

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

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, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Thursday, December 2nd, 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Legislator Kate Browning - Chairperson
Legislator Vivian Vilorio-Fisher - Vice-Chair
Legislator John Kennedy
Legislator Jack Eddington
Legislator Tom Muratore

Also In Attendance:

Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay - District #8
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning
Terry Pearsall - Chief-of-Staff to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Marge Acevedo - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Kara Hahn - Director of Communications for P.O. Lindsay
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Caucus Leader Cooper
Stefanie Fisher - Aide to Deputy Presiding Officer Vilorio-Fisher
Jessica Priois - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Leslie Kennedy - Aide to Legislator Kennedy
Greg Moran - Aide to Legislator Nowick
Diane Dono - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Craig Freas - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Steve Tricarico - County Executive Assistant
Lynne Bizzarro - Chief Deputy County Attorney
Greg Blass - Commissioner/Department of Social Services
Ed Hernandez - Deputy Commissioner/Department of Social Services
Linda O'Donohoe - Asst. to the Commissioner/Dept of Social Services
Dr. James Tomarken - Commissioner/Department of Health Services
Margaret Bermel - Director of Health Administration/DHS
Dot Kerrigan - 4th Vice-President/AME
Sean Walter - Supervisor/Town of Riverhead
Mason Haas - Town Assessor/Town of Riverhead
Susan Schlomann - Resident of Smithtown
Linda Ogno - Employee/John J. Foley Nursing Home
Nancy Dallaire - Employee/John J. Foley Nursing Home
Arlene Forwand - Suffolk County League of Women Voters
Other Interested Parties

Verbatim Transcript Prepared By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter

*(*The meeting was called to order at 2:10 P.M. *)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Good afternoon. We'll start the Health & Human Services Committee with a Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Vilorio-Fisher.

Salutation

Okay, good afternoon. Okay. I do have some cards here, we'll start with the public portion. And I see we have the Supervisor of Riverhead is with us today, Mr. Walter; so if you would like to come up first. And I believe you have someone with you. I'm drawing a --

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Mason Haas, the Town Assessor.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, I did know that. However, if you would like to go ahead. Public portion is three minutes. So Mr. Walter, welcome.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I'll try to keep it brief. Thank you for allowing me this time. Sean Walter, I'm the Riverhead Town Supervisor. I'm here to discuss the sex offender trailer in Riverhead. I think everybody understands what the issues are. And Anna Throne-Holst, the Supervisor from Southampton I believe is on her way to discuss this as well.

I'm urging you to support County -- the County Executive's resolution, 2103 of 2010. This institutes a voucher system. Legislator Browning, I come from the same, similar type of district you have. It is not right; you all know this, I know it, the residents of Riverhead know it. It is not right that the residents of Southampton and Riverhead have all the sex offenders throughout the entire County coming to live in trailers that I've personally visited two or three times. They are inhospitable, they don't have showers, and I won't let them hook-up to my sewer treatment plant, quite frankly. It isn't right they get on a bus, they come to my downtown area and shower, and they're not locked up, they're free to roam downtown.

We've arrested them for urinating. We had one that urinated in front of the Police Department. We don't mind doing our fair share, okay, we accept our fair share. We accept that if the trailer is to remain in some fashion, that it is only for Southampton and Riverhead residents, but it cannot be the case any longer. It just cannot be the case that we continue to do what we are doing. It is irresponsible, it is physically -- financially inefficient, and quite honestly, it's more dangerous. If Nassau County can use a voucher system, if Westchester County can use a voucher system for these sex offenders, then we certainly can use a voucher system. We cannot continue down this path.

And I'm asking you -- there are two resolutions on the table, one laid down by Legislator Romaine, and I believe Legislator Schneiderman was part of this, which was Resolution 2103 of 2010. The alternative to the sex offender voucher system is the CHI proposal, and I can tell you that is crap. Because what's going to happen is these -- CHI is going to come into every one of your Legislative -- I already know where mine's going to be, it's probably going to be shared with Anna Throne-Holst. I'll fair out better with this but you all won't, because it's they're coming to a neighborhood near you. And if you can't do -- it's only a matter of time before something is done. If you don't do the vouchers where we disperse them into the villages and into the towns, you're going to have one of these homes where five or six people live in every town. And I know that's --

Timer Beeped

I'll wrap it up in a minute. I know that's not going to be politically palatable. Supervisor Throne-Holst and I -- I mean, I hate to say it -- we are going to be on the phone with every Town Supervisor in the next couple of weeks to talk to them about the CHI resolution. So your alternative is a voucher system where they're dispersed throughout the neighborhoods -- I understand people don't like that, but they're not centrally concentrated -- or you're going to wind up with what we have and it's not a good thing. So we urge you to vote to take the voucher system off the table, send it to the full Legislature, and I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Hold up a minute. You know, I'm glad that you appreciate the concerns I have for my district also. And the voucher system, I could name two hotels right now in the Shirley/Mastics area where a homeless sex offender could ultimately wind up, and they're both near residential communities.

The CHI plan is, you know, to house the homeless sex offenders in industrial sites, not in residential communities. And I think while none of us want to do anything about it because, you know, we all have the same feelings about these individuals, you know, is it fair now to put -- I can tell Legislator Lindsay had a motel in his district where homeless sex offenders were placed, that was right next to a residential community. So is that -- you know, is the CHI plan and the plan that Department of Social Services has been directed to, isn't that better than having them in motels next to homes?

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

My personal opinion is that it is not and here's why. The minute you try -- hey, take it to EPCAL; you can't get more industrial than EPCAL, take it to EPCAL. You will have people coming out of the woodwork that you've never met before trying to block this, from the Town Supervisors right on down, and it will be very difficult to site these particular hotels. And I understand the concern with the sex offenders going to specific hotels and making them -- we have them, too, they're right on West Main Street. But the problem here is what you've done is you've burdened my town with all of your sex offenders, and I can't have that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, but I don't think we have burdened -- we are very much in support of closing down those trailers. Specifically, you know, we understand the burden on your communities and that it's gone on for too long. However, we have come up with a solution. Legislator Lindsay -- and Bill, I know you're here -- has come up with a bill requiring DSS to find housing throughout the entire Suffolk County which would equally distribute the sex offenders. And out of fairness to everyone, everybody, like you said, everybody has to do their fair share.

So, you know, the problem is that plan has not been implemented. /and I believe it was October when that was to be implemented and they were to start doing this, and here we are it's December. But I know Legislator Vioria-Fisher has a question for you, or a comment.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Can I just respond to that?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Sure.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I understand that. I've been meeting with the County Executive with Anna, Supervisor Throne-Holst, and I know she had work session today, multiple times with our Town Assessor. We believe the vouchers will be the more politically palatable thing for the residents and the neighborhoods. But we -- if we can't get the vouchers, then we urge you to take both of them off the floor.

I didn't -- our Legislator Romaine asked us, because we don't like to the CHI plan as much, he asked us, "Do you want us to pull this back," and I said, "No, leave it here." Because the County Executive has basically told us and CHI has told us they want to know that the Legislature supports this before they invest a lot of money trying to find these homes, and you can understand their hesitancy when they start to spend money and all of a sudden the Legislature is not behind them. So then I urge you to take both of them off the floor -- well, not off the floor, send them both to the full Legislature.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Vivian?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Good afternoon, Supervisor Walter. And thank you for coming down, and I know it's been a long trip many times made by you and your fellow Supervisor. But I'm concerned about a statement that you made, because I have been very much on the side of fairness and understanding the burden that you've been asked to carry on the east. And it wasn't one that was placed there by the Legislature, just so that that's absolutely clear; that was done by the County Executive and not by the Legislature. But let me finish.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Okay.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

But I'm very, very concerned to have you come before us and tell us that you're going to lobby Supervisors to work against 2105.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I absolutely am going to lobby Supervisors to support either my first preference is the voucher system, because I think as a Supervisor -- you guys sit here, I understand that.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

But let's look to 2105 because --

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

But as the Supervisors, we're where the rubber hits the road. These people, the residents come out and yell at us twice a month every month. And if you're a Town Supervisor and they're going to try to site a CHI near you, you're going to be speaking against it. And that's why I think from a Supervisor's standpoint, from a Town Council standpoint, it is more palatable to have vouchers, and I think that's why you have them in Nassau County and you have them in Westchester.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, but I want to go back to the statement that you made about 2105 which is the siting by CHI, and it sounded to me as if you were going to have a negative campaign regarding that with Supervisors. And I really think if you're coming to us to say it should be a shared burden through all ten towns or all 18 Legislative Districts, then it seems incongruous to me that you would say that you're going to lobby against the CHI plan with Supervisors.

