

## **SUFFOLK COUNTY CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION**

### **MINUTES**

A Public Hearing of the Suffolk County Charter Revision Commission was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on June 12, 2008.

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sondra A. Bachety, Chairwoman  
Arthur Cliff  
Ronald F. Devine, Jr.  
Victor Fusco  
Kathy Giamo  
Marlene B. Israel  
Edwin Perez

#### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Christine Malafi, Suffolk County Attorney  
Terrence G. Pearsall, Chief of Staff  
Arona Kessler, PO Office  
William Shilling, Aide to Presiding Officer  
Kara Hahn, Communications Director  
Debra Alloncius, AME Legislative Director  
Joe Dujmic, County Executive's Office  
Angie Carpenter, Suffolk County Treasurer  
Joseph Sawicki, Jr., Suffolk County Comptroller  
Vincent DeMarco, Suffolk County Sheriff  
Judith Pascale, Suffolk County Clerk  
Thomas Isles, Director, Suffolk County Planning Department  
Carl Lind, Chief Cartographer of Suffolk County  
And all other interested parties

#### **MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

**(THE HEARING COMMENCED AT 2:35 PM)**

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

We have a couple of members of the Commission who are in traffic on Route 111, but they should be here soon. So we're going to just open the meeting and get started.

Before we do that, I would like to enter into the record a letter that I received from County Executive Steve Levy.

"I wish to clarify my position that the separate elected offices of the Suffolk County Treasurer and the Suffolk County Comptroller should be consolidated. There are a number of large municipalities that do not have separate offices for the functions of the Comptroller and Treasurer. Consolidation into one office will not only save taxpayer dollars, but will also make government more efficient.

The one elected position should be that of the Suffolk County Comptroller. I hope this letter provides clarification."

And this a letter that I have given a copy to each of the members of the Commission.

I also received an e-mail from Steve Kenny who is a member of the Commission. And I'm going to ask the Comptroller and the Treasurer if they would just address his question at the end of their remarks.

He's not going to be here today. "Assuming a system of financial checks and balances requires separate departments of Comptroller and Treasurer and assuming it is desirable to elect the head of one of the departments and professionalize the other" -- as a side note that's kind of implying one of them isn't professional -- you don't have to include that, that was my comment, "which of the two departments should be headed by an elected official?"

And that's it. So those are the two that we have. And although we do not have a quorum at this moment, we will hear the testimony because all members of the Commission will be receiving the minutes and will have an opportunity to review the statements. And since we have elected officials here today, I certainly don't want to keep them waiting long.

So our first speaker of the day will be Angie Carpenter, Suffolk County Treasurer. And she will speak first.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Thank you Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. Listening to you recite that question I almost felt like a contestant for Miss America, but I'll get to that after the testimony.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

That's fine.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

I've asked -- we brought packets with some backup information on this issue of consolidation, elimination, if you will, of a myriad of elected positions as was presented in the testimony that we reviewed in the minutes.

As far as the Office of County Treasurer, this whole issue was brought to light again in the early part of 2006. There was a resolution introduced before this Legislature asking for a referendum on the issue of consolidating both offices under one elected position and eliminating the Office of the Treasurer.

The interesting part -- first of all, just for history, there have been two referendums on this issue in the past. It was in 1993 when the gentleman who ran against John Cochoran ran on a platform of eliminating the Office of the Treasurer. He was defeated. Mr. Cochoran was elected so in essence the voters spoke and felt that there should be an elected position of Treasurer. Again in 2005, the opponent that ran against me used that as part of their platform also, that the office be eliminated. So it seems to me that the voters have spoken twice on this.

Some of the testimony that I reviewed that the County Executive referred to, one of them being cash flow, that we're both doing cash flow, there's duplicative services and functions being performed, this is not the case. Everything that's done in the Treasurer's Office needs to be done; and everything that's done in the Comptroller's Office needs to be done. There is no duplication. Even to the issue of cash flow, we do cash flow on a daily basis. We are the County's banker. We have to make sure that there's money in the bank to pay the bills, checks go out every week whether it's payroll checks, operating checks, bail refunds, whatever. It's a plethora of things that are addressed. We have to make sure that the money is there. So we are monitoring cash daily.

The County Comptroller monitors cash monthly in their cash status report, but they're doing it in an auditing function, making sure that what we're doing daily is, in fact, accurate and reflective of what's really happening.

The issue of eliminating or consolidating or putting under one roof the person that writes the checks with the person that has the authority to authorize the checks just is a recipe for disaster. And that's exactly what happened in Orange County, California. And when you have an opportunity and you can review all of this, I think it really clearly says it.

There are a number of facts in the very beginning that speak to this idea of eliminating the office in it not being right because it eliminates checks and balances. There's a quote there from our independent financial advisors. Internal management controls are weakened. The bond rating is in jeopardy. And I won't go down the list because I know you've got other speakers. And I know what it's like to sit behind there and listen to speakers drone on. So I'm really going to try and be as succinct as possible.

But the thing that is most telling and really, really in my mind says this is an issue that has been brought up before, has absolutely no merit, is the memo that comes from our financial advisors, Capital Market Advisors. They are there with us when we go with the rating agencies. They clearly, clearly state that this is not a good idea. These are the people that we're paying for financial advice. So are we going to disregard it? I don't think so.

They're clearly stating that the bond rating, the incredible bond rating that we enjoy right now in this tough economic climate Suffolk County got a bond rating upgrade. And this didn't happen just, you know, wishing it to happen. It happened because we have independent controls over our cash, over our finances. The Comptroller is the -- has his role to play and I have mine. He's the Chief Financial Officer. I am the Chief Investment Officer. And it plays well to the rating agencies to know that you have this separation, to know that you have this independence. That's what they want to see. That's what they want to hear. They don't want to hear that you're consolidating it and putting it under one umbrella because, again, it leads you down a path you just don't want to go.

