

**WAYS AND MEANS**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**of the**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**  
**Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Ways and Means 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 Wednesday, January 29, 2015.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Steven Stern - Chairman  
Legislator Tom Barraga - Vice-Chairman  
Legislator Sarah Anker  
Legislator Al Krupski  
Legislator Tom Muratore

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Jason Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern  
Bill Shilling – Aide to Majority Leader Calarco  
Laura Halloran - Budget Review Office  
Tom Vaughn - County Executive's Office  
Judy Pascale - Suffolk County Clerk  
Rick Brand, Newsday  
All other interested parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Gabrielle Severs - Court Reporter

(\*The meeting was called to order at 12:33 p.m.\*)

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the committee on Ways and Means. I'm going to ask everybody to please rise and join us in the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Spencer.

(\*Salutation\*)

Please remain standing and join us in a moment of silence as we keep all our brave men and women fighting for our freedoms overseas in our thoughts and prayers.

(\*Moment of Silence Observed\*)

Thank you. Welcome, everyone, and thank you for joining us. Mr. Clerk, I don't have any cards in front of me. Do we have any cards?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We do not have any cards.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Before we move on to the agenda, as our guest today, it's always good to see you, Madam Clerk. Thank you for joining us. Fire away.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Thank you. I have with me my chief deputy, Nicole DeLuca, who is usually the one that monitors any resolutions that affect my office through the Legislature. We're here today simply because we would like to amend a local law that was instituted several years ago by this body. I'll give you a little brief background. Typically, when, as many of you know, anybody that satisfies a mortgage has to file it in my office and we would send a notice back with paper and say that your notice has been satisfied. What was happening, and some of you that have been here a while would probably remember that, is that sometimes the homeowner whose taxes were usually paid -- well, routinely paid through their mortgage -- once their mortgage was satisfied, they no longer -- they kind of forgot about their taxes, and sometimes that created a problem because they were delinquent on their taxes, so this body passed a local law requesting that my office, the county clerk's office, submit, when they return their paperwork, a little notice that said "If this document that was just recorded is a satisfaction of your mortgage, please be advised that you will now have to notify --" we give them the names and addresses of the 10 tax receivers in the County of Suffolk so that they knew exactly what to say -- what to do.

Very simply, it says "If the document you've just recorded is your satisfaction of mortgage, please be aware of the following: If a portion of your monthly mortgage payment included your property taxes, you will now need to contact your local town tax receiver so that you may be billed directly for all future property tax statements," and then we give them the names and addresses and the phone numbers of the 10 tax receivers.

The reason that we're here today is one of the nice things that we're able to do in my office, obviously, with the support of this body is we are about to venture into e-recording in my office and that means that the paper will no longer be -- it's not going to be -- anybody's not going to touch paper, so we got an opinion from the county attorney and he actually prepared this resolution and it quite simply says that heretofore, once we do institute the e-recording process, we are able to alert the homeowner in a means other than paper, and that would be -- well, paper would be maybe a

postcard or in some instances, if we have the ability to do that, which is our goal, is to send these people an e-mail just alerting them that from now on, you are now responsible to make sure that your real property taxes are paid to your respective taxing entity. So basically that's all it is. It's nothing more than that, and does anybody have any questions?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I do.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

You are still going to mail these people something out, I'm assuming.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Well, it's either going to be via a postcard. We're trying to do the most simple thing. I mean, we take that responsibility extremely seriously. We understand that these people must be notified because I guess some people, when you're used to paying a mortgage and your taxes are paid through your mortgage, whoever holds your mortgage and then all of a sudden you don't have that payment, people sometimes do forget that they have to make that tax payment. Your taxes don't go away even though your mortgage did.

So we will be notifying them and quite simply, this just gives us the ability to notify them in a means other than that piece of paper, so it's either going to be in a postcard -- we haven't worked out the final details. We anticipate that we will be e-recording sometimes in the beginning of the summer of this year if all goes well, or, quite simply, it would be via an e-mail if that's possible and the people have that ability to accept an e-mail from us.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I'm just -- a lot of people who are no longer paying their mortgage are elderly, I'm assuming, and they might not have e-mail. I don't know how you would get their e-mail, and I'm not understanding if you're going to mail them something, why don't you just continue mailing them what you're mailing?