And I don't want to have the discussion about vouchers again, I want to talk about the CHI plan because that was something that was put on the table by this Legislature with the Presiding Officer as lead. So we, in good conscience and out of a sense of fairness, have supported the Presiding Officer's legislation because it seemed to be a vehicle to have a shared burden through all 18 Legislative Districts. So I really find it very disconcerting for you to come here and say that you're going to lobby against this with Town Supervisors, I don't understand and that doesn't make sense

to me.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

As I said to you, and I'll try to clear this up, my preference is the vouchers. I will take CHI, but if I --

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Then why lobby against it?

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

But if the Legislature does not choose, if this committee does not choose to send this to the full Legislature, either one or both of these, then I'm going to go to the Supervisors with Anna Throne-Holst -- she's not here to speak, I don't want to put words in her mouth -- but I am going to go to the Supervisors one at a time and explain to them what it means to have a CHI home, what it means to site -- I'll give you an example.

I have a group home for men on West Main Street and they lost their Federal funding, and they sent letters out to all the elected representatives to ask various Federal representatives to give the funding back. And some of them, the Supervisors called me and said, "Well, do you want us to do that?", and I said no. We've been there 75 times last year, we've made multiple felony arrests, and I think the Supervisors understand.

I mean, I am the Police Commissioner as well as the Supervisor, so maybe I deal a little bit differently with the Police than a regular Supervisor does, but they are going to understand they're not going to want this, it's going to be a very difficult thing to site. Vouchers are going to be a whole lot less difficult to deal with. So I support the vouchers, but I do support the CHI; I support the vouchers as my primary choice.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Eddington.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, I don't think you would have to tell any Supervisor or any Legislator that it's a difficult lift. We had a homeless shelter for families that was being planned in my community --

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I know.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

-- and there was a hue and cry, so we all understand that. And I think it does --

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

And I commend you. I know you supported that and I commend you for your efforts.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

It does all of us a disservice for Supervisors to go out actively lobbying against this with other Supervisors, that's my point.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I appreciate that, but that's the American way. I need you guys to move this off, that's part of democracy. I need you to move this off -- well, not the table. I need you to move it to the --

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

If we move it off to the General, you're saying you're going to lobby against it.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

But if you don't move it -- what are my options? If you don't move this up to the full Legislature for a vote, what are --

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

What we're trying to say is if you want the fair and equitable distribution, then I say --

MS. ORTIZ:

Your mic is off.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

-- silence would be the most golden way for you to go on this, because you would be turning people against something that would be helping your community.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

So then I take it that this body, this subcommittee is going to move one or both of these to the full Legislature, because if you don't do it, it dies here. It has to happen. I cannot have this, Supervisor Throne-Holst cannot have this die here. This today, one of the two of these -- and again, my preference is vouchers -- one of the two of these has to be moved today. So if one of the two of them is moved to the full Legislature, then I'm very happy; but if it isn't, then I have to lobby. If you have any other questions?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah, there's a couple more. Jack?

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yeah. You know, I heard what you said about the trailers and you basically said that they're really not humane conditions. But at the same time, I mean, you said, "But I'm not going to allow them to hook-up to the sewer system."

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Absolutely not.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

So I don't know, maybe it's just because I'm a social worker, but those two things seem to be in conflict. You could make it better, but you choose not to, even though it would only be --

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

That's not really accurate, sir.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Well, let me finish my inaccuracies then. So that it seems like a conflict, because even if you did something temporarily to help the people that you're concerned about, because you're saying that it's not a real great place to live, and then when you say -- you know, talk about political palatability; I have to tell you, I hate that. I don't know if anybody else hates it, but I hate it. I'm more into fair and humane. I don't care anymore about politically the right way to do it. Do the best for the people. And Legislator Lindsay has come up with something that seems to be fair and humane, the problem is we are trying to motivate the other branch of government to do it. But this isn't about politics, this is about homeless people that we want to help. You could help them right now by allowing them to get into the sewer system, but you're not going to.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

No, you're inaccurate, sir.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

You're just going to come here and tell us what we can do.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Sir, you're inaccurate.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Well, it wouldn't be the first time.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

You've done -- your trailer is in the Wild & Scenic Recreation Rivers Act. You violate the DEC regulations, you violate your own Suffolk County Health ordinances. If I were to hook that up, I would be violating those same ordinances. You're violating the law with your trailers.

Suffolk County contributes 75%. Now, we'll have this conversation, sir, since you raised the issue. Twenty-five percent of the flow into Riverhead Sewer District comes from you all, Suffolk County, and you pay about 17% of the rate. I'm already over burdened by your jail and everything else. I'm not going to take any more into my sewer district. If you want me to do it, give me the 25, 26%, legalize it with the New York State DEC and your own Suffolk County Health Department and then we can talk, but you haven't done that. I'm sorry, I didn't mean this to be a debate.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

No, it's okay. Presiding Officer, the Presiding Officer has a comment or question.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, Mr. Supervisor, some of your comments are inflammatory, all right? It's as simple as that. If you don't want the County facilities in your town, maybe you don't want the revenue that it brings into your town either. You don't think that's an economic engine, all those people that flow through your town?

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Which, the jail?

P.O. LINDSAY:

All the people that work at the jail, all the people that work at the County Center, all the people that visit those sites.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Sir, have you been to my downtown Main Street?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, I have. We're out there six times a year, we go down there and eat every time we go there.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Do you see a lot of people walking on my Main Street? This is not about my Main Street. This is about you all sitting here moving one or both of these to the full Legislature, that's what this is about; don't lose site of that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, and let's get back to the issue then. First of all, I resent that you're the only one that hears from the public; every time we meet here the public comes to talk to us. So don't put yourself on a pedestal and make a martar out of yourself.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Don't be ridiculous.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm not being ridiculous.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

You're being ridiculous.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You're the one that made the statement, I didn't.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Sir, with all due respect --

P.O. LINDSAY:

But let's go back to the bill that I sponsored, all right.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Okay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What it called for is that the burden be spread throughout the County; I don't think you could object to that.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I don't object to that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. That they be in non-residential settings; I don't think you object to that.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I don't object to that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

That there be 24/7 supervision of these people. It's as close to house arrest as we can get; I don't think you object to that.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I don't object to that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But you'd rather have a voucher system where somebody checks into a hotel without the neighborhood knowing they're there, without any supervision in residential areas.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I would rather you do your job and let the Suffolk County --

P.O. LINDSAY:

I did do my job. You know what some of my colleagues told me? "Leave it go, they're out in those trailers"; I didn't do that.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I understand that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I didn't leave the burden on you. I fought for this bill to be passed, it passed, and now the Executive Branch refuses to implement it.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

You guys, what you have done is you're pitting me against -- well, the Exec -- I'm not involved in this between the Executive and the Legislature.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Then what are you doing here?

