

SM110801.txt

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

SPECIAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 8, 2001

MEETING HELD AT THE WILLIAM H. ROGERS LEGISLATURE BUILDING
IN THE ROSE Y. CARACAPPA AUDITORIUM
VETERANS MEMORIAL HIGHWAY, SMITHTOWN, NEW YORK

MINUTES TAKEN BY
LUCIA BRAATEN AND DONNA BARRETT, COURT REPORTERS

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY
LUCIA BRAATEN AND ALISON MAHONEY, COURT REPORTERS

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 11:12 A.M.]

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I would ask for a roll call.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
(Not Present)

LEG. GULDI:
He's back.

LEG. TOWLE:
Here.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Here.

LEG. FISHER:
Here.

LEG. HALEY:
(Not Present)

LEG. LINDSAY:
He'll be a few minutes late, I have a note.

LEG. FOLEY:
Present.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Here.

LEG. FIELDS:
Here.

LEG. ALDEN:
Here.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Here.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yeah, here.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Here.

LEG. BISHOP:
Here.

LEG. BINDER:
Here.

LEG. COOPER:
Here.

2

LEG. POSTAL:
Here.

P.O. TONNA:
Here.

MR. BARTON:
Sixteen present.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I would ask all rise for the salute to the flag, led by
Legislator Foley.

(Salutation)

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you very much. Okay. I would ask that we all stand just for
one more second for a moment of silence. This is a moment of silence
for Louis "Buddy" Fuoco, former Legislator who died on October 26th,
one of the charter members of the Legislature. Louis Fuoco was the
first elected -- was first elected in 1969 and served as the
Legislator from '70 to '75. This is a seat that was held by both John
Foley, now by Brian Foley. Louis Fuoco died at the age of 73.

(Moment of Silence)

Thank you. Okay. I'd like to call to order this special meeting of
the Legislature to address the 2002 Operating Budget. Henry, please
read the special meeting notice.

MR. BARTON:
Notice of a Special Meeting, dated November 2nd, 2001, to all County
Legislators, from Paul J. Tonna, Presiding Officer. "Please be advised
that a Special Meeting of the Suffolk County Legislature will be held
on Thursday, November 8th, 2001, at 11 a.m., in the Rose Caracappa
Legislative Auditorium, located at the William Rogers Building, 725

Veterans Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, New York, pursuant to Section 2-6(B) of the Suffolk County Administrative Code for the following purpose: A one-hour public portion, plus twenty additional items, including the 2002 Operating Budget," signed by the Presiding Officer.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you very much. Okay. We'll begin our meeting with an hour public portion. I'll start with James Blawn, Jr. Sir, come on right up. Sir, you can go right there, and you have three minutes.

MR. BLAWN:

Thank you. Good morning.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you, sir.

MR. BLAWN:

Gee, I can't hear myself on this thing. I hope it's working. Okay. Well, you'll have to forgive me. I'm sorry. Pull it up higher? Okay. How's that, better? Okay. My name is James Blawn, I live in

Medford, and I'm here to speak about the property tax increase. And I have to honestly tell you people, this is the first time I've spoken in public. I'm scared out of my whits, I've got water in my shoes about two inches thick from anxiety sweat. I wish I had prepared a statement, I'm going to have to speak off the top of my head so I hope this makes sense.

As a blue collar worker, as you can see before me, you know, I work with my hands for a living. And I'm on a limited income, and I've been voting for about almost 40 years now. And there's -- for the most part, I've never known who it was I voted for. My representative, Legislator here is Mr. Foley, whom I voted for yesterday, sir.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you.

MR. BLAWN:

All right, excuse me for that. However, being on a limited income, it is difficult, as time has come by, to meet my burden at home, such as my utility bills and, of course, mandated increases in school taxes. I feel that the increase in the property tax is really a travesty because it's being done to offset the monies not being claimed through the use of sales tax. People are not buying goods and services any longer because they just don't have the money to go out there and purchase these products and, therefore, your sales tax revenues are

down. To hit them from behind with a property tax increase really truly is a travesty in my opinion, and I read about this in Tuesday's newspaper. I didn't prepare any statement, I wish I had because then my comments would make more sense. I wish my wife was here, she speaks well in public.

LEG. COOPER:

You did great. You did fine.

MR. BLAWN:

I lost track of my thoughts. See I'm going to leave here in two minutes and I'm going to say to myself, "Gee, I wish I had said this, I wish I had said that." I'm sorry, gentlemen, ladies, I just lost my train of thought.

LEG. BISHOP:

Do you have any thoughts about where we could get the money from, how we should handle our problems?

MR. BLAWN:

Well, I know sitting in my living room and in my kitchen when I read the newspaper and I read about tax hikes and so forth, I think to myself that all these people, whoever ran for election, always promised tax cuts and yet today I'm paying more than I ever paid before. Where I'd -- to answer your question -- is it Mr. Bishop is it?

LEG. BISHOP:

(Nodded head yes).

MR. BLAWN:

Legislator. To cut the thighs of this large Goliath we know as government, I don't know where -- I'm not in your shoes and I'm not as worldly and I'm not as educated in this field of taxes as you are. I can only say what I feel when I'm sitting at home, and that is that the government is much too large. Positions are created and filled with people who really don't need to be there, and salaries are generated for these people and you read about it in the newspaper and you say, "Gee, why are they doing this? Why are they putting more of a burden on the average homeowner like myself?" That's the only thing -- only answer I can give you. I really don't know. I don't know things about programs and what monies are funded for what programs. All I -- I just don't know, I really don't know where it can be generated from. All I know is that when I look at this and I see my money at home that I put into the bank and I try to get some savings at less than 2%, and if you put a thousand dollars in a

savings account, the end of the year you only made \$20 in interest; I mean, that is really poor. The market is down, people aren't getting the interest out of the market that they once got. My own IRA isn't worth what it was a year-and-a-half ago. And there are a lot of senior citizens out there that are on limited incomes and to tax them further on property taxes because they're not going into the market place to buy goods and services, it just seems wrong to me, it just does. It's not fair. They have to do something. What are they going to do? They're going to cut down on their cable performance. They got to get the money from somewhere to pay you and this is the only way they can do it. Either they don't -- they don't have that plate of pasta and they have to eat a hot dog or something. The money has to come from somewhere. If you increase the property taxes the money has to come from somewhere. In the public's -- and out of my pocket. Somewhere it's got to come from, so I've got to cut someplace.

LEG. BISHOP:
I just -- if I may?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Go ahead. And then Legislator Carpenter has a question

LEG. BISHOP:
Just so you get some extent of what we're dealing with, and I appreciate your comments because they're very earnest and they're thought out. We have to deal with, in the wake of the World Trade Center disaster, a very sharp decrease in our sales tax revenue, which is what dominates the funding of County government. So we're not getting that source of funding. We're also, New York State is compounding the problem because they're cutting aid to us while that's occurring. So we're taking in less because the economy is slowing, and the State of New York is providing us less. So that's part of the overall budget picture. Add on to that that we have additional costs for -- to provide public safety, which is something that the public demands, particularly in the wake of what occurred on September 11th, so we have a very difficult budget situation. And I know that every Legislator here is grappling with the question of how to best balance this budget so that the problems are not just rolled over for future year -- into the future years, which is what Nassau County did in the past, and you saw what happened in Nassau County.

MR. BLAWN:
Yes, I did

LEG. BISHOP:
You lose local control and you have to raise taxes suddenly enormously. And so what we're trying to do also earnestly is to

SM110801.txt

address the problem so that we can go forward next year without additional tax increases and so we can go forward and provide the public with the public safety that they need and that we can continue to provide services to the public that they also demand. So these are very difficult questions and I know that every one of my colleagues is trying to do it -- to address them sincerely and earnestly and to limit the amount of pain. But make no mistake, the world of municipal finance changed drastically after September 11th and we're trying to deal with that today.

MR. BLAWN:

I understand what you're saying, Legislator. But only to repeat myself --

LEG. BISHOP:

I have another question.

MR. BLAWN:

-- the one point I want to repeat is that the consumer is not in the marketplace buying goods and services, therefore you're not getting that sales tax. To take it from them through property taxes is like going through the back door.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Bishop, do you have another question?

LEG. BISHOP:

No.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Hello.

MR. BLAWN:

Good morning.

LEG. CARPENTER:

When you began speaking, I don't know if you spoke in terms of what your property tax is now, but I have a copy of a tax bill here. It is not mine, it's someone who lives in the West Islip community, and their total tax bill is \$7,300. And of that, the County portion of it, including the General Fund and the Police District, is a thousand dollars, a thousand and two dollars to be exact. And what I found interesting in doing some research was that in 1996, this same property tax owner was paying \$1,204 for their County property tax, including the Police District. So they were actually paying \$202 more in 1996 than they are paying in 2001. So I think that with the information that is out there, sometimes the media doesn't tell the

whole story and you see, you know, we're considering a 15% tax hike, but it's not on your -- you know, total bill. And I think you need to speak to what the dollar amount is.

And I really applaud you for coming down here, because most people are not going to take the time to be informed and are not going to take the time to share their feelings about something and I'm hoping that when you're down here towed and you're listening to what is going on, listening to the various groups that are going to come before us asking the County to continue to fund their programs that are extremely worthwhile and something that County residents have come to appreciate and request and almost require, I think you'll get a sense of what we're really faced with when we're trying to make the hard decisions. And as Legislator Bishop said, in the aftermath of what happened September 11th, everything is totally different. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you, Legislator Carpenter.

MR. BLAWN:
Legislator --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
I think that you make a very good point. I've I guess given a lot of latitude, normally during the public portion we ask questions, but this is such a complex process this year that I think it's important that we provide some clarification, some information. I think that perhaps later, after the public portion when we're actually discussing the 2002 budget, it would be really helpful to go through the entire tax bill that you brought so that we really have an understanding of what the different percentages and amounts are. Thank you, Mr. Blawn.

MR. BLAWN:
May I just respond to Carpenter's statement about --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
If you can do it very briefly.

MR. BLAWN:
Very, very quickly. You brought up just that one section, that the tax that individual was paying; from what year was that? You mentioned the year, I don't remember.

LEG. CARPENTER:
1996.

MR. BLAWN:
So we're talking five years ago.

LEG. CARPENTER:
They were paying \$200 more five years ago.

MR. BLAWN:
For that one particular item.

7

LEG. CARPENTER:
For the County tax, what we --

MR. BLAWN:
Right, that one particular item.

LEG. CARPENTER:
What we are responsible for, right.

MR. BLAWN:
What we're talking about here is what actually goes out the front door of the homeowner, that's not just the one item, it's everything. It's the school taxes --

LEG. CARPENTER:
Exactly.

MR. BLAWN:
So what they paid in 19 --

LEG. CARPENTER:
But that is where I would challenge you --

MR. BLAWN:
Ma'am, I listened to you, please don't interrupt.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Okay, go ahead.

MR. BLAWN:
I listened to you without interrupting.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Well, you really didn't have much of a choice, but go ahead.

MR. BLAWN:
Excuse me. No, I don't mean to be rude, I really don't, I really don't.

LEG. CARPENTER:
You're not.

MR. BLAWN:

I've never spoken public before, this is the first time. But that individual in 1995 had an outlay going out his front door of much less than -- well, not much, but less than the \$7,000 that you're talking about today. The school taxes have gone up, everything's gone up. He's got to get that money from someplace and if you increase the property taxes today, that's just another something in that man's home that he's going to have to do without in order to make up the subsidy needed if this property tax goes up. So it's coming out of his pocket.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Can I -- okay, Legislator Carpenter.

8

LEG. CARPENTER:

I have a question for you. What you're saying, have you taken the same feelings, have you shared how you feel about the property tax bill at your local school board?

MR. BLAWN:

I was so frightened that day, I walked out. I couldn't stand up.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Because I don't know how you're particular school district --

MR. BLAWN:

But I have calmed down now since I'm standing here.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Pardon me?

MR. BLAWN:

I've calmed down considerably since I'm standing here.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. But that is where I really feel a lot of what people are feeling when they've got to write those checks out for their property taxes, that has to be shared. Because the school districts control the major portion of our tax bill.

MR. BLAWN:

And I have voted negative on a lot of the budget proposals but they get passed anyway.

LEG. CARPENTER:

But unfortunately --

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Carpenter, Mr. Blawn, I think we really need to move along. You know, we do understand where you're coming from. On the other hand, we are responsible for the County portion of taxes, we really have no control over the rest. We do understand where you're coming from though, Mr. Blawn.

MR. BLAWN:

I understand. I understand that. I just want you to take into consideration the average Joe and how much money goes out his front door.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

We do understand.

MR. BLAWN:

It's not just that one item, it's everything.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you.

MR. BLAWN:

Thank you for allowing me to speak in front of you.

9

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Our next speaker is Laura Ahearn.

MS. AHEARN:

Good morning.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Good morning.

MS. AHEARN:

My name is Laura Ahearn, I'm the Executive Director of Parents for Meghan's Law and I'm scared too .I'm scared because one in four of our girls and one in seven of our young boys will be sexually abused before they reach the age of 18. I'm here today to ask you to restore our funding to what it was last year. We had originally requested an increase in SCOPE and budget before we became aware of the problems that was facing all of our Legislators this year.

Parents for Meghan's Law benefits the County by providing necessary human services to people in each of your districts. The human services are summarized in sheets that were distributed. Does everybody have the protecting our children sheet?

LEG. LINDSAY:

They're coming around now.

MS. AHEARN:

Coming around now? Briefly, we provide a hotline, and this is very briefly, to help parents and community members deal with sex offender notifications and Meghan's Law. We also provide those same individual sexual abuse prevention information. We provide advocacy for those families whose children have been sexually victimized, we help them through the criminal justice system. Where will those families be without these services? We also provide advocacy support for communities who have been noticed of resident offenders and help them to deal with that information responsibly. We are now providing educational services, necessary prevention services for children from four years old up through 17 to help them to help themselves. Of course, everybody knows we have literature, thanks to you, you've supported it, funded it, it's distributed throughout all of our communities. And we have now a website that has every moderate and high risk sex offender here in the County available to any resident.

How we save the County is going to be presented by Steven Feketa and I'm hoping that he was put in the order, Steven Feketa from Parents for Meghan's Law, he's our volunteer Director of Operations; is that in the order, Paul?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

I don't know, I don't have the cards in front of me.

MS. AHEARN:

Is it okay for him then to take his three minutes because he would be finishing?

10

LEG. CARACAPPA:

He's next.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

He's next.

MR. FEKETA:

Good morning.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Good morning.

MR. FEKETA:

Ultimately, services provided by Parents for Meghan's Law saves Suffolk County money. These services save money by reducing the need for law enforcement to handle questions that are generated by sex offender notifications. Through the first nine months of this year, Parents for Meghan's Law has served 939 unique individuals in our County. These individuals have been served through the course of over 3,000 individual phone calls or individual meetings. These services also save the County money by providing all levels of government, Executive, Legislative and Judicial, a referral source for constituents who need assistance in the criminal justice system as it relates to childhood sexual abuse. These services save money by helping parents of victims develop necessary skills to effectively parent their children that are prone to alcohol and drug abuse as well as poor performance in schools. These services save money by ultimately reducing childhood sexual abuse through education, which in turn reduces the load on our criminal justice system.

The fact is, Ladies and Gentlemen, these services save the County programs money. In addition, they provide necessary human services to our constituents. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Next speaker is Kevin Rooney.

MR. ROONEY:

Good morning. My name is Kevin Rooney, I am the Chief Executive Officer of the Oil Heat Institute of Long Island, a not-for-profit trade association representing the heating oil industry in both Nassau and Suffolk Counties. I appear before you today on behalf of my industry and the more than 300,000 Suffolk County homeowners whom we serve to voice our very strong opposition to a proposed increase in the sales tax on residential energy consumption. It is a fundamental tenet, a progressive tax policy that sales taxes are clearly the most regressive of all taxes which government may impose, for they are levied without regard to income or ability to pay. Thus sales taxes place a disproportionate financial burden on those least able to pay. Let me enumerate. The elderly and others on fixed income, working single mothers, lower income residents, the working poor, and unfortunately far too many minorities in our county.

By their very nature, sales taxes are levied with a callous indifference to the financial condition of those individuals who are forced to pay them. It is also a fundamental tenet of progressive

basic clothing purchases, we don't tax medical services or prescription drugs and we absolutely should not tax the energy source which we use to heat and light our homes. Suffolk County already has the sad distinction of being the only county in the State of New York with a 1% tax on home heating. This proposal would raise the rate to 2 1/2% and that is simply unacceptable.

We now live in difficult economic times. Government revenues are down and cuts have to be made or taxes raised. Difficult, politically unpalatable choices have to be made by you, our elected officials. Seventeen members of this body were reelected last Tuesday. The voters of this county put their trust in you to make those difficult choices based on what is right and proper and just and not based on what is politically expedient. That a sales increase -- sales tax increase of such dubious economic validity should even be considered a mere two days after this election furthermore is the height of political hypocrisy. Finding a way to generate a \$12 million increase in County tax revenues by hiding it in your constituents home heating bills is not only disingenuous, it is fundamentally and intellectually dishonest.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Kevin, I'm sorry but your time is up. Question, Legislator Binder?

LEG. BINDER:

Did you have anything else you wanted to add to this?

MR. ROONEY:

I'd like to finish.

LEG. BINDER:

I'm asking --

MR. ROONEY:

It will take me all of about another minute.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Go ahead.

MR. ROONEY:

Thank you. I cannot believe that I am standing here today arguing against increased taxes on something as essential as home heating. I am equally amazed that you are actually considering such an increase. Periodically, I reread this book, Profiles in Courage by John F. Kennedy. It is a book I would very strongly recommend to each and every one of you, because courage, Kennedy says, is exhibited by those individuals who stand boldly for what is right without fear of public reprisal. Courage, Ladies and Gentlemen, is an attribute notably absent from this sly, devious and surreptitious home energy tax proposal. I sincerely hope that this body unanimously rejects the County Executive's home energy tax. But in the event that a majority of you gives in and goes along with it, then all I can say is you should be ashamed of yourselves. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

LEG. FISHER:
Question.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Question, Legislator Fisher.

LEG. FISHER:
What kind of dollar amount impact would this have on --

MR. ROONEY:
It's a \$12 million total increase.

LEG. FISHER:
No, on the average homeowner.

MR. ROONEY:
On the average homeowner, it depends because you're looking at different prices for natural gas, heating oil, electricity propane, the different fuels that people use to heat their homes. But something --

LEG. FISHER:
Well, let's say oil.

MR. ROONEY:
Something on the order of around 40 to -- 40 plus, maybe \$50 a year.

LEG. FISHER:
That's \$40 a year?

MR. ROONEY:
At current energy prices and I'm using an average of all energy prices.

LEG. FISHER:
Thank you.

MR. ROONEY:
The dollar amount is not what is in question, it's the type of tax, Legislator Fisher. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Next speaker is Werner Nufer.

MR. NUFER:
Hi, good morning. My name is Werner Nufer, I live right across the street there. I'm a master gardener, I served on the Cooperative Extension Board of Directors on their Agricultural Advisory Committee

and on their Finance Committee. I was out on my two mile walk this morning and my wife flagged me down and she said, "You've got to go to the Roger's Building," I said, "What's the matter?" I can't believe, okay, that there's a proposal in the Omnibus bill to delete almost \$700,000 of Cooperative Extension funding, it's like shooting yourself in the foot. There's all kinds of State funds that come along, okay, with that funding, there's industrial indirect funding that comes, okay, for the maritime industry, diabetes programs bring in money. So

13

what happens is, okay, you may cut \$700,000, but you're going to lose a lot of money, you're not going to save 700,000.

The Maritime Program, okay, has really been built up, it's a tremendous educational resource and it's a big assistance to the maritime industry out there, they're trying to bring back a lot of the fisheries work, the Diabetes Program has been very good. I couldn't believe -- I think I scanned down, I think there was \$2,500 coming out of the police funding, I can't believe it. Okay, one of the reasons you're in trouble is what happened in New York City and also on account of the settlements that were made with the police, okay, which were astronomical and terrible.

If you're worried about terrorism and you're worried about biological warfare, the police are not going to save you. I worked in biological warfare at Ft. Deitrich in the Army for two years in 1956 to 58. I really won't go into a public forum here or how you have to defend against it, but the police are not your first line of defense. Your scientific community is, your {aciologist}, your biologist, your entomologists, okay, and that's what you're going to impact here cutting back on Cooperative Extension. I don't know whether everybody is aware of it, but almost 50% of your New York State farm industry, financial recovery, okay, and then the nursery finances are right out in Suffolk County, okay, they're a major producer. And that industry, both the farm industry, the maritime industry, the nursery industry, they're all supported by Cooperative Extension. You also have a whole team of volunteers, okay, that support and support this effort.

So I would implore you, okay, to absolutely not cut that out. And I don't know what to say to the man that's worried about his taxes going up, I think you hit the nose -- the nail on the head when you said the school taxes are the place to go after because the school districts are killing us. That's about all I have to say. If anybody has any questions I'd be glad to try and answer them.

LEG. CARACCILO:
Madam Chair?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes. Specifically, which drop in Cornell Cooperative funding are you addressing yourself to?

MR. NUFER:
The maritime funding of 400,000, almost 400,000, okay, and the Diabetes Program funding of almost \$280,000. It's in the Omnibus bill, item D005.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
It's very interesting. Over the course of the last three weeks, I have chaired three budget hearings in the Finance and Financial Services Committee and not once did anyone come forward that's sponsoring this resolution and identify this as an area where they thought cuts should be imposed. So that brings me to the point of

14

asking our Budget Review Office, how did this wind up in this resolution?

MR. POLLERT:
The proposal was proposed at the last meeting of the omnibus group. The proposal was to consider an across the board cut or to target it to specific programs. The decision was to do the targeted programs, to the Marine Science Program and to the Diabetes Program.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
What was the rationale?

MR. POLLERT:
The rationale was that it was proposed that because of the County's financial problems there were other municipalities across the State of New York that were reducing Cornell Cooperative Extension.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
But why these particular programs?

MR. POLLERT:
There were two options which were presented. One option would have been an across the board cut of approximately 25% which would have totaled approximately \$800,000 worth of reductions. The other proposal was to -- rather than just cutting across the board, was to take out two specific programs that were not core central to the County operations.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Madam Chair, are there other speakers here from Cornell?

MR. NUFER:

Yes, I believe there are.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

There are a number of us.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Okay, good, Sally, I'm glad you're here because I have some very specific questions that I'd like to ask you about this cut. Thank you.

MR. NUFER:

Thank you very much.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Next speaker is Louise Stalzer.

MS. STALZER:

My name is Louise Stalzer, I'm with Peconic Community Council. And I am a little nervous today because I came here prepared to talk about the public transportation cuts, and saw that my agency's total funding is in -- slated to be wiped out. It's \$43,369; this is core money for us. And we've been around since 1976, a volunteer group on the east end of Long Island. We have 240 members. Back in 1988, the County divided Suffolk County into CAC's, we are the last of the CAC's in Suffolk County. We did have a name change about two or three years

ago. This -- the purpose of that that was set up at that time is still the purpose today, and that is to identify health and human service needs, to prevent duplication and to coordinate services. We do that, we do that well. Our membership, as I say, is up to 240 members and we address various human service needs. I do not have anybody with me in support of the agency because I did just learn it. We have -- we're slated in the County Exec's budget to continue, we are in the Budget Review Office Review of the budget to continue, so this is a complete shock to me.

The current initiatives I'll go over with you as brief as I can. We are working in transportation, we are concerned about the people on the east end who are more vulnerable, your elderly, your disabled, your low income. In that regard, we've done some advocacy, we sit down at many different levels of government including from the federal to the local municipalities. We spun off a not-for-profit called Peconic Connections. And one important thing I think I should say today is the money that we've brought in to the east end, that's other

than County money with this relatively small investment that the County gives us. We're grateful for that money, though, and that money is, like I said, our core, the money that we're bringing in is for programmatic.

For the transportation initiative for -- we provide medical transportation for people who have no other way to get to these services and we work in concert with Dominican Sisters, a volunteer network, and the town senior centers who bring people to the senior centers and then we pick up from there. And we've brought a total of \$84,000 into that project through various grants.

We now have bus shelters going up on the east end that was never before. We started that initiative in 1999. We worked in the initial beginnings with East Hampton and they have taken off and had actually the first shelter besides -- the only other one up is one at the County Center. And we're working closely with Southampton Town and we have over 26 shelters and we just began to go out for bid on that.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Ms. Stalzer, your time is up. A question, Legislator Foley?

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Ms. Stalzer for attending today and giving us your thoughts on some mass transportation issues. At the budget meeting for Public Works and Transportation Committee, you and a lengthy list of advocates had testified at the committee meeting, and could you share with the other members of the Legislature here some of the more salient points that were raised that particular day. For instance, I know there were a number of paratransit clients and customers who had attended, who spoke about the need to continue with paratransit. Because as you know, and the record should reflect, there was a significant cut for paratransit within the proposed operating budget and that there was over a \$900,000 proposed cut for our established bus routes, which only in the last 12 months we have seen an enhancement, an extension of services. Now there's a proposal to, in essence, cut back on those enhancements that we all worked so hard to put into the program. So could you share with us some of the

more important points that were raised at that committee meeting so that other colleagues who weren't in attendance at that particular meeting would have the benefit of your overview.

