

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Health and Human Services 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 Friday, November 21, 2008, at 2:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Legislator Jack Eddington, Vice-Chair
Legislator DuWayne Gregory
Legislator Tom Barraga
Legislator John Kennedy
Legislator Wayne Horsley

Also in Attendance:

George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Barbara LoMoriello, Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
Maxvel Rose, Legislative Aide to Legislator Gregory
Marge Acevedo, Legislative Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Caucus
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Caucus
Diane Dono, Budget Review Office
Dr. Humayun Chaudry, Commissioner, SC Department of Health Services
Janet DeMarzo, Commissioner, SC Department of Social Services
Ken Knappe, Client Services, SC Department of Health Services.
Margaret Bermel, Suffolk County Department of Health
Dominick Ninivaggi, DPW, Vector Control Superintendent
Kim Shaw, SC Department of Health Services, Office Of Ecology
Kevin Rooney, Oil Heat Institute of LI

Minutes Taken By:

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:08 P.M.]

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Good afternoon. We will start our Health and Human Services Committee with a Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Kennedy.

(*Salutation*)

Good afternoon, everyone. And we will start with the public portion. We have one speaker, Kevin Rooney.

MR. ROONEY:

Once more for the record, my name is Kevin Rooney. I'm the Chief Executive Officer of the Oil Heat -- am I on?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Your mike isn't on, push the button.

MR. ROONEY:

Okay. My name is Kevin Rooney. I'm the Chief Executive Officer of the Oil Heat Institute of Long Island. I would like to offer a couple of comments on Introductory Resolution 2098, a resolution to maximize MIHEAP assistance benefits. MIHEAP -- what the Suffolk County Legislature did in enacting MIHEAP is something that I have said publicly, and I will say it here on the record, you are to be commended for. I think it is a terrific program. I think it recognizes a need for those individuals who are not at an income level where they might be eligible for the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program, but nonetheless there are families that are having a hard time financially. And I think setting that limit at 135% of the State HEAP, LIHEAP allowance, was a very good thing.

Notwithstanding that, I have a couple of -- a couple of concerns and a couple of questions with how this particular proposal would be implemented. And I understand the idea here is that the Legislature has set aside \$5 million that will be allocated to the first 1,000 applicants in an amount of \$500.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Five hundred and five hundred.

MR. ROONEY:

Five hundred and five hundred, okay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's not a million -- it's not 5 million is what you said.

MR. ROONEY:

It's 1,000 recipients at 500 apiece.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Five hundred dollars, right, but you said 5 million. Never mind.

MR. ROONEY:

I'm sorry, yes. No, wait a second. A thousand times 500 is 500,000. Okay. I'm off by a factor of one zero.

LEG. HORSLEY:

That was my point.

MR. ROONEY:

Sorry about that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Can I immediately negotiate a new oil contract with you?

MR. ROONEY:

No, I don't do that kind of stuff. I don't run their businesses, thank God. The question I have here is, and I'm very familiar with the, politically it's not LIHEAP, but we know it's LIHEAP, with the State program that is administered by OTDA, the Office of Temporary Disability Assistance, and implemented locally by the Department of Social Services. And under that program, and they rolled us out a couple of years ago, dealers who opt to participate in the HEAP Program have to sign a uniform vendor agreement. That then commits them contractually with OTDA to make deliveries on behalf of their customers who are HEAP eligible. If they make a single delivery, the Discount Off Retail Program, the DOR Program, is 13 cents off their posted price. If it is an existing customer, however, and they deliver all of their product for the year, then it is seven cents off their price.

My question here is under MIHEAP, this is a single allotment grant, okay, how would that be structured? At what rate is that structured? Does that rate, that discount off retail, which is part of the LIHEAP Program, does that apply to customers who are under contract? Because under LIHEAP, under the State HEAP Program, if a customer is under either a service contract, or a fixed price, or a cap price program, then the discount off retail does not apply.

Secondarily, you have -- you have dealers who have a uniform vendor agreement. The advantage of having a uniform vendor agreement with OTDA is that the heating oil company is paid directly by the State Comptroller. If the heating oil vendor does not have -- the dealer does not have a UVA, a Uniform Vendor Agreement, then they can still make deliveries under the HEAP Program, only they have to go through a third party check procedure.