**MS. PASCALE:**

Because the paper -- they're not going to get the paper back. It's going to be e-recorded. So in other words, you're not going to get your document -- your physical document back. It's going to be into the system, so yeah we are going to send them something back. It would be a postcard, and the way the system -- we're trying to design the system, and I'm pretty sure we're going to be successful in doing it, is that once this document is e-recorded, it would -- the system will -- I don't want to use the term "spit out," but give out a postcard alerting the homeowner that, okay, your document has been satisfied and, you know, you now will have to contact your -- whatever your tax assessor is.

So yeah, I understand that not everybody is computer literate. We understand that not everybody has the ability to take e-mail. We understand that, you know, some of our citizens are not computer savvy, so we have taken that into consideration ergo the postcard.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So they are going to get both.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Probably not. They'll get one or the other. They will be notified.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm just thinking -- I've actually got complaints about this and people have said it's like a serious amount of money if you're a day late. It's hundreds of dollars being a day late.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Okay.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I was thinking maybe there's some kind of return receipt that they got it. You know, because the taxpayer -- the burden on the taxpayer is pretty heavy in this county, and I don't want to see an older couple, you know, have their mortgage paid off and then hit with a \$500 fine because they're a day late.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Yeah, well, nor do I. Obviously, that's the whole purpose of this exercise, that we want to make sure that the homeowner -- essentially, what will happen, we are -- what we're asking today is that we no longer be held to this method of notice. They will get notice one way or the other. We have not worked out all of those finite details. They will get notice whether it's via e-mail, and like you said, I'm very aware that a lot of people do not -- although, we get tons of e-mails a day from constituents and whether it's a postcard, whether you -- I mean, our return address is on everything, so if the postcard comes back and it's not received, it would come back to us so we would be alerted to that. But, you know, we're certainly not shirking the responsibility of notifying the homeowner. Basically, what we're asking is that we just amend this so that we are allowed to notify them in a means other than hard paper because they are not going to be giving us hard paper anymore.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

This is what we're sending them, this is writing?

**MS. PASCALE:**

The important notice thing in the back, yeah. This is like a cover sheet, so they would get this notice in the back, where it says "important notice," yeah.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

But this would be their mortgage, their satisfied mortgage in the front.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Well, this cover sheet covers a bunch of different things.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

It's really an all-purpose cover sheet, right?

**MS. PASCALE:**

It is, yeah.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

It covers a lot of different things. One could also make the argument that since it's an all-purpose type of a cover sheet and the importance notice is on the back of it, which comes attached to whatever important document which has just been filed, you can make the argument that a postcard

that comes that's just simply the notification for this purpose is a better form of notification.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Because you'd have to be pretty hard-pressed to find a lot of people that are looking at this cover sheet first, because it appears to be a cover sheet -- not many people are looking at the particulars -- and then to go on the back of it when it's attached to their other important document, which is really what they were waiting for to get in the mail, it would be interesting to know if anybody ever reads this important message. So I can see where just a simple postcard could actually be a more effective message as to what you're trying to get across here.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Yeah, and that was our thought exactly. Did you want to say something?

**MS. DELUCA:**

Yeah --

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

I'm sorry. Legislator Trotta, did you want to --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I just want to -- I don't want senior citizens to get banged 500 bucks because they were, you know, late for two days and because they forgot that their mortgage company wasn't paying.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Okay. Well, we serve the same constituency; nor do I. That's the whole purpose of this. I certainly don't want to see any senior or anybody else get a tax penalty for nonpayment of their taxes. That's why we are going through this exercise to make sure that they are notified. If you satisfy your mortgage, you will be notified by my office that your satisfaction of mortgage is on file and from here on in, you will have to contact your taxing entity. So notice is not going to stop; it's just going to be in a different format. Did you want to say something, Nicole?