I really, really would ask that you review it when you have an opportunity. We've gone through and clearly showed what the office does. In fact when the resolution was first introduced in 2006, that first couple of months, in fact I had just been sworn in as the Treasurer, I invited the Legislators to come out to Riverhead to see exactly what it is the Treasurer's office does. We have -- again, it's all outlined here, but it was an education process for them. And everyone from the Presiding Officer and everyone else that came out there were impressed with the work that we did and were enlightened by the fact that there really wasn't duplication. And because of that, after a number of months there was no action on the resolution and the issue was put on the shelf.

And the thing that I'm going to close with is ask that you review the quote, the County Executive in his very own words when he prepared his narrative for the 2006 budget, and this is in the very back of the pamphlet, he clearly commends and acknowledges the fact that we got a bond rating upgrade because of our strong financial team. And he clearly identified that team as four components: The Legislature, the County Executive, the Comptroller and the Treasurer. Those four independent bodies. Just as it's important to maintain that independence between the County Exec's branch of government, the executive branch of government and the Legislative branch of government, that kind of oversight, it's the same kind of oversight that you have in the separate Comptroller and the Treasurer. And there is no greater accountability as an office that reports directly to the people.

And I had a gentleman call a couple of months ago who was quite angry because he was paying interest in penalties on his past due taxes and didn't feel he should. And I wasn't giving him the answer that he wanted. And he wanted to speak to my boss. And I said to him, you know, you are my boss. You and the rest of the residents of this County are who I have to answer to.

And, again, if there are any questions, and I will answer that question as far as which of the two offices if there's only to be one, there shouldn't be one. There should be two: An elected Treasurer and an elected Comptroller. And I think when you review the material, I'm confident that that's the same conclusion that all of you will come to. Are there any questions?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Let me see. Do any -- yes.

**MR. FUSCO:**

I have a few actually. Could you tell me if -- you said the Legislature came and evaluated the operations in your office. Did the County Executive ever come and look at the operations in the office?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

No, but certainly the invitation is there.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Could you contrast the situation in Nassau County where there is no Treasurer? That County seems to be operating.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Well, it seems to be operating but it's also operating under a fiscal oversight agency because --

**MR. FUSCO:**

What about New York City?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Pardon me?

**MR. FUSCO:**

New York City has no Treasurer, does it?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

I'm not quite sure of the structure of New York City. And I, you know, point to Nassau County. They have an appointed Treasurer. And it's interesting, one of the arguments for was, well, you know, you'd have less, you know, deputies if you had an appointed rather than an elected. Well, that's not the case in Nassau County. You know, they have the same amount of deputies as we have. And to think that the deputies don't play a role or do anything, that they're just there, you know, if the Treasurer is not, everyone clearly has their duties and are working everyday. I mean we are in the office everyday. There's no question about that. There is no duplication.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Is there any study showing which counties in New York follow the Suffolk County model and which have the single financial officer, how many of each there are?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

We have -- there is a listing of which of the counties, and I don't think it's included but I certainly can get it to you, that have elected Treasurers. But remember we are operating a multibillion dollar corporation. We are bigger than 13 states. We have a budget that's bigger than a lot of states. You know, to compare us to some, you know, remote county in Upstate New York is not a valid comparison. The proverbial, you have to compare apples to apples, oranges to oranges.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Thank you.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

You're welcome.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Does the current oversight function of the Comptroller's Office include reviewing the investment that the -- the investments that the Treasurer's Office makes? Would --

**MS. CARPENTER:**

The investments that we make are very limited in what we can do. Every January when the Legislature meets and has their organizational meeting, they authorize the depositories that we are allowed to use to put the County's money in. They have to have a branch in Suffolk County. And it's very clear and very specific. And there have been times that depositories have been removed midterm. But we -- you know, some of the high risk investments that are -- lead people down a path that causes trouble is not something that is available to us.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Well, I mean for example in your presentation, you mention the situation in Orange County, California. Would that have been --

**MS. CARPENTER:**

They had the model that is being advocated if you eliminate.

**MR. BRAUN:**

I understand. But would that have been avoided if there had been --

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Absolutely.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Would their separate comptroller's function have stopped that investment under those circumstances?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

It does. It would. In fact the memo that the financial advisors produced in 2003 speaks very clearly to Orange County, California. And when they got themselves out of that brink of bankruptcy that they were at, they adopted a model that we have in place here in Suffolk County now.

**MR. BRAUN:**

So within the scope of those investments that the Legislature authorizes each year, would the -- does the Comptroller's Office currently have the ability to tell you we don't like our money being there, we want you to move it?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

No, because I'm the investment officer. He's the financial -- the Chief Financial Officer. So, you know, certainly there are communications between the two departments. And if there was some egregious, you know -- but there isn't that chance to do that because we really can only invest in the banks right now.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

And the moving that's done is basically to try to get -- maximize the interest. And that I watch like a hawk. Let me put it to you that way. From the day I first came in, I found that there were some accounts that perhaps were not earning interest that they should have been. In 2005 the year before I came into the Treasurer's Office, the County earned \$11 million in interest. In 2006 we earned 23 million.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Was that on the relatively same amount of revenue?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Yes. And in 2007, we earned even with the interest waning in the last quarter and even with the fact that we went out for a \$50 million less than TAN borrowing, Tax Anticipation Note borrowing than we did the year before, we earned close to \$20 million.

Now this year, all bets are off. It's bad. You know, every time the feds, you know, announce that they're lowering the rates, you know, I shudder. And I usually get a call within a day or two from the bank that they're closing the rates; but we whenever possible will move for, you know, a quarter of a point, a tenth of a point. I will, you know, move accounts just so that we can maximum our interest rates. But I do this, you know --

**MR. BRAUN:**

But again the thrust of my question is more whether the two separate entities now would have avoided the Orange County type of situation for them in advance under our current rules?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Yes, because you have that separation. They didn't have it in Orange County, California. And that's why they -- the person that was, you know, making the investments and authorizing it all was all in one.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Kathy.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Hi, Kathy, how are you?

**MS. GIAMO:**

Hi, Angie. Can you tell me the Capital Market Advisors --

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Is your mike on?