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

I am here to get one or two of these out of this committee. And it was my Legislator Romaine that laid 23 -- 2103 on the table, at my request he did this, so that if we can't get the vouchers -- which again, I think would be more politically palatable. If you can't --

P.O. LINDSAY:

It's the worse system, the worst system.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Okay, then that's fine. Then I expect from this committee, then, what I'm hearing is that 2103 is going to go to the full Legislature.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do you know the original legislation did not require that the vendor come back to us, and it was designed that way for a reason. Our Social Services Department ignores that fact, our County Executive ignores that fact.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Well, sir, from my understanding --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Romaine has in good faith submitted this resolution that we maintain we don't need, but we'll probably act on it, though.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Well, my understanding, and I could be wrong, is that when you have one bid, that it goes back to the Legislature or it has to go to a waiver process. The County Executive has said to me that CSI -- CHI does not want to go to a waiver process because they don't want the rug pulled out from under them.

All I'm asking in this whole three minute conversation, all I'm asking is one or both of these be moved to the full Legislature for a vote, because we cannot continue down the road we're on.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We heard you.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

And that's it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We heard you.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

That's all I'm asking.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We heard you loud and clear.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Mr. Walter. And I guess we have -- did you have a question?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll save it for later.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Mason is probably geared to get up here.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, next we have Mason Haas.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Just don't tell us you're advocating us passing something or you're going to lobby against it and you'll be fine.

MR. HAAS:

Hello. I know all of you, you have all seen me. My name is Mason Haas, I'm Town Assessor of Riverhead. Prior to being Town Assessor I was just a citizen and I became actively involved in the trailer issue, as many of you know from way back. I'm aware of Legislator Lindsay's bill that he passed, I remember being there speaking in support of your bill at the time, okay?

I am here today because, you know, we're at a situation and realistically. But one of the first things I want to talk about is Legislator Eddington's bill that's also before you today, 1939, if I'm not mistaken. I want to speak fully in support of that because that is an issue that we have to deal with where he calls for notification by 11:59 AM. He speaks to the fact of the problem with us having homeless sex offenders that are not using the trailer and then not checking in as to where they are, and he makes a requirement that they have to notify the County by 11:59 or else there will be legal action taken. I am in support of that bill and so is the Town of Riverhead, and Town of Southampton in conversations with them, as well as many of the public people who live in that area.

The issue we have really, Ladies and Gentlemen, is simply this. We have this bill, you know, the CHI and the concern is this on the CHI bill, because you saw it happen with Legislator Gregory's district where they attempted to find an area and they found a spot and then everybody came out. And the question is here plainly is with the CHI bill, and I applauded the CHI bill, I supported it, I

liked the idea of six. It's time that the County steps up and possibly be the model for all the other states to follow because it's a problem everybody has. All the other states, you see it in Florida, they're living under the overpasses, on the highways, Probation has a problem tracking them because of these situations. There needs to be hand-in-hand work between whatever the solution is and also the probation requirements that are being placed on them by the courts, there has to be amendments done at that level also, but we have to go somewheres.

And yes, we have talked about the voucher system, and actually one of the biggest issues regarding the voucher system was the fact that they were going to be out there and nobody knew where they were. Legislator Eddington's bill does take care of that because now he makes it a requirement of that.

Let's go back to the CHI bill. The question here is what happens if we approve the CHI bill? We're for the CHI. We would rather see everything come forward together with a closure on each one of these so that one or the other enacts and kicks the other to keep it moving forward. Because it's simply, you know, we're going to turn around and they come out and they find a location and everybody in the neighborhood turns around and complains, then where are we?

Legislator Fisher, you saw it happen in your own neighborhood, I believe it was a CHI you were working with, and everybody came out and what happened? So where do we go there? We have a couple of neighborhoods that are being burdened with this problem and we're looking for answers as to how to resolve it. So if there was a way of possibly bringing both bills forward, you know. And I understand the concerns of what the voucher system did, I wasn't for the voucher system, I was for -- oh, this button. You guys need a toggle switch where it will just turn it on.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I know, it would work a lot better.

MR. HAAS:

I know, everybody's hurting plenty. But, you know, we have a problem, we're running into it. Right now we're going to spend over a million dollars. I'm Town Assessor, all right? I know I have people coming in every day, as you people are getting the phone calls, all talking about the problems of being able to afford their taxes. We're spending over a million dollars on these trailers.

Yeah, the voucher does look good. Because if you do the voucher system, and say we have an average of 20 people over the course of the year a day staying there, at 365 days, that's coming out to just under \$700,000 to do the voucher system and done. We don't have to worry about security, we don't have to worry about food, we don't have to worry about transportation, and under Eddington's bill they have to call in.

We need to try to find a way of coming to closure because this is a four-year old issue. Yes, you guys didn't place the trailer there, I don't hold you responsible for that. You didn't put them there, you didn't sneak them in. I'm the guy that turned around and took the press and local Legislators through the woods coming in through the opening in the fence showing how they can go out, and we still have the same problem. There is no oversight of them during the day. They get transported to their local DSS office that they work out, that they have to check in at that has their file. And then what do they do after there? I'm there for a couple of hours, well, I'm off and running, nobody is watching them. Okay.

You know, the recidivism rate, everybody screams about it and stuff like that. I've read article after article. Ms. Browning, I've sent you issues on that, you know, articles on that and everything like that, studies that have been done. There's problems. Even the women who's son was kidnapped years ago, she's even saying the same thing; we're coming out with too many laws and what's

happening is we're creating our own problem.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Uh-huh.

MR. HAAS:

And now we need to resolve the problem. Can we rescind all those laws and just go by the State law and operate under that? Not really. You guys, you're in a bad spot because then everybody's complaining and screaming at you. So if there's a way to bring bills forward and run them parallel and with a definite answer, so let's say the voucher system comes in, the trailer's got to be out in 30 days, decommissioned in 30 days. CHI comes in, 30 days trailers have to be done, because then they're going to come back to you that we've got to find the locations.

And yes, I agree with you, Legislator Lindsay, what you said. One bid came in, it doesn't take you guys to make that decision, all right? You're being thrown out there. We turned around, and I'm going to be straight up, we had a press conference, Legislator Schneiderman was there, and prior to that press conference we got a phone call from the County Exec's Office saying this and that and this and that, and what I said and what we said was, "Let's have a meeting." And I wanted Legislator Lindsay there, Schneiderman, Romaine, I wanted a couple of people from this committee there, I wanted DSS there, I wanted people from the news there and some local community people who have been very active in this, along with the Town Supervisors, to turn around so we don't have this he said/she said, he said/she said going back and forth. Four years later, and that's only since I've become involved, and the trailers are five, six years old, I think. We need to come to a closure on the thing.

John, you've been out there -- and I call him John, Ladies and Gentlemen, because he worked at the County Center with me, we've known each other a long time. We had that big thing out there in Riverhead, same as what they had in Babylon and the public comes out. So how do we resolve it? Explain it to me, somebody, let's resolve it. That's what I'm looking for, that communication. We need to come up with something that will work for everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

First, Mason, thanks for coming out today. I think we understand your frustrations. We didn't create this problem, as we know. The community in Riverside was never asked if it would accept this location, it just showed up one day, you know? Not like these other sites you're talking about being controversial, the community is going to come out. You didn't know about it, you would have come out, too.

MR. HAAS:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There would have been a mob scene, right, if this being proposed.

MR. HAAS:

Yes, there would have been.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We have been struggling at the Legislative level -- which this, frankly, doesn't belong at, it's an administrative function -- we have been struggling to try to correct this problem. The most difficult

challenge for me, having both of these in my district, is I've got to get a bunch of Legislators who aren't elected by the people in my district to support this at their own risk. And thank God we've had enough people who were able, you know, to look at this and saw the unfairness and we stood together, we mustered up ten, eleven votes, got a veto from the County Executive, we got enough votes to override it because we had 12 Legislators who said, "You know what? This is wrong. It could have been me, I could have been the Legislator that got all the County's homeless pedophiles and sexual predators," and we stood together with a plan that was a good plan. It approached the issue from the standpoint of fairness, no more than six per, tops. Right? We were not going to congregate, we were going to spread it out, no more than one per township or Legislative District, 24-hour surveillance; all the things we were missing that Riverhead has been suffering with. You don't have any of those things, you've got 20, you don't know what kind of surveillance you have.

