see whether it works. It's modeled after a project which was approved at SUNY Purchase in Westchester County where this type of housing and housing for its seniors was approved on campus. And so we want to see whether this is possible with our institutions of higher education on Long Island. So we would urge this Committee and the full Legislature to approve this resolution.

In addition, we're here on 1922 and 1923, which will give us more work to do, but will do so for a very important reason. As you know, our charitable arm, Long Island Home Builders Care Development Corp., is in the -- we have built two houses for returning veterans. And we're in the process of building six more. That subdivision hopefully (knocking on wood) will be finished by Christmas so that our six veterans and their families will be able to move in. It's an interesting -- since the six families were selected by the VFW and we started building, one of the families had another child; and one of the families was not a family at that time, was a young man and a young woman who got together and recently were married by Mayor Pontieri in Patchogue, because we had to find somebody to marry them for the VA mortgage. So the Mayor was grateful enough to do that for us.

We will be finished with these six houses by the end of the year. And we look forward to having the opportunity to build more and the ability to get land from the County to in this case the Village of Islandia and then to us is the way we sell it for half of the price with the mortgage. And I think when you come down -- hopefully the dedication on December 19th, to which you will all be invited, you'll see what a great job our people did on this subdivision and we look forward to continuing to provide this benefit to our returning veterans. I thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you, Mr. Pally. And we thank you for the work you do for our veterans. Legislator Browning had a question for you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, talking about the Long Island Builders Institute and your non-profit arm, because I know we have had numerous conversations --

MR. PALLY:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- with the 72-h program.

MR. PALLY:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

And how much have you -- you haven't received any properties through the 72-h?

MR. PALLY:

No, we have gotten a number of properties from 72-h --

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, you have.

MR. PALLY:

-- that go from the County -- there I go -- sorry about that -- from the County -- one went to Brookhaven, which we actually built a home on in --

LEG. BROWNING:

That's the one in Ronkonkoma, right?

MR. PALLY:

That's correct. We have two more that we got in East Patchogue that we have not started yet, but we are working our way down through.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

We would add these two to that ability to do so. Our goal over some period of time is to do as many of them, all of them as we can. And it's a great way because, you know, land cost being what they are is, as you're very well aware, our ability to get this land for less than its purchase price for free in that regard allows us -- you know, the houses that we're building now on Motor Parkway would sell for between 400 and \$450,000. We are selling them, because we are required to do so, to the veterans for 199. Now part of that is the free land; part of that is the fact that many of our members donate their services, their labor, their supplies. But it's a -- what it is, it's a great public/private partnership of government and the private sector working together for what is clearly a tremendous benefit for these veterans. Otherwise, you know -- our concern is that many of them would not be able to afford a house on Long Island. And they're here. They've served our country. They want to be very much productive citizens and work in our companies. And this is our way of making sure it happens.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Now, the resolution here -- and maybe the sponsor since she's here can respond, too, to some of it, but -- because the same construction, affordable housing for young professionals, what's the definition of a young professional? And, again, I know that in the past there's been conversations about, you know, when we were doing housing for veterans and there was like, okay, are we discriminating --

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- when we say housing for veterans? What's a young professional? Is it somebody that has to have a college background? Could it be somebody from the carpenters' Union or an electrical workers' union?

MR. PALLY:

From our perspective, it's anybody.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

We are not -- you now, we're not looking at it as a specific age group or a specific occupation group. From our perspective it's young people who want to live on Long Island, start a family on Long Island, work on Long Island, enjoy that. So from our perspective we take a much wider view of the perspective clientele. Obviously our young people, because they do not have the equity in a home already, find it difficult for this housing as opposed to someone who may be selling their home already who's lived in it and moving into, you know, downsizing in that regard. So it's much more difficult for the young people to do it in that context. And that's the -- that's the criteria we're using.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

And I think the criteria that would be used in this study is to see how that could work its way out.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, because -- I mean I look at -- a friend of mine was going through a residency at Winthrop Hospital. And they have housing for the residents.

MR. PALLY:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

And I'm wondering -- so this is not targeting employees of the college who are young -- many of them are young professionals that --

MR. PALLY:

It may be, but that's not its sole purpose.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

I don't want to give the impression its sole purpose is, you know, if you work at Stony Brook, you're going to get a parcel on Stony Brook or near it. That obviously -- that group of people find it difficult to find housing on Long Island that they can afford and so they may be eligible for this and may take advantage of whatever opportunities we do, but it is not designed just to be for them.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. And I know that there was a couple of years ago another issue that came up because -- I believe it's the Selden Campus and possibly probably Brentwood Campus, we have -- we're actually getting kids who are coming from other Counties to come out here. I know the automotive program we had a lot of -- they said students that are coming from, you know, Queens, from the City, coming out for the automotive program and we don't have campus housing.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

And I think that's something that we should be looking at is creating some kind of housing for students.