So I understand what you're doing here. I understand you're trying to give the MIHEAP money some additional legs and stretch it out further and make more people eligible for it. My question is how it actually gets implemented.

And one last thing, and this really goes sort of to the amount in question, when heating oil prices back in just July were 4.97, 4.99 a gallon, that \$500 would have covered about a 100 gallon delivery. Today that \$500 covers a delivery of about 185 to 190 gallons if they're buying from a full service company. If they're buying from a COD company, it actually goes well beyond 200 gallons. So, in actuality, if it's a COD company that's going out and making a delivery, and let's say the delivery is 200 gallons and the price they're charging is 2.10, 2.20 a gallon, we're actually going to give them more money than the amount that they actually delivered. So the mechanics here are what I'm concerned with. I think my concerns are shared by the Commissioner's Office as to how this would be implemented, given the fact that this does not go into effect until the 2009/2010 heating season just a year from now.

I would ask respectfully, Madam Chair, that this be tabled and allow myself, representing the Heating Oil Industry, to sit down with Social Services and try between us to figure out how we would actually work this out and implement it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. If -- Janet, do you have somebody, because I know I did request somebody come over and talk about that.

MR. ROONEY:

I didn't want to put you on the spot there.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But I did have questions, if we have someone who's on one of those contracts. They're contracted to pay a certain amount of money when the prices were \$4 a gallon. Now they're much less, and they're having a hard time paying their bill, you know, they're in violation of their contract if they use MIHEAP if they're under contract. So that's a question I have, how are we going to take care of that problem? But if you would like to go ahead.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Madam Chair, may I just interrupt one second?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Just to correct one issue beyond the \$500,000 issue, is that this does not start on January 1st, this starts on November 3rd.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Of this year?

LEG. HORSLEY:

That starts this year.

MR. ROONEY:

MIHEAP does.

LEG. HORSLEY:

MIHEAP.

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

Yes. MIHEAP did start on November 3rd.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Right.

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

And it was the reading of the legislation, though, where it said the 2009/2010 season, which would be the season beginning in 2009. The State refers to this currently as the 2008/2009 HEAP season. So I don't know if that was intentional or if you meant it to cover --

MR. NOLAN:

Can I just clarify that point? The MIHEAP Program obviously started this year.

LEG. HORSLEY:

This year.

MR. NOLAN:

But the terms of this resolution would take effect for the next heating season. The reason we did that -- and I'm just talking about the terms of this resolution.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I'm not that familiar with this --

MR. NOLAN:

What this is trying to do is in terms of the vendors that are used under MIHEAP to bring it into closer compliance with the regular HEAP Program, okay. That's really the goal of this in order to save money, so that the prices that are delivered to the MIHEAP recipients are lower and more in line with the regular HEAP Program. That's the goal, but it was -- we decided in drafting this that it would be impractical to try to implement this now in the middle of the home heating season. We're looking more towards next year and let MIHEAP function this year the way it is.

LEG. HORSLEY:

The way it is.

MR. NOLAN:

Right. They don't have -- a person doesn't have to use the vendors that have a contract with DSS.

LEG. HORSLEY:

A message to Counsel. I didn't even know about this. This is the first time I'm hearing this.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Now you do.

MR. NOLAN:

I will actually -- I will talk to you about that after the meeting.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sorry, Janet. I think Janet wasn't finished, right?

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

Well, basically, if it is for next year we would, as has been said here, respectfully request delay of implementing it, because there are a lot of administrative steps that would have to be taken. The system in MIHEAP is very different than the HEAP system, and the processes are much more streamlined under MIHEAP. It would significantly change the program and may impact, as Legislator Browning has said, people that have agreements and service contracts. So we think, in the first instance the goal is very laudable, but the processes may make it difficult for some of the people that don't access our services on a regular basis to be able to have these conditions placed upon their purchases.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I think you -- I think you agree, is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

(Nodded yes). Sorry.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Just to make it -- I don't know if it's more clear, but the request on how this was all formulated comes from your office. We made -- we made a number of last minute changes to it so that it would be in line with your processes, so you didn't have to do mathematical calculations and all sorts of things like that. So are we okay? I mean, I'm not sure --

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

No, the program, as it's run right now, is truly okay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Are people being serviced right now from November 3rd on?