Some of the services in terms of job placement and rehabilitation, you have people who have been living in that Riverside trailer for years, right?

MR. HAAS:

Oh, yeah, it's not temporary.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's not temporary housing, it's permanent housing. So, you know, the idea of any homeless housing is to get people out of homelessness, to get them into permanent housing. It's failing, right? It's not happening. So we came up with a plan, we looked at the voucher program. The voucher program last time was that this body got two votes, and I was one of the Legislators who supported it, I understand it. Have the prospects for the voucher program improved? I'm afraid not.

MR. HAAS:

Well, the only thing --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me just finish.

MR. HAAS:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So the support isn't there; I wish it were. Maybe that system is fairer because there aren't these specific sites, but I don't see it happening. So what do we have? We have this other program and a fragile amount of votes to surpass, to pass it; this new program, implementing this. I thought October 15th was the deadline, we were going to have it, I thought DSS was going to put this program in place; it didn't happen. For some reason it's back here where it never should be to begin with, but it's back here. And I'm hoping that we have the votes to put the CHI plan in place, I don't know. That's why I think some Legislators are nervous when we hear the Supervisor and others saying, "Well, you know, we might advocate against the CHI plan". That's scary because we know how fragile that is. If we end up with neither -- it seems to default constantly to using these trailers which don't even meet the State's standards for housing the homeless.

So I don't know what else to tell you, but it's fragile and I think -- you know, we'll see how the vote goes. I'm hoping we at least can implement the CHI plan, they'll vote on the voucher program as well. But hopefully there's an end in sight for this.

MR. HAAS:

One of the concerns we did have --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I just point out one thing, that there also are bills, I have bills today to decommission that Riverside trailer, remove it from the site.

MR. HAAS:

Okay, I haven't seen that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

As well as the West Hampton trailer.

MR. HAAS:

Oh. We keep trying to decommission it

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And I think, you know, being that the October 15th deadline has come and gone --

MR. HAAS:

Can we just drag it out? Then it's gone, it's decommissioned (*Laughter*).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, decommission it. And then, again, DSS, the County Executive, they've got to find another alternative, but that would send a message that the trailer is not an acceptable program. And I think those are important bills as well.

MR. HAAS:

Understand the Supervisor's concern and the people of Riverhead's concern, too, is that CHI could be, simply, again, the same problem where you can't get approval, just as what just happened just trying to get a homeless, one for a homeless -- set up for homeless people, not sex offenders, couldn't get through. And now we end up with this going on for another year, we're still stuck with the trailers. Okay?

The voucher program? Yes, there were problems with the voucher program. But, however, along with the voucher program, the voucher bill last time when it came around, there was the bill that Legislator Lindsay produced that turned around and made hotels and motels put certain restrictions on them where they had to notify people in the neighborhood, they had to notify people when they called up for reservations and they had to put, you know, more or less a sign up.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

But Mason, what permits were issued for the current trailers?

MR. HAAS:

Excuse me?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

What permits were issued by the Town of Southampton for the --

MR. HAAS:

Oh, none.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. HAAS:

No, no, no permits were issued. No, the trailers --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So you're worried it's going to take a long time to get these new facilities permitted when the old ones have no permits.

MR. HAAS:

Unless you guys bring a court action against the County Exec's Office to force this issue, we're going to have that -- I could see this going on. I'm here for you's now with you guys. I'm coming up to run again, that's how long it's been going on. I'm a four-year term and I'll dealing with this again, and that's where we're at.

So like I say, that's the question; what happens if you can't -- you know how the opposition comes out. Legislator Browning, in your district, what are you going to do? What are you going to do? You're in a tough situation, you and I have talked about this.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I am not -- yes. And I will tell you, I will not support vouchers, because I know the motels and I know the homes in Gordon Heights where those vouchers will go and it's already overburdened. It's not appropriate to put them in residential communities.

MR. HAAS:

I agree --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

And those motels are in residential communities.

MR. HAAS:

I agree with you 100%. So if they come to you and CHI says, "Well, we got one in your district," a location, will you --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It will be in an industrial site.

MR. HAAS:

Yes, it will be an industrial site. But however, we did try an industrial site once before at Babylon and look what happened; somebody created a little park or something and now all of a sudden that was that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

However, when you -- you know, Jay spoke about getting the support; I absolutely support what Jay is trying to do, it's not fair. And equal distribution is the only way to do it, and I have continually supported Jay and I've continually voted for him.

And I'll tell you, one of the biggest problems is is that I've had three elections. My first election, when I ran for the first time, I did not use sex offenders as an issue to run, it was inappropriate. Because there's not one of us who disagrees with the issue, we all feel the same way. However, the second and the third time, I got hammered, being accused of putting sex offenders in my district, which is absolutely outrageous. And this is where it's all coming from, is we have people who ran for office and decided that this is a great issue to run on and beat up your opponent. And it's just raised so much animosity and it's raised so many problems that now for each and every one of us, if we're going to do anything on the sex offender issue, then you're wrong. And then I'm sure next

time around, if I support, you know, putting sex offenders in a resident -- sorry, not a residential, but in an industrial community, area, yeah, I'm going to get beat up for it.

But you know what? There is no easy solution to the problem. And the problem is is that there's too much politics in play with this issue and that's something that has to stop on every side of the aisle; and when that stops, then we can even result the problem. But we have Legislators here who say, "I'm not going to touch that because I'm -- they're going to use that against me in my campaign." We want to help you. You're running next year? We want to --

MR. HAAS:

I'm not planning on making this a campaign issue, believe me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

But we want -- we want to help you in your district but, you know, your concern will be, "These trailers are still in my district and my opponent is going to use it against me," and that's where the problem is, is that it's being used way too much as a political issue. We have to resolve the problem, we all have to stick together and it needs to stop.

MR. HAAS:

Okay. Well, let me ask you this. There's been two Supreme Court rulings, one in New York and one in New Jersey, and they both dealt with the same things.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are you using the mic?

MR. HAAS:

This button; I've got it down. I speak loud, don't I?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, I can't hear you.

MR. HAAS:

Okay. There's been two Supreme Court rulings, one in New York and one in New Jersey and both of them dealt with the same thing about sex offenders, homeless sex offenders, and they actually were a court case where it worked it's way all the way up there and it was a sex offender that brought the court action. And both rulings were pretty much still the same; they said that the local town and County laws that are being adopted can't override the State laws. Because that's one of our biggest problems, we have so many local town and County, everybody is trying to protect their turf, we're all adopting things and we're creating the problem.

Now, if CHI comes in, what laws are they going to be able to work under? Are they going to have to work under the Suffolk County laws or are they going to be required to go by the State laws, and will you support them going by the State laws? Because you're going to be -- again, you're going to be in a tough situation because you're the Legislators. So understand where I'm coming from there; that's one of the things.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

They have to abide by Local Law and, you know, one which I'm very proud of is schools, day cares and playgrounds.

MR. HAAS:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

What industrial site is that close to a school, day-care or playground?

MR. HAAS:

Well, I opened up a day-care center in my --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

There may be day cares.

MR. HAAS:

Somebody can open up a day care center right in an industrial site. Let's be realistic, they're business and somebody could turn around and say, "Okay, you know what? Run an office." As a matter of fact, when I came here and talked about the Dennison Building, "Oh, there's a day care center downstairs." And I happen to know for a fact, that day care center hadn't been used for years when we turned and said, "Well, why don't you house them here?"

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

No, it isn't.

MS. ORTIZ:

It is very active.

MR. HAAS:

What's that; is it very active?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, it is.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

It's used.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

It is used.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It's used every day.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I saw the kids there last week.

MR. HAAS:

Okay, because I -- now, I'm going back four years ago at that time. You know, I don't believe it was used that often.