MR. PALLY:

And that is -- that may be part and parcel of this discussion point.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

Because unless you look at the entire -- what land is available at the institutions of higher education either directly or in the surrounding areas for housing options that do not exist today for a wide variety of possible clientele, look at that and say, "okay, these are the opportunities we have. How can the institution and the County and the Town " -- because if it's on --

LEG. BROWNING:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

You know, if it's not on the Campus land, and the private sector work together to accomplish it? What we're trying to find out here, what are the options available? We're not going to say we're going to build it here, tomorrow, but unless we find out what the opportunities are, we'll never be able to say we're going to build it there tomorrow. And that's why I think, you know, this type of study and review is so important. Is it going to lead to more housing opportunities? I think the hopeful answer is yes; but unless you preview what's possible first, we're not going to be able to decide that.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, so it's -- while it seems a little restrictive, it's really not being restrictive.

MR. PALLY:

It's not the intent.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's a very big picture. It's a very big picture.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

And, again, we had a lot of properties on the 72-h's -- sorry, not on the -- on the auction.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- that in all honesty, there was structures, you know, improved properties that were on the auction block. This is something that we should be looking at, because I'm assuming that what you're going to build on a campus is going to be more condo-style; and reality is, is when the young people do get married and start having kids, they want the front yard and the backyard.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

So it just seems to be -- there should be more effort to do more. And I know we're doing a lot with the 72-h program, but when we're looking at an improved piece of property and it's on the auction, in my opinion, it shouldn't be the auction. It should be going for a first-time home buyer.

MR. PALLY:

And you and I have had that conversation..

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

MR. PALLY:

On many occasions.

LEG. BROWNING:

And our veterans.

MR. PALLY:

Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

And I think the end result is, you know, housing opportunities and options in Suffolk County are limited. We have to look at a wide ranging number of ways in which to accomplish it. 72-h is one way; houses on the auction is another way; this study with institutions of a higher education is another way. No one way is going to solve the problem.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

Our goal is that putting them all together will help us alleviate it. And that's why we've tried to find a variety of different ways to do so. That's why the transient-oriented development in the downtowns by the rail stations is not a solution. It is part of a solution.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right, right.

MR. PALLY:

Whether it's Ronkonkoma, as I said, or Wyandanch or Patchogue or whatever it is, it provides more housing options. The more options you provide, the more likely we will be to keep our young people here.

LEG. BROWNING:

And I assume -- I know Dowling College, there's some issues --

MR. PALLY:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- going on right now in Brookhaven that, you know, off of William Floyd Parkway, that there's possibly an opportunity there.

MR. PALLY:

That's correct.

LEG. BROWNING:

But, again, sewer capacity. Are we going to have the sewer capacity to do this?

MR. PALLY:

And if we know what's possible at different locations, then we could pinpoint the sewage treatment plant or the sewer issue directly in that area because we'll know what we'll get out of it by going in that area. And that, I think, is part and parcel of this also.

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, I would say affordable housing can't happen without sewers.

MR. PALLY:

I understand. We have said that for many years.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yep. Thank you, Mitch.

MR. PALLY:

My pleasure.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you very much, Mitch.

MR. PALLY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Do I have any other speakers in the audience? Anybody else like to address the Committee? Seeing none, we're going to move onto the agenda. I'm going to take things a little bit out of order. We have a few people who are here to speak specifically to a couple of resolutions.

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

So I'm going to start with IR 197 -- 1928, excuse me. We have Al Lofaso who is the developer and Eric Russo, his attorney, as well as Jill, if she could come up, Jill Rosen-Nikoloff. And they're just going to tell us a little bit about their proposed project here. This is **IR 1928, Authorizing the retirement and use of Workforce Housing Development Rights banked in the Suffolk County Save Open Space Bond Act Workforce Housing Transfer of Development Rights Program Registry for use in the development of affordable housing in East Patchogue. (County Executive)** Welcome, gentlemen, if you could just kind of give us a brief overview of what you're looking to do and why you need the County credits, I would appreciate it.

MR. RUSSO:

Good morning. For the record my name is Eric Russo. I'm with the law firm of Van Brunt, Juzwiak and Russo with offices at 140 Main Street in Sayville. I'm here today representing Mr. Lofaso to my left. It's Al Lofaso, who's the President of ALR Residential and Commercial Development in Patchogue.

We're speaking today on behalf of Mr. Lofaso's proposal and in support of this Resolution 1928-13. We have filed an application with the Town of Brookhaven for a land division. The land division was approved with seven lots. The seven lot condition also indicated that we would have one lot that was workforce housing pursuant to New York State law.

As a result of that, we were in need of a credit, which we sought out the assistance of Jill Rosen-Nikoloff in the County here. And the credit that we're in need of, as determined by Mr. Hilbert at the Suffolk County Department of Health Services, is point 8325. He has designated that it could come from groundwater management zone six, from Golden Properties, which is another allocated donated credit that was given to the County.

That being said, we are proposing that lot number five in the subdivision would be the affordable housing lot. We would comply with affordable housing home priced in the \$250,000 range. And we also indicated that it would be comparable with the other six homes that are being proposed in the subdivision.