MS. STALZER:

There were many people that are much more vulnerable who came and testified and actually got very afraid that their services would be cut and it was very -- it was quite incredible. And certainly the

SM110801.txt

fixed routes, most of them slated to be cut are on the east end. This is at a time when we're looking to do planning to save money. This is at a time when people can't get to work, economically it makes sense, but of course, in the implications for the more vulnerable that rely on this transportation. And this is -- just to save -- the {Seeds} Grant is on the east end, we're working with all of Suffolk County for all the routes to see how to improve it through the Suffolk County Executive Legislative Task Force that's recommending expanding. And so it's critical that we keep what we have in place and then let's build from there, it just makes sense economically and certainly to do -- to do for these people that are more vulnerable. Thank you.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thanks.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Next speaker is Augusta Field. Augusta Field?

MS. FIELD:

Yes. I'm Augusta Field. I work with Cornell Cooperative Extension and the American Diabetes Association and I live in Riverhead but my office is here in Hauppauge.

November is National Diabetes Month. Over 16 million people have diabetes but one-third of those people do not know they have diabetes. On Long Island, about 6% of the population have diabetes, that's about 200,000 people. We reach out to many communities through the health service and through our diabetes outreach people, we are in health clinics throughout Suffolk County. We held our first east end community forum this past weekend in Riverhead, bringing people from both the north and south forks to come, to hear the endocrinologists, pediatric endocrinologist, diabetes educators, health and human service speakers, to hear about what's going on in diabetes to help people who have diabetes now.

This is a very serious disease. I'm sure people are not quite aware of how much diabetes impacts on our health in this country and particularly in this County. Its underlying causes are for heart disease, for kidney problems, for blindness. There are many, many issues that are -- that are addressed through diabetes. And we are just beginning to get the word out. Eighty hungry people came to our conference on Saturday. The evaluations were such they were thrilled with the excellent speakers; Dr. Gary Trigger from Huntington, an endocrinologist, Dr. Allen Goldenberg who runs the East End Associates from Greenport and Westhampton. To have money cut back at this particular time when the children are now getting Type II Diabetes, when you're seeing children from 14 on up with diabetes, this is a

disease that used to affect people with Type II Diabetes starting in their thirties, now it is at a much younger age.

We need to continue to reach the community through our outreach workers through information, and by cutting back funds, this is a terrible time to be even considering such a thing. I implore you to reconsider this.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Madam Chair?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Do you know, Mrs. Fields, when this program was instituted?

MS. FIELD:
I think it started -- Sally, you can tell me, probably --

MS. FOULKE:
It's been on the board about two years, two-and-a-half years. It started in June of '99.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
She's actually -- Sally Foulke has signed a card.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Okay.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
So you might want to ask her that when she comes up.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I have a number of questions for you, Sally, then. Okay, thank you.

MS. FOULKE:
Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you very much.

MS. FIELD:
Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Next speaker is Sally Foulke.

MS. FOULKE:
Good morning. I'm Sally Foulke, I'm the Interim Director for Cornell Cooperative Extension. To say that I heard that they were -- a proposed 25% cut was a shock to me because I just learned it as we sat in that room -- sat in the room. We learned this morning the magnitude of the cut about an hour before we got here.

I would like to address note D005 on several things. The first, to give a little continuity here on the diabetes, I am really surprised and distressed that the Diabetes Program of \$277,893 and the State aid for that of \$100,041 is being cut out. I don't understand the wisdom of that because of the fact that there is a 36% reimbursement that comes back to the County through the State and in addition to that, there was an additional \$250,000 that was able to come back on what the savings were for this Suffolk plan patients. So at this point, if you kind of do your math very quickly, we're looking at about a net cost to the County of \$27,000. Now, this is the third -- we're getting ready to -- we're at year two-and-a-half and we're going into three. What's going to happen is we're in the process of getting ready, we now have almost enough figures to document to go for the certification through ADA for a program. That being the case, that means that there will be additional reimbursement coming back which means that the County will be saving money and actually getting something back in terms of dollars.

I would now like to address the Marine Program. The Marine Program is a vital part of Cornell Cooperative extension, it is a vital part of this County. It has been around since 1989 and it has progressed very dramatically. There are things that are done in this program that are at the cutting edge, it has brought a lot of visibility to this County. This County relies very much on what happens with its maritime industry, as well as the whole issue of visitation and the -- that happens. It's important. It makes a tremendous contribution. It brings in several million dollars worth of funding.

Now, if you give Cornell Cooperative extension these cuts as you have proposed them, what you're going to do effectively is you're going to reduce our funding to almost a little more than a million and a half dollars, because this -- Well, actually it's going to be more than that because we have grants that we use the County funds as seed money for. In addition, it means that we're going to have to layoff eighty-five people. So you're going to have eighty-five people that have been laid off from our agency that are going to be in the lines, and this to me does not make a lot of sense when you're bringing money back in. I know, Mike, you have some questions.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you for that --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Yeah, Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

-- for that very succinct but very significant statement. The question I had earlier had to do with the Diabetes Program, when was it instituted and what type of results have we seen as a result of that program?

MS. FOULKE:

We have had tremendous results. We have over 400 people that have been served. We have been able to document this last year around \$250,000, have been able to be saved just in the Suffolk health care patients alone. I believe Patty Andronica is here, she also is from the County

19

Department of Health and works exclusively with that program and she would be able to give you even additional information.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

But in terms of results, there have been results. In terms of cost effectiveness, it's very cost effective because if we don't help the people with disease get the care and take the preventive measures that can help them improve their own health, then we as government pay for those patients and patient care at the other end of the spectrum; is that not right?

MS. FOULKE:

That is absolutely true. Plus the fact that you -- if this is cut you all would be losing that 36% coming back, which is well in addition to \$100,000 that comes directly back to the County from the State because of that program.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I'd like to share with my colleagues that my own sister -- and some of you attended her funeral three years ago -- was a diabetic, died at a premature age and probably in the last 11 months of her life her medical costs exceeded \$2 million. Two million dollars. So where is the cost effectiveness of not helping people while their alive help themselves and help us with the medical costs associated with their illness if we fail upfront to help them help themselves?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Can I just --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

The other question I have has to do with the other programs.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. Do you want to ask Ms. Foulke?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes, yes.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

In terms of the Marine Sciences Program, could you just expand and elaborate so again everyone has a sense of what -- how important that program is to our marine industry and agricultural industry in Suffolk County? And quantify it in terms of dollars what that industry brings in, the amount of people it employs and how important that is to our local economy.

MS. FOULKE:

Thank you for raising that question. Chris Smith will be talking, he has signed up and he will have specific numbers for you. But I just want to layout for you that it has a number of various dimensions to this. The Cedar Beach facility is key and critical. There are hatchery works that go on there. The program has just recently introduced a new program called {Spat} where there are shellfish where

20

we have a whole volunteer core of -- and believe me, some of you are going to be hearing from those people today who have learned how to do shellfish hatchery farming, it's a new kind of aquacultural farming. There is DNA research that is key and critical, not only to this, this particular County, but it goes on to how it's going to be disseminated and serve the whole nation as well.

As far as education is concerned, there is an educational component which teaches children about the ecology, about the land they live in, to value it, how to recreate appropriately, so there is that whole component.

The whole marine industry itself has undergone a tremendous amount of stress in the last ten years, starting with the brown tide, going through to many of the fishermen because there are not enough fish in certain areas. The federal legislation has changed things tremendously, it means there have been people that have been displaced; that program has helped those people find other kinds of employment and has addressed those issues. So by doing that and taking away that Cedar Beach facility, you're not only getting rid of jobs, but what you're doing is you're impacting your own economy and that does not make any kind of sense.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

When you say impacting, Sally, you mean adversely impacting the local economy.

MS. FOULKE:
Adversely impacting, absolutely.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Okay. Now, earlier I had raised the issue with the previous speaker if anyone from Cornell, and since you are the Acting Executive Director, did anyone on this omnibus group, either in the Legislature or Executive Branch of Suffolk County government, inform you before my office did yesterday when I learned of this cut, that this cut was contemplated? Did they seek any type of information about what impact it would have?

MS. FOULKE:
No, no. What happened was we learned from your office that there was a problem, we got the specifics this morning around quarter after nine.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
We have less than ten minutes left on this one hour public portion and there are an additional 14 people who have signed cards.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Motion to extend the public portion another hour.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
I don't know, do we have a quorum?

21

LEG. FISHER:
Second.

MR. SABATINO:
It takes three quarters vote.

LEG. CARPENTER:
We don't have a quorum.

LEG. TOWLE:
You don't even have ten people here.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
We need a three-quarters vote to do so. Do you want to make that
Page 25

motion?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, if we don't have a quorum, I'll make a motion to recess until we have a quorum.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Will all Legislators please return to the horseshoe.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Let's continue with the portion --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

This is only a \$2 billion budget we are, you know, discussing today.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Well, why don't -- while we're waiting for Legislators to come back, the next speaker is Howard Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON:

Good morning. My name is Howard Johnson. I am the immediate past president of the Long Island Farm Bureau, I'm also a third generation farmer in East Northport and I'm here to speak in opposition to the budget cut for the Marine Program.

Although I'm not a direct recipient of the knowledge from the Marine Program, I do use the services of the Cooperative Extension on a daily basis, almost. And if the need that I have as an individual grower is anything like the marine industry and their needs, then this cut does not make sense.

First of all, I represent the Long Island Farm Bureau. Joe Gergela asked me to come here. I only got the call at 10:30 this morning, so I didn't have time to prepare too much of a statement, but the Long Island farm Bureau represents over 6,000 members. We have over 20% of the New York Farm Bureau membership. Suffolk County is the largest wholesale producer of agricultural products in New York State, and the marine industry is an important part of our agricultural industry. With what happened September 11th, there's some questions about food safety and different things that are coming up. Food safety starts at a local level, and if you can't control food safety in your own county, how can you expect to control it coming from a neighboring

county, a neighboring state or a neighboring country or a foreign country? We have the assets right here? We have with Cornell Cooperative Extension in my meetings -- and I've been involved with the Farm Bureau now for about 13 or 14 years -- we have what is the

envy of the entire nation in what we have in the Cooperative Extension. We have some of the most renowned experts right here in Suffolk County. We cannot afford to have these budget cuts to curtail these programs.

The other issue I'd like to speak on is the -- I think it's budget on line number 11 for the entomology department. Approximately five or six years ago the Long Island Farm Bureau was very instrumental in getting State funding to provide for an entomology expert here on Long Island through the Cornell Cooperative Extension, and it's Dan {Gelrain's} position, he's working at the research lab. Long Island Farm Bureau was able to get money from the program. I believe it had to do with the landfill issue.

LEG. FISHER:
I'll ask him a question.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Okay. There's a question, Mr. Johnson, from Legislator Fisher.

LEG. FISHER:
Can you explain how the entomology funding would impact the Farm Bureau, or the lack of funding? This is just so you can continue.

MR. JOHNSON:
Thank you. The entomology department is very critical, especially now that everybody has a perceived notion that pesticides are the ills of the world. The entomology position, Dan {Gelrain}, he is working on some of the new techniques for controlling insects through the IPM programs, through biological controls, through a lot of different things. I personally use his services three or four times a year to ask questions on how to control certain insects, pests, with the least impact on the environment. We all understand that -- in the agricultural industry, we all understand that the pesticide issue is a public panic button. A lot of people don't realize that as of six or seven years ago, baking soda and baking powder were classified as pesticides. So when you say pesticides, anything that is used to control a pest is a pesticide, and baking soda can be considered a pesticide.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Madam Chair?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator D'Andre.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Farming is what in New York State on Long Island, what part of product is farming?

MR. JOHNSON:

The diversity of Long Island agricultural makes it unique. We have from the Marine industry, we have the 60% of the greenhouse industry is here on Long Island, 60% of the nursery industry. Go back when my father farmed in the 1930's and 40's in the East Northport area, my father and his brothers farmed 1,500 acres of potatoes, today there are only 5,000 acres of potatoes grown in all of Suffolk County. There were over 70,000 acres grown then.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

But we still --

MR. JOHNSON:

We still grow --

LEG. D'ANDRE:

We lead the State.

MR. JOHNSON:

We lead the State in agricultural production, but it's a diversification of the entire industry that is unique to Long Island.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

And of course the nursery business, but then the marine business comes into play. We can't afford to cut because those two big industries really has an impact on Long Island like no one can understand. The marine and the farm. And to cut those, we need knowledgeable people, particularly today as you stated, with the insects, with the pesticides. The biggest threat, of course, are homeowners and their lawns and nobody is going to go against the homeowner because they're voting, but actually a lot of pollution comes from that. So we need trained people in the extension service. We can't cut extension service. We can't cut marine biology, that has a place in Long Island's history that we can't do without. So, Mr. Caracciolo, in your district out east, I'm supporting you a hundred percent.

LEG. CARACCILO:

Thank you, Mike. Maxine?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCILO:

Howard, in terms of quantifying the largest industries in Suffolk County, do you have any knowledge of that, where agriculture and

aquaculture industries would rank?

MR. JOHNSON:
In the United -- in New York State?

24

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No, in Suffolk County.

MR. JOHNSON:
In Suffolk County it's the largest agricultural producing county in --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No, in the state, that's in the state.

MR. JOHNSON:
-- in wholesale value in the state.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Right. I'm saying within industry within the County of Suffolk. Do you know --

MR. JOHNSON:
The individual breakdown of all of the things?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Right. I understand -- I've been told on many occasions that tourism is Suffolk County's largest industry.

MR. JOHNSON:
Yes, but tourism is also --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, part of tourism are those folks that come out to the east end and want to see those beautiful vistas and those farm fields and go out on those hopefully not pristine bays and waterways but near pristine bays and waterways to fish and take stock and so forth.

MR. JOHNSON:
Absolutely. We work very closely with the Long Island Convention and Business Bureau to try and attract more people out to the east end, and that's part of the tourism. It's -- it's an integral part.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And it's really not limited to just the east end because you still have over a thousand acres of farms in the Town of Huntington.

MR. JOHNSON:
Absolutely.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Which is -- most people don't realize, they think all the farms in the western part of the County are gone, they're not, but also the Great South Bay and the Long Island Sound. You know, we funded in this Legislature the Lobster Study Program, Legislator Cooper and I last year. We funded a number of programs with Cornell Cooperative Extension. And what I really find disconcerting is that both myself and Legislator Bishop serve on Cornell's board. Now, I believe he had something to do with this resolution, I did not, so I just want to state that for the record. Thank you.

25

MR. JOHNSON:
Any other questions?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you. No, there are none. But Legislator Caracciolo, the time is almost up, so your motion to extend the public portion. Is there a specific period of time for which you'd like to --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
One hour.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
There's been a motion to extend the public portion for one hour.

LEG. TOWLE:
On the motion.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Is there a second?

LEG. FISHER:
Second.

LEG. TOWLE:
On the motion.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Second by Legislator Fisher. On the motion, Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:

You've got nine people here.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

I know. I've been repeatedly --

LEG. TOWLE:

Well, the motion's going to fail.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

-- attempting to get people back into the room. I will ask again that all Legislators please come to the horseshoe for a roll call.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Madam Presiding Officer, if I could just make a comment.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Just to set the record straight, a comment was made about Legislator Bishop and his input into one of the parts of the Omnibus and I just would like to say that any Legislator really could have come and given their input into any of the -- during the deliberations and working with the budget offices, both the County and -- the County Executive's and the Legislature's. And Legislator Bishop was at all of the meetings.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Madam Chair, just let's make it a full record. There was a meeting in this building last Friday afternoon that excluded by design and intent the Finance Committee Chairman of this County Legislature. That -- there is no justification, there's no excuse for that; that was by design and intention. And this is the work product you get as a result.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Caracciolo, as a member of that work group, I will say that I attended every meeting of the work group, there was none that I missed. And I must say that -- and I'm sorry, I might have been speaking, I might be repeating what Legislator Carpenter is saying -- there was at least one Legislator who was not a member of that work group who came to the meetings of the work group because that person wanted to be informed about the process. And this is -- I think any one of us will tell you that we all agree that this is probably the most difficult and complex budget that we've seen in many, many years. So that, you know, it was certainly open. I have no idea about Friday's meeting, but I can tell you that anybody was welcome to come,

SM110801.txt

there was never a time that a Legislator was excluded from such a meeting. There were members of the work group who did not attend those meetings, I can tell you that. But certainly everybody was welcome to attend. Now, there is a motion and a second to extend the public portion for an hour?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
I don't know if anybody else -- I don't think that's a debatable motion, right? All in favor?

P.O. TONNA:
Roll call. Roll call.

MR. SABATINO:
You need 14 votes.

P.O. TONNA:
You need 14 votes. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Pass

27

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. HALEY:
(Not Present).

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

(Not Present).

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. BINDER:

(Not Present).

LEG. COOPER:

(Not Present)

LEG. POSTAL:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Yep.

LEG. TOWLE:

Yes.

LEG. HALEY:

(Not Present).

LEG. ALDEN:

(Not Present).

LEG. BINDER:

(Not Present)

LEG. COOPER:

(Not Present).

MR. BARTON:
14, four not present.

P.O. TONNA:
Well, that's good, we have 14. Okay. So continue.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Okay, the public portion will be extended to 1:16. And the next speaker -- okay.

P.O. TONNA:
Chris Smith. Chris, you have three minutes.

MR. SMITH:
Thank you for -- thank you for hearing me today. I'd just like to point out, to embellish on some previous comments, some of the aspects of the Marine Science program of Cornell Cooperative Extension of which I direct. For every dollar that the County -- for every dollar that you give our program, we bring you back \$20 in non-County funding through a whole variety of different types of grants and contracting services. We put those dollars not to esoteric kinds of research but to bring benefits to the environment through things like improving wetlands in the Town of Babylon to improving the plight of the lobstermen in Huntington, to helping the Great South Bay and its non point source runoff, and improving the environment drastically improves our over one billion dollar tourism.

Several other aspects of our program. We provide a lot of support services for the Suffolk County Health Department, and Vito Minei is here and willing to answer any questions or help. We're a critical part of the Health Department's outreach components to the marine environment, we work very closely with them on a number of critical issues that the Suffolk County faces throughout the County.

Also, I'd like to point out that we have initiated a number of contracts, we're a very aggressive unit for your behalf in that we bring in over \$3 million in contracts a year and we've contracted for a lot of work that's going to extend over the next two years, and I'm not sure how that's going to leave our organization in terms of legally being able to fulfill those contractual commitments.

I'd like to also put in a word for the Diabetes Education Program and the Entomology program. I think they're critical components to helping the entire population of Suffolk County. You've heard some previous speakers go over the importance that the entomology position has for our agriculture industry. Suffolk County's \$90 million commercial fishing industry depends on us. There is a woman who will be speaking in a minute very factually in that she owns a dragger, she also owns a shop and she was willing to drop everything she was doing today to come at the last second to help out.

Another critical component to our program is reaching out. Legislator D'Andre mentioned about having the importance of minimizing pollution to our bays addressed. We have an active outreach component throughout Suffolk County in helping home owners do integrated pest management which intercepts and prevents pollution to our bays. We

also have an active educational program that helps homeowners learn the different types of landscaping and other issues that they can do to minimize pollution to our bays. Was that the bell?

LEG. BISHOP:
Legislator Tonna?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes. There is a question from Legislator Fisher. And then Legislator Bishop, you had a question?

LEG. BISHOP:
Yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I also have a question.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, and then Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. FISHER:
Hello, Chris. Actually, you answered my first question which was the education of homeowners as far as using less dangerous pesticides in taking -- in caring for their lawn and in residential use. But I missed what you said at the beginning of your speech which was with regards to how much the County gets back for every dollar it spends. Was it in the marine science or entomology? I didn't hear which department you were referring to, which program.

MR. SMITH:
The marine division actively goes after non County funds. The County -- the funds that you provide us put the experts in place that can then go out and receive grants. And for every dollar you give us we return approximately \$20 in return to the County.

LEG. FISHER:
And the entomology programs, would that be the same portion?

MR. SMITH:
The entomology program would be pretty close to that if you added the value of the agriculture of crops that were produced as a result of that position. And also farmers -- farmers are open space. It provides a lot of what we value about our entire heritage of being here and keeping the farmers in business is critically important. A big part of staying in business for farmers is decreasing the cost of operation, decreasing the amount of impact farms have on their

surrounding communities such as applying pesticides to crops. That position will solely be devoted to the integrated pest management concept which minimizes chemical applications to land crops.

LEG. FISHER:
Thank you, Chris.

MR. SMITH:
Dave, did you have a question?

30

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:
Could you briefly go over the aspects of your program that relate to the quality of surface water pollution reduction?

MR. SMITH:
Yes. We have a very active program in storm water runoff which a subsequent speaker will address. But just briefly, we have worked diligently with communities around --

LEG. BISHOP:
No, I don't need -- I just want to know -- what portion of your overall efforts are dedicated to that?

MR. SMITH:
I would say about 40 to 50% of our efforts are dedicated to storm water runoff.

LEG. BISHOP:
Okay. That means that 40 to 50% of this cut will be restored through the Quarter Cent Program which covers that. So it's just the General Fund cut that we can't do, that's why we're doing it. You're eligible for the Quarter Cent funding.

MR. SMITH:
Well, the Quarter Cent Fund is strictly -- is restricted in the nature at which those funds could be applied. And they have to relate to --

LEG. BISHOP:
What's the restriction?

MR. SMITH:

Well, a big part of reaching the quarter percent sales tax is doing the planning that's required, and the prioritization of where storm water run off sites are located.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right. And we're doing that now, right, through our Planning Department?

MR. SMITH:

We are doing that in the Marine Program by educating communities and working with them on which sites to prioritize to then apply to the quarter percent sales tax.

LEG. BISHOP:

I don't understand. Why are you not eligible for the quarter cent? I don't understand the answer.

MR. SMITH:

Well, there's a -- the way it has been explained to me through the

Planning Department is the quarter percent sales tax is to go into implementing storm water run off projects that are presently ready to go in.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right.

MR. SMITH:

We help communities prioritize what -- where that should occur.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay.

MR. SMITH:

Because there's trillions of dollars worth of effort.

LEG. BISHOP:

I'm sure that's by regulation and not by the referendum. The referendum didn't say implementation only.

MR. SMITH:

Well, there's a lot of things that we do around education that results in efficiently spending government money.

LEG. BISHOP:

All right. Independents you're here to advocate for restoration. My

point to you is that its -- that there is an alternative source of funding that I'm sure you're going to be able to access.

MR. SMITH:

Well, I guess we have a friendly disagreement on that one, Dave, because I've gone through that program.

LEG. BISHOP:

Well, okay. I think would be in a better position to know than you. But I'm sure you're going to be able to access the quarter cent for at least the portion that deals with surface water.

MR. SMITH:

Well, I guess these funds are -- these cuts are due to go into effect next year and that doesn't give us a whole lot of time to access those funds to try to recover and there's a lot of momentum that goes into making those funds efficiently applied.

LEG. BISHOP:

We have a hundred million dollar deficit and we've got to close it.

MR. SMITH:

I know, Dave. I realize that.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Paul?

P.O. TONNA:

Yes. Michael?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you. Chris, how long does it take to apply for outside grant or fund aid?

MR. SMITH:

Well, it takes sometimes years. I know in the case of federal dollars, which we get significant, they usually are announced sometime after the federal fiscal year starts and those contracts do not go into place until sometime around August, usually. In the case --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

It may not be a fair question, but given what the federal government now has to deal with, what the State government has already announced will be somewhere in the area of a \$9 billion State deficit, after this year they had close to a \$3 billion surplus -- that's all wiped out, two-and-a-half billion went to New York City, 500 million went to

SM110801.txt

a variety of other State services and programs -- I think it's clear that every level of government is going to be stressed. So the opportunity to take advantage of other levels of government funding is just wishful thinking. So, in effect, taking the funds out of this program at the County level pretty much eliminates the program.

MR. SMITH:
Oh, it definitely would.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And that's not acceptable from my perspective.

MR. SMITH:
It definitely would, Mike.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Having said that, could you share with us some statistics about what the marine and agricultural industry generates in terms of annual revenues to the County?

MR. SMITH:
Well, in terms of agriculture production, as Howard mentioned, there's over -- well, we're the largest value of agriculture production in the State. There's certainly well over \$300 million in agricultural production. In commercial fishing alone there's over \$90 million in impact and that has an economic multiplier of three, so actually \$270 million as a result of commercial fish landings go to impact our area.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Okay. Then the question becomes for Legislators that have to evaluate this particular program and program cut, is what impact, if any, will the elimination of this funding at the Marine Sciences Center have on those revenues; will it have an impact?

MR. SMITH:
It definitely will have an impact. It's going to have a major impact. No one else really is reaching out to the commercial fishermen in our area to the extent that our program is. And I hope you ask that question of a following speaker coming up because she owns a dragger.

33

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Who would that be?

MR. SMITH:
Mary Bess Phillips.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. I know you made a reference to Vito Minei.