MS. ORTIZ:

It's still active.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Well --

MR. ZWIRN:

And the County Executive said you could put a trailer there if there wasn't the --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, we can't have cross conversation here. But we appreciate you coming in and we do respect, you know, your concerns. And again, I've supported Jay and we'll continue to support and make sure that what's being done is done right.

MR. HAAS:

Well, when you look at the voucher one, okay -- because again, somewhere is long closure. The hotels have been taken out of the picture by Legislator Lindsay's bill that he passed before, and he protected the hotels and motels under that bill; am I correct? You passed that bill, turned around it was a bill you had passed that said that notification by the -- if you were to let a sex offender stay there, did that pass?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, it passed.

MR. HAAS:

Okay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But that's to protect the other residents that stay at that facility.

MR. HAAS:

Well, that's my point. Yeah, that's my point, but it also would be the same thing as, you know, neighborhoods from the residents. And I'm not saying you would put them in there.

You guys are a committee, look at everything you have and let's try to come forward with something out of this. Because that's the concern, that the CFHI will take forever because of all the other lawsuits that will happen and we're just looking for closure. And if you attach a 30-day thing or whether you bring an action against the County, something to get something resolved.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We appreciate your comments. And like I said, we will work together and stick together on this issue.

MR. HAAS:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

MR. HAAS:

Thank you very much for your time, everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Next we have Susan Schломann.

MS. SCHLOMANN:

Good afternoon. Thanks for letting me come today. I wanted to share a little information on the Foley Skilled Nursing Facility and that issue of what the future will be.

I was trying to find a little more information on it, and I did find that there's a concern about the potential buyer, Kenneth Rozenberg. And I found a newspaper article raising a concern about a nursing home run by this man, the Williams Bridge Manor Nursing Home in the Bronx. And it was cited in the article, in 19 -- in 2007 as having a fairly bad score Statewide, so I thought I would

check that out.

In 2007, the State scored -- the higher the score the worse the rating. The State average was negative 17, the Foley Nursing Home score was negative 36 and the Williams Bridge Manor Home was negative 25; Foley was worse that year. In '08, the State average was negative 15, Foley was negative 32 and Williams Bridge Manor was negative -- excuse me, 12. Last year I'm going to tell you about, '09, the State average was negative 20, Foley's score was negative 278, as I told you last time, and Williams Bridge Manor's score was negative six. In two of those years, Williams Bridge Manor score was better than the State average, and in the third year, '07, it was better than Foley's score; in all cases it was better than Foley's score.

So I really hope you'll keep this in mind when you're considering mocking -- saying that the owner is not doing a good job. I want the people who are at the Foley home to be well cared for. As of April 1st this year, the Foley Nursing Home has a one-star rating for the State; it's in the 30% in the bottom; the Williams Bridge Manor has three stars, it's in the 40% in the middle. That's it.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you.

MS. SCHLOMANN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Linda Ogno.

MS. OGNO:

Hi. My name is Linda Ogno, I work at John J. Foley. I was going to first speak about Foley, but after sitting here and listening, I think we should maybe go forth with Mr. Lindsay's bill that was already passed and stuff like that about this

It seems to me, and I sit here and we've already -- this whole thing should have been already solved in the government. We've already had a great bill. To pass a voucher system which I think that would be a danger to our residents because you don't know where these people are. Mr. Lindsay seems to have hit it right on the head with a good solution, and I think we already have that solution, that we should go forth with it. And what's stopping us? Is Mr. Levy stopping it? I just wanted to know, because he maybe stops a few things there that this government -- this governing body has passed.

And now about John J. Foley. I like this lady's figures. I think she should come over and see us. Because most of the times when other nursing homes make their complaints, it comes from the residents and their families. We've stood here these last three years, we've had a lot of residents and families come up here and speak about us. I don't know, sometimes the State makes regulations and have come in to see us, but most of the time all our residents are very happy and so are their families. And any time anybody here wants to come out and visit us, please do. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Linda. And next is Nancy Dallaire.

MS. DALLAIRE:

Thank you for this opportunity. I have been here a few times to express my concerns for the closure or the sale of the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility. I have only spoken about the things I see with my eyes every day that I'm at the facility.

We have not been able to convince this County of the untapped potential that exists at this facility. And once again, this facility and the employees are not given the respect that they deserve. This institution that has evolved from the Suffolk County nursing home into the Skilled Nursing Facility that it is today, despite years of neglect and obvious mismanaged administrations. This facility and staff have remained committed to serving this community. The commitment and compassion from these County workers cannot be overlooked, but once again it is. Instead of this County being proud to have these hard working civil servants represent our County, they are notifying them that their positions with the County will be abolished. This is the treatment that these dedicated workers will receive from their years of service; shame on Suffolk County.

I thought we were searching for solutions. This institution that has handled a variety of needs for this community and this facility that is equipped to meet the demands of our future and we must anticipate those needs in our future. Remember, our troops will be coming home. Right now they are serving this country, preserving our government and way of life. We should have this facility waiting to serve them when they return. John J. Foley can meet their rehabilitation needs, regardless of what they are, and that they need to recover and return to their way of life. Why would we look to overburden the already over crowded health care facilities? John J. Foley already is available to serve this County. Why would we even consider getting rid of this vital health care center by closure or by sale when the people can only again be sure that this facility and all of its programs will continue for the next 100 years, then we will see what valuable this facility is to our County.

Given the attention and guidance required to operate properly and utilizing all of the programs that are essential to the success of John J. Foley, this facility can be the non-profit institution it was intended to be, not by being neglected and abolished. But with some effort, we can preserve this health care center and protect the vital programs that continue to support these citizens who depend on this incredible institution. Please, preserve these precious resources.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Thank you, Nancy. Okay. Commissioner Blass, did you have something before we get to the agenda? Did you want to come and speak in front of the committee?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Yes, thank you. Good morning -- good afternoon, Madam Chairman, Members of the committee. I just wanted to give you a head's up about a CN that's coming forward at the next meeting. And this involves a grant for the Social Services Child Care Block Grant of \$1.8 million, approximately, and this block grant is for the purpose of adding to our child care subsidy.

We have been trying to get this from the State for quite some time. They have, of course, for a variety of reasons up there, been delayed in the allocations; they finally got it to us. We could do without a CN, but the problem is that it has to be spent by March, and if it's got to be spent by March, the sooner we have access to it by your accepting and appropriating it the better. And so it's better that we have a CN do it than to wait for the regular cycle to accept this grant.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

You're talking about the CN for Child Care Block? I have that.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Right, I had it distributed before the meeting. That's all I wanted to ask you about that.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I don't think anybody is going to say no to money.

*(*Laughter*)*

Does anybody have any questions?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, Commissioner, we had a second response to the homeless sex offenders providers that needed a waiver because they were only approved for a family shelter. Where is that? We were going to get a waiver; what happened to it?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I attempted to get the waiver. I was just recently advised that the Waiver Committee would not entertain it because they don't have jurisdiction over that kind of a waiver.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Who has jurisdiction?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

The only way a waiver can be given to them, without going through an entire bidding process, is if the Legislature gave it to them.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So the whole thing is back on us again. Okay, I'll put in a bill. I'll put in a bill, lay it on the table. I'll lay it on the table Tuesday, that's fine.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

That was not my intention, but I will say that we do hope that there can be more than one plan.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, it was always our intent, mine and yours, that we would have multiple providers to provide this service.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

That's correct, and we want to have more than one. CHI will feel very -- I spoke to them today, in fact, they would feel very much comfortable if there were more than one. But this thicket that we've encountered with the restriction is unfortunate, I regret it sincerely. I only learned about the methodology of getting it approved and how the Waiver Committee was not appropriate within the last few days, and I apologize for the difficulty it presents.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, I'm glad somebody informed you because nobody informed me.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Bill, don't you sit on that Waiver Committee?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

If I could follow-up on that?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner, so this second responder, you're saying that a waiver could be granted by the Legislature. If that waiver were granted, then, there would be no need to come back to this body in terms of approving the plan and implementing the plan; is that correct? The only reason why you feel you would have to come back now is because there's only one respondent?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

No. The reason for -- your question is speaking to why a vote on the CHI plan is called for?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Uh-huh.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, because we had passed a bill that basically said, look, go out and develop a plan and implement it by October 15th. You came back and said no, we have to come back to the Legislature to approve it because there's only one respondent, and the County laws require --

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I would respectfully differ from that recollection of the sequence.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, go ahead, tell me the way you see it.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

The resolution did not say to implement it. But more importantly, the CHI plan seeks to have further Legislative approval because there are components in their proposed plan which are not covered in the enabling legislation. And they have, therefore, asked that the policy making body which set this process in motion also endorse the features of the plan such as the Community Governing Board which has the power to close a site if the Community Governing Board considers the site to have not functioned properly and in the public interest. That's one of several features of the plan that are not even mentioned in the enabling legislation.