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

Yes. We have -- Ken can actually give you the statistics on the --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Because they're calling my office.

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

We have seen a real response. It's over 1,000 applications for MIHEAP.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Great. No one told me that. Okay.

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

We have already approved a number of MIHEAP benefits, but we -- it's very different. I mean, Ken can speak to it. We think they're similar, but they don't overlap completely, and this structure, while helpful for HEAP, is much more labor intensive and restrictive for the clients than the MIHEAP Program.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'm game for anything that will make this thing work. I mean, let's help the people. That's all I care.

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

It's working really well. Ken, why don't you share with them the MIHEAP --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Can I ask, too, if maybe he can answer this also. You're saying you have about 1,000 applications already?

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

It's more.

MR. KNAPPE:

It's actually -- excuse me. Ken Knappe from Client Benefits Division in the Department of Social Services. As of Tuesday morning, it was reported to me by our temporary staff that are working on the MIHEAP Program and the HEAP staff, that we received over 1600 MIHEAP applications to date. Approximately 500 or so have been processed, about 200 of those applications have been approved. Three hundred of those applications have been denied. But a majority of the denied applications have already been referred to our HEAP Unit because they actually met the HEAP guidelines, so they'll actually get a better benefit.

The way that the MIHEAP Program works, and, for a lack of better terms, it's almost like a backroom operation where there is no interview with the client, very different in that respect than the HEAP Program. We wanted to make it easy for the clients applying. There's a two-page application with the documentation that is needed presented in the application. All they have to do, the clients or the applicants, is to mail that into the address that's on the application. Then we have people reviewing the application, matching up the calculations, making sure that they meet the income threshold that was set, which was the 35% above the HEAP standards. That's how when we're able to identify if their income is below, we refer it to the HEAP Office.

The check for the approved applicant for MIHEAP, it's a \$500 benefit and it gets sent directly to the client to defray the cost, maybe of the oil that they already purchased, or to put it towards an oil purchase that they're making in the next month or two. It's a one-time \$500 benefit. That's how it works currently.

Based on the wording of the resolution, and it's really the second Resolved Clause when I first

looked at it, it would change that mechanism and that's what we were respectfully requesting, perhaps a table of this resolution to see what's the best way to implement that, if that's the desire and the will of the Legislature.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Is that the desire and will of the Legislature?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We'll see. I wanted to ask --

MR. NOLAN:

Why are you looking at me?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Someone wrote this thing.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You know, the 1600 applications, you know, we mentioned about the people who are on a contract and they're locked into a certain price, and now with the prices being so much lower. Do you know how many of them are -- were locked into a contract with the -- you didn't ask?

MR. KNAPPE:

We wouldn't know that. A majority of the people, of the residents in Suffolk, are already locked into a contract, are already locked into a contract per se, especially this population. I don't have numbers to back that up. All that is requested when they submit the MIHEAP application currently is the last copy or the last couple of copies of their utility bill, their fuel bill, as well as their income verification. So we do not know if they're in a contract or not.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think it would be good to know, because I think that's probably the intent of this bill, is to make sure that we're maximizing that money, that more people are going to be serviced, if you get what I'm saying.

And, you know, I think it's important, you know, that -- and I understand that people were locked in at one time and maybe don't have the money today that they had six months ago, that, you know, now they're kind of stuck between a rock and a hard place and their contracts are now invalid or they are violating the contract if they go to somebody else.

MR. KNAPPE:

The difficulty with -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

John, you have a question?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Based on the numbers you've just given us, we've already exhausted the \$500,000. Well, if we have 1600 applications, if it's a \$500 grant, I know you said there were 300 rejects, and maybe you're going through the rollover process, but it's conceivable out of that 1600 we could hit 1,000 that are eligible and we've already exhausted the \$500,000. The question --

MR. KNAPPE:

I'm sorry.