**MS. DELUCA:**

Yes. The current process is is that the original document, the instrument is mailed back now without electronic recording with this cover sheet. Once we do electronic recording, that original document will never be seen by the filer again. It will be recorded and in the e-filing system in the county clerk's office, so we'll have no means to send them, so we will have to do a postcard. The e-mail was way down the road. We know some counties now actually e-mail the notice back to their constituents. We won't, so we won't have the ability because that original document will not be with us any longer.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yeah. I mean, the e-mail throws me off because how is the county going to know your e-mail address?

**MS. DELUCA:**

In the e-filing system, there's a lot more information that's captured than when you do a paper document. When you register into the e-filing system to record something, they ask you for name and phone number. There's more information that's needed when you actually go on the e-filing system that's done now that is not done with hard copy.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Okay.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Any other questions?

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

I just want to reiterate Legislator's point, your point, you're saying that anybody going forward that's going to be satisfying your mortgage, more likely than not, you are, because of the process that they would've followed, you're going to have their e-mail address, if there is an e-mail address to be had.

**MS. PASCALE:**

In this case, we could capture that, yes.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Got it. Okay. Legislator Martinez.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

One, I want to appreciate your efforts in providing different needs to get the information out, but if I may also suggest, also use us to help you as well in disseminating information. Please reach out to my office just in case some people in my community don't receive the correspondence that you send out, I can also assist you in making sure that my residents are given the proper information.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Everybody good? Madame Clerk, thank you. Ask for being with us today.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Really appreciate it. Thank you very much.

**MS. PASCALE:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

There being no other correspondence before the committee, we will then go to the agenda.

Beginning with tabled resolutions, **IR 1658, Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Charter Law to strengthen and streamline lobbyist registration and reporting requirement (Lindsay).**

This is in public hearing. Motion to table by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1658 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0)**

**IR 2083, Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Cheryl L. Stilwell Et Al (Anker).** Motion by Legislator

Calarco. Second by Legislature Browning. Everybody good on it? All right. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **IR 2083 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

**IR 2084, Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to save taxpayer dollars on County signs and printed publications (Muratore).**

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion to table subject to call.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

I hear a motion to table subject to call by Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Second by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm going to make a motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Browning.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Second by Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

On the motion, Legislator Martinez.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Thank you. I just want to say that, though I understand what the concept is here, I'm also looking out for my residents in my district, and I believe it's very important to have our residents be aware of who their elected officials are, and yes we can say they need to look up the information, but unfortunately I can only speak to my district. I need to provide them with information that they at other times may not have. By removing names from different areas might hurt some individuals in knowing what's taking place in their community. For example, as some of you may know, my district is dealing with an immense tragedy where our park was dumped on with illegal toxins, and on that park, it shows who the members of the town are and if they would like to go to the town and speak, they are able to go to speak to their local representatives based on the issue. So for me, I think it's very important that my residents know who their elected officials are, and I just wanted to make sure that I went on the record with that.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Martinez. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

The reason I support this is I know our former legislator, Ed Romaine, put this in under the last administration and at that time, I didn't think it was necessarily a bad idea, either. But, you know, it's not taken -- it's -- you're town representatives have the opportunity to take that name down if they choose. I know that in the Town of Brookhaven, the intent -- we have our parks commissioner here today -- if it's our parks, the Parks commissioner's information is still available on the sign and who to call. My legislative office, my district office is still going to have the sign outside as will yours so that way people know.

Now I don't know anywhere else in my district if they go to a local park in my district, my name's not on the sign. You know, that's something the towns do, not the county. The only name on there is the county executive and obviously the parks commissioner. Yeah, there should be a phone number for people to call because I can tell you they don't have a hard time finding me to call me when there's an issue at a park, right? I know our Parks commissioner agrees. Again, it's when there's signs -- there's been a couple of events in the district and there was two legislators names and the county executive's names, one in the Patchogue area, the other one in Riverhead, and that was Suffolk County taxpayers' money that paid for it. Now if it came out of my pocket, then I would say, yeah, I want my name up there. But if it didn't come out of my pocket, then granted I might have secured some of the funds the for that, but in those two instances, it should have been paid for by Suffolk County taxpayers or just said "Suffolk County" because it wasn't just four legislators and the county executive; it was all 18. So I think that was unfair to not post it that way and constituents in my district were contacted for that event in Patchogue, and I believe some of mine were contacted for the event in Riverhead, but, you know, my name wasn't up there, but I can't imagine why.