MR. SMITH:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I'd like Vito to come up because I know as the individual not only now that heads up the Environmental Quality Program in the County, he's been there from the very beginning when Legislator Thiele and I sponsored the Peconic Estuary Program legislation that made us an {NAEP} recipient. We have spent millions of dollars in County funds to try to clean and determine the source of brown tide. It seems to me that you take funds out of the Marine Science Program at Cornell, you begin to not only diminish but possibly eliminate some of the effort that we have made over the last decade and the millions of dollars of investment we've already made. I'd like Vito to comment on that.

P.O. TONNA:

Yeah. No, excuse me. He -- this is the public portion stand to talk. If he filled out a card, an additional person filled out a card, he can speak and you can ask him questions.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. I don't know if Vito did or not, but if you didn't, would you kindly fill out a card?

P.O. TONNA:

Mike, no. Vito, I'm sorry. We have a person who is being asked questions --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, I don't mean right now.

P.O. TONNA:

You're given an opportunity to fill out a card and we'd be glad to entertain those questions when it's your turn to speak, sir.

MR. MINEI:

It's just that I have a doctor's appointment in about a half an hour or so.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Well, fill out -- do you have a card filled out?

MR. MINEI:

No, I don't.

P.O. TONNA:

I'm sorry, Michael, you know that it's the public portion time to

speaking. This opportunity was for Chris --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So we are going to stand on formality and not give --

P.O. TONNA:

No, we're going to stand --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Not give a department head who knows all about this program an opportunity --

P.O. TONNA:

Michael, he'll have an opportunity to speak, he'll fill out a card like everybody else.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

-- to give us the information we are entitled to.

P.O. TONNA:

Do you have any other questions of the speaker, sir?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, I don't.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. Lee Lutz.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

It's amazing how we like to stifle debate when we don't like the answers.

P.O. TONNA:

We're not going to stifle anybody, Michael, and you know that. We're going to give everyone an opportunity to speak who filled out a card.

MR. LUTZ:

Good afternoon. Lee Lutz, Executive Director, Campaign Finance Board of Suffolk County. First of all, I offer my congratulations to all of the Legislators who stood for and successfully achieved re-election. However, I add to that I don't envy the position that you're all in today. Times have changed radically and I'm afraid this body is the bulls-eye on the target right now in terms of the necessity of cutting spending and finding additional revenues. I don't envy what you have to do here today and over the next week or two.

Nonetheless, I must speak on behalf of the board and the information that I received this morning regarding the proposal that the board's budget for 2002 be significantly reduced from the recommended level from the County Executive and in fact also the identical amount that was budgeted for this year, 2001. A 39% cut specifically, which is obviously significant, particularly if you take into account the fact

that what we were charged with doing this year was to prepare for a program that we're actually to run next year. And the proposal will, in fact, provide us with less resources next year to run a program than we had this year.

35

In addition, I would point out that in your omnicode list of notes of the changes that were suggested, that the reduction in the amount of money proposed for next year is intended to reflect 2001 revised expenditure levels. If I understand that correctly, what's happening is that the board in fact is being punished for not spending more money this year. The campaign board has been extremely efficient and economical and concerned with the taxpayers' money from its inception. It has not spent even half of its allotted appropriated budget in its first year of operation in '99 or in 2000, and it appears as if that will hold true in 2001. We've done an amazingly efficient job of saving the taxpayers money while at the same time preparing to run a program dictated by law and dictated by a County referendum which was passed by the voters by a two to one margin. That cut is going to be very, very difficult to absorb and make it extremely difficult for the board to, in fact, do the job that the law requires it to perform. And we are obviously asking that you look to at least restore that amount of additional cut in order that there is a possibility we'll have sufficient funds in order to do our job next year.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you, Lee.

MR. LUTZ:

Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Next speaker is Paul Arfin.

MR. ARFIN:

Good morning, everybody. My name is Paul Arfin, I'm Director of the Community Program Center of Long Island. I want to acknowledge and support the Legislature's budget amendment to include funding for the living wage bill. It's not too long ago that I stood at this podium and spoke against that bill, and my concern at that time was where was the money going to come from. Well, I'm here to publicly thank you for including in the proposed budget amendments the funding to make that happen. You're doing the right thing. That's what I wanted to see happen. I didn't -- as an administrator of a program, I can't -- I couldn't at that time budget money that I wasn't certain of, so I took the unpopular public position that I did, and I thank you very much for putting your money where your hearts are.

I also want to ask the Legislature to continue to do the right thing as it considers budget amendments during these difficult times. The social and health programs that we've created together over the years, over the past 20, 30 years, has -- the period that I've been around, are needed more than ever to keep the fabric of our families and communities in tact. One of these programs is CPC's Intergen -- three intergenerational day-care centers in Edgewood, Ronkonkoma and Port Jefferson. These centers primarily serve low income families, over 600 daily. Forty-one percent of them are single women, heads of household. For several years, the only County funding that CPC has received has been approximately a \$32,000 grant through the Youth Bureau. Last year the Legislature, through an omnibus bill, gave us an additional \$80,000. We're asking that the Legislature consider continued support to CPC by adding to Legislator Carpenter's budget

36

amendment to the Community Program Center. Our centers keep families in the work force, paying taxes. Our centers help to delay nursing home entries for the frail elderly, and people with Alzheimer's Disease.

Again I know that there is an amendment. I hope that some of you that are in districts other than Legislator Carpenter might consider adding to the amount that she has put forth in her budget amendment. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you, Paul. Just with regard to the beginning of your statement, just personally, it's nice to have somebody come to tell us that we did the right thing. Thank you. The next speaker is Patricia Andronica.

MS. ANDRONICA:

Good afternoon. I'm Pat Andronica and I'm the Coordinator of the Diabetes Education Program for Suffolk County Department of Health Services and our program is in collaboration with Cornell Cooperative Extension.

As was mentioned earlier, diabetes is a very serious and costly disease and it's rising nationally and locally here at an alarming rate. In the Year 2000, more than 4,000 people with diabetes were seen at County health centers, generating more than 17,000 patient visits. The services provided through our program include individual nutrition counseling for those with diabetes and also for those without diabetes but who are at risk for diabetes with risk factors such as obesity, high cholesterol levels, high blood pressure. We also provide diabetes self management education, both individually for health center patients and in classes which are open to all County

residents. The American Diabetes Association which sets the clinical practice recommendations for taking care of diabetes, they recognize that diabetes self-management education is such a critical part of diabetes management that providing care that does not include this can be considered substandard and unethical. People who live with diabetes, it really is a -- it is a condition of self care that requires self-management. It's daily decisions regarding blood glucose monitoring and food intake, activity level, medication adjustment, and people need to be provided with the knowledge and skills to be able to do that.

We also provide weight management classes which are open to all County residents with or without diabetes because we know that obesity is rising at a very alarming rate and we know that is a very significant factor for the development of Type II Diabetes.

In 2000, because we've implemented our program, we saved Suffolk County \$250,000 in hospitalization and emergency room costs for our Medicaid Managed Care patients. Our team works with health center staff to facilitate referrals to the eye doctors which are so important to save the vision of those with diabetes, and also to make sure that patients receive the proper foot care, both self care and care by providers. We know that diabetes is the leading cause of non traumatic lower extremity amputation and we're out to prevent that.

37

We also work to educate residents to learn to manage their diabetes to prevent these costly complications and to prevent -- to prevent hospitalizations. We've seen through our program decreases in blood glucose levels and we've also seen behavior changes that are so necessary to manage diabetes and to prevent these problems. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you, Pat. Next speaker is Leah Nemerson.

MS. NEMERSON:

Hello. My name is Leah Nemerson and I am a registered dietician working for Cornell Cooperative Extension in the Diabetes Education Program. As many people have said before, I'm not completely prepared to speak today but I do have some information that you may find interesting.

Thirty-nine thousand people in Suffolk County are living with diabetes and patients with diabetes consume three to four more -- times more health care resources than comparable non diabetic individuals. As well as that, people with diabetes are three times more likely to be hospitalized for chronic complications than those without diabetes.

As Pat Andronica just stated, we offer the weight management classes as well as the diabetes self-management classes that are open to all in the County. We also offer foot screenings that we did back in November of 2000 and we've begun again this year. And in November of 2,000, 687 people -- I'm sorry, feet were screened with educational counseling and subsequent referrals to podiatrists, as well as 127 patients referred to ophthalmologists due to screening efforts. Five thousand nine hundred and forty-two County residents received printed educational information on diabetes and 1,106 County residents with diabetes or those at risk for diabetes were reached with individual medical nutrition therapy. We have begun the foot screenings again this November and just yesterday I saw a man in Riverhead who without our screening would not have come in as he had repeatedly missed medical visits. And upon the foot screening we realized that he had many blisters as well as an infected toe due to wearing work boots seven days a week at work and due to our efforts we referred him to a provider who provided him with the appropriate care; without that care the provider was concerned that it would lead to an amputation which is -- diabetes is the leading cause of amputations in this country.

So I just would really like to implore you to continue the funding for this program as the need is growing at an alarming rate as was stated earlier. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Next speaker is George Gaige.

MR. GAIGE:

Good afternoon. My name is George Gaige, I'm the Coordinator of the Tobacco Action Coalition of Long Island, formerly the Nassau Suffolk Tobacco Control Task Force. I'm here today to ask you to reconsider cutting any budget -- budget money from the Suffolk County Department of Health services Smoking Control Program.

Budget cuts that were contemplated would include supplies for curriculum guides and other classroom materials to be used in prevention education of school children. Research has shown that early tobacco prevention education is the most effective means of preventing teens from smoking. We all know that once a child starts smoking, he or she faces a life-long struggle with addiction. I don't know how many of you smoke or how many of you have children, but I'm sure that you don't want your children to smoke.

The Tobacco Action Coalition is asking that the Learn to be Tobacco Free Program, if it must sustain cuts -- and we all recognize that in these difficult times there is going to have to be cuts -- but we'd

SM110801.txt

like to see that the County be allowed to determine where the cuts -- the Health Department be allowed to determine where the cuts be made so that they can maintain an adequate program. You wouldn't buy a car with no engine just to save some money, it's not going to get you anywhere, but if you buy a car that's a little less money you'll still get -- be able to go down the road, that's what we're asking.

I also have a letter from the Roswell Park Cancer Institute that I was asked to read portions from from K. Michael Cummings, PhD, MPH, Chairman, Department of Cancer Prevention, Epidemiology and Biostatistics with the Roswell Park Cancer Institute. Dr. Cummings writes that he understands that the Suffolk County Legislature is consider cutting the Health Department's Tobacco Control Budget. We -- he wants you to know that the Suffolk County government is recognized as a leader in New York State and nationally for its support of comprehensive tobacco control for its citizens. You should think of your Tobacco Control Program like a vaccine to prevent cancer and heart disease. While he thinks it's fair to spread the pain of any fiscal cutbacks across all government services, he would urge you to do so prudently and with the input of those in the Health Department who are in the best position to tell the Legislature where the cuts can be absorbed and where essential programs can be maintained. The investment that's already been made could be lost if you single out specific elements of your program.

One final letter I have, I'd like to read it from -- this is from the American Lung Association of Nassau Suffolk from Deborah Carioto, CEO of the American Lung Association. She writes that on behalf of the American Lung Association, she asks that the County Legislature please reconsider the substantial cuts contemplated to the Tobacco Control Education budget for the upcoming year. "Suffolk County is the leader in New York State when it comes to appropriately spending the tobacco settlement funds and Suffolk County is a model that other counties are trying to live up to when justifying the spending of their settlement monies. As Suffolk County nears the end of the first year of its enhanced programs and services aimed at reducing the dangers of smoking to our residents, we must allow adequate time to evaluate these programs and their impacts. For the Suffolk County Health Department to face significant cuts in staff and programs will severely impact the benefits in health for future generations."

Please keep in mind that the dollar that you spend today will save you hundreds or even thousands of dollars in your own budgets and in the

39

health of your citizens in the future. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. There's a question -- just a minute, Mr. Gaige. Legislator Foley has a question.

LEG. FOLEY:

Hi, Mr. Gaige. Mr. Gaige, just again tell us for the record your position within the Health Department.

MR. GAIGE:

I'm with the Tobacco Action Coalition of Long Island.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. GAIGE:

This is a group of 35 community groups, departments, agencies, public and private, that work on one issue which is tobacco control. We've been in existence for ten years, we're funded by the State Health Department.

LEG. FOLEY:

And how do you fit into that; are you the Executive Director or are you --

MR. GAIGE:

I'm the Coordinator.

LEG. FOLEY:

Coordinator?

MR. GAIGE:

Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. GAIGE:

And we work closely with the Health Departments and the American Lung Association and the Cancer Society, League of Women Voters, many other agencies. We've been in existence for ten years and we've been helped with -- we've helped with many of the progressive gains that we've made in tobacco control.

LEG. FOLEY:

So being in existence for ten years and being active in a number of the progressive elements of tobacco control, you readily acknowledge the fact that this Legislature has been on the vanguard of fighting tobacco; is that not correct?

MR. GAIGE:

Yes, absolutely.

LEG. FOLEY:

Very good. If you could also give us a copy of your written comments, that would be important. I noticed you read from a prepared statement; is that not correct?

MR. GAIGE:

I didn't have time to prepare a statement, I read from some letters that I received copies of and a short statement that we prepared this morning. We only received notice of the hearing about nine o'clock.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. Well, of what you do have, if you could leave it with the staff here so they can make copies and give it to each of us so we can review it before we make some final decisions.

MR. GAIGE:

Certainly.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Any other questions? I would just like to ask the Budget Review Office, I don't know if Mr. Spero can answer this. There was certainly a commitment not to weaken tobacco prevention and cessation programs. Can you tell me -- the Budget Review Office tell me some of the ways that the money has been used?

MR. SPERO:

Some of the funding is used for, you know, advertising type, promotional type of materials that are handed out to the public, pens and different kinds of promotional materials; I have never received any myself but I understand that this is how the money is being spent in some cases. The funding was cut this year and next year, 500,000 was cut this year, which it probably really won't be a cut since it didn't appear that the funds would be spent in any case, and a million was removed from next year's budget and that funding was used to offset the creation of the Bioterrorism Task Force in the Department of Health services.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. So did I understand you to say that the money that's in this year's budget in all likelihood will not be used this year?

MR. SPERO:

That's correct. There's quite a large uncommitted amount of funding in the program this year.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

And when you talk about the amount that's used for pens and other promotional items, do we have any idea of what that comes to in a dollar amount, any idea?

MR. SPERO:

No, I can't -- the specifics of their expenditures we don't have available.

41

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Mr. Gaige, do you have any idea about what that figure comes to?

MR. GAIGE:

I don't know what the figure comes to but we recognize that we're opposed to cutting of funds that's used for curriculum materials in schools and these types of things that actually reach the teens that are making a decision whether to smoke or not.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

I guess my question had not to do with curriculum materials but with things like pens and I don't know if there are cups and other promotional items. And I would really -- for myself, if you could provide that information for me, how much, for example, was spent this year on those items, that would be helpful.

MR. GAIGE:

Okay.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Our next speaker --

LEG. FOLEY:

I have a question of Mr. Gaige.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:

It's a question to the Chair and then if Mr. Gaige would like to comment. Legislator Postal, it was never the intention of any of the Legislators to cut curriculum materials from the budget.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Absolutely, you're absolutely correct.

LEG. FOLEY:

The issue was whether or not monies were being utilized for

essentially promotional items that are not part and parcel of what we call curriculum materials and whether or not they could be more effectively utilized in other ways to enhance the curriculum materials that we hope are going out to the students. And that really was the frame work from which as Vice-Chair of the Health Committee I can tell you that I and the Chair of the Health Committee, Ginny Fields and others, when we had spoken to the Health Department about the way that they were utilizing the tobacco monies, we made it very clear that not only to on a regular basis come back to the Health Committee to tell us how things were -- where things stand with the program, but that the key -- one of the key elements is for the Health Department to work with all the seventy-two component school districts in the County to ensure that the emphasis, that the budgetary emphasis is on curriculum materials, not on other promotional items that are -- what I would call of a transitory effect, rather to emphasize and to allocate dollars in those areas that we know through educational experience had the best, deepest, longest impact on the student population, and that's not a key chain.

42

MR. GAIGE:
Right.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you, Legislator Foley, I think that was very well put. Next speaker -- thank you, Mr. Gaige -- is Greg Rivara.

MR. RIVARA:
Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Greg Rivara. I have been a Cooperative Extension Educator with Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk in the Marine Program since 1986. I have been the Suffolk County Marine Environmental Learning Center Site Director since we have operated that facility starting in 1991, about ten years ago. I work with fishers and farmers of seafood in Suffolk County. I also work with town shellfish management programs. Currently over 30% of New York State hard clam and over 90% of New York State Oyster Landings come from aquaculture, that's sea farming. I've held over 50 commercial fishers that have been hurt by dwindling resources from Babylon and Huntington to Orient and Montauk get into shellfish farming with the help of over \$200,000 in State and Federal funding since 1994. Note your own Legislative Seal right on the front of this podium pictures a plow. Many of these individuals are currently growing oysters in the Long Island Sound, Great South Bay and the Peconic Bays. Many local restaurants and fish markets are selling this locally grown seafood keeping these dollars in Suffolk County.

The Marine Program alone has 200 -- I'm sorry, \$2,435,562 in grants
Page 50

SM110801.txt

and contracts, that includes only \$115,000 in direct County contracts. I have two copies of our 2000 annual report I'd like to give you when I'm done that has that information detailed. I am the principal investigator of a New York Seagrant Project that will look at hard clam seed plantings at six sites in Suffolk County. All ten Suffolk towns have shellfish management programs that include shellfish sea planting. This grant is for almost \$200,000 and is not included in the year 2000 annual report, its pending. If I lose my job, I doubt that sea grant is going to give that money to Suffolk County, basically, to continue that kind of work.

I would like to leave you with a series of news clippings that quantify the Marine Program's impact in all Legislative Districts of Suffolk County. I would also like to give a handout that details cooperative programs between Cornell Cooperative Extension and the Suffolk County Department of Health Services. I think it is important -- despite the fact that Mr. Minei could not speak, it's important to relay that our program operates as a Suffolk County Health Department's outreach program, freeing up their staff to do environmental monitoring which includes all ten towns of Suffolk County. Any questions?

LEG. GULDI:
If I may.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Guldi.

43

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Guldi?

LEG. GULDI:
Yeah. Gregg, one of the things I want you to focus on is the -- the concern or perception is that the -- Cornell's program, Marine Program is an east end program located on the North Fork and focusing on the Peconics; I know that that's not true. And I want you to illucidate for us more precisely the activities that your program directly provides and those that it facilitates in the Great South Bay, in the Long Island Sound and the impact it has on the west end operations. I want you to focus on that and tell us what those are.

MR. RIVARA:
Yes. Despite our -- one of our building's locations, we're not solely located at the Cedar Beach facility that the County owns. And by the way, Suffolk County put over half a million dollars into that facility just five years ago. I'm not really sure what's going to happen to

SM110801.txt

that building that we've been taking pretty good care of. With very little County funding, we clean our own bathrooms over there half the time; I have no problem with that. I just want to bring that to light because that building -- and we appreciate DPW's help as well as this Legislature's help in keeping that building going, it's a 25 year old building.

To answer Legislator Guldi's question, we're Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County, not Cornell Cooperative Extension of Southold or Riverhead or East Hampton. I personally, and all of my colleagues work in all ten towns in Suffolk, all ten towns. This grant I spoke about, we're working in Babylon and the Towns of Huntington, those six sites are throughout the County, not just east end sites. We just started, as most of you hopefully know, running a program at the Vanderbilt, another County owned site in Huntington Township. That program is providing outreach to school groups as well as working with the lobstermen to look into this whole disease issue and hopefully with your help will continue into the future.

There's some numbers you might want to hear. Peconic Bay -- these are market values of the estuary, and I'm going to start with Peconic Bay and work west -- \$400 million market value with over eleven hundred establishments and seven thousand jobs dependent on the Peconic Bay Estuary, directly dependent, I'm talking about boat dealers, bait shops, seafood shops, restaurants. The South Shore Estuary, okay, that's the south shore right to the County line, \$800 million market value, double the figures for establishments and jobs. Long Island Sound, the lobster industry alone was about \$100 million and hopefully it will get back to that shortly.

So are we working with those groups? Yes, we are. Do we go into schools right from the County line to Montauk and Orient? Yes, we do currently, we have been doing that since I've been here 15 years now. And I'm -- I'm a little upset about all of this. I'm sorry if I'm kind of surprised.

LEG. GULDI:
Okay. Thank you.

44

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you.

MR. RIVARA:
Can I present these?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Yes, please. The Clerk will take it from you.

MR. RIVARA:
Thank you very much.

LEG. FISHER:
Thank you for coming.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you very much. The next speaker is Mary Bess Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS:
Good afternoon. My name is Mary Bess Phillips, my husband Mark and I are from Greenport, New York. We own the Fishing Vessel Illusion, we own -- which is an 83 foot off-shore dragger which works in the Federal waters. We own Greenport Seafood Dock which is the pack-out dock in the Village of Greenport for all the baymen in the Town of Southold, the Town of Shelter Island and some from the South Shore. And I also own a retail fish market called Alice's Fish Market which provides seafood to the consumers.

I got a call this morning that there was a cut in the budget dealing with the Marine Program. As a taxpayer, I'm a little upset because as far as I'm concerned, the County gets the most for their dollar from not only the Marine Program, but the whole Cooperative Extension Program itself, in educating people, in helping business people understand Federal, State, all of the regulations that are in our industry completely now. I feel that it's only one part and I understand that Mr. Bishop, I believe, was -- Legislator Bishop was harping on the water quality; that is only one part. We also are part of the tourism. Many people come out to the east end and to the west end to either view the fishing boats, to view the lobstermen, to fish on the charter boats, to go to the fish markets. And I'm not sure if any of you are really aware of the amount of legislation and regulations that we have to deal and the Marine Program is the magnet that makes us all understand to deal with the State, the County and the Federal governments. Thank you. Any questions about our industry? Because it's -- has very -- to be honest with you, earlier today this reminded us of a fisheries management meeting where everyone was arguing with each other and not realizing that you have one program that's a real positive for Suffolk County. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you. Next speaker is Susan Wilk.

MS. WILK:
Good afternoon. My name is Susan Wilk and I am very proud to say that I do work for Cornell Cooperative Extension. And this is not my

normal speaking voice, I have a real bad sore throat so please bear with me, as well as my stress being here today.

I'm really scared to hear about the possible cuts for the Diabetes Education Program. More than an employee of Cornell Cooperative Extension, I'd like to say I represent we the people who live our lives, every day of our life with diabetes. I personally have had diabetes for over 30 years of my life fighting a battle. I am here because of diabetes education. It has been an ongoing process. Without programs as of such that we have with Cornell and the Department of Health, people will be in the hospitals more, people will be using the ER's more.

I have worked in the field of diabetes education for over 20 years. I have seen so many people visit the ER that with the little bit of education and a lot more of education, those visits can be stopped. It is crucial that we keep this program going. I am begging everybody to support this program personally. I do represent we the people of Long Island, of New York that live with diabetes every day. I guarantee if everyone in this room has a family member or a child with diabetes, you would know diabetes. It's not just a word in the dictionary, it has so much more. It has true impact, it affects every part of our body each and every day with daily decisions to be made.

I will say I've always been proud to be a New Yorker. As far as legislation that has been passed for people with diabetes, as far as being able to get our medical supplies, New York has been a leader thanks to Assemblyman Robert Sweeney, and I worked closely with him many years ago fighting for that legislation so people can get what they need. This is just an extension from those days starting ten years ago when all this started happening. And please, please keep our program together. I thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Next speaker is Christopher -- looks like Ackerwell?

MR. PICKERELL:

Pickerell.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Oh, Pickerell, I see. Sorry.

MR. PICKERELL:

My name is Christopher Pickerell, I work with Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County's Marine Program. I apologize for my appearance, I heard about this about an hour-and-a-half ago so we raced here to speak as we can.

I wanted to add to a couple of things that Chris Smith our Director stated as well as a couple of other speakers previous to me, and that is kind of the fact that we leverage funds. My position is funded maybe 25 to 50% from County dollars, the rest of my money comes from what's called OTC, Other Than County Funds. I actively seek those monies out to cover myself, I live with that on a day to day basis. I

also hire technicians who live and work in Suffolk County for me.

46

I bring in money, again, working, creating projects for them to work off of and work with me on.

I cut my teeth kind of in the Town of Southampton as well as in the Town of Babylon. A couple of the first projects I did back in the early 90's were wetland restoration projects, and that's really my specialty, and working with those towns to identify areas that could be restored and then attracting public dollars for those restoration projects. I'm not going to say that if I wasn't there it wouldn't have happened, but I think I allowed them to spend their money wisely, to use my expertise to make attractive proposals that allowed them to get that seed money to conduct the projects. I have acted as experts on their behalf working with municipalities, working with regulators, DEC as well as the EPA and Corps of Engineers. I can be kind of their eyes and ears. I'm often times brought in to act as kind of a pseudo staff member; I'm not on their staff but I work for everybody in Suffolk County from a citizen up to a town or County official.