If you have any further questions from there, I'd be happy to respond unless Miss Nikoloff has

something further to add.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Yeah, this is -- this is in my district. And Eric and I spoke briefly before the meeting. And I spoke with Jill yesterday. And I'm very comfortable with it. I happen to know Mr. Lofaso well and know that he does good work. And so I'm certainly comfortable and think this is a good project to move forward. Do any of my colleagues have a question for them? Seeing none, okay, great. Thank you very much for the presentation and your time.

I'm going to make a motion to take IR 1928 out of order.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Seconded by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1928 is now before us. I will make a motion to approve; second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1928 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

Gentlemen, thank you, again, for coming today. And we would not need you on Tuesday at all.

MR. RUSSO:

Thank you very much. Have a good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Thank you.

MR. RUSSO:

We appreciate your time.

MR. LOFASO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

My pleasure.

Okay, we also have with us today our Deputy County Executive Dennis Cohen, who's here, wanted to address us regarding **IR 1966, Authorizing the County Executive to execute an agreement with the Suffolk County Association of Municipal Employees Bargaining Units No. 2 and No. 6 covering the terms and conditions of employment for the period January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016. (County Executive)** I do want to make mention that we did receive correspondence from the President of AME Dan Farrell in favor of this resolution. Unfortunately the union has their annual convention this week as well so they are out at convention, but they did send a rep in case we have any questions. But, Dennis, please go ahead.

MR. COHEN:

Thank you. You know, we negotiated this agreement with AME. I want to thank, I know they're not here, but Dan Farrell and Mike Finland. We had many negotiating sessions. I think we reached a fair agreement and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you all may have.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Hello, Dennis, how are you? Longtime no see.

MR. COHEN:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Without having the writing in front of me, could you just give me generally what the language is regarding the no-layoff provision? I heard the term. It's been represented. I'm just curious as to what the writing actually reflects; and to what extent, you know, we are, we aren't bound going forward?

MR. COHEN:

Sure. Do you want me to just read it to you?

LEG. KENNEDY:

You can paraphrase, you can summarize. I mean it is -- anything that I've ever seen is always, you know, a good faith representation; but pretty much anything we ever do is subject to appropriations and receipt of revenue.

MR. COHEN:

Well, it is a very -- it's a broad no-layoff clause. I'll just read it to you. It says *the County will, not pursuant to the Civil Service Law, the Suffolk County Department of Civil Service rules or any other provision of law lay off any employee because of budgetary governmental restructuring including, for example, contracting out of work performed by any unit member, position, abolition, service elimination or any other reason.* This paragraph does not apply to positions that become vacant through attrition, for example, resignations, disciplinary terminations, retirements. And the paragraph sunsets and becomes null and void as of 11:59 PM on December 31st, 2016.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And so -- I mean -- okay, so let me see if I can make sure I understand it. So the existing workforce, the Administration's making that representation, if, in fact, we have positions that go vacant -- that piece I don't quite understand.

MR. COHEN:

If positions become vacant, there's no obligation under this contract to fill them.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, there's no obligation to fill them. And how about the language that goes towards efforts to contract out or privatize?

MR. COHEN:

Again, under the contract, no employee can be laid off as a result of contracting or privatizing.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. All right. That's -- thank you, Mr. Chair. That was my only question. Thank you, Dennis.

MR. COHEN:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

Hi, how are you?

MR. COHEN:

Good, Legislator. How are you?

LEG. SPENCER:

I'm very good. Good to see you again.

There was a situation that we had to vote on recently with regards to AME employees. I think when we were looking at the -- the DA's Office. I'm not sure. It escapes me. But my question is that there were a couple of employees that were part of AME but they were exempt employees. They had membership. The Comptroller, yeah, the Treasurer's Office. So would the -- this new contract, does that only apply towards, like, employees who are non-exempt employees or if someone has a membership to AME? Because it started splitting hairs. And they said -- you know, I guess the criticism was that these are AME members, but they're exempt employees. Is there any distinction there? Does it have to be --

MR. COHEN:

I mean, the distinction is, you know, whether someone's exempt, non-competitive, competitive, those are Civil Service designations. To be honest with you, I'm not sure under the -- you know, whoever's covered under the AME contract has the protections of this contract. Whether there's certain exempt employees -- I mean, I know there's certain exempt employees that are not covered by the AME contract. I don't know if no exempt employees are covered. I don't know the answer to that at this point. I could find out for you, though, and let you know.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. I mean, I guess it was -- you can become a member of the AME organization if you pay dues, but how does that -- does anyone know what that -- by Civil Service -- these employees -- I mean, maybe someone can clarify for me because it was always a point of confusion. In the Treasurer's Office, there were a couple of employees that -- they were --

MR. COHEN:

As far as I know, it's a not a -- Civil Service doesn't decide who's in the union. Basically the parties decide who's in the union and employees decide who's in the union. So there's mechanisms for people do join unions. Again, I don't know -- I don't know the history of Suffolk County well enough to know which employees are within the AME bargaining unit. I think it's safe to say, you know, your competitives, your non-competitives. With respect to exempts, I'm not entirely sure.