So, you know, any events that are going on I think taxpayers should be aware that, you know what, it's not coming out of my pocket; it's coming out of your tax dollars, and if it's hotel/motel tax money, then they should know that. I mean I secured funding for events in my district, but there's never a sign up saying I did it. You know, granted they might say, on the mike, thank you to the Legislator for securing the funds and the grant for this, but I didn't pay for it. The taxpayers paid for it, so I think it's a little -- and yeah, we can talk about the politics about having an election year, get your name out there. I don't necessarily think -- if you're looking for that event to get your name out in an election year, you know, for a summer event or whatever, then I think you may be not be working hard enough in your district. That's the way I feel. I work in my district every day, all the time, and I don't wait for events to put my name on a sign to get re-elected, and if I want signs with my name on them, that's what my campaign money is for; and you can spend all the money you want on signs, but signs don't vote. People do. I've always said that. So it's what you do in your district, how hard you work is what gets your name out there, not a sign.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, I disagree quite strongly with my colleague on that point. I don't think there's any taxpayer that sees a sign and ever makes the assumption that it was the elected official who paid for it. I think our voters are a lot more sophisticated than that. I think it's about accountability. I don't think -- I disagree with the point that it's about getting your name out there. It's shameful that still less than 20 percent of the people typically participate in the political process. There are still people that still don't even know or understand the different levels of government and who their representatives are, and I've seen many situations where there have been name that are up there that those names give people a place where they can go to and get information. And when Suffolk County I don't think that adequately gives people the direction they need to go, so one I think that I

disagree with this very strongly because it does not save any significant amount of money there. Two, I think there's a lot of unintended consequence that the legislation -- the only "therefore" says that "all signs and publications," and I think that that's inappropriate. I think there's going to be massive unintended consequences when it says "all signs, publications, and brochures used in Suffolk County Government do not contain the names of any elected officials."

When we pass this, those words have a lot of power. At the very least, if we were to approve some form of this, it needs to be a lot more detailed, a lot more specific. There are situations where people need to have names and have information. I think that this legislation is -- I think it's shortsighted. I don't think it goes far enough, and I think it's ridiculous to think that because you see a name on anything that's related to the government that you assume that government official is using their money. People know it's the taxpayers' dollars. So this is not good legislation. We should table it subject to call, and it should go away.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you, and I think that Legislator Spencer made some very important points, and I think it's important to also note that this resolution, first of all, is not really about saving money. It would save \$368 is the total amount of money that this would save in not putting the county executive's name on parks signs. And if we were talking about signage alone, perhaps we could take a look at that, but by expanding out to all brochures, all publications, each and every one of us at one point in time has the ability to mail out newsletters. We still have the ability to create newsletters and print them, and those fall under this category. I'll give you the example of something I think is very important to being able to communicate, which after all as legislators is one of our primary responsibilities to our citizens is to communicate with them. I've got a parcel in the county in my district in Blue Point -- the old Blue Point laundry property, a property the county took on tax default. The community has had quite a bit of discussion about what they want to do with it. In order for me to better communicate with them, I did a brochure. I developed a brochure that went to those streets that were affected by this property asking them, What do you want. Now of course my name was on there. I put the brochure together to communicate with the district, with my residents. If I don't have the ability to put my name on there, who do they think they're communicating with? We should give them that ability to communicate with us and know what's going on. The language in this is so broad that it affects everything. How many people sitting around this table have done coat drives, blood drives, food drives, all those different kind of activities where we put out brochures and we put out pamphlets and other things that say, Hey, heres something that we're doing out of our office. We do drives for cell phones for veterans, all sorts of things that we've done that would be precluded under this legislation, and I think that until it's better thought out in terms what they're trying to accomplish here, I can't support it because I have a very large responsibility to my constituents to communicate with them, and if this is going to impair my ability to communicate with my residents, then I can't support it.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right, I understand, but that does not stop you from having your letterhead, and I know we don't do newsletters anymore.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