As I said, Babylon was one of my first projects, it moved on east and west, so I've gone from both directions. I'm working with the Long Island Initiative to a certain extent, with DPW, with Vector Control, with Ducks Unlimited, with DEC, so I work with all of these parties. Another thing that I do besides the larger projects, actual restoration projects, is work with private citizens. I get calls every week, and I have a stack of messages, about people regarding wetland issues, delineation issues, jurisdiction issues, things like that. So I work on behalf of citizens or the town.

I have to be careful of what I'm actually doing, but I'm often called in to help satisfy both parties and smooth things out. Also between the towns, villages and the State DEC, there's some friction there at times, you would imagine. So I'm called in, I serve whether it's for the public or for the towns, the town is not directly paying for my services. Often times when I leave a homeowner's site and I do the work for them with them, they say, "What do I owe you?", I say, "You don't owe me anything, this is your tax dollars at work." So they really appreciate that and they're somewhat surprised because my subject matter is somewhat esoteric and isolated, not everybody knows about it unless you maybe live on the water, but everybody should appreciate it in that we all enjoy the maritime esthetic, the open area of the wetlands, hiking, bird watching, whatever it may be, but I'm there to kind of bolster those things.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

There are some questions. Your time is up --

MR. PICKERELL:

Yes, okay.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

-- but Legislator Fields has some questions.

LEG. FIELDS:

Hi.

47

MR. PICKERELL:

Hi.

LEG. FIELDS:

Can you tell us a little about the OMWM and the wetland restoration and whether or not that's going to be continued if this cut is actually -- if it goes forward and if the OMWM and habitat or the wetland restoration would help Vector Control not have to spray as much?

MR. PICKERELL:

I'm working on a project right now that I started with the Long Island Initiative about four or five years ago; Beaverdam Creek in the Town of Brookhaven, and that project is one that I designed with the help of others and that was implemented about four or five years ago. Since that time we've gone to Phase II. In the meantime, Vector Control was involved with that project, they were able to actually see a reduction in mosquito pest problems because of the work that we did. We took what was a stagnet system and made it beneficial for fish species which were predators of mosquitoes. So even though it's just a beautiful looking thing, it's also very functional in terms of vector control issues.

As far as Open Marsh Water Management, OMWM, another staff member may speak to that a little bit more, but without me being there to work with the towns, some of the smaller towns are not going to be able to do the projects. I'm called in and it's not always that obvious that I'm involved but I am to a certain extent helping with expertise, helping to refine those proposals and get those things done and acting, as I said, as a liaison between the towns, villages and the DEC. And with that trust, without that report that I have, it's often hard for them to get these projects -- move them forward.

LEG. FIELDS:

Thank you.

MR. PICKERELL:

Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Thank you. Next speaker is Louis Medina. Louis Medina, is he here?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

He had to leave.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. Next speaker is Christine Ladley.

MS. LADLEY:

Hello. I'm Christine Ladley, I work for Cornell Cooperative Extension which, as Susan Wilk said, I'm very proud to represent them. I am the Diabetes Coordinator and obviously I'm not prepared at all. I'm very shocked and upset.

Without diabetes education, people with diabetes will feel as if they're victims. They need to know how to manage the disease. It is a problem solving disease, you need education. Without the education, as Susan Wilk said, they will be in the ER and that's going to be money. And I know you guys -- you know, we're talking about money today, but on the front line of things, when you work with people as I have, looking them straight in the eye and seeing them finally understanding how to control this son of a gun, it's the coolest thing to see that. I -- I'm talking to you as a clinician. I don't have stats in front of me, I don't have numbers. I'm just talking to you as when you look at somebody and they say to you, "I finally got it," you know what that does? That gives them the power to control the disease and that in turn will save the County money. And I know, like I said, it's all about money, but you got -- the emotions involved with diabetes is incredible. There are a lot of people out there in denial. Some people think they have a little bit of sugar; this is not true. They have a very serious disease that can be very slow and painful in terms of -- and it can be fatal. It affects every organ, like Susan said. People don't seem to realize that.

Besides educating people, we educate physicians and nurses. Physicians, yeah, they need to be up-to-date some physicians in terms of the guidelines, they are always changing. So what we do is we're in the front line and we're trying to help them know what's the latest

in terms of the recommendations via the ADA in terms of clinical care. And that's really what I have to say. I think we -- we're in nine health centers of Suffolk County and people are very happy to see us in those health centers. So I just -- I beg you to reconsider. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Madam Chair.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator D'Andre has a question.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Are you so qualified that you can help a doctor or advise a doctor on diabetes?

MS. LADLEY:
Yes. I'm not saying I know everything. I am saying -- you know, I don't know if this doesn't go over well or whatnot, but I'm telling you the truth, some of them need to be up-to-date, so what we do is do that. They don't know everything because they're treating every type of disease, every type of condition. What we do is we focus right on diabetes, so we have the luxury of knowing exactly what needs to be done.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
I find that hard to believe but I'm happy to hear it.

MS. LADLEY:
Oh, yeah. No. And I feel very confident in saying that. Like I said, they treat every type of disease, every condition so there's no way they know every single thing. And again, forgive me if it's too forward, but I do feel very confident.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
I thought they would check with the State Health Department or --

MS. LADLEY:
Well, that's what we are. You know, in coloboration with the Health Department we're right there. We're doing in-services, we're -- so it's pretty vital, our presence.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

And I thought -- I also thought, and maybe I'm --

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Mike, question, please.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

I thought that the diabetes -- the diabetics, that there was so much understood today as opposed to years ago, there's so much information that's known that wasn't known years ago.

MS. LADLEY:

Yeah.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

That the problem, they can't eradicate probably entirely but there's a lot of knowledge out there.

MS. LADLEY:

There is and I appreciate you saying that. I guess the more we know the more we find out we don't know and we find out how big this disease is and how it does -- I mean, 80% of people with diabetes die of heart disease.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

Well, I'm happy to hear what you're saying, it makes me feel good. Thank you.

MS. LADLEY:

Oh, okay. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Mike. Thank you, Ms. Ladley. Next speaker is Tom Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Hi. Yes, Tom Williams, the Director of the Suffolk Community Council. I'm here to ask really for your support to restore the funding that was removed from our Community Partners Projects. That project, as you know, is -- works with a wide variety of community agencies throughout Suffolk to build collaboration efforts, coordination efforts to make funding in services more efficient and the delivery of services to children, youth and families a more efficient process.

We work closely with many agencies. We have active projects in Bay Shore, Brentwood, Amityville, South Country, William Floyd and in Three Village and we're bringing agencies together to make delivery of services more effective. Many agencies count on us, we've run grant

SM110801.txt

making -- grant writing workshops and we have worked with schools to develop community school collaboration contracts. We have worked very hard with agencies to bring up their management standards and their -- and work with them on things like accreditation where that's appropriate and the Council is a resource for the not-for-profit community in Suffolk County. As you probably know from economic forecasts and statements, the not-for-profit community represents about 14% of the economic engine of Suffolk County. So we would ask you to support the Council.

At the same time, I would also support the Peconic Community Council which does a lot of what we do on the east end. We work with transportation, we've been providing a lot of information on transportation resources and coordinating with transportation efforts throughout the County. It would be a big blow for us. It will eliminate three people from our agency and a big portion of our budget, so I would hope that we could have this restored. Thank you very much.

LEG. FOLEY:
Madam Chair?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
Thank you, Thomas. Again, could you tell us the amount that is being eliminated, the proposed plan?

MR. WILLIAMS:
What's proposed in this budget is \$227,000 removed from the Council's budget.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay. Now, it's removed -- just to amplify on your remarks earlier, if those monies are not restored what are the potential -- what's the potential impact both programatically as well as personnel?

MR. WILLIAMS:
There are two full-time or part-time -- three part-time salaries that come out of that budget. We would no longer be able to organize and bring together the Coordinated Partnership Programs in Brentwood, Bay Shore, William Floyd, South Country, Amityville, we're working on them.

LEG. FOLEY:
And what's the benefit of coordinating those programs?

MR. WILLIAMS:
Well, we have found --

LEG. FOLEY:

I mean, absent that coordination, what difficulties would there be?

MR. WILLIAMS:

We find that agencies are often unaware of other agencies services. We find that by bringing them together they can -- they can reinforce what they do with each other, they can form collaborations. We have worked with the William Floyd School District in putting together an Even Start Program which has collaborative members of that project, that project was funded. We feel that it would be -- there would be a lack of those kinds of problems, the coordination, collaboration would not be there.

LEG. FOLEY:

It's your considered opinion that absent the participation of Suffolk Community Council, that these disparate groups, if you will, in and of themselves don't have the ability to coordinate; is that a basic premise that you started to say?

MR. WILLIAMS:

Yeah. We found that there can be some collab -- there is some networking that goes on but the kind of technical assistance that we can provide to them gets lost.

LEG. FOLEY:

And the reason it gets lost is because they don't have people on their own staffs? Well, they have people on their own staffs that are doing the work of that particular project.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

But they can't take on the added responsibility, if you will, if they have a full plate with that alone is what you're telling us.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Right, yeah. Yes. We look to create self-sufficiency within these communities but then they come back to us asking for more technical assistance, more help, more support. Grant writing, as I say, is one, risk management work shops we run for these agencies, coordination with County programs as well. I'm working with Nickie Pach in the Family Drug Court to look at a coordination project that would expand and assist her and reduce the number of cases coming into the Family Court. So yes, we feel that it would be a loss to the not-for-profit community.

LEG. FOLEY:

Again, through the Chair, working with Family Court, are there monies through OCA, Office of Court Administration, that could also be of

help to your organization? I know there are problems with the State budget that we all are well aware of.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Right.

52

LEG. FOLEY:
But with that said, is there a potential or a promise with OCA dollars?

MR. WILLIAMS:
Well, we were hoping to be able to put together a proposal with the Family Court to apply for some funding, I'm not sure that it's through OCA.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS:
But it wouldn't actually fund our overall County wide coordination, it would be specific to that project.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yeah. It would be program specific, if you will.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Yes, right.

LEG. FOLEY:
As opposed to the coordination approach. Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Thank you. Will all -- actually the one hour extension on the public portion is now over. Will all Legislators please return to the horseshoe.

LEG. FOLEY:
Madam Chair, are there other cards, people that still want to speak?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Yeah, there are three cards, two are people speaking about the issue of Cornell Cooperative Extension and Chief Otto speaking about the Sheriff's Department.

LEG. FISHER:
Can we extend it just to hear those?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
There has to be a motion.

LEG. GULDI:
Motion to extend to hear the three cards.

LEG. FOLEY:
Second.

LEG. FIELDS:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

53

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Just the three.

P.O. TONNA:
Next speaker is Paul Eglevsky.

LEG. FISHER:
Ilona, do we have enough votes?

MR. EGLEVSKY:
My name is Paul Eglevsky --

P.O. TONNA:
We need a vote?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
All in favor of the extension? Any opposed? We need more --

P.O. TONNA:
Can I ask all Legislators please come to the horseshoe so that we can call the vote.

LEG. FISHER:
Ilona counted them already, we need two more.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Get two more Legislators in here.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Just hang in.

(*Legislator Caracciolo entered the meeting*)

P.O. TONNA:
There's one. We'll get one more. What's the matter, D'Andre?

LEG. D'ANDRE:
I'd like to know how we're doing.

P.O. TONNA:
We're doing good, I'm feeling good, bobbing and weaving.

MR. BARTON:
Fourteen.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes. Okay, could you please call the vote

MR. BARTON:
Fourteen.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you very much.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Mr. Eglevsky.

MR. EGLEVSKY:
Thank you. My name is Paul Eglevsky, I'm the Board President for Cornell Cooperative Extension and thank you for allowing me to just briefly address this prestigious group.

I'm a volunteer with Cornell and I do a lot of other volunteer work. In fact, I've been spending so much time with Cornell recently, my staff where I do work asked me if I am on the payroll with Cornell and I'm not. You must also think that Cornell is very prestigious because you're currently completing a very large state-of-the-art building for us out in Riverhead, which we hope to occupy next year. Just to let you know a little bit about Cornell, it's the largest extension in New York State and, in fact its activities are larger than many states combined. I've never come across an organization that has so much spirit and energy and affects so many people in Suffolk County. The Draconian cuts that have been proposed will destroy this organization and will really set it back. I also wanted to bring to your attention that in addition to the two program cuts that are proposed, there is also no mention of the 247,000 that the Budget Review Office recommended for continued funding in the Parent Education Program. And

in addition to that, the 195,000 for the IPM Program was moved out of Cornell's budget. I really -- I don't understand the process and I don't understand what's going on.

I know that there are going to be very difficult times ahead and Cornell has taken measures to address that and prioritize programs in anticipation of drastic cuts ahead. But I really need you to take a second look at what's being proposed because I'm afraid that it's really going to harm this organization to a point that I don't -- I think it's really going to set it back significantly. So please, just rereview what is being proposed and you've seen people that have come up here and the energy and the talent, we're going to lose these people.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Mr. Eglevsky, your time is up.

MR. EGLEVSKY:

Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Next speaker is Emerson Hasbrouck.

MR. HASBROUCK:

Thank you for extending the public comment period to give me an opportunity to speak. My name is Emerson Hasbrouck and I'm an extension agent in the Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Program. As you may or may not know, non point source pollution is the leading pollution problem on Long Island. The main cause of decreased water quality on Long Island as well as many other areas is non point source pollution. And I kind of want to ask a somewhat rhetorical question and then I'll help you answer I guess.

If you have a pollution problem in your favorite bay or your favorite harbor, to steal a phrase from a popular movie several years ago, who you going to call? Who are you going to call to figure out what the

problem is and how to fix it? An area has just been uncertified for shellfish harvest and the baymen who utilize that area now can't dig clams in there and they're concerned and they come to you and say, "Help us figure out what the problem is and help us fix it." Or it's the summer time, it's the middle of July, it's very hot and a bathing beach is closed and the people who want to go to the bathing beach come to you and say, "What's the problem here? Help us figure out what it is and how to fix it." Well, who you going to call? You can call the EPA but they don't have a program to respond to immediate needs like that to figure out what's the problem in your localized

SM110801.txt

harbor and how to fix it. You can call the DEC, they have regulatory authority over shellfish growing waters but they don't have a program to come in and figure out what the problem is and how to fix it. You can call the Office of Ecology, they can do some monitoring in there but they don't have a program really to come in and figure out what the problem is and how to fix it. So people inevitably end up calling Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Program, that's who you're going to call.

And as a result of that, this is a front page Newsday story from a couple of years ago, and if you can't see it from where you are, the front page says, "Dig it! Clammers return to once-banned site." And inside the story goes on, "Open Season. Closed for 20 years, 90 acres of Centerport Harbor is reopened to winter shellfishing." And that was based on both baymen and concerned citizens groups in Huntington, surrounding Centerport Harbor coming to us and saying, "Help us figure out what the problem is and help us fix it." So those are the types of things that we do. We went in, we worked with the town of Huntington, we got 90 acres of shellfish area reopened for harvest. There were over \$100,000 worth of hard clams taken out of that area during the first month of harvest.

In addition, the Town of Huntington took the report that I generated and they went out and they attracted over a million dollars worth of remediation funding to go in and do the things that needed to be done to remediate non point source pollution.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Mr. Hasbrouck, your time is up.

P.O. TONNA:
Your time is up, sir. Thank you. Thank you very much, sir.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
And our last speaker is Chief Otto.

CHIEF OTTO:
Good afternoon. I just finished reviewing the Omnibus Bill and looking at the budget in general. And while I can see that the Omnibus did address the restoration of 26 Deputy Sheriff positions -- and I have to thank you for that alone right now, I appreciate that -- it did come, though, without any recommendation for additional funding.

Now, in my earlier presentation to the Legislators, you know that that, in fact, was one of the options I brought to your attention thinking that we can restore the Deputy Sheriffs to the budget and without any additional funding hire them in November of 2002. However, D-96 and M-96 further reduces funding in the Operating Budget to the amount of half a million dollars. If this is permitted it will, in fact, negate -- necessitate the delaying of a hiring of Deputy Sheriffs II sometime late in 2003. The Sheriffs Department, last time they hired Deputy Sheriffs, was in October of '99. We currently have 40 vacant positions as we speak. And if M-96 and D-96 is not restricted from the Operating Budget, we're not going to be able to hire Deputies, so we really didn't do anything here under all the presentations I made.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Okay.

LEG. BISHOP:
Mr. Chairman, does that conclude the public portion?

P.O. TONNA:
That concludes the public portion.

LEG. BISHOP:
Mr. Chairman, I would -- you know, we could say that we're going to have a ten minute recess and we know full well it's going to be --

P.O. TONNA:
Right. How much do you need, Dave?

LEG. BISHOP:
I think we're going to need at least two hours.

LEG. TOWLE:
I make a motion that we recess until three o'clock.

LEG. BISHOP:
You can say an hour but you know it ain't going to be even close.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. You know what? We'll recess until 3:30, okay?

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
So if people want to catch lunch, whatever they want to do, you know.

LEG. BISHOP:
Right. Let's be honest, it's not going to be an hour.

P.O. TONNA:
If they want to sit down and be brow beat by Dave Bishop, whatever -- no, I'm joking. Anyway, whatever we want to do. Knee beat? Okay, there you go. We will recess until 3:30. Thank you.

[THE MEETING WAS RECESSED AT 1:30 P.M.]

[THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT 4:26]

P.O. TONNA:

We were talking about Pacific Standard Time when we said 3:30. Basically we're just wrapping up our side-bar conversations and we should get the show started soon. Thank you.

[THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT 5:20 P.M.]

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, Henry.

MR. BARTON:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Like I said, I wanted to start this meeting at 3:30 and here it is 3:30 in Japan. So we will -- you have -- okay. I would ask that you do a roll call. All Legislators please come to the horseshoe.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Here.

LEG. GULDI:

Still here.

LEG. TOWLE:

Here.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'm here.

LEG. FISHER:

Here.

LEG. HALEY:

(Absent).

LEG. FOLEY:

Present.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Here.

LEG. FIELDS:
Here.

LEG. ALDEN:
Here.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Here.

58

LEG. CRECCA:
Here.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Here.

LEG. BISHOP:
Here.

LEG. BINDER:
Here.

LEG. COOPER:
Here.

LEG. POSTAL:
Here.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, here.

MR. BARTON:
17, one absent (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Yeah, I want to -- I would ask that -- it's not like Fred is, you know, just wandering the halls on his own. But Fred, if you can, we would like you here. I'm sure there'll be a number of -- a myriad of questions. He's finishing it up?

LEG. TOWLE:
He left.

LEG. FISHER:
He's working.

LEG. TOWLE:

He went home, it's after five.

P.O. TONNA:

He took a slow boat.

LEG. BINDER:

We can't do anything without Fred.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Before we start, I would ask -- we have all 18 Legislators or 17?

MS. BURKHARDT:

We have seventeen.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, great. I would ask that -- first of all, County Executive Robert Gaffney has requested the opportunity to make a brief statement to the Legislature. This is not a time for debate. Any questions

59

will be directed to Ken Weiss when we get to the amendments. But Bob, thank you very much for coming and I want to welcome our County Executive.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE GAFFNEY:

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. And thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you on what I think is a very, very important issue.

The last time that I did this, I guess, other than the individual maybe ten or so times when I've come before you with the State of the -- State of the County Message, it's less than a handful of times that I've come before the Legislature with -- in order to make a point or to ask for your support for one initiative or another; tonight is perhaps one of the most important of those occasions. In fact, this is the first time I've ever come before the Legislature to request action on the budget. But never has it been more important than tonight for a lot of reasons, as most of you are probably aware.

When my budget was submitted to you back in September, as most people know, that was -- it was a budget that was crafted over the summer. It was presented to the Legislature during the statutory time just after the events of September 11th of 2001. It was a budget that was a snapshot of a time and a place and a condition that has changed dramatically since then; indeed, the entire world has changed dramatically. And so the world that we live in has changed and those

changes are not reflected in the computer models that were used to craft budgets. Since that time, our economy has slipped significantly. The demands for services of County government have gone up dramatically and we expect will go up even more dramatically in the future. So we've worked together as a result of the need to do so in a bipartisan basis and have developed a budget, a series of omnibus amendments to my budget which now no longer reflects what we would have hoped because it was done at a time when the world was different. So now is the time that we can together, and we have, crafted a series of omnibus budgets that deal effectively with the economic considerations that are before Suffolk County.

I want to thank the Legislature collectively and the Presiding Officer specifically for working so closely with us in -- or permitting us to work closely with you to craft these omnibus amendments to my budget. It's the first time I believe in the history of Suffolk County that both branches of government have worked on crafting the omnibus amendments to a budget. I hope it's not the last time. It's been a very effective process, it's been a very, very gratifying process. So I'm coming before you today to ask for your support for that. It's I think extremely important that the amendments collectively which constitute the budget be adopted. It's not always easy to do the right thing but it's never been more important to do the right thing. We've been faced with a series of economic difficulties. We've seen what it's like when somebody doesn't address them up front and clearly. So I think this -- this budget process, different as it has been from every other budget process, is very reflective of a new spirit I think that's very important in Suffolk County.

60

So again, I just want to urge you to support this process, support the adoption of this version of the budget. I think it adequately reflects all of the needs of Suffolk County and will take us through what all of us I think anticipate will be a very, very difficult period of time. So thank you for your attention. Thank you for your support. Thank you more than anything else for giving us the opportunity to work collectively and cooperatively in a bipartisan, nonpartisan and joint fashion, the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch working together for the people of Suffolk County. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you, Bob.

SM110801.txt

Okay. We'll go to -- I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Postal. If you have your resolutions amending the 2002 proposed Operating Budget sheet, it's -- I guess we would call this Omnibus number one, is that --

MR. SABATINO:
Budget Amendment No. 1.

P.O. TONNA:
Budget Amendment No. 1. Roll call. I made a motion and a second, motion to approve and a second.

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
On the motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, on the motion, Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
How many votes are required?

P.O. TONNA:
Paul?

MR. SABATINO:
Budget Amendment No. 1 requires 14 -- 14 votes because it's a reclassification.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, thank you.

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman?

61

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:
Number one, it says it's conforming the 2002 Operating Budget to the expenditure and tax cap levies; is this the Omnibus amendment or is

this the conforming?

P.O. TONNA:

No, this explains -- this really explains the methodology; I think that's the best way to put it. But I'd ask Fred maybe --

LEG. BINDER:

I would say then we should have a full explanation of what exactly is in this before we vote on it.

P.O. TONNA:

Great. Fred?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. What Budget Amendment No. 1 does is it conforms the budget to the current Legislative interpretation of what is a mandated expense, what is a grant, what is a discretionary revenue and what is an allocated revenue. It does not by and of itself bring the budget into compliance, it provides a vehicle when Ken Weiss, the Budget Director, and myself meet in March of each year on what the Legislature believes is a mandated versus a discretionary expense. It is identical to what was included in previous years, it just picks up the new grants that are coming in.

LEG. BINDER:

So, Fred, you would say that this doesn't actually create anything in the budget, it doesn't --

MR. POLLERT:

It is totally budget neutral, that's the reason there's no Melvin to it, there's no budgetary impact.

LEG. BINDER:

I just wanted to get that on the record. Thank you.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Mr. Chairman?

LEG. ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I note that we've received two CN's and I note that CN 2068 or I.R. 2068 does not include a financial impact statement. I would like to request one at this time so before we vote on it, the Budget Office, or whoever prepared this resolution -- Budget Review, did you prepare this?

LEG. GULDI:

Energy conservation.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

It's the increase in home heating oil tax.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, we will prepare a fiscal impact statement.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay, thank you.

LEG. ALDEN:

Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. TONNA:

Yes, Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Fred, why is number one a 14 vote?

MR. POLLERT:

By Charter, anything that the Legislature recategorizes as far as mandated or discretionary requires 14 votes.

LEG. ALDEN:

So we're actually taking categories in the past that were one or the other and we're recategorizing those things?

MR. POLLERT:

No. Actually, this reflects what has happened in previous years, it picks up the new categories of grants. If you look at --

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Now I got it, Fred. Thanks.

P.O. TONNA:

Maxine, could you just recognize who's next?

MS. BURKHARDT:

There's nobody else.

LEG. GULDI:

Call the question.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

There were other --

P.O. TONNA:

Roll call on the vote.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

P.O. TONNA:

Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

63

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
14-3, one not present. (Absent: Legislator Haley).

LEG. BINDER:
Hey, Paul?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
You're welcome. It was 14.

64

P.O. TONNA:
You voted for that? Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Budget Amendment No. 2, is there -- motion to approve Presiding Officer Tonna, I'll second it. On the question? Okay.

LEG. BINDER:
On the question. On the question.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:
Fred, do we have the breakdown --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Hold on, excuse me.

LEG. BINDER:
I'm sorry.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Oh, okay. All right, go ahead.

LEG. BINDER:
If there's a problem I'll hold up.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
No, no.

LEG. BINDER:

You sure?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Go right ahead. I'm sorry I interrupted.

LEG. BINDER:

Okay. I have all the scenario impact -- there are two things. I have all these scenario impacts. Two questions to lead off. Number one, the Budget Amendment 1 that I have I am pretty confident isn't the same Budget Amendment that we're voting on. So the one that's in my packet there have been changes probably this evening; do we have a list of all the changes that have been made?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

This is the mandated.