LEG. SPENCER:

All right. I'll look --

MR. COHEN:

I'll find out for you. I'll let you know.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, exempts typically are not in the union. But management, 21 -- as a matter of fact, bargaining unit 21 you can actually be in it because I was. As a governmental liaison officer at 26, I was in, covered. So you're right as to it really depends upon your classification -- your Civil Service classification as far as whether you're conventional Civil Servant, exempt or management.

MR. COHEN:

Right.

LEG. SPENCER:

All right, so -- and as we look at this particular contract, obviously they've recommend that we approve it. And Administration's comfortable with this particular contract. Could you talk a little bit about just some of the other features, besides the no-layoff clause, what does it mean as far as salaries are concerned; and then in terms of raises and just the highlights?

MR. COHEN:

Sure. So the highlights of it are, there are increases built into the contract. The term of the contract goes from January 1st of 2013 through the end of 2016. The increases begin July 1st, 2015 with a 1% increase. There's an additional 1% increase on December 1st, 2015; and then a 3% increase on July 1st, 2016.

The agreement also, you know, resets the salaries for new employees. So what we did and what was agreed upon was depending on where you are on the salary scale, so for grades 2 through 10, the starting salary was reduced by 1%; for grades 11 through 26, the starting salary was reduced by 3%; and for grades 27 and above, the salary was reduced by 5%.

The other thing that we did was we expanded the amount of steps. So we went from -- from -- I think it was 12 steps to 15? To 13. The beginning steps were lengthened from 12 months to 18 months. It just provides more immediate savings in the beginning of the contract for new employees.

Those -- it also allows, if necessary, for the County to do a lag payroll for up to ten days for AME employees. And that would begin -- will go through December 31st, 2016. So basically we can do one ten-day lag. We can do two five-day lags. And, again, that depends on the County's finances and the County's needs. So just gives us a -- the County a little flexibility with respect to the agreement.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. Just as Kate had shared with me, I guess, Dr. Lipp had given us an analysis kind of -- I'm sorry, I see it's dated today, but I don't have a copy of it.

MR. LIPP:

So we distribute it in two ways. One is we sent you electronically. And we also put a copy in your mailbox here. But, you know, the e-mail was only like maybe 45 minutes ago.

LEG. SPENCER:

Oh, okay. All right. So I'll get that. Then I'll look at that and I'll yield at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay, Legislator Cilmi's next.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Dennis, I wanted to dig just a little -- a little bit deeper into the no-layoff provision, specifically as it relates to our plans to divest ourselves of the health centers. Can you speak to that?

MR. COHEN:

Again, I mean, the layoff clause is fairly broad. And it covers any kind of contracting out or privatization. So with respect to any agreement we may make with respect to the health centers, no employees would be laid off.

Now, we're negotiating, you know, what that means with -- you know, we're negotiating with HRH, what that would mean. I mean, would they continue to work at the health center; would they be

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

transferred to a different unit of the Health Department? So that remains to be worked out. But, again, it's a very broad no-layoff clause. We will not layoff as a result of any agreement with -- with any entity.

LEG. CILMI:

So is it -- is it conceivable, then, in the law that a company like Hudson River, for example, could take over one of our health centers? And the employees -- our employees might remain our employees while working for this private company? Is that legally conceivable?

MR. COHEN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

It is. Not to -- not to open up a wound here, but -- there's a "but", yes, there is a "but" --

LEG. SPENCER:

The doctor's here if you need it fixed.

LEG. CILMI:

I mean, that was something that we sort of tried to explore during the whole Foley debate.

MR. COHEN:

Okay, is there a question?

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, at that time I don't think that was an option that was presented to us as legally feasible.

MR. COHEN:

I'd have to go back and review, you know, what was discussed and whether that was an option that the potential purchaser was willing to do. And I don't know the answer to that.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Well, I'm happy to hear that it's an option now, at least. And --

MR. COHEN:

And by the way, I mean, again, not to dwell on it, I think the question that was asked at that time was could they become somehow the other entity's employees but remain on our payroll. And, you know, that's not allowed. I mean, they can't be someone else's employees --

LEG. CILMI:

Obviously.

MR. COHEN:

And we pay them. I remember there was some discussion about that. I don't remember all of the discussion.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, all right. Well, it sounds like, if we go down that road with regard to the health centers, it sounds like it's a -- it would be a creative solution to a challenge here. And I always appreciate those creative solutions. Unfortunately, I don't think we have -- we have enough of them. But I want to commend the Administration on negotiating this contract. And I want to commend our employees on accepting; and in particular AME Dan Farrell and his crew there for working on this with you.

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

Now, this is the second, I think, of the -- what do we have, ten unions in the County; 10 or 11?

MR. COHEN:

Something like that.

LEG. CILMI:

And so this is the second of the 10 that have -- that have valid enforced contracts?