**MS. GIAMO:**

Capital Market Advisors, is this firm -- at any time, were they hired to do this independent analysis of opinion? Or have they actually advised your office on investments?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

They do not advise our office on investments. They are --

**MS. GIAMO:**

So they were hired specifically to render an opinion on --

**MS. CARPENTER:**

Oh, no, no, no. They're the County's financial advisor. And when I say they don't advise on investments, again, the Legislature authorizes the banks that we can deal with and that's, you know, who we deal with. But when it comes to bonding, when we meet with the rating agencies, everything that's involved in that issue is advised by the Capital Market Advisors.

**MS. GIAMO:**

Could you tell me how -- was this -- in order to -- was this particular area, was this outsourcing through a bid process?

**MS. CARPENTER:**

What area?

**MS. GIAMO:**

Capital Market Advisors, how were they hired? Were they hired through an independent bid process or did they come in and give a presentation? Do they give monthly presentations or quarterly --

**MS. CARPENTER:**

They were the financial advisors in place when I took office. And it's my understanding that it was a bid process. But the County Comptroller can speak more to that than I because he works more directly with them than I do.

**MS. GIAMO:**

Thank you.

**MS. CARPENTER:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Angie, thank you very much. I think you've answered most of the questions that everyone had and --

**MS. CARPENTER:**

And if there are any others, you know where to reach me. Thank you.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

I sure do. Thank you very much.

The next speaker, I guess, he almost could have come up and sat with her, is Joseph Sawicki, the Suffolk County Comptroller.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Good afternoon everyone. Hi, Sondra.

There's an old saying. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. In the day of age of Enron and other corporate scandals, of Roslyn, of William Floyd and unfortunately on and on, in Suffolk County in comparison,

in stark contrast is doing so well financially; not only in our long term credit ratings but in our achievement, the excellence and accounting awards, financial reporting awards from the GFOA of the United States and of North America. To tinker with the financial system that's in place that's already earned us a high distinction in the nation and on Wall Street, just makes no sense to me whatsoever particularly when there is no documentation, no evidence that we could gain anything, any efficiencies by doing this. And I just think it's -- I think what we have intact now works quite well. The separation of our duties, of the powers, if you will, is extremely important in any corporate or public entity when you're talking finances.

Right now in regard to some of the questions that were posed to the Treasurer, if the two offices were merged together, how would -- and if the Comptroller were to oversee both, both functions, how would you audit yourself? How would I audit myself? Right now I have the power and the authority to audit the Treasurer. We just performed a couple years ago an audit of all the bank accounts in the County and through the Treasurer's Office.

If that was under me, you know, again, it's a dangerous -- it's a dangerous situation where one has to audit themselves. And we don't -- you know, we can just imagine what that could lead to if the wrong person is in that position. So, again, I don't think we should go down that road. And given the magnitude of Suffolk County, we're the 12th or the 13th largest -- larger than 12 or 13 states in the nation, we're the 21st largest county in the nation, I just think financially and the rest, we would be going down the wrong road. So I would just urge you, you know, the status quo has worked for so many years, again, it ain't broke, don't fix it. And that's basically my, you know, my message to you.

I have a couple -- my thoughts that I'm sharing with you, rather. But I have a couple of other issues that I would like to ask your support of and your consideration of. And that would be the expansion of the authority of the Comptroller's Office. The Nassau County Comptroller has the authority to audit and review the accounts of the towns and special districts. The Suffolk Comptroller does not have that.

And the reason why this comes up and how this comes up is that often times I'm sure many of you have read that the District Attorney, Tom Spota and I have worked together on various investigations. Obviously he does the criminal investigation. He's called upon us, you know, my staff to do the auditing and the financial examination. And often times Tom will ask me to do a certain audit of a town or a district, or there aren't a lot of districts -- special districts in Suffolk County, but I don't have the authority to go in. The only time I can go in like we assisted each other -- I assisted him in the William Floyd school district scandal investigation. He had to actually get a share order through the courts to allow our office to share in the Grand Jury proceedings, in the grand jury testimony.

So, I'd like to provide you before the day is out with a copy of the Nassau County Charter which just basically very simply allows -- would allow the County Comptroller to audit towns and special districts.

**MR. BRAUN:**

We do have it.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

You have that, okay. You have everything. Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Before you go on, Joe --

**MR. SAWACKI:**

Yes, Sondra?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

If that were to happen and you were to have the ability to go in and audit towns, on what basis -- because towns are audited by New York State now.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Correct.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

So, what would be the purpose?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Well, I don't think -- I don't think the Nassau Comptroller audits the towns per se because, again, you'd be replicating or duplicating what the State Comptroller does. We don't need any more work than we already have. As, you know, we don't have enough staff to go around now to audit that we'd like. But it's just from time to time when -- for instance, the last -- to be very specific is, Mr. Spota asked if we could take a look at the alleged debacle in the swimming pool in Mastic Shirley, which is part of the Brookhaven Town thing. And I just didn't have the authority to go in and do that audit. So it would only be circumstance. It would be from time to time. It would be very, very -- we have our hands full and plenty to do auditing County agencies, contract agencies and County departments. But it would just -- the authority would be there just in case we needed it or we wanted to.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

But would there be a proviso that there had to be a specific reason or a special reason for you to go in and do that? Obviously, you know, I'm not -- certainly not implying you would do it but you might some day have someone who just wanted to cause a little difficulty.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Audit a town just for the sake of auditing? Yeah, that's true. And you saw the way the Nassau Comptroller took on all the special districts. Fortunately we don't have that issue in Suffolk County. We have two special districts, whatever. But that -- because these special districts apparently weren't audited properly, if audited at all, you know, it begged the County Comptroller to go in there. I don't see -- I don't see any real situation currently existing in Suffolk County that I would want to go in to do any towns or any special districts. It would just be if called upon by like a District Attorney or the County Legislature or, you know, whoever. I mean for instance --

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

You don't want the County Legislature, no.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

So.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

But you would say there could be -- if in fact we wanted to recommend something like that, we would have to have some kind of proviso --

**MR. SAWICKI:**

A cavaet, sure, sure.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

-- some reason for you to do that.