MR. POLLERT:

With respect to the mandated budget --

LEG. BINDER:

Even with the mandated, that's what I'm asking.

MR. POLLERT:

Currently I believe there's only one change to the mandated budget

65

which is an increase in the revenues associated with the home heating fuels. The Omnibus was originally constructed with a one and a half percent increase, which has been revised to 2 1/2%. That will increase the amount of -- okay. Yes, it's going from one to 2 1/2% for an increase in the revenues in the mandated portion, which we will calculate.

LEG. BINDER:

I don't understand in that what I have in my packet, I have all the notes and so on the mandated, I assume the changes to the home heating fuel portion is in here already. So what's the difference?

MR. POLLERT:

It will increase slightly because --

LEG. BINDER:

And you're changing the estimate on the revenue.

MR. POLLERT:

That is correct.

LEG. BINDER:

And what's the difference, from what number to what number?

MR. POLLERT:

We haven't broken it mandated to discretionary, but the total amount will be going up between the mandated and the discretionary \$1.1 million in total.

LEG. BINDER:

So we're estimating that the revenue from the one and a half percent home heating oil will be thirteen -- over 13 million now.

MR. POLLERT:

Will be approximately \$14 million for fiscal year 2002.

LEG. BINDER:

It's 14 million.

MR. POLLERT:

That's correct.

LEG. BINDER:

Okay. Madam Chair, I'd like to -- I'd like to make a motion to amend the mandated omnibus in that I would make a motion to replace the one and a half percent with however much it takes in the securitization program to cover that 14 million. I wouldn't think that we'd need to do the whole thing, the 37 million net. And also I would ask that that be a multi -- based on the multi-year program that was presented to us, not a one shot but on a multi year so it's taken care of over the years rather than do the one and a half percent. So I would be -- I'd make that motion, I don't know if I have a second.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. There's a motion to amend Budget Amendment No. 2 to replace the revenue generated by a one and a half cent increase in the sales tax

on fuel oil -- on home heating oil and to replace that with tobacco securitization which would generate the same amount of revenue.

LEG. BINDER:

Right. What happened -- just let me tell as a quick explanation -- we backed into the 37 million, we could have done almost any number we wanted and done it in a multi-year program. I would suggest that we back into the 14 million this year and whatever we think we need next year and at least for four years, four or five years, the way they did the same program, I'd use the same program just to back into the same number so it's a multi-year program to just replace the revenue so we don't run short then.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Okay. Is there a second to that motion?

LEG. TOWLE:
Yeah, I'll second it.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
On the motion

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Second by Legislator Towle. On the question, Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes. I'd like to see the financial impact on tobacco securitization for the proposal before us and what it will mean to the taxpayers of Suffolk County in terms of how much will be forfeited from the tobacco settlement monies.

LEG. BINDER:
If I can just --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Binder?

LEG. BINDER:
Could you also make sure we have that in present value because the present value is where we actually do a lot better and present value is where it should be calculated on the monies we get now. So I'd like that analysis to have a present value component, please.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And also, I'd like to know what the commissions and fees to the individuals that would be underwriting this. And has an underwriter been selected? Is that part of the proposal?

LEG. BINDER:
I would hope that there would be -- I would assume there would be an RFP.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, I know you've argued for that in the past.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Could I --

LEG. BINDER:
I still argue with them.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Gentlemen, can I ask you to please go through the Chair?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I'm sorry. Okay.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Right. The question is does part of adopting this budget amendment include blanket authorization for the County to go out and securitize its tobacco settlement monies with any particular Wall Street firm? First question.

LEG. BINDER:
Can I interrupt you?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And then the second question is --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
No, let me him ask his question.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Second question, just two questions. What would be the fees and commissions associated with that?

LEG. BINDER:
On the first one, if you would suffer an interruption, I would like to make just a parliamentary inquiry to Counsel. The question would be on a budget amendment would I be able to specify in there, because I know it's not authorizing, would we be able to specify that that would happen through an RFP? Is there language that we can insert into that to make sure that it would be directed that this would happen through an RFP process? Because I wouldn't want it to happen any other way but -- or we'd have to wait until the authorizing process?

MR. SABATINO:
There are two answers. The starting point is that because the proposal that has currently been under consideration deals with the creation of a separate corporation, that corporation is not subject to the normal RFP requirements of State or County Law. So therefore, in absence of the County doing something affirmatively to impose that requirement, it would be an RFP bypass situation to do the transaction. The two -- the two ways to go would be one is to try to impose the conditions as part of this legislation, and also you need a Local Law to create the corporation and authorize the program. So it would really have to be in both places so there's two answers which are --

LEG. BINDER:

Okay. So if I can amend my amendment to include the language that would say, at least at this section and then we'll do it again later when we create the program under the Local Law, that it has to be by an RFP process or we would impose that condition. And on the second one I can't help you with.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Madam Chair?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Can I just ask the seconder of the motion, the motion has been amended

LEG. TOWLE:

That's fine.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Right. As you know as Vice-Chair of the Finance Committee, that that has been a contentious subject in the committee as well as amongst some Legislators like Legislator Binder. So to do anything short of that would clearly be irresponsible on the part of the Legislature and the County. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Can I --

LEG. BINDER:

Well, I've amended the motion.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Excuse me.

LEG. BINDER:

Okay, sorry.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Just based on the questions that were asked, I would just like to ask the Budget Review Office, in view of the questions that were asked in terms of a fiscal impact statement and fiscal information, how long would it take for the Budget Review Office to give us answers to some of the questions which have been asked here?

MR. POLLERT:

We would not be able to provide the data directly, I would have to reach out to some of the underwriters. It's a fundamental

restructuring of the entire omnibus bill because you can only use the proceeds of tobacco securitization for working capital or to reduce debt service. So what would happen is you would have to totally rerun the numbers. The original County Executive proposal was to defease approximately \$55 million worth of debt, now we're looking at just a net of 14. We neither have the capabilities to do that, we would have to rely upon the people who had made the proposals; I don't know how long it would take them to do it but I would imagine at least a day.

69

D.P.O. POSTAL:

But in other words, we would not have all of the information to make a decision with regard to the mandated portion of the budget by adopting this amendment, for example, we wouldn't know all the ramifications.

MR. POLLERT:

No, in fact, you would not. It would be starting from scratch with respect to the mandated portion of the budget, because that's where the tobacco securitization really has its impact, less so in the discretionary side. Although I would also have to redo the discretionary side of the budget because I'm picking up \$15 million worth of tobacco revenue on the discretionary. So even though there were two separate omnibus bills, the discretionary and a mandated, the two are linked and they're linked because of changes to tobacco securitization.

LEG. TOWLE:

Legislator Postal?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:

Yeah, Fred, just to follow-up on that for a second. The oil tax, the financial impact on that is based on, you know -- how do you come to a conclusion? How did the Budget Review Office come to a conclusion on what the one and a half percent would mean and is that an absolute guarantee that that's what we're going to generate from that oil tax? Because I'm curious how we would come to the conclusion or, you know, so fine tuned that we know exactly how much oil businesses or residents are going to buy.

MR. POLLERT:

The amount that we had projected is based upon what we are actually receiving for the current portion of the sales tax on home heating fuels. Because we already have an exemption they break out what the value of that is, so it's a question of incrementing from that value. We further contacted the the State of New York to develop and to

verify that our methodology was proper and correct.

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay. So basically we used the 1% that we have now and multiplied it another one and a half percent and that was the number we came up with.

MR. POLLERT:

That's correct. And then what we did is the County Executive's Office and the Budget Review Office, because of the declining cost of fuel oil, put in an adjustment on there.

LEG. TOWLE:

But it's a guess because we don't know if fuel oils are going to go up --

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, it's absolutely a guess, yes.

70

LEG. TOWLE:

We don't know if it's going to be a cold winter and people are going to use more fuel or a mild winter and they use less fuel.

MR. POLLERT:

That is correct.

LEG. TOWLE:

Unlike the tobacco settlement where that money needed no upfront once the RFP was issued, once we hired a financial company to do whatever they were going to do, the money would be fixed, we'd have a fixed amount we'd know for sure we're getting.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, you would have a sum certain.

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay. I mean, I think that's clearly, Legislator Postal, another argument to be added to this process. That, you know, depending on the conditions of weather and sale, the oil tax is at best a guess; it may be a very good educated guess but it's a guess nonetheless.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. BINDER:

Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
This is on the amendment.

MR. BARTON:
Yes.

(*Roll Call Continued by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCILO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
(Not Present).

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
Can you restate the amendment; is it to --

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Securitization.

71

LEG. FISHER:
For securitization?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Right.

LEG. BINDER:
For enough to cover the one and a half percent tax.

LEG. FISHER:
Okay, no. Thank you.

LEG. FOLEY:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
(Not Present).

P.O. TONNA:
Where is Legislator Guldi?

MR. BARTON:
Two. It got two votes.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, great. Can you find Legislator Guldi?

72

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Just Legislator Postal, what were you saying?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
No, (inaudible).

P.O. TONNA:
I thought we voted on that already, right?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
No, that was an amendment.

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I'm going to make a motion to amend Budget Amendment No. 2 to include the heating oil adjustment and direct BRO to make all the necessary technical adjustments.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Second by Legislator Postal. Legislator Binder, on the motion.

LEG. BINDER:
This is just to the mandated portion.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
Okay. No, that's fine.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCILO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:

Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yes.

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

No.

LEG. ALDEN:

Nope.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. BINDER:

No.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. Okay.

MR. BARTON:

Thirteen.

P.O. TONNA:

I'm going to make the next motion --

MR. SABATINO:

That was the amendment.

P.O. TONNA:

That's the amendment. Now --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Mr. Chairman, what was the vote on that last one?

74

MR. BARTON:
13-4, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. And that -- now it's a motion to approve Budget Amendment No. 2.

LEG. TOWLE:
On the motion.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Second the motion.

LEG. FISHER:
Number three.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, sorry.

MR. SABATINO:
No, no.

P.O. TONNA:
Number two.

MR. SABATINO:
This is a vote on Budget Amendment No. 2 as amended by the previous vote, this is the mandated portion of the budget.

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:
How many votes are required?

MR. SABATINO:
Ten.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

P.O. TONNA:

Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No.

75

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:

Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yes.

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

No.

LEG. ALDEN:

No.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. BINDER:

No.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

MR. BARTON:

13-4, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. Okay. Now I'm going to make a motion to amend Budget Amendment No. 3 by incorporating the following changes: Increase home heating fuel tax to 2.5% beginning March, 2002; reverse funding, Cornell Cooperative IPM Program from Fund 477 to General Fund 001; add \$250,000 to Sheriff's Department, Gabreski Airport security; fund one half of the Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Science Program in the General Fund; restore Peconic Community Council 43,000; restore 15,000 to Literacy Volunteers; reduce various contingency -- contract agencies \$200,000; increase 2002 revenue estimate for home heating fuels to 14 million; reduce police property -- Police District

76

property tax from amounts included in original omnibus. I make a motion, seconded by Legislator Postal. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. BINDER:

On the motion, Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:

On the motion, Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:

Before we vote on it, I wonder if we can get an impact. I mean, that was a -- that was a list of things. What I'd like know is we have tax impacts, scenarios, I'm wondering if we can get a tax impact scenario before and after so we can understand what we're -- what we're voting on as a package.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

I don't know if the Budget Review Office can do that.

LEG. BINDER:

Well, if Budget Review says there's no impact, then that --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Budget Review?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, the last page --

LEG. CRECCA:
Motion to recess. Motion to recess for -- until six o'clock.

LEG. BINDER:
Actually, Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I haven't --

P.O. TONNA:
Yeah, okay. Sorry. Go ahead, Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:
I haven't relieved the floor for a motion. No, I'm not done with the question.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. The last page of Omnibus Resolution No. 3 includes a fiscal impact statement, which is a detailed fiscal impact statement. It is a combination of Resolution No. 2 and 3 taken together. There will be changes from that fiscal impact statement in that the property tax increase in the Police District will be lowered. I do not know exactly at this point in time how much it will be lowered by, but it will not be an appreciable change. There will be a slight moderation in the Police District, less than \$1 million change from what is presented as a last sheet of that omnibus resolution.

77

LEG. BINDER:
Okay. So in the blended -- this is the last page of this group that you gave us, I assume.

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct.

LEG. BINDER:
And it would -- let me just make sure, it says: "Property tax warrant, comparison of 2001 Adopted/2002 Recommended, combined mandated, discretionary"?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:

Okay. So you're saying, essentially, it will be the same, considering with the mandated that just passed and the way this is with the amendment that was just proposed.

MR. POLLERT:

That is correct.

LEG. BINDER:

Okay, thank you. I'm good. That's fine.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

On that --

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

On the motion, on the resolution. What is the impact on the General Fund, Fred?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. The impact on the General Fund is a 9% increase from the 2001 adopted level. The County Executive had proposed a 5% increase. This would be 9%, in total a \$4.4 million increase in real property taxes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So -- and could you give me the breakdown in the five east end towns?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. The breakdown in the five eastern towns --

LEG. FOLEY:

The dollar difference, Legislator --

MR. POLLERT:

Would you like it on the --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, the percentage basis.

MR. POLLERT:

-- total tax?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, just give me the percentages.

MR. POLLERT:

Okay. In the Town of East Hampton, it is 13.2% on the General Fund Tax Levy, .6% to the total property tax bill. In the Town of Riverhead --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No. We're only talking about the County portion, not the total -- we don't control school taxes and town taxes.

MR. POLLERT:

No, no, I understand that.

LEG. FOLEY:

What about the dollar impact.

MR. POLLERT:

But, you know, like just in general, I know that you don't like to do the percentages. The increase in the Town of Riverhead is .5%, the increase in Shelter Island is 13.5%, the increase in Southampton is 8%, and the increase in Southold is 8.3%, and that's all on just the General Fund portion.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Fisher?

LEG. FISHER:

Fred, could you, please, translate those percentages into dollar figures?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. In the Town of Riverhead, there would actually be a decrease from what the tax bill was last year by \$2 on the average homeowner. There would be a \$17 increase in Shelter Island, a \$9 increase in Southampton, a \$6 increase in Southold. And I left out --

LEG. FISHER:

While you're at it, can you give it to us for Brookhaven as well?

MR. POLLERT:

In the Town of Brookhaven, there would be --

LEG. FISHER:

Oh, it's okay, it's all right. I just wanted those translated. Thank you.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I'd like that number, please, Fred.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
General Fund.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Fred.

LEG. FISHER:
General Fund.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No, combined fund, Town of Brookhaven, I'd like that number.

MR. POLLERT:
Combined funds, Town of Brookhaven would be an increase of \$83.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you.

LEG. FISHER:
Okay. Thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Caracappa, did you have a question?

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. BINDER:
Could I just have him add Huntington --

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:
Huntington, Babylon, as long as you're reading them all off.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. That would have been a lot easier.

LEG. BINDER:
I guess I'm just trying to say, why don't you just read all the towns off?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes. In the Town of Babylon, it would be \$80; Brookhaven, 83; 153 in Huntington, 100 --

LEG. BINDER:
One-fifty-three?

MR. POLLERT:
One hundred and five in Islip, 152 in Smithtown, and I have read all the eastern towns.

80

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Are there any other questions?

LEG. ALDEN:
I have one question.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:
Fred. Fred.

LEG. GULDI:
Hold on.

LEG. FISHER:
General Fund.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, I'm sorry.

LEG. ALDEN:
Fred, now the numbers you read off, that's increases in property taxes, right?

MR. POLLERT:
That's for the average homeowner tax bill, that's correct.

LEG. ALDEN:
Now this budget amendment also includes a -- that 2%, or whatever -- whatever percentage increase in the home heating oil?

MR. POLLERT:
It would include a 1 1/2% increase in the home heating fuels.

LEG. ALDEN:
But that's not -- that number isn't included in what you just read off on the property taxes.

MR. POLLERT:

It is included and it --

LEG. ALDEN:
That is included.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
Okay.

MR. POLLERT:
This is the -- you know, the balancing revenue between total expenditures and revenues is property taxes, so this is after the home heating fuels have been taken into account.

81

LEG. ALDEN:
Okay. But that's not going to be collected in property tax, that's still going to be collected on point of delivery.

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct.

LEG. ALDEN:
Okay, thanks.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Other questions? Legislator Carpenter?

LEG. CARPENTER:
Thank you. As we are discussing what these numbers actually are from town to town, I just had read something earlier today, and I know some of the Legislators had to step out of the room, and I wanted to bring everyone's attention to it now. This morning, someone that I represent in the district, who has a tax bill of \$7,368. In looking at the County portion of that tax bill, it is \$1,002, and that includes the Police District, both the General Fund and the County Police. The person's tax bill for the County is \$1,002 out of a total tax bill of \$7,368. And what I found interesting, the person had called me back and said, "You know, I pulled out my tax bills from '96, '97, and '98, and where the County portion of the tax bill in 2001 was \$1,002, in 1996 it was \$1,204." So in five years, the County portion of the tax bill for this taxpayer has actually gone down \$202.

And I think it's important to keep this all in perspective when we're looking at what the actual impact is. When you start getting caught up in percentages, whether it's 3%, 9%, 15%, whatever the percentage

is, when you don't look at what the real impact is, and the real impact, and we just heard some of the numbers, \$60, \$80, and in some instances, a reduction of \$2, I think that's very, very important. We need to keep that perspective, especially in light of what the County Executive said today. These are unprecedented times. It was unprecedented that in a bipartisan fashion, there was a working group of Legislators, not only working with our Budget Review Office and our budget experts, but working with the County Executive's Budget Office and the County -- Deputy County Executive actually sitting in meetings for hours and hours, going over this budget, trying to come up with something that would satisfy the needs and protect the residents of this County, and, at the same time, trying to minimize the tax impact wherever possible.

We have been so overly dependent on sales tax revenues in these past years, and as Budget Review can attest to, the last quarter of sales tax revenues came in at \$5 million less than we had projected. And remember that last year, when we were going through the Operating Budget, the Legislature actually reduced the projections for the sales tax revenue by \$20 million, so we were already on the right track as far as seeing that the economy was starting to soften. But no one, no one, no matter how brilliant they are in economic forecasting, could have forecast what was going to happen on September 11th.

82

So I think that as we deliberate this right now, we can feel comfortable in knowing that we're doing the right thing for the residents of this County.

LEG. FISHER:

Madam Chairman, just very briefly, I want to thank Fred for those numbers, for those actual dollar amounts, because I would like to reiterate what Legislator Carpenter said. When you look at the dollar amounts, this is per year, this is a critical time in our history, and, certainly, a challenging time economically, and I don't think that these dollar figures on a per anum basis are exorbitant in any manner.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, I just -- I'm going to call a ten-minute recess. But before I call a ten-minute recess, I'm going to, as of right now, just withdraw my motion for amendments, and then when we get back, I'll make another motion. Thank you.

[THE MEETING WAS RECESSED AT 6:00 P.M. AND RESUMED AT 6:25 P.M.]

P.O. TONNA:
All Legislators, please come to the horseshoe. Roll call. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Barton)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Here.

LEG. GULDI:
Here.

LEG. TOWLE:
Here.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Here.

LEG. FISHER:
Here.

LEG. HALEY:
(Not Present)

LEG. FOLEY:
Present.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Here.

LEG. FIELDS:
Here.

LEG. ALDEN:
Here.

83

LEG. CARPENTER:
Here.

LEG. CRECCA:
Here.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
(Not Present)

LEG. BISHOP:

(Not Present)

LEG. BINDER:
Here.

LEG. COOPER:
Here.

LEG. POSTAL:
Here.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, here.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Here.

LEG. BISHOP:
Here.

MR. BARTON:
17, 1 not present. (Not Present: Leg. Haley)

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Thank you very much. I'd like to make a motion to amend Budget Amendment Number 3 by incorporating the following changes: Increase home heating fuel tax to 2.5% beginning March 2002. Restore Peconic Community Council \$43,000. Restore \$15,000 to Literary Volunteers -- Literacy. It says Literary here, though. Literacy.

LEG. TOWLE:
Okay. How apropos.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I'm reading what it says. Okay?

LEG. TOWLE:
How apropos.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Paul's the first client.

P.O. TONNA:
Or maybe I'm not. Maybe -- okay.

LEG. CRECCA:

Maybe you need some of that funding.

LEG. TOWLE:

May you're not reading, that's the problem.

P.O. TONNA:

No, I am. Literary.

MS. BURKHARDT:

It says Literary.

P.O. TONNA:

Yeah, it does say literary, right? Okay. For --

LEG. GULDI:

You know who she works for.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Reduce -- reduce various contract agencies \$200,000. Increase 2002 revenue estimates for home heating fuel oil to 14 million. And reduce Police District property tax from amounts included in original omnibus. And I -- and part of this motion to amend or to adjust and direct BRO, Budget Review Office, to make all necessary technical adjustments.

LEG. POSTAL:

Second.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Seconded by Legislator Postal.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

On the motion.

P.O. TONNA:

On the motion, Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Could you identify and quantify by contract agency where the \$200,000 in cuts is coming from?

P.O. TONNA:

Yes. Oh, yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, for the record.

P.O. TONNA:

Oh, can I do it? No.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

We don't have anything here? It's not in -- it's not as part of this resolution?

P.O. TONNA:
I don't -- I would ask, Jim? How about like "The King and I,"
etcetera, etcetera, etcetera? No? Do we have them?

MR. SPERO:
We don't have it.

MS. SIRACUSA:
These are additions to the County Executive's recommended budget --

P.O. TONNA:
Right.

MS. SIRACUSA:
-- that now will not take place.

P.O. TONNA:
Right.

MS. SIRACUSA:
You don't see it in your current omnibus, because they weren't --

P.O. TONNA:
Because they're not there.

MS. SIRACUSA:
-- there.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you.

LEG. CARACCILO:
But what agencies will be impacted by a reduction in contract --

P.O. TONNA:
No, there's no reduction. It's just not an addition, that's all, and
they're not in the omnibus.

LEG. CARACCILO:
Okay.

P.O. TONNA:
Period.

LEG. CARACCILO:
Next question. On the reduction of Police District property tax --

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, Michael.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
From amounts included in the original omnibus, quantify that amount.

P.O. TONNA:
Would you like me to give you the long story or the short?

86

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Short.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Budget Review, give him the short.

MR. POLLERT:
It's a good budget.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
There we go.

LEG. FOLEY:
All right, Freddy.

(Applause)

The revised detailed fiscal impact statement will be approximately as follows, and I want to emphasize it's approximately: The increase will be 11.89% combined for all funds. It will have an average tax impact for the average taxpayer of \$73 increase. The fallout on a town-by-town basis will be \$62 in Babylon, \$65 in Brookhaven, 123 in Huntington, \$86 in Islip, 127 in Smithtown, 27 in East Hampton, Riverhead will be a minus two, Shelter Island will be 17, \$9 in Southampton, and \$6 in Southold.

LEG. FOLEY:
Mr. Chairman.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Foley.

MR. POLLERT:
There will be some minor modifications, but it will not be too terribly significantly different from this.

LEG. FOLEY:
Mr. Chair -- Madam Chair.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes, thank you. Fred, just to give further clarification, if you look at the top of the Melvin, the County portion of the tax warrant, the General Fund increase, the change from the 2001 adopted to what's being proposed or amended here tonight, on the General Fund side, we're looking at an increase of \$7 per household?

MR. POLLERT:
That is correct.

LEG. FOLEY:
Could you just --

87

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, that is correct.

LEG. FOLEY:
And within the Police District, we're looking at a \$77 increase?

MR. POLLERT:
That is correct.

LEG. FOLEY:
Okay. Now, if we go down by a town-by-town breakdown, okay, which I know you'll be giving us a more detailed copy within the hour or so, for Brookhaven Town, for instance, we speak of \$65. But if we would break that down as to the way that people see it on their property tax bill, between the Police District and the General Fund, the General Fund increase in the Township of Brookhaven would be?

MR. POLLERT:
Relatively de minimus --

LEG. FOLEY:
Six?

MR. POLLERT:
-- as opposed to --

LEG. FOLEY:

Six? If it's 73 combined funds county-wide, and it's 65 within the Township of Brookhaven, we're probably looking at about a \$6 increase on the General Fund side, I would imagine.

MR. POLLERT:

What I would like to do is I would like to give you the detail --

LEG. FOLEY:

Right.

MR. POLLERT:

-- but it's approximately 10% of that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

MR. POLLERT:

That's correct.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. So it's \$6. And the remainder is the Police District?

MR. POLLERT:

It's actually a little bit more than 10%, but I would have to give you the detailed breakout.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Question.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Binder, then Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. BINDER:

Yeah. I guess it's actually a question for the Chair. It would seem that we're discussing the amendment, the budget amendment itself, rather than Legislator Tonna's amendment to the amendment. I would -- I would think that we --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Let's vote on the amendment.

LEG. BINDER:

SM110801.txt

-- probably -- right, try to focus on Legislator Tonna's amendment, and then we can continue to get more of the breakdown. I think it kind of happened, because Fred kind of went off into the numbers. Why don't we --

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Yeah.

LEG. BINDER:

Why don't we finish the one and then go on to the other?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Yeah, that's a good point. Any additional questions or comments on the proposed amendment to Budget Amendment 3? Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. LINDSAY:

I need an explanation.