LEG. KENNEDY:

One second, Kenny, before we go to that. The question I have here is, I was under the impression with the '09 budget that we just adopted, not that that additional 500,000 was going to be something that was first accessed next November. If I've got a constituent on January 1st who

needs this benefit, I've already got the applications, as a matter of fact, and I'm encouraging people to go ahead and complete them because we're in a heating season that's going to run through March or April. Am I misunderstanding with my constituents? What's the process we're going to look at.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

This bill doesn't have anything to do with the current MIHEAP.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, no, I'm not speaking about this bill so much, Madam Chair. I'm speaking about the '09 budget that we just adopted that had an additional \$500,000 for HEAP for '09 which I thought -- I was under the impression it takes effect on January 1; is that correct?

MR. NOLAN:

That money will be there January 1st.

MR. KNAPPE:

It was our understanding, and I think we agree with Legislator Kennedy, that we had 500,000 available to us up until December 31st, and we were holding those applications that were approved, but perhaps the funds were exhausted in 2008, and on January 2nd start that process with those applications once the 2009 funds have been made available on January 2nd. So we completely agree with your interpretation.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Based on the metrics, this is essentially irrelevant. We're never going to see November of next year before this money is exhausted unless we move additional money in there.

MR. NOLAN:

Correct. It presupposes that there'll be additional money. If there's no money available next year in 2010, then, obviously, this will have no impact. It really is only going to have a practical impact if there is more money either set aside in 2009 or in 2010 above what we've already appropriated.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Kevin, there's some other question here, though, as far as what Ken was talking about in that I guess that's not data that we capture now in the application process as to whether or not individuals are just taking spot drop or they are in contract?

MR. KNAPPE:

Not in the MIHEAP application. There was never -- it was never seen as that being relevant for the \$500 benefit that we wanted to give to those people that were 35% above the HEAP standards.

MR. ROONEY:

Nor for that matter is it under the regular HEAP Program. They don't ask them who they're buying from, as long as they buy it from a company that is approved by OTDA, as either a first party or a third party company.

LEG. KENNEDY:

If the objective here is to assist as many constituents as possible with a finite amount of money, then what's the delta between a spot drop and a full service? How much of a span do we have? And what's the cost for maintenance? Maybe we're better suited to get, you know, some maintenance separate.

MR. ROONEY:

Well, it's interesting. One of the things that you should be aware of, and maybe this has to some degree driven the applications to DSS. I sent out a special notice to every single heating oil company located in Suffolk County, or located in Nassau that delivers into Suffolk County. It was entitled "Financial assistance is available to your customers" and it detailed the LIHEAP Program,

MIHEAP, Project Warmth, a whole bunch of other things. We then put all of that information on our website and we get a lot of hits on our website. Naturally I went through it with the Chair. There's a separate box on our website that says "Do you need financial assistance with your heating bills?" And you can click on that and it goes right to all of those programs. I think we probably helped generate some of the applications and some of the demand. And, in fact that's a good thing.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Absolutely.

MR. ROONEY:

But the delta between a full service company and a spot COD company right now is probably on the order of I'd say 40 to 50 cents a gallon.

LEG. KENNEDY:

That's a lot of oil.

MR. ROONEY:

But then most full service companies also include service in the price of the fuel without paying a separate service contract. So -- and I actually calculated it again with the Chair earlier, what she pays for a separate service contract and buys COD comes out to around 25, 30 cents a gallon. The average is around 35 to 40 cents a gallon for a full service company. So if I'm paying hypothetically \$3.50 a gallon, 40, 35 to 40 cents of that price is the cost of service because I don't pay for service. It's included in my -- in my price.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Does the industry have any position on this as they look at, you know, this effort to try to assist individuals one way or the other? I mean, you have membership that covers the full range of product deliverers, right?

MR. ROONEY:

Yes, we do. And we do a lot of things. I mean, the fact that under the HEAP agreement that we have as an industry with the Office of Temporary Disability Assistance, OTDA, we have agreed to accept a lower retail price to HEAP recipients, so we're discounting our price on a single delivery or multiple deliveries over the cost of the heating season.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And does it matter whether or not that's with service or without service?

MR. ROONEY:

No, it does not. No, it does not.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So you just set the rate that you've brokered and that's what you'll accept for delivery.