We have a print shop that prints up these brochures for us. Counsel has already opined that if we

did a brochure through the print shop, we actually hand deliver the brochure, but it was still printed by the county, it would fall under this category.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I don't think I have actually done any of those. Generally, I use Facebook, e-mail, you know, and granted when I'm reaching out -- I understand what you're saying --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

When I have a district like that --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, let me finish.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Hold on.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

If you're sending -- if you're contacting your constituents about a specific issue, I don't believe that this is going to prohibit you from reaching out and doing a correct contact with constituents. You're not going to be prohibited from reaching out to your constituents to respond back on an issue, and I don't think that's the intent of this bill.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'd be happy to go to counsel, but his opinion is that publication that we put together, that brochure that we hand deliver -- because quite honestly when you're dealing with issues of that specificity to the district to a community, we hand delivered it house to house to make sure that every single individual in that area got notification, not just to registered voters, not just through Facebook. I wanted to make sure that every single homeowner had the opportunity to respond, and that would be covered under this resolution, and that's a problem for me.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

It says "any and all materials."

**MR. NOLAN:**

Legislator Calarco spoke to me just before the meeting began, and the requirements are broad. It says "no sign, printed publication, brochure or form used by the County of Suffolk should contain the name of any elected official or appointed county official." There are exemptions, but it's just for individual departmental letterhead, directory listings or directory signs. So the scenario that Legislator Calarco just discussed where he had a brochure printed up that was distributed by hand in a community, under the language of this law as it's currently, his name -- he couldn't put his name on it.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm curious how you paid for that because I thought that type of --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

County print shop will print up anything we ask them to.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I wasn't aware that we did that.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

In fact, this last budget cycle, we increased slightly our mailing budget here in the legislature so we can better communicate with our district. Unfortunately, not everybody Facebooks, not everybody goes on the web. There's lots of individual that just don't communicate in that fashion and sometimes with issues, especially with that local significance, the last thing I want to do is have a decision made and have residents come to me afterwards and say "I had no idea, nobody told me about that," and in fact, I'm dealing with a very poignant issue up in Medford right now and that's exactly what the civics ask me to do is to send out notifications to the entire community so that they can be aware of what's being proposed in that their community.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

But you can still do that in the form of a letter to your constituents.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Sometimes the brochure works better.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

If I'm doing a neighborhood watch, if I have an issue in my district and we're going to try to create a neighborhood watch, I draft a letter on letter paper with a letterhead and my aides will go out and hand deliver, and myself at times, to the affected homes. I don't do a brochure for that. We just do a letter, and I don't believe -- are we now being prohibited from having our name on our letterhead? Is that included?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Letterhead is exempted, but the situation -- a flier, a handout is not a letter. So what I'm saying is if Legislator Calarco wanted to get a brochure or flier printed up and wanted to distribute that to a community in his district. Under the terms of this law as it's drafted right now, he couldn't put his name on there.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Now let's talk about events. I have crab festival. I have the summer events, music events that we have in our districts in the summertime. The organization who applied for the grants gets the grant, and they put a sign up, you know, their organization, but there's never -- my name is never on there because, you know -- and I've helped out many times with a lot of events in my district, but I don't put my name on it that I paid for it because I didn't.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

The problem is, Legislator Browning, that this doesn't speak to just those events. This speaks to everything, and it's not just the situation I'm describing with a brochure that we've handed out. It goes far beyond that. So if we host a blood drive and we want to put out fliers in our community that we run off on our own print copy machine, those are covered under this. If we have -- any time we print something up that is not on our letterhead, it is covered under this law. So if you do a flyer out to your community that says you're hosting a drug awareness seminar in the school district, you would be impacted by this even if you run it on your own machine. So I'm sorry; this really, truly hinders my ability to communicate with my district.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I understand anything to do with direct contact to your constituents, especially when you need a response back.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

That's what it covers.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I know I've had blood drives, but I have not used taxpayer dollars to --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Just because when --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- put out literature on it.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