MR. POLLERT:

Just because I was out of the room, I was wondering if -- just wanted to clarify with respect to the revenue estimate on the home heating fuels. That's on the base amount of what was originally forecast. That will float up, because there has been an increase in the rate.

P.O. TONNA:

Yes.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Thank you, Fred. Okay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Could I get an explanation of what we're voting on?

P.O. TONNA:

We're voting on the amendment to omnibus.

89

LEG. CRECCA:

Number 2.

P.O. TONNA:

Three. Three. Budget Amendment Number 3.

LEG. CRECCA:
Number 3. I'm sorry.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay? This is the -- this is the amendment. So we're adding -- we're putting this into the omnibus, and then we're going to vote on the omnibus. Am I saying that right?

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
I really worked on it this time.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes, you did, you actually said that right.

P.O. TONNA:
It used to be omni-bus. I'm growing with the job. Okay. And I even -- I didn't say Gaf-fi-ny, I said Gaffney, so I'm getting there. But it's still Caracciolo. All right, here we go. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

No.

LEG. ALDEN:

Nope.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. BINDER:

No.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

MR. BARTON:

13-4, 1 not present. (Not Present: Leg. Haley)

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you very much, or thank you very much. All right. Now we're going to Budget Amendment Number 3 as amended.

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman.

LEG. CARACCILO:

On the motion.

P.O. TONNA:

Motion to approve by myself.

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:

Wait. Motion to approve by myself, seconded by Legislator Postal.

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:

On the motion?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
On the motion, yes.

91

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you. Budget Review --

P.O. TONNA:
Then Legislator Binder.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
-- how much money is in this particular budget amendment for what is commonly referred to as Legislative initiatives?

LEG. CARPENTER:
None.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, then it's another term of art, maybe, but it's \$2.8 million in here. Some would call it "pork." It's \$200,000 per Legislative district, as I understand it; is that an accurate or inaccurate statement?

P.O. TONNA:
I will answer that. That's a totally inaccurate characterization.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
All right. Then what amount of money is in here for --

P.O. TONNA:
County-wide initiatives for not-for-profit organizations that restore cuts; Fred, how many?

MR. POLLERT:
\$2.6 million.

P.O. TONNA:
\$2.6 million.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
All right. Jim -- Jim told me 2.8 a few minutes ago. It's 2.6?

P.O. TONNA:

2.6.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. What agencies are receiving that funding, and what is the justification?

P.O. TONNA:

Well, I'd like to answer that first.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Because there are a lot of agencies that were -- that received cuts --

P.O. TONNA:

Right.

92

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

-- that were not restored and I think they should have an understanding why some cuts were restored and why others were not.

P.O. TONNA:

Well, I would say, just by function of the Legislative process alone, we've been involved in this, and, Michael, I think you've been involved in this for ten years now, in the Legislative process of where we take a budget that is suggested by the County Executive and we look at that, and we say, with our legal right to amend the budget, to come up with our own budget that controls the purse string. We were able to build consensus, if we get ten votes, or whatever else, on what we felt was important with regard to cuts that are made to the budget, and I think it's over \$20 million worth of cuts, to shifting the County Executive's forecasts on budget projections with regard to the sales tax, and also to be able to say, "Hey, we think this is underfunded, this is overfunded." I'll give you a perfect example for myself. I felt that the Dolan Health Center that provides service as basically the County Clinic, Health Clinic in the Huntington catchment, Smithtown catchment area was underfunded. So those are the type of things that we're talking about. I'd just -- I think Legislator Postal would like to also to address that, and then Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. POSTAL:

Yeah. I noticed, just in response to Legislator Caracciolo's question, that there's a restoration of funding for the Marine Education Program of Cornell Cooperative Extension. There's also --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

But it's not -- it's not restoring all of the funds that were cut.

LEG. POSTAL:

No, no. But, you know, it's -- there's an attempt to restore some of the reduction that was in the proposed budget. You know, I think that we recognize this is a tough budget. We can't do everything that we'd like to do, but this is an attempt to, I guess, moderate some of the cuts to programs that we felt were important programs. So that's why there's the restoration to Cornell. I can tell you, just for example, there's a restoration of funding which was cut completely for the Patient Navigator Program for victims of breast cancer, which is a program that's existed for at least three years and was completely defunded. So that there are restorations in as much as we could possibly do to vital programs which were cut in the proposed budget.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Mr. Chairman.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

My question simply was what was the justification for the --

LEG. POSTAL:

That was it.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

-- restoration of cuts?

LEG. POSTAL:

That was it.

P.O. TONNA:

Well, I think that -- I think that there were enormous amount of reasons, or whatever else, and discussions, and everything else that takes place in the Legislative process --

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, there were discussed.

P.O. TONNA:

-- which, Michael, you --

LEG. CRECCA:

They were --

P.O. TONNA:

You are --

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, they were discussed in the Omnibus Committee.

P.O. TONNA:

You are fully aware of. This is the Legislative process. This is what Legislators do. They prioritize based on, you know, their own thinking, information that they receive, and everything else. That's the same reason why some people vote for budgets, some people don't, some people do things. For example, I think that there was broad agreement among Legislators in this omnibus that, right now, the avenue of tobacco securitization was not the way to go. So we even looked, you know --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, that was a result of what took place in the Finance Committee, thank you. I think we exposed that fraud for what it was.

P.O. TONNA:

Michael, do you think at any point here that I was at all --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, I know you were not.

P.O. TONNA:

-- excluding you --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, I know you were not.

P.O. TONNA:

-- from the process of --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Mike.

P.O. TONNA:

-- you know, the reasoning that takes place? But it wasn't -- you know, of course, I'm glad that the Finance Chair was able to show that there would be much more reasonable ways of raising revenue. And so I implore you to vote for this budget, because this is a budget that looked and took very seriously at making the tough decisions in coming up with a budget that is post September 11th, where we know that when you have a County that is very dependent on sales tax revenue, that we need to put ourselves in the most solid footing. There were other restorations. For example, there are restorations or additions in our Police Department, in our Health Department to better prepare us for the possibility that right now we have a domestic threat of terrorism.

And so I think that this budget has done a -- the corporate work of Legislators. To put a budget as solid as this before us is really a testament, a testament to both --

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
If the speaker would suffer an interruption.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Sure.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Just a follow-up question on his original question. Fred, you're well aware of how tough this budget is. What did we do with relation to cutting Legislative initiatives with relation to last year's budget to this year's budget, round about? What was our initiative as Legislators in trying to conform to a very tough budget year? What did we do with relation to cutting Legislative initiatives ourselves?

MR. POLLERT:
Currently, there's been a reduction in the Legislative contingent account of \$400,000, which is a significant reduction from what was included last year and in previous years.

P.O. TONNA:
You mean for the community not-for-profit organization?

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Community not-for-profit.

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct.

P.O. TONNA:
Right. We cut 400,000 there, which is half. And for our process last year to this year in restorations or increases, I think that we're at 50% of what we were last year.

LEG. CARPENTER:
More than that.

LEG. CRECCA:
It's more than that, Legislator Tonna.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
I'm talking total, Fred.

MR. POLLERT:
Even more than that.

P.O. TONNA:
Yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:
I know, Legislator Binder after yourself. Legislator Caracciolo.
Right?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Okay. I notice that there's \$7,500 here for Rotary Club. Could I have
an explanation of what that's for?

P.O. TONNA:
I have no idea.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
See, that's the problem. There's stuff in here that got --

P.O. TONNA:
Well, it's not the problem. There's 14,000 subitems.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well --

P.O. TONNA:
I -- if you're asking me to be accountable for every single subitem,
you know, I could probably ask you the same questions.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Somebody requested \$7,500 for the Suffolk District Rotary, somebody on
this horseshoe.

LEG. CARPENTER:
I'll respond to that.

P.O. TONNA:
Sure. Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:
The Suffolk District Rotary is planning a Peace Conference at Suffolk
County Community College in April of 2002. They are leasing the Field
House and paying for it at a not-for-profit rate. They had asked

about the fact that there are windows in the building, and there are no way to block the light for presentations, audiovisual presentations during the day. When they were asked -- asked about whether or not there is going to be any room darkening devices that were going to be put there, they said they were told that the College budget had been slashed, they didn't have the appropriate -- they didn't have the money for it. The District Rotary is willing to -- wanted to go out to rent whatever equipment that they needed, and when they found out that the equipment would have to be fire retardant, it increased the cost of it appreciably and made it more cost effective to actually purchase it than to rent it. So they said that they would be willing to pay for half of it. So --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So, it -- I'm sorry.

LEG. CARPENTER:

So this is really an investment in getting this equipment for our Community College for the Field House to be used for future events at half the cost of it. It's to be considered a matching fund program.

P.O. TONNA:

You know, the --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Well, Legislator Caracciolo. Legislator Binder.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, I have a lot of questions regarding these. But in terms of Cornell, since Cornell was mentioned, what is the amount of the restoration, total amount?

LEG. POSTAL:

\$35,000. Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind.

P.O. TONNA:

Yeah, sure.

LEG. POSTAL:

\$35,000

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thirty-five out of 277,000 in the Marine Science Program, and nothing for the Diabetes Program.

LEG. POSTAL:

I don't know. Did you put in an amendment?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, because I'm not -- I'm not going to be sold and bought for to become part of something that is irresponsible.

97

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, thank you. Legislator Binder.

LEG. CRECCA:

May I respond to that?

P.O. TONNA:

Don't react. Don't -- let's keep the decorum.

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like --

P.O. TONNA:

Legislator Binder, I turn to you for decorum.

LEG. TOWLE:

Oh, boy. I make a motion to recess.

LEG. BINDER:

Not adjourn.

LEG. TOWLE:

No, recess.

LEG. BINDER:

Based Budget Review analysis of a problem, the problems inherent in Insurance and Risk Management not being in Audit and Control, I'd like to make a motion to amend the omnibus to move, based on Budget Review's analysis, move back Audit and Risk -- sorry, Insurance and Risk Management back into the Comptroller's Office.

LEG. FISHER:

Don't we have a motion to approve already?

LEG. TOWLE:

Second.

LEG. FISHER:

Don't we have a motion --

P.O. TONNA:
Yeah.

LEG. FISHER:
-- to approve already?

P.O. TONNA:
There's a motion to approve already.

LEG. BINDER:
I'd like to make a -- I was trying to make a motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Well, I'm --

98

LEG. BINDER:
And I would -- I would think the Chair would want to entertain all opportunities to amend, so we have a full --

P.O. TONNA:
You might think that.

LEG. BINDER:
So that we would have a full discussion on this, so there can be full opportunities, because the Chair -- because the Chair --

P.O. TONNA:
Tell me about the Chair.

LEG. BINDER:
-- has the microphone and has the ability to just cutoff debate and cut off all amendments just by yelling a motion themselves and not recognizing. I would hope that the Chair would recognize an amendment that --

P.O. TONNA:
I just recognized you.

LEG. BINDER:
-- that is by Budget Review Office, has already said in their analysis is something that they think is an important move.

P.O. TONNA:

Allan, I just asked Budget Review -- I mean my Legal Counsel, I just said, "Who cares? Sure. We'll recognize your amendment and then we'll vote it down and then we'll go on our way."

LEG. BINDER:
That's fine. That's fine.

P.O. TONNA:
All right. There's a motion and second to amend -- what is the amendment, Allan?

LEG. BINDER:
The amendment is to move Insurance and Risk Management back into the Comptroller's Office as per recommendation of the Budget Review Office.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. There's a motion by -- is there a second?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Second.

LEG. TOWLE:
I'll second.

P.O. TONNA:
Second? Okay, Fred.

99

LEG. TOWLE:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Seconded by Fred. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No.

LEG. FISHER:

No.

LEG. HALEY:

(Not Present).

LEG. FOLEY:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No.

LEG. FIELDS:

No.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

No.

LEG. CRECCA:

No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

No.

LEG. COOPER:

No.

100

LEG. POSTAL:

No.

P.O. TONNA:

Nope. Thank you.

MR. BARTON:

Six.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay.

LEG. CRECCA:
Move the question.

P.O. TONNA:
I'm going to vote --

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Henry, change my vote to a yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
I have a question.

P.O. TONNA:
No, just -- you have a question? Can we get this vote done?

MR. BARTON:
The vote was seven.

LEG. BISHOP:
Is this on the overall omnibus?

P.O. TONNA:
Yeah, let's just -- there's a motion and a second.

LEG. BISHOP:
I have two --

LEG. BINDER:
I'm --

P.O. TONNA:
No, you don't have the floor, Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:
I'm asking for the floor on the motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I have Legislator Bishop I'm recognizing.

LEG. BINDER:
Okay.

LEG. BISHOP:
I, of course, am proud to have worked on this omnibus, but I have two

concerns that didn't make into the omnibus and what I'm looking for is an answer from counsel about when is the appropriate time to do the following. If I want to reverse the fact that Cornell Cooperative's IPM Program is being paid for out of Fund 477 and would like that paid for out of the General Fund, do I do that now or do I do that subsequent to the vote on the --

MR. SABATINO:

At that point you want to make it part of omnibus, so you would make the motion now to amend omnibus to --

LEG. BISHOP:

Well, I mean, I don't need to make it part -- if the underlying merits can be considered after omnibus I'll do it after omnibus.

MR. SABATINO:

Well, then what you need -- then what we need to do is we need to create a stand-alone resolution, it will move to the end of No. 20 or 21.

LEG. BINDER:

So the only way to do it verbally --

LEG. BINDER:

They do, they'll do it; if it's a stand-alone they'll create it.

MR. SABATINO:

If you're making the request, I mean, Budget Review can do the stand-alone while we're going through the other -- we're going to spend some time going through these other bills and that stand-alone would be like No. 21 which would go -- you know, it would be at the end of that process.

LEG. BISHOP:

All right. And then the other concern I have is that there's not adequate security at Gabreski Airport and there's a need to put the sheriffs out there which would cost approximately \$250,000 next year. Can I do that as a stand-alone separately to the omnibus or do I need to amend -- attempt to amend the omnibus to have that included?

LEG. GULDI:

It's already filed.

MR. SABATINO:

It's the same situation which is that if you wish to make a motion you may.

LEG. BISHOP:

Same thing, I can do that, all right. In that case, I will wait until after the omnibus to discuss it.

LEG. CARACCILO:

Okay. I'd like to make a motion to amend and include the full restoration of funds that were cut for Cornell Cooperative Extension's

Diabetes Program, as well as the Marine Science Program.

102

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Is there a second?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No, full.

LEG. BINDER:
I'll second it.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Okay. There's an amendment to --

P.O. TONNA:
Who's made this amendment?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Caracciolo has made the motion, seconded by Legislator Binder.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And I'd like to know from Budget Review what the financial impact -- what's the increase in the taxes, tax rate for the restoration of Cornell?

LEG. CRECCA:
Are you going to -- I'm just --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Fred.

P.O. TONNA:
You're saying that you want to add to the budget?

LEG. CRECCA:
He wants to add to the budget. I guess he's going to vote for it.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I want to amend this particular --

P.O. TONNA:
Motion to add, to add to the budget.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Just as you did with the \$2.8 million, yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Right, you want to make an amendment. Okay.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes.

MR. POLLERT:

The cost is approximately \$400,000 in the Marine Science Program. The net cost on --

103

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No. Fred, my question was, what is the increase to taxpayers? What's a \$400,000 increase, how many pennies?

MR. POLLERT:

It's roughly a dollar-eighty per million.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So it's not even a million dollars, that's my point.

MR. POLLERT:

It's approximately a 72 cent increase --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

MR. POLLERT:

-- to the average homeowner.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So to restore two very good programs that we've heard from speakers today for 72 cents, I move that motion.

LEG. TOWLE:

Can you give me a breakdown one more time, Fred?

LEG. CRECCA:

I'm just -- Legislator Caracciolo, on your motion. Is that -- does that mean if we approve this, that you will be voting for the omnibus?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

I don't barter.

LEG. FOLEY:

Oh, come on.

LEG. CRECCA:

I wasn't -- I just -- if you were moving to amend it, I thought that --

LEG. BISHOP:

You're in the wrong place.

LEG. FOLEY:

I have a question.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

There's a motion and a second.

LEG. FOLEY:

Just on the motion, Mr. Chairman. Legislator -- through the Chair, Legislator Caracciolo, you have some stand-alone resolutions. I notice you have one, No. 11, which adds seventy-three-four-seventy-nine to the Cornell Cooperative Extension Entomology Program.

104

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Correct.

LEG. FOLEY:

If in fact your present amendment fails, you have the opportunity through the stand-alones to make that same motion.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you, Brian. I appreciate that. And thank you, Vivian, for reminding about that earlier.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Just roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes.

LEG. BINDER:

Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
That's an add, Allan, you're willing to add to the budget?

LEG. TOWLE:
Pass.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
No.

LEG. FOLEY:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
Nope.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

105

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
Nope.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
Five.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, thank you. Roll call on the amendment. I mean roll call on
Budget Amendment No. 3 as amended.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

106

LEG. ALDEN:
Nope.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
13-4, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you very much. Okay, now --

MR. POLLERT:
Excuse me. Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
No, I have a -- I want to take -- right now I would like to take out of order Certificate of Necessity No. 2068 - Amending Resolution No. 745-1968 for energy conservation purposes. I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Postal.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Explanation.

P.O. TONNA:
The explanation, this is amending -- it's an amending resolution for energy conservation purposes. This is -- this is the accompanying resolution that basically -- and I guess, Fred, maybe you could describe -- or Paul, you could describe it. This is the compendium to backup what we've done in omnibus.

MR. SABATINO:
Right, this is the funding mechanism for the energy charge from 1% up to 2 1/2%.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Roll call.

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman, on the motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, hold it a second.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Where's that bill?

P.O. TONNA:
Right here, right in front -- it's a CN, Michael. Legislator Binder,
you have the floor.

LEG. BINDER:
Yeah, just real short. I just think that putting a tax on a necessity
or restoring a tax to a necessity is a bad idea, particularly in times
when we have down turns. As we took away taxes on clothing and shoes
under \$110, I think this is comparable, and so I just think this is a
bad idea.

LEG. FOLEY:
Mr. Chairman?

LEG. POSTAL:
Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yeah, the effective date is March 1st of 2002, so it doesn't impact
this coming winter; is that correct?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
That's right.

LEG. FOLEY:
It does not impact this coming winter.

MR. SABATINO:
That's correct, it's March 1st.

LEG. FOLEY:
Thank you.

LEG. TOWLE:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you.

LEG. FISHER:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Fisher and then Legislator --

LEG. FISHER:
I would just like to remind --

P.O. TONNA:
-- Towle.

108

LEG. FISHER:
Remind my colleagues that when I asked the question this morning what kind of impact this would have, the response was \$40 a year.

LEG. BINDER:
Forty to fifty.

LEG. FISHER:
Possibly.

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yeah, I just wanted to go over the impact with Budget Review --

LEG. CARPENTER:
Mr. Chairman?

LEG. TOWLE:
-- and I also had a question of Counsel. What are we estimating that the impact is going to be? I know Kevin Rooney's number this morning was \$40; is that the \$40 additional to the 1%, or what numbers do you guys have on the impact per homeowner on the fuel tax in total?

MR. SPERO:
We did look at the entire fiscal impact, we didn't break it down to the average household.

MR. LIPP:
The only calculation we made per household was the reduction it would imply in property taxes which would amount to a \$25 per homeowner in 2002 and over five years an average of \$34 per homeowner.

LEG. TOWLE:
So as opposed to raising property taxes by adding this oil tax, it's \$25 less we have to increase in property taxes.

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

LEG. TOWLE:

So would one assume then that it is \$25, it's equivalent to \$25 or not?

MR. LIPP:

Not really because it's a different animal.

LEG. TOWLE:

Do you think that Mr. Rooney's number of \$40, based on looking at the information, per household, about an average obviously, is accurate or inaccurate from the numbers you looked at?

MR. LIPP:

I didn't do a calculation based upon home consumption of energy, so I'd have to defer to him, he is an expert in that field.

109

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay. So your calculation, the \$25 was just basically the one and a half percent increase, that's not the 1% that already exists.

MR. LIPP:

Correct, the additional one and a half percent.

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay. So what does the 1% represent then?

MR. LIPP:

The 1% represents on an annualized basis about -- about \$8 million.

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay. So on a property tax increase on that, what are we talking about?

MR. LIPP:

No, it's more than that. It's actually -- you know, the numbers I've been looking at, I can't remember off the top of my head, are closer to \$14 million for 1% if you look at the actuals. We were very conservative in estimating that the additional one and a half percent would bring in 14 million.

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay.

LEG. FISHER:

Fred, if I may. So the net impact on the households would be \$15 a year if the figures we heard this afternoon are correct? Because

they'd be saving 25 and he said 40.

MR. LIPP:
Oh, okay. If you look at it that way, yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
That's if we increase taxes. I mean, the reality is that that's --

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Towle, have you given up the floor?

LEG. TOWLE:
Actually, I didn't, but I was just --

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, let Legislator Towle finish.

LEG. FISHER:
Sorry.

LEG. TOWLE:
No, that's okay.

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Lindsay then Legislator Fisher. Okay? Sorry.

110

LEG. TOWLE:
So in essence we're talking --

LEG. FISHER:
No, I just said what I wanted to say.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you.

LEG. TOWLE:
So in essence, you know, using their number of \$40 this morning, you're saying the one and a half percent was a \$25 tax increase. What would the 1% be in a tax increase?

MR. LIPP:
It's about 16 bucks.

LEG. TOWLE:
Okay. So we're talking --

MR. LIPP:
Sixteen sixty-seven.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yeah, basically \$41.

MR. LIPP:
Uh-huh.

LEG. TOWLE:
So his number this morning about \$40 a household, I mean, the numbers seem to be almost equivalent to me.

MR. LIPP:
Uh-huh.

LEG. TOWLE:
And that's the point I'm trying to get at, it would be a \$41 tax increase or a \$41 increase per homeowner on the oil bill.

MR. LIPP:
That's possible. It's hard to come up with firm -- as firm numbers on home energy consumption because the data isn't there that I have. He might have it because he works in that industry.

LEG. TOWLE:
Okay. Just one other question to Counsel, Mr. Chairman. Any -- I had

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:
I had a twofold question. Any sunset provision on this or this actually becomes permanent until we remove it?

MR. SABATINO:
There's no sunset but you retain the authority and the right to change it any time you want, as long as you do it on 90 days notice. This is not like the tax on -- the exemption on clothing where you can only do it once a year. This particular one you can do whenever you choose, as long as you do it with the 90 day notice, 90 days in advance.

LEG. TOWLE:
And the one and a half percent tax increase on oil and the 1% tax increase is going where in our budget? I mean, obviously originally

SM110801.txt

my understanding was that it was originally dedicated to deal with the issue of the Southwest Sewer District; we obviously dealt with that issue. The 1% has remained in place, it's obviously I guess going into our General Fund, is that --

MR. SABATINO:

General Fund, right. The issue that you're raising goes back to the late 1970's. That was a pledge or a security or additional collateral for Southwest Sewer District bonds because of financing problems arising out of the New York City financial crisis. But the issue of that pledge ended when we passed a referendum in 1999 to use the quarter percent money to take care of all of the sewers.

LEG. TOWLE:

And this 2 1/2% is only on residential homes.

MR. SABATINO:

Residential facilities, correct.

LEG. TOWLE:

Not commercial.

MR. POLLERT:

That's correct.

MR. SABATINO:

That's correct, there's a separate stand-alone State tax on commercial.

LEG. TOWLE:

Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Carpenter, did you want the floor? Legislator Carpenter?

LEG. CARPENTER:

I'm sorry. I just wanted to clarify something that was said this morning when Mr. Rooney was here. He had stated very passionately that we were the only County in New York State charging 1% fuel tax, and he's right. Because if you look at the list of counties that are charging fuel tax, Albany 3%, {Allaganey} 4%, Cayuga 4%, {Chitaugua} 3%, {Lackawana} 7%, another district in {Lackawana} five and a quarter percent, 3%, two and a quarter, 5%, three and three-quarters. So I think for us to be restoring a part of the 3% that we were charging ten or 15 years ago to two-and-a-half certainly is not irresponsible. And trying to calculate what that might be, I think that generally

SM110801.txt

people have tanks that hold 250 gallons, 300 gallons, and even if you came down to an empty tank and had a fuel delivery, at five times a year would be really pushing it. So five times -- even if you wanted to say 300 gallons would be 1,500 gallons of fuel, so 1% of that would be -- or one and a half percent of that would be \$22.50. So again, I think per year or per heating season, so again, I think we need to put it in perspective. And again, at two and a half percent, we would certainly be in the range that goes from two and a quarter to 7%.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

P.O. TONNA:

Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No.

LEG. GULDI:

(Not Present).

P.O. TONNA:

Could -- I would ask that somebody find Guldi.

LEG. TOWLE:

No. Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

That means everybody.

LEG. TOWLE:

Yes.

MR. BARTON:

Legislator Towle?

LEG. TOWLE:

For the third time on that tax, yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yes.