So I would add to that a general point about the need for the second vote, and that is that the provider is going to be very uneasy proposing a plan and has met with silence by the policy making body saying we've done all we need to do. They're asking for this endorsement. And I would suggest the point you made earlier and that has been made in this committee several times, that the Legis -- that the department hasn't paid any attention or has not acted on the legislation is not correct. We have expended considerable effort.

We rallied the providers, we struggled to get more than one, we almost didn't get one to come forward with a proposal, and we got that proposal here. Unfortunately, it had the word "confidential" written across the paper, but that's not an issue and that's not to be regarded as binding, it's not confidential. And it was supposed to be a plan that is in harmony, as best we could, with what the resolution called for.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

If I could ask Counsel to chime in on two points. One, the plan did say, at least the amendment of it, what we approved had an implementation deadline. I don't understand how the Commissioner, you know, in his read, and he can explain it, but that what we approved did not require implementation of a plan; is that correct? And then obviously, the other point has to do with the, you know, minor differences in what the respondent provided compared to what the RFP or what the legislation dictated and whether that would require an amendment or anything action by this board to rectify that.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah. Legislator Schneiderman, we actually, you know, went over this I believe at the last committee meeting where the Commissioner came in and said they couldn't or wouldn't implement the plan. I believe the two resolutions that were passed, the original Lindsay resolution and your resolution, certainly authorized the department, if, they wanted to -- well, not if they wanted to, authorized them and directed them to implement a plan that came out of the RFP. The department disagrees with that; I can't speak to the reasoning or why they come to that conclusion.

In terms of the additional elements that are a part of the CHI plan, we -- in our legislation, we laid out three or four or five parameters that have to be followed, and as long as the CHI plan complies with what we directed, they're good-to-go, they don't have to come back to us for a resolution to give the imprimatur to the board or anything else. But, you know, this is a territory we've gone over before at prior committee meetings. You know, then we also raised the question, if you think another bill is needed, why don't you bring a bill over; they don't bring a bill over. You know, I don't know.

*(*Laughter*)*

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator -- oh, are you done?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Madam Chairman, may I --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

-- just make a brief comment? I wish that it was so simple that it was simply the department that didn't like it, but it's also the County Attorney's Office that's issued an opinion, it's also the County Executive's Office, it's also, most importantly, the provider itself has asked for it. They have a Board of Directors just as this County has a Board of Directors, and their policy making body has sought Legislative approval of this plan.

MR. NOLAN:

It's highly irregular --

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I'm almost finished, Counsel.

MR. NOLAN:

-- that a provider would come to us and say, "Do a resolution".

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Counsel, I'm almost finished. The only point I want to make is that if the plan is in furtherance of the policy that the Legislature has promulgated, why is an additional vote so problematic? That's what their board is asking us. I know some of the answer to that. But the point is that this is a difficult issue, we are really on the verge of doing one of two choices, they're both before us now, and that to us is progress.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Commissioner, for being before us. And I -- by some of your own definition, I believe I'm completely barred or precluded from voting on the resolution ratifying the CHI proposal because I believe you just said that it contains portions that were not in what the original letting is.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Right.

LEG. KENNEDY:

If we go out to the world to buy a dog and we're offered a cat, that doesn't mean that we can go ahead and say, "Well, it's an animal, we'll go forward with it." There's procurement rules and regulations that say what we seek, bidders must then offer, and then we decide with what's been offered. If all we have before us is a thing we didn't seek, we can't, after the fact, make it fit what we put in there to begin with. We can't vote to approve 2105.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I seriously question the accuracy of your analogy, because you did not receive back that which you did not seek, you received back substantially most of what you did seek and then some.

So you have both aspects of that point; you have substantially all what's in compliance with the bill that enabled the plan to be created and you have additional blanks, if you will, that the provider chose to fill because the enabling legislation left those blanks, and that's all well and good. The Legislative process may not work perfectly, but we're getting there. And what's important now is that there are choices before the Legislature and the department is prepared to proceed with whatever we can in the wake of those choices being made.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But by definition then, we would have to go back to the rest of the world and give them the opportunity to resubmit under the same enhanced parameters that CHI is now coming to us for. How could we -- how could we violate the letting process by agreeing to -- even if it was more, we didn't ask for more. We're getting more indifferent, it deviates from what we sought in the first instance.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

It only -- it does not deviate, it complies with what you sought initially and adds more, because what you sought initially in the eyes of the provider were not enough.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I -- well, look, nobody needs to go ahead and argue as far as where things go as far as our interpretation, and we can have some conversation after the fact. But I go back to the fact that I tend to believe the Presiding Officer's resolution was quite specific in the first instance and you have been charged with and given all the authority you need to go ahead, get the provider and engage in the function. If there's a County Attorney's opinion contrary to that, I would welcome seeing that. Our Counsel is telling us there's ample legal authority to go forward. And notwithstanding your decades of legal acumen, I don't purport to try to tell you the law, but help me out so I can read it and see the difference.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Well, the Counsel has issued his respective, esteemed opinion, the County Attorney has done likewise. The department has discussed this with the Executive and the Presiding Officer and the committee, and now we are at the stage where there are two choices, and certainly it is your prerogative to vote yes or no. But I would suggest that the County Executive's plan is the voucher plan, we stand behind that plan because it has worked, without incident, in many counties in this State, including our neighboring counties.

If the Legislature chooses to take an alternate route, as it has with a bill that the Presiding Officer submitted and the Legislature approved, that is their prerogative. We are now at the stage to wait until you act. But to suggest that the initial legislation and the one that followed are all that was needed, somehow the clarity of how you see that escapes the provider. The provider doesn't see it that clearly and doesn't find it to be a matter of legality. They are going to be even more reluctant if they don't -- if we're talking about the CHI plan, and maybe Haven House Bridges, if the waiver is granted to them. How anxious do you think they will be to go on to the most difficult feature of the process of all, which is site selection, when they don't have Legislative approval of how that site selection is done? There's no mention of how site selection is done in the enabling legislation, of how it's done, yet that is a crucial step to be taken in the implementation that we're talking about. And they won't feel very comfortable at all doing it if they are told that, "We gave you general parameters, now you're on your own." It's comparable to setting -- and I'm referring to an analogy I have shared with others before. It's like sending a ship on course and while under way, everyone -- not everyone, but a lot of the people on board take to the life boats, very quietly and wish good voyage to those still remaining on board and the ship just sails off to the horizon. CHI would not be comfortable on a ship like that, nor would anyone be expected to be.

So if the choice is as you say it is, then please make it for them. But again, we think the voucher plan would work, as it's worked elsewhere, without incident, without incident. And we also remind you that the voucher plan is also something that can be done soon, whereas the site selection process and the setting up of these facilities, while it shares the burden too, is going to take time. Yet again, this is the Legislature's choice and we hope that you'll make it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And I appreciate your trying to enlighten us, Commissioner. Through the Chair, I'm going to ask whether there is a representative from the County Attorney's Office here. If there is an opinion that's been furnished on this matter from the County Attorney's Office, I'd like to see a copy of it, please.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I think, Lynne Bizzarro, you're here; can you respond to this?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I would like to see a copy of that.