MR. ROONEY:

Well, OTDA set the rate and we agreed to it. That applies whether it's a full service company or a COD company. A COD company hypothetically could opt to go with a margin-over-rack number that is also part of the HEAP process, which is 35 cents over their wholesale price. Most full-service companies wouldn't take the margin-over-rack, they'll take the discount off retail because they just operate totally differently.

But in terms of reaching out and helping customers, we have so far sent out about 400,000 envelopes to customers in Nassau and Suffolk County soliciting donations to Project Warmth. We have given as an industry \$25,000 to Project Warmth. We're part of a collection of entities within the oil industry that so far has generated close to a quarter of a million dollars for Project Warmth. So, yes, we're very aware of the fact that oil prices were high. Thankfully, they're now a lot lower.

I would just correct one thing that was said. The number -- the percentage of customers who have fixed price contracts, particularly higher priced fixed-price contracts that were taken out over the summer months, is only about 10% of the entire heating oil market. There are approximately 600,000 homes on Long Island that use oil heat, there's about 65 to 70,000 that actually have those high-priced contracts. And we're -- and, as I said in an interview I did right here around 12 o'clock with News 12, my recommendation, and this is something that you can take back to your constituents and your offices.

My recommendation is if you get calls from your constituents, they have to talk to their supplier, their heating oil company, because what you're dealing with, Mr. Kennedy, is a three party two-part contract. The three parties are the customer, the retail heating oil company, and the wholesale provider. The two parts of the contract are the part between the customer and the retail company, and the second part is the part between the retail company and the wholesale company. If you are my customer and I am your oil company and if you called me up today and said, "I want to lock in, what's my price?", I could give you a price. I would lock you in at that price, and I, in turn, today will call my or contact electronically, but I would contact my supplier and I would lock in your consumption for the year.

Let's say you use a thousand gallons. I'm going to lock in a paper contract, contract to buy a specific amount at a specific terminal on a specific period of time on your behalf. So, if you lock in with me today, I'm locked in with them as well. If you decide you want out of the contract, I have to figure out a way for me to get out of my contract. That's where the problem is.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And I -- we just spoke about this, and I agree with you, that, you know, this huge, tremendous swing in the price shouldn't be something that works a hardship on the industry. But I'll also share with you that what I've been dealing with in my office are senior citizens, individuals on fixed marginal incomes, who, by the way, have not executed a writing. They've engaged in this oral process, which I question as far as I don't know whether it even comports with a Statute of Frauds. And a 78 year old widow is ill equipped to deal with a supplier, to communicate, you know, the degree of hardship that she's facing. She's very easily, you know, flustered and put off by it.

Now, fortunately, we had a positive resolve in an individual case, but I would say that this is something that, you know, from an industry perspective, perhaps your folks can at least look at those numbers that fall into that senior or handicapped category and say maybe we do have to take a look at this.

MR. ROONEY:

With all due respect, Mr. Kennedy, we are doing this and we have been doing this for about the last three to four months. Starting on July 15th, when the price of crude and wholesale and retail started coming down, it topped out on that day. July 14th was the highest price for all three products. From that point on it has come down dramatically. I have been talking about this as a problem since that point in time. Part of the problem -- and this is not -- we're probably far afield from this bill, but it might be helpful to some of you in dealing with these kind of calls that you're getting in your offices. From that point in time, I have been urging -- I've done it on T.V., I've done it on the radio, I've done it in print. I have been urging customers to talk to their companies and try to negotiate a way out of their contract, assuming, assuming that the company can also negotiate a way out of its wholesale contract, and that's part of the problem.

The wholesalers, who then take out secondary contracts with trading companies on the Mercantile Exchange, they can't get out of their contracts with Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs. So if they can't get out of their contracts, then they can't let the retail company out of their contract either. So, it's a process of negotiation.

I would say to you that if you, hypothetically, took out a contract on July 14th at the very height of

the market and you want to negotiate that contract now, there's a difference in both the retail and the wholesale price on the order of about \$1400. If a company says, "Here's an amount that I will have to charge you to get out of that contract," and let's say, hypothetically, it's \$500, there's a \$900 difference that somebody's going to absorb, either the retail company, or the wholesale company, or the trading company. Somebody's going to absorb that loss because there is a contract to pick up that oil at that higher price. And if I said to you in this kind of economic environment, Mr. Kennedy, if I told you, "If you give me \$500, I will save you \$1400," your response to me would be, "Where would I sign up?"