**MR. SAWACKI:**

Yeah. I mean right now -- I mean the County Legislature does vote time to time to request that I do an audit of this agency or that department, blah, blah, blah.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Right. Well, that's different, though. Those are not -- having been in a town myself for a longtime, I would have a little difficulty with that.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

And there's ten towns right now in Suffolk County compared to three in Nassau.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

I know. I don't think you have enough people to do that.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

No, you're absolutely right, Sondra.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Go ahead, please, unless you have a question.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Are we up to questions? I don't want to interrupt.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

No, I was asking a specific question on that issue.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Yeah. I just have one more area I just wanted to get into.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Yeah, please, please. Sorry for interrupting.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

The Insurance and Risk unit of the County used to be under the auspices of the Comptroller for many, many years. And I believe it was only moved out of the Comptroller's Office and placed under Alan Schneiderman's (sic) Civil Service and Personnel back in 2001. And it probably had more to do with politics than anything else at that time. I know every once in a while it does creep into county government.

And looking at the size of Insurance and Risk, the fact that they process -- excuse me, let me find my notes here real quick -- they process roughly over 1300 vouchers weekly, over \$450,000 weekly; to be in the Department of Civil Service and Personnel really, really is not a fit -- it's almost like putting a round -- a square peg in a round hole or a round peg in a square hole or something like that. And I would say that being that the County Charter currently gives the Comptroller the power to audit and approve -- and it's a charge -- audit and approve all bills, invoices, payrolls and other evidences of claim, what Insurance and Risk processes fits right into that. It's more of an administrative, more of a bookkeeping, more of an accounting function, ministerial, administrative function. And I would like to ask you to consider if -- to make a change in the Charter to move Insurance and Risk back to the Comptroller's Office where it's a much better fit, I believe, in County government than over in Civil Service and Personnel.

So in conclusion, I'd just like to thank you for listening to my side of the consolidation issue. Again, I know I'm being repetitive but the issue with checks and balances is so important that we maintain in our county. So, thank you. Yes, Mr. Braun?

**MR. BRAUN:**

Thank you. Yes, a couple of -- first, I guess, a little question. Does the County also employ outside auditors, independent accounting firms from time to time to --

**MR. SAWICKI:**

We are annually audited by Ernst & Young for the last several years. And we -- every three years we go out through the RFP process and, you know, retain an outside auditor, yes.

**MR. BRAUN:**

So it's not only the Comptroller's Office that's currently doing the -- the audit's being audited in other words?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Exactly, exactly, exactly.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Okay. The other question is a little perhaps more speculative. The presentation that we got from Ms. Carpenter, which I guess you concur with, about keeping the offices separate includes a statement from Capital Markets Advisor that says that in April 2008 Fitch ratings revised the County's bond rating upward from stable to positive. But this -- are you attributing that to the independence of the two offices? I mean the County's been structured that way for a longtime.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Yeah, yeah. No, that's part of it. It's a very integral part of it, sir. The County's financial foundation is in great shape. And it's -- that's part of it. It's all reflected in our bond rating, but they look at the County's proactive approach to mitigating any cash shortfalls, projected shortfalls in the next year or two ahead. It's really a teamwork, like I believe Ms. Carpenter summed up at the end, the County Executive acknowledges that it's teamwork between the County Executive, the Legislature, the Comptroller and the Treasurer's Office.

**MR. BRAUN:**

So it's some of the fiscal policies that have been in place more recently perhaps rather than the separation of the two offices at the moment that --

**MR. SAWICKI:**

I would say that adds to it.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Okay.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

That adds to it. It definitely is. I mean it's not -- you can't point to any one particular reason why we got the upgrade. It's everything all -- one thing is for sure, is that if you were to combine them, you would weaken the internal controls in the County's financial structure.

**MR. BRAUN:**

And would there be something, the equivalent of an inspector general or an auditor general who might have some separate function that could do the same thing without a separate department?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

But then if you do that, then you're -- then what are you saving? You have a Treasurer now who's elected by the people. I mean some counties have -- I think someone asked the question before, some counties have a Treasurer under the County Executive, for instance, an appointed position. You still have the Treasury, you still have the same amount of administration. So the savings is what I question. You know, I don't know where any savings would be. Like you say, could you have an inspector general, well, sure; but now you're getting away from an elected position. An elected is the most independent because then they -- then you're resistant to the --

**MR. BRAUN:**

Well, we're very fortunate that the people we have elected are qualified, but you don't necessarily

need to be elected to be qualified. Somebody appointed might be more qualified. No? Not in the current occupants of the office but in theory.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

I mean that's a speculative question, I suppose. I mean, you know, maybe you can get Donald Trump to come in here and be the Treasurer or Comptroller or something like that, you know. I don't know. Maybe you can get -- you know.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Thank you. I appreciate it.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Kathy.

**MS. GIAMO:**

Could you tell me, and I'm very familiar with the firm Ernst & Young, I've sat through audits with them from a public company nature, but could you or is there a way that we could find out, what is the cost of that audit and --

**MR. SAWICKI:**

That audit is approximately \$500,000. 380,000 for the County part.

**MS. GIAMO:**

Per year.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Per year.

**MS. GIAMO:**

380,000. Could you also then tell me what the operating budget is for the Office of the Treasurer?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Angie, what's your operating budget? I'm not familiar with that off the top of my -- in dollars or personnel or everything?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

The Treasurer or the Comptroller?

**MS. GIAMO:**

The Treasurer. No, the Office of the Treasurer.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Well, she's still here. Angie's still here.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Two million.

**MS. GIAMO:**

It's two million. Thank you.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Question.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Yes.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Insurance and Risk, it seems to me that really should fall under the County Attorney, no? I mean, a lot of that is, you know, tort claim, Workers' Comp claims, things of that nature where, you know, there's a legal question involved and is the amount right? Wouldn't that more appropriately be under the County Attorney rather than the Comptroller?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Well, the good thing that the -- the current system -- Mr. Fusco, right -- is that all claims that are between -- I believe it's zero to \$10,000 can be settled with Insurance & Risk itself. The next level between 10,00 and 25,000 need the approval and sign-off the County Attorney. And anything in excess of 25,000 has to be approved by the County Legislature. So it's a good system of checks and balances there. I'm thinking of the ministerial side of the -- ministerial end of the department. I mean 363,000 vouches and sign-offs a week is a lot.