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

113

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
Absolutely not.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yeah.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
13-4.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
13-4, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, thank you very much. Okay, now we go to --

LEG. TOWLE:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Excuse me? Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:

While you're doing CN's, there's another one in the packet, can we do that too and get that out of the way?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes. This is --

LEG. TOWLE:
2069.

114

P.O. TONNA:
-- 2069 - Approving the acquisition and appropriating quarter percent sales tax proceeds for the drinking water protection program open space acquisition (Fanning Landing Road Property, Moriches) Town of Brookhaven. Legislator Towle wants to make a motion.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Seconded by Legislator Caracappa. Explanation.

LEG. TOWLE:
I'd be happy to give it if you'd like.

P.O. TONNA:
Sure.

LEG. TOWLE:
Basically we had approved the purchase of a piece of property called Fanning Landing in Moriches. It's a joint acquisition between the Town of Brookhaven and the County of Suffolk. Unfortunately, although we approved it and the County Executive signed it and the contracts have been signed, the \$700,000 needed is not available in that account and it was moved to a different acquisition account and that's what this resolution does. By delaying this and not putting this through the normal process, we would not have been able to close on the property for another two-and-a-half months, and by doing this they can move forward with scheduling a closing.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Okay. There's a motion and a second. All in favor?

LEG. BISHOP:
On the motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Opposed? On the motion.

LEG. BISHOP:
I thought that this money was not available until next -- Paul?

P.O. TONNA:
Excuse me? Paul Sabatino. He's looking to the guy with the information.

LEG. BISHOP:
Quarter cent money is available this year, correct?

MR. SABATINO:
No. We did not -- we did not exhaust the full amount. We've only had two appropriations, one was for six million earlier in the year and there was a second one -- Well, the six million came from open space, the second one came from farmland, so we still have a little money left, yes.

115

LEG. BISHOP:
What is the closing date that you have?

LEG. TOWLE:
They're prepared to do the closing, but unfortunately there's not money in the account and that's what's delayed them from closing on this property now. And if I would have just filed the resolution on its own, by the time we voted on it and it got to the County Executive it would be December.

LEG. BISHOP:
This is remaining a 50-50 prop --

LEG. TOWLE:
Yeah, it still is 50-50.

LEG. ALDEN:
On the motion? Paul?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes. Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
Fred, this is a new quarter cent program.

LEG. TOWLE:

No, I think it's out of existing money, as Paul just said.

MR. SABATINO:

No, this is the pay-as-you-go, the new program.

LEG. ALDEN:

The new program.

MR. SABATINO:

As I said before, we've only appropriated once which was the six million.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Okay. Paul?

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Roll call. Oh, no. Just all in favor? Opposed? Great.

MR. BARTON:

17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you very much. That might be the last 17 vote. I have another CN, 2067, this is delegating to the County Comptroller of the County of Suffolk the power to authorize the issuance of and to sell not exceeding 250 million -- what's up with that? No, I'm joking -- Tax Anticipation Notes, this is a TAN's.

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion, Paul?

116

P.O. TONNA:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

To Budget Review, Fred?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

This is a normal thing that we do in the course of business every year?

MR. POLLERT:

That is absolutely correct. We have to borrow to meet cash flow because of the Suffolk County Tax Act.

P.O. TONNA:
All in favor?

MR. BARTON:
You need a motion.

P.O. TONNA:
I had made a motion, seconded by Legislator Postal.

MR. BARTON:
Thank you.

P.O. TONNA:
All in favor? Opposed? Approved. Okay, now we go back --

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. You want to finish the Budget Amendments or go -- all right, you want to go -- where is the agenda, this? Okay. We'll pick up No. 4 on the agenda, "To consider the vote of Bond Resolution, authorizing the issuance of additional 465 serial bonds, land acquisition," yada, yada, yada. (To consider and vote on IR 2043-2001; Bond Resolution, a resolution authorizing the issuance of an additional \$465,000 Serial Bonds of the County of Suffolk, New York, to pay part of the cost of the acquisition of land in connection with the construction of safety improvements on CR 16, Portion Road at Hans Boulevard, Town of Brookhaven (CP 3301).

MR. SABATINO:
What happened was at the last Legislative meeting in October we passed the appropriating resolution right at the very end and I think it was even a Certificate of Necessity and the Bond Resolution was not there, so this is to catch up to where we were on October 23rd.

LEG. LINDSAY:
What's the number on that?

117

LEG. CRECCA:
I don't have it.

LEG. BINDER:
Wait, wait. Hold on, everybody's a little confused.

P.O. TONNA:
I would ask --

MR. SABATINO:
It's in your folder.

P.O. TONNA:
It's in your folder.

LEG. ALDEN:
Which number is it?

MR. SABATINO:
2043.

P.O. TONNA:
It's on the Special Meeting of the County Legislature, Special Meeting Notice.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Just a quick background. We voted for this already as a body I think unanimously, this is part of the County Road 16 reconstruction process, we just forgot to do the bond.

LEG. CRECCA:
What --

LEG. FOLEY:
Second the motion.

LEG. CRECCA:
What bill is it? I just want the number.

MR. SABATINO:
2043A. It's item number four on the Special Meeting Notice.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Motion.

LEG. FOLEY:
Second. Second the motion.

P.O. TONNA:
There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Approved.

MR. BARTON:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
It's a bond, that's why --

P.O. TONNA:
Oh, roll call. Sorry.

MR. BARTON:
That's what we failed to do the last time.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

119

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present on the bond (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, thank you very much. No. 5 (To consider and vote on IR 2045-2001; Bond Resolution, a resolution authorizing the issuance of an additional \$81,456 Serial Bonds of the County of Suffolk, New York, to pay part of the cost of the rehabilitation of runway light systems at Francis S. Gabreski Airport including planning in connection therewith (CP 5726).

LEG. GULDI:
Motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Motion by Legislator Guldi

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Seconded by myself. Legislator Caracciolo, you want to second that?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Sure.

P.O. TONNA:
Seconded by Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. FOLEY:

Explanation.

LEG. GULDI:

This is part of an airport rewiring project that's eligible for and will receive 90% federal reimbursement.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Very good.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Roll call.

120

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:

Pass.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yes.

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yep.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present on the bond (Absent: Legislator Haley).

121

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you.

LEG. TOWLE:
The answer is yes, even though I passed.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. No. 6, No. 6 (To consider and vote on IR 2052-2001; Refunding Bond Resolution No. Of 2001 dated , a resolution authorizing the issuance pursuant to Section 90.10 of the LOCAL FINANCE LAW of Refunding Bonds of the County of Suffolk, New York, to be designated substantially "Public Improvement Refunding (Serial) Bonds" and providing for other matters in relation thereto and the payment of the bonds to be refunded thereby (if discharged from committee). I'll make a motion to discharge from committee and seconded by Legislator Crecca.

LEG. TOWLE:
Explanation.

P.O. TONNA:
Explanation. Paul?

MR. SABATINO:

This is the refunding initiative which the County Comptroller had recommended and it -- I believe it saves \$2.6 million for Fiscal Year 2002 and that's part of what the omnibus accomplishes which is to take advantage of the savings. So in order to implement that you need to adopt this resolution.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to amend that motion to discharge from committee and waive the rules, the one hour rule -- oh, you don't have to, Paul?

MR. SABATINO:

There's no one hour rule --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Great.

MR. SABATINO:

-- when it's specifically named.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, to discharge and to vote on?

LEG. TOWLE:

And approve.

P.O. TONNA:

Oh, to discharge and approve?

LEG. TOWLE:

Yeah.

122

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yeah.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. There's a motion and a second, seconded by myself. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. BINDER:

This is on the discharge.

P.O. TONNA:

And approve.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. HALEY:
(Not Present).

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
17 one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. No. 7 - (To consider and vote on IR 1937-2001; A Local Law in relation to the sale by Suffolk County of its rights to receive payments expected to become due under the master settlement agreement and the related consent decree and final judgement with various tobacco companies (public hearing closed on 10/23/01). I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Postal.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Explanation.

MR. SABATINO:
No. 7 is the Local Law that was tabled at the last meeting to today, but this is the Local Law that would be the one to implement and authorize tobacco securitization. Since the omnibus has reverse tobacco securitization, this should not be adopted, it would be inconsistent with the omnibus.

P.O. TONNA:
So we're just going to what, withdraw the motion? No, I can't do that.

MR. SABATINO:
Well, table it subject to call and then --

P.O. TONNA:
All right, I make a motion to table subject to call.

LEG. CRECCA:
Second.

LEG. GULDI:
Second.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Seconded by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? Thank you.

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, No. 8 - (To consider and vote on IR 2057-2001; a Local Law to enact domestic security probation fees (to be laid on the table and set public hearing)).

LEG. TOWLE:

Explanation.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, explanation.

MR. SABATINO:

Okay, the next series of bills which are number eight through number 17 are bills that have to be laid on the table. They implement a portion of the omnibus resolution but they require an aging process. So if they get laid on at this meeting they'll be eligible for the November 20th meeting.

P.O. TONNA:

So there is --

LEG. GULDI:

Can we do them all at once?

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah, do them all at once.

P.O. TONNA:

There is a change -- what?

LEG. GULDI:

Do them all at once.

P.O. TONNA:

Yeah. No. 9 --

LEG. BISHOP:

Can I ask --

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:

No. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, I'll make a motion --

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:

-- seconded by Legislator Postal to lay them on the table. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman?

125

P.O. TONNA:

And to set the meeting for --

LEG. BISHOP:

We have another vote and he's --

P.O. TONNA:

Wait. And --

MR. SABATINO:

And to set the public hearings.

P.O. TONNA:

And set the public hearing for?

MR. SABATINO:

For November 20th.

LEG. BINDER:

Mr. Chairman? I just want to know, the titles in here are not the titles --

P.O. TONNA:

Right, right, there is two words taken out, thank you, on each of them.

LEG. BINDER:

That's fine.

LEG. BISHOP:

Can you just --

LEG. BINDER:

That's fine, leave it alone.

P.O. TONNA:

They're going to be -- they're going to change the titles, but the substance of the bill is the same. All in favor? Opposed? Approved.

MR. BARTON:

17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

No. 9 - (To consider and vote on IR 2058-2001; a Charter Law to authorize one year rolling debt under 5-25-5 Law for domestic security; (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 10 - (To consider and vote on IR 2059-2001; a Local Law to impose Domestic Security Motor Vehicle Use Fee in Suffolk County (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 11 - (To consider and vote on IR 2060-2001; a Local Law to impose Domestic Security Motor Fuel Facilities Use Fees in Suffolk County (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

126

No. 12 - (To consider and vote on IR 2061-2001; a Local Law to impose Domestic Security Occupational Licensing Fees (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 13 - (To consider and vote on IR 2062-2001; a Local Law to impose Domestic Security Tax Map Verification Fees (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 14 - (To consider and vote on IR 2063-2001; a resolution implementing Domestic Security Bus Fares (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 15 - (To consider and vote on IR 2064-2001; a resolution to impose Domestic Security Parks User Fees in Suffolk County (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 16 - (To consider and vote on IR 2065-2001; a Local Law to impose Domestic Security Fees for Use of County Clerk's Office for Title Examination Purposes (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

No. 17 - (To consider and vote on IR 2059-2001; a resolution to impose Domestic Security Civil Service Fees (to be laid on the table and set public hearing).

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. No. 18, right? Yes. No. 18.

LEG. CRECCA:

Mr. Chairman?

LEG. BISHOP:

Mr. Chairman, I asked to be recognized. I just -- for the purpose of clarification and public knowledge, on items eight through 17 the words stricken are domestic security, correct?

P.O. TONNA:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you. So that's not in the title of -- so there's no longer a domestic security probation fee, it's a probation fee, right?

P.O. TONNA:

Right.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you.

P.O. TONNA:

Right. We felt that that would be clear.

LEG. BISHOP:

Good. I hope it's clear to everybody.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay, there we go. All right, No. 18. (To consider and vote on IR

127

1946-2001; a resolution to adopt the County Executive's Recommended Operating Budget for Fiscal Year January 1, 2002, through December 31, 2002 for the County of Suffolk (if discharged from committee). This is 18 -- what are we doing with 18?

MR. SABATINO:

Eighteen is no longer relevant. There was -- that would have adopted the budget as submitted.

P.O. TONNA:

All right, so we're not doing that; 19 or 20, right?

MR. SABATINO:

You have to do something with it just so it cleans up the record for the Clerk.

LEG. CRECCA:

Make a motion to table subject --

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I'll make a motion to table subject to call, seconded by
Legislator Crecca. All in favor? Opposed? That's 18.

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
No. 19?

MR. SABATINO:
Now 19 was completed earlier when we did the budget amendments.

LEG. CRECCA:
Motion to table subject to call.

MR. SABATINO:
No, no, no.

LEG. POSTAL:
We did that already.

P.O. TONNA:
We did it already.

MR. SABATINO:
Nineteen has already been done.

LEG. CRECCA:
Sorry.

MR. SABATINO:
We're now currently in No. 20 at Budget Amendment No. 4.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, so let's get to Budget Amendment No.4, back to the other sheet
(Remove \$150,039 for salary increases above 3%, reinstate existing

salary structure). Okay. There is a motion by Legislator Caracciolo
and a second.

LEG. FISHER:
Explanation.

P.O. TONNA:
Wait, wait, there has to be a second; is anybody going to second this?

Let me guess.

LEG. BINDER:

I'll second for an explanation.

P.O. TONNA:

Legislator Binder wants to second this for purposes of an explanation.
Legislator Caracciolo?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, it indicates it removes \$150,000 -- 150,039 for salary increases that were granted above 3% and reinstates the existing salary structure and Budget Review could elaborate.

MR. POLLERT:

The County Executive had proposed a reorganization in the titles in the Law Department so that they were more comparable with those of the recently approved District Attorney salary structure. What this budget amendment would do would be to restore the existing salary structure in the Law Department.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

What were the salary increases above the 3% level, Fred?

MR. POLLERT:

There was a whole variety of them because it's a no salary structure which is being proposed, so that the salary increases were not equally distributed, but it was a salary structure which the Law Department felt would be closer to the salary structure granted to the District Attorney's Office. The Law Department did receive a salary increase as part of the exempt salary increase that was granted by the Legislator.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

If you combine those two salary increases, what amount would that be?

MR. POLLERT:

It would come -- approximately an average about 5% -- whoops.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Based on the increases that the District Attorney received, it's approximately a 9% increase over what they received through the exempt agreement.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, my question was if you combine what they received through the exempt salary increase and that 9%, what is that figure?

MR. POLLERT:

It's a total of approximately 9% salary increase.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. So it's a reduction of only \$150,000. That shouldn't be too difficult for people to understand given the fact that the CPI right now is 2 1/2% for this year.

P.O. TONNA:

Vote.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Anyone else?

P.O. TONNA:

Yes, let's go.

LEG. TOWLE:

Just one question, just one question, I'm sorry. How many people does this affect, Fred? How many people is this --

P.O. TONNA:

Countless millions.

LEG. TOWLE:

Well, it's 150 something thousand dollars. Give me a ballpark.

MR. POLLERT:

Just one moment, we'll look it up.

LEG. TOWLE:

Sorry.

MR. DUFFY:

Approximately 60 individuals.

LEG. TOWLE:

Sixteen individuals.

LEG. FOLEY:

Six oh.

MS. BRAATEN:

Six oh?

MR. POLLERT:

Six zero.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So what is the average of reduction; if you divide 60 into \$150,000, how much are these people going to be sacrificing?

LEG. BISHOP:

2750.

130

MR. POLLERT:
Roughly \$2,500.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And if you calculate leaving it as it is, what was a 9% increase?
Three percent represents 2,750, are we saying that these people
received an average of eight or \$9,000?

MR. POLLERT:
No. What we're removing is the additional 5% on top of the three that
was originally included.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Right.

MR. POLLERT:
So it's -- the three that they received was worth --

P.O. TONNA:
Are we almost voting on this?

MR. POLLERT:
Go ahead.

MR. SPERO:
It could be up to \$7,500 per individual.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I'm sorry?

MR. SPERO:
Upwards of \$7,500 per individual.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you. A \$7,500 increase when we have people being unemployed,
when we have programs being slashed that would only require
seventy-two cents to restore, costing millions of dollars in
individuals. Eighty-five individuals will be laid off at Cornell,
that was what we heard before, and on this end we have people
receiving \$7,500 increases, six-and-a-half percent above the cost of
living.

LEG. TOWLE:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
I've got to follow-up on this.

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Caracciolo, are you done?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

131

LEG. TOWLE:
It's just a question. The \$7,500 represents --

MR. POLLERT:
The \$7,500 would represent the entire raise including the three.

LEG. TOWLE:
The entire raise that was proposed in the 2002 budget.

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct, as well as --

LEG. TOWLE:
Are they getting that?

MR. POLLERT:
-- the previous raise that was previously approved by the
Legislature, that's all embedded.

LEG. TOWLE:
Okay. The raise that was approved by the Legislature was how many
percent, what was the percent?

MR. POLLERT:
Three point two five percent.

LEG. TOWLE:
And we did that when?

MR. POLLERT:
That was done in the --

MR. SABATINO:
August.

MR. POLLERT:
August some time.

LEG. TOWLE:
August, that's fine. So we gave them 3.2% then they got another 3%, is being proposed.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Five.

LEG. TOWLE:
Five or three?

LEG. FISHER:
Five.

MR. POLLERT:
Five.

LEG. TOWLE:
So altogether they were getting 8.2.

132

MR. POLLERT:
Approximately.

LEG. TOWLE:
And Legislator Caracciolo is trying to cut it back to 5.2.

MR. POLLERT:
No, he's cutting it back to the 3.25.

LEG. TOWLE:
Okay.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

Pass.

LEG. TOWLE:

Pass.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Pass.

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Pass.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Pass.

LEG. CRECCA:

Pass.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

No.

133

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

No.

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
No.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

MR. BARTON:
Ten.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay.

MR. BARTON:
10-7, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
No. 5.

LEG. FOLEY:
Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:
Yeah.

LEG. FOLEY:
That was included in the omnibus, so I withdraw the --

P.O. TONNA:
Number 5? Thank you.

LEG. FOLEY:
I withdraw the resolution.

P.O. TONNA:
No. 6 (Reduce 2001 \$19,000 for Mattituck Chamber of Commerce, Shelter
Island Senior Citizens \$50,000, increase 2002 for both agencies).
Legislator Caracciolo?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Oh, I'm sorry.

P.O. TONNA:

Do you have a motion?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes. This is a revenue neutral resolution. It simply takes money that could not be used by the Mattituck Chamber of Commerce and the Shelter Island Senior Citizens Association for 2001 and rolls it over into 2002. Revenue neutral, Dave. It doesn't increase taxes, it doesn't add money, it's revenue neutral.

LEG. CRECCA:

Was this a -- was this not-for-profit monies? Where was this; where did this come from?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Fred, where did this money come from? And by the way, speaking of money, in this year's budget for what you call --

LEG. CRECCA:

I wasn't -- I was talking to Budget Review, Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, I'm answering your question.

P.O. TONNA:

Legislator Crecca has the floor. Legislator Caracciolo, you'll have -- you'll have the floor when --

LEG. CRECCA:

I'm just asking where the money is coming from.

MR. POLLERT:

It was a funding for a not-for-profit agency that could not be expended.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Right.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CRECCA:

No, I have another question, I'm sorry --

P.O. TONNA:
Oh, sorry, Legislator Crecca.

LEG. CRECCA:
-- for Budget Review.

P.O. TONNA:
I apologize.

LEG. CRECCA:
And what would -- if the monies don't get transferred over, I know you're saying it's revenue neutral, but does it -- doesn't it go back to the -- into the tax warrant, reduce the tax warrant?

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, it would. It would increase the size of the fund balance, which in turn would be applied as a credit to the tax warrant.

LEG. CRECCA:
So if we don't approve this, then the tax -- the dollars that would be saved here, I know it's not much, but it would go back in taxpayers' pockets; correct?

MR. POLLERT:
That's correct.

LEG. CARACCILO:
Fred, how much money would go back to taxpayers' pockets, since we want to play this charade?

LEG. FOLEY:
Come on, Mike.

MR. POLLERT:
It would be a total of \$69,000.

LEG. CARACCILO:
No, no, no, no.

LEG. CARPENTER:
It wasn't a charade for 150,000, that wasn't a charade.

LEG. CARACCILO:
Give me the -- per average taxpayer in Suffolk County, how much does that equate to?

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. I would say let's just --

MR. POLLERT:

It's about 12 cents.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Thank you.

136

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Let's go. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

MR. BARTON:
There's no second.

LEG. GULDI:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
There's no second. It fails for lack of a second.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
George seconded it.

P.O. TONNA:
Who did?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
George.

P.O. TONNA:
Oh, George, okay. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
No.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
Pass.

137

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
No.

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes? An add?

LEG. BINDER:
No, it's revenue neutral.

P.O. TONNA:
Oh.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

MR. BARTON:
Six. (Absent: Legislator Haley)

138

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. No. 7, I think that was included.

LEG. FOLEY:
Withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. No. 8, I think that was already in, right? No. 8,
Legislator Guldi?

LEG. GULDI:
Yeah, it was in the omnibus; correct?

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. No. 9?

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Withdrawn.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. No. 10.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Withdrawn.

P.O. TONNA:
No. 11, Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, it's quite evident, and I know from conversation that the County Executive has had with people at Cornell, including several people in various programs, he's in support of this resolution, unless something's changed in the last few hours.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. So are you making a motion?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
In addition, I'd like to make a motion to amend this and restore the complete funding for the Marine Scientist -- Marine Science Program that was previously reduced in the omnibus, as well as the Diabetes Education Program.

LEG. GULDI:
Second.

LEG. FISHER:
I'll second that.

LEG. CRECCA:
I'm not sure.

LEG. BINDER:
You're the author, you don't have to make the motion.

139

P.O. TONNA:
I don't --

LEG. CRECCA:
I'm not sure what the motion is.

P.O. TONNA:
I'm going to ask -- I'm going to ask Legal Counsel what was -- what just transpired, is that legal, possible? Can he amend an amendment and -- wait.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

You did it with omnibus over and over and over again.

P.O. TONNA:

Can I say something? I'm sure if our Legal Counsel says it's fine, then it's fine.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

But you should know that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Mike, Mike, Mike.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

You stood there and made all kinds of budget amendments.

LEG. FOLEY:

Michael. Let him go, Mike. Let him go.

P.O. TONNA:

But, Michael, I am -- I have limited cerebral power in these things.

LEG. GULDI:

That's for sure.

P.O. TONNA:

I will do this on my own --

LEG. FOLEY:

Mike. Mike.

P.O. TONNA:

-- and I will ask our Legal Counsel. I don't have the breadth of experience that some of you might have.

MR. SABATINO:

You can vote on his motion to amend his resolution.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay.

LEG. FISHER:

I'll second it.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay.

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
So Michael, can you put it into a form that actually the Clerk can do his "Clerky" thing?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I think the Clerk -- the Clerk understands the intent here.

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
It's to restore --

P.O. TONNA:
Well, I want to hear it again for the Legislators so that they can vote.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
All right, we'll get the numbers quantified by Budget Review. What was the cut --

LEG. FOLEY:
Page 112 of the discretionary omni notes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
What is the amount, Brian, do you have it there?

LEG. FISHER:
399,107.

LEG. FOLEY:
Well, just on the record, it's 399,107 for the Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Science Program, \$277,893 for the Diabetes Education Program conducted with the Department of Health Services.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
And Mr. Chairman, just to reflect --

LEG. FOLEY:
State aid is reduced -- well, never mind.

LEG. FISHER:
One hundred thousand.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
The net cost to the Marine Science Program after State aid and other aid, it comes out to \$27,000.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay.

141

LEG. BINDER:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
All right. Legislator Binder.

LEG. BINDER:
I just have a parliamentary inquiry of --

LEG. BISHOP:
I don't know if that's true.

LEG. BINDER:
-- of Counsel.

P.O. TONNA:
That's okay. Legislator Binder has a parliamentary inquiry.

LEG. BINDER:
Just a question because --

P.O. TONNA:
I've read Robert's Rules of Orders -- wait.

LEG. BINDER:
The author of the amendment made a motion to change his own amendment; is that required or can he just amend just by -- instead of making a motion, can he just change his amendment right now on the floor and then vote on it as he changes it?

MR. SABATINO:
The reason we're having to go through the motions tonight is because we don't have sufficient time to recreate the hard copy documents. So under ordinary circumstances, if he had made -- excuse me -- the request earlier in the day and there was sufficient time, then you're right, there wouldn't be a need for the motion, but what we're trying to do to expedite the votes tonight is to make the motion.

LEG. BINDER:
Yeah, but even -- wait a minute. If it passes by motion it's going to be changed -- the hard copy's got to be changed anyway. So if he just says, "I'm changing" -- because you said he can do the motion, that doesn't mean he must. My thought is that if Legislator Caracciolo could just change it and then we'll vote on it as changed, we can -- right, as long as he makes it clear what changes he just made, why vote twice? It's a waste of time. Let's --

LEG. BISHOP:

Why do we have to vote to let him change --

MR. SABATINO:

This meeting has been different than in past times because in past times we've had the ability to develop the document.