MR. COHEN:

I think this was the -- right, at the present time, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. COHEN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

What would be next on your list of --

MR. COHEN:

I mean, we talk to all of them. You know, so whoever -- you know, whichever one we come to the next agreement with. We're not --

LEG. CILMI:

Irons are in the fire, you would say, then, with all -- all of the rest?

MR. COHEN:

I think it's fair to say we've had discussions with every single union.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. All right. Thank you very much, Dennis.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Did you get my attendance on this?

MS. FLESHER:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay, thanks. Quick question: When I -- when you read the clause, I want to make sure I understand that no position can be abolished where a live body is in that position during the term of this contract.

MR. COHEN:

Right. So it says including, for example, contracting out of work performed by any unit member, position, abolition or service elimination.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. So I understand that to mean that you cannot abolish someone's position if there is a person in that job; is that correct?

MR. COHEN:

I would say as long -- as long as the employee -- the employee can't be laid off.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, that's different. I'm going to get to that point next, but I want to stick to the possible abolition of a position. The way I read -- the way I understand the clause, as you read it, and I haven't read it myself, just listening to you, the interpretation I would get is that you cannot abolish a position of someone who is in a job during the life of this contract. Is that accurate or is that inaccurate?

MR. COHEN:

I'd have to think about that. I mean, can you abolish a position without laying off the body who takes -- who currently serves in the position? I guess you can if that person is transferred. I mean, this is a hypothetical. It's not something we considered, you know, this again --

LEG. MONTANO:

Right, but I'm --

MR. COHEN:

What we talked about was a very, you know, specific no-layoff clause.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, I understand the no-layoff aspect. But the way that's written and the way I -- you know, and hearing it for the first time, I just want to be clear that the understanding is that you will not be laying -- you will not be abolishing positions of encumbrance during the term of the contract irrespective of whether or not -- and we can get to the transfer issue next. Or you don't know, I mean --

MR. COHEN:

I can't answer that. I don't know the answer to that.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Well, could you at some point give me a clarification maybe Tuesday when we vote on this?

MR. COHEN:

I will -- I will try to, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

You will try. Okay.

The second component is that you said that someone could be transferred under the terms of the contract; correct? Into another position.

MR. COHEN:

Well, again, I mean -- what the contract says is you can't be laid off. I mean, there's provisions elsewhere in the contract and Civil Service Law that talk about transfers. So, for example -- and I'm probably using the term too loosely, but -- I mean, you certainly could transfer to another division within a department.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. Understood.

MR. COHEN:

To transfer without -- outside of the department, I believe, takes more work.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. COHEN:

But, again -- and this contract doesn't address any of that. This is just a we-can't-lay-off-clause.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. Getting to the example that Legislator Cilmi brought up with respect to, let's say, a position in the Health Department, if, in fact there is a movement to eliminate the County's role in health departments and the employee that's performing at the health center were transferred or reassigned or something of that nature, would that be a lateral transfer? Or could they -- would they fall back on a previous position? You know, what I'm getting at is when the transfer comes in, is there a guarantee that that particular employee salary will not be diminished during the term of the contract?

MR. COHEN:

Yes, that's my understanding.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. COHEN:

That they would keep -- they would keep the title and the salary.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

While I -- I think most of the questions were asked that I was gonna bring up. I'm mean, I'm certainly not going to vote against a contract that the membership have agreed upon. You know, one of the things I do kind of take issue with is the lag payroll. And they are a large membership. I get that. And the fact that they're taking two zeros. And I would like that this Administration would be respectful of the fact that they did take two zeros and try and avoid a lag payroll, especially in that zero. Because basically what you're doing is doing a pay cut, if we do it. And I know that lag payroll, they get it when they retire. And, again, the lag payroll, one of the issues was a few years ago when they took a lag payroll, it was done during the Christmas vacation. And that hurt a lot. So, you know, many of these County workers are not highly paid workers.

And so I do take a little issue with the lag payroll because it is not -- from what I can see it's not been negotiated in the contract. It's already been agreed upon with another entity. And I somehow doubt that it's going to be in any other union contracts. So, like I say, the membership voted on this. They have agreed to this. I will not go against what the membership agreed upon, but I would like some caution on the issue with the lag payroll.

MR. COHEN:

We will certainly keep that in mind.

LEG. BROWNING:

Seriously. Keep it in mind.

MR. COHEN:

Seriously.

LEG. BROWNING:

I think it would hurt. It would really hurt the membership, you know, especially the lower paid ones. And, you know, Tom, you had mentioned about that one -- and that issue. There was conversation about, you know, taking over the nursing home, either a lease agreement with another entity or just the operations. So I have spoken to individuals who had an interest in the nursing home. And we did talk about keeping the County workers there. In fact, one person offered to run it, get it in the black. And said "I can keep your County workers. And I'll just be your manager," but I guess his offer was rejected.