**MR. FUSCO:**

In Nassau County sometime ago we had a terrible morass with Workers' Comp claims. The County Attorney had to approve them. Nothing got settled. Okay. And then the Comptroller had to approve them. And as a result nothing got done. And the Comp system there just went into complete disarray. Some years ago, I don't know if at the time Suffolk County system was under the County Attorney or under your department, but I remember when Phil Bauccio was running the Comp end of it. And I can say at that time it ran pretty good. It ran smooth, cases were resolved. And it was a pretty tight ship from the standpoint of a consumer of that. Do you know at that point what department Insurance and Risk was under when Mr. Bauccio was running the Comp?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Phil Bauccio, I believe, has been retired.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Yeah, a number of years.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Yeah, so it would have been the Audit and Control then.

**MS. MALAFI:**

I think for part of the time -- hi, Christine Malafi, the County Attorney. I believe when Mr. Bauccio first became the -- is it called Director of Insurance and Risk Management -- the head of Insurance and Risk Management -- was in the County Attorney's Office.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Yeah, it preceded my term of office.

**MS. MALAFI:**

It was in the County Attorney's Office. And then it moved to Civil Service -- the Civil Service Department. That I don't know why it happened, but it was with the County Attorney's Office. I moved up here so I can answer any question.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Well, since you're both there, can you answer my question on whether it really should be under the County Attorney as opposed to the Comptroller. And if so, why?

**MS. MALAFI:**

Okay. I work very closely with Insurance Risk Management, but I do not have the authority to change any of their procedures. And just as by way of example, they have procedures in place on how they handle, for example, flooding claims, sewer backups, things of that nature. And two years ago, I think, we had a hundred year storm. And when Insurance Risk Management instead of getting their usual five to ten flood claims a year got \$4 million worth of flood claims, they did their

usual procedure. If they -- and it was not -- it cost the County \$4 million. Because it was a hundred year flood, if there were in my shop, I would have stopped that before they even started that because County did not --

**MR. FUSCO:**

The flood or the claims?

**MS. MALAFI:**

Well, if I could control the flooding, I would do that, too. So there were problems that if it was in my shop and I could direct them a little bit on how to proceed, could have been avoided.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Why couldn't that be done if it was in his shop, for example? I mean, it's not like you don't talk to one another. I mean couldn't you still exert a supervisory function from a legal standpoint even if it was under the aegis of the Comptroller?

**MS. MALAFI:**

As the lawyer, I do not direct any department heads. And I especially do not direct any elected officials who are my clients. So I pretty much don't -- I can give general legal advise but I'm supposed to wait until I'm spoken to. And I can lay things out there but people don't have to return a phone call or take my advice. So in order to actually run Insurance Risk Management and tidy up, for lack of a better word, they do a great job, they work very hard; but to tidy up some of the procedures, they would have to be in my department.

And also I -- for example, Workers' Compensation Counsel, under the Charter right now I retain all outside counsel. So I do the RFP -- I'm sorry, the RFQ that goes for the Workers' Compensation Counsel. And I -- all the bills that get paid, we have to approve them. But yet they're not in -- I don't -- the department that that lawyer functioned for -- I'm sorry, the division that that lawyer functioned for is not within my department.

There are also several issues that arise frequently when you get a special type appeals from Workers' Compensation cases that require an additional outside counsel. Again, that all goes to my department but it takes a little longer for us to get up to speed on something because it's not in my department. And they're all legal issues. It's not a -- it's not really an administrative type of issues that they have.

Also, if Insurance Risk Management was in the Department of Law rather than in another department, the claims people could come to me and ask me or my torts division questions on a regular basis. It would be more like an every day occurrence. We have this claim, is there any liability on the part of the County, little questions that they can ask that can avoid the payment of what seem like nominal sums, a thousand claim; but when you add together, let's just say a hundred \$1,000 claims, that's a significant amount of money.

And if the Law Department had the one on one with the employees of Insurance Risk Management because we would all be in the same department, that would, I believe, aid them in doing their job, also. And you can do it in such a way where the claims settlement authority that presently rests with Insurance Risk Management can still rest there. So that the head of Insurance Risk Management would still have the authority to settle claims under, I think it's \$5,000 without needing my approval but yet they're in my department to aid. It's sort of like in the Charter right now, the Human Rights Commission is in my department. And we give them -- we work with them on a daily basis, whenever they have questions on discrimination claims and things that come into their, office but in no way do I direct or control what they do on a daily basis.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Could I get Mr. Sawicki's response to what you said?

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Yeah, I didn't know we were going to get any kind of debate here between -- I just thought --

**MR. FUSCO:**

Neither did I. I just asked a simple question.

**MS. MALAFI:**

I didn't know either. I thought you were asking questions.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Don't I have the floor? I mean I'm an invited -- I mean don't I have the floor?

**MR. FUSCO:**

If you have a response.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

I don't really think that that's kind of appropriate at this moment. I think that Mr. Sawicki just mentioned a department that in the eleven years I was here was in the Comptroller's Office; and frankly I preferred it. And the attorneys used to assign attorneys from the department to work with Risk Management. But that's an internal thing that would have to be done. And I don't think we want to have a debate back and forth today.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

Yeah, exactly. I mean you asked me for testimony. I'm done. I appreciate the opportunity to be here but the last thing I was going to do was debate my good friend Christine Malafi.

**MR. FUSCO:**

I wasn't looking for a debate, I just wanted to see if there was --

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

But you can't have a lawyer in the room and not have a debate.

**MS. MALAFI:**

And there's a lot more than one here. I just answer questions. My office was brought up so I figured I would sit here in case anyone has anything.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

No, I appreciate very much your comments. I thought it was helpful. But I also think that basically the question we were addressing today was the whether or not there should be a consolidation of the Comptroller's Office and the Treasurer's Office and if there should be an elimination of an elected official. And I think that was answered. And if anyone has any other questions about that, I think it would be important.