-- you have an event in your district -- I've done drug awareness seminars in the school district where we actually got the school districts to send fliers home with their students to make sure the parents get that information and we print those up. We run copies off our machines, but we print those up. Every one of those types of things are things that would be affected by this resolution and those are all, in my mind, in my opinion, very much relevant and acceptable communication that I need to have with my district.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And I don't disagree that you should be able to if you're having something specifically for your constituents to help your constituents, but if you're running summer music events where it's taking hotel-motel money or whatever, grant money --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

That's not what this resolution does, Legislator.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, then, I wouldn't be opposed to saying table it for now and let the sponsor amend it.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Okay.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I just think --

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

While I think this is a good thing, I think maybe it's a little too restrictive and I would be amenable to the tabling and having it restructured. I mean, I just pulled up the Suffolk County Government website and on it, it says, you know, about the marathon, it says, "If you'd like to visit Facebook.com/SteveBellone." I think that's, like, going over the edge there, you know, promoting your Facebook page on a county website. I think that's what the flavor of this law partially does, so while I think this is a good thing, I agree with Legislator Calarco that it needs to be fine tuned.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

So I guess I'll withdraw my motion to approve and I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'll withdraw my motion subject to call and I'll -- we'll go with tabling.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

All right. So motions are withdrawn. We now have before us a motion to table. Who was the first on the motion to table. Legislator Browning is the first motion on the motion to table. It's seconded by Legislator Spencer. That's all we have before us at this point. All right. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **IR 2084 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

**IR 2115, Authorizing the erection of an Irish Easter Rising Memorial at the Cohalan Court Complex (Browning).**

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation. I know the Sitings Committee has yet to meet.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

The Sitings Committee has yet to meet. That is now scheduled for when?

**MS. HARRIS:**

Tomorrow afternoon.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Tomorrow afternoon is the Sitings Committee. I'll ask our counsel if the Sitings Committee has not yet met, is the bill before us eligible to be discharged in any way, or does it depend on the Sitings Committee having met?

**MR. NOLAN:**

The way the Sitings' law is written, the committee can discharge the bill. The Legislature as a whole cannot act on the bill until the Sitings Committee makes its recommendation.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Okay. So it's eligible for a discharge without recommendation.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes, it is.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

All right. So we have a motion to discharge without recommendation by Legislator Browning. I'll second. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? **IR 2115 is discharged without recommendation. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

**IR 2157, Authorizing the town of East Hampton to utilize a parcel, Suffolk County Tax Map No. 0300-162.00-01.00-010.002, for park and historic preservation purposes (Schneiderman).**

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll second.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Second by Legislator Browning. Anyone here from the administration that can discuss the resolution before us? Mr. Vaughn.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Good morning, sir. How are you? Yes, this is a parcel that was originally given to the Town of East Hampton to be used as affordable housing. They cannot use it as affordable housing because of the historic nature of the property. The town supervisor has sent us a letter saying that they would like to take it into their parks system. Jill Rosen-Nikoloff has been in contact with the Town of East Hampton to ask that they send us a formal resolution codifying that that is what they would like to do with the property. We are currently waiting on that. It is my understanding that the sponsor would like to see the resolution move today. We think that the resolution would be contingent upon us finally obtaining the formal notification from the town piece of legislation codifying. So we think it could be moved today, and it would just not become ratified until after we receive something from the Town of East Hampton formally.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

All right. So originally it was transferred for affordable housing purposes, right? The town then decides that they are not going to utilize the property for affordable housing purposes. They don't want to give it back. They want to keep it for their open space or parkland purposes, and at this point, unless I'm not entirely up-to-date, there has been a value that has been calculated here, and there's currently no plan to have that value paid to the county. So in effect, if I just have the facts straight here, this was property that was offered up for affordable housing purposes, they don't want it for that purpose, but they'll keep it, anyway, but they don't want to pay us anything for it.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