So that disappoints me because when I look at this, no-layoff clause, you know, they got hurt back by this double zero, but anyway, I shall say no more other than, you know, personally I've been involved in many contract negotiations. I understand there are -- our economy and whatnot. But the fact is, you know, the membership agreed to it so I will support it. And I hope, again, that this lag payroll issue will be addressed and be taken into serious consideration that you don't do it upfront.

MR. COHEN:

Thank you, Legislator.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Do I have any other questions? I just have one follow-up. And it's to the point that Legislator Browning was mentioning on the lag payroll. Is it your understanding that under this contract you would still need to come to us before implementing a lag payroll of any kind?

MR. COHEN:

Let me think about that. I mean, the agreement says that it's the -- providing the County Executive with the discretion to institute it. So I don't know the answer to that. I have to think about that.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

I would appreciate it if you could try to sort that one out a little bit for us --

MR. COHEN:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

-- and get a little better clarity. I would like to see it come back to us.

MR. COHEN:

Sure. I tried to anticipate your questions. I didn't anticipate that one, though.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

To ensure that if we do choose to implement it, it is because it's absolutely necessary.

MR. COHEN:

Understood.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Okay. Very good. I have no other questions. So I'm going to make a motion to take IR 1966 out

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

of order. Can I have a second? Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1966 is now before us. Okay, I will make a motion to approve IR 1966. Do I have a second?

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1966 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

IR 1533, Directing the Department of Economic Development and Planning, in partnership with State and County Institutions of Higher Education, to study the feasibility of constructing affordable housing for young professionals. (Anker) I'll make a motion.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Spender. On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Just a question through the Chair, if I may, to the sponsor. Sarah, what -- give me a short list of factors you envision this study looking into.

LEG. ANKER:

Well, this study, again, will be orchestrated by the County. We have Jill here to talk a little more about it if you need details. But pretty much it's basically taking a big net and throwing it over the housing issue and focusing on our graduating kids, you know, our young professionals and seeing what we can do to help them.

The idea came after visiting many times to -- I have so many PRCs, Planned Retirement Communities for our seniors. And so, you know, as I -- and as Chair of Education, of course, I'm out with the schools and visiting with many colleges. And the seniors and the graduating kids or just young professionals have the same issue, where they -- they have limited financial resources. And that's just -- that's the bottom line of this resolution.

LEG. CILMI:

But this is studying the feasibility, right, of constructing affordable housing. So what would be some of the factors that would make it possibly feasible or unfeasible or --

LEG. ANKER:

Well, again, the situation -- and again comparing PRCs with the youth is that 55-and-above communities are legal. You can actually say, you know, if you're 55 and above, you can live in these communities. Now if you go below 55, it's illegal because there's a Federal law saying you can't discriminate with people younger than 55.

So the idea basically it's going to be similar to Purchase College in Westchester. And basically it's focussing on a -- on a group of -- I would say between the ages of 18 and 30 to see if we can create a type of -- whether it's a condominium or housing development and focus on the needs of our young professionals. Again, with transportation, with sewerage; also what benefits do you have in addition with the main goal being housing for our young kids -- excuse me -- young adults.

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

Let's create more work for our workforce, for our contractors. Let's see if we can create tax incentives to build these structures, to build these communities. Let's see if we can help our universities by maybe having some type of income coming in from these housing units. You know, again, it's a pretty big net we're going to throw. And I'm leaving it up to the County and to Jill to see at which direction she wants to go. But, again, you know, what we do at times is just take a fishing pole and try to get one specific fish. We're throwing a big net and we're hoping to really make some progress with housing for our young adults.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So maybe -- if Jill is able, could you -- because, Legislator Anker, you've identified the legal question as one of the questions that the study might address, but I'm still unclear as to what other issues the study might look at.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Well, first of all, we support the effort. You know, I would welcome a legislative mandate to seek out additional affordable housing opportunities. And the way I see this, frankly, is I basically along with a group of people that I'm going to put together, we'd be looking into potential partnerships, additional sites that are available around the universities, the parameters of what comes out of that in terms of what we target, what type of housing we build, all remains to be seen; but I'm looking forward to opening the door and starting that conversation. We might be able to identify some additional sites which is -- you know, finding the land is a crucial step in building affordable housing.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So now we have a legal question and we have a land availability question. Will you be looking into public as well as private campuses, universities or just public or just private or --

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

I'm going to start with the public and see how that goes. I have no problem with expanding that. I mean, at the very least, it open doors; it starts a conversation. I think it's a good thing. I would like the opportunity to pursue it based upon a legislative mandate.

LEG. CILMI:

Would -- I guess demand would probably be part of your analysis, whether or not there would be demand for this type of housing given certain price points.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Sure, absolutely, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So you really -- I mean, it's not -- you haven't really given a heck of a lot of thought to exactly what issues the study would address, only that there is a -- you perceive a need -- Legislator Anker perceives a need. And so we're just going to kind of explore it and see where it takes us.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

There's definitely a need.

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

We agree with that. Now we're just going to see if there's interest on the part of the universities and colleges.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, so that's another question is whether or not the colleges and universities are interested in --

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

For sure, yeah. That'll be a threshold item.