I think you have to look at it and customers and your constituents have to look at it very pragmatically. That they may be asked to make a contribution to offsetting this enormous differential, but it is a contribution that doesn't come close to covering the entire cost. And if they're pragmatic, and I think a lot of companies also -- look, we're a family-oriented business, we're family companies. We know our customers. Even the big companies know their customers pretty darn well. What they'll do is they'll say to a customer, "Look, if you can't pay the \$500 upfront, here's what we'll do. We'll increase your budget amount by \$40 a month, \$50 a month. We'll stretch it out over a period of time." We essentially will carry you as an account receivable, we'll carry that debt over an extended period of time. Again, unfortunately, that comes down to our ability to get revolving lines of credit that we need to be able to do that, and I don't need to tell you how tight the credit market is these days.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Kevin, I appreciate the explanation and I don't want to keep at it now to remedy a particular constituent's issue. I will deal with that separately. But I would say I'm disinclined to hear about the hardships of Goldman Sachs or folks like that.

MR. ROONEY:

Me, too.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But I'll yield.

MR. ROONEY:

Believe me, they get no sympathy from me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thanks for coming in and explaining everything.

MR. ROONEY:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I appreciate you taking the time earlier with me.

MR. ROONEY:

You're more than welcome, Madam Chair, members of the Committee. Thank you for your indulgence.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Ken, Janet, do you have anything else you would like to add besides this?

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

No.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No? Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEMARZO:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Commissioner Chaudhry, do you have anything you'd like to report? Nothing? Okay, great. Sorry, Dominick. I see you're here. Do you have anything you would like to say? I know you have a vector control bill.

MR. NINIVAGGI:

I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So we'll move on with the agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

Tabled Resolutions. ***1886 - Adopting a Local Law to enact a grading policy for food establishments.*** I'll make a motion to table for Public Hearing. Do I have a second?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

LEG. GREGORY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

1995 - Amending the 2008 Adopted Operating Budget to accept and appropriate 100% additional State Aid from the New York State Office of Mental Health to Brookhaven Memorial Hospital Center and Clubhouse of Suffolk County. I make a motion to approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion is carried. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

1996 - Accepting and appropriating 100% State grant funds from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to Suffolk County Department of Health Services for the DNA Capacity Enhancement. Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

1997 - Accepting and appropriating 100% State grant funds from the New York State Department of Health and the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York to the Suffolk County Department of Health Services for the HEAL NY Phase 6 - South Shore Regional Health Center. Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

1998 - Accepting and appropriating 100% additional Federal grant funds passed through

the New York State Department of Health to the Suffolk County Department of Health Services for the Beach Act Sanitary Survey Project. Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

All these 100 percent's. I love them. ***2002 - Accepting and appropriating 100% State grant funds from the New York State Department of Health to the Suffolk County Department of Health Services for the HEAL NY Phase 6 - Primary Care Infrastructure Project.*** Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

2003 - Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funding from the New York State Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance to the Suffolk County Department of Social Services for the continuation of services provided under the Community solutions for Transportation Project, Employment Shuttle, and authorize the County Executive and the Commissioner of Social Services to execute a contract. Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

2054 - Amending the 2008 Adopting Operating Budget to accept and appropriate 100% additional State Aid from the New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services for Pederson-Krag Center. Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

2062 - Approving the Vector Control Plan of the Department of Public Works Division of Vector Control pursuant to Section C8-4(B)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter. I'll make a motion to approve. Second, Legislator Eddington. Anyone, any questions? No questions? All right. So we made a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

2098 - To maximize MIHEAP Assistance Benefits. I guess I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. Motion's tabled. ***(Vote: Tabled 6-0-0-0)***

I thank you. And with that, we have no other business. Motion to adjourn. Second, Legislator Eddington. We're adjourned. ***(Vote: Approved 6-0-0-0)***

[THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 2:43 P.M.]