**MR. SAWICKI:**

I would just like to add, Ms. Chairwoman, that, you know, here I am -- think of it this way -- here I am. I could potentially gain financial authority, if you will, if this were to go through. And here I'm saying I don't want this extra authority because I don't think it's good. I mean from an egotistical point of view, a financially egotistical point of view, I'd say, you know, wow, this would great, look at all the financial powers, look at all the banks I can deal with, look at all the investments I could make. And what I'm saying to you is, you know, please, you know, please, listen to me a little bit, and just, you know, where I'm coming from is that I don't think it's good to put all that power in one person.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

That's perfect. Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you very much for being with us today. I

appreciate it very much. Christine, thank you. That was very interesting.

Our next speaker is our Suffolk County Sheriff, Vincent DeMarco. Judith, I'm sorry, you're last on the list. What is it, the last shall be first? So, you'll be next.

**MR. DEMARCO:**

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for inviting me to today's meeting to -- and affording me the opportunity to share my thoughts on the elected office of Sheriff.

At your April 3rd meeting County Executive Levy made a few comments about the need for a separately elected sheriff. And he pointed out that Nassau County has an appointed Sheriff and really with shocking lack of documentation or justification somehow suggested that some cost savings or efficiencies could be gained here in Suffolk County by having an appointed Sheriff. And I was actually a little confused after I read his testimony.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

He complimented you.

**MR. DEMARCO:**

What?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

He complimented you.

**MR. DEMARCO:**

Well, I know. But he didn't even try and make a case for, you know, efficiency or effectiveness, how that could affect county government. And, you know, he did say that I was doing a great job and following a philosophy of being a taxpayer watch dog and fabulous. I want to compliment him on the record because there is a record here -- thank him for his compliments. But it's my opinion that a government system should not allow for the concentration of power in the hands of a few. And with County Executive Levy's suggestion of replacing elected official with appointed officials, that's the road we're heading down.

And, you know, without a doubt it's been the long standing practice in this country to elect local, state and federal officials. And when someone or some agency questions the Office of Sheriff, you know, I want to point out that the Sheriff is a New York State constitutional officer. And it's my opinion that in order to remove an elected Sheriff, you would have to change the state constitution. And I know there are varying opinions on that, but I disagree.

And, also, that -- I want to point out that I am directly answerable to the taxpaying voters in Suffolk County. And I'm not controlled by another County officer. And that affords me the ability to speak freely on issues without the fear of offending an appointing authority. I can come to this Legislature and answer questions freely, give testimony freely. And I was a union official before I was the Sheriff. And in my time of coming to the Legislature as both, I witnessed a lot of testimony by elected officials and appointed officials. And I can tell you there's a big difference when an elected official comes up here and gives testimony and answers questions from the Legislature as opposed to an appointed official. And, you know, I'm just going to say an elected official answers questions directly. And I'm just going to leave it at that.

It's my opinion that we need courteous, accommodating, honest elected officials. And most importantly they have to be accountable to the taxpayer. Electing a public official assures that. I am directly answerable to the voters of Suffolk County. And I have my finger on the pulse of my constituents. I'm accessible. If a constituent has -- calls and wants to speak to me, they get to speak to me. You know, if you ask the residents in this County if they've ever spoken to -- had the opportunity to speak to an appointed commissioner when they've called, I think we all know what the answer's going to be.

You know, a pretty prominent economist, Milton Friedman, said that nobody spends someone else's money as carefully as they spend their own. And elected officials are closer to the taxpayers and the taxpayers' money than anyone else. We're accountable to them and we know it. And that is why in my opinion elected officials operate more cost efficiently than appointed officials.

Appointed officials have to serve two masters. They have to serve the appointing County Executive in this case; and they also have to serve the policy making Legislature. And that just leads to conflicts, waste of time and a waste of taxpayer money.

Across the country popular election is the means of selection of the Office of Sheriff. And over 99 percent of 3,088 jurisdictions throughout the country, the Sheriff is elected. The Office of Sheriff provides checks and balances as an elected law enforcement officer who is directly responsible to the citizens. Elected Sheriffs themselves are subject to numerous checks and balances. Local voters can remove a Sheriff through the electoral process. The County Legislature ultimately has oversight over the Sheriff's budget. And the governor in an extreme case can remove a Sheriff for a malfeasance or a nonfeasance of duty.

County Executive Levy also mentioned in his testimony that he would like to see the Sheriff send out his own tax bill. I'm not necessarily opposed to that. But if that were the case, I feel that I would have to have more control over filling my vacant positions so I can operate my office the most effective way I can. And, you know, while I'm not opposed to that, I just don't think it could be justified because my budget is only 4 percent of close to a \$3 billion budget. It probably cost more to print and mail the tax bill out.

I'd like to return to County Executive Levy's perception that Nassau County and their appointed Sheriff is somehow a good thing. Nassau has had an appointed Sheriff for quite a while. And because there is no direct accountability to the taxpaying voter, it's probably the most inefficient operation in the state. And recently they came out from under federal oversight because of their poor management.

Appointed officers have more patronage and fat than elected officers and that's a fact. And Nassau's no exception. I'd also point out that Nassau County has less inmates than Suffolk County. We have about 300 more yet their budget is a \$155 million and ours is a hundred -- probably around 120 this year. And we're probably going to come in \$2 million under this year. That's a \$35 million difference. That's a big hole to plug.

I would also like to point out that Nassau spends about \$22 million in overtime. Again, with a similar amount of personnel I have 300 more inmates. We're probably going to spend around 16 million this year. So there's another big difference. Nassau County has 41 cooks. I have 25. Cooks are appointed positions. They can be called patronage positions. And we're cooking for 300 more inmates.

The Suffolk County Sheriff's Office has two appointed Under-Sheriffs. That's it. That's my top management, me and two other people. Nassau County has an appointed Under-Sheriff, four appointed Deputy Under-Sheriffs, an appointed Commissioner of Corrections. You know, and history has shown that in those jurisdictions in which the Sheriff is appointed, there's a decrease in quality and efficiency. When the Sheriff is subject to the whims of another County official, the office becomes more politicized; not less.

I'm summing up here. Citizens should have the freedom to choose their public officials and direct election is the best means to accomplish that. In my opinion elected officials are more creative, innovative, stable, cost-effective than officers run by appointed officials. And that's because the public demands that of us.