LEG. BINDER:

But if we pass the amendment anyway, you'd have to change the document

142

in any event. So why just not let him change it, it doesn't make a difference, that's what we've always done. Let the Legislator change the thing, we'll vote on it as changed; what's the difference?

LEG. FOLEY:

No, no.

MR. SABATINO:

We've never done that before. We've had hard copies because -- especially when you're making a dramatic change, I mean, this is going from 73,000 on one line to whatever it's going to be on four or five lines. So I think the motion is in order.

LEG. BINDER:

So do we have a hard copy on the omnibus where we made all the changes? I don't have the hard copy on a dramatic change.

MR. SABATINO:

That's why we made the motions. That's the point I was communicating to you which is the reason we made all the motions was to get it on the record.

LEG. CRECCA:

Does the Chair recognize the motion? Does the Chair recognize the motion?

P.O. TONNA:

Yes, I recognize the motion. Does the Clerk feel comfortable that they have a motion that they -- okay.

MR. BARTON:

I just need a second.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Does Budget Review feel that they have a motion that they can, you know --

MR. POLLERT:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
No. Fine.

MR. POLLERT:
Just because the sponsor had indicated that the net cost was lower than what we believe the net cost to be, I need clarification of what I'm going to restore. Under D -- Number D-5, the budget was reduced a net of \$576,000. We are not showing any aid on the Marine Science Program. If we're to restore something else, I need to know what number the sponsor wants to have restored.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Okay. Mr. Chairman, could --

143

P.O. TONNA:
What is the number that you would like to have restored, Legislator Caracciolo?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, I think we need -- we need a point of clarification --

P.O. TONNA:
Okay.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
-- because the Executive Director, Acting Executive Director, Sally Foulke, who's still here, could get up and respond, a --

P.O. TONNA:
No, I'm not going to --

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, of course not, of course not.

P.O. TONNA:
Just ask -- get your Aide to ask her.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
I mean, you don't want a clear record, you don't want to do the right thing.

P.O. TONNA:
Michael, you want to make --

LEG. FOLEY:
No, Mike.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
You just want to ramrod, railroad --

LEG. FOLEY:
Mike. Michael.

P.O. TONNA:
Michael.

LEG. FOLEY:
Michael, it's not how you win friends and influence people here, Mike.

P.O. TONNA:
Wait.

LEG. FOLEY:
You're trying to get this thing to pass.

P.O. TONNA:
Wait, Michael.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Well, acting like a sap doesn't either.

144

LEG. FOLEY:
Mike. Mike, come on.

P.O. TONNA:
With all due respect, you wanted to make an amendment. You have an opportunity to make an amendment. I don't want testimony. Make your amendment, so it's clear for Budget Review, that's all. Whatever it is, make a clear amendment.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
You heard -- you heard the numbers recited by Legislator Foley. Those are the gross numbers, the net numbers are less.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Fred, did you hear the numbers articulated by Legislator Foley?

LEG. FOLEY:

It's on page 112. I believe what the sponsor of the resolution is attempting to do is to reverse the reduction or the removal of monies from Cornell Cooperative Extension. And he's reversing the removal, if you will, to the -- it's D-005. The motion is to add or to restore 399,107 for the Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Science Program and restore 277,893 for the Diabetes Education Program conducted within the Department of Health Services.

MR. POLLERT:

And that's --

LEG. FOLEY:

That's on page 112.

MR. POLLERT:

Right. And that's a -- but when the omnibus was done, what the omnibus struck in funding was \$576,959 net --

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. So then --

MR. POLLERT:

So to restore the program --

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes, 570 -- the lower numbers?

LEG. CARACCILO:

576.

MR. POLLERT:

-- that is what needs to be restored.

LEG. FOLEY:

Fine.

P.O. TONNA:

What needs to be restored?

LEG. FOLEY:

Five --

LEG. CARACCILO:

Seventy-six.

MR. POLLERT:
576,959.

P.O. TONNA:
Five, \$5, 550, what?

MR. POLLERT:
Five hundred seventy-six thousand, nine hundred and fifty-nine dollars, plus the amount for the entomologist.

P.O. TONNA:
Which is?

MR. POLLERT:
Which is --

LEG. FISHER:
Seventy-three.

MR. POLLERT:
Which is 73,000.

LEG. FOLEY:
All right. You make the motion.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
That's the motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Okay, there's the motion.

LEG. FISHER:
Fred, I have a question. I was on line, I think I was --

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Yes, Legislator Fisher is next.

LEG. FISHER:
Okay. I believe there's some confusion with regards to how much money comes back to the County. Is that what Legislator Caracciolo was referring to?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yeah.

LEG. FISHER:
Can you, please, expand on that? We heard testimony this afternoon that for every dollar that we spend, \$20 comes back. Does that come back to the General Fund, does that go back to the program? Can you, please, explain how that process works?

MR. POLLERT:

It may come back to Cornell Cooperative Extension, it does not come to the County. Suffolk County's funding is a 163,789, and then funding for the management salaries is 273,637, so there's a total of \$436,000 of which we removed \$400,000. Therefore, if funding comes back, it comes back to Cornell but it is not an offset like State aid for Health or Social Services or anything else. Our net cost is the two numbers that I cited.

LEG. FISHER:

Thank you, Fred.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Move the motion.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Who's the second? Is there a second?

LEG. FOLEY:

I'll second it.

P.O. TONNA:

Legislator Foley seconded it. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

MR. BARTON:

On the amendment.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

(Not Present).

LEG. TOWLE:

(Not Present).

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No.

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. HALEY:

(Not Present).

LEG. LINDSAY:

No.

LEG. FIELDS:
Pass.

147

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

MR. BARTON:
Seven, the amendment fails.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you. Okay. Now, you have a motion, right, Legislator
Caracciolo? Is there still -- there still is a motion for No. 11,

right? Okay. You have a motion to pass?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Correct.

P.O. TONNA:
Is there a second? Is there a second?

LEG. GULDI:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, yes. Is there a second?

148

LEG. BISHOP:
I'll second it.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, Legislator Bishop. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Pass.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
No.

LEG. FOLEY:
This is for the -- this is for No. 12?

MR. BARTON:
Eleven.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes, yes.

MR. BARTON:
Legislator Lindsay?

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

149

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
No.

LEG. TOWLE:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay.

MR. BARTON:
Four.

P.O. TONNA:

SM110801.txt

Okay. We have, let me see, No. 12 - Add \$134,213 for four new positions for Terrorism Response Unit. Legislator Caracciolo?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Motion to approve.

P.O. TONNA:
Motion to approve. Is there a second?

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Guldi.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
This request was made by Dave Fischler, Commissioner of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services.

P.O. TONNA:
Great. Roll call.

LEG. CARPENTER:
On the motion.

LEG. CRECCA:
On the motion.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

150

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Wait, wait.

LEG. TOWLE:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
I already did it. I'm sorry, Angie.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
No.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
Nope.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No, these were already added.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
(Not Present).

LEG. CRECCA:
They were added already, right?

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yeah, they were added already.

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
Nope.

LEG. BISHOP:
(Not Present).

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Bishop?

LEG. CRECCA:
He's absent.

MR. BARTON:
Four.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay, great. Motion fails. Next, No. 13, covered by the omnibus already.

No. 14 (Restore \$49,000 for South Fork Rural Health Initiative, 001-HSV-DDB1, Increase State Aid \$10,500). Legislator Guldi?

LEG. GULDI:
Yeah, motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Motion by Legislator Guldi. Is there a second?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Second by Legislator Caracciolo. Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
No.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Is it in or --

P.O. TONNA:
No.

LEG. FISHER:
It's not in the omnibus.

LEG. CRECCA:
No, we're doing 14, she's looking at the wrong one.

LEG. FOLEY:
I'm a yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
(Not Present).

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
Nope.

MR. BARTON:
Five.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. No. 15, that's included in omnibus. No. 16 --

LEG. FOLEY:
I withdraw that.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, thank you. No. 16 (Add \$175,406 for five Park Police Officer I positions).

153

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Motion by Legislator Caracappa, seconded by Legislator Carpenter.
Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes, cosponsor.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
Pass.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
(Not Present).

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
Pass.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

154

P.O. TONNA:
No.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

MR. BARTON:
Eight.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. No. 17 is already in omnibus. That's withdrawn?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
No. 18 (Add \$69,939 for a Senior Civil Engineer for Bridges and Structures.)

LEG. FOLEY:
Motion.

P.O. TONNA:
Legislator Foley. Is there a second?

LEG. FOLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to have as an offset gasoline.

P.O. TONNA:

Gasoline what?

LEG. FOLEY:

Gasoline --

LEG. BINDER:

On the fire.

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, if you look at other offsets it says "offset gasoline". The gasoline account.

P.O. TONNA:

The gasoline account.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right?

P.O. TONNA:

What is the gas -- how are we doing with the gasoline account? I know some people have been throwing some gasoline today.

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, if I hear a second I'll explain it.

155

P.O. TONNA:

Do we have a second?

LEG. FISHER:

Second.

P.O. TONNA:

Vivian, don't encourage him.

LEG. FOLEY:

The Budget Review Office has stated within their review of the proposed budget that with the drop in gasoline prices that we can prudently use the gasoline account, if you will, for some offsets.

Additionally, they made the recommendation to include this Senior Civil Engineer position for Bridges and Structures because the current Senior Engineer will most likely within the next year or two retire. And part of the problem that that department has experienced over a

number of years is there hasn't been a mentoring program to bring younger engineers into that -- into the different departments to get them ready to take over the reins of that division once the division director retires. So this is a way for the Bridges and Structures Division to develop, if you will, a mentoring program, bring in a Senior Civil Engineer who would be ready within the next two years to fully assume the responsibilities of the Senior Civil Engineer position once the current person retires after many years of service.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Roll call.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Roll call for the gasoline.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
Legislator Fisher?

P.O. TONNA:
For the gasoline, Legislator Fisher.

LEG. FISHER:
Oh, yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

LEG. GULDI:
No.

LEG. TOWLE:
No.

156

LEG. CARACAPPA:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
No.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
(Not Present).

P.O. TONNA:
Just say pass while you're looking. He said no.

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
No.

LEG. POSTAL:
No.

P.O. TONNA:
No.

MR. BARTON:
Three.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. Now, we're on to -- No. 19 has been withdrawn.

LEG. FOLEY:
That was --

P.O. TONNA:
In omnibus.

LEG. FOLEY:
-- contained within omnibus so I'll withdraw the motion.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. No. 20 (Add \$278,595 for six Deputy Sheriff I positions and 4X4 vehicle for new Gabreski Airport Security Unit).

LEG. GULDI:

Motion.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. This is No. 20 by Legislator Guldi.

LEG. FOLEY:

Just on the motion, Mr. Chairman.

P.O. TONNA:

Wait, wait. Let there be a second first.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'll second it.

P.O. TONNA:

You're going to second it?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

On the motion.

P.O. TONNA:

Wait. Legislator Guldi is making the motion, Legislator Caracappa is seconding it.

LEG. GULDI:

On the motion.

P.O. TONNA:

On the motion, Legislator Guldi, then Foley, then Caracciolo.

LEG. GULDI:

Okay. I need to -- I wanted to -- this is a bill that will provide one full-time duty Security Officer at our airport, at Gabreski Airport. The facility has 1,100 acres and is a shared or joint use facility between a civilian airport and a military base operation. The civilian airport has 75, approximately, based aircraft and two fuel farms. The base -- in addition, on a seasonal basis the aircraft that use the facility include aircraft of every character and nature in the aviation industry. Frequently in the summer it is used by high profile business executives and celebrities who have high security needs. The Air Guard Operation Base at Gabreski Airport, as many of you know, is unique in that it provides literally flying fuel tanks to permit long-range helicopter operations for search and rescue. The -- they -- in addition to the fuel capability in the aircraft, they have their own fuel farm operations.

The security at the civilian side of the airport prior to September 10th was nothing at all. The facility demarcation between the civilian air side of the facility and the military side of the facility literally on the air field consists of a red line painted on the pavement. We, I feel it's critical, must provide a level of security at the facility. The facility is by most -- by aircraft travel time, about 11 minutes from Plum Island, 15 minutes from the Millstone Power Reactors, and depending on the air craft type, as much as a half hour from the New York City central core area. I think that it is critical that we, as the airport owner, provide a level of security. The proposed amendment provides literally one officer on duty around the o'clock, that's what it would require. I urge you all to take the responsibility for this security operation seriously. I think it's something that we must pay attention to given our current climate.

LEG. BISHOP:
Madam Chair, you're in charge now?

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:
I just want to echo Legislator Guldi's sentiments. I don't think there's any resident in Suffolk County that doesn't want us to take a long, hard look at security issues. And this proposal is not an east end proposal, it's not a south fork proposal, it's a Suffolk County, it's a Long Island, it's a United States proposal. It is probably the type of initiative that ultimately will be reimbursed by the Federal Government. Now, they've been slow -- Well, or relatively slow, they're not prepared yet to issue their guidelines into how they're going to help local governments, but let's assume that providing assistance so that local governments can provide adequate security is forthcoming. So I think as a fiscal issue it's probably going to be -- ultimately have no impact.

LEG. ALDEN:
On the motion.

LEG. BISHOP:
Furthermore, even if it does have a local impact, it's something that we should be doing, as Legislator Guldi articulated.

LEG. FOLEY:

Mr. Chairman?

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator -- excuse me. Legislator Alden, then Legislator Carpenter, then Legislator Foley.

LEG. ALDEN:

Legislator Guldi, maybe you have the answer to this. Isn't security being provided right now by the Sheriff's Department?

159

LEG. GULDI:

At the moment it's being provided, it has been since it was requested after September 11th on an ad hoc basis. They're unfortunately doing it with over -- without a budget appropriation and without adequate personnel requiring substantial overtime, so it will be a cost overrun in their department. It's not in the budget but it's being provided on an emergency basis without a budget allocation.

LEG. ALDEN:

One other question. I don't know if you know the answer or not, but are they applying for that emergency relief under federal --

LEG. GULDI:

I don't know the answer to your question, but I can say that we have had the beginnings of a series of meetings with all law enforcement agencies in the region including the State police, the security personnel of the Air National Guard, the Town police and all involved agencies to conduct a security review and create a security plan. This measure is intended to be an ad hoc measure until we complete that security review and implement whatever are appropriate and necessary indicated security measures at that time.

LEG. ALDEN:

Thanks.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Thank you. I just wanted to verify with the Budget Review Office that we did include in the omnibus resolution increased fees at Gabreski Airport.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, it is part of the RESOLVED clause that there will be increased fees. However, because we didn't know exactly what to include at this point in time, it was not included as a revenue in omnibus.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay.

MR. POLLERT:

So it's a directive to the division to increase the fees.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. And especially in light of what Legislator Guldi said, that there are 75 aircraft based there, that there are a lot of high security needs, people that are flying in and out of there, I think it is imperative that they're paying their fair share. Because in reviewing the Operating Budget, it came to light that the amount of revenues that that we're generating there are far, far below what they should be, that in many instances fees are being waived because they're purchasing fuel at the airport. So as long as I know that there's a commitment to look at that overall structure, I'm very happy to support this. And I would just ask Legislator Guldi if you would let me know when those meetings are being held.

160

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Legislator Foley?

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I just spoke a few moments ago with the sponsor of the resolution. And if we turn to page 282 of the operating -- Recommended Operating Budget, I mentioned earlier about BRO's recommendation that the gasoline and diesel fuel accounts, and this is right on page 282, the second diamond, "If prices stabilize at or near the current price, the recommended 4.23 will be in excess of what will be needed. If they are further reduced, recommended amounts may be overstated by as much as \$1 million in light of the situation in the Middle East." The BRO goes on to recommend a reduction of 750,000 which is included in the Omnibus, but when we look at this proposed resolution it's an additional \$278,000, which would make it roughly about a million dollar reduction in the gasoline price, gasoline account which I don't think is too onerous. I think it would be a way to make this resolution, although it already speaks for itself but it makes it more palatable for those who are concerned about any tax implications. So Mr. Chairman, through the Chair, would the sponsor want to use the gasoline account as an offset?

LEG. GULDI:

Is that -- do you concur that the account's available, Budget Review, and that would be an appropriate and a level offset, or do you think that gasoline pricing is too unstable to take that steep of an offset?

LEG. FOLEY:

And even if it does increase, there's other accounts that I'm sure we could transfer into the gasoline account.

MR. POLLERT:

When we had done our estimate in the report on October 19th, the fuel oil prices have continued to track down. We felt confident that the \$750,000 that was included in the omnibus, at this point in time if the prices don't go up, there should be the possibility of generating another \$250,000 of savings in the gasoline accounts. So truly the market is very volatile, but if they continue to hold at this level there should be additional savings there in that \$250,000.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yeah. And if there's a spike next year --

LEG. GULDI:

So was that a yes or no, Fred?

LEG. FOLEY:

It's a conditional yes.

LEG. GULDI:

Give it to me that way.

MR. POLLERT:

It's a conditional yes. If -- because there's a lot of volatility, we were conservative and used \$750,000. If the current gasoline prices hold through 2003, there's another \$250,000 there.

LEG. FOLEY:

And just to the point, Madam -- Legislator Cara -- Legislator Guldi, we do this on an ongoing basis. If, in fact, there's a spike next year, we can make an interdepartmental or interfund transfer, we've done that before.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah. So, I mean, it's what the will of the body is. Since we have to vote on the amendment separately, I'll make the motion to amend the

-- amend No. 20 to use the gasoline account as indicated as an offset --

LEG. FOLEY:
I'll second it.

LEG. GULDI:
-- so that it is a revenue neutral amendment, we'll vote on the amendment and --

LEG. FOLEY:
I'll second the motion.

LEG. GULDI:
-- see whether or not it's palatable to a majority of the Legislators.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yeah, I'll second the motion.

LEG. ALDEN:
On the motion.

D.P.O. POSTAL:
Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:
Fred, I don't need the exact numbers, but to add these six positions at 278,595, is that cheaper than covering these positions with overtime?

LEG. GULDI:
Oh, absolutely.

MR. POLLERT:
Yes, it's much cheaper than covering it on overtime.

LEG. ALDEN:
Thanks.

MR. POLLERT:
But there is a greater level of assurance with reimbursement if we

incur overtime expenses. So we do anticipate these costs are being claimed to the Federal Government. It is far less expensive to cover it at straight duty time than on overtime, but there's a greater probability of reimbursement with the overtime.

LEG. ALDEN:

These positions couldn't be filled immediately anyway, right, so that they're going to have to cover it on an overtime basis for like the immediate future.

MR. POLLERT:

That is correct, yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay, thanks.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Legislator Fields?

LEG. FIELDS:

During the budget meetings we heard from Alice Amrhein and she had said that they were meeting with the FAA and there may be criteria that would make us place these positions at the airport anyway. So I think we'd be acting in a positive manner in order to protect the Island and Suffolk County if we do it now.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

All right. There's a motion to amend --

LEG. GULDI:

The motion to amend and the second would be first.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

And that was on the amendment to --

LEG. GULDI:

The amendment to No. 20.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

-- use gasoline savings as the offset.

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

Okay. There's a motion and a second to amend Budget Amendment 20 to offset the cost so that it's revenue neutral with gasoline savings.
Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Pass.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:
Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yes.

LEG. BINDER:
Yes.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
There we go.

LEG. GULDI:
All right. Motion to approve as amended.

164

LEG. FOLEY:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
That was, it was done.

MR. BARTON:
I have a motion and a second.

P.O. TONNA:
All in favor? Opposed?

MR. BARTON:
17, one not present (Absent: Legislator Haley).

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you very much. And the last --

LEG. FISHER:
Withdraw.

P.O. TONNA:
No. 21 is withdrawn. Okay. Do we have --

LEG. CARACCILO:
Mr. Chairman?

P.O. TONNA:
Wait, just wait. Do we have any other --

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes, you do.

LEG. FISHER:
What do we have?

P.O. TONNA:
What else do we have?

LEG. FOLEY:

We have to go back to your --

LEG. BISHOP:

I think Budget Review was huddling in the corner when I had a conversation with Counsel about --

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Legislator Caracciolo?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Could Budget Review just indicate what the actual increases are subject to finalization, this draft that they distributed?

P.O. TONNA:

Right. What I would like to do -- Fred, if I can just -- do we need a break and come back with the numbers basically?

165

MR. POLLERT:

Why?

P.O. TONNA:

You've got to have some time, right?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. In fact, what I handed out is I handed out a change to the two and three based upon the amendments that were done on the floor. So we have a draft on two and three. We will have to price out these individual ones.

P.O. TONNA:

How long will it take?

MR. POLLERT:

How long is it going to take, Vickie?

MS. SIRACUSA:

Can't we have till tomorrow?

MR. POLLERT:

Would it be possible to fax it out to the Legislators tomorrow so we don't have any other mistakes?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

All right. Based on what's in two and three --

P.O. TONNA:

Yes. But wait, just wait one second.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Based on what's in two and three, could we have for the record what the numbers are?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. Then Legislator Bishop, you'll be recognized after Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. BISHOP:

I had an amendment.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay.

MR. POLLERT:

Just because we have to go through to finalize it, the tentative increase was the County Executive had proposed a 9% increase and the increase adopted by the Legislature would be 14%; 14.1%.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What's the dollar amount?

166

MR. POLLERT:

The dollar amount would be a tax increase of less than \$20 million.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, no.

D.P.O. POSTAL:

No, per house, on the average house.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What's the dollar per household?

MR. POLLERT:

How would you like it?

P.O. TONNA:

Wait, wait. Guys? We have a Legislator who still has an amendment to make, so let's just hold off.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Let's just get this on the record what the average increase is per house.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. But Fred, if you look at that line it says \$88, change from 2001 adopted is --

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. If you want it on the average homeowner, that's \$88, that's correct.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you.

P.O. TONNA:

Thank you. Okay. Legislator Bishop, you have an amendment you would like to make?

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes. Mr. Chairman, I believe that one of the actions in the omnibus is inappropriate and may even be illegal in that one of the items is that Cornell Cooperative IPM Program is funded from the Quarter Cent Drinking Water Program, and I'm not -- Well, as one of the sponsors of the Quarter Cent Drinking Water Program I think that's inappropriate, and I think that that program should be funded out of the General Fund. So my amendment is to move the Cornell Cooperative IPM Program from Fund 477 to the General Fund 001.

P.O. TONNA:

Okay. There's an amendment -- there's a motion. Who seconds that?

LEG. GULDI:

Second.

P.O. TONNA:

Second by Legislator Guldi. Roll call.

MR. BARTON:

Fred, is this amendment 22 then?

P.O. TONNA:

This will be Amendment No. 22.

MR. BARTON:

Thanks, Paul.

P.O. TONNA:

You're welcome, Henry.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No.

LEG. TOWLE:

No

LEG. FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. HALEY:

(Not Present).

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No.

LEG. FIELDS:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Abstain.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Pass.

LEG. CRECCA:

No.

LEG. D'ANDRE:

No.

LEG. BINDER:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

P.O. TONNA:
No. No, there's a scowl for you, no.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

MR. BARTON:
Nine.

P.O. TONNA:
Thank you very much. Okay. I can --

LEG. GULDI:
Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. TONNA:
-- I guess, adjourn the meeting, right?

LEG. GULDI:
Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. TONNA:
Yes, Mr. Guldi.

LEG. GULDI:
On Budget Amendment No. 4, I wanted to make a motion to reconsider.

LEG. TOWLE:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
Budget Amendment No. 4. Could you just -- just hold it one second.

LEG. GULDI:
I was on the prevail --

P.O. TONNA:
Budget Amendment No. 4, to reconsider. Thank you.

LEG. GULDI:
Yeah. That was the raises for the --

P.O. TONNA:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
-- County Attorneys, the -- I was on the prevailing side, and I'm --

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. So there's a --

169

LEG. GULDI:
I'm reflecting on a constrain to make a motion to reconsider.

P.O. TONNA:
Okay. There's a motion to reconsider.

LEG. TOWLE:
Second.

P.O. TONNA:
And a second. All in favor? Opposed?

(Opposed Said in Unison by Legislators)

LEG. GULDI:
Roll call.

P.O. TONNA:
Roll call.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Barton*)

LEG. GULDI:
Yes.

LEG. TOWLE:
Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:
No.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
(Not Present).

LEG. FISHER:
Yes.

LEG. FOLEY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. FIELDS:
No.

LEG. ALDEN:
Yes to reconsider.

LEG. CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:
Yes to reconsider.

170

LEG. D'ANDRE:
No.

LEG. BISHOP:
To reconsider? Sure.

LEG. BINDER:
No.

LEG. COOPER:
Yes.

LEG. POSTAL:
Yes.

LEG. D'ANDRE:
Change my vote to a yes.

MR. BARTON:
Okay, Mr. D'Andre.

P.O. TONNA:
Yes. All right. Thank God they can't take verbals --

MR. BARTON:
Thirteen.

P.O. TONNA:
-- for a record. Thank you. Now, I'll make a motion to -- oh, all right. So now what do we have?

LEG. GULDI:
It's before us. Now we have to --

P.O. TONNA:
Now it's before us. Is there a motion to approve? No. So the motion

SM110801.txt

fails for lack of a second. Thank you. Just -- that does not
stricken, you understand that. Thank you.

[THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:00 P.M.]