There is one caveat to that, because that was my original position on this bill too, sir. The caveat to that is there is a historic structure on it. I was going to use the word "allegedly" because I have not been out to the site to look at the historic structure myself. I know that we have had frequent debates here in the legislature about maintaining our own historic structures, so the idea of giving the land to the Town of East Hampton for them to maintain the historic structure, even though we went, looked, would be about \$6,000 what we should have gotten for the parcel back when it was originally transferred, which was, I believe, in 19 -- 2002. I was going to say 1999 but pretty close, 2002. We think that that's an acceptable tradeoff since we would no longer have to maintain the historic structure.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Does the town plan on maintaining the historic structure?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And that is why we are asking for the formalized resolution.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Well, that's why I would suggest that we get that formalized resolution that is going to bind them to whatever kind of representation they're going to make if we believe that the historic structure is worth maintaining.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We would not argue against that.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Did you say \$6,000?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

In 2002, that was the amount that was owed in back taxes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

All right. So it's 1.7 acres in East Hampton Town. It's probably worth, you know, three quarters of a million dollars.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'm not a real estate appraiser, so I'm not going to make that guess.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I won't out on a limb. What is the structure? Do you have a picture?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Trotta, as the County Executive's Office is not the sponsor of this piece of legislation, I would suggest that Mr. Schneiderman could probably provide you with a picture of that structure.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Okay, or the location. I could go look at it.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Do we have a position at this point on whether we believe that the historic structure is worth maintaining, and do we have an opinion on whether we will hold the town to preserve that historic structure going forward?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We certainly will hold the town accountable for preserving the need for the legislation. As I said, it is my understanding that the sponsor of this legislation would like to see this moved forward at this point in time. Our position is that it's the will of the legislature, whatever this committee would like to do. Certainly in the past, traditionally, having a piece of legislation, a corresponding piece of legislation when we are dedicating something, has been the normal procedure.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Is the administration aware of any pressing time constraint or issue here?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Stern, I am not aware of any time constraints. My understanding is they've had the property since 2002, so I do not know of a pressing time concern.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

All right. So we have a motion and a second to approve before us. I'm going to offer a motion to table.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Second by Legislator Trotta. I'm offering the motion to table as there's no time constraint. As the administration points out, this has been around as a lingering issue for more than a decade. If

we're going to make this type of a transfer without consideration, and the only consideration being that the town is going to bind themselves to maintaining a seemingly important structure going forward, I think it would be important to have that resolution.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'll withdraw my motion.

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Legislator Calarco is withdrawing the motion to approve. All right. So the only resolution we have before us is the motion to table. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions?

**IR 2157 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Moving to Introductory Resolutions, **IR 1001, Authorizing certain technical correction to Adopted Resolution No. 895-2014 (County Exec.)**. I'll make a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstention?  
**IR 1001 is approved and placed on the consent calendar (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

**IR 1015, Accepting and appropriating 100% Local Government Records Management Improvement Fund Grant from New York State for Records Management Programs (County Exec.)**. This is a 100 percent grant, so I'll make a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions?  
**IR 1015 is approved and placed on the consent calendar. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

**IR 1026, Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law Amending Section 232-2 of the Suffolk County Code regarding tax notices after recording of mortgage satisfactions (County Exec.)**. Madam Clerk was here to discuss that earlier; however, this is adopting a local law, and that needs to be tabled for public hearing, so it's a motion to table for purposes of a public hearing by Legislator Spencer. I'll second. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstention? **IR 1026 is tabled for public hearing. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

There being no other items on the agenda, I'll make a motion to recess for purposes of -- we have executive session. Second by Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? We are adjourned for purpose of executive session.

(\*The committee met in executive session from 1:16 p.m. until 1:53 p.m.\*)

We are back on the record in the Ways and Means Committee having returned from executive session.

For the record, we note that the committee met for the purpose of approving settlement in the manner entitled Ernestine Mackey versus County of Suffolk. The vote was four to one. In the matter of Morales (ph) et. al. versus County of Suffolk, the committee met in executive session for the purpose of approving a settlement, and that was an otherwise unanimous decision other than us noting the recusal of Legislator Trotta.

There being no other business before the committee, we are adjourned.

**(\*The committee was adjourned at 1:54 p.m.\*)**