The County Clerk's Office has been cited numerous times as the best Clerk's in the State of New

York. My office is the only law enforcement agency in the northeast that is using innovative iris scan technology. We're a show case agency for that. And any agency -- agencies from around the region come to us to consult with us about moving towards this technology. We also have a model council for unity anti-gang program that's a model for the country and soon may be a subject of an HBO documentary.

And just being directly accountable to the taxpayers forces us to be on the cutting edge and run the most efficient office possible. Because I'm directly accountable to the 1.5 million citizens here in Suffolk County, the Sheriff's Office is the most cost efficient component of the criminal justice system.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Thank you. That was a wonderful presentation. Do we have any questions?

**MR. FUSCO:**

Just a comment. As appointed commissioners I want to say how much we appreciate your remarks.

One question. Before you became Sheriff, there was some tension between Sheriff officers and Correction officers. Has that been resolved?

**MR. DEMARCO:**

Yeah, between the Deputy Sheriffs and the Correction Officers. I was [there for|therefore] 12 years before I became Sheriff. And in my opinion, the relationship's never been better. And there's actually harmony for once.

**MR. FUSCO:**

Good.

**MR. DEMARCO:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is our Suffolk County Clerk Judith Pascale. Thank you and welcome. Thank you for being here.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to come before you and address you and talk to you a little bit about the County Clerk's Office.

You've just introduced me but for those of you that have not met me before I am Judy Pascale. I am the Suffolk County Clerk. I was appointed by Governor Pataki in March of '06 to fill the vacancy left by Ed Romaine when he left office prior to the expiration of his term. I was subsequently elected to the office in November of '06.

The Office of the County Clerk dates back to the year 1683 when it was established by the general assembly of the colony of New York. And since 1821 County Clerks have been elected by the voters of their respective counties. As many of you may be aware I not only serve as the County Clerk of Suffolk County but I'm also the Clerk of Supreme and County courts which falls under the jurisdiction of the New York State unified court system.

The New York State constitution clearly states that the Clerk of each County shall be chosen by the electors once in every three or four years. Additionally New York County law also states that there shall be elected a County Clerk. All 62 County Clerks in the State of New York are elected. Those clerks within New York City are appointed by the governor, not the locally elected mayor or a

borough president.

The scope of the County Clerk's Office goes beyond local capacity. Through judiciary law and as the Clerk of Supreme Court, the County Clerk is considered a quasi state official. In fact past case law states that because the County Clerk serves a state function as Clerk of the Supreme Court, and courts have in the past held the state liable for acts of the County Clerk, state law, not local law, shall be controlling in regard to the Office of the County Clerk.

Those are my comments. They're very brief. I would like to thank the Sheriff for the kudos to the office. And I am available to answer any questions you might have.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Questions?

**MS. PASCALE:**

That was very easy.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Well, we thank you for coming and sitting through all the other testimony.

**MS. PASCALE:**

That's quite all right. Thank you for inviting me.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

And being with us this afternoon. Thank you.

**MS. PASCALE:**

And for sending us the minutes of the meetings. That's very, very helpful to us, by the way. And it was nice to get the verbatim minutes. Thank you again.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Okay. Thank you very much.

And our last speaker today is an appointed official, Thomas Isles, the Director of the Suffolk County Planning Department. And this is on the official County map.

**DIRECTOR ISLES:**

Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

I'm here today to provide you with an update on the County Official map which was referred to in the last review by the Charter Review Commission. And subsequently there were certain steps that were taken. And I believe the purpose of my presentation today or appearance today is to provide you with what happened as a result of that last consideration.

The official map in Suffolk County was first referred to in 1970 in the County Charter that stipulated that a map should be prepared and adopted by 1974. That was never done. It was then readdressed in the late '90's and here again included in the recommendations of the Charter Revision Commission at that time. And then reflected in County law in 1999 with the passage of a resolution and signature by the County Executive at that time directing that the official map be completed. That duty was directed to the County Planning Department. We were given until January 15th of 2005 to complete the map. And then it was presented to the Legislature with a date of completion or adoption by the Legislature December 31st, 2006.

I can inform you at this time that the County Planning Department did complete the map project. I have with me today our Chief Cartographer of the County Planning Department Carl Lind. We do have a copy of the map or copies of the map here today along with an accompanying report that

described the methodology for preparing the map.

The map, as you probably know, the official map is a planning tool is what it is. And they've been in existence in the country for over a hundred years. They do have a certain purpose, most particularly in undeveloped or more rural areas of the world. And in the case of an official map, it requires in the mapping that we did in accordance with both county law and state law was to indicate all federal roads, federal facilities, properties and so forth, all state facilities, state roads and facilities, drainage, parks and so forth as well as all County roads, County facilities and so on. It was not an easy task to assemble this information but we were able to do it with the assistance of the cartographic staff and other departments in county government.

It also requires the mapping of the drainage systems. And, here again, not to get in to much detail today but rather exhaustive requirements in terms of district boundaries -- just looking at the map right here -- water courses and drainage systems, anything that's mapped on a capital program at the federal, state or county level of government. So all of that was done, here again, with this process.

We were able to comply with the deadline as established in the 1990 law. And the map was submitted on January 15th as I indicated. The first legislative action taken on it was by resolution 803-2005. That action was taken on August 18th, 2005, which directed the County Planning Department and the Clerk of the Legislature to begin the formal review process for the official map. And that was a referral to the federal and state governments that had a role, here again, in the map; and also to all the municipalities of the County, the towns and villages, all 42 of them, to give them an opportunity to review the map and provide comment back to the County. There was also referral to the County Planning Commission as well as to the County Commissioner of Public Works. In addition that resolution also authorized a public hearing to be held by the Legislature.

So those steps then proceeded. We received actually through the Clerk of the Legislature 8 municipalities provided comments back with relatively detailed type of corrections and updates. There was also a resolution passed by the County Planning Commission at that time and also a detailed letter submitted by the Commissioner of Public Works.