MS. BIZZARRO:

Yes, I do have a file and I was looking through it to see if the County Attorney ever issued a formal opinion in writing, and I do not see that.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

We're shocked.

MS. BIZZARRO:

Perhaps Commissioner Blass, you know, might state something contrary, but I know there were many discussions with our office on this.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Yes, we had one signed by Assistant County Attorney Gail Lolis, and I had distributed it to the committee, not at the last meeting, but I believe two or three meetings before that. I believe Counsel Nolan was privy to it as well.

MR. NOLAN:

I actually don't remember. I know that Gail Lolis came here and testified to the effect that more action was necessary by the Legislature. I don't remember if there was a written opinion to that effect.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I gave it the same day I gave the committee the letter from CHI requesting the vote that we're talking about.

MR. NOLAN:

It has been located.

MS. BIZZARRO:

Oh, it has. I was going to say, give me a minute and I'll look further. It has been located? Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, Legislator Vilorio-Fisher.

MR. NOLAN:

I'll get you a copy.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I had a question that I wanted to ask, but before I ask that question, I do have to say that in response to Legislator Kennedy, and to a few of the things that you said, Commissioner. When we have a resolution and a department has to send out an RFP and get bids, Commissioner, you said that you're perplexed by our resistance to having to file another resolution. I've seen us have many policy positions that have required departments to go out to bid. We don't have to come back here, and the reason we're balking at it is because it defies the process with which we're all familiar, and that's why there's been reluctance.

The second piece of that, and this goes to what Legislator Kennedy said, John, because of the nature of the resolution which was -- we were looking for an agency to create a plan with the Department of Social Services, then I don't see that that has the four corners within the resolution of what we anticipated the contractor to provide for us, and that's why there's more than we asked for because

we asked for a plan. So I don't see that there would have been any problem moving forward with CHI's plan because we had such broad parameters.

Now, if -- now I come to what I see what might be problematic. If we have a second bidder, are we going to have a problem with the process? Because 2105 is a resolution that directs the department to execute a contract with CHI. If we execute a contract with this first bidder, then what happens when there is a subsequent bidder? I'm very concerned that we're going to stop the process, so help me work through this, either Counsel or the Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I would only say that while we would welcome as many and actually sought as many to respond as we could, we only got one within the proper timeframe.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

The second one did not respond to us within the timeframe that we set; not a fatal flaw, but a point that we had to consider. And secondly, when they initially responded to the RFP that the bidding process that allowed these providers to do business with us, they specified they did not want to be a singles provider. So that's why some kind of waiver process has to take place for them. We have what we --

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, but that's not my question. My question is 2105 is directing you to execute a contract with CHI. The presiding -- I might have asked the question badly. The Presiding Officer has now indicated that -- well, you've informed us that the Legislature can provide a waiver to another agency who could then also bid on the project or execute a contract, and let me ask this question to Counsel because he's used to my convoluted way of asking questions.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

All right. But Legislator, may I ask you -- make one point about what you said? You said that usually it very simply works where a department is directed to submit something to bid and it's left there.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes, right.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

We would have been very pleased to proceed that way but for two complications. First, only one, with great difficulty, responded. And secondly, they, unlike all these other simple agency approaches that you alluded to, this particular respondent came back and told us, "Well, here's what we can do, but we can't do it unless we also do this, and this we don't want to go ahead with until we have a vote that supports it, especially since we're going to be asked to go into these Legislative District neighborhoods."

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

And that's the very unusual piece of this, it's very unusual.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I agree with you.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

And let's just say we might be suspicious about things. But Counsel, if, in fact, this Legislature were to grant a waiver to the second agency, what would then happen with the directive that we have in 2105 for the contract to be executed? How can we have an executed contract on a project and then invite a second bidder? I don't understand how this would work.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, I hate to do this, but I would ask the Commissioner a question. If the Legislature granted a waiver for another provider, what would the intention of the department be? What would you do at that point if we gave a waiver to another group, would you be looking to contract with that organization as well?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

We would be happy to see cooperation between the two contractors. In fact, CHI told me just today, because I asked this question in anticipation of this discussion, whether they -- and how they felt about an additional contractor and they were delighted at the idea to have someone to work with.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

So you can have more than one provider, you can contract with more than one provider.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

That is a legal question. I'm only going to tell you that yes, we would welcome a second provider.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Come on, Greg, stop. We always intended to have multiple providers, it's a legal question. The RFP was designed that we would get multiple providers.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

But it becomes a legal question because the second provider, welcome as he may be, didn't have the status as a singles provider.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Let me ask you something. The Babylon site that you guys picked, who was the provider going to be there?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

You mean the Farmingdale?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Farmingdale; isn't that in the Town of Babylon? I believe it is.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I'm sorry, I was thinking of Babylon as a community. It was going to be CHI probably.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Did we do an RFP for that site? Did we ask that to come back here for approval?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

We didn't have to.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No, you didn't, you just were going to contract with them.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Because we didn't have to, they were already a provider. Pursuant to the contract process, we didn't have to go out for bid.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So why are we going through this convoluted effort here now?

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

What's convoluted about it? I don't see it's convoluted.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What's convoluted about it? It's been going on for six months and you haven't moved the ball one inch. You've had the policy directive from the Executive Branch for six months and the Executive Branch has not done anything with it but throw road blocks in the way.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

I will respond to your point but I will use a civil tone. I will tell you now, as I've said before in writing, on telephone, in e-mails and elsewhere, that this department has consistently worked to make your resolution, as adopted by this Legislature, happen. No matter what you may want to say to cast dispersions on that point, it's absolutely true.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I disagree and I point to one aspect today. That only under questioning did you come forth with that we have to provide a waiver for the second provider. After I went out and solicited the second provider, you told me it was an easy process to get a waiver, then it was in the Waiver Committee, and only today under questioning did you say that you now have the legal opinion that the Waiver Committee can't provide that waiver.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

And that's because I was only recently provided that myself -- let me finish, and I was provided that myself. I asked could I have a County Attorney opinion to that effect and I didn't get it yet, so I had to wait and wait and finally I had to say it when I was questioned. But I gave you the information as I had it, I would liked to have had a County Attorney opinion to back it up.

P.O. LINDSAY:

This is the most convoluted conversation I've ever had in my life. Let's just get it over with. Let's just pass 2105, put the ball in their court to make them implement the policy that was passed by this Legislature.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, with that, any other questions?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Madam Chair, I'd like to make a motion to take 2105 out of order.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I guess we had a motion to take it out of order and a second by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'd like to make a motion to approve 2105.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

2105-10 - Authorizing and directing the Department of Social Services to enter into an agreement to house sex offenders (Romaine). The motion was made by Legislator Viloría-Fisher, seconded by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion, Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm going to restate what I just said before to the Commissioner. I'm reading both one of these resolutions right now and I believe that we do not have the legal authority to go ahead at this point to execute this with CHI because of the fact that they deviated from what the RFP was. I agree that we have to do something as far as providing these services, but I disagree respectfully with the Commissioner as far as what we're expected to go ahead and do right now.

I've just scanned this opinion from Gail Lolis and I find that there's points in there that I don't agree with. So I'm abstaining on this, not because I don't believe that we need to address this issue, but I do believe that either you had the authority to go ahead and execute it and you didn't need to come back to us, or you're asking us to ratify what was something that was beyond what the normal RFP process is. Because as Legislator Viloría-Fisher said, it is essentially unheard of that a department comes back to us to go ahead and ask us to ratify somebody that goes ahead and harvests scallops or goes ahead and takes care of cows or does anything else for us, but here we are back with this one in particular. I am abstaining.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy, I respectfully disagree with you. The original legislation set out parameters for a plan. It didn't write the plan, we asked vendors to come back with the plan.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm reading it.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

That's correct, I agree with you.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

We have a motion and a second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Abstain.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, one abstention, Legislator Kennedy. Okay. With that, the *motion has been approved (VOTE: 5-0-1-0 Abstention: Legislator Kennedy)*.