LEG. CILMI:

What about funding?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

We, of course, have the County's programs. We would bring in, as I indicated, I'm going to bring in some partners on this, if you will, the housing advocates to see about their interest in terms of maybe State and Federal funding. But there's always gotta be private dollars as well. And the university, if they're going to participate, they'd be part of that deal as well.

LEG. CILMI:

And you're comfortable in your ability to undertake this study given the other demands on your time and your department?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Yes. Thank you for asking, though.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Sure. That's important; that ever present opportunity cost that we talk about. All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

My question, I guess, to the sponsor and/or to Jill, either one of you, do we have anything from Dr. Stanley over at Stony Brook or from the St. Joseph's Campus or any of the campuses that we would be looking at expressing the willingness to be involved or to participate?

LEG. ANKER:

Yeah, we reached out to some of the college campuses. And they're very interested. They are interested. Again, what direction this is going to take exactly will be up to Jill and her committee. But, you know, again, as we know, there is a housing issue at Stony Brook right now as we speak, you know, Brookhaven Town is having a time with illegal landlord rentals. So this may, again, help with that situation.

My focus, again, is just trying to find housing for our, you know, our young professionals. And this, I hope, will complement Ronkonkoma Hub and Wyandanch Rising and Patchogue Village. Again, this is just something that I think will be -- you know, Tom -- Legislator Cilmi mentioned creative -- you know, creative ideas to accomplish goals. This is a creative idea. And I'm hoping we can find some success and different routes. But, again, I'm hoping Jill will direct this. And, again, there has been an interest in working with the colleges.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And my other question to you, Jill is, is that your testimony here now with Legislator Cilmi is that you have the ability to go ahead and undertake this additional responsibility within your department, or within the division?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Yes, I will make it happen.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Because that's different from the last time when we had this conversation. Last time we had this conversation, I think, you were somewhat concerned that you could continue to meet what the additional responsibilities are. I don't know what the staffing change is. I take you for what you go ahead and present, but it's different now than it was the last time we spoke.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Just the one point, I could tell you that down Patchogue, St. Jo's doesn't have dormitory space and they're actually looking at developing some residential for their students, which is something that could partner here. And you'll be surprised. My alma mater is, as Legislator Browning mentioned earlier --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, I understand that piece. And as a matter of fact my alma mater Stony Brook does necessarily need additional student housing in the form of dormitories --

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:

-- but that's not what the bill talks to us about. The bill talks to us about graduates who are looking to establish permanent residencies.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Not dorms associated with the educational side, right?

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

That's true, but it doesn't mean that they have to be -- that the residential -- permanent residential type housing, especially if they're looking at creating apartments or condo style, don't necessarily fit into the model of what they're looking for.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Legislator Spencer had a question.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sarah, thank you. I appreciate you introducing this. And it's very important. I guess one of the things -- and, again, I appreciate your work. For me, I just wanted to clarify just some definitions. And I like your bill because it's one page, but sometimes that also -- and I'll just say when we look at the idea of young professionals leaving Long Island in increasing numbers and we talk about

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

workforce housing and affordable housing -- excuse me -- the definition -- if we're studying something, I think that -- I'm trying to figure out the term young professionals, and it was alluded to before, what is a young professional? Are we defining that by particular jobs? Are we defining it when we say young? Are we defining it as a particular age group? When we say affordable, are we defining that by a particular socioeconomic class? Because all of those would be important in terms of defining the need. And it would be great if you both could just kind of tell me what the parameters are.

LEG. ANKER:

Right. And I understand. You know, you have to start somewhere. And, you know, like I said it's a wide net. But as far as the actual name of the resolution, it's affordable housing for young college graduates. So we're going to start with young college graduates, you know, on the -- with the resolution title. And, you know, we'll work our way around that. But, again, we're going to focus on those kids that are graduating from school and they need a place to live. That's going to be our main focus. And then we'll see what happens.

Again, we know there's an issue with kids that have not graduated that need housing. We know there's an issue with folks that may be between 25 and 30 that are still looking -- that are paying \$100,000 loans and they don't have the credit that they need to get their mortgage. But, you know, this again is working in a broad perspective and I'm giving Jill a lot of leeway to figure out which way is the most productive.

LEG. SPENCER:

And, Jill, I'll let you ask in just a second, but I guess, Sarah, I immediately think of those that are becoming like electricians and plumbers and things like that, that are finishing. And then also when we look at those that are -- on their ability to be able to maybe have support from their parents or come from a different socioeconomic status, we hear of affordable housing not necessarily being attainable. So it's like when we look at Long Island, there are some areas that are extremely affluent and where those young professionals may be in a different set of circumstance. And I know if it's too broad, then it may make it difficult to kind of hone in. You know, are we going to say less -- earning less than \$35,000? Are we not looking at plumbers and electricians at this time?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

So, that's a focus. You know, young professionals is a focus, not a requirement. So it would have to, I think, surpass the definition of young professionals. But still for our purposes, it's opportunities for affordable housing. Now what that means to us is that it is limited to families under certain income levels. For our program, that means you can go up to 120% of the HUD area median income, which, as an example, for a family of four is about \$127,000. And then we go down from there. You take the overall income and then you kind of factor in, well, is affordable to that family. And there are formulas that go into that. The general rule of thumb, you don't want them paying more than 30% of their income for their housing cost. Right? So it's sort of a formulaic assessment that is done in terms of affordability.