The next Legislative action was then taken in a bill that was introduced under Introductory Resolution 2531 in 2006. That map was -- pardon me. That resolution was to adopt the official map. That was the subject of an initial Legislative review at the committee level, the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee in February of 2007. There was discussion at that level. Subsequently the resolution was withdrawn in March of 2007. So that's the current status and history of it in terms of the process that was triggered by the Charter Review Commission in 1988, I believe, it was, the law in 1999 and then the subsequent actions.

I think the overall conclusion in my reading or interpretation of it is that we did a search of other counties in New York State that had official maps. And we found very few out of the 62 or so counties that we have. It appears at this point in the development stage of Suffolk County a map would not offer great benefits in the sense that we're not an area of a lot of undeveloped land, where new highways are needed to be set aside and so forth.

It's also noted, here again, an official map is one of the earliest planning tools to go into effect, but since, you know, over the course of years going back to 1930's and so forth, other tools have come into more common use such as zoning codes, subdivision regulations, site plan regulations and so forth, permit authorities, bi-highway authorities and so forth. That the primary intent of protecting land for future public facilities and highways is less necessary, here again, in the case of Suffolk since we are predominantly developed. And then secondly due to the other tools, planning tools that are available to provide for, here again, these public facilities, set backs from roads and so forth.

I'll just close with some of the comments -- specific comments that were noted by the Commissioner

of Public Works that I think are important in terms of that department's administration of the County highway system. They indicated that there would be concerns about its impact on the dedication of land meaning that when a developer goes to develop on a county roadway with access to a county roadway, it's not uncommon for the developer to make an offer of dedication for a strip of land in order to accommodate both the needs of the development but also to the highway needs. So there might be a strip of land to put a side walk in along a County highway that's going to help that development.

The Commissioner of Public Works expressed concern that if that then constituted an amendment to the official map, it would create a burdensome time consuming encumbrance to actually making that happen. Similarly to changes to the County Capital Program, where a new project is anticipated to do a highway intersection improvement, that here again that may be complicated, compounded, made more difficult by having to then do an amendment to the official map.

So those are some of the points. And I do have a copy of the Commissioner of Public Works memorandum that he had prepared with his comments that I think were very significant to the Environment Committee of the Legislature. That's where we sit at this point.

The only other point I'll make is that although we put a lot of effort into this map, here again, if you care to look at it later on, it was not a -- I do not consider it a waste of time as far as the department's concerned because the map has been used for a lot of other projects in terms of it gave us a lot of base information that we use regularly and we share this information with other agencies and county government as well as the municipalities of the County. But certainly if you have any questions on the official map and the process we follow, I'll do my best to answer those.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

But I think the main question is, it had been recommended to the Commission that we recommend the elimination of the word official map in the Charter. And from everything you're saying, it seems as if you concur with that.

**DIRECTOR ISLES:**

Yes.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

You do?

**DIRECTOR ISLES:**

I do concur.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Okay. That's what I thought. Anyone have any questions? Yes.

**MR. BRAUN:**

In the absence of an official map, this information is more easy to update, I take it, then? You said that the Commissioner of Public Works indicated that a dedication along the right-of-way of a county road might require the map to be -- I assume you mean officially updated?

**DIRECTOR ISLES:**

Correct.

**MR. BRAUN:**

And in this case -- in this -- under these circumstances if there is no official map, it could be simply be updated.

**DIRECTOR ISLES:**

Right, exactly, without having to go through a public hearing or amendment process, whatever that

may entail.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Well, that's simple enough. Thank you very much.

**DIRECTOR ISLES:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Appreciate it.

Okay. Those are our speakers for today answering questions that we had.

I would like to suggest that the next meeting, and I would like to talk to Terry, too, could we have -- sit around a table, a conference table and address so we that can put together some of these things before we have the hearing on the east end of Long Island? Would that be possible?

**MR. PEARSALL:**

Certainly that's possible.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

So our question then would be our next meeting.

**MR. BRAUN:**

If I'm not mistaken --

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

It's open to the public, of course. It's just that it's easier --

**MR. BRAUN:**

Yeah, it's still a public -- that's fine. It still an open meeting.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

It's hard to work like this. I found it difficult, I don't know about you. You want to work like this, it's fine.

**MR. BRAUN:**

No, it's fine but it's still an open meeting.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Always. I never anticipate in unopen meetings. Do we need to have a meeting in July? We're having a tough time in June with this heat, what about July? Would August or July be better? I'm freezing, it's very cold. Well, it's up to you. Do we need to have a meeting? Do you want to have one in July or September? We have to have the public meeting September. Terry, have you found out where we can have that?

**MR. PEARSALL:**

We will find a place. Just give us a date or two.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

In September.

**MR. PEARSALL:**

In September.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Well, I think we ought to look at the -- the same Thursday.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Public hearing in September.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Well, that's for the east end. So we have to have that. But we might want to kind of get things a little more organized before we do that. So we'll have one more meeting? Do you feel the need? I think we should.

**MR. BRAUN:**

I think we should have at least have one more meeting.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

Before September.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Before September, yes. How does everyone feel about that?

**MR. BRAUN:**

Pardon me?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

They were just discussing whether it be August or July. So, what would be the best for everybody, the people that are here. July 10th should be all right? The Budget Reform meets in the morning? How does that sound?

**MR. PEARSALL:**

July 10th is fine.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

With everyone who is here? All right, then. We will have a meeting at 2:30 on July 10th. And it'll be probably in one of the conference rooms.

**MR. PEARSALL:**

We'll do something that you can work at a table.

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

And we can even sit around here. This might be easier to chat. And at that time we'll try to put together a few of the ideas and thoughts, recommendations that we've had. Okay? Anybody else?

Thank you all for coming. Enjoy the weather.

**MR. PEARSALL:**

The public hearing for September, we would like to work on that. Are we looking at September 18th?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

I would think the 18th would be better. Everybody would be off to school, finished with college, good byes, all of that. Yes, September 18th. It would be an evening meeting. It would have to be an evening meeting on the east end.

**MR. PEARSALL:**

You want it on Shelter Island or Fishers Island?

**CHAIRWOMAN BACHETY:**

I was thinking of West Hampton. We are adjourned. Thank you.

**(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:00 PM)  
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**