You know, I have to say, there was -- I believe we have an RFP bill. Legislator Romaine has a bill requiring us to approve RFP's, and I believe the County Executive seems to be absolutely opposed to any RFP's coming back for our approval. So I'm a little confused. It's --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Very convenient.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Very convenient is the word. So anyway, thank you, Commissioner. And I'm sure there will be no problems with that CN, accepting that \$1.8 million. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I don't want to go on. Dr. Tomarken is here from the Health Department; do you have anything you would like to report or any comments?

CHAIRMAN LAGUARDIA:

Nothing.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Any questions for Dr. Tomarken?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I have only one question, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I had a funny feeling there was. Doctor, if you could come up? Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. It's actually -- it's just a request. And I thank you for being at the Oversight Committee meeting the other day for John J. Foley, Doctor. I am going to plead with you to please task one of the staff there now to do the on-site recruitment and evaluation work that's necessary to accept residents into the facility.

I saw this morning we're at, I believe, 230 in total census. I know we have a total of six vacancies right now on our 4th floor, on our Alzheimer's Unit. Doctor, I know for a fact that there are eligible discharges from some of our community hospitals, and if there is a bed that can be utilized at Foley, to not fill it right now is unconscionable. So I'm going to ask you to please task somebody in the facility, and I believe it has to be a nurse who -- or a social worker who has the ability to evaluate an eligible admission, to please go ahead and do that.

COMMISSIONER TOMARKEN:

Certainly. And all our admissions are approved by the Medical Director and the Nursing Home Administrator together.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Which is -- I understand that in-house approval process, but we have spoken at length, Doctor, about the fact that there is a need to have one of our licensed folks at the facility, at the discharging facility, at the community hospital, to be able to accept that discharge into our nursing home. And again, I think it harmonizes and comports with good public health to free up the acute care bed and have the individual moved to the long-term residential bed.

COMMISSIONER TOMARKEN:

Yeah, we will pursue that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you. I appreciate that, Doctor. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. On another note, I mean, I just received some notification about the FQHC Board and really got no time to come up with some appointments. I think I'd like to talk to you some more about that, because I have been approached by some individuals who are interested in sitting on the FQHC Board. But again it was -- we received the letter and it was, "Give us somebody today." So what is your -- I mean, how much time can we have to really look at this and come up with --

COMMISSIONER TOMARKEN:

It's a two-stage kind of process. We have to get -- we have an application due December 15th, and so we have to get as many board members nominated at that time, but there still will be time after that because we won't have the entire board. And as each new facility is added there will be a change to the board composition.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. It's just that, you know, I do have people that were, you know, interested. I think I may, you know, know of a few people that are possibly qualified and eligible to sit on the board. But some of the other people that have reached out to me, I'm not sure if they're eligible so I need some time to reach out to them.

COMMISSIONER TOMARKEN:

Okay. So, I mean, it's a -- the more that we can present to {HERSA} as being board members, the better our case will be.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you. With that, any other questions? Nope? Okay.
So we will move -- thank you, Doctor. We'll move on with the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

We have ***1634-10 - Establishing community safeguards from registered sex offenders placed in emergency housing (Schneiderman)***. Do I have a motion? I'll make a motion to table.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, the only thing is -- you want to get a second to that? Because I did want to talk on this.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Eddington.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm behind you, Renee.

MS. ORTIZ:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Bill?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I know that, you know, the sponsor is walking out, he has to go get his kids, but this -- you know, we originally passed a reso to put GPS systems on and it was knocked down by the State. This legislation would -- it would give the sex offender the option of wearing a GPS or having an escort. I don't really think it's a bad piece of legislation. I think it goes along with my image of having them under 24/7 supervision. I mean, we could do whatever you want with it, but I don't think it's a bad bill, I really don't.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I think at this time I'd like to stay with my tabling motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I don't know if there's anyone -- Jack, are you?

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. And I think maybe I'll talk to the sponsor and maybe we'll revisit it next committee meeting. So I made a motion to table, second was Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

1820-10 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Stony Brook University Hospital Comprehensive Psychiatric Emergency Program (CP 4018) (Kennedy). Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, we have to table one more cycle. As a matter of fact, I spoke at length with the County Attorney's Office, there's a memorandum that's close to approval. So I'll table it till the next go around, hopefully we have an executed writing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. So that's motion to table.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

1886-10 - Authorizing a contract amendment to the Youth Development Delinquency Prevention Contract with the Suffolk Y Jewish Community Center (County Executive). I'll make a motion to table.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Viloría-Fisher. I don't know if there's anybody that can answer this question, but do we have other contract agencies where we have actually given them -- forgiven them the money that they owed us in the past? Nobody can answer? No. I was just curious. I don't think so. And this is a substantial amount of money that the County Executive is wanting to give back, it's \$778,000, so in this economy, I think if they didn't spend it probably we should be getting it back.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Have we voted on the tabling motion yet?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, we did.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I was going to say --

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

I made a motion to table and you seconded.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

-- we should do a motion to table subject to call.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

But I don't know if we called the vote; did we, Renee?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We did.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

On 1886?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yeah; I made the motion, or you did.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Say it again?

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

We didn't call the vote.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I'd like to offer a motion to table subject to call.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. I can second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, it's ***tabled subject to call (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)***.

2015-10 Directing the Department of Social Services to close the sex offender trailer in Westhampton, Town of Southampton (Schneiderman).

I guess I'll make a motion to table being that we can't do that right now until we get this other issue squared away. So I'll make a motion to table. Do I have a second?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)***.

2016-10 - Directing the Department of Social Services to close the sex offender trailer in Riverside, Town of Southampton (Schneiderman).

I guess same motion, same second, same vote. ***Tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)***.

2034-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law establishing a Food Policy Council for Suffolk County (Viloría-Fisher).

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Table for public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Oh, sorry. Okay. Motion to table for a public hearing. I'll second All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It's tabled for a public hearing (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)***.

2054-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law authorizing the County Executive to execute agreements for the sale of the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility (County Executive). I am making a motion to table. Do we have a second?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)***.

2063-10 - Amending the 2010 Adopted Operating Budget to transfer funds from Alternatives Counseling Center, Inc. Alternatives for Youth Program to the Project Outreach Alternatives for Youth Program.

(County Executive). Motion to approve.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

2064-10 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal grant funds from the United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, to the Department of Health Services for a Forensic DNA Backlog Reduction Program, FY 2010 (County Executive). Motion to approve?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Approve and place on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Yes, thank you. So the motion is approved. Second, Legislator Eddington. So it's been approved and placed on the Consent Calendar. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It's approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

2065-10 - Amending the 2010 Adopted Operating Budget to accept and appropriate 100% additional State Aid from the New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services for Eastern Suffolk BOCES to purchase Youth Development Surveys (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. *Approved and placed on the Consent Calendar (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

2073-10 - Establishing an automated calling policy prior to distributing rabies baits in Suffolk County (Stern).

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to approve, Legislator Viloría-Fisher. I guess I'll second. All in favor? Do you want to speak on that?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

This is just -- this is similar to the other reverse notification system that we had with the Vector Control, and it was indicated that there's certainly room and this is to include this.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you. So we did have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *It is approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).*

2103-10 - Restoring the voucher system and directing the Department of Social Services to close Riverside and Westhampton trailers (County Executive).

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to table subject to call.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Motion to table subject to call by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.
Do I have a second?

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Second, Legislator --

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

(Inaudible).

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

You want to?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Do you want to have a motion approve so we can fail it?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Table it.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:

Okay, so it is tabled subject to call. And the second is Legislator Eddington. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstentions? ***It is tabled subject to call (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).***

And I believe 2105 we have done.

With that, there is no more on the agenda. So motion to adjourn, Legislator Viloría-Fisher and
second Legislator Eddington.
We are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 P.M. *)