LEG. SPENCER:

And the reason that's important in my district where we've had a few development projects there that are going on and there's been some opposition from the communities saying, you know, these one, two-bedrooms that we have a shortage of are not necessarily affordable. So they're not at market rate, but they're still -- and we start to get into this definition of affordable versus attainable. So if you bring in some of these housing projects that you can put a lot of one and two-bedroom professional development communities, but when you look at that price -- I apologize -- I have a tickle in my throat, I probably need a drink of water and I'm record -- but one of the -- I guess that would be some of the issues that you could work and create these opportunities. And if we're catering to a particular -- when we say professionals, are we talking doctors, lawyers, engineers? And then, you know -- so I think those questions do matter as we start to look at different

11/14/13 Gov Ops, etc. Committee

opportunities because you'll have developers that will come in and will present plans. And you may have -- members of the community and will come and say "that's not affordable for me."

And so I see you're using the HUD guidelines. I'm a former housing authority chairman. And I think that's a -- that does seem to be in the attainable range. But then also in certain communities, too, where it starts to get into an argument, our concerns "not-in-my-backyard" so there's a lot of undertones when you look at housing be it -- bias on -- with regards to socioeconomic or racial or other things. And so these are just some of my cautions as being someone that has kind of looked at these particular topics. And it may sometimes confound a very important study that you're doing. So that would just be my words of caution. And I plan to support this.

LEG. ANKER:

And I just to want comment on that is that, you know, we have to get pass the word affordable housing, because it scares people. You know, you talk about NIMBY, you know, we can change it to workforce housing, we can change it to young professionals, you know, young adult housing, but this is what I'm hoping to do; by working with the colleges and universities who have their -- the understanding that they're there, they're respected in their communities, if we complement housing -- and I'm assuming there will be restrictions. There will be restrictions, you know, you talk about having, you know, young community, well, we don't want them having parties and, you know, creating issues. Well, if they're on the college campuses, there are going to be parameters for, you know, for their -- for them to stay there, for them to live there. And that will be -- that will have to be accepted.

So, again, this is something that we're going to look into. And, you know, I just want to, you know, compliment Jill and thank her for, you know, being able to work with these different ideas. Because, again, we -- we need this housing. And we've needed it -- we've need it for so long, for decades and decades. We have to think out of the box. And I think this will do it. I think it will absolutely complement what we already have planned thanks to Connect Long Island, thanks to our sewerage of our infrastructure. This, I think, will be a very important part. And I hope we can find some -- you know, we can succeed in helping our kids find these homes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll yield.

LEG. CILMI:

Just one last question. Is there a timeframe associated with this study?

LEG. ANKER:

I think about -- 120 days. But, again, it's just basically a study. And this might be the tip of the iceberg, you know, so to say. So if you can just give us, you know -- how do you feel about that, Jill, as far as if you can come up with just a basic understanding of this type of study in that 120 days?

LEG. CILMI:

Is it 120 days? I just wanted to -- that was the only question I had.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Yes. Yes, I mean, I think that's sufficient time for us to get some -- begin the study and get some details together and report back. If we need more time, I'll let you know.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Great. Thank you. If I have no other questions, I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Abstained.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

IR 1533 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-1-0)

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Moving onto Introductory Resolutions, **IR 1910, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law authorizing an exemption in County's Backflow Testing Law. (Schneiderman)** This must go to public hearing. I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1910 is tabled. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

IR 1922, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Incorporated Village of Islandia for Affordable Housing purposes (SCTM No. 0504-017.00-02.00-029.002). (County Executive) Motion by Legislator Cilmi; second by Legislator Kennedy. Any questions? A motion and second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1922 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

IR 1923, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Incorporated Village of Islandia for Affordable Housing purposes (SCTM No. 0504-017.00-02.00-029.001). (County Executive) Motion by Legislator Cilmi. I'll make the second. Second by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1923 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

IR 1975, Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Brookhaven for Affordable Housing purpose (SCTM No. 0200-975.90-01.00-042.000). (County Executive) I'll make motion to approve, second by Legislator Browning. Any questions? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1975 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

HOME RULE MESSAGES

Home Rule number 09-13, Requesting the State of New York to enact legislation authorizing the County of Suffolk to establish a County-wide Master Electrician Licensing Program (Senate Bill No. S.5132 and Assembly Bill No. A.7298). (Cilmi) A motion to table by Legislator Cilmi. I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Home Rule number 9 is tabled. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

I have no other resolutions before us. If there is no other agenda -- anybody has any other actions, I will make a motion to adjourn, second by Legislator Spencer. We are adjourned.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 2:41 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**